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Abstract
This thesis deals with politeness and its realization in a classroom discourse. The theoretical part describes the most influential politeness theories and also the findings on the topic of teaching pragmatics and linguistic politeness. The research in the thesis focuses on analysis of teachers’ verbal realizations of politeness as found in the recordings of four English lessons. The research was designed to verify the two hypotheses: (1) teachers are basically polite in a classroom of English as a second language and (2) politeness strategies of Czech teachers of English differ from those of native speaking teachers. The analytical part adopts the viewpoint of Brown and Levinson’s positive and negative politeness. The last part of the thesis aims at summarizing the implications that this thesis, its theoretical summary and its research, have for teaching English as a second language.
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Abstract
Tato diplomová práce se zabývá zdvořilostí a její realizací v diskurzu školní třídy. Teoretická část popisuje nejvlivnější teorie zdvořilosti a také zjišťuje v oblasti výuky pragmatiky a jazykové zdvořilosti. Výzkum v této práci se zaměřuje na analýzu slovních realizací zdvořilosti v promluvách učitelů, které se objevily v nahrávkách tyší lekcí anglického jazyka. Výzkum byl navrhnut tak, aby ověřil dvě hypotézy: (1) učitelé jsou v zásadě zdvořili v hodinách angličtiny jako druhého jazyka a (2) zdvořilostní strategie eských lektorů se liší od zdvořilostních strategií lektorů, kteří jsou rodilí mluvčí. Analytická část považuje hledisko pozitivní a negativní tváz BJZ Brownové a Levinsona. Poslední část práce usiluje o shrnutí důsledků, která tato práce, její teoretická část a výzkum, má pro výuku angličtiny jako druhého jazyka.
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1. Introduction

This diploma thesis deals with *Aspects of politeness in a classroom of English as a Second Language*. The most popular method or approach in the English language teaching methodology in the past few years has been the so-called "Communicative approach." The name of this approach already reveals that the communicative skills of learners and communication itself are emphasized. This thesis concerns with the parallel between the TEFL methodology and linguistics. The link between the two can be subtle, but is crucial. It is understandable that research in linguistics reflects in TEFL methodology. A quite recent turn in linguistics away from langue disciplines towards parole disciplines and recent findings in studies concerned with pragmatics can be visible in the turn in TEFL methodologies away from methodologies focused predominantly on structure of language such as "Grammar-Translation Method" towards methodologies focused on language use in real life contexts, such as the aforementioned "Communicative approach." Students generally learn the language in order to be able to communicate, and their goal is to be able to express any type of speech act, including requests or apologies that are essential for the topic of politeness. Politeness is a part of communication, and therefore plays a vital part in the process of language learning and in a classroom of English as a second language in general.

One can sometimes hear students or the general public questioning the reason why demanding courses in linguistics, such as morphology, phonetics and phonology, semantics, lexicology, syntax, text linguistics, pragmatics and psycholinguistics, are studied by students of faculties of education in such detail, when such knowledge is dispensable for language teaching. This thesis strives to advocate the opposite. As already mentioned, recent findings in linguistics are reflected in English textbooks and teachers' resources, but the teacher is the one who should understand the importance of what is taught, because s/he is the one who is usually in charge of L2 teaching.

In the first part of the thesis, the theories of politeness will be outlined. Later on, current approaches to teaching politeness in the ESL classroom will be introduced in order to see more clearly how the theoretical knowledge is applied to the practice of language teaching. It is very important for learners to acquire the language use and also to know how to speak politely to be able to save their and other party's face. Learners' language acquisition mainly happens in a classroom, in the interaction between the
teacher and students and between students and students. Politeness is learned when having explicit teaching of politeness in mind, but also during friendly teacher/student chats or during classroom management. Teaching linguistic politeness is a way of promoting the learner’s pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence has been claimed to be the most difficult aspect of language to master in learning a second language (Blum-Kulka and Sheffer, 1993: 219). Thomas (1983: 92) affirms that an individual’s linguistic competence consists of grammatical competence and pragmatic competence; the latter is defined as the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context. Thomas (1983: 96–97) stresses the importance of pragmatic failure by comparing it with grammatical errors:

Grammatical errors may be irritating and impede communication, but at least, as a rule, they are apparent in the surface structure, so that H [the hearer] is aware that an error has occurred. Once alerted to the fact that S [the speaker] is not fully grammatically competent, native speakers seem to have little difficulty in making allowances for it. Pragmatic failure, on the other hand, is rarely recognized as such by non-linguists. If a non-native speaker appears to speak fluently (i.e., is grammatically competent), a native speaker is likely to attribute his/her apparent impoliteness or unfriendliness, not to any linguistic deficiency, but to boorishness or ill-will. While grammatical error may reveal a speaker to be a less than proficient language-user, pragmatic failure reflects badly on him/her as a person.

All the above-mentioned words show the importance of politeness teaching and learning in a classroom of English as a second language and these words also reveal the utmost motivation of the author to dedicate the following text to politeness in combination with L2 classroom.

This thesis will not focus only on theory, but it will also map particular situations in model classrooms in its practical part. The practical section is based on the analysis of verbal politeness aspects, as found in video recordings of four English lessons on the intermediate level taught by four different teachers of English. The topic of the four lessons was always the same and it was concerned with politeness in general. It is hoped that we will see many different politeness aspects in every single classroom and that some differences will be caused mainly by the changing of one variable, i.e. the teacher
himself/herself. This change of one variable should influence aspects of politeness, since politeness is assumed to unfold in its unique context and to be predominantly situational.

There are two hypotheses that research in this thesis strives to verify: (1) teachers are basically polite in a classroom of English language, and (2) the politeness strategies of Czech teachers of English differ from those of native speaking teachers.
2. Overview of Linguistic Politeness

The origin of the English lexeme 'polite' lies in the Latin past participle form *politus*, meaning 'polished'. The same is true for the French term *poli*, which is the past participle of the verb *polir*, meaning *to polish*. "The etymological roots of the terms 'polite' and 'politeness' in English are thus to be found in notions of cleanliness, a smooth surface and polished brightness which can reflect the image of the beholder" (Watts, 2003: 33).

Politeness has been studied since the 1960s from the perspectives of many scientific fields – psychology, philosophy, sociology, ethnomethodology, social anthropology and linguistics. This thesis will be focused on the most prominent one, i.e. the linguistic point of view. Since politeness can be understood as an instrument, it is logical that the research of politeness is usually classified as a part of linguistic pragmatics (pragmatics), a discipline that studies language from the functional point of view and assesses the appropriateness of use of certain elements of speech in particular communication (Chejnová 2005: 191).

The pragmatic turn in linguistics dates back to the second half of the 1960s. Yule (1996: 4) follows Morris in describing pragmatics as the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. While syntax is the study of how linguistic forms are arranged in a sequence, and semantics examines the relationship between linguistic forms and entities of the world, pragmatics is concerned with the notion of implicature, i.e. implied meaning as opposed to the mere lexical meaning expressed. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning, or contextual meaning, and dwells upon how more than what is said is expressed and the expression of relative distance in a natural language setting (Yule, 1996: 3). Much linguistic research has moved from langue disciplines, focusing on competence, to parole disciplines, emphasizing language performance. The parole perspective brings context into linguistics, i.e. the relationship between speaker and addressee, illocutionary effect, topic and motivation of communication, and due to this every text or discourse is considered a unique event of perception and creation.
2.1 Roots of Linguistic Politeness – Austin, Searle, Grice

We should first mention the theories of the “fathers of pragmatics” in brief to see the framework of politeness concepts that will be analyzed later on in the text. First and foremost, we should mention John Austin, the author of theory of speech acts. His lecture series named *How to Do Things with Words* (1962) reveals that we not only say things, but we also do things when using language. A speech act is therefore an utterance, functioning as a unit of communication. There are three components in a speech act: the Locutionary Act (producing the actual meaningful utterance), the Illocutionary Act (the intended significance and socially valid verbal actions, such as ordering, warning, undertaking etc.) and the Perlocutionary Act (the actual effect of the utterance, or what we achieve with an utterance, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, surprising, misleading). The Locutionary Act and Illocutionary Act are always realized simultaneously, these two are inseparable (Hirschová 2004: 165). The Illocutionary Act determines a certain illocutionary force. When the illocutionary force is different from the Locutionary Act, this situation is called an indirect speech act. A typical example of an indirect speech act is a request formulated as a question: *Could you open the window?*

Building upon Austin’s work, J. R. Searle (1965) argues that to understand language one must understand the speaker’s intention. Since language is intentional behavior, it should be treated like a form of action. A theory of language is a part of theory of action (Searle 1969: 17). When one speaks, one performs an act. Searle proposes that all acts fall into five main types: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.

The aim of the speaker is to make the addressee understand his intention. To convey the illocutionary force, the speaker can use intonation, punctuation, and verb performatives (verbs, such as promise, invite, apologize, and forbid, that explicitly convey the kind of speech act being performed), or the illocutionary force can be assigned to the interpretation itself. Sometimes the type of the Illocutionary Act comes from the context of a communication, for example *I am here by car* as a reply to *I missed my bus* is an offer. However, as a reply to *Would you like some wine?*, it means a
refusal. Due to these hints the act is called Illocutionary, because the word illocutionary derives from the word illoquor, meaning unexpressed. (Grepl, Karlík 1998: 419).³

Furthermore, Searle specifies the conditions that each Illocutionary Act must fulfill. He divides these conditions into three types: preparatory conditions (e.g. a preparatory condition for reprehension is the fact that the addressee has done something wrong), sincerity conditions (the subjective standpoint of a speaker, e.g. a sincerity condition of a question is the speaker's desire to learn something new) and essential conditions (the aim of the speaker, e.g. the essential condition of an announcement is to inform the addressee about the content). (Grepl, Karlík 1998: 426-429)

The basis of the majority of linguistic theories on politeness could be traced back to the Cooperative Principle of H.P. Grice. His theory can be succinctly illustrated by the following sentence, taken from his essay Logic and Conversation:

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. (Grice, 1975: 45)

The participant of a conversation is therefore expected to formulate his utterances as it is adequate for a certain phase of a conversation (Grepl, Karlík 1998: 421). Grice suggests four conversational maxims under the Cooperative Principle which are prerequisites for a successful and effective communication (Grice 1989: 28-29):

The Cooperative Principle (abbreviated to CP)

QUANTITY: Give the right amount of information: i.e.
1. Make your contribution as informative as required.
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

QUALITY: Try to make your contribution the one that is true: i.e.
1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

RELATION: Be relevant.

MANNER: Be perspicuous; i.e.
1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly.
The floating of these maxims can lead to uncohesive communication or misunderstanding. Even though the CP is always valid, participants of a conversation often break its principles, for which they usually have a reason. When a speaker breaks one of the maxims, the addressee starts thinking of the reasons the speaker might have had. S/he starts adding the missing pieces of a conversation that were not explicitly mentioned, but are still somehow present in the utterance, and the speaker wishes the addressee to understand them. These implicit parts of utterances are called conversational implicatures. The presence of a conversational implicature must be capable of being worked out (Grice 1975: 50). One of the reasons for breaking a maxim can also be politeness. An example of this is when a wife tells her husband, "The Novák family are coming over for dinner tonight and the husband replies, "It will be nice to see Jana. The husband's reply floats the maxim of quantity, but is more polite than explicitly saying that he doesn't like Mr. Novák (Hirschová 2006: 156).

Moreover, Grice himself maintains that some maxims are more important than others, and he also acknowledges that these maxims are often violated. Nevertheless, they seem to form the basis of any rational conversation. Grice also points out that his list of maxims is not final, and identifies other important maxims, e.g. "Be polite.

There are, of course, all sorts of other maxims (aesthetic, social, or moral in character) such as "Be polite that are normally observed by participants in talk exchanges and these may also generate nonconventional (i.e. conversational) implicatures. (Grice 1991: 308)

These words have inspired many linguists who have elaborated on Grice's suggestion for a certain politeness maxim. Names connected with linguistic politeness are Robin Lakoff, Geoffrey Leech and Brown and Levinson and Watts. There are other linguists who deal with politeness (e.g. Fraser and Nolen, Eelen, Scollon and Scollon), but the theories of Lakoff, Leech, Brown and Levinson and Watts are generally considered the most influential ones. Accordingly, this thesis will focus predominantly on the latter. The term linguistic politeness refers to strategies that aim at conflict-free communication, especially Leech's Politeness Principle, and also at the self-realization and the self-defense of a speaker in a conversation. The theories of the above-mentioned
linguists have shaped the perception of linguistic politeness, and they will provide a framework for the research in the practical part of this thesis.

2.2 Robin Lakoff and Politeness

The idea that politeness can be studied and interpreted as adhering to certain pragmatic rules was first worded by Robin Lakoff in her essay The Logic of Politeness: or, Minding your p’s and q’s (1973: 45). Here, Lakoff defines politeness as forms of behavior that have been developed in societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction. According to her, pragmatic competence consists of a set of sub-maxims, namely:

1. Be clear
2. Be polite.

The continuity of Grice’s thought is clear, especially in the fact that Grice’s Cooperative Principle in a way overlaps with Lakoff’s first rule. Again, there are many situations in which the requirement of the first maxim (be clear) is more important than the other one (be polite), and vice versa. Lakoff (1973: 297-298) clarifies this relationship by asserting that, Politeness usually supersedes. It is considered more important in a conversation to avoid offense than to achieve clarity. This makes sense, since in most informal conversations, actual communication of important ideas is secondary to merely reaffirming and strengthening a relationship. Lakoff characterizes politeness from the perspective of the speaker, identifying three sub-types (in Hirschová, 2006: 171):

1. formal (or impersonal) politeness (Don't impose/remain aloof).
2. informal politeness: hesitancy (Give options)
3. intimate politeness: equality and camaraderie (make A feel good: be friendly/act as though you and the addressee were equal)

These strategies (distance, deference and camaraderie) are usually applied in different circumstances. When the relationship between the speaker and addressee is not close, formal politeness should prevail, and the speaker must conform to social etiquette. The speaker should be indirect, and in certain situations can be considered reserved.
According to Lakoff, informal politeness is typical of women. A speaker using strategies of informal politeness can sound indecisive, because s/he leaves the decision to the addressee.

Intimate politeness is typical for conversation between close friends. If the relationship between the interlocutors is not close enough, this strategy can be troubling (Chejnová 2012: 37).

In brief, Lakoff views politeness both as a way to avoid giving offense and as a lubricator in communication that should maintain harmonious relations between the speaker and the hearer.

### 2.3 Geoffrey Leech and the Politeness Principle

As already mentioned, Grice’s cooperative maxims do not cover all the situations that we may come across in communication. These maxims do not even consider some specific situations. Moral and ethical values seem to be excluded from Grice’s point of view. Therefore, even when adhering to all cooperative maxims we may very well be impolite. Grice’s maxims are focused on truth value, adequacy and the content of our contribution in general. In situations where polite, social behavior is required, it is not advisable to adhere to the Cooperative Principle. To add the missing piece, Geoffrey Leech provides us with the “Politeness Principle” (PP), delineated in his book *Principles of Pragmatics* (1983). Following this principle seems to be just as important as following the cooperative one (Hoffmannová, 1997: 100).

Leech formulates the Politeness Principle by giving us a set of maxims. His concept is based on the terms *self* and *other*. In a conversation the *self* would be identified as the *speaker* (or anybody or anything close to the speaker), and the *other* would normally be identified as the *hearer* (or anybody or anything associated with the hearer). An interesting example related to who or what is considered to be a speaker (s), and who or what is considered to be a hearer (h), and indeed one which may shed light on this division, is when referring to s’s or h’s spouse (Leech 1983: 132): s’s has to be more polite in referring to h’s spouse than in referring to s’s own spouse. Even in this area, however, there are cross-cultural variations: in some societies, a man discussing his wife will treat her as *self* and therefore feel free, perhaps even obliged, to denigrate her; but in other societies, he will treat her as *other*.
The PP is formulated (1983: 81) in a general way according to Leech as follows: in its negative form “minimize (other things being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs,” and in its corresponding positive form “maximize (other things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs.” The goal of the PP is to maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly relations which enable us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative in their communication with us. The PP employs six maxims (that tend to go in pairs) to perform its functions. The six maxims with their corresponding sub-maxims go as follows (1983: 132):

1. **TACT MAXIM**
   a) Minimize cost to *other*;
   b) Maximize benefit to *other.*

2. **GENEROSITY MAXIM**
   a) Minimize benefit to *self*;
   b) Maximize cost to *self.*

3. **APPROBATION MAXIM**
   a) Minimize dispraise of *other*;
   b) Maximize praise of *other.*

4. **MODESTY MAXIM**
   a) Minimize praise of *self*;
   b) Maximize dispraise of *self.*

5. **AGREEMENT MAXIM**
   a) Minimize disagreement between *self* and *other*;
   b) Maximize agreement between *self* and *other.*

6. **SYMPATHY MAXIM**
   a) Minimize antipathy between *self* and *other*;
   b) Maximize sympathy between *self* and *other.*

When commenting on these maxims of politeness, Leech argues that not all the maxims are equally important. The tact maxim is more important than the generosity maxim, and the approbation maxim is more important than the modesty maxim. Politeness in general is predominantly concerned with the *other*, and because the sub-maxim b) is always more important than sub-maxim a), we can again say that in general
the negative politeness (i.e. avoidance of conflict) is more significant than the positive one (seeking concord) (1983: 132-133).

Here, as in the Cooperative Principle, we are dealing with maxims that should be followed in order to reach the desirable outcome and not with rules that must be followed in all cases. As Searle writes (1969: 33), “conversational principles and maxims are regulative rather than constitutive.” Therefore, we cannot expect interlocutors always to adhere to these principles; for example, if a participant of a conversation strictly followed the modesty maxim, his/her contributions could easily float the quality maxim, and the conversation in general would sound rather bizarre (Hirschová 2006: 158). Leech himself acknowledges this with the pragmatic paradox, i.e. interlocutors would never be able to communicate in the event that both participants of a conversation were equally determined to be polite. (Leech, 1983: 110 ÷ 114)

To judge the appropriateness of the degree of politeness in a certain speech event, Leech introduces five scales (1983: 123):

1. The COST-BENEFIT SCALE on which is estimated the cost or benefit of the proposed action, A to s or h. For example, an offer (e.g. Sit down, please.) brings more benefit to the addressee than a request does (e.g. Wash the dishes, please.)

2. The OPTIONALITY SCALE on which illocutions are ordered according to the amount of choice which s allows to h. A request in the imperative (e.g. Help me!) gives addressee a smaller amount of choice than the same request formulated as question (e.g. Could you help me, please?)

3. The INDIRECTNESS SCALE on which, from s’s point of view, illocutions are measured with respect to the length of the path (in terms of means-end analysis) connecting the illocutionary act to illocutionary goal. For example, an interpretation of Close the window, please is easier than a request formulated I am cold.

4. The AUTHORITY SCALE on which is the ‘power’ of authority of one participant over another is determined (Brown and Gilman, 1960). This, for example, means that a superior has more of a right to expect an inferior to fulfill his request than vice versa.

5. The SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE on which we ascertain the overall degree of respectfulness, which depends on relatively permanent factors of status, age,
degree of intimacy, etc. but to some extent on the temporary role of one person relative to another. 6 This means that a speaker can expect help from his friend rather than from a passer-by.

The cost-benefit scale corresponds to the tact maxim and generosity maxim. Leech claims that the tact maxim is perhaps the most important kind of politeness in English-speaking society (1983: 107). Again, we see the asymmetry of politeness in general; what is a cost to the speaker is a benefit to the hearer and vice versa. To be tactful, we can also use the optionality scale, giving the hearer a choice by being indirect. The authority scale is crucial to determine the use of respectful pronouns in many European languages, the Czech language being one of them. In English there is no pronoun distinction, but we can use another language choice in order to show respect to the other party. The last but not least scale reflects on politeness as people consider it in the everyday use of language. Obviously, we can differentiate speaking to family or friends from speaking to a stranger or our employer.

Leech also distinguishes between relative politeness, which is connected with a particular situation, and absolute politeness, which is inseparable from a certain Illocutionary Act. According to Leech, some Illocutionary Acts are inherently impolite (e.g. imperatives), and some are inherently polite (e.g. offers). In some speech acts (declarations, announcements, instructions etc.), politeness is partially irrelevant. Yet some (e.g. threats or accusations) have basically no bearing upon politeness insofar as the aim of the act is to cause damage to the hearer. (Leech 1983: 83-84)

At this point, it is important to elaborate on the relationship between the two sets of sub-maxims of the two principles (cooperative and politeness). According to Leech, their relationship is complementary, and there is a tension between the two. Another paradox that arises from the relationship between politeness and cooperativeness is that the more polite you are, the less cooperative you are. Similarly, the violation of the Politeness Principle is usually caused by following one of the cooperative maxims ì usually the maxim of quality. On the other hand, Richard Watts (2003) asserts that Lakoff and Leech (and also Brown and Levinson) misunderstand Grice’s model. Marta Dynel (2009: 24-32) also supports Watts in saying that the clash between the Politeness Principle and the Cooperative Principle derives from a misunderstanding. The Cooperative Principle should be understood as the interlocutors' rationality underlying a communicative exchange, and therefore the CP is a basic condition for any
communication. Being polite is more of a social and moral rule, or a background assumption independent from the CP model. Another problem in Lakoff and Leech, according to Watts, is that they do not take into consideration that politeness behavior is in its substance egocentric. The speaker often uses politeness in order to achieve his/her goal. (W)hereas on the surface politeness may appear to fulfill altruistic goals, it is nevertheless a mask to conceal the ego’s true frame of mind. (Watts 1992: 46).

2.4 Brown and Levinson’s Face

One of the most influential, detailed and well-known models of linguistic politeness is that of Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson. It is said that perhaps the most thorough treatment of the concept of politeness is that of Brown and Levinson (Fasold 2000:160). Their book, Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage, was first published in 1978; however, we usually cite the second edition from 1987, where the authors answer various objections to their theory. Brown and Levinson were not only inspired by Grice’s CP and Austin’s and Searle’s theory of speech acts, but also by Erving Goffman’s conception of face (1955; 1967).

Goffman understands the construct of face in accordance with certain English folk terms, like losing face or saving face, and defines face as an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes albeit an image that others may share (Goffman 1967: 5).

Face is the public self-image of a person. Thus, every participant of a conversation has a face, and everyone’s task in a conversation is to maintain and protect his or her face within the interlocutors. However, face can be threatened in specific situations and such threats are called face-threatening acts (FTAs).

The concept of face was borrowed from Goffman by Brown and Levinson (1987), and used in their Model Person, who can be defined by the following three characteristics: this person speaks a natural language, is rational (and therefore capable of means-end reasoning) and has a face. Consequently, this Model Person is used by Brown and Levinson to illustrate the connection between the use of language and politeness.

In their theory, face is two dimensional they work with the concepts of positive and negative face. However, the terms positive and negative are not subject to evaluation; we cannot consider the positive face to be better than the negative one. The
terms are meant in a directional way (vectorial), i.e. the positive face metaphorically aims outwards and the negative inwards, into the inner world of the speaker. A different explanation is given by Scollon and Scollon (1995: 37), who say that these terms make sense when compared to the behavior of magnets: the positive poles of magnets attract, while the negative poles repel. Brown and Levinson (1987: 61) define the positive face as "the positive consistent self-image of personality (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants. On the other hand, the negative face is your wish not to be imposed on by others and to be allowed to go about our business unimpeded with our rights to free and self-determined action intact (Grundy 2000: 133). To sum up, the negative face is the desire of every competent adult member for his/her actions to be unimpeded by others. The positive face is the wish of every member for his/her wants to be desirable to at least some others.

It should be the interest of all participants in a conversation to enable each other to save their face, minimizing face-threatening acts. As Watts describes it (2003: 86): politeness strategies will therefore be those which aim (a) at supporting or enhancing the addresssee's positive face (positive politeness) and (b) at avoiding transgression of the addresssee's freedom of action and freedom from imposition (negative face). Positive politeness serves to make the hearer feel liked and approved of; whereas negative politeness serves to minimize the imposition on the hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987: 102) give us examples of positive politeness strategies:

- Expressing an interest in and noticing the hearer
- Using in-group language
- Noticing and attending to the hearer's desires
- Making small talk
- Exaggerating interest/approval/sympathy with H
- Intensifying interest in H
- Seeking agreement/avoid disagreement
- Showing optimism

and negative politeness strategies:

- Being conventionally indirect
- Questioning or hedging
- Pre-sequences to directives
- Showing pessimism
- Impersonalizing
- Apologizing
- Nominalizing
- Stating FTA as a general rule
- Minimizing imposition

As already mentioned, the face is threatened in certain situations, and those threats are called *face-threatening acts* (FTA). We can mediate FTA through politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987: 65) regard face-threatening acts as those acts which run contrary to the addressee's and/or the speaker's positive and/or negative 'face.' We can generally divide FTA into these categories:

- Acts threatening the positive face of the speaker (e.g. apologies, confessions)
- Acts threatening the negative face of the speaker (e.g. expressing gratitude, promises, offers, obligations)
- Acts threatening the positive face of the addressee (e.g. criticism, disrespect, refusal)
- Acts threatening the negative face of the addressee (e.g. orders, requests, threats)

Brown and Levinson then focus especially on acts threatening the addressee, providing us with a taxonomy of strategies that the speaker can follow when intending to do the FTA:

1. Do the FTA on record without redressive actions (the least polite) Ī e.g. *Watch out!; Don't burn yourself!; Give me 10 bucks.*
2. Do the FTA on record with redressive action addressing positive face Ī e.g. *Your concert had a relatively low attendance.*
3. Do the FTA on record with redressive action addressing negative face e.g. *Would you mind...?*; *Forgive me for interrupting.*

4. Do the FTA off record e.g. irony, rhetorical questions, discourse markers; conversational implicatures in general (Grice 1975)

5. Don’t do the FTA (the most polite strategy)

This can also be illustrated in the following figure:

Figure 1. Strategies for performing FTAs (Brown and Levinson 1987: 60)

When choosing the strategy, the speaker should take into consideration how serious the FTA is. The face-threatening potential of an act is represented as its weightiness (W). To calculate this, the social Distance (D) between interlocutors, the Power (P) of the addressee over the speaker, and the Ranking (R) of an imposition are compounded using the formula $W_x = D(S, H) + P(H, S) + R_x$ (Brown and Levinson 1987: 76-77). As the weightiness of an FTA increases, interlocutors move upwards along a scale of increasing indirectness represented as a hierarchy of strategies (figure 1) (Terkourafi 2004: 120) Factors P, D and R have different importance value in different cultures. Hill (1986: 350) points out the similarity of those factors and Leech’s scales. The social distance factor corresponds to Leech’s *social distance scale*; factor P corresponds with the *authority scale*; and factor R can be found in Leech’s *cost-benefit scale*. The indirectness scale is manifested in the strategies employed when the speaker intends to do the FTA.

In short, Brown and Levinson’s framework provides a highly detailed description of the specific manifestations of politeness strategies. It has remained the
most seminal and influential starting point for cross-cultural and cross-linguistic contrastive pragmatics. (Leech, 2005: 3)

### 2.5 Watts and Discoursive Politeness

Richard J. Watts (2003: 4-9) points out that the linguistic definition of politeness is usually different from the general perception of the term politeness. According to Watts, we should differentiate first-order politeness and second-order politeness. First-order politeness is what the majority of people of a certain cultural and language community consider polite (e.g. to behave well by using polite phrases, like please, thank you, your welcome, etc.). On the other hand, second-order politeness is the theoretical term used in sociolinguistics. First-order politeness is always connected with evaluation, while second-order politeness is a term for a set of strategies in communication, not an evaluative term (Hirschová 2009: 10). The theory of politeness should be based on first-order politeness, and should also be discoursive, i.e. based on how the politeness is perceived by people in real situations (Watts 2003: 9).

When asking people for the definition of politeness, we may find out that politeness is often evaluated negatively. Some people may consider politeness to be impersonal, insincere or hypocritical. We can find a justification for this approach in history. In 18th-century England, politeness was a way of enhancing (their own) social standing and signal (their) membership in an elitist social class (Watts 1992: 47). Politeness was a velvet glove within which to hide one or another kind of irons first (Sell 1991: 211 in Watts 1992: 45). In a way, politeness is such a glove even today to the extent that one may use politeness to achieve his/her goal. Whereas on the surface politeness may appear to fulfill altruistic goals, it is nevertheless a mask to conceal the ego’s true frame of mind (Watts 1992: 46). The difference between 18th-century politeness and that of today is that nowadays the goal is not to enhance the social standing, but to avoid conflict.

More importantly, Watts says that linguistic politeness should be always perceived in this double perspective; otherwise the notion of politeness is too narrow and abstract. According to his discoursive approach to politeness (Watts 2003: 23), it is impossible to differentiate polite from impolite behavior without the context of the particular interaction, which happens in a certain environment, in a certain situation,
with a specific speaker and addressee. Moreover, we must consider the perspective of the speaker and also the addressee. Lexical terms such as *please* or *thank you* are not polite inherently or always; they can be interpreted as polite only in certain communication.

Watts also comes up with the term *politic behavior*, defined as *that behavior, linguistic or non-linguistic, which the participants construct as being appropriate to the ongoing social interaction* (Watts 1993: 144). Participants enter the interaction with certain knowledge of what behavior is appropriate in the specific situation. This knowledge is based on their prior experience. Many of the preceding politeness strategies worded by other linguists are in fact examples of this politic behaviour.

In conclusion, Watts is one of the first linguists to have noticed aspects that earlier authors had not; for example, the above-mentioned fact that abstract theories of politeness are not always reflected in the use of real language, and that politeness is something that every interlocutor can perceive differently.
3. Teaching Linguistic Politeness

3.1 Methodological Approaches to Teaching Pragmatics

Pragmatics is still relatively new to language teachers, who appreciate its difficulty in comparison to grammar, which is traditionally embedded in TEFL methodologies. Thomas (1983: 97) gives us two explanations of this situation: (i) that pragmatic description is not as precise as grammar in accounting for linguistic competence; and (ii) that pragmatics is a delicate area and it is not immediately obvious how it can be taught. Grammar consists of rules, and when a speaker follows the rules of grammar, s/he will speak correctly. The situation in pragmatics is not as clear, for in pragmatics we can only come across principles, which apply differently in different contexts of language use; apply in variable degrees; can conflict with one another; and can be contravened without self-denial of the kind of activity which they control (Leech 1983: 8).

On the positive side, since 1990 various studies have shaped methodologies such that they are suitable for teaching pragmatics. Here, we should quote Richards (1990: 76-77) on teaching conversation:

Currently there are two major approaches to the teaching of conversation in second language programs. One is an indirect approach, in which conversational competence is seen as the product of engaging learners in conversational interaction. The second, a more direct approach, involves planning a conversation program around the specific microskills, strategies, and processes that are involved in fluent conversation.

In the indirect approach, the teacher should only provide students with opportunities for speaking by giving them communicative tasks, which will improve their knowledge of conversational skills. There have been many objections to this approach, and one of the strongest is that the majority of tasks in the indirect approach are based on transactional (message-oriented) discourse to the neglect of interactional (interpersonally-oriented) uses of the language (Brown and Yule 1983). This can have major consequences, given that conversation is the prototype of interactional discourse.
It is an essential skill for language learners to be able to produce casual conversation language as well as to produce language appropriate for more formal encounters (Richards 1990: 74), and also to understand and interpret both uses of the language [interactional and transactional] appropriately (Bou-Franch and Garcés-Cornejos 2003: 7).

Richards (1990), Schmidt (1993), Bou-Franch and Garnés-Cornejos (2003) all maintain that the direct approach to teaching pragmatic knowledge should be combined with the indirect approach. Direct or explicit teaching of pragmatic competence according to Schmidt (1993: 21) is an approach that focuses explicitly on the strategies involved in conversation and emphasizes consciousness-raising concerning these strategies. Schmidt also stresses the importance of the teacher in drawing learners' attention to the information to be acquired:

Explicit teacher-provided information about the pragmatics of the second language can also play a role in learning, provided that it is accurate and not based solely on fallible native speaker intuitions. Explicit teaching is often more efficient than attention to input for identifying the pragmalinguistic forms of the target language. (Schmidt 1993: 36)

To conclude, all the authors who are concerned with teaching pragmatic competence are aware of the fact that pragmatics may be more difficult to be taught or learned than grammar, but it should have its part in language teaching in both the implicit and explicit ways.

3.2 Teaching Linguistic Politeness

Bou-Franch and Garcés-Cornejos (2003: 8) consider linguistic politeness to have a central place in foreign language teaching. The interpersonal aspect of communication has been empirically proven to be evident not only in interactional, but also in transactional discourses (Garcés-Conejos and Torreblanca-López 1997, Garcés-Conejos and Sánchez-Macarro 1998, Gómez-Morón 2001). Scollon and Scollon (1995: 49) sum this up by pointing out that there is no faceless communication. This means that learners of a foreign language must be able to understand linguistic choices.
participants of a conversation make in different contexts to improve their own production and comprehension of pragmalinguistic resources.

Native language influences the learning of a foreign language, and the role of L1 seems to be significant in performing speech acts. As Kasper argues, adult learners have already fully developed their knowledge in native language, and therefore they:

[É ] have been shown to display sensitivity towards context-external factors such as interlocutors' familiarity and relative status [É ] and context-internal factors such as degree of imposition, legitimacy of requestive goal and standardness of the situation in requesting, and severity of offence, obligation to apologize, and likelihood of apology acceptance in apologizing. (1992: 211-212)

This means that the teacher should try to sensitize learners to the differences and similarities between two cultures and to how these can be derived from the generic analysis of linguistic politeness devices (Bou-Franch and Garcés-Conejos 2003: 17). They suggest teaching about positive-politeness oriented cultures and negative politeness oriented cultures. They would like learners to become aware of the fact that some societies or languages are not more polite than others; rather, they just use different means to reach the same goal. (Bou-Franch and Garcés-Conejos 2003: 18)

The majority of authors (e.g. Garnés-Conejos, Bou-Franch, Kasper) agree that politeness theory can serve as a good tool for teaching contextualized language. Bou-Franch and Garcés-Conejos suggest that it would be extremely useful for learners to study and apply the formal descriptive apparatus provided by Brown and Levinson model against the background of different types of genre, oral and written, in which various degrees of formality would apply. In this way, students could observe how these matters affect politeness (2003: 12).

Bou-Franch and Garcés-Conejos take a stand for the following three opinions: (i) we can teach students to express solidarity and deference, and therefore to act in linguistically appropriate ways in equal and unequal encounters; (ii) that these behaviours have consequences for the linguistic forms chosen in each type of encounter; and (iii) that students can be made aware that different genres require different linguistic expressions of solidarity, deference and hierarchy. Furthermore, they believe that genre-
specific, awareness-raising tasks are essential for the development of learners’ pragmatic knowledge (2003: 16).

### 3.3 Politeness in Classroom Discourse

Politeness is not only a universally valued virtue, but also a widely employed strategy to achieve tactful and effective communication. Furthermore, politeness can help the speaker to negotiate his/her position in society, eliminate conflicts and facilitate cooperation. Politeness is thus important for classroom discourse for two main reasons. By using politeness strategies, the teacher can create a classroom atmosphere that establishes congenial and respectful relationships between the teacher and the student(s). In such a polite atmosphere, the learner can feel respected and trusted, and thus feel unthreatened or embarrassed by his/her own mistakes, facilitating his/her involvement in various classroom activities. Accordingly, the politeness of the teacher has a great impact on the learner’s language achievement and success. On the top of that, learners do not only learn by explicit teaching, but they also adopt strategies that their teacher is expressing implicitly. This basically means that when the teacher uses the politeness strategies in his/her verbal cues, students can adopt those strategies themselves. As ALFattah (2010: 137) formulates it: “Learning a foreign language involves not only knowing how to speak and write, but also how to behave linguistically; therefore, the speakers and users of the language must be equipped with politeness formulas in speaking and must be aware of how to use politeness in different communicative acts in their daily life.” Teachers can help learners understand politeness by both explicit and implicit teaching.

On one hand, Lakoff (1989) claims that classroom discourse is an example of informative discourse, and in this type of discourse politeness is given little importance. On the other hand, Torreblanca-López and Garcés-Conejos (1996) and Garcés-Conejos and Torreblanca-López (1997) explore the interaction found in classroom discourse, providing an analysis of the power differential typical of this setting. These linguists have found that teachers use lexical means of mitigation, and are therefore oriented towards face relations and politeness. Teachers use politeness strategies in evaluating students. Garcés-Conejos and Torreblanca-López (1997) find involvement strategies in positive evaluations and mainly independence strategies in negative evaluations, and relate these findings with the effort teachers make to lower the affective filter and

Didactic communication involves the use of positive and negative politeness at all levels (verbal, non-verbal and paraverbal) concerning the interaction teacher-student (Hobjil 2012: 213). Politeness can be mainly visible in teachers’ academic instructions, motivation and evaluation of students and classroom management. The following chapter will focus on the verbal realization of politeness in a model classroom.
4. Research Design

4.1 Objectives and Research Hypothesis

In the previous parts of the thesis, the theoretical basis of politeness and its importance in the classroom of English as a Second language has been presented.

The purpose of the practical part is to find out which features of politeness explored in the theoretical part occur in the classroom interaction, especially in teachers’ speech. In the presented study, teachers’ utterances from four recorded lessons will be picked out to investigate and analyze the application of politeness strategies in EFL context. These findings will hopefully provide some suggestions for EFL teachers regarding politeness in a classroom.

The research was designed to verify the following hypotheses:

1. Teachers are basically polite in a classroom of English as a second language.
2. Politeness strategies of Czech teachers of English differ from those of native speaking teachers.

4.2 Participants

The research data are based on recordings of four, 60-minute lessons of English for intermediate students. Since the objective of the study is to focus on teachers’ use of politeness in an English classroom, the main focus was on the choice of eligible teachers. To show as many differences as possible that arise from the teacher him/herself, the lessons were designed to be as alike as possible, i.e. the same level of English, a similar number of students in a class and, above all, the same lesson content. Another aim was to observe how politeness features differ between Czech teachers and native speaking teachers of English. Therefore, two Czech teachers and two native speaking teachers of the same sex and similar age were chosen for the recording.

Figure 2 below shows age, sex, place of origin, qualification and years of teaching experience of all four teachers who took part in the study:
Figure 2. Personal data of the subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Place of origin</th>
<th>Qualification (Educational Background)</th>
<th>Years of teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Karlovy Vary, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Charles University in Prague</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Lakeland, Florida, USA</td>
<td>TEFL Certificate</td>
<td>The Language House, Prague 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Green Bay, Wisconsin, USA</td>
<td>TEFL Certificate, Caledonian School, Prague 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Charles University in Prague</td>
<td>Master’s Degree 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the teachers are currently employed as teachers of English at the largest language school in the Czech Republic. They also meet the requirements of the Association of Certified Language Schools (http://en.acert.cz/) for a qualified teacher, meaning that all four of them match the idea of a "typical teacher in a language school." The two teachers of the Czech origin have graduated from the Faculty of Education at Charles University in Prague, where they both studied English, and therefore their code of ethics in the classroom should be quite similar.

The instructions given to the teachers were very brief. They knew that the recordings would serve for the purpose of a diploma thesis, but they did not know the topic or any other details related to the thesis. The instructions given were as follows (the full version of instructions given to teachers can be found in Appendix 2):

1. Your lesson should be based on New English File Intermediate, unit 3A, page 37 – 39
2. It is up to you what you decide to cover, but there is an obligatory homework assignment for your students. It is also your decision whether you want to give
your students extra instructions during the lesson, making it is easier for them to do their homework.

3. There is an idea for a role play at the end of this page. You can use it if you want, or you can modify it according to your needs.

Homework

Please send your homework to subertova.aneta@gmail.com.

Your Italian colleague is receiving personal phone calls in the office. He speaks very loudly, and you are very often unable to focus on your work. You told him many times that it annoys you, but he seems to ignore it. Write an email to the HR manager of your company, complaining about it. Make sure your email is polite (you don’t want to lose your job over it!).

None of the teachers used the role play suggestion in their lesson, so there is no need to describe the details here. In the course of writing the thesis, it was decided that the main aim would only be the teachers, so the homework would not be analyzed either.

The students who participated in these lessons were mainly people who regularly attend English courses for free with TEFL applicants, so they appreciated the fact that they could take part in a lesson for free with experienced teachers. The only obstacle with these students was the fact that even though they had been informed the lessons would be on the intermediate level (B2), their knowledge of English was lower (A2 – B1). Because all four teachers are experienced, and English teachers in general often come across mixed-ability classes, these teachers were able to deal with this problem such that it did not affect the outcome. The rest of the students were the author’s friends, the majority of whom were at the intermediate level. As already mentioned, the study was planned to focus on the teachers’ role in the politeness analysis, so the students were an important factor. Nevertheless, it was not crucial for their level of English to be precisely the same. Except for one L1 Russian speaker (in group 2), all the other students were L1 Czech students.
4.3 Instruments and Data Collecting

This study is based on a research method called Ŕnaturalistic inquiringû (Allwright and Bailey, 1991), which is meant to investigate as realistic a situation as possible in an ESL classroom. ŔNaturalistic inquiryû can be defined as a holistic and heuristic method with low control, with which the researcher tries not to intervene in the research setting and does not try to control naturally occurring events: the research aims principally to describe and understand the process. The instrument adopted in this study was a video recording. The method used in the present study also corresponds to claims of recent researchers who advocate the importance of analyzing discourse and the practice in the community more than just the speaker him/herself in studying politeness (Locher, 2006; Locher and Watts, 2005; Mills, 2003; Watts et. al 2005).

4.3.1 Video Recording and Transcription

The original idea was to record four, public-course lessons in a language school during a semester to analyze politeness in Ŕregularû lessons. Due to the fact that it was impossible to get permission to video record public course lessons for the purposes of the research, the option to record lessons at secondary schools was also considered. This option would be quite difficult to put into practice because the thesis requires four different teachers of English (two native speakers and two Czech teachers) of the same sex and similar age. Moreover, it was important to record four lessons based on similar content, because the content of a lesson also contributes to what happens in a classroom. To record four lessons of similar content at a secondary school would be almost impossible to carry out on account of the low number of native speakers. Additionally, the teachers that had been approached unanimously disliked the idea of being video recorded.

Due to all the above-mentioned reasons, four, 60-minute lessons at the intermediate level were organized in order to obtain the research material for analysis. The author was not present in the classroom during the lessons in order to prevent distraction, curiosity and nervousness among the students and teachers.

After recording the four lessons described above, the material was transcribed by the author. Being primarily interested in teachersû use of politeness, only studentû teacher interactions were transcribed and analyzed. Studentû student interactions were
deliberately omitted. Pair work or group work is a good way of making students practice the target language and of enhancing their active participation in the lesson. The communicative approach stresses the importance of student talking time claiming that student talking time should always be higher than teacher talking time. The transcribed material shows a larger rate of the teachers' contribution than the students' contribution, because the focus of the thesis is on the teacher. Accordingly, only the student-teacher interactions were transcribed. The material was transcribed with some speech phenomena, those that were considered irrelevant for the purposes of the current research, being deliberately left out, e.g. simultaneous and overlapping utterances were not captured in the transcription. Also, at places where an end of a sentence would normally occur, punctuation was typed to mark the semantic end. To sum up, an attempt was made to convert the spoken language into its written counterpart as faithfully as possible for the reader's comfort.

This rather atypical way of speech transcription gives me the possibility to draw conclusions based on the percentage of use of certain politeness phenomena, such that I can estimate the total number of utterances used by each teacher in each transcription. An utterance is here meant in accordance with the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (2002: 584), i.e. a unit of analysis in speech which has been defined in various ways but most commonly as a sequence of words within a single person's turn at talk that falls under a single intonation contour.

All four transcriptions of the material are to be found in Appendix 4. Every example used in the analysis and discussion of findings will be marked by a number in brackets. This number will help the reader comfortably find the example in the broader context, if the reader wishes to see the context of an example. We can say that, very roughly, the number in brackets corresponds to a turn. However, due to the fact that student-student interactions were left out of the transcription, there are a lot of turns missing and not all the numbers in brackets correspond to just one turn as it might be expected. Those are the instances where individual work, pair work or group work took place in the lessons. This is marked in the transcription usually by a sentence in italics: e.g. Students perform the task.

The student-teacher interactions provided a sample of approximately 317 estimated utterances (2377 words) of teacher 1; approximately 204 estimated utterances (946 words) of teacher 2; approximately 301 estimated utterances (1882 words) of teacher 3; and approximately 397 estimated utterances (3810 words) of teacher 4. In all
the examples, numbers in brackets (1) Ñ (252) correspond to student-teacher interactions in lesson 1 by teacher 1; numbers (253) Ñ (482) refer to student-teacher interactions in lesson 2 by teacher 2; numbers (483) Ñ (774) refer to student-teacher interactions in lesson 3 by teacher 3; and finally numbers (775) Ñ (1173) refer to student-teacher interactions in lesson 4 by teacher 4. Due to the fact that exceptionally I will also refer to students in the analysis, I should also mention that students produced approximately 704 words in recording 1, approximately 553 words of students in recording 2, approximately 774 words of students in recording 3 and approximately 1057 words of students in recording 4 in the transcribed student-teacher interactions.

4.3.2 New English File and Politeness

Teaching material has its essential part in language teaching. The choice of material strongly influences all aspects of a lesson Ñ its content and aims, so we can say the material strongly influences both teacher and learner in the learning process. Material from New English File Intermediate was chosen to provide a similar framework for all four lessons for politeness analysis.

New English File is one of the most commonly used, modern textbooks of general English that meets current methodological requirements, such as realistic context, pragmatic instructions and natural communicative tasks. In New English File Intermediate, we can find all three basic tools students need to speak English Ñ grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. This book also provides students with many opportunities to practice all four skills: speaking, listening, reading and writing. Moreover, at the end of each unit there is a special part called Practical English. The authors of the book, Clive Oxeden and Christita Latham-Koenig, understood that students will need English both when travelling to an English-speaking country and as a lingua franca. Lessons in this part are designed to help students feel confident in typical everyday social situations. As the authors state in the introduction to New English File Intermediate, Teacher's Book (2006: 12): ÒThe seven Practical English lessons revise and extend common situations (for example, introducing yourself and others, or making polite requests) and go on to introduce and practice the language for new situations (for example, expressing opinions or apologizing)Ó There is no need to stress that these parts
were designed to help learners with their pragmatic competence and that in these units politeness has its place.

Practical English lessons are only one page long, which might not be enough for a 60-minute lesson. Moreover, even though recording four lessons with a topic like polite requests or apologizing might have been interesting, a more typical unit from the book was chosen in order to analyze material from a lesson that covers all four skills in more detail and that is probably more enjoyable for both teacher and student. Also, I thought that a lesson covering all four skills would correspond more to the chosen method of "naturalistic inquiring" to the extent that such a lesson would be more natural for all four teachers.

Unit 3A in New English File Intermediate is called "Modern manners." The grammatical focus of this unit is on modal verbs. This unit was found interesting for the purposes of the thesis for two reasons mainly: it meets the requirements of a typical lesson, and the topic deals to some extent with manners and politeness.

The definition of manners in the student's book (2006: 37) is as follows: "a way of behaving that is considered to be polite in a society or culture." Reading in this unit deals with politeness that is introduced by a humorous postcard (see appendix 1). This postcard should draw the students' attention to different perceptions of politeness in different countries and/or languages, particularly to the perception of politeness that English people have. According to the Teacher's Book (2006: 53), the postcard suggests that "being polite is very important to the English. If you want someone to do something, you must ask them politely."
5. Teachers’ Use of Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies – Analysis and Discussion of Findings

In the following section, data collected by the video recordings will be analyzed from different perspectives of Brown and Levinson’s model of politeness. The analysis adopts the viewpoint of Brown and Levinson’s positive and negative politeness for the following three reasons: (1) Brown and Levinson’s model is considered to be perhaps the most thorough model of linguistic politeness, (2) Brown and Levinson’s model is very often adopted by other researchers dealing with linguistic politeness and is perhaps the most quoted one and (3) the tentative analysis revealed that this model is suitable for verifying the two hypotheses.

It is important to note the claim of Susan Wolff Murphy (2001: 116), who mentions that there can be a simultaneous interplay of different kinds of politeness. It is important to recognize, she writes, that strategies are used simultaneously, and that multiple motivations may be attributed to each act. Positive and negative politeness acts occur together, and actually may overlap quite a bit, when cases are considered.

The first two parts of this chapter provide a close look at certain positive and negative politeness strategies and their realization in the four lessons. The third part will then present the findings of this study, and a final recapitulation will comprise part 4.

5.1 Positive Politeness Strategies in Teachers’ Talk

Positive politeness strategies appeal to the hearer’s desire to be liked and approved of. Positive politeness utterances are used as a kind of metaphorical extension of intimacy, to imply common ground or sharing of wants, including goals and values. (Brown and Levinson 1987: 103). Figure 3 shows all positive politeness strategies that Brown and Levinson comment on. Examples of the most prominent or interesting strategies, as found in the samples, will be given and discussed below. In the analysis, I will comment on the following strategies: expressing an interest and noticing the hearer, using in-group language, making small talk and being agreeable.
5.1.1 Expressing an Interest in and Noticing Hearer

Expressing an interest and noticing the hearer is one of the major means of expressing positive politeness. In general, this output suggests that S should take notice of aspects of H's condition (Brown and Levinson 1987: 103).

This can be done in a lesson by greeting. Every lesson usually starts with a greeting. However, only three out of four recorded lessons started like this. Teacher 3 started by introducing himself, and this was probably because he had already greeted his students prior to the lesson.

Given the fact that in these specific lessons the teachers did not know the learners, all of these teachers asked the students to introduce themselves, and later on the teachers used the students' names while nominating. This is another example of expressing interest in the hearer, and it should be noted that this positive politeness strategy was used by each teacher.
5.1.2 Using ‘In-group’ Language

In-group language is about how the speaker involves himself with the hearer and communicates that S and H are members of the same group. This is achieved by means of in-group address terms, use of slang or jargon terms, expressions which make the addressee more active in the conversation, ellipsis, inclusive we paralinguistics and kinesics.

In-group address terms and slang language were not expressed frequently in the analyzed lessons. An important aspect that influenced almost no incidence of slang language or in-group address terms is that these lessons were in fact the first lessons with the students ľ in this respect the lessons were similar to a substitute lesson. Therefore, the teachers and students usually had no prior relationship before these lessons. However, in-group address terms could be viewed in the samples in how the Czech teachers address the students. Only the Czech speakers have an option to modify Czech students’ names in order to appeal to their positive face. This could be found in both teacher 1 and teacher 4 (Dasa instead of Dagmar, Stepanka instead of Stepana and Zdenda instead of Zdenek). On the other hand, the use of slang language does not usually have a place in classrooms of English in general. Even the native speakers did not use any slang terms in their lessons, because intermediate students might not understand them.

Expressions such as you know, I mean, or you understand are considered a part of in-group language by Lakoff (1974), because they make the addressee a more active participant in the conversation, serving predominantly to express solidarity between the speaker and the addressee. This strategy was found only in lesson 1, which was conducted by a Czech teacher.

(37) T: Is it really necessary to use it? I mean, grammatically it is correct, but ľ did you understand?

This brings us to a very popular strategy among all four teachers ľ the inclusive we. The inclusive we is an utterance of we which includes both the speaker and the hearer, enabling the speaker to show a common goal and to create rapport between the teacher and the student. Figure 4 summarizes the frequency of the use of the inclusive we as it occurred in the speech of each teacher.
Figure 4. Occurrence of inclusive ‘we’ in teachers’ utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
<th>Teacher 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive ‘we’</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Utterances” total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence %</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inclusive ‘we’ was used by every teacher, but more frequently by Czech teachers. This might arise from the fact that the inclusive ‘we’ is, like some other politeness markers, also employed in the Czech language. For instance, example (1) shows that the translation to Czech also includes both the speaker and the hearer:

(215) T: Yes, we use have to with some rules.

Czech translation: Ano, have to používáme v pravidel.

Perhaps the most commonly applied markers of ‘in-group’ language are kinesics. All four teachers used gestures which emphasized solidarity and showed common ground. They were frequently smiling at students, laughing at students’ jokes and head-nodding to express approval. They also often moved closer to students or even squatted or sat down on the floor in order to be at the same eye level with the students. All of these non-verbal means of expressing politeness aim at creating a bond, rapport or even camaraderie between the teacher and the learner, and they are quite important for a positive learning environment. Not surprisingly, positive politeness gestures were very often observed in learners also, because these politeness strategies are not connected with the knowledge of L2 language.

5.1.3 Making Small Talk

Another way to claim common ground between the speaker and the hearer and to avoid abruptness is by making small talk. In so doing, the speaker enhances the hearer’s positive face (Brown and Levinson, 1978). In the classroom environment, small talk can sometimes appear in the initial part of a lesson. We can see an example of small talk only with teacher 1, when this teacher used a short opening to his lesson as follows:
(1) T: Hello everybody. (pause) Welcome. I am terribly sorry you had to wait for me. (pause) I see you have some cakes, so I hope you have enjoyed the break. Did you enjoy the break?

(2) Ss: Yes.

5.1.4 Being Agreeable

Positive politeness can also be accomplished by being agreeable. Linguistic means of expressing this strategy are repetitions of what a preceding speaker has just said and positive back channel cues. Both repetition and positive back channel cues are widely used in a classroom context. It is important for learners to hear feedback from their teacher. These expressions serve not only to express positive politeness, but sometimes to provide corrective feedback; for example, a learner’s mispronunciation. To demonstrate this strategy, we can refer to Figure 5, which shows the occurrence of ōKô as a positive back channel cue.

Figure 5. Occurrence of ōKô as a positive channel cue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterances “total”</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
<th>Teacher 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Utterances” total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, we can turn to Figure 6, which illustrates the occurrence of repetition and positive back channel cues in response and follow-up turns. Figure 6 reveals very interesting results. Based on Amy Tsui’s English Conversation (1994), inspired by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), I took into consideration the three-part exchange structure of initiation, response and follow-up. The positive politeness strategy of being agreeable, namely repetitions and positive back channel cues, are by their essence a part of response or follow-up only. Based on the data presented in Figure 6, we can summarize the findings by saying that the majority of all the teachers’ responses and/or follow-ups are either repetitions of what a student has said or positive back channel cues. Here are some examples from the recorded lessons to see the actual usage of these strategies:
(70) T: (É) So what is the tense? - initiation
(71) S: Past perfect. - response
(72) T1: Past? - initiation
(73) S: Present perfect. - response
(74) T1: Present perfect. Yes. So Petra Ī what would it be? Ī follow-up; initiation

In the teacher’s follow-up sentence, “Present perfect, yes” we can see the repetition of what the student has said. By this strategy, teachers affirm the student’s answers. Another way of confirming acceptance of what has been said is to use positive back channel cues, as the following example (478) shows:

(476) T: And if someone is on time, he is Ī - initiation
(477) S: punctual - response
(478) T: Good, OK. Ī follow-up

Figure 6. Occurrence of repetition and positive back channel cues in teacher’s responses and follow-ups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
<th>Teacher 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetitions total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive back channel cues</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses and follow ups total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence: repetitions %</td>
<td>50.73</td>
<td>62.16</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>13.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence: positive back channel cues %</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>63.16</td>
<td>73.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Negative Politeness Strategies in Teachers’ Talk

After discussing the data on positive politeness, we can now turn to the examination of negative politeness strategies. Negative politeness strategies aim at addressing the hearer’s negative face, i.e. hearer’s want to be free from imposition and distraction, to have his/her territory respected and his/her freedom of action unimpeded by others. The speaker can achieve this by showing distance and impersonality and by
adhering to certain strategies. Negative politeness strategies that were most commonly found in the recorded data were questioning or hedging, indirectness, pre-sequences to directives, impersonalizing and using deference. We can see the chart of all negative politeness strategies in Figure 7 below.

Figure 7. Chart of strategies: negative politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987:131)

5.2.1 Questioning or Hedging

Hedges indicate the speaker’s lack of commitment to the truth of a statement, or a desire not to express that commitment categorically. Hedges can be manifested in different linguistic means, but very common are particles, such as perhaps, kind of, sort of, maybe, probably; expressions, such as I wonder if, the thing is, something like that; and to a certain extent verbs, such as think, and modals, such as could. Furthermore, another lexical way of expressing the speaker’s concern not to impose on the hearer by sounding more tentative is to use question tags. Question tags are instances of biased questions (Leech and Svartvik 1975: 112).

There were no incidents of any particles, such as perhaps and sort of, but teacher 3 used kind of to express negative politeness as shown in the first three examples (693), (731), (533). Kind of is here used as a softener of what the teacher is saying. Example (693) also represents an instance of a face saving act. Examples with maybe and I think nicely illustrate the freedom given to the hearer I the hearer is given
an opportunity and even suggested to think differently than the speaker, in this case the teacher. The last three examples show the use of question tags. The teachers usually pronounced question tags with a falling tone, which implies that they do not expect any response to follow, and thus these questions seem to work as assertions. The scope of findings on hedging in the recorded data allows us to present all instances here:

(693) T3: Yeah, yeah, yeah, so that\textit{kind of} confusing, that\textit{kind of} what people confuse a little bit.

(731) T3: Well, it \textit{kind of} your opinion, well, I don\textit{t} know if I would use mustn\textit{t} because it\textit{t} not like forbidden, it\textit{t} not like banned, is it? \textit{Maybe} should or shouldn\textit{t}.

(533) T3: Yeah, so is that \textit{kind of} what you meant with the old fashion manners? So would you say that British are polite?

(159) T1: he is probably very noisy, yes, uh huh; he is laughing out loud, if you know the acronym \textit{LOL}. Vlasta \textit{I} what else can you see? \textit{Maybe} behind him

(357) T2: Yes, OK, \textit{maybe} \textit{I} we don\textit{t} have to hurry.

(529) T3: Terrible food, that\textit{t} definitely one. Fish and chips \textit{maybe}. But I like fish and chips. OK and anything else you can say for Americans?

(655) T3: \textit{maybe} \textit{I} they have to be careful.

(1048) T4: Good manners, it means \textit{something like} being polite.

(895) T4: Yes, \textit{something like} that. Whenever people are all together is a social occasion. You can with your friend-

(175) T1: It is not comfortable for anybody. We can all agree on that it is a very bad experience, \textit{I think}.

(861) T4: Zdenda asks if he can see it, but \textit{I think, maybe} after the lesson \textit{I}


(880) T4: Yes, \textit{I think} that is quite annoying

(983) T4: Yes, \textit{I think}, you can\textit{t} do this. It\textit{t} not just a manner.

(1009) T4: Yes, \textit{I think} it\textit{t} very hard to \textit{I}

(1011) T4: \textit{I think}, it depends, is it really a manner?

(1119) T4: Yes, \textit{I think} that we should agree on that.

(213) T1: So it \textit{could} be an advice in some cases, but generally \textit{I} it is \textit{I} what?

(885) T4: Yes, but you always express something negative, don\textit{t} you? (laughs)
With this strategy, we can also comment on the student–teacher relationship in the classroom, because it definitely influences the use of politeness, and negative politeness in particular. In the theoretical part, I mentioned the power that the speaker has over the hearer in the weightiness of the FTA. Traditionally, it is the teacher who possesses the (better) knowledge and the student is the one whose role is to (passively) accept the knowledge from the teacher. This concept slightly changes with the turn away from teacher-centered lessons or teacher-fronted lesson, towards student-centered lessons. However, both the teacher and the student in the learning process often adhere to these traditional roles. This can be seen in a very high ratio of hedges among students in the recorded lessons. Because L2 learners are usually lacking a complete repertoire of hedges, we took into consideration two well-known ones. Typically, intermediate students are already familiar with hedges such as maybe and I think. Maybe and I think are used very often by students because they are traditionally hesitant to commit to the truth value of their statements. By this, they are inviting their teacher to be the powerful one and tell them the truth, to confirm or reject their statement. In the transcribed data, we can find 25 instances of I think or maybe produced by students and only 22 instances of these same particles by teachers in all teacher-student exchanges. Given the fact that the students’ contributions were approximately one third of the teachers’ when counting all analyzed words of all four samples, we can say that students used hedges maybe or I think to express negative politeness more than three times more frequently than teachers.

### 5.2.2 Being Conventionally Indirect

Indirectness is defined by Shimanoff (1977) as *not making all of the speaker’s beliefs or desires explicit.* This can be done by the indirect formulation of replies in order not to be felt by the hearer as imposed by actions, threats etc.

There are many ways of expressing indirectness. Here are examples of teachers using would you like, do you want to and could you to express indirectness.

(243) T1: So we started at 5 past eleven, so would you like to finish at 5 past 12?
(259) T2: OK, so, the topic is here. You must find it. Ah, could you move this way?

(483) T3: So could you put your name on here, so I can call you by name?

(820) T4: So do you want to hear it one more time?

Perhaps the most common way of expressing indirectness is by using the modal verb can. With an example T1: Can you turn to page 27? or T4: Can anyone tell me what a questionnaire is? we can see that this strategy is very typical in any ESL classroom. Of course, we can just say turn to page 27, but teachers very often choose to use this negative politeness strategy and be indirect. However, the Czech teachers were more in favor of this strategy, as illustrated in Figure 8.

Figure 8. Occurrence of can for indirectness strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
<th>Teacher 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Can” for indirectness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Utterances” total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence %</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>10.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 Pre-sequences to Directives

In the teachers’ replies, directives were often accompanied by other features marking politeness. These co-occurring features are referred to as pre-sequences to directives, as they function to signal that what follows is a directive. Examples of this phenomenon are please, I am sorry, excuse me, and performative utterances such as I tell you. Examples of this strategy were found in replies by all teachers, and some instances can be found in the following examples:

(24) T1: (É) please, read the questions. (É)

(250) T1: (É) So please, do this homework and send it to Aneta.

(388) T2: (É) Oh please, say it - punctual.

(459) T2: Oh please, 15.

(568) T3: (É) please do not be afraid to ask
Scarcella and Brunak's research indicates that while some politeness features appear to emerge quite early in adult second-language acquisition (e.g. pre-sequences to directives, such as *sorry* and *please*), others (e.g., slang, ellipsis and the inclusive *we*) do not. (2003: 71). Thus, we could presume that the students are also able to express pre-sequences to directives. Not surprisingly, no such instances were found in the transcription. The students' role in a classroom does not usually enable them to use any directives, only in role play situations. It should be recalled that no role play occurred in any of the analyzed lessons.

### 5.2.4 Impersonalizing

Impersonalizing can be done by using passive constructions or by the exclusive *we*. These strategies aim at placing greater social distance between the speaker and hearer. The exclusive *we* removes the hearer from the action, and passive constructions can make the agent appear to be other than S and the addressee other than H. Interestingly enough, *we* was often used by all of the teachers, but none of the utterances of *we* was the exclusive *we*. There were not many instances of passive constructions for impersonalizing either; in fact, only one example was found: 瑄1: Stepanka, so you know. *It has been already said.*瑄(190).

### 5.2.5 Using Deference

Brown and Levinson (1987) also note that employing deferential address terms are also characteristic of negative politeness. This can be done in English by using, for example, title and last name, as in 瑄Mr. Black瑄 and 瑄sir瑄

EFL teachers usually address their students by their first name and that is also the case of the recorded lessons with one exception. In group two, there were eight female students, half of whom were approximately 25 years old, and the second half consisted of students who were approximately 50 years old. In this group, their teacher
twice - in (704) and (760) - referred to them as *ladies*, which is an instance of showing deference.

(704) T3: Yes, you. Alright, ready, *ladies*, for listening? So what about the first one, Julie?
(760) T3: So next, *ladies*.

### 5.3 Findings on the Application of Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies

After presenting instances of each positive and negative strategy as found in the classroom interactions, we can now move to a general interpretation of the findings. Here, we will be able to see the strategies that are more favored by specific teachers, and we will be able to focus on preferences based on whether the teacher is of Czech or American origin.

Figure 9. Occurrence of application of positive and negative politeness strategies in teachers' talk
From the figure above we can see that the preferred strategies of politeness by all four teachers in the recordings were being agreeable and using in-group language. Generally speaking, all teachers preferred achieving politeness by means of positive politeness and by appealing to a learner’s positive face. This is understandable, given that a positive learning environment and a pleasant atmosphere for learners has long been stressed by the majority of TEFL methodologies.

Out of all negative politeness strategies that were analyzed in the preceding part, the most commonly used strategy was indirectness. This strategy enables learners to feel unimpeded by action in a classroom, and allows teachers to give learners the opportunity to decide on the learning process themselves. Through negative politeness, teachers can emphasize the magnitude of the student’s role in learning collaboration, and thereby minimize the student’s dependence on the teacher to accomplish his/her educational goals.

Figure 9 also shows the personal preferences of each analyzed politeness strategy in comparison to other teachers. In the following section, we will look at the use of politeness as achieved by each teacher in his lesson.

Figure 10. Use of politeness strategies by Teacher 1

![Teacher 1](chart.png)

Figure 10 illustrates the specific situation of politeness use of Teacher 1 (Czech teacher). Teacher 1 used positive politeness strategies in his contributions more
frequently than negative politeness strategies. The "being agreeable" strategy occurred the most frequently (in approximately 18% of all utterances produced), followed by the use of "in-group" language (approximately 10% of all utterances). Teacher 1 was also "unique" in his use of politeness strategies insofar as the small talk and impersonalization strategies occurred only in his contributions.

Figure 11. Use of politeness strategies by Teacher 2

![Figure 11: Use of politeness strategies by Teacher 2](image)

Figure 11 represents the use of politeness strategies by Teacher 2 (native-speaking teacher). Teacher 2 enacted the lowest number of politeness strategies in total. Therefore, we can say that he was slightly less polite than the remaining three teachers. However, he used a lot of positive back-channel cues, repetitions, "in-group" language and also non-verbal politeness strategies, such as smiling or laughing. By no means can we deduce that the lesson by Teacher 2 is an example of an "impolite" lesson. The video supports the claim that Teacher 2 managed to create a pleasant learning atmosphere and these incidents show that he was polite. To create a pleasant and supportive classroom atmosphere, teachers certainly need to use at least some politeness strategies, and the ratio of politeness strategies used by Teacher 2 was sufficient to create a pleasant atmosphere in the class.
Figure 12. Use of politeness strategies by Teacher 3

Figure 12 represents the realizations of politeness by Teacher 3 (native-speaking teacher). This graph shows us that Teacher 1 predominantly used positive politeness strategy, namely "being agreeable" i.e. positive back-channel cues and repetition. In comparison to other teachers, this teacher used "pre-sequences to directives" the most frequently. Teacher 3 is the only one who used deference by referring to a group of students as "ladies".

Figure 13. Use of politeness strategies by Teacher 4
Figure 13 shows us the employment of politeness strategies by Teacher 4 (Czech teacher). Again, we see that the majority of politeness strategies aimed at enhancing students’ positive face. This teacher also applied one of the negative politeness strategies, namely indirectness, more frequently than other three teachers. He often achieved indirectness by using the modal verb ‘can’.

After the discussion of the findings on the use of politeness strategies by each teacher, we can now focus on summarizing the data. I will try to draw some conclusions based on the origin of the teacher. The realization of politeness strategies by the two Czech teachers will be compared to those of the native-speaking teachers. It is understandable that the validity of the data would be higher if more than four teachers had been recorded and analyzed, but I submit that some tendencies can be observed from the current sample.

![Figure 14. Average occurrence of application of positive and negative politeness according to the origin of the teacher](image-url)
Figure 15. Application of politeness strategies according to the origin of the teacher ĭ summarizing graph

Figure 14 and Figure 15 summarize the findings of the use of positive and negative politeness strategies according to the origin of the teachers. Figure 14 shows the average of occurrence of each strategy by either the Czech or native-speaking teachers. Figure 15 then totals the percentage values to give us a summarizing graph of the use of politeness in the recordings. These figures provide us with some remarkable findings.

We can see that the Czech teachers used politeness strategies more frequently than the native speakers did. Nevertheless, we cannot say that politeness strategies occurred in 43% of all řutterances because some strategies occurred multiple times in one řutterance. We can exemplify this by the following turn of teacher 4: ř(861) T4: Zdenda asks if he can see it, but I think, maybe after the lesson ĭ ř In this particular example the teacher used the řn-group address term řZdenda to express positive politeness, but he also used hedges ř think and řmaybe to express negative politeness. In any case, out of the data we may conclude that politeness features were found more when the teacher was of Czech origin. This can be seen with both positive and negative politeness. The Czech teachers also used, as Figure 15 illustrates, the majority of analyzed strategies more frequently than the native speakers did. The only
two exceptions were two negative politeness strategies, namely pre-sequences to directives and using deference.

Another interesting fact is that the positive politeness strategy being agreeable was found in approximately the same frequency with the Czech teachers and native speakers. This strategy was also used most frequently by both Czech teachers and native-speaking teachers. This strategy is achieved by repeating what the previous speaker said or by positive back channel cues. The majority of all follow-ups or responses contained this strategy. This interesting result, which shows a similarity irrespective of the origin of the teacher, is a consequence of the type of context, i.e. the classroom as such. One of the teachers' roles in a classroom is to support the learners by providing them with positive feedback, which tends to create a positive learning environment. All four teachers from the recorded lessons fulfilled the expectation of creating a pleasant classroom atmosphere, and this strategy was one of the means of achieving it.

Another similarity can be discovered amongst the negative politeness strategies, namely hedging. Hedges show the speaker's desire not to commit fully to the truth value of a statement, and are realized by incorporating certain expressions, such as maybe, I think, perhaps, kind of, wonder if etc., into a statement. As already mentioned, the teacher is traditionally the one who possesses the knowledge in a classroom, and therefore s/he should be always ready to commit him/herself to the truth value of anything s/he says. This setting has slightly changed, and teachers now tend to interact with students as partners in the learning process. Nevertheless, what is interesting about the results of the frequency of hedging by the Czech teachers and the native speakers is this similarity. The number is high in neither of the two groups, but the percentage is very similar.

An-group language was used over three times more often by the Czech teachers in comparison to the native-speaking teachers. This positive politeness strategy can be linguistically accomplished in many ways, but in the speech samples the use of the inclusive we prevailed. It has already been commented on the fact that an equivalent to the inclusive we can also be found in the Czech language, and therefore it may be natural for Czech speakers to adopt this strategy. However, some other strategies are also similarly used in Czech and English, which is also a partial explanation.

The use of indirectness by Czech teachers appeared four times more frequently in comparison to their American counterparts. This is a typical negative politeness
strategy that is widely used in the majority of contexts. However, indirectness is not very typical for classroom language, but it should not be considered a problem when this strategy is realized only marginally. There are two justifications for this. The first one is the economy of teachers' language in a classroom of English. Here, we can again repeat the notion of teacher talking time and student talking time and the claim that the teacher talking time should not exceed the student talking time. Indirectness in and of itself is not a way of achieving language economy. The second argument relates to the respective roles of the teacher and the student. It is understandable that this strategy is probably more appropriate for interactions between speakers who do not know each other, or when the speaker is talking to someone on a hierarchically higher position. In connection with this particular example, it is worthwhile to refer to Leech's pragmatist paradox, as already mentioned in the theoretical part. That is, if teachers were overly polite, especially with certain negative politeness strategies, their teaching might become ineffective, because they would not be cooperative.

5.4 Discussion of Findings

This research aims at verifying two hypotheses:

1. Teachers are basically polite in a classroom of English language.

2. The politeness strategies of Czech teachers of English differ from those of native speaking teachers.

To draw such a conclusion, four lessons of English at the intermediate level were video recorded, using the method of naturalistic inquiring. Afterwards, teacher-student interactions were picked out and analyzed in terms of certain features of positive and negative politeness, as suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987).

1. Teachers are basically polite in a classroom of English as a second language.

The classroom is a unique context where teachers are in a position in which, especially when they give instructions or elicit information from students, their utterances should be clear and direct. Also, the teacher-student relationship is still quite hierarchical. Even though this hierarchy notably changes with the shift towards student-centered teaching, and we can see that many teaching methodologies accentuate that teachers should be learner partners in the learning process, the teacher is still the one
who possesses the knowledge, enabling him/her to exercise a certain power over his/her students. Finally, teachers face time constraints. They should achieve certain goals in a lesson, and so they need to employ language economy, i.e. be efficient and urgent.

All these arguments could mean that teachers may or even should be impolite in a classroom, but the research results showed the opposite. The teacher frequently used positive politeness strategies in the lessons to create a congenial atmosphere. They also employed some negative politeness strategies. Students, thanks to positive politeness strategies employed by teachers, should feel unthreatened by their mistakes and thereby encouraged to communicate in English. Additionally, thanks to negative politeness strategies, they should feel as responsible managers of their own learning.

On the basis of the research results, we may reasonably conclude that teachers are, on the whole, polite in a classroom of English as a second language.

2. The politeness strategies of Czech teachers of English differ from those of native speaking teachers.

From the analysis in part 5.1.3 of this thesis, we can come to the conclusion that teachers' application of politeness strategies in a classroom interaction differs according to the origin of the teacher only to a certain degree. To support Hypothesis 1 the sample of four lessons is sufficient to draw a conclusion. To support Hypothesis 2 fully, a broader sample of lessons would be preferable.

Nevertheless, in the four lessons some noteworthy phenomena were detected. Politeness strategies were executed more frequently by the Czech teachers in comparison to the native speakers. Some strategies, namely “being agreeable” and “hedging”, were used in a similar frequency irrespective of the origin of the speaker. The native speakers used some strategies that the Czech teachers did not, namely “pre-sequences to directives” and “using deference”. On the other hand, “small talk” and “impersonalizing” were applied only by one Czech teacher. The difference between the uses of politeness strategies according to the origin of teachers can be mainly seen with “in-group language”, which was utilized three times more often by the Czech teachers, and “indirectness”, which was used four times more often by the Czech teachers in comparison to their American colleagues.
On the basis of the research results and the subsequent analysis, we can deduce that the politeness strategies of Czech teachers of English most probably differ from those of native speaking teachers in specific ways.

6. Implications for Teaching English as a Second Language

This brief chapter aims at commenting on the implications of politeness as such for teaching English as a second language based on the studied literature and research findings.

An English classroom should be a place where students acquire L2. The teacher is usually the one who controls most of what is said or done in a classroom. By expressing these two premises, we can see that the teacher is also responsible for creating opportunities for learners to acquire the language in an appropriate way. Here, we can cite Kasper, who sets an important goal of language teaching by saying:

Language teaching [. . .] has the important task to help students situate L2 communicative practices in their socio-cultural context and appreciate their meanings and functions within the L2 communityÔ(Kasper 1997: 7)

Based on the studied material and on the research findings, I would like to advocate the importance of mastering the theoretical knowledge of pragmatics and politeness in particular. When the teacher is aware of the theoretical background of politeness, s/he can evaluate its importance, and consider both the explicit and the implicit teaching of politeness in an English classroom.

Politeness is realized by teachers in every lesson. Teaching involves didactic communication, and communication as interaction between the teacher and the student involves the relationship to the other and thus also politeness.

Teachers should aim at using politeness strategies appropriately. Adopting the notion of face as suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987), we can see the magnitude of both the positive and the negative politeness strategies in a classroom for these two reasons. (1) By expressing positive politeness, teachers can generate a relaxing atmosphere in a classroom that is enjoyable for both the teacher and, more importantly, the learner. In such an atmosphere, the learners can feel confident, unthreatened by their
mistakes and motivated to get involved in various classroom activities. The use of positive politeness strategies contributes to successful learning and achieving goals. (2) By expressing negative politeness, the learner is given certain autonomy in the educational process. The learner’s autonomy is vital, because s/he is after all the one who can influence his/her learning the most. The student’s self-management of learning should also be stressed throughout the process.

In conclusion, thanks to the knowledge of politeness and the use of various politeness strategies, teachers can foster a positive learning environment, giving learners the autonomy they need to be able to achieve their own goals. Moreover, by both the explicit and the implicit realization of politeness, learners may become aware of how politeness is used in English, and thereby learn to use politeness appropriately. As Bou-Franch (1998: 62) puts it: “Learners need to be able to present the desired image of themselves and at the same time interpret their interlocutors’ image as intended in social interaction.”
7. Conclusion

This thesis deals with Aspects of politeness in a classroom of English as a Second Language. Since pragmatic competence is considered the most difficult aspect of language to master in learning a second language (Blum-Kulka and Sheffer, 1993: 219), and while grammatical error may reveal a speaker to be a less than proficient language-user, pragmatic failure reflects badly on him/her as a person (Thomas 1983: 97), it is important for teachers of English to dedicate extra effort to pragmatic and especially politeness learning and teaching. The term linguistic politeness refers to strategies aimed at conflict-free communication and also at the self-realization and self-defense of a speaker in a conversation. This definition provides us with a strong argument why it is important to master the knowledge of pragmatics and politeness in particular. Therefore, throughout the thesis the crucial place that politeness should have in a language classroom is stressed.

The first part of the thesis is dedicated to the overview of linguistic politeness to present a framework for the analytical part. At the very beginning of this part, the thesis mentions the theories of the fathers of pragmatics that inspired the politeness theories. The dominant part of this overview is then devoted to the most influential theories on politeness, namely those by Lakoff, Leech, Brown and Levinson and Watts.

Since this interdisciplinary thesis focuses on the relation between politeness and language teaching, Chapter Three summarizes the findings of theorists on the topic of teaching linguistic politeness. It is emphasized that teachers should sensitize learners to the differences and similarities between two cultures and to how these can be derived from the generic analysis of linguistic politeness devices (Bou-Franch and Garcés-Cornejos 2003:17). A broader perspective of politeness in classroom discourse is given in Chapter 3.3, which provides a commentary on the impact that politeness strategies have on the classroom atmosphere and learner language achievement.

Didactic communication involves the use of positive and negative politeness at all levels (verbal, non-verbal and paraverbal) concerning the interaction teacher-student (Hobjil 2012:213), and research in this thesis focuses on the analysis of verbal realizations of politeness as found in the recordings of four, 60-minute English lessons at the intermediate level. The research was designed to verify the two hypotheses: (1) teachers are basically polite in a classroom of English as a second language and (2) the
politeness strategies of Czech teachers of English differ from those of native speaking teachers. To investigate as realistic a situation as possible in an ESL classroom, the thesis employed a method called “naturalistic inquiring” (Allwright and Bailey, 1991). The author tried not to intervene in the research setting at all, and the only “unnatural” part of the lessons was a video recorder present in the classroom. The participants in the research were four qualified English teachers of a similar age and the same sex, two of whom were of Czech origin and two of American origin. After the lessons, student-teacher interactions were transcribed and analyzed from different perspectives of Brown and Levinson’s framework of positive and negative politeness strategies. Brown and Levinson’s model was chosen partly because this model is considered to be perhaps the most thorough and most quoted one, and mainly because this model proved to be suitable for verifying the two hypotheses. Since all four lessons had prescribed material from New English File Intermediate, this book was also briefly analyzed from the perspective of politeness.

The analytical part commented on those instances of positive politeness strategies that were found in the sample, namely: expressing an interest and noticing the hearer, using in-group language, making small talk and being agreeable. Negative politeness strategies that were discussed were questioning or hedging, indirectness, pre-sequences to directives, impersonalizing and using deference. The beginning of the analytical part presented instances and showed some examples of each strategy from the recorded samples. The next chapter of the analytical part provided a more general interpretation of findings. This research produced some interesting results. All four teachers preferred achieving politeness by means of positive politeness, especially by being agreeable and using in-group language strategies. The most common strategy of negative politeness was proven to be indirectness. This part also outlined the distinctive features of the politeness strategies realized by each teacher and presented some particularities (e.g. only Teacher 1 used small talk or impersonalization; Teacher 2 realized the lowest number of politeness strategies in total; Teacher 3 used “pre-sequences to directives” the most frequently; and Teacher 4 used indirectness more frequently than the other teachers). As far as general conclusions based on the origin of the teacher goes, the Czech teachers used politeness strategies and a majority of the analyzed strategies more frequently than native speakers did. The only two exceptions were the two negative politeness strategies, namely “pre-sequences to directives” and “using deference.” Another interesting fact was that the positive politeness strategy
“Being agreeable” and “hedging” as a negative politeness strategy were found in approximately the same frequency with the Czech teachers and native speakers. This similarity probably arises from the fact that professional teachers, irrespective of their origin, should adopt a native-like way of teaching, and therefore the use of politeness is to some extent alike among English teachers.

The analytical part provided the conclusions that even though the role of the teacher in a classroom sometimes undermines politeness in several respects, such as the hierarchical relationship between students and teachers and a certain time pressure that favours language economy, teachers are, on the whole, polite in a classroom of English as a second language. The second hypothesis was not so easy to justify in light of the current research. Despite the fact that some remarkable findings concerning the difference of politeness strategies used by Czech teachers in comparison to native speakers were observed, it is only in some measure that we can say that the politeness strategies of Czech teachers of English most probably differ from those of native speaking teachers. The current research could only show a tendency in this area.

The last part of the thesis aims at summarizing the implications that this thesis, its theoretical overview and its research have for teaching English as a second language. It advocates the importance of mastering the theoretical knowledge of pragmatics and politeness in particular. Since teachers are responsible for what is happening in the classroom, and therefore govern the language acquisition of their students to a fundamental degree, they should be aware of the importance of politeness and pragmatic competence in general. Furthermore, since it was observed that teachers use both positive and negative politeness strategies in their interaction with students, it is important to stress how these strategies influence the learner and the classroom atmosphere. Positive politeness strategies contribute to creating a relaxing, amiable atmosphere and even camaraderie in the class, resulting in the enhancement of the learner’s confidence, his/her greater involvement in classroom activities, and his/her appeal to extrinsic motivation in the learning process. On the other hand, negative politeness also has a preeminent role in the classroom to the extent that the teacher respects the learner’s individuality and the learner is given autonomy in the educational process. Negative politeness thus appeals to the intrinsic motivation of a learner.

However, this thesis has some limitations. To address the issue in its full range, a broader sample of lessons would be needed. Given the limited sample, the findings, especially regarding the difference of employment of strategies based on the teacher's
origin, are less convincing. It is hoped that more accurate and generalizable results will be reached in future research. Also, the politeness in an ESL classroom could be viewed from the perspectives of other politeness theories. Specifically, Leech’s Politeness Principle could be applied to the classroom context and could bring another stratum of data to the current research. It is also quite crucial to note that in all four lessons the students were adults and quite respectable learners, usually with a university degree, and therefore politeness had an appropriate place. It would be interesting to compare these results with lessons involving young learners. This thesis also focused on the teacher’s use of politeness, but it could be also directed at the learner’s use of politeness. On a different note, the recorded lessons and the transcript could be used quite universally by future researchers, and the lessons could be observed and studied with any politeness-unrelated perspective on mind.

Ultimately, this thesis may inspire some new ideas concerning politeness strategies employed in an ESL context, and thereby enable teachers to take a more effective approach to teaching, such that their students will master the uses of politeness.
Notes:

1 "Výzkum zdvořilosti se zpravidla řadí do pragmatické lingvistiky (pragmatiky), tedy do disciplíny, která studuje řál z funkčního hlediska, posuzuje vhodnost určitých promluvových prvků v konkrétních komunikačních situacích."

2 "Lokuce se vyjádří simultánně, nelze je od sebe oddělit."


4 "However, as Hirschová (2006: 140) points out, Grice is not proposing a manual for successful conversation, but his Cooperative Principle is often misinterpreted in this way. These are not advice how to behave in a conversation but a description of how we behave."

5 Hirschová (2006: 171) comments on the Lakoff approach as follows: "In different cultures are principles 1–3 employed in different scope, i.e. the succession of these principles can differ, but principles 1–3 are always applied."

6 "This scale was also introduced by Brown and Gillman, but they called it the solidarity factor."

8 This strategy often leads to ineffective communication or to the end of conversation. (Hirschová 2009: 175).

9 Pages 36 - 39 from the student's book are to be found in appendix 3.
**Abbreviations and Transcription Symbols**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(. )</td>
<td>short pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Cooperative Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>social distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>English as a foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>face-threatening act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>hearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>person's native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>person's second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Model Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Politeness Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Teacher 1 (recording 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Teacher 2 (recording 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Teacher 3 (recording 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Teacher 4 (recording 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFL</td>
<td>Teaching English as a foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_x</td>
<td>seriousness (weightiness) of FTA x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendices

Appendix 1: How to be Polite Postcard

Appendix 2: Full version of instructions for the research lessons as given to teachers

Instructions for the research lesson on 13/4

1. Your lesson should be based on New English File Intermediate, unit 3A, page 37–39
2. It is up to you what you decide to cover, but there is an obligatory homework assignment for your students. It is also your decision whether you want to give your students extra instructions during the lesson, making it easier for them to do their homework.
3. There is an idea for a role play at the end of this page. You can use it if you want, or you can modify it according to your needs.
Homework
Please send your homework to subertova.aneta@gmail.com.

Your Italian colleague is receiving personal phone calls in the office. He speaks very loudly, and you are very often unable to focus on your work. You told him many times that it annoys you, but he seems to ignore it. Write an email to the HR manager of your company, complaining about it. Make sure your email is polite (you don’t want to lose your job over it!).

Role play instructions:
Tell students that they are travelling by bus. Rearrange the seating, so that the chairs are in two rows behind each other like on a bus.

Hand out the role play cards; give the students a few minutes to read their card. Monitor and help your students. According to number of students, you might have to be the man talking on the phone. If you have enough students, you should pick the strongest student to play that role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student A:</th>
<th>Student B:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are a 15-year-old teenager. You are on a bus on your way home from school. A man in the front row is talking very loudly about a personal topic. You don't mind a bit, because you think the man is cool. An old lady starts to complain and you want to explain to her that everyone has the freedom to do whatever they want.</td>
<td>You are a 70-year-old lady. You are on a bus on your way to the cemetery. A man in the front row is talking very loudly about a personal topic. It really annoys you and you start complaining to the person sitting next to you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student C:</th>
<th>Student D:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are a 40-year-old woman. You are on a bus on your way to a business meeting. A man in the front row is talking very loudly about a personal topic. It annoys you, because you want to prepare for the business meeting. You hear that some old lady is also complaining about it and you decide to speak to the man and politely ask him to speak quietly.</td>
<td>You are a 25 year-old man. You are on a bus talking to your friend on the phone about last night's wild party. You cannot hear him properly so you speak loudly. You usually call your friend “dude”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student E:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are a 50-year-old bus driver and you are very stressed, because the traffic is really bad today and it's raining heavily. The man speaking on the phone very loudly is annoying you very much. You are commenting on the traffic and in between you are trying to tell the man to be quiet. You are a very rude man who is not afraid to use bad words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: New English File Intermediate page 36 ÷ 39
4 READING

a. Look at the postcard. What does it say about the English?

b. Read Culture Shock and tick ✔️ the sentences which says what the article is about.

- The English have very good manners.
- The English and Russian idea of good manners is different.
- The English are polite but insincere.
- The Russians are very rude and unfriendly.

5 LISTENING

a. (04) Listen to four people who live in England, answering the question 'Are English people too polite? Do they answer yes or no? If yes, what do they think the English should do?

1. László, an English teacher from Hungary  Yes / No
2. Paula, a businesswoman from Argentina  Yes / No
3. Máté, an economist from Turkey  Yes / No
4. Brenda, a student from Germany  Yes / No

b. Listen again and answer the questions.

1. Why were László's and his friends in London?
2. Did he and his friends think they were going to pass or fail? Why?
3. What happened in the end?
4. What does László think when English people are polite?
5. How does Paula describe the Latin people?
6. What does Máté think about the English people he has met in his job?
7. What kind of English people does he say aren't polite?
8. What happened to Brenda when she was in London?
9. What did she say to the last person? Why?

6 SPEAKING

Look at the five situations. In groups, discuss...

Do people do these things in your country?

Do you think it's good or bad manners to do these things, or does it matter?

In a restaurant
- let your children run around and be noisy
- be very affectionate to your partner
- talk on your mobile

Men and women - A man's role
- pay for a woman on the first date
- wait for a woman to go through the door first
- make sure a woman gets home safely at night

In a house
- always stop at a pedestrian crossing
- honk at someone who's driving slowly
- drive with the windows down and your music playing

Good manners? Bad manners? Does it matter?

Greeting people
- use people on both cheeks when you meet them for the first time
- call older people by their first names
- use more formal language when speaking to an older person

In a house
- take a present if you're invited to dinner at someone's house
- arrive more than 10 minutes late for a lunch or dinner
- smoke in a house where the owners don't smoke
Appendix 4: Transcripts

Transcript 1 (Teacher 1)

(1) T: Hello everybody. (pause) Welcome. I am terribly sorry you had to wait for me. (pause) I see you have some cakes, so I hope you have enjoyed the break. Did you enjoy the break?

(2) Ss: Yes.

(3) T: May I ask you- if you can prepare a piece of paper and write your name on it, so I can call you, so I can call your name and I do not have to say you and you. (pause) Alright, so this is Pavla, Vlasta, Jiří. So the topic today is mobile phones. I believe that everybody knows what a mobile phone is. Jiří, what is a mobile phone?

(4) J: What is mobile phone?

(5) T: Yes, what is mobile phone?

(6) J: Mobile phone is something with these can I speaking of the people when I did not see.

(7) T: When you can’t see them. Yes, this is correct. Does everybody have a mobile phone in these days Ž Petra?

(8) P: Yes, in these class we have everybody.

(9) Vlasta Ž do you agree?

(10) V: A mobile phone is a very good thing for pictures and discussing (unintelligible)

(11) T: So, it is a thing not only for calling. What else can we do with a mobile phone? Dagmar mentioned pictures.

(12) S: Internet.

(13) T: Yes, definitely, you can access the internet.

(14) S: An email.

(15) T: Yes, we can send emails. Do you happen to come across anything else?

(16) S: Music.

(17) T: Listening to music. Yes very good.

(18) S: And game.

(19) T: Games! Playing games. (smiling)

(20) S: Go to websites.

(21) T: Yes, yes, the internet. Looking at websites.

(22) T: I would like you to have a look at this mobile phone questionnaire. And we’ve got pairs here, so it’s going to be Petra and Pavlač.

(23) Dagmar and Ž sorry Ž

(24) T: Vlasta.

(25) T: Vlasta. Yes! (laughs) And this was Střéanka and Jiří together. Ask you partner, you can choose, you don’t have to ask everything. There are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, eight questions. I would like you to choose three. So read the questions, please, read the questions. If you find words you don’t understand, you can ask me and if not just choose three questions and ask your partner.

(26) T: (to a student) Vlasta, do you understand what to do?
Students talk to each other. Teacher squats down in order to be on students’ level, because they are sitting on chairs. Help them with vocabulary, monitors. Teacher laughs with students.

T: Have you completed all three questions?

Thank you very much for speaking – this is enough.

T: Petra, can I ask you, the most interesting thing you’ve heard from Pavla.

S: She still have one mobile phone for 4 years.

T: Uh huh.

S: - and itâ€™s still working.

T: And itâ€™s still working. Good. Pavla, what about the most interesting thing you’ve heard from Pavla? mmm- Petra, sorry.

S: Petra have a new mobile phone.

Petra: Petra has- (laugh)

T: Is it really necessary to use - I mean grammatically it is correct, but ů did you understand?

P: Yeah. (laughs)

T: (laughs) Uh huh. Sheâ€™s got a new mobile phone - is the information. Dagmar ů what did you hear from Vlasta?

D: Vlasta has her mobile phone for a very long time and she use in her car hands-free.

T: She uses hands- free. Everybody knows what is a hands-free, right? And Vlasta ů

S: Dagmar have had her mobile very long time, she bought it when this mobile was first in the Czech Republic.

D: When it came to the Czech Republic.

T: (laughs) Really? Do you have it here?

D: Yeah.

T: So the bag is full of it, right, so itâ€™s like (mime the action of carrying a heavy bag) ů you have to carry it... So Jiří what did you hear from Stepanka, what did she tell you about the question?

S: What ask ů?

T: The most interesting.

S2: About your kolegyn.

S: About my kolegyn what is the most interesting? T: (laughs) Only from the questions? (T Smiles)

S: For me is interesting, she has used her auto ů car ů hands-free.

T: And when you have a look at it (writes on a board) she has used. Is it really what we want to say? So is has used really necessary? Well - look at the question and there is ů, ř Do you ever use hands-free?

S: Neslyším (unintelligible) I have bad hearing.

T: Sorry, yes, ãšÌŽ speak loudly. The tense here - What tense is it? What tense is it?

S: pÅedpÅ¾tomy | as.

T: Present perfect ů yes.
S: She has used to é
T: Oh, no no no, she has used hands free (writes on board) is ok. But what does it mean? What does it say?
S: From past to now.
T: Really?
S: She used hands-free in the past and now...
T: There is some effect,
S: yes
T: yes, yes, that what the sentence says. That she used it in the past and now it has some effect. Which well- grammatically OK, but Iâ€™t say ì she uses (hands-free this is definitely better, this is present simple and we use it for repeated actions.
S: She usually uses hands-free.
T: That is beautiful, yes! Uh huh. She usually, or often, always... right? It is much better. It is better than has used. Thank you. And Stepánka, what about Jiří? What did he tell you?
S: He donâ€™t remembers wie long he has his phone.
T: Uh, I see, he doesnâ€™t remember it. Uh huh. And again, he remembers how long not wie long ì youâ€™ve been studying German, right?
S: Yes. (laughs)
T: (laughs) German is wie lange, is it? He remembers how long he é . And again what about the tense? It was you ì if I remember ì who said she has her mobile phone for three/four years. And itâ€™s the same tense. So what is the tense?
S: Past perfect.
T: Past?
S: Present perfect.
T: Present perfect, yes. So Petra ì what would it be? He rememberers how long ì or he doesnâ€™t remember- this is not important, really ì
S: He is using now.
T: Is using? Do you agree?
S: He has usedÉ
T: is using now ì because itâ€™s for ì you are sitting now. Has had is the best. Has used is also fine, but has used is different, you could say ì he has been using ì but this is for longer than just five minutes to explain that. Good. Alright. Now, I want you to look at this exercise and weâ€™ve got some sentence s printed in bold. (board) Do you know what it means? If I say ì something is printed in bold. What is it? Stepanka ì
S: I donâ€™t know.
S2: Bold is plešťtý.
T: Yes (laughs), but his is something different. Do you use Microsoft Word? You've got b and you've got this I do you know that? In Microsoft word. When you want to underline something I so it's this one. (writes on the board) And you want to for example underline something I so its u I underline and then you have this.

S: Yes.

T: What is it the I in English?

S: I I I

T: This would be italics ī in Czech kurzíva. And you've got another button to make it thick, to be in bold.

S: tučně.

T: Yes, they call it tučně, no, we call it tučně, they call it printed in bold. And here you have some words printed it bold. You have ě .

Is there anything you don't understand?

S: Já nevim, co se s tim má dělat.

T: Just read it and tell if there's anything you don't understand.

S: engaged?

T: When you have "The line is engaged, or the line is busy." Jiří - what does it mean?

S: The person is for example to at work and he is busy, she not engaged, he hasn't hung up the telephone.

T: The previous call. The person is speaking to someone else. This is the

S: Yes.

T: Now it's clear? Good.

S: busy is the same as engaged.

T: [writes pronunciation of engaged on board] Like this

S: What is it engaged?

Other students laugh.

T: (laughs a bit desperately) This is the last sentence.

S: engage, jojojo. I understand.

T: Alright. So finally we get to the exercise itself. I would like you to listen to the sounds and you'll write the number of the recording and you'll connect it to the sounds. You'll match the sounds and the sentences.

Listening

T: I don't want to play it again. Sorry, the CD is probably scratched or something, I am sorry. But the first one I what did you hear I Stepanka I what was it the 1st sound.

S: I write the line is busy but já mám problem s tím na zvukama

S: The first sound is dialing the numbers.
S: She is choosing her ring tone.

T: Yes. She is choosing her ringtone. A ringtone is the sound you hear when some is calling you.

The second one. ŘOK! Goodbye. Ř(demonstrates hanging up) Dagmar Ř what was it?

S: 2 is (pause)

T: Which one was it? It was ŘOK! Goodbye. Ř(demonstrates hanging up)

S: leaving message?

T: leaving message?

S: Yes.

T: No, no, no.

S: He just hung up.

T: He just hung up. Yes. He just hung up. Again Ř you can see the present perfect here, pŘepřítomný Ř as, why is it? Why is the present perfect here? He just hung up. That something we've spoken about. Anybody?

J: Explain?

T: Yes. The tense.

J: Hang up is something (other students laugh) when a person _

T: Not the verb, just the tense Ř why has hung up?

S: In this situation somebody doesn't is- emm- doesn't stop thisé

T: The activity hasn't finished? No you can say this. The action itself is finished.

S: It past.

T: Yes, it is past - the action is in the past. So why present perfect? (pause) there is the effect, the result in the present, now the phone is completed, is finished, he doesn't speak anymore. This is the result, the effect, the consequence in present. OK, thank you. Three Ř who knows?

S: (unintelligible)

T: I am sorry. (leans towards the students, because he doesn't understand.

S: The line is busy.

T: The line is busy. Yes, this was number 3. Number 4 Ř Stepanka.

S: I don't have it. (laughs)

T: (laughs) You don't have it, you're lost.

S: She has a message (unintelligible)

T: Very good, very good. Number 5?

S: He is dialing a number.

T: Yes, He is dialing a number. To dial a number is to choose the numbers, right Ř 35426 Ř this is to dial.

Alright, good.

Do you have to leave, or can you stay for 60 minutes? Can you be here till 12 o'clock? Is it OK for everybody.

S: Yes.

T: Good. Thank you. Can you turn to page 27? There is a picture, a man. Can you describe the picture, Dagmar?
S: This picture?
T: Yes, the man. What can you see?
S: The man sits in a tram.
T: Every day?
S: Yes, it's possible, every day.
T: No no no, but you said he sits that why I said every day.
S: Every day, he sits and
T: Sorry, I confused you (laughs a bit desperately)
S2: present continuous
T: Present continuous is better for describing pictures. He is sitting
S1: He is sitting, yeah and he is smiling
S3: He is speaking and laughing.
T: He is speaking about something. What else can you see (points at different student)
S4: He is noise
T: he is probably very noisy, yes, uh huh; he is laughing out loud, if you know the acronym LOL.
Vlasta what else can you see? Maybe behind him
S: Behind him, a man is sitting and writing a book reading.
T: reading, he is reading. Jiří - what do you think -
S: I think it's a bad thing to do this.
T: It's a bad thing to do this. I would agree and I think everybody would agree. And Stepanka, what are the feelings of the people behind him?
S: He is (pause) no rozloben angry.
T: Angry. Angry and we know why. Now, I would like you to talk to your partner and say if you ever call on a bus, or a tram yes, if you ever call to someone, or you answer the phone, or if you rather wait until you get out of the tram and then you answer the phone, or if it's not a problem for you to (T mimes that he answered the phone) Hey to be calling in a tram or on a bus.
S: je mi to jedno.
T: So who feels OK speaking on the phone and he doesn't mind. Do you mind I don't mind do you understand?
S: When I need, when I must.
S: I speak in tram on my mobile but I am not noisy.
T: You are not noisy Uh huh. And what about the other way around when you hear someone speaking very loudly do you mind? If you hear somebody
S: It is not comfortable for anybody.
T: It is not comfortable for anybody. We can all agree on that it is a very bad experience, I think. OK. We will have another listening. It's 3.2. You will hear 5 people speaking about using telephones and if they feel OK, if they don't mind... I would like you to say I hope it works I please work. I would like you match the people with the sentences. Does everybody know what to do? Yes. (the CD player doesn't work) This looks bad. Meanwhile you can read the sentences. (pause) Sorry, no listening. The CD is OK; I think it's the CD player, what is bad. So let's say that we hear it, we did the exercise, we know who said what (laughs) and now we can have a look at these sentences, these were taken from the recording. From what we have just heard (laughs) and again we are interested in the words in bold. So now we will connect the area of mobile phones with should, have to and must.

S: Modal verbs.

T: Yes, these are modal verb. Are all of these modal verbs? Modální, způsobová slovesa. Is should a modal verb?

S: Yes.

T: Is must a modal verb?

S: Yes.

T: Is have to a modal verb?

S: by by I

T: Can you give me negative sentence with should?

S: You shouldn't call on the public transport very noisy-

T: You shouldn't speak on your phone loudly let's say.

T: Sentence with must, negative one. Can you give me a sentence with must? For example I Nemíš... nemisí telefonovat.

S: mustn't

T: You mustn't speak. And what about have to I nemusí telefonovat

S: You haven't to.

T: Stepanka, so you know. It has been already said. You don't have to. So what is the difference I Vlasta?

S: Can I explain in Czech?

T: (laughs) Rather English. (FTA) And we are not speaking about the meaning; we are speaking about the structure of the sentences now. So how do you form a negative of should I shouldn't right? You add not to should. With mustn't.

S: The same.

T: But with have to? What is this (don't)

S: auxiliary.

T: Yes, that's an auxiliary verb, yes- That's why I asked you is have to a modal verb. And it is not. Because you ask I Do you have to? Not have you to doé this is é you don't make questions and negatives with other auxiliary like can, should, must, would, will I no you don't you say I would you, could you I not do you will or do you could I this is nonsense. Do you understand that?
S: Yes I do, but I don’t use it. And what about the meaning? again in pairs I speak about the meaning and you can use the sentences to help you. And again I on the right side you have the meaning; so again, you can match it I numbers and letters. So again, you can speak about it and I will speak about it with you.

Try in pairs. What do you think that number one means. This one

Speaking and the T is helping them, observing

T: Good so, should I if you use should I you should do this or you shouldn’t do this what is it

S: Advice with something, help, recommend

T: Yes, (board) or some kind of recommendation. So when you say, you should answer the phone if you are talking to a shop assistant. You are just recommending something, Stepanka I what do you think, which of these is it?

S: It’s bad thing to do this.

T: It’s a bad thing to do this. Would you agree with d?)

S: It is not allowed.

T: It is allowed. You can answer your phone when you are talking to a shop assistant. It is not very polite, but it is allowed, right. Good. When you use must and when you use mustn’t I is must and have to the same?

S: No.

T: No (laughs) that’s why we have two words.

S: have to is advice.

S2: No no

T: In some cases it is true, when you say: You have to go there and there to get to the tram is yes.

S: have to is (unintelligible)

T: Yes, we use have to with some rules-

S. law

T: Yes, law. (board) On the other hand must

S: From my person I for example I you must teach there in this (unintelligible)

T: You would say it? You would say you have to teach here.

S: Because Aneta ask you (laughs)

T: (laughs) but you would say I you have to. I can tell you you must do this homework.

S2: I feel I must

T: Uh huh

((Phone rings))

S1: You must switch off your phone in the class

T: Somebody hasn’t, yes. (laughs)

S: (laughs)

S2: School.
T: Yes. Do you understand this?
S3: Must je zákaz.
T: Ban.
S1: Must je jako z mýho (unintelligible)
T: This is personal feeling about a must. But the difference between must and have to is bigger.
We can have a look at the second. Than we have you mustnâ. We said must is a ban.
S: A recommendation.
T: No it is much stricter.
S: Donâ do this because it is not allowed.
T: You donâ have to shout on the other hand is not a ban, what is it.
S: a)
T: Yes, it is a) You donâ say nesmî ale
S: nemá
T: nemusí i it is not necessary. And the last one į we spoke about it before į
T: So we started at 5 past eleven, so would you like to finish at 5 past 12?
S: Yes.
T: So we have last 5 minutes. And I would you to spend it with speaking. So we will have a look at this į manners or the law. So have a look at the sentences and I would like you to į we can have a switch here į oh no-

Students are reading the sentences and speaking. T is helping, observing.
T: I am sorry; I will speak to you in a minute.
T: This is homework you must do (laughs)
S: (laughs)
T: So I say itâ necessary for me as a teacher. So please, do this homework and send it to Aneta. I think that 200 words is the top. So this is the end. I am sorry, I am sorry I came late and you had to wait for me, but hopefully you liked the lesson, I hope you enjoyed it.
S: Yes, thank you, thank you very much.
T: Thank you, thank you, have a nice day.

Transcript 2, Teacher 2

T: Hi, Iâm (teacher 2).
S: Stepana, Dagmar, Vlasta, Pavla, Lenka, Denis.
T: Denis į Itâ Czech?
S: Russian. (laughs)
T: Ah OK. (unintelligible) something in Russian
S: (laughs)

T: OK, so, the topic is here. You must find it. Ah, could you move this way? I think, we are still not on the camera, we must make a circle, it would be easier. Closer this way. Yeah. OK. This is the topic. You can work together to find it.

S: one word?

T: One word.

S: Menus? Manners?

T: Does it work?

S: Manners.

T: Manners?

S: Yes.

T: Yes, it's manners. It's correct. Yeah? (board)

T: If you have manners, what kind of person you are.

S: Rules.

T: Rules for what?

S: Social –

T: Yes, exactly, social rules. What is an example of good manners?

S: Say hello to someone.

T: Say hello to someone, yes. If someone gives you a present, you should say:

S: Thank you?

T: Thank you! Umm - If you go to a restaurant with a woman - ?

S: First go in a restaurant man and then women -

T: really? First the man and then the woman? Is that true?

Students all speak at one time.

S: Man should open the door.

T: Oh, the man should open the door and then -

T: Do you agree with Pavla, Stepanka?

S: Yeah, She is, she have Í

T: She's right. (leans towards the student)

S: Only in restaurant, in kino Í

T: Where?

S: - in cinema is first woman then man.
T: Why?
S: Because in restaurant there could be a danger in a restaurant.
T: There can be a danger? What is dangerous? You might eat bad food?
(laughs)
S: (laughs) Drunk guy who might hit someone.
T: Glass ľ
S2: Glass ľ what is dangerous about a glass?
S: Mime throwing
T: Ah, you mean flying glass. (laughs)
S: (Glass)
T: Is that true in Russia?
S: I don’t know, long time I’ve not been on Russia, but I think it’s the opposite.
T: Opposite?
S: Fist woman and after her man.
T: Well, that’s true in US also. But - manners are different in every country.
S: When you come in a room, you say “hello”
T: To greet someone. Do you know what is it?
S: Hi, hello, good morning ľ
T: In the afternoon you say-
S: Good afternoon.
T: And when you are going to bed?
S: Good night. S2: Go with me! (laughs)
T: (laughs) or good night. So ľ manners. So your topic ľ here. OK, so, (unintelligible) in a restaurant, so tell me about manners, number one
S: You have to order meal.
T: You have ľ yes ľ you go to a restaurant, you have to order meal. Yeah, also ľ
S2: You mustnât leave
T: You mustnât ľ itâ against the law, you would go to jail, if you donât pay.
S: You should give 30% tip.
T: You should ľ ľ itâ a good idea. Uh huh
S: (unintelligible) fifty percent tip.

T: How much?

S: 15 percent.

T: Fifteen percent, yes. Bad idea. Bad idea. Bad manners. OK.

S: You don't have to eat whole meal.

T: It's true? You don't have to; if you don't want it's not necessary. So tell me about the manners in the Czech restaurant if you have to, what you don't have to do, what you should do, what you shouldn't do. O Russian if you remember (laughs)

S: (laughs)

T: 5 sentences.

Students work together, teacher helps them, writes on the board. E.g.: T: But that's my example I tell me something different. Or T: The sentence's fine. Or: Do you have any question?

T: OK, so I do you have 5 sentences? Yes I Stepanka? So tell me, in a Czech restaurant what?

S: In a Czech restaurant you should give 10 percent tip.

S2: You shouldn't leave less than 10 percent.

T: per cent

S3: You don't have to leave any tip, if you are not satisfied.

T: Oh if you don't have to. It's not necessary is that true?

S3: If you are not satisfied with the waitress or with the food, you don't have to leave the tip.

S4: You shouldn't leave a tip when the food is sh (unintelligible)

T: I am sorry?

S4: In Czech it's (pause) terrible.

T: Terrible. Uh huh (laughs) you shouldn't if it's a bad idea to give a tip if the meal is horrible, terrible. Denis

S5: You must not come to the restaurant in the dirty clothes (wrong pronunciation)

T: In what?

S5: Dirty clothes.
S5: Dirty clothes.
T: Yes. You mustn’t. It’s against the law. Or against the rules.
S5: Against the manners.
T: Is that true Vlasta, you mustn’t come to the restaurant in dirty clothes.
S: I think (laughs)
T: (laughs) OK, what do you have to do?
S: Say hello.
T: You have to greet i who?
S: The waitress, or the people-
T: anything else?
S: You have to order.
T: You have to order, yes. What don’t you have to do?
S: You don’t have to clean your table.
T: (laughs) OK. Good. What don’t you have to do?
S: We don’t have to go to home soon.
T: I am sorry? What do you mean soon?
S: Before 10 p.m.
T: Yes, OK, maybe i we don’t have to hurry. OK, good. We can wait. OK, good. Give students card i so tell me should you, shouldn’t you, must you, mustn’t you, don’t you have to?
 Students work in pairs. T observes, lean towards students. Helps students.
T: Finished? OK, So i Střápánka i tell us.
S: (unintelligible) you have to take (unintelligible) someone’s house.
T: you have to? It’s a good idea or you have to?
S: it’s a good idea.
T: You should i but you do you have to?
S: No.
T: You should but you don’t have to, it’s not the rule. OK. Good. Uh i anything else?
S: You shouldn’t arrive more than 10 minutes for a lunch or dinner.
T: Do you agree? You should arrive more than ten minutes?
S: It’s normal (laugh)
T: (laughs) It’s normal?
(370) S: 10 minutes is good but more is bad.
(371) T: 10 minutes is the maximum.
(372) S: In Czech it's 15 minutes.
(373) S: is diplomatical
(374) T: 15 minutes is the maximum, more than 15 minutes is the problem.
(375) S: You can go home?
(376) T: Really?
(377) S: For man 15 minutes is OK, for man it's not.
(378) T: How do you call someone who is always on time? I will meet you at 7 am and I meet at 7 exactly. Do you know an adjective?
(379) S: Late man
(380) T. No, always on time.
(381) S: Our first lecturer was late. (laugh)
(382) T: Yes, exactly, he was not. (writes on board)
(383) S: punctual.
(384) T: So if you are punctual you are always on time. Please say it's punctual Stepanka.
(385) S: punctual.
(386) T: Next? I - I'm sorry, I've forgotten your name, it's she Stepanka, you are? It's
(387) S: Dagmar
(388) T: Dagmar, that's right! Oh, it's such a nice name, too. Oh please, say it's punctual.
(389) S: punctual
(390) S: punctual
(391) (é)
(392) T: Are you punctual?
(393) S: sometimes.
(394) S: always.
(395) S: No.
(396) T: No. Good Is it necessary, do you have to be punctual in the Czech Republic?
(397) S: No no, it is not necessary. Tell me do you have to? No, you don't.
S: You don't have to be punctual.

T: It's true.

S: No you have to.

T: It's a rule?

S: No, it's a good manner so you should.

T: I am more Spanish. I am not punctual. Spanish is very not punctual. Who is punctual in Europe? German.

T: That's right.

S2: English.

T: English, yeah.

S: Österreich too.

T: Österreich

S: No no - Austria.

T: Austrian what?

S: Schweiz

T: Schweiz is -

S: Switzerland.

T: OK, alright, ok, so, (hands out slips of papers, true/false on the board)

Students do the activity, T observes, help them out. Helps students

T: Who has number one?

S: (unintelligible) chopsticks

T: up what upright I explains the vocabulary. So what do you think I true/false?

S: True

T: It's true. OK. Three?

(é)

T: That's really good French I Napoleon? /napoleon/

 (...) 

T: Thumb say it. Say it. Say.

S: fam. (laughs)

T: (laughs)

S: correct pronunciation
(428) T: Perfect. OK, good. 7 1 who has 7?
(429) S: In Germany, every office must have a view of the sky.
(430) S: False.
(431) T: False? It true.
(432) S: Really?
(433) T: I donât, thatâs what the book says (laughs) I donât know. The book says it true and the book is the word of God.
(434) S: (laugh)
(435) (...) 
(436) T: Do you have homeschool here?
(437) S: Yes.
(438) S2: I think you must.
(439) T: Must you?
(440) S2: If your children sick, you have to learn your 1
(441) T: - teach
(442) S2: teach your children at home but when he/she is 1
(443) T: - healthy
(444) S2: they must go, but I donât know.
(445) T: I donât know. What do you think Dagmar?
(446) S2: I think you can homeschool.
(447) T: OK, 13-
(448) S2: In Russia, men should take off their gloves to shake somebodyâs hand. It true
(449) T: It true, of course. (laughs) Ok, next.
(450) S: In Iceland, you mustnât take dogs into the city center. It false.

(451) T: Which number?
(452) S: 14
(453) T: It true. Yeah, it true. I - Iâve been to Iceland and I didnât see any dogs. OK, next.
(454) S: (unintelligible) it â against the law for man to forget his wifeâs birthday. It false, I think.
(455) T: Which number 15?
(456) S: 17.
(457) T: Oh 17. Who has 15?
(458) S: We have 15.
(459) T: Oh please, 15.
(460) S: In Thailand, you shouldn't touch person's head, even of child, the head is sacred. It's true.
(461) T: It's true, good. 16?
(462) S: (unintelligible) It's false.
(463) T: 16 is false. Good. 17?
(464) S: (unintelligible) It's against the law for man to forget his wife's birthday. It's false.
(465) S2: False.
(466) T: (shakes his head) True. 18
(467) S: In USA, you shouldn't tip a taxi driver, it's considered an insult. It's false.
(468) T: False? Yes, very false! Alright, good. So. Whoop, sorry. So, before we finish, what am I doing ï Hello, good afternoon ï What am I doing?
(469) S: Greeting.
(470) T: Say it.
(471) S: Greeting.
(472) T: Say it.
(473) S: (pause)
(474) T: (shakes his hand with the student and laughs)
(475) S: (laughs) greeting
(476) T: And if someone is on time, he is ï punctual ï
(477) S: Good, OK, so we can stop.
(478) T: Thank you.
(479) S: Thank you.
(480) T: Thank YOU. And I am sorry ï do your homework. You should read it first and tell me if you don't understand.
(481) S: after lesson ï nice to meet you. T: nice to meet you. Shake hands
(482) Teacher shakes hands with everyone before leaving.

Transcript 3 - Teacher 3
T: So could you put your name on here, so I can call you by name? Yeah, perfect, perfect. Excellent. (pause) It doesn’t need to be artistic or anything. OK.

S: Same things. Same actions.

T: mmm (he shakes his head) that’s more of like a routine (board). What we would call a routine. Stereotypes are a little bit different. Please?

S: If you think something about some nations for example.

T: Yes, very good. Exactly. So if we think if there is a stereotype about Americans what is it?

S: They are fat.

T: They are fat, yes. Fat all of them. What else?

S: Noisy.

T: Noisy. Good one. Noisy Americans, OK, so what I want you to do (.)is with your partners or with your groups. (pause) I want you to brainstorm some stereotypes for Americans, British people, Russians and Czechs. So, working in pairs two, two and three. Have you understand stereotype? Yeah? It’s something that we think about countries that generally isn’t true, but it’s something we have in our perception about them so I’ll give you three or four minutes, so brainstorm some ideas about these nationalities.

Students perform the task.

Meanwhile students are working in pairs: T: Speak in English you speak Czech very well.

T observes, evaluate.

Music.

T: Alright, So what about Czechs? What would you say the Czech stereotypes are?

S: Beer lovers.

T: Yeah, beer lovers, definitely. (board) Anything else?

S: Lazy.

T: Lazy? OK, interesting.

S: Don’t speak foreign languages.

T: Uh huh. Foreign. OK. Any others?
S: Mean.
T: Mean. You mean like err or cheap?
S: No, they don't want to give advice to strangers and things like this.
T: Uh huh, alright. What about Russians?
S: Alcoholics.
T: OK. Anything else for Russians?
S: Mafia. (laughs)
T: (laughs) Mafia? OK. This is why they are stereotypes, because they are not true typically. Alcohol, mafia
S: I don't know (unintelligible)
T: What do you mean?
S: (pause)
T: mm?
S: (unintelligible) ne ne, government
T: What do you think by government like corruption? OK, so what about the British?
S: Cold.
T: Cold? Like (touches his skin) cold? no I'm joking.
S: Special humour. Reserved.
T: Colder, reserved. Sure. Anything else?
S: Old fashion manners.
T: Uh huh ľ ok - what do you mean by that?
S: (laughs) I don't really know, but like they are (pause) speaking, speaking in phrases, something like this?
T: OK. Anything else?
S: Special humor.
T: Sense of humour, yes, that's very true. OK. Anything else for British?
S: Terrible food.
T: Terrible food, that's definitely one. Fish and chips maybe. But I like fish and chips. OK and anything else you can say for Americans?
S: They like hamburgers.
T: They eat hamburgers all the time. (pause) That's true though. So ľ I have
some pieces of paper for you and I would like you to look at the postcard and what does it tell you about the British culture, ok. So what does it say about English culture.

(532) S: They don't want to bother people.

(533) T: Yeah, so is that kind of what you meant with the old fashion manners? So would you say that British are polite?

(534) S: Yes.

(535) T: Yes, we definitely have that perception. My next question for you (writes on board) So I have two questions that I would like you to discuss with your partner. What is culture shock? And I have you experienced it sometime in your life? So what is culture shock? And I have you experienced it?

(536) S: In English?

(537) T: In English, of course, it's an English class.

(538) Students perform the task, T observes.

(539) T: Don't read. You are not reading (takes away the paper from the student). Don't read.

(540) Alright so what is culture shock Katka?

(541) S: If you are used to behave in some way and you go to abroad, for example, and you are surprised how they behave (unintelligible)

(542) T: OK, good. And what's your name, I can't see it ah Julie I have you ever experienced a culture shock?

(543) S: No. (laughs)

(544) T: No, never?

(545) S2: We are used to everything.

(546) T: OK.

(547) S1: we know it from television. (laughs)

(548) T: OK. Alright. What about you Dasa, have you ever experienced culture shock?

(549) S: I think their cold behavior.

(550) T: Uh huh, OK. Vlasta what about you, have you experienced culture shock?

(551) S: I had experienced a culture shock last year when I was in South Africa.

(552) T: OK and what happened?
S: There are very poor people and everything was another.
T: Uh huh, did you enjoy it? Was it a good trip, though?
S: Yes.
T: Yeah, ok. Have long were you there?
S: I was there 3 weeks.
T: Three weeks? Ok. Did you go on the safari?
S: Yes, yes, I was.
T: OK perfect, so next, I would like you to read the text and choose the best, let's say, summary. Which of these four sentences describes best the idea in the text? So now you can read. And if you see any new words, underline them.

Students read

T: OK, one more minute.

Students read

T: OK, so compare your answers is what is the best sentence that describes the paragraph and explain yourself is why?

Students perform the task.

T: So what do you think?
Ss all: Second.
T: Second, yes. Vocabulary is anything - any new words? (pause) Nothing, you know everything. Awesome. OK. Well, your next tasks... are you listening? You have 10 sentences and you must decide, if they are true or false first and if they are false, you have to correct them to make them true. So, individually, please, individually. (pause) My name is Collin so if you have any questions as we're going along; please do not be afraid to ask. This will be about 60 minutes and then you can enjoy the nice weather, hopefully if it's still happening and not rain. Anyway. Who can tell me what a stereotype is?

Students perform the task.

T: OK, compare your answers, please.

Students perform the task. Meanwhile- T: English, English, please.

T: OK, so let's check together. First one- Julie, number one, please read.

Teacher sits on the floor.

S: Miranda got angry because her husband asked her to make the tea. It's
false, jo

(575) S2: No, true.

(576) S3: False.

(577) T: Why false?

(578) S: She got angry because of how he said it, not because, he wanted the teach.

(579) T: She got angry because of the way how he said it. Good. Number two.

(580) S: Miranda had to teach him to say dory when something wasn’t his fault.

True.

(581) T: Agree?

(582) Ss: True.

(583) T: Good Ī next Ī I don’t see your name Ī Marie, good.

(584) S: Her husband thinks English people are too polite. That’s true.

(585) T: Good OK, next.

(586) S: Alexander wasn’t surprised when people said they liked the food at the dinner party. That’s false. He was surprised.

(587) T: Yeah, next Dasa.

(588) S: The food was delicious. It’s false.

(589) T: What was it?

(590) S: For Russian woman, it missed any ingredients.

(591) T: Uh huh, so what adjective did she used ī it wasn’t delicious, but ī

(592) S: mmm

(593) T: disgusting. OK, next. I can’t see your name. Number six, please?

(594) S: Miranda didn’t mind when her mother-in-law crici (wrong pronunciation)

(595) T: Criticized

(596) S: criticized her cooking. It’s false.

(597) T: Why? How did she feel?

(598) S: (pause)

(599) T: Was she happy?

(600) S: No.

(601) T: Was she angry?

(602) S: Yes.

(603) T: Yes, good. Next, Vlasta, please.

(604) S: Alexander thought his mother was right. I think it is false.
(605) T: Agree?

(606) S: True.

(607) T: True, Uh huh, it’s OK. Next Š Julie.

(608) S: In Russia it isn’t normal to smile all the time when you speak to someone. It’s true.

(609) T: Uh huh, ok. Yeah.

(610) S: His Russian friends thought Miranda was very friendly because she smiled a lot. False.

(611) T: Uh huh, yes, what did they think?

(612) S: That she is mad.

(613) T: That she is mad. Yes Š Marie.

(614) S: Alexander never says thank you for his tea when he and Miranda are speaking in Russian. That’s true.

(615) T: That’s true. OK. Well done, any questions? No, OK. So next, I have some signs here and I want you to talk about what the signs mean with your partner. What do they mean. Work together.

(616) Students perform the task. Meanwhile: What was that? What did you say?

(617) T: OK, so what did you find out Š Dasa.

(618) S: First one?

(619) T: Sure, yes.

(620) S: This is danger of animals.

(621) T: Yeah, yeah, yeah, alright and next one Š Katka?

(622) S: Aliens (laughs)

(623) T: Uh huh, ok, another one Š Julie?

(624) S: Don’t jump into the water, because there’s not enough water.

(625) T: So what’s the verb?

(626) S: Jumping.

(627) T: (jumps) this is jumping.

(628) S: Diving.

(629) T: diving Š yes, to dive, another one Š Pavla.

(630) S: Dangerous.

(631) T: Yes, OK, so all of these mean it’s forbidden (writes on board). If we want to say that something is forbidden in English, which modal verb do we use? If
it is forbidden.

(632) S: You can’t

(633) T: You can’t, Uh huh, or?

(634) S: You are not allowed. Alright, another one.

(635) S: You mustn’t

(636) T: You mustn’t yes, very good. Yes, you can’t do it, it’s not allowed or you mustn’t do it. OK. What about if you want to say that something is a bad idea.

(637) S: Shouldn’t

(638) T: Shouldn’t, very good. It’s a good idea.

(639) S: Should

(640) T: Uh huh, What if something is the law?

(641) S: You have to.

(642) T: Uh huh, good ī and ī what about ī it’s not necessary.

(643) S: You don’t need to.

(644) T: You don’t have to or you don’t need to. Good, so. These are some basic modal verbs that we would use to describe different situations so not all of these mean that it’s forbidden, so what would you use to describe these signs.

(645) S: should ī You should pay attention.

(646) T: Yeah! You should pay attention. Good. What about this one?

(647) S: You should run away. (laughs)

(648) T: (laughs) You should run away, yeah. That’s how I would say it. Yeah, you should run away. OK, good and what about the UFO?

(649) S: You should be ī

(650) T: You should be what? (laughs)

(651) S: (laughs)

(652) T: You should be careful. Yeah, so what can we say about the UFO.

(653) S: They have to be caref (unintelligible)

(654) S: (laughs)

(655) T: maybe ī they have to be careful. OK So we have some different ideas. Alright, so those are some basic modal verbs and this is our grammar point of today and next we have some useful tips for tourist to the UK. So what I want you to do individually first, is read through the tips and you have to choose
the correct modal verb to complete the tip. Individually first, please.

(656) Students perform the task.
(657) T: OK, compare your answers, please.
(658) Students perform the task. Meanwhile: Speak in English, too.
(659) T: Alright, OK, ready?
(660) S: Sorry sorry.
(661) T: That’s OK. So number one Vlasta, what do you think?
(662) S: should
(663) T: Full sentence, please.
(664) S: if you want to ask someone a question on the street, you should say excuse me to (unintelligible) their attention.
(665) T: Good. Two?
(666) S: You must drive on the left.
(667) T: It’s the law.
(668) S: (unintelligible)
(669) T: OK. Can we use have to also?
(670) S: Yes.
(671) T: So both are OK.
(672) S: Maybe it’s the law i like - it should be have to, because it must depends on your opinion.
(673) T: In my opinion, it really doesn’t make a difference, but it depends which grammar book you read.
(674) S: That’s what they taught us in high school.
(675) T: I know, I know, but typically it’s like if somebody tell me i like my doctor told me, I must lose weight, so I think i
(676) S: Mother says i you must teach, yeah.
(677) S2: So there’s no difference.
(678) T: Not for me, nor really, but some book says like must come from somebody like mother, for me it’s not really any difference. So i Katka i next.
(679) S: (unintelligible)
(680) T: Great, ok.
(681) S: (unintelligible)
(682) T: Alright
(683) S: (unintelligible)
(684) T: Good, Julie
(685) S: You don't have to smoke in any public building, it's prohibited by law.
(686) T: So it's not necessary?
(687) S: (laugh)
(688) S: Já nevim.
(689) T: So is it forbidden, can you not do it?
(690) S: Yes, you cannot do it.
(691) T: So, don't have – it means that it's not necessary.
(692) S: Tak mustn't.
(693) T: Yeah, yeah, yeah, so that's kind of confusing, that what people confuse a little bit. FSA
(694) Don't have is like you can but you don't. Next one- Vlasta.
(695) S: While talking to British people you shouldn't ask personal questions like how much you earn (unintelligible)
(696) T: Yes, very good and the last one, Pavla.
(697) S: You should go for a trip..
(698) T: Yes! questions?
(699) S: Five, again, please?
(700) T: You don't have to. Anything else? Next, back to this page, please. And a little bit of speaking work that I would like you to do. So - with your partner you need to have a look at good manner, bad manners, doesn't matter. I want you to look at each different topic and discuss with your partner if you should, you shouldn't do it, you have to do it, you don't have to do it. So talk to your group, just a speaking exercise. Yeah? Got it? So in the Czech Republic.
(701) Students perform the task. T monitors, help students, lowers himself at student's level. T Helps with vocabulary. T: Pavla! (reminder, because she keeps speaking Czech)
(702) T: So Julie.
(703) S: Me?
(704) T: Yes, you. Alright, ready ladies, for listening? So what about the first one, Julie?
(705) S: Julie doesn't like when she has to kiss people on their cheeks, but people
do it.

(706) T: So what’s the modal verb?
(707) S: You should do it on some celebrations only.
(708) T: OK, OK, next one – Anna.
(709) S: Call all the people by their first names. It depends if it’s your mother.
(710) Ss: (laugh)
(711) S: You should call people by their first name if it’s your mother.
(712) T: Next one, Marie.
(713) S: You should use more formal language when speaking to an older person
      if it’s not your grandmother. (laugh)
(714) T: (laughs) OK. Good, next one.
(715) S: You shouldn’t let your children run around and be noisy.
(716) T: Uh huh, OK.
(717) S: You shouldn’t be very affectionate to your partner.
(718) T: Why not?
(719) S2: Maybe at home.
(720) T: Maybe at home, not in a restaurant, OK, alright.
(721) S: You shouldn’t talk on your mobile phone in a restaurant.
(722) T: You shouldn’t? OK. Do you agree with that.
(723) Ss: No.
(724) S2: If you are on a date with someone, maybe you shouldn’t.
(725) S3: and it depends on a type of restaurant.
(726) S4: and the type of a conversation.
(727) T: That’s true. So, ok next, Vlasta.
(728) S: You mustn’t pay for a woman on a first date.
(729) T: mustn’t?
(730) Ss: should.
(731) T: Well, it’s kind of your opinion, well, I don’t know if I would use mustn’t
      because it’s not like forbidden, it’s not like banned, is it? Maybe should or
      shouldn’t.
(732) S: Should
(733) S2: every time.
(734) T: Yeah, It’s expensive for us [men], unfortunately.
S: But you’re supposed to be rich, so..

T: Yeah, all Americans rich, another stereotype. OK, what about the next one, Anna?

S: You should make sure a woman gets home safe at night.

T: Uh huh, gentleman, ok, alright.

S: You have to always stop at pedestrian crossroad.

T: But Czech drivers do not always do this. Especially Czech men, terrible drivers. OK, next?

S: You shouldn’t arrive more than 10 minutes late for lunch.

T: Any question? No. Have you ever played a game taboo? You don’t know this game, ok. For example let’s say, the word is tacos and Mexico, beef and tortilla etc. The idea of taboo is that you will get a card and you will have a word on the top that you must describe and there will be words below that you cannot use. So you mustn’t use these words. So, on these card, you and your partner you will get a place, so a place that you can go to and on the card, you will have words that you cannot use. And in your group, you will have to write a description, so you have to do this here, you can, you are not allowed to, so your writing some rules for this place, ok? So do not show this to another group it’s a secret. OK, so, now you have to talk with your group. So for example my card is hospital, yeah, so if I am describing hospital and I cannot use these words, I would say mmm It’s a place you should go to when you are sick, it’s a place where you can find a doctor, you don’t need to bring money and you shouldn’t bring your dog. So you are just thinking about a way to describe the place using modal verbs. Yeah? So talk with your group. Working together, because you are going to ask them.

Students perform the task. T monitor and help. Meanwhile: One more minute.

T: OK, so let’s stop there. So you must listen to the other group and you must guess what place they are describing. So it’s Marie and Katka.

S: So it’s a place, where you should go if you want to have a nice evening.

S2: Restaurant.

S: No.

S3: You should go there if you want to see some document.

S: Cinema.
S3: Yes exactly.
T: Good, next.
S: You should go there for fun, not because of fighting.
T: OK, next.
S2: You should wear some colours of your favorite team.
S3: Sport match.
S2: place
S4: gym
S3: football stadium, stadium
S2 stadium.
T: So next, ladies.
S: When you will read you go to this place.
S2: Library.
T: Uh huh, so (writes on the board) These are two mistakes that I’ve heard. I want you to talk to your partner - what’s wrong with these sentences?
Students perform the task.
T: Any ideas? First one?
S: They taught us.
T: taught irregular verb. OK and, next one
S: doing
T: (unintelligible) Ok and Pavla, how do you say this word?
S: (pause)
T: criticized
S: criticized
T: Very good. OK, questions? No? That it. You can go. Oh, wait wait wait, I almost forgot, your homework, this was very important and I almost forgot. So, this is for Aneta. So, it again practicing the modal verbs.
T: May I have the card? (pause) thank you.

Transcript 4 - Teacher 4

T: Hello. (laughs) OK, so welcome in today’s lesson. We will start to talk
about mobile phones.

( 776 ) S: I have one.
( 777 ) T: Yes, this is a mobile phone, thank you, so - what make do you have?
( 778 ) S: what what?
( 779 ) T: What make. So does anyone know, so Martin do you know if I say what make do you have, what does it mean?
( 780 ) S: Where it was made, or maybe the brand.
( 781 ) T: yes, the brand, So ř what make do you have, Václav.
( 782 ) S: Nokia.
( 783 ) T: Nokia, ok. So, speaking of mobile phones ř I make sure you switch them off. I don't want to hear anything. OK, we are here to talk in English language, but first we need to know how to say mobile phone in other languages. And we will start with exercise 1, a. So you can discuss in pairs ř so Marketa and Václav, Martin and Dasa, Zdenek and Honza together. And if you can discuss which country or which language goes with which in a to g ř with what.

( 784 ) Students perform the task. Meanwhile: T: Ah, you have finished, good thank you. T : English, Dáša, please.
( 785 ) T: OK, so number one is ř Marketa.
( 786 ) S: portable ř France.
( 787 ) T: Do you agree?
( 788 ) S2: No.
( 789 ) T: So what do you think?
( 790 ) S2: I think Argentina.
( 791 ) T: So you think France is Argentina (laughs)
( 792 ) S2: No no no, I think Argentina is portable.
( 793 ) T: Ok, so any other suggestions for number one?
( 794 ) S3: c)
( 795 ) T: No, unfortunately it d) but good thing is that we are here to talk in English, not in French which apparently is not ř
( 796 ) S: I don't think so.
( 797 ) T: You don't think so? Why?
( 798 ) S: Because I studied French and I don't think it correct.
You are right, it's e). Alright, of course. So what about number two?

Absolutely, number three Ždenda.

Telefonino.

Yes, it's b and now the important two - number 4, is Honza

Cell phone.

Yes, cell phone and number 5?

S: Yes it's mobile. So as you can see, there are in every language, of course, it's important to know how to say a mobile phone, because it is an important part of today's society. And there are many other expression that we need to know and we are going to talk about them in exercise b. So - If you can have a look at it. I will give you 30 seconds, if you can read it for yourself.

Students perform the task.

And now in the same pair, if you can explain each what these words mean in some other words. So again Marketa and Vaclav, Martin and Dagmar and Honza and Ždenek. And if you can tell each other how would you explain dialing for example, you can use some other words you can act it out, it's all up to you. I will give you two to three minutes, so if you can start.

Students perform the task.

Ok, thank you, so Vaclav, what a ringtone is.

Ringtone is a signal when your cell phone makes when someone calls you.

Yes, that was quite a sophisticated explanation, but thank you. Ok, so now, what we are going to do, I am going to play you some expressions, or some sounds and what you have to do is to put a number into this little square that you have next to the sentences.. So for example, the first one is Ž i just to make sure that you know Ž (T plays the recording) Ž What was it?

A ringtone.

Yes, a ringtone. So number one is d). So if you don't know, don't worry, we will hear it twice.

Can I get a pencil?

Yes, sure.

S2: Two.
T: OK, so next lesson, please be prepared, this is the last time I am doing something like this. OK, let's start.

Listening activity.

T: So - Do you want to hear it one more time?

S: Yes

T: Ok.

T: OK, so let's check it now. So, Zdeněk, can you start? So we know that d) is number five. What is number two?

S: c)

T: Yes, perfect. Number 3 is, Honza?

S: g)

T: Yes, excellent. Next, Dasa?

S: Ja to mam tady nejaky prehazeny.

T: I am sorry, I don’t understand this language.

S: I am on – I don’t know? (laughs)

T: Where are you? So number 1 was c), 2d, 3g and you don’t know what is 4, right? So Martin, number 4.

S: It’s f.

T: perfect. So Vaclav.

S: Number five is a.

T: Amazing, Marketa.

S: 6 is e.

T: Excellent and the last one I don’t know? (laughs)

S: last one, what was last one?

T: 7

S: I took b, but ř

T: Yes, it is correct. Yes, perfect. (laughs) So - if you can now turn up upside down, like this, so you don’t see it. So what do you call when a person is speaking to someone else? The line is, Martin ř

S: busy

T: Yes, thank you. So what do call the activity when you want to write some words and send them, Honza?

S: text, text a message.
T: Yes, texting, but you can text a message as well, of course. And what do you call when a person just ended the call. Marketa.

S: Hang up.

T: Hang up, perfect. So you can now turn the page back. And Zdenek, if I can ask you, Zdenda, to move over here. And we will do different pairs together now, so Zdenek and Marketa, Vaclav and Martin and Dagmar and Honza. And here you have a questionnaire. So, first of all, can anyone tell me what a questionnaire is?

S: A lot of questions.

T: Again, I –

S: A lot of questions on one paper.

T: A lot of questions on one paper. Yes. And why do you ask these questions in a questionnaire?

S: Because you want to be clever?

T: (laughs) Yes, it's basically because you want to know other people opinion, not because you want to sound clever. So now in pairs, if you can ask and answer these questions. I will give you, I think, maximum of 7 minutes and Vaclav and Martin, can you start from the last one so that you don't hear the same answers around you? Í and you can start from the beginning.

Students perform the activity. Meanwhile: T: One minute.

T: Ok, so Vaclav, what make is your mobile phone?

S: My Nokia is (laughs) Í my phone is Nokia

T: Do you have voice mail?

S: I hope not. (laughs)

T: (laughs) Are you thinking of getting another mobile phone, Honza?

S: (laughs) No, my mobile phone is good for me.

T: Zdenda asks if he can see it, but I think, maybe after the lesson -

S: (shows the phone)

T: (laughs) So when you are in a public place, public transport for example, do you lower your voice or you talk normally Í Martin.

S: I usually lower my voice.

S2: I usually louder
T: You are usually louder, so it's nice to travel with you. (laughs) So, if you can turn the page now. And we are going to talk about this, about on mobile phone in public places. The other one- Martin, here. Yes, this page with this picture of a man in the right top corner. And I will give 1 or 2 minutes and again if you can in pairs discuss these three questions that are in exercise 1 and they are all related to the picture that is there. (pause students haven't started) so again, you can start - Zdenek and Marketa, Vaclav and Martin and Dagmar and Honza and you can discuss these three ĭ

Students perform the task.

T: Ok, thank you. So Dasa what the man doing?

S: The man is calling with mobile. To mobile.

T: Yeah, you can call someone ĭ

S: He is speaking in mobile.

T: Yes, you can say, that the man is speaking to someone on a mobile phone. Yeah. Does it annoy you when something like this happen, Honza?

S: Yes, of course.

T: Yes, of course. Does -

S: I hate a lot of people.

T: Does it happen a lot, do you think?

S: Yes.

T: Yes, I think, unfortunately. What other things with mobile phones annoy you, Zdenek?

S: They play songs in public places.

T: Yes. I think that is quite annoying. We can agree on that. Which brings us now to exercise b. Before we start, do you know what a complaint is? If someone complains.. is it positive or negative ĭ Martin?

S: Negative.

S2: It depends on what are they complaining.

T: Uh huh, can you give me an example of a positive complain?

S2: About politicians.

T: Yes, but you always express something negative, don't you? (laughs)

S2: Yes, but it's positive to talk about it.

T: (laughs) yeah, I see, the action of actual talking. OK. That's a good one, so
what about social occasion? Honza, do you know what it means?

(888) S: mmm- no.
(889) T: So do you think that it's something when people are alone or when there are lots of people?
(890) S: When there are lots of people.
(891) T: Uh huh, so can you give me an example of a social occasion? Marketa?
(892) S: Social occasion example? She points at Vaclav. (Vaclav is raising his hand in order to speak)
(893) T: No, Václav is not a social occasion. (laughs)
(894) S: But he goes to social occasion. I don't know. Could it be a festival? Music festival?
(895) T: Yes, something like that. Whenever people are all together is a social occasion. You can with your friend-
(896) S: meeting?
(897) T: Yes, meeting. Or you can go to a theatre, it is all a social occasion. And now, here you have 5 statements, in exercise b. I want you to read them for yourself silently.

(898) Students perform the task. Meanwhile: S: So what does it mean that someone is impatient to use their mobile phone? T: So Martin, can you explain the word impatient? S: It's the opposite of patient? (laughs) S1: But what does it mean with connection to mobile phone? T: It mean that for example you check it every time, you are impatient, you want to know if someone texted you and so on. I and the word interrupt? Does it mean to stop the conversation, or to continue the conversation? Dasa?
(899) S: It is a to stop.
(900) T: Yes, exactly, to stop the conversation. So now you will hear 5 different speakers and if you can do the same as we did in the last listening activity I so put the number to the expression. So they will talk about annoying habits connected with mobile phones and if you can tell me which speaker said what. We will listen to it twice, so don't worry.
(901) Listening activity.
(902) T: OK, so now one more time, so you can catch on details.
(903) T: OK, so the first one was, Václav, can you start?
S: Number ī eh ī letter e.

T: Letter e, yes. Martin, can you continue?

S: Second one was b.

T: Uh huh, Dasa? What was number 3?

S: (unintelligible)

T: So is it a, b, c, d, or e?

S: Já to mám řatnī]

T: I donâ€™t understand.

S: I ī bad. (laughs)

T: [laughs] Yeah, youâ€™re wrong. So Honza, do you know number three?

S: I think d.

T: And you think perfectly. Number four ī Zdeněk.

S: Itâ€™s c.

T: Yes and 5, Marketa?

S: a.

T: Brilliant! Yes, so before we move to another exercise, can you tell me, what a rule or law is - Martin? Is it something you ī

S2: - her? No, never before.

S: (unintelligible)

T: Is it something you must do? ī or something you can do if you want?

S: You must do.

T: Yes, exactly. And if something is allowed or permitted. What does it mean ī Honza, do you know?

S3: Have to.

T: No, itâ€™s the same as must. But allowed, or permitted.

S: Can.

T: Yes, thatâ€™s the important word. You can do it, if you want. So, for example, in Czech pubs you usually can smoke ī you are allowed. And now in the c) exercise, if you can have a look and individually if you can match sentence s 1 to 5 with their meanings in a, b, c, d, e. So, ī give you 3 minutes. ī And Vaclav, if you can do this one on your paper.
Students perform the task. Meanwhile: T: If you want to tell something to your partner, say it in English, Václav. T: From what I see, I really love your organization, Vaclav. It’s amazing if you can tell me at least one correct answer out of this.

S: (laughs)

T: So we will probably start from the other end. So Honza, can you tell me number one, what did you connect it with.

S: I think d.

T: Yes, amazing. And Dasa, what do you think number two is?

S: c?

T: Yes, amazing. Martin, number 3

S: I have d.

T: Excellent. 4 Václav ĭ

S: Number 4 is (pause) d.

T: So, we’ve already said that number d. is assigned to ĭ

S: e.

T: So you think it’s e? So ĭ do you agree with Vaclav’s answer?

S2: Never.

T: Never – yes, definitely (laughs) OK. I would actually blame it on your organization skills, not your knowledge. But, that’s why we can probably skip you, so Marketa, number 4 is ĭ

S: Number 4 is a.

T: And the last one, Zdenek?

S: It’s e.

T: Yes, excellent. OK, now, it is important in English language to have a correct rhythm and we are going to practice it with these important words ĭ should, shouldn’t, must and so on. I will always play you one sentence, the sentence is written in exercise 3 ĭ Pronunciation and speaking. What you have to do then is to repeat it after the recording with the stress on the underlined words to make sure that the rhythm is correct and you can exaggerate, make your voice really loud ĭ shows an example (You mustn’t use your phone on plane). Really, like that. OK, so we can start. So listen to the number one and then I will nominate one of you and you will repeat it
after it.

(948) T: So number 1, Vaclav.

(949) S: You mustn’t use your phone on a plane.

(950) T: Yes, I think you can go somewhere public and can recite some poems for example.

(951) S: I don’t have to go to work tomorrow.

(952) T: Yes, exactly I an next one.

(953) S: We have to do an exam in June.

(954) T: That was excellent, I loved the rhythm. So if you are engaged in a normal conversation, you don’t have to do it like that I just to make sure that this is just for now. Dasa, please?

(955) S: You should switch off your mobile in class.

(956) T: Yes, that was the closest to a normal conversation. Honza?

(957) S: You shouldn’t talk loudly on a mobile phone.

(958) T: Yes, perfect. Zdenek?

(959) S: I must go to the bank this morning.

(960) T: Yes, that was perfect. So I what is important is that in an English sentence when you have these words that we have on the top on the page I must, have to, should and their negative form, if it’s in positive (board), do you pronounce it in a normal sentence like should (strong), do you normally say should (weak) I so which one? Do you say it really strongly or is it weak?

(961) S: strong

(962) T: Do you agree with Honza?

(963) S: Depends to

(964) T: Not depends ĭ

(965) S: depen

(966) S2: depends on

(967) S: It depends on

(968) T: So what does it depend on?

(969) S: On the person you talk to.

(970) T: So if I would talk to Vaclav I would say should in a strong form

(971) S2: Because I am strong.

(972) S: Yes.
T: So if you want to stress it, you can say you should (stressed) do it. But normally, we say it only really with a weak form. I should (weak) do this. Same it with have to: you don’t say have too, but only have to (weak). But the difference is in negative, we have the negative form and you say mustn’t, shouldn’t, you really have to pronounce it normally (says it in strong form).

And that’s what we are going to practice now. You have some description of some manner. (board) do you know what good or bad manners are?

S1: Good manners is a band, like music band.

S2 And bad manners is when you interrupt somebody else. (laughs)

T: (laughs) Thank you Martin. Bad manner is when you for example interrupt your teacher, Vaclav and good manner is when you say it as Martin said. Good. So now you have 8 manners. First of all, if you can tell me, I will give you 3 or 4 minutes, write if it’s manner – and you should do it or shouldn’t do it or if it’s a law and you must do it. So just write M if it’s a manner and you should do it and L if it’s a law and you must do it.

Students perform the task. Meanwhile: If you want to tell something to your partner, say it in English, Vaclav.

T: So if you can always read the sentence, focus on the rhythm and then tell me if it’s manner or a law. And of course, let’s start with you Vaclav.

S: Play noisy game on a mobile phone in public. It’s a manner.

T: Yes and 2 Marketa?

S: Send messages when your car is stopped at traffic lights. Law.

T: Yes, I think, you can’t do this. It’s not just a manner. So you do know what traffic lights are - Martin?

S: When you are at cross, cross street

T: It’s not cross street

S2: Crossroads

T: Crossroads, yes.

S: You have to stop, when you have red.

T: Yes, superb. And brilliant you have to stop see, so you are already using the new material. And Zdenek, can we go to number three, please?

S: Switch off your mobile phone. It’s law.

T: I think so, number 4 Č Honza.
S: Switch off your mobile phone in class. I think, anner ĭ
T: so - did you switch off your mobile phone before the lesson?
S: Yes, I do. Yes, I did.
T: Thank you. And number 5, Dasa?
S: (unintelligible) . Shouldnâ
T: So do you think itâ a manner or law.
S: Manner.
T: Yes, definitely, itâ a manner. So Martin ĭ next one.
S: Use hand held mobile Law.
T: Yes. And what is the opposite of hand held.
S: Hands free.
T: Yes, perfect. And 7- Vaclav?
S: Make very personal calls in public. Itâ manner.
T: Uh huh and last one, Marketa?
S: Use your mobile at the metro station. Law.
T: Yes, is it a law?
S: No. I donâ think it law.
T: Yes, I think itâ very hard to ĭ
S: Is it manner?
T: I think, it depends, is it really a manner?
S: No.
T: Yes, I see no point why you couldnâ call when you are at the metro station.
S: You can explode (Laughs)
T: You can explode? (Laughs) So now, pairs again and I will give you 3 minutes and if you can transform the sentences with using should or must, so for example the number one - Play noisy game on a mobile phone in public.- So weâve decided it was a manner, so what would you use, Honza?
S: shouldnâ
T: Yes, exactly, so now in pair if you can do with other sentences the same ĭ You shouldnâ play noise games in public. So next one, if you think you should put there should, shouldnâ, must or mustnâ.
Students perform the task.
T: OK, so I think we can check it. Marketa, can you start with number 2?

S: You shouldn't play noisy games on mobile phone in public.

T: Superb, that was number one, but excellent. (laughs) Number two, Zdenek.

S: You mustn't..

T: That's excellent. Vaclav, number 3.

S: You have to switch off your mobile phone in plane.

T: Yes, so four, Martin?

S: You should switch off your mobile phone is class.

T: That's perfect, Dasa, number 5?

S: You shouldn't talk loudly on a mobile in public.

T: Amazing, number 6, Honza.

S: You must use hand held mobile phone in a car.

T: (looks at S)

S: You should use hands free..

T: You can definitely transform it like that and

S2: And if it's a law, the law have to, I think! Ne?

T: Yes, you mustn't, if it's forbidden by law, you must use mustn't. So number seven, Zdenek?

S: You shouldn't make very personal phone calls in public.

T: Yes and in a class, Martin?

S: Can I say the last?

T: Of course.

S: You can use your mobile phone at the petrol station.

T: Uh huh, perfect, so you incorporated verb but that is just excellent.
T: Good manners it means something like being polite. So if someone says that you are being polite, can you tell me some actions that we in the Czech Republic consider polite.

S: Say hello -

Phone rings Ī

S: Sorry Ī

T: Uh huh, good thing is that we didn’t talk about that. (laughs)

S: Apology is polite.

T: Yes, apology is polite. (laughs)

S: She should be sorry.

T: (laughs) She should be sorry. Anything else.

S: To say hello is polite.

S: It depends, if it your boss and you say him hello, he can be (unintelligible)--- (angry?)

T: So it better not to greet him at all. (laughs)

S: That’s a strange boss. When you want to pass in the metro, you say excuse me.

T: Yes, excellent, you say excuse me. And also the word Ī or Ī being polite really depends on the culture. So we in the Czech Republic probably consider politeness as something different from for example English people. And that what we are going to focus on now. So if you can turn the stapled page like this. I don’t know how. It has to be the page that say culture shock. And here you have 2 pictures. What do you think the person who draw the pictures what did he or she wanted to say about English people? What can you see in the picture, Václav?

S: A dock.

T: A dock, perfect, that really the most important part of the picture. Ī (laughs)I love that you have a sense for detail, but that not why are we here for today. What did he wanted to say?

S: He wanted to be funny.

T: He wanted to be funny. Did he succeed? Ī (laughs)

T: What does it say about the English people? (the picture)

S: That you have to be polite to them. Because in other way they won’t help
you.

(1068) T: The focus here is on the fact that probably English people expect you to be too polite. And in every sentence and don’t forget this when you talk to an English speaking person, especially from England, to say excuse me, please and so on. They really, really want that. And that’s what we are going to read about now. So I’m going to give 2 or 3 minutes, if you really quickly go through the text that says Culture shock and then choose the best sentence which summarizes the sentences. So you have it in b, 3 sentences or headlines. So if you can quickly go through the sentences and tell which is the best one. I will give you I will be nice I 4 minutes. Ignore if you don’t understand any words, we will go back to them.

(1069) T: Which one is the best one which summarizes the text?

(1070) S: First one.

(1071) S2: No, second.

(1072) T: So we now have 2 options, so who do you agree with? Or if you think 3 or 4 is better I

(1073) S: I have also the second

(1074) T: Yes, Honza, Unfortunately, (laughs) number 2 is correct. Let’s go through the text again and now if you can read only the 1st paragraph and then stop I we will talk about it. Only the first one.

(1075) T: Which do you think is closer to the Czech Republic? Do you like better the English way or Russian way?

(1076) Ss: English (majority, Václav Į Russian)

(1077) T: Į (laughs) Václav, why Russian?

(1078) S: Because more closer to my heart.

(1079) T: more closer, that doesn’t work.

(1080) S: much closer.

(1081) T: Į (laughs) You can say that it’s close. And Honza, why did you say that English way is closer to you?

(1082) S: Because it (unintelligible) There is the word please.

(1083) T: Yes, so do you think that Czech people are more British way or Russian way?

(1084) S: They should be more British.
T: ĭ (laughs) and do you think they really are?
S: Yes, I think so?
T: Do you agree with Marketa?
S: Yes, I do.
T: ĭ (laughs) yes, you do. Let's go to the second paragraph, again, if you can read the second paragraph, starting however and ending smile smile smile.
S: Say please.
T: No, do it now. Ok. Please. Excuse me, Václav, can you please read the second paragraph and then if it doesn't bother you we can talk about it.
D: (unintelligible) No.
T: Honza, could you change?
H: Yes, I am flexible.
T: Good to know – (laughs). Do you think, it is good to be ĭ like- a bit insincere, to pretend, just to safe the manners..
Z: Yes, in some situations, you just have to.
T: So do you think this is the case? Would you be able to change like this?
S: Like Alexander? (unintelligible)
T: Yes.
S: I would choose the polite way.
T: So is there anyone who would not?
S: I would try the medium way.
T: So How would you do that compromise?
S: I would say only Could you pass me the salt, please.
T: Yeah, so only one polite expression, not too many, ok! So if we can go to number 4 now, or not number 4, but 4th paragraph.

T: So Honza, what do you think Czech people do?

S: I think Czech people are polite, he - they do not criticize the food.

T: Yes, I agree. So would you do something like that, if you don’t like the food you would do something like ů ugh, good?

S: Yes, of course, because you need to be polite, because when someone cooks for you, he was polite to you and now you are polite to him.

T: And don’t you think that the fact, that you are not sincere, is actually being impolite. Vaclav?

S: Maybe the food isn’t good because the other man was also impolite by making it with the wrong ingredients.

T: ů (laughs) So we are in a loop now- So let’s do the last but one. So, the 5th paragraph

T: So do you prefer Czech neutral faces, or do you prefer people to be smiling? In public places, for example, Martin.

S: Well, it’s nice, if the smile is there, but it has to be sincere.

T: Yes, I think, that we should agree on that. So the ultimate one, the last one ů if you can read it.

T: So do you think your personality changes when the language changes.

Z: Yes, I think ů to some extent - yes, because about the content of the language.

M: You need to change yourself if you live in a different country.

T: Yes, definitely, I agree. Perfect, I love it. So now in exercise c, just below the text, you have ten statements or sentences and if you can mark them true or false. If you really think that the sentence was in the text or if you think that it is incorrect. Of course, you can go back to the text, if you like.

T: Alright, so Martin, can you tell me number one.

S: False.

T: Can you correct it?

S: Miranda got angry because her husband asked her to make the tea.

T: That’s perfect. Yes, Dasa, can you do number two, please?

S: Miranda had to teach him to say sorry when something wasn’t his fault.
It's true.
(1130) T: Yes, definitely. Amazing. Honza?
(1131) S: That is true.
(1132) T: Excellent, Zdenek?
(1133) S: All the people said they liked the food at the dinner party. It's false.
(1134) T: So how would you change it?
(1135) S: He was surprised.
(1136) T: Yes, he actually was very surprised and Marketa, number 5?
(1137) S: The food was delicious. It's wrong.
(1138) T: -and can you change it so it is right?
(1139) S: It was disgusting.
(1140) T: It was disgusting, perfect. Next one Š Vaclav?
(1141) S: Miranda didn't mind when her mother-in-law criticized her cooking. False.
(1142) T: And can you correct it?
(1143) S: She did.
(1144) T: (laughs) Yes. That is amazing, brilliant. So the next, Martin?
(1145) S: Alexander Š
(1146) T: You don't have to read it, just say if it's true or false.
(1147) S: Well I have a question?
(1148) T: OK
(1149) S: That the mother was to tell her the true, or the mother was right that it was disgusting?
(1150) T: Oh yeah, it's about the flavor.
(1151) S: So false.
(1152) T: So how would you correct it?
(1153) S: Alexander thought his mother was right to tell the truth.
(1154) T: So the sentence is correct. Yeah it's hard to say what the sentence refer to. I think that we all can agree on that. So, number 8 then, Dasa?
(1155) S: In Russia it isn't normal to smile all the time when you speak to someone. True.
(1156) T: Uh huh, definitely this. Number 9?
S: False.
T: OK, can you correct it for me?
S: His Russian friends thought Miranda was mad.
T: Mad, yes! That’s excellent and the last one, Zdenek?
S: It’s true.
T: It’s true. OK, so before we finish, can you tell me what we call the sound (too, too, too, too)
S: Busy.
T: Yes, the line is busy. When the person just finishes the call.
S: hang (.) up
T: Yes, hang up, perfect. So what do you call when you don’t have hands free, but ĭ
S: hand-held.
T: Yes and some vocabulary from the text. What do you call when somebody do this (mimes stepping on foot)
S: steps
T: Step, yes. That’s perfect and the last one ĭ when for example you have a tea pot and you want to put it into the cup, what do you do?
S: pour.
T: And the very last thing ĭ here is your homework, read carefully the instructions and then send it, bring it to the next lesson. OK, so, thank you very much for your participation and see you.. somewhere (smile)
S: Thank you for teaching.