СЕКЦІЯ 1. ТЕОРІЯ ТА ЗАКОНОМІРНОСТІ РОЗВИТКУ КОМУНІКАЦІЙНОЇ СИСТЕМИ СУСПІЛЬСТВА

THE CONCEPT OF A COMMUNICATIVE UNIT IN DIALOGIC SPEECH

Ponomarenko O.
*Ph.D, Associate Professor at the Department
of Foreign Languages for non-philological specialities
of Dnipro National University named after O. Honchar
Dnipro, Ukraine*

In face-to-face communication, the speaker uses expressions of one's thoughts directed speech works that are called communication units. Orientation communicative unit can be progressive, coming from speaker, and regressive, that is, being a form of speech reaction to communicative behavior of the interlocutor or on their own speech work. In accordance with the sign of orientation, speech works, they can be divided into intentional communicative units, that is, communicative units in which arbitrarily the speaker's thought is expressed, and reactive communicative units, in which forms of expression of a speech reaction are determined by the type of speech stimulus. In the latter case, two subtypes can be distinguished communicative units:1) communicative units that are a reaction to speech stimulus coming from the interlocutor; 2) communicative units that are a reaction to one's own speech stimulus.

Communicative units, that is, units of directed speech communication, were taken into account in the theory of supply only partially, namely in the form of the so-called communicative types of sentences, distinguished by purpose of the utterance. This is the well-known division of sentences into narrative, interrogative, imperative and exclamatory ones. Its division was based primarily on taking into account the syntactic form of communicative types. This resulted in two shortcomings: classifications noted in various ways by a number of researchers, namely that this classification is not semantic enough, since it does not take into account many communicative units that do not have a fixed morphological or syntactic form of expression, and that this classification is not sufficiently formalized, since some of the communicative types distinguished by form express different content. For example: an interrogative sentence can express a request, an assumption,

a reproach, and others; imperative – command request, permission, prohibition and others [1, p. 29–40].

The theory of communicative sentence types called communicative units, was not complete enough because it was based on the concept of the syntactic form of the sentence, that is took into account only the traditionally distinguished members of the proposal. The contribution of other elements of the sentence (for example, introductory and isolated members' sentences) was not taken into account in the theory of communicative types. Not nominative ways of expressing were taken into account, which in this case are understood as types predicates and arguments and logical-semantic structures.

As already noted, the theory of communicative types of sentences constantly subjected to refinement and modification. Yes, currently exclamatory sentences are derived from communicative types on the grounds that they do not express a particular communicative goal, but emotional aspect. It was also noted that the remaining three communicative types sentences are not equally opposed to each other, for the opposition declarative / interrogative sentence stands out purely functional feature, while the third communicative type is imperative sentence – is not purely functional, but modal-functional, since it is expressed by a special morphological form (imperative mood [2, p. 13–17].

Having put the units of communication at the forefront, we propose to consider first those of them, which go on communication of only two interlocutors. There are three types of functional-semantic elements, which, combined in different ways, create different types of communicative units: 1) Functional-semantic elements reflecting relationships that exist in situations of objective reality. 2) Functional-semantic elements associated with reflection of human mental activity. 3) Functional-semantic elements reflecting logical activity of human thinking.

Thus, we can distinguish the following types communicative units: 1. Ascertaining communicative units. The traditional distinction between narrative, interrogative and imperative sentences is based largely on the fact that declarative sentences were singled out within the functional style of narration, and interrogative and imperative – within the framework of functional style of dialogue. Meanwhile, while studying non-interrogative sentences of the dialogue, it is clear that they do not have narrative function, but can perform a variety of other functions, which are often labeled nominatively. A feature of non-interrogative dialogue sentences is that about nor reflect internal mental experiences of a person about some facts; give report on the facts of objective reality or nominate behavioral response of the speaker or interlocutor. From point of view communicative purpose contained in them, they can be called ascertaining statements and subdivided

into a message, assertion, assertion, supposition. 2. Imperative communicative units. Complete semantic structure of imperative statements includes a semantic element with the meaning of command, request,, proposals, prohibitions; semantic element nominating that behavioral response that the speaker wants to receive from interlocutor, and a non-predicate semantic element that nominates that the object that the speaker wants to receive from the interlocutor, or that way action required of the interlocutor. Usually full the semantic structure of the imperative utterance is not used in process of direct communication [3, p. 176–180].

That is why there can be distinguished certain semantic types of imperative statements independent from the type of nomination presented in it. With nominative point of view imperative communicative units can be divided into several types, namely: 1) predicate nominations with predicates naming specific activities; 2) predicate nominations with predicates expressing phases incentives to action; 3) predicate nominations expressing the pragmatic aspect communication situations; 4) non-predicate nominations, nominating only the subject (substance) that is the goal of a specific action; 5) specific predicate nominations, that is, nominations that include a predicate with one of the situation parameters, or modifiers. 3. Interrogative communicative units. Communicative units expressing a communicative action – a question, can be represented by statements of a complete semantic structures, that is, with the nomination of a communicative action, or truncated. The first in traditional grammar is usually called indirect question, the second – an interrogative sentence [4, p. 138].

Having done this analysis we can consider types of communication as more detailed units. If we base on the theory of allocation of communicative units in linguistics, we can talk about the existence of two main types of units in dialogical speech, such as question and answer, because first of all dialogic communication presupposes, a reaction to interlocutor's speech behavior [5, p. 39–42].

Literature:

1. Щербан Т. Д. Психологія навчального спілкування : монографія. К. : Міленіум, 2004. 346 с.

2. Черниш В. В. Навчання іншомовного діалогічного мовлення в аспекті компетентнісного підходу. *Іноземні мови*. 2012. Вип. 4(72). С. 11–27.

3. Наконечна А. О. Особливості навчання діалогічного мовлення при вивченні англійської мови / А. О. Наконечна, І. Я. Ординська. *Збірник наукових праць Національної академії Державної прикордонної служби України. Серія : Педагогічні науки*. 2015. № 2. С. 175–189.

4. Костюченко К. Є. Особливості навчання діалогічного мовлення на заняттях з англійської мови у ВНЗ. *Наукові записки. Серія : Педагогічні науки*. 2015. Вип. 135. С. 135–139.

5. Гордій О. М. Проблемні комунікативні ситуації та діалогічне мовлення як основа розвитку творчого мислення у вивченні іноземних мов. *Наука та практика 2007* : матер. наук. Інтернет-конф. 2007.

ДО ПИТАННЯ РОЗВИТКУ
СОЦІАЛЬНО-КОМУНІКАЦІЙНИХ СИСТЕМ СУСПІЛЬСТВА

Старков В. І.
аспірант факультету систем
та засобів і систем масової комунікації
Дніпровського національного університету імені Олеся Гончара
м. Дніпро, Україна

Розвиток всіх напрямків суспільної діяльності людини разом із процесами соціалізації вдосконалюється у всьому світові. Подібні процеси відбуваються, завдяки зростанню ефективності спільних дій, які відрізняються від спільних зусиль інших видів біологічних істот, усвідомленістю та цілеспрямованістю.

Насиченість сучасного життя інформацією розширює громадські та міжособистісні зв`язки та контакти, визначаючи розвиток гуманістичної сфери суспільства, виникненню нових соціальних ініціатив, розвитку культурних процесів [1, с. 30].

Подібні явища стосуються не лише виробничої діяльності, навколишнього середовища, але й суспільної організації, яка безпосередньо впливає на формування духовно-культурної сфери суспільства. Закономірності сучасної цивілізації, вдосконалення структури суспільства пов`язані з розвитком горизонтальних форм обміну інформацією, до яких відносять соціальні мережі [1, с. 31].

В останнє десятиріччя, розвиток соціальних мереж, динамічно вплинув на комунікаційну систему світу та української держави. В соціальній і політичній сфері України, існує чимала кількість партій, громадських об`єднань та рухів, що об`єктивно мають передумови задля вирішення проблем, які постають перед країною. На жаль за всі тридцять років української незалежності, політичні сили та більшість громадських об`єднань не скористалися можливістю конструктивно