1 БӨЛІМ.
ТІЛ БІЛІМІ ЖӘНЕ ӘДЕБИЕТТАНУ

РАЗДЕЛ 1.
ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ И ЛИТЕРАТУРОВЕДЕНИЕ

SECTION 1.
LINGUISTICS AND LITERARY STUDIES

F.R. Avazbakieva
Eurasian National University named after L.N. Gumilyov
email: flyura_85@bk.ru

Zh.Z. Ospanova
Pavlodar Pedagogical University, Pavlodar, Republic of Kazakhstan

D.V. Pashkanyan
Pavlodar Pedagogical University, Pavlodar, Republic of Kazakhstan

ON THE ISSUES OF DISCOURSE AS A UNIT
OF COMMUNICATION AND LEARNING

Abstract. *The article deals with the problem of complexity and versatility of discourse concept. The subject of numerous discussions were the communicative characteristics of discourse and its functions in public practice. In fact, each human activity has its own, characteristic for it, discourse, in which human abilities for reflection and communication are realized. In our article we will consider the problems of understanding the term "discourse".*

Key words: *discourse, addressee, utterance, communicative phenomenon, communicative situation.*

The analysis of linguistic literature suggests that a lot of attention has been paid to the study of the linguopragmatic aspect of language in recent years. At the same time, the understanding of speech interaction expands the boundaries of the elementary process of information exchange, moreover, it turns into an object of research of various fields of knowledge related to human activity. As proof of this, it is possible to give interpretations of the term «speech communication».

So, in linguistics, speech communication means «communication carried out with the help of speech acts, during which information, actions and states are exchanged and joint decisions of various kinds of communicative tasks are made. A speech act is a purposeful speech action performed in accordance with the principles and rules of speech behavior adopted in this society; the main features of a speech act are intention (intentionality), purposefulness and conventionality. The sequence of speech acts creates a discourse» (Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1990, p. 412).

In ethics, speech communication is represented as «simultaneously an exchange of actions, deeds, thoughts and feelings, experiences with other people, as well as a person's appeal to himself – to his own soul, memories, conscience, dreams» (Dictionary of Ethics, 1989, p. 225).

In philosophy, speech communication is thought of as «a complex system of subject-subject interaction aimed at establishing certain relationships, including the achievement of spiritual community; it encompasses the entire conscious depth of people's mutual involvement, implemented through the enrichment of the life of all other subjects» (Philosophical Dictionary, 1987, p. 330).

In psychology, speech communication is «a complex multidimensional process of establishing and developing contacts between people, generated by the needs for joint activities and including the exchange of information, the development of an interaction strategy, perception and understanding of another person» (Psychology: Dictionary, 1990).

In the methodology of teaching a foreign language, it is interpreted as «a form of interaction between two or more people through language, including the exchange of information of a cognitive or affective nature. There are five components involved in speech communication: the communication situation, the sender of speech, the recipient of speech, the conditions of the speech action and the speech message» (Dictionary of Methodological Terms (theory and Practice of Language Teaching), 1999).

It should be noted that in each of the definitions, «speech communication» is presented from the standpoint of the science within which it is considered. And, nevertheless, in each of them the analyzed concept is conditioned by the triad addressee – text/utterance – addressee. Such an approach to the problem of speech communication allowed us to destroy the traditional view, limited by the framework of two-dimensional space – language – speech and language – thinking, which existed as long as language was studied «as a multilevel system serving as the basis of speech activity» (Vladimirova, 2007, p. 9). The expansion of boundaries caused by the involvement of the third component (the addressee) serves, undoubtedly, as evidence of their inclusion in the communicative paradigm.

Thus, a comparison of definitions presented by various fields of knowledge reveals that communication is based on the processes of exchange and transmission of information, and, consequently, it implies both the presence of communication participants manifesting themselves through communicative behavior, and discourse-text as a meaningful component of this process, built in accordance with the norms of language. Moreover, the characteristics of interpersonal interaction are mainly fixed for communication. At the same time, communication is carried out in the process of speech through speech acts – segments of speech, utterances – as units that make up any speech.

It is also important to keep in mind that every utterance is produced and realized. At the same time, it is filled with a certain meaning, primarily through the speaker's activity. It is the speaker who has the ability to express speech intention both verbally, and, in particular, orally, and through non-linguistic means (facial expressions, gestures, body movements, etc.). Actualization of the speech act takes place if linguistic and non-linguistic means are connected with the speaker, i.e. the addressee. According to G.Ya. Solganika, the «speech act» accommodates» all uttered and not yet uttered

(potential) statements. Its generalized structure can be represented as follows: «I am (the speaker) I am telling you (the listener) something about him (an object, a person, an event, etc.)» (Solganik, 2002, p. 120).

Hence it is clear that the speaker, being the producer of speech, is the original subject and the organizing link: without him there can be no communication, as well as discourse. And the speaker's intention, his ability to create a statement, intellectual base and emotional state, mood, predisposition to communication correlate with the implementation of the communicative task and the result in achieving the final communicative goal.

In addition, it should be taken into account that the speech act is carried out at a certain time and in a certain place, i.e. it has its own coordinates as independent support points – «here and now», forming a «semantic framework of speech» (Solganik, 2002, p. 13), representing a complex organization in time and space. It is the dependence on these philosophical dimensions that connects the speech act with the chronotope category. Attaching special importance to this moment, G.A. Zolotova writes: «There is not a single text that is not generated by the communicative intentions of the subject and does not reflect in its structure one or another of its spatio-temporal position in relation to the reported» (Zolotova, et al., 2004, p. 20).

However, as discursive practice shows, grammatical time does not always coincide with the moment of speech. For example: I was walking along a forest path covered with fresh June greenery. I heard thrushes singing in the thickets of bird cherry. In this text, the verb forms (walked, heard, filled in) of the past and present tense are called actions «as simultaneous, parallel and sequential, i.e. being in a taxi connection» (Zolotova, et al., 2004, p. 21). This fact is a clear demonstration of the choice of time forms corresponding not to the real moment of speech, but to the addressee's idea of the relationship between time and events in his perception. In confirmation of this, «the reference point of time <...> can move at the will of the speaker, as his observation point, in different directions with respect to the axis of events, taking a position synchronous to what is happening where he mentally places himself in the chronotope of actualized pictures and events, restored by memory or drawn by imagination, fantasy» (Zolotova, et al., 2004, p. 75).

In this regard, in the volumetric space of text time, following G.A. Zolotova, we will distinguish three temporal axes, or lines interacting with each other, namely: a) line T1, representing calendar, natural, physical time, «external to the text, unidirectional and irreversible» (Zolotova, et al., 2004, p. 22); b) the T2 line denoting the event time; here, a prerequisite is «a relational, taxic connection of all predicates of the text, free and connected («semi-predicative»), in terms of simultaneity or different timing, precedence or succession,» although in some moments it can be projected onto the chronological axis. For example: «At the beginning of 1812,» Burmin said, «I was in a hurry to Vilna, where our regiment was located» (Pushkin, Blizzard); I silently jumped out of the sleigh and entered the church, dimly lit by two or three candles... (Zolotova, et al., 2004, p. 23]; c) line T3, called perceptual, «expressing the position of the speaker (writer), real or mental, in time and space in relation to the events of the text.» For example: Here is a week, another passes. The old woman was even more puffed up (Zolotova, et al., 2004, p. 23).

Thus, in the center of communicative activity is a person as a subject of speech activity and communication in society. Perceiving and comprehending the world,

he gives an assessment of what is happening, while taking a decisive position in the organization of the text, using the selection of speech means according to the intention, conditions and tasks of communication. Moreover, the presence of the producer of the speech act, discourse, «more precisely, the first <...> component (speaker) can be defined as personalization (egocentricity)» (Solganik, 2002, p. 13). In order to identify the degree of abstraction of the speaker from reality, G.A. Zolotova suggests presenting the levels of abstraction as communicative types of speech (registers) located in a horizontal coordinate – reproductive, informative and generative.

In the reproductive or pictorial register, the speaker, being in reality or imagination – in the chronotope of what is happening, «reproduces directly, sensorially observed, in a specific duration or sequential alternation of actions, states,» which corresponds to the approximate scheme: «I see how...», «I hear how...», «I feel how...» (Zolotova, et al., 2004, p. 29).

The information register, penetrating more deeply into the field of cognition and touching on thought processes, assumes «the sphere of not direct observation, but knowledge obtained either as a result of repeated observation, experience, usage, or as a result of logical, mental operations.» At the same time, the speaker's position in relation to reality can be conditionally represented as follows: «I know that ...», «It is known that ... (Zolotova, et al., 2004, p. 29).

The role of the speaker in the generative register, being more complex and creative, consists in the fact that he (the speaker), solving difficult cognitive tasks, "generalizes information, correlating it with universal experience, covering the length of the T1 line (= calendar time – B.I.), and rising to the highest level abstractions from event time and place" (Zolotova, et al., 2004, p. 30). In this case, statements acquire a generalized meaning, taking the forms of proverbs, conclusions, aphorisms. For example: Enlightenment leads to freedom (E. Dashkova). The word sounds only in a responsive environment (P. Chaadaev). Under each Opinion there is Doubt, As a reserved treasure: that is, the honor of the personal will (I.V. Konevskaya). To eat a fish, you have to get into the water (Proverb) (Zolotova, et al., 2004, p. 30).

In connection with the above, we note that the formation of the structure of a monologue text occurs precisely through the interaction of these registers. In the dialogic speech act, in addition to the above, it is possible to attract the means of voluntary and reactive registers that do not contain the actual message, but implement speech intentions as "respectively "addressed to the potential performer of the speaker's will and expressive-evaluative reaction to the speech situation" (Zolotova, et al., 2004, p. 20]. Such as: Read! Tie up! Accordingly, the utterance can be constructed in such a way that the subject of speech is connected with what he reports not directly, but indirectly, i.e. the "I" as such is not expressed. However, this eliminates the obstacle to understanding the meaning of the information presented, so communication takes place.

It should be noted that in the structure of the speech act considered by us earlier, the addressee (listener) is no less an essential component, in the scheme of the speech chain (see pp. 39-40) designated as You. As a rule, the utterance is designed for the perception and, accordingly, the reaction of the interlocutor, "without You, it becomes meaningless, turns into a "voice crying in the desert" (Solganik, 2002, p. 14). Often, at the moment of communication, the addressee (recipient) has a passive position of the contemplator, nevertheless, perceiving the information (You write correctly), the listener acts as a

potential participant in communication (Write correctly). Hence, it is clear that addressing as the most important feature determines the discourse as a whole.

From the point of view of pragmalinguistics, "dialogical relations" (according to M.M. Bakhtin) take place at the heart of the discourse – the "speech whole" (according to M.M. Bakhtin) as semantic relations between utterances determined by the existence of such functions as:

1) expressive, in which the addressee's attitude to the subject of speech is expressed;

2) conative, prompting the addressee to a certain action;

3) phatic, or contact-setting and contact-supporting function;

4) metalinguistic, expressed in checking how well the communicants understand each other;

5) denotative, conditioned by the context of interaction;

6) poetic, characteristic of a message in which the expressive function of language has found expression" (Yakobson, 1985, 213–214).

In the process of in-depth research of discourse, this series is supplemented by: a) speech-thinking as the most significant in the dialogue, "aimed at discussing and finding a joint solution, when the interlocutors "play" various alternatives of events"; b) worldview, which "as a rule, reveals itself in the process of reaching agreement or compromise, as well as in situations awareness of their impossibility"; c) ethical, in the case "when the situation of difficult communication arises due to the inconsistency of norms and rules of communication among representatives of various linguistic and cultural communities"; d) facilitative, manifested in the communication of foreign speakers; its essence lies in the willingness of the speaker to come to the aid of the addressee who does not speak a foreign language well enough (Vladimirova, 2007, p. 11).

So, these theoretical developments contribute to the development and deepening of the view of discourse as a unit of communication, including language, speech, thinking and extralinguistic factors that determine this cognitive integrity.

Recognizing the connecting role of discourse in the context of time, it is possible to present it as something general, multiscale, continuous, global, eternal, along with this – conditioned by a living personality. "This is a stream that is passed from one generation to another," says G.P. Shchedrovitsky. "Generations are born and die, and activity flows through them, and it is largely independent of its material biological substrate" (Shchedrovitsky, 1995, p. 256).

Thus, discourse is a unit of communication in which, on the one hand, the primary role is assigned to the speaker (writer), who seeks to reflect his vision of the problem and influence the addressee; on the other hand, it assumes the participation of the listener, who is able to adequately perceive the information. Discourse is a spiritual union of people in the context of time and space.

In addition, T.E. Vladimirova points to the self-developing and sense-generating ability of discourse as a speech unit, which makes it possible to see in it not a static utterance, but an integral speech phenomenon capable of reinterpretation and transformation, "moving from one transitional variant to another" (Vladimirova, 2007, p. 16]. This opinion allows us to assert that discourse is a mobile, dynamic process capable of enriching and renewing itself in the process of a dialogue of personalities.

We have considered discourse as a unit of communication. At the same time, discourse makes it possible to realize communicative competence, and, in our opinion,

provides for the formation of skills by means of language communicative tasks in specific speech forms and situations. One of the aspects of solving the problem in the methodology of language teaching is an activity-based approach associated with understanding and constructing discourse, while assuming purposeful work on the inculcation and development of coherent speech. This approach to discourse in speech practice allows us to see it as a unit of communication training.

It should be noted that for a long time the sentence was used as the main didactic unit. Meanwhile, the communicative-activity approach, which has given rise to many new concepts (communication, information, meaning, etc.), is a turn to communicative-oriented learning. In the methodology of teaching communication, this dictates the choice of a new unit of study, which is the text in combination with external factors: social, psychological, cultural, etc., i.e. discourse. The researchers write that the communicative approach drew a line under the period of arbitrary division of language, consolidated the idea of the functional inviolability of language as a means of communication and an object of assimilation.

At the same time, back in 1938, E.S. Istrina pointed out that grammar classes, in fact, represent one of the varieties of speech culture classes. On the other hand, it has become an axiom that in speech culture classes the text is now the main didactic unit with which the language system is studied.

Moreover, the text as the "the highest language unit", which occupies the highest position in the level scale of language science, subordinates, integrating units of all other levels of the language system (Kolshansky, 1978, p. 35]. They function in perfect unity: none of the elements exists in isolation, each individual element of the structure has only a relatively independent meaning, a complex of linguistic units of different levels is used to express thoughts.

Therefore, by studying a coherent text, it is possible to obtain unique information about the "behavior" of language units at all levels – phonetic, grammatical, lexical, including spelling and punctuation aspects. At the same time, discourse, like text, is a level that allows determining the relationship between the content of speech and the forms of its expression, evaluating the choice of certain grammatical means and tracing the features of their "behavior". It is in the text that it is possible to note and motivate the peculiarities of the functioning of various lexical means in accordance with the stylistic affiliation, context, in relation to the genre, type of speech of a particular utterance.

It should be noted that the formal study of spelling and punctuation rules, all kinds of definitions in isolation from the text, in the absence of connection with the culture of speech, cannot fully solve didactic tasks, since the main contradiction lies in the discrepancy between how we teach and what we want to teach. At the same time, there is a gap between the way of teaching and the methodological attitude. It is important to realize that it is the developed speech that forms the need for its correct use. Consequently, discourse as a kind of coherent text is the basis for the study of formal grammatical means of language, as well as the basis for the formation of norms of communication and teaching various types of speech activity, speech culture in general.

The study of the text allows you to penetrate into its meaning, understand the main idea, see the logical structure of the work, determine the role of stylistic features of the use of words and sentences. This is the motive for the formation of the need to create your

own text, as well as discourse. It can be argued that working with the text generates and improves the need to learn to see not only what is in the book, but also to take information from it, pass it on to others in order to subject it to the evaluation of both your own and someone else's.

Thus, the analysis and perception of discourse as a special kind of text is a propaedeutic link to more complex processes of speech activity: the creation of one's own statements in accordance with the target setting, language norms and genre features, i.e. one's own discourse. The text as a kind of discourse and as a didactic unit not only opens up opportunities for learning a language as a system, but also contributes to the formation and development of communication depending on the context, situation (i.e. consituation).

References

Azimov, E.G., Shchukin, A.H. Slovar' metodicheskikh terminov: (Teoriya i praktika prepodavaniya yazykov). SPb.: Zlatoust, 1999. – 471 s.

Filosofskiy slovar'/ Pod red. I. T. Frolova. M.: Politizdat, 1986; M.: Politizdat, 1987. – 588 s.

Kolshanskiy, G.V. Kommunikativnaya funktsiya i struktura yazyka. M.: Nauka, 1984. – 175 s.

Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar'. Gl. red. V. N. Yartseva. M.: Sov. entsikl., 1990. – 682 s.

Psikhologiya: slovar'/ Pod obshchey red. A. V. Petrovskogo, M. G. Yaroshevskogo. 2-ye izd., ispr. i dop. M.: Politizdat, 1990. – 494 s.

Shchedrovitskiy, G.P. Izbrannyye trudy. M.: Izd-vo shk. kul't. politiki, 1995. – 759 s.

Slovar' po etike/ Pod red. A. A. Guseynova, I. S. Kona. 6-ye izd. M.: Politizdat, 1989. – 447 s.

Solganik, G. Ya. Stilistika russkogo yazyka: 10–11-ye kl.: Uchebnoye posobiye dlya obshcheobrazovat. ucheb. zavedeniy. 2-ye izd. M.: Izd. dom «Drofa», 1998. – 268 s.

Vladimirova, T.Ye. Prizvannyye v obshchenii: russkiy diskurs v mezhkul'turnoy kommunikatsii. M.: URSS, 2007. – 303 s.

Yakobson, R. O. Izbrannyye raboty. M.: Progress, 1985. – 460 s.

Zolotova, G.A., Onipenko, N.K., Sidorov, M.Yu. Kommunikativnaya grammatika russkogo yazyka. M.: In-t russkogo yazyka RAN im. V.V. Vinogradova, 2004. – 540.

Ф.Р. Авазбакиева[1], Ж.З. Оспанова[2], Д.В. Пашканян[2]
Байланыс және оқу бірлігі ретіндегі дискурс мәселелері туралы

[1] Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті,
Нұр-Сұлтан, Қазақстан Республикасы
email: flyura_85@bk.ru

[2] Павлодар педагогикалық университеті,
Павлодар, Қазақстан Республикасы

Аңдатпа. *Мақалада «дискурс» ұғымының күрделілігі мен жан-жақтылығы мәселесі қарастырылған. Дискурстың коммуникативті сипаттамалары және оның қоғамдық және әлеуметтік тәжірибедегі функциялары көптеген талқылаулардың нысанына айналды. Шындығында, адамның әрбір әрекетінің өзіне тән дискурсы бар, онда адамның рефлексия және қарым-қатынас жасау қабілеттері жүзеге асады. «Дискурс» терминінің әртүрлі түсіндірмелері мен интерпретациялар зерттеледі.*

Түйін сөздер: *дискурс, адресат, мәлімдеме, коммуникативті құбылыс, коммуникативті жағдай.*

Ф.Р. Авазбакиева[1], Ж.З. Оспанова[2], Д.В. Пашканян[2]
К вопросу о дискурсе как единице общения и обучения

[1] Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева,
г. Нур-Султан, Республика Казахстан
email: flyura_85@bk.ru

[2] Павлодарский педагогический университет,
г. Павлодар, Республика Казахстан

Аннотация. *В статье рассматривается проблема сложности и многогранности понятия «дискурс». Предметом многочисленных дискуссий стали коммуникативные характеристики дискурса и его функции в публичных и социальных практиках. По сути, каждая человеческая деятельность имеет свой характерный для нее дискурс, в котором реализуются способности человека к рефлексии и коммуникации. Исследованы различные трактовки и интерпретации термина «дискурс».*

Ключевые слова: *дискурс, адресат, высказывание, коммуникативное явление, коммуникативная ситуация.*