Ольга Петровна Дмитриева, к. истор. н.
Белорусский государственный университет
информатики и радиоэлектроники,
Минск, Беларусь
э-почта: volhadzmitrieva@gmail.com

Volha Pjatrowna Dzmitryieva, Cand. of Sc. (History)
Belarusian State University of Informatics and Radioelectronics, Minsk, Belarus
e-mail: volhadzmitrieva@gmail.com

КООПЕРАТИВНОЕ И КОЛЛАБОРАТИВНОЕ ВЗАИМОДЕЙСТВИЕ В ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНОМ РАЗВИТИИ УЧИТЕЛЯ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

Представлен сравнительный анализ двух способов взаимодействия в контексте профессионального развития учителя иностранного языка – cooperative development 'кооперативное развитие' и collaborative development ('коллаборативное развитие'). Дана оценка возможности использования данных форм взаимодействия в саморазвитии современного учителя.

Ключевые слова: профессиональное развитие; кооперативное развитие; коллаборативное развитие; говорящий; слушатель; элементы обучения; основа отношений; навыки взаимодействия; фатический дискурс

CO-OPERATIVE AND COLLABORATIVE INTERACTION IN TEFL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

A comparative analysis of the two ways of interaction – cooperative development and collaborative development, in a TEFL (teaching English as a foreign language) professional development context, was conducted. The author evaluated the perspectives of implementing these forms of interaction for a modern teacher's self-development.

Key words: professional development; cooperative development; collaborative development; the speaker; the listener; learning elements; attitudinal base; cooperative skills; phatic discourse.

Introduction. Considering a language's constant change by nature, TEFL may require a teacher to continuously search for purposeful approaches, methods, and techniques and their appropriate selection and implementation in a certain context. Methodology choices are often supported by teachers' experience gained through *continuous self-learning or professional development* in different career circles of an English teacher [1].

Most teacher learning sources may be categorised into *training* (theory, basic skills), *professional information* (linguistic context, teaching materials, professional literature, conferences), *life experience* (self-knowledge, social skills), *teacher experience* (reflection on events, conscious experimentation), *talking to colleagues* (observing/being observed, formal/informal feedback), and *a teacher-student(s) interaction* (student's feedback, teacher's experience of being taught).

The purpose of this paper is to analyse the two developmental approaches designed in the 1990s in terms of their persuasiveness in a professional development context: J. Edge's *co-operative development* [2, p. 62–71] and, as an alternative to J. Edge's model, C. Lansley's *collaborative development* [3, p. 50–56], through focusing on the methodology for interaction between two teachers.

Defining the concept of professional development. In Edge's view, co-operative development is a practical way of working towards the widely accepted goal of autonomous development [2, p. 2], whereas Lansley opposed it by stating that development is more about two-teacher collaboration on furthering the ideas and plans of one of the pair [3, p. 50]. Considering these two concepts, the idea of collaboration seems to be more purposeful rather than autonomous development, as it may contribute to eliciting many more ELT-related ideas by a teacher.

Learning elements. In Edge's designed interaction with three learning elements – *understanding, expression, and formulation*, there are two roles – *the Speaker* and *the*

Understander. The Speaker carries the Speaker's ideas. In contrast, a Listener's function is to help the Speaker clarify these ideas and discover where they lead [2, p. 62]. However, Lansley stated that such an approach excludes the active participation of the listener in 'debate-making' and may lead to the non-scientific nature of professional development through imposing a Speaker's hypothesis over the hypotheses of others, e. g., a Listener's hypothesis [3, p. 51]. Supporting Corder's view on the core role of everyone's initial hypotheses acting as a possibility for creating multiple hypotheses [3, p. 51], Edge's definition of the Listener's status and function may be less purposeful for the professional development of a teacher than Lansley's collaborative approach. However, Edges' view on personal development as progress happening with a teacher 'from where this teacher' is' seems reasonable, as we mostly get new knowledge or skills based on our professional experience and reflection on our experience [4].

Attitudinal base. Edge's attitudinal base is referred to C. Rogers's researc [2, p. 63–64] and includes *respect, empathy*, and *honesty*. Egge defined respect as non-judgmental respect for the Speaker's purposes and views [2, p. 63], whereas Lansey opposed it by stating that a non-judgmental approach to respect might be questioned in the teaching community context and is more appropriate in moral decision discourse [3, p. 54–55] than in pedagogics. Supporting Lansey's view, we admit that the character of respect for a teacher may be defined by numerous factors, including the status of a teacher and their contribution to teaching and learners' learning progress, and a teacher's role in LTO quality performance. However, from the perspective of humanism, any speaker should be treated with respect.

Cooperative skills. Collaborative interaction requires from a teacher a set of *cooperative skills – attending, reflecting, focusing, thematizing, challenging, disclosing, goal setting, trailing*, and *planning*, adapted by Edge from Egan [2, p. 64–69]. Due to the publication limit, let us focus only on reflecting and disclosing.

Describing reflecting as a skill, Edge offered to use open questions that may stimulate the Speaker to expand on his or her ideas more effectively than closed questions [2, p. 69], whereas Lansley might sound a bit categoric stating that it leads to phatic discourse and negative stereotyping [3, p. 53]. Such an opinion may be mistaken, as, the Listener's open questions to the Speaker might be positively challenging and engaging.

Concerning Edge's understanding of a cooperative skill of disclosing, Lansley interpreted it as making the subconscious the conscious, i. e., vocalizing that is already known [3, p. 55]. However, for any single case, it may be rational to research first if there is such a need, as it may be doubtful that each English teacher faces difficulties in expressing the relevant ideas.

Conclusion. Based on the results of the comparative analysis of the two designed interactions – *Edge's co-operative development* and *Lansley's collaborative development*, both may be characterized as persuasive for implementation in teachers' professional development. However, these interactions may require certain improvement through adaptation regarding the context and target teachers: e.g., collaborative development may be successfully implemented at the novice-teacher stage, whereas cooperative development may be more effectively used by mid-career or late-career teachers.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА
1. Bolitho R. Stages in an English teacher's career and some of the dilemmas and questions that accompany each stage // Humanising Language Teaching. URL: https://www.hltmag.co.uk/feb2020/rethinking-language-teacher-training (date of access: 01.03.2025).

2. Edge J. Co-operative Development // ELT Journal. 1992. Vol. 46. P. 62–70.
3. Lansley C. 'Collaborative Development': an alternative to phatic discourse and the art of Co-operative Development // ELT Journal. 1994. Vol. 48. P. 50–56.
4. Heron M., Maley A., Bolitho R. Rethinking Language Teacher Training and Professional Development // Humanising Language Teaching. URL: https://www.hltmag.co.uk/ feb2020/rethinking-language-teacher-training (date of access: 01.03.2025).