

Тульский научный вестник. Серия История. Языкознание. 2025. Вып. 2 (22). С. 196–206.
Tula Scientific Bulletin. History. Linguistics. 2025. Issue 2 (22). P. 196–206.

Scientific Article

UDC 81'4

<https://doi.org/10.22405/2712-8407-2025-2-196-206>

COMMUNICATIVE STYLES IN TEACHER'S DISCOURSE IN ALGERIAN AND RUSSIAN CLASSROOMS

Souhila Laiche

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia
named after Patrice Lumumba
Moscow, Russia, laiche.souhilaa@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8895-1490>

Abstract. Communication is the way through which individuals interact, as well as a basic element of cultural and social life. Communication takes place in different contexts and circumstances, including in the classroom. The classroom atmosphere implies different communication styles between teachers and students. The study objective is to unveil the most common communicative styles in Algerian and Russian classrooms. The Discourse Completion, in which 143 students participated, is a source of data for the study. The author focuses on the communicative styles that Algerian and Russian teachers use when interacting with their students in the classroom and applies the qualitative method. The results obtained show that Algerian teachers tend to use two communicative styles, which are direct and contextual. As for the Russian teachers, they tend to use indirect and contextual styles, showing politeness and a high-power distance index.

Keywords: communicative styles, classroom interactions, Algerian classrooms, Russian classrooms, direct style, indirect style, contextual style, communication, cultural studies, speech acts, politeness.

For citation: Laiche, S 2025, 'Communicative Styles in Teacher's Discourse in Algerian and Russian Classrooms', *Tula Scientific Bulletin. History. Linguistics*, issue 2 (22), pp. 196–206, <http://doi.org/10.22405/2712-8407-2025-2-196-206> (in Russ.)

Information about the Author: *Souhila Laiche* – Postgraduate Student of the Department of Foreign Languages, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia named after Patrice Lumumba, 6, Miklukho-Maklaya Str., Moscow, 117198, Russia.

© Laiche S., 2025



Научная статья
УДК 81'4
<https://doi.org/10.22405/2712-8407-2025-2-196-206>

КОММУНИКАТИВНЫЕ СТИЛИ В ДИСКУРСЕ УЧИТЕЛЯ В АЛЖИРСКИХ И РУССКИХ КЛАССАХ

Сухила Лаиш

Российский университет дружбы народов
имени Патриса Лумумбы
Москва, Россия, laiche.souhilaa@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8895-1490>

Аннотация. Коммуникация рассматривается как способ взаимодействия людей, а также как базовый элемент культурной и социальной жизни. Коммуникация происходит в разных контекстах и обстоятельствах, таких, как обстановка в классе, которая подразумевает разные стили общения между учителями и учениками. Цель исследования – выявить наиболее распространенные стили общения в алжирских и русских классах. Данные были получены с помощью исследования с участием 143 студентов. Основное внимание в этом исследовании уделяется коммуникативным стилям, которые используют алжирские и русские учителя при выполнении определенных речевых актов в обстановке класса при взаимодействии со своими учениками. В исследовании был применен качественный метод. Полученные результаты показывают, что алжирские учителя склонны использовать два коммуникативных стиля: прямой и контекстный. Что касается русских студентов, они склонны использовать косвенный и контекстный стили, с помощью которых учителя показали вежливость и высокий индекс дистанции власти.

Ключевые слова: коммуникативные стили, взаимодействие в классе, алжирские классы, русские классы, прямой стиль, косвенный стиль, контекстный стиль, коммуникация, культурология, речевые акты, вежливость.

Для цитирования: Лаиш С. Коммуникативные стили в дискурсе учителя в алжирских и русских классах // Тульский научный вестник. Серия История. Языкознание. 2025. Вып. 2 (22). С. 196–206. <https://doi.org/10.22405/2712-8407-2025-2-196-206>

Сведения об авторе: Сухила Лаиш – аспирант кафедры иностранных языков, Российский университет дружбы народов имени Патриса Лумумбы, 117198, Россия, г. Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 6.

1. Introduction

The practice of passing on or communicating ideas from one person to another is referred to as communication. Communication is successful when messages are exchanged and communicated in an intelligible and clear manner. Furthermore, classroom communication is a critical component of the educational process, shaping how knowledge is transmitted, received, and internalized. It encompasses verbal and nonverbal interactions between teachers and students, as well as among students themselves. The nature of classroom communication varies across cultures, reflecting broader societal norms, historical contexts, and educational philosophies. In Algeria and Russia, classroom communication is influenced by distinct cultural, historical, and linguistic factors, which shape teacher-student dynamics, communication styles, and pedagogical approaches [16]. Additionally, communication is surely a hard process, especially for humans. According to [16], "humans communicate cognitively, emotionally, and socially," which contributes to this complexity. This demonstrates the significance of communication in human life. Communication issues must be avoided if good communication is to be achieved. Communicative styles are described as "language devices used to overcome communication problems related to interlanguage deficiencies" [10].

Algerian classrooms are strongly influenced by hierarchical cultural values and a high power-distance dynamic, where teachers are viewed as unquestionable authorities [15]. This stems from broader societal norms that emphasize respect for elders and figures of authority, as well as the legacy of colonialism, which shaped the education system to prioritize obedience and rote learning [5]. In Algerian classrooms, teachers are seen as the primary source of knowledge, and their authority is rarely challenged. This often results in a predominantly teacher-centered approach, limiting opportunities for active student participation. Adding to that, teachers often provide feedback indirectly to avoid causing embarrassment, consistent with the high-context communication style prevalent in Algerian culture [14, p. 35–45]. However, this can lead to misunderstandings, as students may not fully grasp the feedback's intent. Furthermore, students are generally expected to be passive recipients of knowledge, with limited interaction unless initiated by the teacher.

Russian classrooms are also characterized by a high power-distance dynamic, where teachers are respected as authoritative figures. This stems from the Soviet-era education system, which emphasized discipline, academic rigor, and a centralized approach to curriculum and pedagogy [28]. However, modern Russian classrooms are gradually incorporating more collaborative and student-centered practices. Russian teachers are seen as both educators and moral guides, with a strong focus on instilling discipline and work ethic, furthermore, they tend to provide direct and explicit feedback, reflecting the low-context communication style typical of Russian culture [14, p. 35–45]. This approach ensures clarity but can sometimes come across as overly critical.

In Russian classroom settings while traditional classrooms are focused on rote learning, modern Russian education places a greater emphasis on fostering critical thinking and analytical skills through dialogue and interactive activities [29]. Adding to that, the emphasis on academic performance can create a high-pressure environment, where interactions are often focused on outcomes rather than the learning process [29].

According to [18] it is worth noting that cultural differences in communication are not random, but rather the result of systematic and consistent use of typical strategies, which leads to the formation of communicative features, more broadly – communication dominants, the sum of which forms a culture specific style of communication that is referred to as communicative ethno-style. Effective techniques are required for communication to be successful. We thus require communicative styles.

Communicative styles are frequently used to "bridge the gaps between the linguistic and sociolinguistic knowledge of the foreign language learners and those of the interlocu-

tors in any communication situation," according to [25]. Also, it is noteworthy to mention the four dichotomies of the communicative styles asserted by W. Gudykunst and S. Ting-Toomey. They proposed to reduce all cultural distinctions to four binary style oppositions: direct versus indirect, elaborate versus succinct, personal versus contextual, and instrumental versus effective [12, p. 67–89].

Direct versus indirect styles are determined by how thoroughly and clearly the speaker expresses his or her objective in speech. In a direct communication style, the speakers state their goals directly in terms of their wants, needs, and desires. However, in indirect style, their goals are concealed and presented indirectly.

The second dimension is connected to the amount and expressiveness of speech in various cultures. It has three different styles: complex style, precise style, and concise style. The use of expressive language in ordinary speech is referred to as the ornate style. Understatements and semantically laden silent pauses are used in the concise style.

Contextual style is role-centered, with an emphasis on interlocutors' role connections. It represents societal hierarchy and uneven positions. Many European nations, as well as the United States, have a communicating style that falls somewhere in the middle, being meticulous and ritualized.

Personal versus contextual communication styles are connected to the importance of the context in communication and, more importantly, role connections between speakers. Personal style is individualistic, with an emphasis on individuality. Language is used to portray equitable social order and balanced role arrangements.

Instrumental versus emotional approaches are related to what is ultimately intended to be expressed. The instrumental style emphasizes content and is intended to fulfill the purpose of communication. The emotive style emphasizes the process of communication rather than the objective of communication. Non-verbal communication (gestures, facial expressions, etc.) plays a vital part in the transmission of information.

Partially these communicative styles are analogous to P. Grice's ideas because they relate to communication parameters involving quantity, quality, relevance, and manner (clarity of speech), etc. [11], while also convincingly demonstrating that the concept of effective communication is not universal, but culturally variable. They have a high explanatory value since they help us comprehend the existing similarities and contrasts in communication from an intercultural standpoint. It is not incorrect to argue that the aforementioned styles exist in all cultures, but it is critical to evaluate which of them are prominent in a certain society [18]. The language employed to convey the message can be utilized to identify communication methods.

J. L. Austin [3] and J. R. Searle [23, p. 209–223], two significant figures in linguistic philosophy, have developed taxonomies of speech acts. For instance, [23] defined five categories for speech acts: representatives (such as asserting or concluding) commit the speaker to the truth of the stated proposition; directives (such as asking or pleading) are attempts to persuade the addressee to do something or to move in the speaker's direction; commissive (such as promising, threatening, or offering) commit the speaker to a future course of action; and directives (such as requesting, questioning) are attempts to persuade the addressee to move in the speaker. Thanking, apologizing, welcoming, and congratulating are examples of expressives that express a psychological state and the speaker's inner state. According to [1], it is also obvious that the traditional binary opposition between instructor and student is eroding in this regard. Appointing, excommunicating, and declaring are examples of declarations that affect immediate changes in institutional state of affairs and frequently rely on complex extra-linguistic institutions. As a result, examination of speech acts can be a useful tool for learning more about how one particular group of people uses language and communicates.

These styles are shaped by cultural, social, and individual factors, influencing how messages are conveyed, interpreted, and received. The relationship between communicative styles and cultural settings is significant, as different cultures have distinct norms, values, and expectations around communication. In some cultures, communication is more direct, with individuals expressing themselves in a clear and straightforward manner. For example, in many Western cultures, such as the United States or Germany, being explicit and to the point is often appreciated. Direct communicators value clarity and precision, and messages are expected to be delivered without ambiguity. People in these cultures may use a logical and analytical approach to discussions, valuing facts over emotions or relationships.

Furthermore, and according to [9] who looked at a few of the social, practical, psychological, and emotional elements that contribute to communication difficulties. He came to the conclusion that good small group activities are crucial for empowering students and that student-teacher discussion is an essential component of classroom communication. According to [17], there are many modes of verbal and non-verbal communication, cultural communication and communication enhancers. He argued that the classroom should offer a range of stimuli, a safe, comfortable environment, and the flexibility to accommodate different activities while allowing for some privacy and individuality. He asserts that the teacher must be able to communicate with the child at their level of comprehension and comprehend the nature of language and dialect differences.

According to a review of the literature, there has been a recent surge in studies examining teachers' communication competencies [21]. Additionally, a significant amount of national and international research has been done to investigate the communication skills and empathy of the teachers [4], [8] and [27]. Studies have looked into the connection between empathy and communication abilities of the teachers' inclination levels, according to [2] and [13, p. 25–26], however some argued on how communication training can affect the teachers' degrees of empathy and communication abilities.

2. Methodology of the study

2.1. Methods and population

The present study makes use of a qualitative research method drawing on Sociolinguistics, Cross-Cultural Pragmatics, Discourse Analysis, and cultural Studies. The qualitative method is carried out by analyzing responses from a discourse completion task (DCT) which consists of different situations that tend to study different classroom interactions and involves different speech acts and communicative styles. This method would give a more in-depth overview on the participants personal responses. Also, it provides the researcher with more generalizable results, since it tends to examine the detailed responses of the participants. Furthermore, the data used throughout this research was collected from Algerian and Russian universities that are exposed to certain academic factors related the given cultural settings.

Tools of data collection

The tools used in data collection in order to conduct this study is Discourse completion test, it contains a number of questions that study the teacher-student interactions and aims at uncovering the different communicative styles used by the teachers when performing certain speech acts, as well as, knowing what expression the Algerian teachers usually use when communicating with their students in-classroom-settings. The discourse completion test included a set of situations that studies different speech acts through which the classroom interactions are realized in classroom settings in both Algerian and Russian Classrooms.

3. Summary of the findings

The data collected throughout this paper were obtained through a discourse completion test (DCT) distributed amongst the Russian and the Algerian students. Participants

were asked to specify the expression used by their teachers while communicating with them and asking them to perform certain tasks. As a result, 143 students took a part in this study, from whom 71 are Algerian students and 72 are Russian students. The questions of the DCT involves a set of speech acts, such as, orders and requests classified from low-cost to high cost.

3.1. Russian Teacher's classroom interactions

According to the replies gathered, Russian teachers employ a range of language models while executing the speech act of request while speaking with their pupils; the language models chosen can reveal how power is distributed in the classroom. It is noted that in the seventh Situation (S7), where the teacher asks the students to write the exercise on the board, (72.3 %) of the responses are direct and contain imperatives, and (20.5 %) of the responses contain questions about the students' abilities *Can you? Could you?* and the interjection adverb *Please* appears in (7.2 %) of the responses. Teachers were seen not to employ interrogative language models *I would want to know whether...* or queries of desire *Would you?* The percentage for these two language categories is (0.0 %). It has been noted that Russian teachers never ask for a favor directly; for instance, the responses indicate that they never use direct requests or imperatives.

This brings us to the eighth (08) situation, in which the students were asked to describe the teacher's expression when requesting a favor, in this case, an extra pen and (0.0 %) of the responses were noted as being direct; additionally, the majority of the responses (53.6 %) used the model verb that asks the students to fulfill the teacher's request or favor; additionally, interrogative language models were used in (26.2 %) of the responses, and the interjection adverb "Please" was noted in (20.2 %) of the responses. Regarding the ninth (09) scenario, in which teachers are expected to ask their students to repeat their responses, it has been observed that the teachers are more frequently employing imperatives to take a more directive approach. As a result, (52.1 %) of the responses are noted as being direct, and the teachers are expected to be straightforward when asking their students to repeat their responses.

The use of the interjection adverb "please," is seen to contain this linguistic variety, was the second-highest proportion of a percentage of (35.6 %). Additionally, a percentage of (0.0 %) was noted for both the language model that questions about the desire and the usage of interrogatives, and another (12.5 %) of the responses are noted to have the language model that asks about the students' capacity to comply with the teachers' requests. Moving on to the tenth (10) situation, in which the teachers are expected to ask the students to close the window, it was observed that most of the responses included the interjection adverb "please," indicating that the teachers are attempting to be less direct in their request.

The use of language models that frequently inquire about students' abilities was reported at (23.5 %), whereas the usage of imperatives by teachers was documented at (5.3 %). Also, It has been observed that teachers frequently use the language model that asks for the students' ability with a percentage of (42.2 %) and the interjection adverb "please" with a percentage of (43.6 %) in the eleventh (11) scenario, which is intended to study a request that is classified as being of a high cost and somewhat difficult to fulfil, through which asking the students to assist a new student with his homework, the percentage of direct imperatives used is (6.9 %), and no model verbs in any of the requests were found to inquire about the students' motivation to carry out this action. (See the table 1).

Table 1

The use of language models in the Russian teacher's requests

Language Models	Top-down interactions. Teacher- Student				
	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
Direct requests, imperatives, declaratives	72.3	0.0	52.1	5.3	6.9
Question of the ability: <i>can you? Could you?</i>	20.5	53.6	12.5	12.5	42.2
Question of a desire: <i>would you?</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Declarative and interrogative: <i>I'd like to know if...</i>	0.0	26.2	0.0	0.0	7.3
Interjection adverb: <i>Please.</i>	7.2	20.2	35.6	72.2	43.6

The examples that demonstrate the way the Russian teachers perform the speech act of request are listed below:

Situation 01: In the first situation the students were asked about their teachers' used expressions when asking then to write the exercise on the board, it has been noticed that the Russian teachers tend to be in directs and use both the polite form of the personal pronoun *You* which is *Вы* in the Russian language as well as they are noticed to use the interjection adverb *Please*.

1) *Напишите задание на доске, пожалуйста.*

1) *Write the task on the board, please.*

Situation 02: in this situation, the Russian teachers are noticed to be indirect when asking their students for a favor, which is lending them an extra pen, or closing the window, there are noticed to use the language models that tend to ask for the ability *Can you* and using the interjection adverb *please*.

2) *Можете мне пожалуйста дать вашу ручку?*

2) *Can you please give me your pen?*

3) *Закройте, окно, пожалуйста.*

3) *Close the window, please.*

Situation 03: When asking the student to repeat the answer, which is a task-oriented request, the Russian teachers are noticed to be likely indirect through using the interjection adverb *please*.

4) *Пожалуйста, повторите ваш ответ.*

4) *Please repeat your answer.*

3.2. Algerian Teacher's classroom interactions

Based on the data collected, it was discovered that Algerian teachers were very direct with their students when performing the speech act of requesting or ordering, and this was very noticeable in the way they uttered their expression. Almost all of the responses collected witnessed the use of imperative verbs, indicating that the teachers have more power than their students, as well as a low percentage of using model verbs. Only a small portion of the responses intended to explore the teachers' speech were found to have a lower cost of imposition; additionally, it was discovered that teachers tend to demonstrate gratitude, respect, and closeness when asking their students to do them a favor.

The participants' responses showed that the majority of Algerian teachers tend to use a lot of imperatives that demonstrates directness and high cost of imposition and tend to be so straight to the point; when asking the students to do something for them, or when asking them to perform a certain task, most of the teachers were very impulsive and a bit unrelenting. This would suggest that the Algerian teachers possess a high-power distance index and tend to exercise this power through being direct and used direct requests and to perform what is called face threatening acts which would threaten the face of the listener who is in this case the student.

Discourse completion tests were used to examine the requests made by student-teachers. Algerian students were asked to describe the expressions of their teachers when speaking to them in class and when completing the speech act of request. It is observed that in the seventh Situation (S7), where the instructor requests that the students write the task on the board, (71.1 %) of the responses are straightforward and contain imperatives; also, (18.4 %) of the responses in this situation include an ability inquiry *Can you? Could you?* and the interjection adverb "Please" appears in (10.5 %) of the answers. Teachers are not observed to use any interrogative language models, like: *I would like to know if...* or language models that ask questions about desire, like: *Would you?*. For these two language groupings, the percentage is (0.0 %). It is observed that Russian professors never expressly ask for a favor in the eighth (S8) situation, when students were asked to describe the teacher's attitude when asking for a favor (in this case, an additional pen). For instance, (0.0 %) of the responses were direct, indicating that Russian teachers seldom to never employ straight imperatives or demands. Furthermore, (33.5 %) of the responses included the model verb that asks the students whether they can do the instructor a favor or request, (26.2 %) utilized interrogative language models, and (20.2 %) of the responses indicated using the interjection adverb "Please."

In the ninth (S9) situation, where teachers are supposed to urge their students to repeat their replies, it has been noted that they are using imperatives in a more directive manner. Teachers are expected to be direct when asking their pupils to respond, as evidenced by the fact that (52.1 %) of the responses in this situation are characterized as such. Second in proportion is the use of the interjection adverb *please*, which is found to include this linguistic variation at a rate of 35.6 %. Furthermore, it was observed that (0.0 %) of the responses had the language model, and another (12.5 %) had the language model concerning the use of interrogatives.

The majority of the responses used the interjection adverb "please," suggesting that the teachers are trying to be less direct in their request. This brings us to the tenth (S10) situation, when the teachers are supposed to ask the students to close the window.

Teachers tend to use the language model that asks for the student's ability with a percentage of (42.2 %) and the interjection adverb "please" with a percentage of (43.6 %) in the eleventh (S11) scenario, which is designed to study a request that is categorized as high cost and difficult to fulfill – that is, asking students to help a new student with his homework. A proportion of (6.9 %) was recorded for the usage of direct imperatives, and none of the requests were found to include model verbs that inquire about the pupils' desire to undertake this action (see Table 2).

Table 2

The use of language models in the Algerian teacher's requests

Language Models	Top-down				
	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11
Direct requests, imperatives, declaratives	71.1	10.2	52.1	22.1	16.7
Question of the ability: <i>can you? Could you?</i>	18.4	33.5	12.5	52.8	33.3
Question of a desire: <i>would you?</i>	0.0	14.6	8.6	0.0	16.2
Declarative and interrogative: <i>I'd like to know if...</i>	0.0	26.2	12.5	0.0	16.6
Interjection adverb: <i>Please</i>	10.5	20.2	14.3	25.1	17.2

Most of the teachers' responses according to their students were as the following:

Situation 01: The students were asked about their teachers' responses when they are requesting them to perform an act, in this situation, it is asking them to write the exer-

cise on the white board, it has been shown that the verbs used by the teachers are directive and imperative and straight to the point; no model verbs were used.

(5) أسامة, أطلع للسطورة أكتب التمرين باش الزملاء تاعك يشوفوه.

5) Oussama, **come** to the board and write the exercise, so your classmates can see it.

Situation 02: Through this situation, the teachers' utterances while requesting the students to do them a favor was examined. The same thing was noticed in this situation, the teachers opt for using a direct imperative verb even though he/she is asking for a favor from the student.

(6) ولدي, أعطيني القلم الأحمر تاعك, تاعي ما يمشيش.

6) Son, **give** me your red pen, mine stopped working.

Situation 03: This situation is meant to examine the expressions used by the teachers while commanding them to do something. The teacher asked the student to repeat the answer because he has problems hearing him, his command is direct and clear. Most of the responses of this situation are noticed to contain imperatives and there was short record of using model verbs that ask for the students' ability to repeat, such as *Can you? Could you?*

(7) بوساحة, عاود واش كنت تقول, ما سمعتش الإجابة تاعك مليح.

7) Boussaha, **repeat** your answer, I couldn't hear your answer.

4. Discussion

The results of this paper show the most common communicative styles that exists in the teachers' discourse in the Algerian and Russian classrooms are three styles: direct, indirect, and contextual styles. For instance, the Algerian teachers are noted to be direct and straight to the point, they tend to request or order the students without any implicitness and in a clear manner but of course in a polite way that shows that there is a mutual respect between the teachers and the students, in another hand, it is noticed the Russian teachers tend to be more indirect when it comes to requesting their students to fulfill and action or even when ordering them to do something related to the course of the lecture, this indirectness can be noticed through the excessive use of the model verbs *Can you? Could you?* and the interjection adverb *Please*, this was stated in classic work in politeness [7, p. 65–68] and [19] and cross-cultural [6]. 'Directness' usually refers to the use of mood for instance, imperatives carry out requests, and performative verbs e.g., *I command you to*; 'indirectness' usually refers to hints. In the middle of the dimension is conventional indirectness, thus, ability inquiries to perform requests, such as, *Can you pass the water?* adding to that, the contextual or personality-oriented style can be spotted in the way how both the Algerian and the Russian teachers are trying to highlight the hierarchical social order and asymmetrical positions, through showing more respect and politeness than showing that he has a higher power than the students and that he has the right to command them directly without using expressions that demonstrate politeness like saying: *excuse me / can you? / Would you?* but of course, nowadays, it is widely understood that individuals from different cultures do not always agree on what is considered polite or impolite [20], [22], [24, p. 227–235] and [26, p. 126–167] this due to the fact that certain cultural parameters can define the way we think about certain aspects related to the interactions and communication. as for the instrumental style, it can be found in the way how the teachers are more focused on the goal and outcomes of the communication more than focusing on the flow of the communication itself.

5. Conclusion

Throughout this paper, it was intended to spot the most commonly used communicative styles by teachers in Algerian and Russian classrooms. It was aimed at shedding the light on how Algerian and Russian teachers communicate certain speech acts to their students. The results of this research show that there are three main communicative styles

that are mostly used in classroom-setting by the teachers, namely, direct, indirect and contextual. This can be strongly related to the cultural background of the Algerians and Russians; thus, Algerian teachers have a slightly high status and more power compared to the Russian teachers; which is well illustrated through the social gap between the teachers and the students in both cultural contexts. Furthermore, it can be also said that the Algerian and Russian teachers tend to show more politeness and respect to the students in their own ways and based on their cultural parameters. The results of this study are preliminary since it is built on limited materials, that's why further investigations and studied are needed.

References

1. Adams Becker, S 2017, *NMC horizon report: 2017 Higher Education Edition*, The New Media Consortium publ, Austin, Texas.
2. Ahmetoğlu, E & Acar, IH 2016, 'The correlates of Turkish preschool preservice teachers' social competence, empathy and communication skills', *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, vol. 16, is. 2, pp. 188–197.
3. Austin, JL 1962 *Speech acts / Sense and Sensibilia*, Oxford University Press publ, London, pp. 98–109.
4. Ateş, B & Sağar, ME 2022, 'Öğretmen adaylarında psikolojik esnekliğin, öz-yeterliliğin ve iletişim becerilerinin yaşam doyumu üzerindeki yordayıcı rolü' (The predictive role of psychological flexibility, self-efficacy and communication skills on life satisfaction in teacher candidates), *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, vol. 11, is. 1, pp. 219–227. (In Turk.)
5. Benrabah, M 2007, 'Language-in-Education Planning in Algeria: Historical Development and Current Issues', *Language Policy*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 225–252.
6. Blum-Kulka, S, House, J & Kasper, G 1989, 'Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview', *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*, Ablex Publishing Corporation publ, New York, pp. 1–34.
7. Brown, P & Levinson, SC 1987, *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*, Cambridge University Press publ.
8. Cochran, LM & Parker Peters, M 2023, 'Mindful preparation: An exploration of the effects of mindfulness and SEL training on pre-service teacher efficacy and empathy', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 12, is. 2, pp. 103–118.
9. Collins, J 1997, 'Barriers to Communication in Schools (Presentation paper)', *British Educational research Association Annual Conference*, September 11-14, University of York, York, England, pp. 3–14.
10. Dörnyei, Z & Scott, ML 1997, 'Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies', *Language learning*, vol. 47, is. 1, pp. 173–210.
11. Grice, HP 1990, 'Logic and Conversation', *The Philosophy of Language*, ed. A. P. Martinich, Oxford University Press publ, pp. 43–58.
12. Gudykunst, WB, Ting-Toomey, S & Chua, E 1988, *Culture and interpersonal communication*, Sage Publications publ.
13. Günözü-Kurt, S 2019, *Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarının İletişim Becerileri İle Empatik Etilim Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki* (The relationship between primary school teacher candidates' communication skills and empathetic tendency levels), Pamukkale University publ, Denizli. (In Turkish).
14. Hall, ET 1976, *Beyond Culture*, Anchor Books publ, Garden City, New York, pp. 35–45.
15. Hofstede, G 2011, 'Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context', *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, vol. 2, is. 1, article 8, viewed 1 May 2025, <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol2/iss1/8/>.
16. Hua, TK, Mohd Nor, NF & Jaradat, MN 2012, 'Communication Strategies Among EFL Students-An Examination of Frequency Of Use And Types Of Strategies Used', *GEMA Online:*

- journal of language studies*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 831–848, viewed 1 May 2025, <https://ejournal.ukm.my/gema/article/view/1058>.
17. Johnson, MB 1999, 'Communication in the Classroom', *ERIC – Educational Resources Information Center*, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED436802>
 18. Larina, T 2015, 'Culture-specific communicative styles as a framework for interpreting linguistic and cultural idiosyncrasies', *International Review of Pragmatics*, vol. 7, is. 2, pp. 195–215.
 19. Leech, G 2007, 'Politeness: is there an East-West divide?', *Journal of Politeness Resear*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 167–206.
 20. Leech, G & Tatiana, L 2014, 'Politeness: West and east', *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, no. 4, pp. 9–34.
 21. Morreale, SP & Pearson, JC 2008, 'Why communication education is important: The centrality of the discipline in the 21st century', *Communication Education*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 224–240.
 22. Pizziconi, B 2003, 'Re-examining politeness, face and the Japanese language', *Journal of pragmatics*, vol. 35, is. 10-11, pp. 1471–1506.
 23. Searle, JR 1969, *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*, Cambridge University publ, London.
 24. Sifianou, M 1999, *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece: A cross-cultural perspective*, Oxford University Press publ, Oxford.
 25. Somsai, S & Intaraprasert, C 2011, 'Strategies for coping with face-to-face oral communication problems employed by Thai university students majoring in English', *GEMA Online : journal of language studies*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 83–96, viewed 1 May 2025, <https://ejournal.ukm.my/gema/article/view/43>.
 26. Watts, RJ 2003, *Politeness*, Cambridge University Press publ.
 27. Wilson, A 2020, A study of empathy and teacher self-efficacy among preservice early childhood educators, master's thesis, East Tennessee State University.
 28. Zajda, J 2003, *Education in the New Russia: Challenges and Prospects*, Nova Science Publishers publ, New York, pp. 83–102.
 29. Zaretsky, VK 2016, 'The Development of Critical Thinking in Russian Education: Trends and Challenges', *Russian Education and Society*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 1–17.

Статья поступила в редакцию: 11.05.2025
Одобрена после рецензирования: 23.06.2025
Принята к публикации: 23.06.2025

The article was submitted: 11.05.2025
Approved after reviewing: 23.06.2025
Accepted for publication: 23.06.2025