

Nataliia MYKHALCHUK

Doctor of Psychology, Professor,
Head of the Expert Commission of
the Educational and Methodological Council,
Rivne State University for the Humanities,
Rivne, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0003-0492-9450
e-mail: natasha1273@ukr.net

Ernest IVASHKEVYCH

PhD in Psychology, Associate Professor
of the Theory and Practice of
Foreign Languages and Teaching Methodology Department, the translator,
Rivne State University for the Humanities,
Rivne, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0001-7219-1086
e-mail: ivashkevych.ee@gmail.com

Tetiana KARLOVA

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Head at the Language Training and Humanities Department,
State Institution “Lugansk State Medical University”,
Rivne, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0001-6241-7774
e-mail: karlovate@gmail.com

Dmytro BIHUNOV

PhD in Psychology, Associate Professor
at the Theory and Practice of
Foreign Languages and Teaching Methodology Department,
Rivne State University for the Humanities,
Rivne, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0001-6100-7765
e-mail: dmytro.bihunov@rshu.edu.ua

**ARGUMENTATIVE AND SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE AND THEIR
INNOVATIVE IMPLEMENTATION INTO STUDYING ENGLISH IN
HIGHER SCHOOL**

Abstract. Argumentative and scientific discourse in their scientific paradigm focus on two basic, intertwined concepts – the meaning and the activity. Argumentative and scientific discourse is the core of a purely activity approach

according to the people's speech, a global analysis of purposeful human use of sound structures, such as segmental and prosodic speech units, tokens, word forms, schemes, phrases and sentences, different types of elementary speech acts and their complexes, communicative moves as chains, discourses of different types, etc. Thus, having had such a wide field of scientific research, argumentative and scientific discourse is actualized on two levels of its analysis – a superficial (symbolic) level and a deep (cognitive-semantic) one. Thus, argumentative and scientific discourse imply the subjective-activity space of the addressee (his/her pragmatic attitudes, deixis, features of quasi-communication), performativity, the theory of speech acts, various explicit and implicit ways of organizing the language code by the subjects of communication (press position, implication, implicative scripts, maxims of cooperative interaction of partners of communication, indirect speech acts, conditions of productivity and success of the process of communication in general); theoretical and applied aspects of relevance; psycholinguistic principles and mechanisms of communication; some aspects of the theory of speech interaction and conversational speech.

Keywords: argumentative discourse, scientific discourse, pragmatic attitudes, deixis, features of quasi-communication, implicative scripts, maxims of cooperative interaction of partners of communication, indirect speech acts.

Formulation of the problem.Traditionally discourse has the meaning of understanding of oral and written information. In recent decades, this term has become widespread in humanities and has gained some new meanings. Frequent identification of the text and the discourse is linked, firstly, because of the lack of the terms' equivalent in French and English and in some other European languages, and, secondly, to the fact that earlier in the scope of the notion the discourse was included into teaching practice. As Discourse Analysis became a special field of empirical researches, it became clear that the meaning of “argumentative discourse” was not limited to written and verbal speech, but also indicated some main semiotic processes. The emphasis in the interpretation of discourse is placed on its interactive nature. Discourse is, first of all, a language having been immersed in our life, in practical situations, in a social context (for this reason, the concept of discourse is rarely used in relation to ancient texts).

Argumentative discourse is not isolated textual or dialogical structure, because much more meaning within it acquires paralinguistic accompaniment of a language that performs a number of functions (psychological, psycholinguistic, semantic, emotional, evaluational ones). Also, we think that argumentative discourse is the essential component of socio-cultural facilitative interaction. The use of mechanisms of argumentative discourse in the process of studying is necessary, because as one of its important functions is to familiarize those ones, which learn a foreign language in a paradigm of a different culture in different situations. Argumentative discourse is also important for language learning, which needs to be studied not in isolation, but in a context, that is, with a help of discourse we can show how a certain language phenomenon is used in one or another speech situation (Dubovyk, Mytnyk, Mykhalchuk, Ivashkevych & Hupavtseva, 2020).

The aim of the research is to study argumentative and scientific discourse and their innovative implementation into studying English in Higher school.

Presenting the main research material. Throughout the term's existence, the concept of "argumentative discourse" was interpreted ambiguously. So, scientists (Widdowson, 1998) considered argumentative discourse to be a coherent text. Other scientists (Zlatev, 2005) regard it as a type of discussion. Some other scientists (El-Zawawy, 2021) call discourse a collection of texts of a certain thematic direction: 1) *special discourse* is in texts of articles, monographs; 2) *popular scientific discourse* is in popular scientific magazines and texts; 3) *psychological discourse* is understood of psychological texts and textbooks; 4) *legal discourse* is in texts of the country's legal system.

Argumentative discourse is also called a process associated with a real speech production, which unfolds in some time and in some space in a certain way. Argumentative discourse is also interpreted as a dialogue and as a category of speech, having been materialized in the form of oral or written texts, completed from the semantic and structural points of view.

There is a definition of argumentative discourse as a social and communicative object, basic linguistic characteristics of which are determined by contacts with the practical actions, which are also necessary for providing argumentative discourse into teaching practice. We think that *argumentative discourse* is a complex of communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, extra-linguistic factors (knowledge of the world, thoughts, settings, goals of the partner of communication), which are the most necessary for understanding the text. In our research argumentative discourse is shown from the standpoint of Cognitive Pedagogical Science. For example, we highlight three stages in people's behavior: a situation, a discourse and argumentation. We think that argumentative discourse is a psychological implementation of a coded relevant constituent and recipient of information. It consists of three components: a plot, a dialect (oriented on geographical, time and social factors) and a dialogue-type (discourse field, discourse register, discursive modus and phases of discourse implementation, general design of phrases, structuring, content presentation, conclusions, evaluation, interactions). The latter indicates that argumentative discourse we can understand as a unique speech act.

Also, we identify three approaches to the concept of "argumentative discourse". The first approach, taken from the standpoint of Cognitive Pedagogical Science, defines discourse as two or more sentences connected by a content. The second approach provides a functional definition of argumentative discourse as "any other use of sense". This approach determines the conditionality of the analysis of the functions of discourse by studying the functions of phrases in a broad socio-cultural context. The third approach defines argumentative discourse as the utterance and puts any of the interaction into a form and functions of argumentation. In this case, argumentative discourse is understood not as a primitive set of isolated units of the linguistic structure "bigger than any sentences", but as an integral set of functionally organized, contextualized units of language use, which have their unique sense.

The expansion of the sphere of use of the concept of “argumentative discourse” led us to the fact that it could also be used in the theory of teaching foreign languages. According to scientists (Strugielska & Piatkowska, 2017), the borrowing from the Pedagogics of the term “argumentative discourse” and then the application of discursive analysis in Pedagogics is important. This allows for a better distribution of foreign language discursive structures that are the main characteristics of a particular spheres of communication, since argumentative discourse helps us to select and make the whole structure of necessary texts, defines the categories of different documents. Some scientists (Drigas & Karyotaki, 2017) believe that discursive analysis also allows a specialist, who has come across a communicative situation, to acquire the necessary skills to transfer the discursive competence from one discursive space to another.

Consequently, the introduction of the concept of “argumentative discourse” in the theory of Cognitive Pedagogical Science was not an accidental use of this complex term. The notion of “argumentative discourse” is used by a number of sciences who think about it from different perspectives. The understanding of argumentative discourse as a unique speech act is important for the theory and practice of teaching, for example, a foreign language, which is not limited to specific language expressions, but also has certain extra-linguistic parameters (personal and social characteristics) (Dubovyk, Mytnyk, Mykhalchuk, Rashkovska & Nabochuk, 2022).

The written form of speech has the aim to overcome the distance between the speaker and the addressee at the movement both spatial and temporal. This overcoming became possible only with the help of a special technological invention; it is a creation of a physical medium of information. The further development of technologies has led to the emergence of a more complex repertoire of forms of the language and lingual discourse in such kinds of printed discourse, as telephone conversation, radio broadcasting, communication through Viber, correspondence by e-mail. All these types of discourse are allocated on the basis of the type of information carrier and have their own peculiarities. Communication by e-mail has a special interest as a phenomenon that has being arisen 10-15 years ago, which has received during that time a huge distribution.

Of course, there are only some peculiarities between oral and written discourse. Like a written discourse, electronic discourse has used a graphical way of fixing information, but like oral discourse it differs with passivity and informality. Even more pure example of connections of features of oral and written discourse is communication in the mode of Talk (or Chat), when two partners “speak” through a computer network: on one half of the screen the participant of the dialogue writes his/her own text, and on the other half he/she can see the initially displayed text of his/her partner of communication. The study of the features of electronic communication is one of the most actively developing areas of contemporary discourse analysis.

The Pragmalinguistic Model of discourse highlights the signs by the way or a channel of communication. We distinguish such means of communication as informative and contextual means, meaningful and actual ones, serious and not

serious means, etc. The channels of communication are *oral and written ones, contact and distance channels, virtual and real ones*. It is worth mentioned another some other kind of discourse, which it is *theimaginary one*. A person can use the language without making any acoustic or graphic traces of linguistic activity. In this case, the language is also used communicatively, but the same person is both the speakers and the addressee. Due to the absence of easily observable manifestations, the imagined discourse is much less studied than oral and written ones.

Under the conditions of various general means of teachings, communicative principles, *argumentative, conflict and harmonious types of discourse* are realized. Another approach to the classification of discourse is the classification of scientists (Bucci, Maskit & Murphy, 2016). He distinguishes *TV and radio discourses, newspapers, theaters, film discourses, literary discourse, discourse in the field of public relations (PR), advertising discourse and also political, religious (fideistic) discourses*.

According to other scientists (Ivashkevych, 2023), the main criteria for the selection of different types of discourse is *the degree of formalism of communication*, as well as the opposition of oral and written discourses. On the basis of concrete the type of information, the following types of contemporary discourses are distinguished: radio broadcast, printed discourse, telephone conversation, correspondence by e-mail, communication on the Internet. All varieties of these types of discourse have their own peculiarities, and their research is actively engaged in the field of contemporary discursive analysis.

One of the first attempts to classify discourses was made by scientists Murphy, Melandri & Bucci (2021). They identified *five types of discourse*, which are implemented depending on the situation:

discourse as a mean of communicative action (for example, conversation for the purpose of information and education or a pre-arranged discussion);

discourse as a means of ideological influence, that is the process of communicative action, which only takes the form of discourse (all forms of ideological justification);

therapeutic discourse (psychoanalytic conversation between a doctor and a patient);

anormal discourse, which has the aim to provide a scientific discussion;

new forms of discourse (learning through discourse instead of discourse as a tool for information and instruction, a model of a free seminar discussion).

Great differences between some types of discourse were described with the help of the concept of the genre. This concept was originally used in literary criticism to distinguish such types of literary pieces of art, such as, for example, short stories, essays, novels, poetry, etc. Scientists (Cui, Wang& Zhong, 2021) have suggested in some case broader understanding of the term “genre”, which extends not only to literary but also to other language achievements. Nowadays, the concept of the genre is used in the discursive analysis quite widely. Exhaustive classification of genres do not exist, but some examples can be called a household dialogue (a conversation), a story (the narrative), the instruction on using the device, the interview, a report, a political statement, a poem, a novel.

Genres have some fairly stable characteristics. For example, the story, firstly, should have a standard composition (a tie, a culmination, the interlace) and, secondly, has some linguistic features: the narrative contains some periodics of events organized in a timed manner, which are described by the same type of grammatical forms (for example, verbs in the past time) and between which there are some connecting elements (the type of union then). Problems of language specificity of genres are not developed enough well. In the researches (Cui, Wang& Zhong, 2021) it was shown that for many genres with the aim to emphasize stable formal characteristics it was quite difficult to do it.

Scientists (Berninger & Abbott, 2010) proposed to consider genres as cultural concepts, lacking stable language characteristics, and they further distinguish some types of discourse on the basis of empirically observed and quantitatively measurable parameters – such as the use of past forms of time, the use of Adjectives, the use of Personal Pronouns, etc. From the point of view of sociolinguistics, two main types of discourse can be distinguished: the personal (individually oriented) one and the institutional discourse. In the first case, the speaker acts as the person who enriches into his/her own inner world, and, in the second case, it is as a representative of certain social institutions. *Personal discourse* exists in two main varieties: in everyday life and in existential process of communication.

Private communication takes place between well-known people, it is reduced to maintaining contact and solving everyday problems. Its peculiarity is that one, that this communication is dialogical in its essence, it proceeds dashed, the participants of the communication know each other rather well and therefore communicate at a shorter distance without talking in details about what has being discussed. This conversation is rather obvious and easy to understand. It is important for this type of discourse that we rightly state as verbal communication, because complements are non-verbal and the main information is transmitted by mimicry, gestures, actions, which are accompanying in the language system.

The specifics of everyday communication is reflected in details in conversational language studies. Household communication is a natural source of discourse, organically assimilated from our childhood. This type of discourse is characterized by spontaneity, strong situational dependence, pronounced subjectivity, logic violations and structural formality of expressions. Phonetically here it is a fuzzy, fast pronunciation. Communicating in a private way, people resort to lowered and slang vocabulary, although statistically speaking words making up no more than 10% of the lexical fund of expressions in colloquial speech. The most important characteristic of units of spoken language is their specific denotative orientation, these words are indicative because of their purpose (that is why they are easily replaced by non-verbal signs). In addition, when we talk about well-known people the limiting (restrictive, passive) function of communication is realized. So, communicants use those signs that emphasize their belonging to the respective team (a family, a group of people) and the signs which are incomprehensible to other people. The fuzziness of the pronunciation correlates with the semantic peculiarities of the units: the meaning of words is rather mobile, the words are easily replaced by

the approximate substitutions, a language in which the pronouns are used is emotive: “Well, what are you?” – “So I’m here, here ...” – “Oh, well, well”.

Household discourse differs in some a case that the addressee has to understand the speaker from the first word. The active role of the addressee in this type of discourse that gives the speaker more opportunities for the quickest switching of topics, as well as for the easy translation of information into subtext (the irony, a language game, hints, etc.). In contrast to the household, it is the existential discourse, which is used with some attempts. They are made to reveal the speaker’s inner world in general; communication is widespread, with a richly saturated character; all forms of the language are used on the basis of the literary language; eternal communication is mostly monolithic and it is represented by the help of fiction, also by philosophical and psychological introspective texts.

In the pedagogical discourse in the paradigm of providing a cognitive model of teaching students at the universities the importance of the personal component of argumentative discourse is quite large (it differs from the linguistic and cultural point of view, for example, because of different modes of communication between teachers and students, the modes of which are adopted at Ukrainian and American universities; in our country, relations between schoolchildren and teachers are traditionally closer than in the USA, but, on the other hand, there is less formal relationships between students and university teachers than in Ukraine). In the paradigm of scientific and business discourse the personal component is much less pronounced, though, for example, recently traditional impersonal relationships are rarely used according to the genres of scientific articles.

Direct existential discourse in the form of semantic transitions. It is represented in any kind of logical inferences. These forms of discourse are well described in scientific literature. Less studied there were types of semantic transformations. It should be noted that if a semantic transition with a high degree of probability leads the addressee to the result that was planned by the speaker, then a successful semantic breakthrough takes place much less often. In this case we have a deal with a communicative failure of a semantic transition, when one or the other one logical faults or deliberate sophistries can be detected, and a failed semantic breakthrough turns into a slight noise, which is incomprehensible by its verbal accumulation. Here, perhaps, it is a suitable analogy with the special quasi-holographic images on the plane circular at this time, the volume depth and the strange sharpness of the image which appears in a particular way of viewing, all other methods disperse the attention and do not lead to stereoscopic effect.

Scientific discourse traditionally attracts the attention of scientists. Participants in the paradigm of scientific discourse are researchers as representatives of the scientific community, while the characteristic feature of this discourse is the fundamental equality of all participants in the sphere of scientific communication in the sense that none of the researchers has a monopoly on the truth, and the infinity of knowledge makes each scientist critically be treated as the “alien”. In the scientific paradigm the “counterpart”, which neutralizes all status features, is accepted this point of view. At the same time, scientists are differed in their desire to set different barriers for the degree of scientific qualification, academic rank and membership in

prestigious scientific communities. The diada “the agent – the client” or “the teacher – the student” is convenient for the description of participants of other types of institutional discourse. That’s why the scientific discourse needs great modifications. The fact is in that, the task of the scientist is not only acquire knowledge, need to evaluate it and report it to the public, but also to prepare new scientists for their professional activity. Therefore, scientists act in several hypostases, while showing various status-role characteristics: a scientist– a researcher, a scientist – an educator, a scientist– an expert, a popularizer. Clients of scientific discourse are clearly outlined only by its periphery, it is a general public that reads popular scientific magazines and watches the corresponding TV shows, on the one hand, and the people who begin their researchers and who are studying in laboratories, on the other hand.

Understanding the genre of scientific language we differentiate them by the basis of two criteria – on the level of macro-text and according to the primary or secondary characteristics which are identify in monographs, thesis, articles, abstracts (the last ones are secondary characteristics of scientific discourse). Scholarly colloquial subtext, in which the report and polemical statements are differentiated, does not differ fundamentally. The type of thinking, as it was shown in another research, is the strongest factor than a simple form of speech. Noteworthy special studies of the introduction in some monographs, for example, are special types of secondary academic text and a metatext (information about data), which provided various kinds of pragmatic plans – the introductive one, the descriptive plans and some others.

Conclusions and perspectives of further research. Meanings of scientific discourse are concentrated in its key concepts (truth, knowledge, research). They are some types of recognition of knowable world, a need to multiply the knowledge and to prove their objectivity, to respect the facts of impartiality in search of the truth, to a high degree of accuracy in the process of communication and if we talk about clarifying of thinking.

Such a variety of classifications is a very positive factor. Classification differences in the most cases, when they are not mutually exclusive, but they are rather complementary by virtue of the uncertainty of principles and typology of discourse were chosen by the investigator who needs specific analysis because real communication types and subtypes of discourse are largely overlap. Consequently, the concept of discourse is one of the main concepts of contemporary Pragmatic Pedagogical Science and Linguistics of the text. Despite the fact that the theory of discourse and its typology have long been developed by pedagogical scientists, psychologists, there is still no universal definition of this concept, which would include all its aspects; and the unified system of the main criteria for the classification of its varieties has not been developed.

We believe that argumentative and scientific discourse can be shown as the independent interdisciplinary field of knowledge that closely interacts with Pragmatic Pedagogical Science, Linguistic Pragmatics and Cognitive Psychology. Argumentative and scientific discourse in their scientific paradigm focus on two basic, intertwined concepts – the meaning and the activity. Argumentative and scientific discourse is the core of a purely activity approach according to the people’s speech, a global analysis of purposeful human use of sound structures, such as segmental and prosodic speech units,

tokens, word forms, schemes, phrases and sentences, different types of elementary speech acts and their complexes, communicative moves as chains, discourses of different types, etc. Thus, having had such a wide field of scientific research, argumentative and scientific discourse is actualized on two levels of its analysis – a superficial (symbolic) level and a deep (cognitive-semantic) one. Thus, argumentative and scientific discourse imply the subjective-activity space of the addressee (his/her pragmatic attitudes, deixis, features of quasi-communication), performativity, the theory of speech acts, various explicit and implicit ways of organizing the language code by the subjects of communication (press position, implication, implicative scripts, maxims of cooperative interaction of partners of communication, indirect speech acts, conditions of productivity and success of the process of communication in general); theoretical and applied aspects of relevance; psycholinguistic principles and mechanisms of communication; some aspects of the theory of speech interaction and conversational speech.

REFERENCES

Dubovyk, S., Mytnyk, A., Mykhalchuk, N., Ivashkevych, Er. & Hupavtseva, N. (2020). Preparing Future Teachers for the Development of Students' Emotional Intelligence. *Journal of Intellectual Disability – Diagnosis and Treatment*. Vol. 8(3). P. 430-436. URL: <https://doi.org/10.6000/2292-2598.2020.08.03.20>. (data zvernennia 15 veresnia 2023).

Widdowson, H. (1998). Context, community and authentic language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 705–716. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588001> (data zvernennia 15 sichnia 2021).

Zlatev, J. (2005). What's in a schema? Bodily mimesis and the grounding of language. In: B. Hampe (Ed.). *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics*. P. 313–343. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197532.4.313> (data zvernennia 13 serpnia 2020).

El-Zawawy, A. (2021). On-Air Slips of the Tongue: A Psycholinguistic-Acoustic Analysis. *Journal of Psycholinguist Research*. Vol. 50(3). P. 463-505. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-020-09755-y>. (data zvernennia 15 veresnia 2023).

Strugielska, A. & Piatkowska, K. (2017). A plea for a socio-cognitive perspective on the language-culture recognition nexus in educational approaches to ICC. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 15(1). P. 224–252. <https://doi.org/10.1075/rcl.15.1.09str> (data zvernennia 09 kvitnia 2022).

Drigas, A. & Karyotaki, M. (2017). Attentional Control and Other Executive Functions. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*. Vol. 12(3). P. 219-233. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v12i03.6587>. (data zvernennia 15 veresnia 2023).

Dubovyk, S., Mytnyk, A., Mykhalchuk, N., Rashkovska, I. & Nabochuk, A. (2022). Training Teachers to Teach Social Competence to Younger Pupils. *Astra Salvensis*. Vol. 22(1). P. 457-470. URL: <https://astrasalvensis.eu/?mdocs-file=2481> (data zvernennia 10 zhovtnia 2023).

Bucci, W., Maskit, B. & Murphy, S. (2016). Connecting Emotions and Words: The Referential Process. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*. Vol. 15(3). P. 359-383. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-015-9417-z>. (data zvernennia 15 veresnia 2023).

Ivashkevych, Er.(2023). The ways of formation of future translators' to perform professional activities in the conditions of war. *Збірник наукових праць «Проблеми сучасної психології»*, No. 58. P. 66–86. <https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2022-58.66-86> (data zvernennia 11 sichnia 2024).

Murphy, S., Melandri, E. & Bucci, W. (2021). The Effects of Story-Telling on Emotional Experience: An Experimental Paradigm. *Journal of Psycholinguist Research*. Vol. 50(1). P. 117-142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-021-09765-4>. (data zvernennia 10 veresnia 2023).

Cui, G., Wang, Y. & Zhong, X. (2021). The Effects of Suprasegmental Phonological Training on English Reading Comprehension: Evidence from Chinese EFL Learners. *Journal of Psycholinguist Research*. Vol. 50(2). P. 317–333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-020-09743-2>. (data zvernennia 07 veresnia 2023).

Berninger, V. & Abbott, R. (2010). Listening Comprehension, Oral Expression, Reading Comprehension, and Written Expression: Related yet Unique Language Systems in Grades 1, 3, 5, and 7. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. Vol. 102(3). P. 635-651. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019319>. (data zvernennia 10 veresnia 2023).

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

Dubovyk, S., Mytnyk, A., Mykhalchuk, N., Ivashkevych, Er. & Hupavtseva, N. (2020). Preparing Future Teachers for the Development of Students' Emotional Intelligence. *Journal of Intellectual Disability – Diagnosis and Treatment*. Vol. 8(3). P. 430-436. URL: <https://doi.org/10.6000/2292-2598.2020.08.03.20>. (дата звернення 15 вересня 2023).

Widdowson, H. (1998). Context, community and authentic language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 705–716. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588001> (дата звернення 15 січня 2021).

Zlatev, J. (2005). What's in a schema? Bodily mimesis and the grounding of language. In: B. Hampe (Ed.). *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics*. P. 313–343. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197532.4.313> ((дата звернення 13 серпня 2020).

El-Zawawy, A. (2021). On-Air Slips of the Tongue: A Psycholinguistic-Acoustic Analysis. *Journal of Psycholinguist Research*. Vol. 50(3). P. 463-505. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-020-09755-y>. (дата звернення 15 вересня 2023).

Strugielska, A. & Piatkowska, K. (2017). A plea for a socio-cognitive perspective on the language-culturecognition nexus in educational approaches to ICC. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 15(1). P. 224–252. <https://doi.org/10.1075/rcl.15.1.09str> (дата звернення 09 квітня 2022).

Drigas, A. & Karyotaki, M. (2017). Attentional Control and Other Executive Functions. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*. Vol. 12(3). P. 219-233. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v12i03.6587>. (дата звернення 15 вересня 2023).

Dubovyk, S., Mytnyk, A., Mykhalchuk, N., Rashkovska, I. & Nabochuk, A. (2022). Training Teachers to Teach Social Competence to Younger Pupils. *Astra Salvensis*. Vol. 22(1). P. 457-470. URL: <https://astrasalvensis.eu/?mdocs-file=2481> (дата звернення 10 жовтня 2023).

Bucci, W., Maskit, B. & Murphy, S. (2016). Connecting Emotions and Words: The Referential Process. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*. Vol. 15(3). P. 359-383. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-015-9417-z>. (дата звернення 15 вересня 2023).

Ivashkevych, Er.(2023). The ways of formation of future translators' to perform professional activities in the conditions of war. *Збірник наукових праць «Проблеми сучасної психології»*, No. 58. P. 66–86. <https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2022-58.66-86> ((дата звернення 11 січня 2024).

Murphy, S., Melandri, E. & Bucci, W. (2021). The Effects of Story-Telling on Emotional Experience: An Experimental Paradigm. *Journal of Psycholinguist Research*. Vol. 50(1). P. 117-142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-021-09765-4>. (дата звернення 10 вересня 2023).

Cui, G., Wang, Y. & Zhong, X. (2021). The Effects of Suprasegmental Phonological Training on English Reading Comprehension: Evidence from Chinese EFL Learners. *Journal of Psycholinguist Research*. Vol. 50(2). P. 317–333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-020-09743-2>. (дата звернення 07 вересня 2023).

Berninger, V. & Abbott, R. (2010). Listening Comprehension, Oral Expression, Reading Comprehension, and Written Expression: Related yet Unique Language Systems in Grades 1, 3, 5, and 7. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. Vol. 102(3). P. 635-651. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019319>. (дата звернення 10 вересня 2023).

АРГУМЕНТАТИВНИЙ ТА НАУКОВИЙ ДИСКУРС ТА ЇХ ІННОВАЦІЙНЕ ВИКОРИСТАННЯ У ВИВЧЕННІ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ У ВИЩІЙ ШКОЛІ

Наталія МИХАЛЬЧУК

доктор психологічних наук, професор,
голова експертної комісії навчально-методичної ради
Рівненського державного гуманітарного університету,
м. Рівне, Україна

ORCID: 0000-0003-0492-9450

e-mail: natasha1273@ukr.net

Ернест ІВАШКЕВИЧ

кандидат психологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри теорії і практики іноземних мов
та методики викладання, перекладач
Рівненського державного гуманітарного університету,
м. Рівне, Україна

ORCID:0000-0001-7219-1086

e-mail: ivashkevych.ee@gmail.com

Тетяна КАРЛОВА

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
завідувач кафедри мовної підготовки та соціально-гуманітарних наук
державного закладу «Луганський державний медичний університет»,
м. Рівне, Україна

ORCID: 0000-0001-6241-7774

e-mail: karlovate@gmail.com

Дмитро БІГУНОВ

кандидат психологічних наук,
доцент кафедри теорії і практики іноземних мов
та методики викладання
Рівненського державного гуманітарного університету,
м. Рівне, Україна
ORCID: 0000-0001-6100-7765
e-mail: dmytro.bihunov@rshu.edu.ua

Анотація. Проаналізовано типи дискурсу, які реалізуються залежно від ситуації: дискурс як засіб комунікативної діяльності (наприклад, розмова з метою інформування та навчання або заздалегідь підготовлена дискусія); дискурс як засіб освітнього впливу, тобто процес комунікативної діяльності, який набуває лише форми дискурсу (всі форми ідеологічного обґрунтування); аргументативний дискурс, наближений до терапевтичного дискурсу за своєю формою (діалог між викладачем та здобувачами освіти вибудовується як ніби психоаналітична розмова); науковий дискурс, який має на меті забезпечити наукову дискусію; абсолютно нові, відмінні від перелічених форми дискурсу (навчання через дискурс замість дискурсу як інструменту інформування та навчання, модель вільної дискусії).

Аргументативний та науковий дискурс у своїй науковій парадигмі базуються на двох базових, взаємопов'язаних поняттях – значенні та діяльності і створюють своєрідне ядро суто діяльнісного підходу щодо мовлення, глобального аналізу цілеспрямованого використання людиною звукових структур, таких як сегментні та просодичні мовленнєві одиниці, лексеми, словоформи, схеми, скрипти, фрейми, фрази та речення, різні типи елементарних мовленнєвих актів та їхні комплекси, комунікативні рухи як ланцюги, дискурси різних типів тощо. Вони актуалізуються на двох рівнях свого аналізу – поверхневому (символічному) та глибинному (когнітивно-семантичному) і мають враховувати суб'єктивно-діяльнісний простір адресата (прагматичні настановлення студентів, дейксис, особливості квазікомунікації), перформативність, теорію мовленнєвих актів, різні експліцитні та імплікативні способи організації мовного коду суб'єктами комунікації (базова комунікативна позиція, імплікація, імплікативні сценарії, максими кооперативної взаємодії партнерів комунікації, непрямі мовленнєві акти, умови продуктивності та успішності процесу комунікації загалом); теоретичні та прикладні аспекти релевантності; психолінгвістичні принципи та механізми комунікації; деякі аспекти теорії мовленнєвої взаємодії та розмовного мовлення.

Ключові слова: аргументативний дискурс, науковий дискурс, прагматичні настановлення, дейксис, особливості квазікомунікації, імплікативні сценарії, максими кооперативної взаємодії партнерів по комунікації, непрямі мовленнєві акти.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 12.02.2025 р.