

JOURNAL

**of Language Research
and Teaching
Practice**

volume #5

ISSN: 2618-0375

JOURNAL
of Language Research and Teaching Practice

Journal of Language Research and Teaching Practice

Ablai Khan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages Journal of Language Research and Teaching Practice is registered in Communication, Informatization and Information Committee of Ministry for Investment and Development, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Editor in chief

Dzhussubaliyeva D.M., doctor of pedagogical sciences, professor, Kazakh Ablai khan UIR&WL Almaty, Kazakhstan

Executive Editor

Usanova M.U., doctor of economic sciences, professor, Kazakh Ablai khan UIR&WL Almaty, Kazakhstan

Executive Secretary

Battal Zhanar, Master of Management, Kazakh Ablai khan UIR&WL, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Editorial team members

Kunanbayeva S.S. Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Doctor of Philology, Full Professor, Ablai khan KazUIR&WL, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Islam Aibarsha, doctor of philological sciences, professor, Ablai khan KazUIR&WL, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Josef Schmied, PhD, professor, Universitat Chemnitz, Germany

Anna Oldfield, PhD, associate professor of Coastal Carolina University, USA

Suzana Mikhaelidi PhD, professor, University of Indianapolis, Athens Campus, Greek Republic

Teresa Lynn Polowy, Doctor of philology, University Orizona, USA

Engberg Jan, PhD, Professor Department of Business Communication, the Aarhus School of Business, Aarhus University, Denmark

Ermagambetova A.S. candidate of philological sciences, Ablai khan KazUIR&WL, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Bolatova S.M., candidate of philological sciences, Ablai khan KazUIR&WL, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Elubayeva P.K., candidate of philological sciences, Ablai khan KazUIR&WL, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Reviewers:

Mizamkhan B., candidate of philological sciences, Ablai khan KazUIR&WL, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Akhmetova G.Sh., candidate of philological sciences, Ablai khan KazUIR&WL, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Zhumabekova G.B. candidate of pedagogical sciences, Ablai khan KazUIR&WL, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Golovchun A.A., candidate of pedagogical sciences, Ablai khan KazUIR&WL, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Asanova G.S., PhD, senior lecturer, Ablai khan KazUIR&WL, Almaty, Kazakhstan

CONTENT

METHODOLOGY OF COGNITIVE-LINGUACULTURAL THEORY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING PRACTICE

Kuznetsova T.D., Karabalayeva Zh.M. Opportunities for change and Daring Greatly through the prism of Action Research Study.....	7
Baigulina E. Some features of a case method in the formation of foreign language communicative competence of students	26
Torekeyev B. A. The role of digital educational resources (DER) in the field of education in teaching a foreign language in a new paradigm of education.....	39
Medvedeva S.M The formation of pedagogical specialties students' discursive competence in the language higher educational institution within dialogue discourse using communicative situations on foreign language practical classes.....	52
Kiyakova G. B., Yermekbayeva.G.S., Turysbekova G.ZH. Practical application and advantages of information technology training in the educational process of higher education	63
Ashirimbetov N., Karmysova M.K. The innovations in “foreign language” educational area within the context of the modern educational paradigm	74
Dzhussubaliyeva D.M., Tuleshova K.T., Aliymbaeva D.A. The digital technology: past, present and future.....	79
VeskaVardareva, Itzka Derrizhan Postmodernity and proactive educational environment.....	91

Veska Vardareva, Itska Derijan, Gergana Dyankova, Sofia Dermendzhieva
Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) in the proactive educational environment 96

**REGULARITIES IN THE FORMATION OF A GLOBAL INTERCULTURAL
COMMUNICATION THROUGH WORLD LITERATURE**

Zhanalina L. K.
Text and Discourse in Nominative Grammar and Communicative Grammar 102

UDK 81'42

**TEXT AND DISCOURSE IN NOMINATIVE GRAMMAR AND COMMUNICATIVE
GRAMMAR**

Zhanalina L. K.

Graduate Studies Department

Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages

Abstract

The article examines the problem of text and discourse which became central to contemporary linguistics. This issue is crucial and became subject of linguistics since resolving it will affect not just the understanding of language but also the disciplinary structure of linguistics. General study of text and discourse is related to various approaches to them and reflects identification of attributes which differentiate and combine them. The latter includes recognition of a connection between text and discourse with speech activity. Simultaneously, concept of “discourse” is broader than concept of “text”. Discourse represents “live”, dynamic meaning creation and generation of original text within speech activity. Text outside of discourse is abstracted from speech activity but still related as a preserved in memory, reproducible secondary artifact. The principal process of discourse is meaning creation and transfer of its products – communicative function. Text preserves and accumulates the results of learning; therefore, nominative function becomes primary. Functional divergence of text and discourse is ensured by use of different language means and models which dictates division of grammar onto nominative branch, which is services text along with other nominative units, and communicative one, which services discourse and speech outcomes. Functional divergence of text and discourse is also demonstrated by their typology, speech registers and register variants, forming nominative and communicative register paradigms.

Keywords: text, discourse, speech activity, nominative function, communicative function, communicative registers, nominative registers.

Concepts of text and discourse which have been popularized in the 20th century linguistics reflect a developing trend in modern linguistic research defined by set of rules known as scientific principles which, due to frequent use on the one hand and sufficient extent of time being in use on the other, transitioned into the class of “default” canons. As such, they necessitate studying language in its multitude of dimensions which approximates the complete language world view. This approximation occurs gradually through selection of certain tenets or their combination at one time or another which leads to the emergence of various scientific approaches, theories. The latter include text linguistics and discourse theory which open up new possibilities for linguists thanks to the multiplicity of their subjects based on the principles of explainability, anthropocentrism, cognitivism, functionalism and integrativeness.

Text and discourse are not only becoming more prominent in linguistics but also increase their influence over the developing understanding of language and yet remain a hotly contested topic for never-ending debates. The main problem involves these concepts themselves, as their ontological and gnoseological aspects are still being questioned. Their existential corollaries are different, accordingly, the assessment of their correlation from various scientific

perspectives differs as well. Text linguistics emerged as a branch of syntax

Obviously, geneses of text and discourse affect their development. Text linguistics emerged as a branch of syntax (text as a unit larger than sentence), and discourse theory came from western linguistics. The latter term was coined by Z. Harris [CITATION Mak03 \p 9 \l 1033] which links discourse with descriptive linguistics and systemic structural approach. There is another opinion regarding the origins of the term “discourse”. N.F. Alifirenko believes it was borrowed from the French language [CITATION Ali12 \p 13 \l 1033]. In any case, since its emergence, the term has been actively advanced by Russian psychologists. L.S. Vygotsky, A.N. Leontieff, and A.R. Luria frequently use related terms in their writing such as “discourse activity”, “discourse reasoning”, “discourse cognition”, “discourse deliberation”, et cetera [CITATION MVG \l 1033].

Formal and psychological origins of text and discourse in linguistics more or less delineates their correlation. Their differentiation defines the boundaries of their research which takes place in the 70s of the 20th century in European and Russian linguistics. The complexity of contrasted phenomena is reflected in the complexity and ambiguity of their definitions inherent in various approaches and recognized attributes

[CITATION Mak03 \p 90-99 \l 1033][CITATION OIT09 \l 1033].

To sidestep a detailed analysis of how text and discourse are defined, a more general framework of their understanding will be presented. The main attributes of text include link grammar, structure and physical embodiment (representation) from a formal, structural approach as well as traits of functional targeting and producibility related to speech activity from a communicative approach. For example, N.F. Aliferenko defines text as a product of speech which utilizes language as a system of means for speech communication [CITATION Ali12 \p 9 \l 1033].

Discourse embodies social, information encapsulating, cognitive, meaning/discourse creative, communicative traits, linked to speech activity, actualization, partly authorizability which creates subjective discourse [CITATION Ali05 \t \l 1033] [CITATION Man05 \l 1033].

The majority of definitions differentiate between the two concepts by the extent of their applicability. Discourse is considered to be a wider concept, while text is a narrower one. Discourse is presented as a speech act which is subject to linguistic (rules of speech making) and extralinguistic (socio-cultural, national, ethnic, worldview, pragmatic) factors and which also utilizes verbal and non-verbal means and finally results in a creation of text. Text represents a

verbal product of speech activity, and it is created in accordance with universal cognitive, nationally oriented linguacultural components of the original thought (knowledge).

Text and discourse have the following in common:

- 1) Their connection to speech activity.
- 2) Simultaneously, discourse = speech activity with its functions, participants, meaning creation and cognition, utilized linguistic and non-linguistic means + text.
- 3) Text is a linguistic product of speech activity, established through the linguistic means (symbols) and models, which expresses cognitive (learning) and linguacultural contents.
- 4) Discourse includes a live cognitive activity (creativity) which text locks in and preserves for further use as needed.
- 5) Discourse is dynamic, constantly reproducing, original, while text is static as a product, secondary in the process of reproduction

It is well known that not all outcomes of speech are reproduced. Sentences and texts, related to them, perform an informational-communicative function and serve as transmitters of data about specific events, their specific participants. Speech maker

saves this information in his or her short-term memory but does not preserve the form in which it was presented, thus able to transmit it again in “different words”. Such texts perform a communicative function and addressed to a listener. Linguistic means selected for their formulation depend on all participants in communicative act or situation, or speaker’s intentions, et cetera.

There are also texts which encapsulate data. They are preserved in memory along with their verbal container and perform a nominative role. As such, they are created to reinforce new knowledge in language and to reproduce. Customarily, they are not changed. Development of understanding of speech activity in reference to Leontieff’s criteria of differentiating between forms of activity according to motives (goals) allows to identify two forms of speech activity: nominative activity which is guided by nominative function, and communicative activity (most active and productive) which is guided by a communicative function [CITATION Zha93 \t \l 1033].

Nominative activity produces nominative units (NU) which are created by the means of different language levels. They include figurative meaning, idiomatic expressions, derivative words, collocations, sentences and texts.

Communicative activity produces communicative units (CU). They include statements and discourses which perform a

communicative role. The reasons for such use of the term discourse for one form of speech activity which performs a communicative function in verbal communication are its dynamic attributes, informational mutability, producibility, situationality, and subjectivity (author’s presence). Text, meanwhile, is characterized by stability, universality (generalizability) of knowledge, reproducibility, extrasituationality, and subjectlessness.

An analysis of means and methods of creating nominative units revealed the fact that they demonstrate an implicitly inherent readiness to participate in nominative activity and that they are different from means and models of language which are prepared to participate in communicative function. This discovery became a basis for differentiating between nominative grammar and communicative grammar [CITATION Zha06 \t \l 1033].

This article attempts to delineate the boundaries between nominative grammar and communicative grammar at the most vulnerable points where nominative and communicative units, born out by syntactical models and means, meet. Under the conventional terminology of nominative theory, this would be phrase formation for nominative grammar and syntaxology for communicative grammar.

Phrase formation establishes a weakly differentiated area of nominative grammar

due to formal unmarkedness and diffuse semantic specialization of collocations and sentences in nominative function.

As noted above, sentence-statements and text-discourses are better differentiated by their contents which play the role of either knowledge generated through the cognitive activity or data which has spatial and temporal limits and operate reproductive reasoning. Compare: Communicative activity (CA) *My wife says: “Nominative activity (NA) Everyone is self-conscious. (CA) You are no exception. You are self-conscious for me”* (S. Davlatov).

Knowledge obtained through cognitive activity is recorded in extratemporal sentences and NA texts and can be reiterated like any NU. They can be reiterated within CA or NA.

In the former case, they are merged with the CA results like the example given above and reflect the coexistence of two forms of speech activity (SA). NU-sentences and NU-texts are differentiated not just as knowledge containers. In archetypal case, predication operation, connecting subject with predicate, used for their production does not grant them predicative, situational attribute, whereas predicate is a condition for obtaining a mandatory communicative attribute of predication for CU-statements and CU-discourses.

Utilization of a dual terminology “sentence-statement” and “text-discourse” is an attempt to mark the differences between structurally similar constructs.

Table. Sentence-Statement and Text-Discourse as NU and CU

Nominative Grammar – post-speech (produced) units	Communicative Grammar – functional (produced) units
Differences <i>NU-sentences, NU-texts from CU-statements and CU-discourses</i>	
Sentences and texts are NU (attributes)	Statements and discourses as CU (attributes)
Nominative function	Communicative function
Express knowledge	Express information
Attributes of predication, situation are absent; occur only in peripheral sentences and texts	Attributes of predication, situation (mandatory attributes) Predication is a trait of a statement
Preserved as a formal semantic product in memory after the act of making it, i.e. it has boundaries (detached from NA), discrete	Formal part of the statement, discourse, is not kept after communicative act, i.e. remains linked to the activity (associated with CA), dynamic Coincidence with CA is a marker of discourse
Producibility and reproducibility	Producibility
May contain precedent names: geographic, historical, cultural	Precedents are uncharacteristic
Form a linguistic world view	Illustrate, clarify the knowledge about the world

	with specific facts and cases
Their content is focused on reality	Their content is focused on an individual
Part of speaker's grammar	Part of both speaker's and listener's grammar

Therefore, main reason for differentiating between statement and sentence is presence of the predicative attribute. Differentiation between text and discourse is based on dynamic openness as opposed to discreteness of text. Other differences are related to common ones for NU and CU.

Integration of NU-sentences and NU-texts into CU-sentences and CU-discourses can be explicit or implicit and the degree of implicitness vary.

1. Example of how the knowledge expressed through NU may be questionable for use in specific circumstances.

(CU) *Once there were three of us – Rain, Brodsky and me.* (CU) *Rain remarked in passing: “(NU 1) Exactness is a great power”. (NU 2) Zoschenko, Block, Zabolotsky were famous for their pedantic exactness.* (CU) *Zabolotsky told me during our only meeting: “(CU) Zhenya, you know how I defeated the soviet regime? I defeated it with my exactness!”*

(CU) *Brodsky interrupted him: “Meaning, by serving his 16-year long prison term in full?!”* (S. Davlatov.)

Knowledge which contains NU is not part of the system of views of native speakers as a norm and it is used to examine actions. The

specific example of knowledge realization described in the last sentence of the given discourse distorts the rule. It is implemented via an exclusion of an explicit attribute “great power” and an implicit attribute “freedom of will” of the subject which makes his act forced and fills the knowledge itself (proclamation) with irony

The second sentence, marked as NU, includes precedents – names of famous poets, writers. Precedents do not belong in a data pool about knowledge in general but to a specific subset of knowledge about reality which cannot be generalized in abstract, save by specific speakers, and as such is a part of worldview necessary for communication.

2. Example of implicit knowledge passed via explicit antinomic formula.

(CU) *Mother went out for a walk. It was raining. She left her umbrella at home. She walking through the puddles. All of sudden a drunk who does not have an umbrella either runs into her. The latter yells at her: “Madam, why are they all hiding under umbrellas like barbarians?”* (S. Davlatov). The first implicit data is extracted from the assumption: *People use one of the fruits of civilized life, umbrellas, when it rains outside to avoid getting wet.* Second explicit

bit of data is inferred: *Those who seek cover under umbrellas are savages.* The inference takes form of rhetorical questions which contain two implicit conclusions, a larger and a smaller premises: *All people are savages. All people outside cover themselves up with umbrellas against the rain.*

Most frequent is the case when NU functions alongside with CU. But there are examples of NU-sentence and NU-texts which do not exceed their functional boundaries. For example: *“Oxford Dictionaries has declared “post-truth” as its 2016 word of the year. It is defined as an adjective relating to circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than emotional appeal and personal belief. Today, post-truth is everywhere (in media, sciences, and even in day-to-day life). The conventional terms of “truth”, “lie”, “deception”, “authenticity” and so on. We are on the verge of post-science which will produce new knowledge with a heavy dose of emotions, personal attitudes and convictions.”* (M.V. Ivanova). This text is a product of scientific cognition, i.e. a NU-text, and included into the homogenic sphere of an academic article by professor M.V. Ivanova *Publicism and Post-Publicism.*

Text-discourses can also be functionally uniform while implementing only one communicative function: (CU) *After a few*

days he saw Marlen Michaylovish on the TV screen and became very proud because such an important person became his “customer”, that is, a repeat client. He was flattered that Marley Michaylovish would honor him with conversations, and not just honors but actually pays special attention as if trying to learn something new from these conversations. When Kuzenkov showed up in the shop, Mr. Merkator would assign the business to two young helpers, requested a “cup of tea” in a dignified manner and invited the guest into his air-conditioned office with comfortable leather arm chairs where they would spend an hour or more talking (V. Aksenov). CA contains a bit of NU in the form of borrowed word “customer”, which neither reaches the level of syntax nor affects the functional orientation of the discourse itself.

Reviewed examples demonstrate two methods of co-existence of CA and NA as forms of SA at the level of sentence-statements and text-discourses.

The first and most productive method across all spheres of linguistic functionality is a *heterofunctional method of coexistence* of NA and CA and their respective NU and CU units, creating combinations of units which perform nominative and communicative functions. This results in creation of functionally *heterogeneous texts.*

The second method is homofunctional, creating CU-discourses with uniform

communicative function or NU-texts with uniform nominative function. Such NU-texts and CU-discourses epitomize functionally *homogeneous texts*.

Typology of texts (and sentences) based on the attribute of functional uniformity – nonuniformity as well as differentiation of heterogeneous texts by the degree of explicitness of NU presence configured with CU matches the classification of communicative text types or speech registers by G.A. Zolotova [CITATION Zol98 \p 402-448 \l 1033]. The latter classification is based upon a general tenet of her communicative grammar about the leading role of communicative function. As such, the aforementioned typology is refined and expanded to include nominative function alongside already included communicative one.

1. The first refinement involves differentiation between communicative and nominative types of texts or registers and register variants.

Most of communicative types identified by G.A. Zolotova remain in the sphere of communication. They include *reproductive (artistic), informational, voluntary, reactive registers* and *real-life exemplary register variants*.

Nomination includes generative register as well as *potentially-generalized* and *generatively-voluntary* register variants.

2. The second refinement and addition consist of types of text-discourse or speech registers. Contemporary stage of language functionality reinforces the role of evaluative, emotional and regulatory linguistic functions. Correspondingly, the register scale is expanded.

Emotional register extends communicative registers. It communicates speaker's emotional reactions which do not have an attribute of universality but can infect and charge up, approximating reactive register. Example: **“Wow!” - joyfully exclaimed Mr. Merkador.** *“So I will be a manager here, a socialist director, won't I? I mean the great Soviet Union can't just turn down my experience, my Mediterranean connections!”* (V. Aksenov.)

Evaluative register consists of texts which express an attitude toward reality, events, people, actions, etc. It is related to nominative registers. World views and opinions inform the evaluations. Social and individual evaluations maintain a certain but incomplete degree of stability as they serve as a condition for selecting an appropriate mode of behavior for each situation. Example: *I love everything Russian. And it's not because that I'm one sixty fourth Russian myself, like our last sovereign, but simply because that we are located here, on the Island, and everyone, even Tatars, are somehow affiliated themselves with the Russian culture. You know, our leadership,*

temp. evacuees were always very sensitive in relation to ethnic groups, and everyone like me, the Mediterranean type, are in favor of acceptance, tolerance, a certain grace in ethnic relations. Consider me: cousin is an influential lawyer in Venice, aunt is an owner of a tea company in Tel Aviv, there are Merkators on Malta, in Sardinia, Marseille, Barcelona... Homo mideo terrano – is a man of the world, Mr. Kuzenko. (V. Aksenov). The text contains a syllogism which provides a foundation for an assessment of inter-ethnic relations.

Regulatory register consists of NU-texts, which establish morality, ideology, ethical norms, legality, inter-state, international and inter-ethnic relations which go through lengthy period of development-transformation. It is related to the nominative set as the assertions pronounced in it act for a long period of time.

Article 2

1. The Republic of Kazakhstan is a unitary state with a presidential form of government.

2. The sovereignty of the Republic extends to its entire territory. The state ensures the integrity, inviolability and inalienability of its territory.

3. The administrative-territorial division of the Republic, the status of its capital shall determine by the law. Capital of Kazakhstan is the city of Astana. (The Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan)

3. Third addition concerns generative register which has variants other than the *potentially-generalized* and *generatively-voluntary register ones* identified by G.A. Zolotova. Register variants of generative register in communicative grammar determine the degree of generality of the subject (potentially-generalized variant) and effect on the recipient (generatively-voluntary variant)

Possibilities for variability of the degree of knowledge generation are theoretically infinite and defined by peculiarities of mental act of classification. Thus, the search for generative register variants is a task for the future, particularly because the data is provided by text, a dynamic and constantly expanding fabric of language as opposed to a linguistic system.

Experience of studying texts of generative type produces the most common attributes of generality or constancy, stability, prevalence which limit the location or time of knowledge applicability. They include geographic names, titles for historical periods, names for historical events themselves, individual or celebrity names.

Knowledge is classified by the degree of its dissemination:

General generative register variant which are pertinent for the all or the vast majority of humanity. Example: *Human is mortal*.

Limited to specific speakers register variant (regional, professional, religious, cultural, gender or age-based, etc). Example: *Tuvinians are one of the most ancient Turkic-speaking people who inhabited the Central Asia and Sayan-Altai mountain range. The contemporary name of the Tuvinian people is “Tuvan”, “Tuvan kizhi”*.

Generative register incorporates texts which contain precedents in the form of geographic names, names for periods of history, time, names of cultural or historical figures.

They include the following register variants:

Precedent text with locational disseminator. Example: *Volga river flows into the Caspian Sea*.

Precedent text with temporal disseminator. Example: *Oxford Dictionaries has declared “post-truth” as its 2016 word of the year* (M.V. Ivanova).

Precedent text with cultural and historic disseminator. Example: *Abay’s nephew Shakarim Kudayberdiyev is a well-known Kazakh poet and philosopher*.

Precedent texts do not contain general knowledge and designate specific realities or events which are marked by a particular

social-cultural significance. As such, they are in frequent use in communication and belong to a common body of knowledge for native speakers. Generalization of text contents is replaced generalization of knowledge carriers.

Thus, two register paradigms of text types are identified which, on the one hand, demonstrate coexistence of two main functional types of text-discourse (sentence-statement) CU and NU, and on the other – an interaction of two forms of SA – CA and NA which emerges in the configuration of registers and register variants.

Communicative register paradigm includes reproductive (artistic), informational, voluntary, reactive, emotional registers and real-life exemplary register variant.

Nominative register paradigm includes generative, evaluative, regulatory as well as register variants: potentially-generalized, generatively-voluntary, universally generative, limited to specific speakers register variants. They are approximated by variants in the form of a precedent text with a local disseminator, a precedent text with a temporal disseminator, a precedent text with a cultural and historic disseminator.

In summary, texts (and sentences) are classified by (1) functional uniformity-nonuniformity attribute; (2) degree of explicit presence of NU in combinations with CU; (3) text-discourse functions.

References

CITATION Mak03 \p 9 \l 1033 : , (Makarov, 2003, p. 9),

CITATION Ali12 \p 13 \l 1033 : , (Alifirenko, Golovaneva, Ozerova, & Chumak-Zhun, 2012, p. 13),

CITATION MVG \l 1033 : , (Gorbunova, 2012),

CITATION Mak03 \p 90-99 \l 1033 : , (Makarov, 2003, pp. 90-99),

CITATION OIT09 \l 1033 : , (Tayupova, 2009),

CITATION Ali12 \p 9 \l 1033 : , (Alifirenko, Golovaneva, Ozerova, & Chumak-Zhun, 2012, p. 9),

CITATION Ali05 \t \l 1033 : , (Alifirenko, 2005),

CITATION Man05 \l 1033 : , (Manaenko, 2005),

CITATION Zha93 \t \l 1033 : , (Zhanalina, 1993),

CITATION Zha06 \t \l 1033 : , (Zhanalina, 2006),

CITATION Zol98 \p 402-448 \l 1033 : , (Zolotova, Onipenko, & Sidorova, 1998, pp. 402-448),