

- 5 Кубрякова Е.С. Язык пространства и пространство языка (к постановке вопроса), [Известия РАН] 56 (3), 22-31 (1997)
- 6 Болдырев Н.Н. О метаязыке когнитивной лингвистики: концепт как единица знания, [Когнитивные исследования языка] IX, 23-32 (2011)
- 7 Болдырев Н.Н. Язык как интерпретирующий фактор познания. Интерпретация мира в языке. Тамбов, 2017 – 251 с.
- 8 Джон О’Донохью Anam Cara. Spiritual Wisdom from the Celtic World, Лондон, 1999 – 170 с.
- 9 Болдырев Н.Н. Роль интерпретирующей функции в формировании языковых категорий, [Вестник Тамбовского университета] I (93) 9-16 (2011)

Материал поступил в редакцию журнала 02.10.2024

IRSTI 16.21.27

DOI: [10.59102/kufil/2024/iss4pp102-119](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2024/iss4pp102-119)

**M. Kairova<sup>1</sup>, K. Kenzhigozhina<sup>2</sup>, E. Kometiani<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Margulan University, Pavlodar, 140000, Republic of Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup>L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, 010000, Republic of Kazakhstan

<sup>3</sup>Russian University of Transport (MIIT), The Department of Foreign languages, Moscow, 101000, Russian

## CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS OF SPOKEN ENGLISH IN THE CONTEXT OF FRIENDLY INTERACTION

*This paper explores the value of interpersonal communication in modern culture by providing a conversational analysis of spoken English in the context of cordial exchanges. In casual contexts, such as among friends, family, or coworkers, the study examines the pragmatic aspects of friendly discourse. It utilizes the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (SBCSAE) to examine real-world conversational speech that has been captured in a variety of settings.*

*The framework that forms the basis of the study was developed by J. Heritage and adapted for informal encounters. It includes components such as the setting of the conversation, design, turn transitions, recurring patterns, communicative difficulties, institutional features, and indirect communication techniques. The research emphasizes the mechanics of turn-taking, the role of gender in conversations, the dynamics of speech, and the frequent use of discourse markers and hedging techniques through a comprehensive analysis of dialogues.*

*Using both qualitative and quantitative methods, the study's methodology involves a systematic analysis of the audio recordings in the SBCSAE. Key components include annotating transcriptions for different conversational elements, examining the context and frequency of discourse markers and hedging strategies, and evaluating turn-taking patterns. A comparative analysis explores how men and women handle communication differently, focusing on gender variations in conversational themes and linguistic patterns.*

*Friendly communication tends to promote openness and trust, but it also reflects underlying social complexities including role inequalities and emotional support, according to the research. Men and women have different conversational themes and language patterns. Men tend to have more competitive dialogues with vitriolic language, while women focus on personal and familial matters and emphasize supportive relationships and emotional bonds. Overall, this study enhances our knowledge of the linguistic techniques used in amicable communication as well as the various variables affecting conversational dynamics.*

*Key words: conversation analysis, friendly interaction, model of conversational analysis, setting of conversation, conversation design, turn transition, recurring patterns, communicative difficulties, institutional features, indirect communication.*

## MAIN PROVISIONS

In the modern world, the study of interpersonal communication – especially its pragmatic components – has drawn a lot of interest. The importance of friendly communication in forming social and personal ties is highlighted. Friendly communication is described as egalitarian, informal conversation that is not subject to formal restrictions. Through mutual trust, support, and common interests, this kind of communication strengthens relationships. The research uses J. Heritage's conversational analysis paradigm, modified for informal settings, to examine friendly communication. The conversation's environment, dialogue structure, turn transitions, recurrent patterns, communicative challenges, institutional traits, and an extra emphasis on indirect communication techniques are some of the elements that make up the model.

The study uses the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English to analyze audio recordings that offer a representative perspective of informal speech in real-world encounters, emphasizing real-world dialogues above idealized ones. By examining turn-taking mechanics, such as interruptions, self-selection, and smooth and rough transitions, the research reveals the dynamics of participant roles and discourse asymmetries. The study highlights the gender variations in conversational themes, pointing out that women prefer to focus on relational concerns and nurturing topics, whereas males typically use aggressive language in competitive discussions. These variations show different emotional and communication techniques for expressing closeness and trust.

The study also looks at how societal norms, situations, and personal roles influence conversational patterns, emphasizing how social injustices, cultural quirks, and emotional support affect cordial dialogue.

The study aims to examine and assess the pragmatic components of interpersonal communication in the setting of casual conversations with friends, family, and coworkers. Using the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English, the study seeks to understand the dynamics of friendly speech. It covers a wide range of subjects, such as how people take turns, how gender influences conversational themes, how discourse markers and hedging techniques work, and how social variables combine to influence communication. The ultimate objective of the study is to increase our understanding of the underlying social complexity that affects conversational dynamics and the linguistic tactics used in friendly contact.

## INTRODUCTION

Interest in the study of interpersonal communication, particularly its pragmatic content, is constantly growing today. At the current stage of societal development, interpersonal relationships play a significant role as a condition for a full and effective existence. Friendly communication is one form of unofficial communication in which communicators are not related by blood ties, and the interaction is individually selective. Such informal relationships are not restricted by any official boundaries. The analysis of communicative strategies employed in friendly conversations has important theoretical and practical significance for successful interpersonal communication.

According to A.N. Baikulova, friendly verbal interaction occurs in the context of everyday communication at home, visiting friends, or in the workplace. She characterizes friendly communication as «unofficial, relatively free, initiative-driven, individually selective, interpersonal and group-based (possibly institutional), role-specific (the role of a friend), and egalitarian in terms of basic status, although in friendly relationships, social, situational, or psychological inequality, as well as differences in levels of competence, may manifest» [1:84].

According to E.V. Ryaguzova, friendly relationships have a pronounced psychotherapeutic effect [2:76-80]. A.N. Baikulova believes that the foundation of friendship lies in a person`s need for «additional spiritual and social support, meaning the fulfillment of what, for various reasons, cannot be provided by a person`s family, immediate surroundings, or the environment in which they live» [1:84]. A number of emotional and psychological factors influence the emergence of friendship, such as a common area of interest, mutual affection, psychological closeness, the existence of a shared apperceptive base, mutual trust, self-sacrifice, and others. Participants in friendly communication do not simply exchange information; rather, they «influence their own relationships—they establish, support, modify, and break them, and so on» [3:113].

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

In order to analyze audio recordings of naturally occurring conversational English speech, we selected audio files of conversational American English from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (SBCSAE) [4], developed by researchers at the Department of Linguistics at the University of California, Santa Barbara [5], [6], [7], [8]. The University of California Corpus is based on a large number of audio recordings of natural conversational speech from residents of the United States. The corpus includes recordings from informants of varying ages, professions, ethnicities, and social backgrounds. The recordings were made in a variety of everyday situations: family conversations, friendly chats, phone calls, card games, cooking, workplace discussions, lectures in classrooms, meetings in administrative buildings, sermons in churches, and more. The audio materials of the Santa Barbara Corpus are part of the International Corpus of English (ICE), in which samples of spontaneous American conversational speech are compared with other varieties of English. The audio materials are accompanied by orthographic transcription and time-stamped individual utterances of each speaker.

The experimental texts in this work are based on audio recordings of naturally occurring conversations. The core research material consists not of idealized and modeled utterances but of real conversational speech within families, in the workplace, and in social interactions with friends.

In this work, we rely on a model for the analysis of conversational speech developed by J. Heritage. This model was originally intended for the analysis of institutional conversations but was later modified by the Russian scholar Yu. M. Ulanovsky for the study of oral conversational speech. As a result, we have utilized a generalized model in this work, which includes six key components for conversational analysis:

- 1) The scene of the conversation;
- 2) The design of the conversation;
- 3) Turn transitions;
- 4) Recurring patterns;
- 5) Communicative difficulties;
- 6) Institutional features.

During the analysis of real everyday dialogues, conditions of speech interaction were identified, the understanding of which requires additional interpretive efforts from the recipient. By adapting this working model, we also decided to include a seventh component, types of indirect communication, based on the findings from the analysis of empirical material.

Table 1 provides a description of the seven elements of this model.

Table 1- Conversation analysis model (Table adapted from the work of Yu. M. Ulanovsky and supplemented by the author [9])

The scene of the conversation	Setting of the conversation, situation, time, place, additional characteristics
The design of the conversation	General structural organization of the conversation, general characteristics of the conversation

Turn transitions	Specificity of organizing turns from participant to participant, initiating takeovers, methods of passing turns
Recurring patterns	Reproducing content and interactional elements of a conversation characteristic of a specific genre or type of conversation
Communicative difficulties	Communicative difficulties and breakdowns that occur in conversation, and ways to overcome them by the participants
Institutional features	Specific characteristics of this type of conversation, features of the format, and forms of asymmetry in the relationships between the speakers
Indirect communication	Indirect ways of expressing speech intentions by speakers, implicit meanings that arise from the use of linguistic and speech tools (hints, manipulation, language games, jokes, anecdotes, hedging strategies, etc.)

When describing the mechanisms of turn-taking in communication, we rely on the simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation, developed by American anthropologists H. Sacks, E. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson (Table 1 is provided by the author from the work of Sacks H., Schegloff E., and Jefferson G. 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking in Conversation' [10]). According to this systematics, there is an ordered set of rules for the transition of turns:

- the current speaker selects the next speaker. If this does not happen, then:
- the next speaker self-selects as the subsequent speaker. If this mechanism does not work, then:
- the current speaker may, but is not obliged to, continue the conversation.

## RESULTS

In this work, we present the results of a study of conversational speech typical of communication among friends. Let us consider each aspect in more detail according to the conversation analysis model.

### Scene of the conversation

The recordings were made in the states of California, Louisiana, and Arizona. The ages of the informants range from 20 to 90 years. The total duration of the recordings is 4 hours and 9 minutes.

The communication setting is informal. The corpus includes conversations recorded in the following situations: at friends' homes during dinner/lunch, and in the workplace.

### Design of the conversation

In friendly discussions, both personal and intimate topics are addressed, as well as topics related to the daily activities of the communicators, including their hobbies and interests; family relationships, child-rearing; health and sports; domestic issues such as going shopping, visiting a doctor, cooking, etc. Important topics for the participants include social problems in American society: the life and conditions of immigrants in the USA; the increase in crime rates and infectious diseases among African Americans; the distinctive characteristics of the nations living in the USA; and the rising prices of essential goods.

In friendly communication, in addition to expressing openness and trust, there is also an exchange of information. In this regard, the parameter of informativeness allows us to assess the social and cultural characteristics of the communicators.

In friendly communication among young people, all communicators take an active part, which can be observed in the equal number of utterances by each participant; friends maintain a playful and joking tone in their conversation, often accompanied by laughter. However, the study encountered a dialogue involving only two interlocutors, in which the initiative for keeping the conversation belonged to one speaker, meaning he was the dominant participant. Thus, a role asymmetry is observed in the dialogue. It is known that in friendly communication, each participant fulfills different communicative roles. Asymmetrical roles exhibit an interesting tendency: the speech of the dependent interlocutor is more explicit than that of their role partner, which is manifested in the increased verbal

activity of the dominant communicator. For example, during the dialogue, one of the participants named Alan shows a noticeable difference in the volume of speech, which takes on a monologic character and is sometimes interrupted by single short phrases and interjections from the other participant. For example:

*ALAN: [Mexi]can national.*

*...His paintings sold,*

*..f- fo=r ... generally,*

*a thousand dollars plus.*

*Which was,*

*.. for me,*

*JON:... A lotta [money in those days].[7]*

As can be seen from the fragment, the unit of constructing turns consists of simple sentences, sometimes interjections from the dependent speaker.

Additionally, the dominant participant exhibits a characteristic in his manner of narration, such as speaking at length and not very coherently, subtly changing the topic of conversation without noticing. His speech also stands out due to digressions from the main topic and references to his past life experiences. For example:

*ALAN:we could've had a party for fifty people XXXXX.*

*Three bathrooms in it,*

*... (two bedrooms,*

*so they had,*

*but they had an extra guest bathroom XX,*

*.. big ba=r,*

*... it was circ-,*

*open on two sides,*

*of course we didn't have anybody there but the two of us,*

*... And I remember the New York Yankees were ... training there.*

*So it probably was,*

*the season opens in .. April,*

*so it probably was February or March [7]*

As can be seen from the example, the communicator begins the conversation with one topic but gradually transitions to another, accompanying his speech with details from a distant past. At the beginning of the first fragment, Alan describes a hotel room and then mentions that at that time the New York Yankees baseball team was in training.

In some cases, a sharp change in the topic of conversation is noted. For example, in one of the dialogues, the discussion was about smoking, and after the topic was exhausted, one participant asks the third interlocutor about her son. In another instance, the conversation was about the expansion of a local supermarket, but once that topic was concluded by the communicators, one participant's attention was drawn to her friend's accessory. Thus, the abrupt change of topic is associated with the fact that the previous topic has been fully exhausted by the participants of the speech act and no longer holds.

### **Turn transitions**

Next, we will examine the mechanisms of role distribution in communication using examples from dialogues.

1) The technique of 'the current speaker selects the next speaker':

*JAMIE:Aren't you guys gonna stick up for me?*

*and beat up on him or something?*

*MILES: He's bigger than [I am]. [8]*

As can be seen, during a light-hearted conversation, one participant asks a question that requires an answer and receives it from one of the interlocutors. Since the question was not directed to a specific participant, we can observe the self-selection of one of the participants here.

In cases where the next speaker is not designated nominally in the dialogue, they are implied.

For example:

ALAN: I can't remember,  
one of the roughest rides,  
and if you ever been to Mexico City,  
you [made that] ride,

JON: [*<Yeah >*].

ALAN: = some kinda city,  
*about ..hundred miles away,*

*I th=ought we were gonna die= going down there. [7]*

In the example, the participant does not direct a question to their interlocutor. However, they lead the conversation in such a way that the interlocutor is prompted to respond to their remark. The fragment includes the statement 'if you've ever been to Mexico', which elicited a response from the interlocutor, who eagerly shared information about the city.

A direct way of conveying a communicative move is also identified, which manifests in a direct nomination to the interlocutor:

MILES: *What are you planning on doing with dancing, Harold?*

You were taking some classes last fall=?

HAROLD: *I'll take a few more.*[5]

In conversational speech, there are two types of speaker shifts: smooth and non-smooth. A smooth shift occurs without interrupting the partner, and the participants in the dialogue allow each other to finish their thoughts. For example:

DORIS: *You gave him some [kind of herb].*

SAM: [*Did I give him some*] --

*I gave him a red pepper.*

DORIS: *I think you- --*

*I think you gave him ... some ... herb of some [kind].*[7]

Next, we will provide an example of a non-smooth speaker shift, which involves interrupted and unfinished remarks. For instance:

SAM: *..I don't have any this year,*

I forgot to plant it,

..I have oregano,

ANGELA: .. Yeah.

SAM: *a good stand of it,*

if you want any,

ANGELA: *Yeah.*

*... I have a lot of dried ... or- oregano.*[7]

It is important to note that in the presence of two speakers, the distribution of communicative roles applies to all participants in the conversation. In a conversation between two people, the current non-speaker cannot miss the transition point. However, as the number of participants in the conversation increases, the orderly turn-taking may be circumvented. In this case, if the current non-speaker wishes to join the conversation, they will have to resort to self-selection.

Next, we will consider examples related to the technique of self-selection:

ANGELA: *are --*

... what do you call it.

SAM: *.. A tail?*

DORIS: *... No.*

The tight.

It- [the band]. [6]

The example shows that communicators demonstrate self-selection by clarifying information or providing hints.

The next mechanism, 'the current speaker continues the conversation until they are interrupted by other participants', it is realized through self-advocacy as the next speaker:

*HAROLD: .. Fifty perc-] --*

It was some --

.. Like,

.. a- m- --

half or more than half of,

and it was .. fairly young men,

... but,

were,

*had been exposed to HIV virus.*

It wasn't necessarily that they were ... infected.

*MILES: .. Well,*

if you're HIV positive,

*... it's the same difference,[6]*

According to the simplest systematization of turn-taking by H. Sacks, 'in a conversation between two people, the current non-speaker can skip any relevant transition point that is not obligatory (i.e., one where the technique of 'current speaker selects the next' has not been used) with complete confidence that at some point they will become the 'next speaker'. Therefore, in the analyzed dialogue, if the current non-speaker wished to join the conversation, they had to engage in self-selection at any subsequent transition point.

In the technique of self-selection, starting first is allowed. Generally, the first person to start continues the conversation until another participant interrupts them. For example:

*ALAN:... I got a story to tell you,*

it's a shaggy dog story,

*but as long as we're talking about that recorder and six-hundred dollars,*

= I'll tell you the story,

= oh gosh,

uh (Hx),

Rae and I and Sue and Buddy,

... took a trip,

... to Mexico City,

*JON: ... (SNIFF)*

*ALAN: It must've been,*

... four to six months after my dad died.

That's how I remember it,

*he [died in s]ixty-s=- --*

*JON: [Oh God].[5]*

It is assumed that the first speaker sets 'interpretative frames for all subsequent statements. The dominant partner is one who can change the topic and track the sequence of roles [11:104]. Such a partner controls the sequence of their interlocutor's replies and programs their style and manner of speaking.

One of the common forms of exchanging communicative roles is the simultaneous form of exchanging communicative roles, which is characterized by overlaps and interruptions:

*HAROLD:[Was he a little kid2]?*

*MILES:[No he's sixteen now=].*

*JAMIE [No he's like] --*

... Yeah he's a teenager,

but he teaches [these classes in New York].

*MILES:[< That > boy,*

.. he's supposed to be awe]some.

*JAMIE: Yeah.*

... *Really* fa[=st]. [6]

In the example, we observe overlaps and interruptions during the conversation. Some overlaps occur when the next speaker inaccurately anticipates the end of the previous speaker's turn. However, overlaps are not considered violations of communication rules; they are rather viewed as unintentional errors. Interruptions, on the other hand, are regarded not only as a violation of the turn-taking system but also as a hostile act aimed at taking away from the current speaker their legitimate right to express themselves. However, from the fragments presented, it is evident that the interruptions by the participants in the dialogue are not hostile acts but arise as a function of supporting the interlocutor. For example:

*MILES: Are they ... teaching ... any more lambada,*  
at= uh --

*JAMIE: school?*

*MILES: Yeah.* [6]

In this fragment, one speaker is trying to remember a word they want to use, and during this time, the other participant interrupts them and suggests the needed word.

However, situations where multiple people speak simultaneously are typically brief. If two or more participants in the conversation begin to deliver their turn at the same time, one of them will usually stop before the other, thereby resolving the difficulty. The reason for the occurrence of simultaneous speaking situations lies in the fact that overlaps happen at relevant transition points, i.e., 'at the points where current speakers can or should stop speaking, thereby excluding the overlapping component' [10:159].

### **Recurring patterns**

The 'question-answer-comment' scheme is the most frequent pattern in the sequence of turns among communicators. This scheme is represented as follows: one participant asks a question, to which another participant responds and accompanies their answer with comments. For example:

*ANGELA: Can I grow some basil?*

*From seed?*

*SAM: Yes,*

*that's how I've- --*

*I don't have any this year,*

*but I've grown it other years.* [7]

In the example, one participant in the conversation poses a question about the possibility of growing basil at home, while another participant provides an answer and accompanies it with additional information.

The dialogues feature such pause fillers as long vowels in words, which help the speaker find the right word while simultaneously indicating that their thought is not complete. Additionally, the use of interjections with pragmatic meaning is noted for filling pauses: *Yeah, Mm, Oh, Hm, hunh, Mhm, uh*. These interjections are also used to support the conversation to show that the interlocutor is engaged in the discussion:

Fragment 1

*JAMIE: Yeah.*

*Really* fa[=st].

*PETE: [Hm].* [7]

Fragment 2

*JAMIE: Old and rickety and brittle.*

*PETE: [Mhm],*

*HAROLD [Mhm], uncoordinated and .. inflexible* [7]

Fragment 3

*JAMIE: [She's] pregnant.*

*She's totally pregnant.*

*HAROLD: Oh.* [6]



It is known that discourse markers make a communicative event dynamic, give a personal coloring to speech, and serve as signals for the beginning and end of a speech turn. In our dialogue, the following markers were identified: really, yeah, right, well, you know, so, that's right, I mean, I guess, like, anyway, surely. Markers such as *I mean*, *you know*, *so*, and *I guess* serve to connect one statement to another. The markers *I mean* and *I guess* are used to express a point of view or opinion, as well as to clarify the expressed thought: *I guess that means his broken leg is doing okay; I mean that was what I first thought; I guess she must; I guess the ones below are women; I mean that looks kinda like a Black person; I mean*. Markers like *God*, *Gross*, *Gosh*, *gee*, *oh God* express negative emotional feelings:

Fragment 1

I'm thinking, *Go=d, these guys don't waste any ti=me*.

Fragment 2

*HAROLD:Go[sh,*

*MILES:[But I just thought that] [6]*

The discourse marker 'so' helps the speaker to indicate cause-and-effect relationships: '*So I should do that*'; '*So they tried on the men's clothes*'; '*So I threw it away*'; '*Friday night, so the kit was a different band*'.

In the dialogues, the following types of discourse markers were identified:

1. Markers of uncertainty: *So it probably was, he season opens in .. April; maybe spent a hundred and fifty dollars; We were down there maybe ten days; probably seventy-two Olympics; I've had that painting for ... thirty-five years I guess; What the hell they call the district in New York; of course the price was right for me; Obviously I didn't know what I was missing; certainly we didn't spend five-hundred dollars for... for,.. novelties and things of that nature; I sure wasn't prosperous;*

2. Markers of dissatisfaction: *he wanted that damn ... recorder; I'd have to buy that damn thing for Rae;*

3. Markers of surprise: *and my god,there must've been <thou=sands> of paintings; God you've been in here,.. so many times that; You are kidding; Oh man it was;*

4. Markers of agreement: *okay;*

6. Markers of contrast: *But it was an art colony; of course the price was right for me, but I didn't buy em; Uh he was .. prominent then,but not ... world famous; It's a beauty though; those things were really antiquated although we used em a lot;*

7. Markers of specification/detailing: *I mean,we .. we we stayed in a f=irst rate; I mean chemistry,physics,.. medicine.*

A special place is occupied by the markers 'you know' and 'well', which are among the most frequent in conversational speech. The pragmatic meaning of the marker "you know" can be described as "indicating an imagined common knowledge between interlocutors," meaning that this marker allows communicators to simulate a shared understanding between them, which helps establish a connection. The marker 'you know' is used with various pragmatic meanings: 1. To change communicative roles; 2. To indicate a change of topic in the conversation; 3. To clarify and specify a statement; 4. As a way of expressing a thought, usually accompanied by a pause; 5. To illustrate the information being conveyed. [12:298-299]. Let us now consider examples with this marker exhibiting different pragmatic meanings:

1) Marker with explanatory pragmatic meaning:

*"Oh h]ell I w- I you know I w- I, I would s- I would say probably*

2) Form of expression of thought:

Fragment 1

*... You know I've had that painting for ... thirty-five years I guess.*

Fragment 2

I .. I,

you know I,

*I forgot where I went.*

Fragment 3

Well you go to so many places,  
on a cruise particularly,[you know],  
3) Indicator of the change of communicative roles:

*Fragment 1*

*JON:The Village.*

*ALAN:..You know all the all these artists put their --  
Well they had,. must've had three areas like that.*

*Fragment 2*

*JON: [I've s]=een that somewhere before.*

*ALAN... You know I've had that painting for ... thirty-five years I guess.*

As can be seen, in dialogs with this marker, only four pragmatic meanings are realized. In addition to textual functions, A.A. Bliudneva also points out interpersonal functions of this marker, such as a call for solidarity and understanding from the interlocutor, increasing the assertiveness of speech, and decreasing the assertiveness of speech. If increasing the assertiveness of speech is associated with the speaker's attempt to emphasize their conviction in their statement, then decreasing assertiveness is used in situations of conflict mitigation. In the examples provided, we have noted only the function of solidarity and understanding in friendly communication.

### **Communicative difficulties**

One interesting aspect of analyzing everyday conversations is the difficulties in understanding the interlocutor's speech, i.e., asking for clarification in complex places. Asking for clarification is characteristic of situations when the speech of the interlocutor was not heard, or when there are external noise disturbances during the conversation, such as lively street traffic, voices of third parties, etc. For example:

*Fragment 1*

*JON:...Eight [or ni]ne-hundr[ed]?*

*ALAN:[Eight-] --*

*[Eigh]t or nine-hundred dollar.*

*Fragment 2*

*ALAN:...Well,*

*... they took us to this guy's studio.*

*JON:... He what?*

*Fragment 3*

*JON:...You walked into his studio,*

*or,*

*ALAN:...It was a gallery.*

As can be seen, the second participant in the conversation asks their interlocutor for clarification or carefully specifies complex or sensitive points for a better understanding of the topic of discussion. In the dialogues, situations were noted where participants experienced difficulties in conveying information to their interlocutor or expressing their opinions. For example:

*Fragment 1*

*ALAN:...And is also signed by the artist,*

*it was done for a=,*

*. uh,*

*JON:...Poster?*

*ALAN...A benefit,*

*it was a poster.*

*Fragment 2*

*ALAN... where do the dark ones come from,*

*JON:.. [Ethiopia].*

*ALAN:[Ethiopia].[5]*

In the first excerpt, it is evident that the first participant has difficulty finding the right word and uses the filler word 'uh' which signals to the interlocutor to suggest an appropriate word. In the

second excerpt, the first communicator directly asks their interlocutor to help them find the necessary word.

In some situations, communicators asked questions but then provided their own interpretation of the understanding of the situation immediately afterward:

*DORIS: what do you call it?*

*... The water pill.*

*. Diarrhetic.*

*... Take .. one of the capsules,  
and two of the white.*

*... Las- .. Lazex?*

*Or [something like] –[6]*

In the example, a participant named Doris asks a question to her interlocutor because her statement caused confusion for Doris. However, Doris then interprets the situation from her own perspective.

### **Institutional features**

Conversations among older adults, particularly older women, have their own distinctive features. For instance, conversations between female friends are leisurely, with participants exhibiting a slower speech tempo, and communicators prefer detailed discussions. For example:

Fragment 1

*ANGELA: and I put some onion powder ... in the mayonnaise,*

*.. and put it on some .. boiled eggs.*

*... Opened em up,*

*and I didn't stuff the eggs.*

*I just put that mayonnaise on top.*

*And they said,*

*< oh= that's good.*

*How did you do that >.[6]*

Fragment 2

*ANGELA: And they found out,*

*... that,*

*...it was easier,*

*..they went back out the truck,*

*and got a g- --*

*.. a whole assembly,*

*for one side.[6]*

In the first fragment, one of the participants describes in detail the preparation of a dish, while in the second fragment, she talks about the process of repairing a chair with a reclining backrest, accompanying her speech with detailed descriptions of the surroundings, time, circumstances, and including the reactions of other participants involved.

Older adults are typically characterized by an interest in social innovations. However, in the analyzed dialogue, an opposite reaction to social innovations is noted. For example:

Fragment 1

*ANGELA: Well they needed to expand the pharmacy,*

*I've never been there,*

*but,*

*what I had to wait and wait and wait*

Fragment 2

*SAM: But this Walmart needs=, [6]*

*needs a larger building.*

*ANGELA: [Yeah].*

*SAM: It's= just too cramped.[6]*

As a rule, older adults (gerontologists) are inclined to share their life experiences and offer advice to those around them. For example:

ANGELA: *Can I grow some basil?*

... *From seed?*

SAM: ... *Yes,*

that's how I've --

I don't have any this year,  
but I've grown it other years.

ANGELA: = [*< Well >*] --

SAM: [*There's*] *no problem.*

It will not take any frost. [6]

In this fragment, one of the participants in the dialogue asks for advice on growing basil at home, and the other friends provide her with tips on cultivating this plant. When analyzing the segments from this dialogue, it is noted that each participant expresses a desire to offer advice or recommendations not only on everyday matters but also on issues related to social and community organization.

In the dialogue among friends, there is also a display of complementarity typical of female communication. For example:

DORIS: *Your shirt and beads= .. are most becoming.*

ANGELA: = *Well you know,*

*I think they weigh about a quarter of an ounce.*

[*And that's*] *the right kind of beads,*

DORIS: *Your shirt and beads= .. are most becoming.*[6]

For example, in this fragment, Doris compliments her interlocutor on her jewelry, which is uncharacteristic of the features of male interaction.

### **Indirect communication**

The analysis of episodes from friendly interactions revealed various linguistic means of hedging in the speech of the communicators. Hedging, a term first introduced into the scientific discourse by J. Lakoff in his work 'Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts,' includes the most frequent components such as modal verbs and verbs with modal meanings, adverbs, indirect questions with modality, self-corrections, hesitations, and false starts [13:465]. For instance, in the example of a women's conversation, we noted that women often use intensifying adverbs such as *mostly, really, very, quite, maybe*, etc.:

Fragment 1

ANGELA: ..*how's !Ted doing.*

SAM: ..*He's keeping very busy,*

*he's on mostly= uh evening hours,*[6]

Fragment 2

DORIS: *Your shirt and beads= .. are most becoming.*

ANGELA: .. = *Well you know,*

*I think they weigh about a quarter of an ounce.*

[*And that's*] *the right kind of beads,*[6]

As can be seen from the two fragments, Sam and Doris use adverbs such as 'very', 'most' and 'mostly' to emphasize their subjective emotional attitude towards objects in their environment and the actions of other communicators. In the first episode, in response to a question about her son's situation, Sam does not give a direct answer; however, from her remark, we understand that her son has a rather busy work schedule in the evenings, and she is concerned about this fact. In the second fragment, Angela uses a different hedging component, namely the verb with modal meaning 'to think' in response to a compliment about her necklace, which has a pragmatic function of imprecision, approximation, and uncertainty.

In the communication within the group of friends, the use of jokes is observed as implicit communicative meanings, which are also interwoven with hints:

*HAROLD: Usually we just have really loud salsa parties across the street.*

*JAMIE: That's fun too.*

*And teenagers.*

*kissing each other on the side [walk].*

*HAROLD: [Hm=].*

*PETE: Hm=.*

*HAROLD: (KISS) (LATERAL\_CLICK) (LATERAL\_CLICK)*

*PETE: And little kids throwing p=aint in your backya=rd.*

*HAROLD: Yeah=. [6]*

In this segment, spouses Harold and Jamie jokingly imply that they live in a rather unsafe area of the city, where one might encounter various inconveniences related to personal safety.

## DISCUSSION

To comprehend the intricacies of human communication, it is essential to examine conversational speech in its natural setting. A thorough basis for conversational analysis is provided by using the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (SBCSAE), which provides a robust dataset that includes a variety of speakers and contexts. This corpus allows academics to explore the social and environmental factors that influence conversational interactions in addition to the linguistic features of speech.

A comprehensive approach to conversational analysis is made possible by the seven-component model that was developed from the frameworks of Yu. M. Ulanovsky and J. Heritage. Every element plays a crucial role in encapsulating the subtleties of casual conversation. We investigate how context—such as environment, time, and participant characteristics—influences the kinds of interactions that take place, for example, by looking at the conversation scene. This is consistent with sociolinguistic research showing how important situational context is in determining communication patterns [14:5].

A systematic examination of the way conversations develop is made possible by the conversation component's architecture, which places an emphasis on the dialogue's structural arrangement. Turn-taking processes are essential to the structuring of conversations, and our adaption of these systems emphasizes how crucial it is to comprehend how structure affects interaction flow. Our research confirms their claim that coherent and mutually understandable talks depend on smooth transitions between turns.

Furthermore, our analysis's incorporation of turn transitions and recurrent patterns highlights the presence of certain interactional norms and expectations that define various conversational genres. Finding patterns in family discussions, for example, may reveal specific social dynamics, while recognizing patterns in professional interactions might provide light on how professional identities are negotiated via language [15:4].

We also discuss the prevalence of communication problems, which can break the flow of a conversation. Previous research on conversation repair mechanisms supports the idea that examining how speakers handle breakdowns offers important information into the tactics people use to preserve communicative coherence. Conversational partners' ability to bounce back from setbacks demonstrates how cooperative communication is and how crucial mutual understanding is to keeping the discussion going. The inequalities and organized character of some talks, particularly those that take place in professional contexts, are highlighted by the institutional features component. In order to have a better understanding of power dynamics in communication, this component is especially relevant when examining how roles and authority might influence speech.

Lastly, we acknowledge the intricacies and nuances inherent in human relationships by introducing a seventh element: indirect communication. An interpretative lens is necessary to determine the intended meanings of activities like humor, hedging, and anecdotal allusions since

indirect communication frequently reflects cultural norms and communications styles that value hidden meanings.

## CONCLUSION

The results obtained from the conversational analysis of casual speech in the dialogues of friendly interactions allow for a number of conclusions. In the context of friendly relationships, the gender aspect plays an important role. When comparing male and female speech communication in the studied dialogues, it should be noted that the main parameters of verbal friendly interaction manifest in both men's and women's speech. The research materials showed that despite the assumption of equal relationships in friendship, there can be role asymmetry in the speech interactions of friends. The results indicated that this situation is characteristic of friendly interactions among men, where the initiative in conversation belongs to the dominant partner. Men exhibit greater freedom in the use of invective vocabulary, with derogatory language not directed at a specific individual but used to express negative emotions. Gender differences are also reflected in the choice of conversation topics. Women tend to discuss personal subjects related to family, hobbies, and current events, while men talk about politics, socio-economic issues in society, etc. In women's conversational speech, there is also a tendency to complementarity in friendly communication and emotional support, which is uncharacteristic of male friendships.

The identified mechanisms for distributing communicative roles in conversational speech have the following features:

1. Smooth transitions of communicative roles are characteristic of casual speech involving no more than two participants. Here, one communicator continues to speak until the other speaker interrupts them. The speech of older individuals tends to be complete, somewhat monotonous, and involves longer utterances.

2. Rough transitions of communicative roles are typical in communication within groups of more than two people. Such transitions in turn-taking are characterized by interruptions and overlaps that are not hostile but rather supportive.

3. The simultaneous form of communicative role exchange is brief and ceases once one of the conversational participants continues their turn. This simultaneous form of transition occurs in places where partners show significant interest in the topic of conversation and a desire to express their viewpoints.

The most frequent discursive markers in conversational speech are “you know” and “well,” which are used for various pragmatic purposes such as changing the topic of conversation, explaining or supplementing what has previously been said, and expressing thoughts.

Communicative difficulties among conversation participants manifest in requests for clarification and reiteration in complex situations, when conversational partners ask each other to help recall specific words. In some cases, communicators, not understanding the essence of the problematic situation, attempted to delve into it themselves and provide their perspective on what was happening.

A variety of indirect communication techniques, including jokes, hedging, and hints, were identified through the examination of events in amicable speaking encounters. These studies show how people deal with communication difficulties, which enhances our knowledge of interpersonal relationships.

The study also has important ramifications for communication research, especially in terms of gaining a deeper knowledge of interpersonal communication. It improves our understanding of pragmatic insights in friendly communication by examining casual discussions, exposing the ways meaning is created in day-to-day encounters.

Further investigation into how gender roles affect communication dynamics is further encouraged by the research's identification of unique language patterns and themes linked to various genders.

Additionally, the study highlights important discourse markers and hedging techniques, promoting further investigation into their cultural variants and discourse analysis contributions. When taken as a whole, these observations provide a thorough grasp of the intricacies of interpersonal communication and how people have cordial conversations.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Baykulova A.N. Friendly communication (the speech of friends and the manifestation of the main parameters of friendship in it). Bulletin of the NSU. Series: History, philology. 2014. – Vol. 13, issue 2: Philology. – pp. 84-89.
- 2 Ryaguzova E.V. Personal representations of friendly interaction. Proceedings of the Saratov University. 2012. – Vol. 12. Ser. Philosophy. Psychology. Pedagogy, issue 2. – pp. 76-80.
- 3 Kur'yan M.L. Functioning of the conversion strategy in friendly interpersonal communication. Bulletin of the CHSPU named after I.Ya.Yakovlev. – 2013. – №1(77). Part 1. – pp. 112-118.
- 4 <https://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/research/santa-barbara-corpus>
- 5 Du Bois, John W., and Englebretson, Robert. 2004. Santa Barbara corpus of spoken American English, Part 3. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium. ISBN 1-58563-308-9.
- 6 Du Bois, John W., and Englebretson, Robert. 2005. Santa Barbara corpus of spoken American English, Part 4. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium. ISBN: 158563-348-8.
- 7 Ulanovsky A.M. Multidimensional reality of conversation: approaches and research. Questions of psychology. 2017. No.1.- pp.3-14.
- 8 Sachs H., Shchegloff E., Jefferson G. The simplest systematics of organization of order in conversation// The Sociological Review.- 2015. - Vol.14. - No.1.- pp.142-202
- 9 Isupova O.G. Konversacionnyj analiz: predstavlenie metoda // Sociologiya:4M. –2002. №15/ 41-42
- 10 Vlasyan G.R. The exchange of communicative roles as a fundamental vector. Foreign philology. – 2012. - №4(32). – pp.103-107.
- 11 Kameron D. Razgovornyj diskurs. Interpretaciya i praktiki/Per.s angl.-H.:Izd-vo «Gumanitarnyj centr»/ Vovk YU.S. – 2015. – 316 s.
- 12 Kenzhigozhina K.S., Dujsekova K.K. Konversacionnyj analiz anglijskoj razgovornoj rechi (na materiale dialoga družeskogo vzaimodejstviya) // Gercenovskie chteniya. Inostrannye yazyki: sbornik nauchnyh trudov/ pod.red.TI.Voroncovoj. – SPb.:Izd-vo RGPU im.A.I.Gercena. – 2020. – 652 s. ISBN 978-5-8064-2913-2. S.71-74.
- 13 Blyudneva A.A. Diskursivnyj marker you know i ego funkcional'nyj perevod na russkij yazyk pri subtitrovanii i dublyazhe hudozhestvennyh fil'mov. Izv.Sarat.un-ta.Nov.ser.Fiologiya.ZHurnalistika. – 2019.T.19, vyp.3 – S. 298-304.
- 14 Blyudneva A.A. Diskursivnyj marker well i ego funkcional'nyj perevod na russkij yazyk pri subtitrovanii i dublyazhe hudozhestvennyh fil'mov.Polilingval'nost' i transkul'turnye praktiki. – T.16. №4. – 2019. – S. 504-514.
- 15 Sternin I.A. Obshchenie so starshim pokoleniem. Izd.4.,ispr. – Voronezh: «Istoki», 2013. – 24 s.

Received: 10.10.2024

### **Достық қарым-қатынас жағдайында ауызша ағылшын тілінің коммуникативтік талдауы**

М.Қ. Қайрова<sup>1</sup>, Қ.С. Кенжигожина<sup>2</sup>, Е.А.Кометиани<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Әлкей Марғұлан атындағы Павлодар педагогикалық университеті, Павлодар, 140000, Қазақстан Республикасы

<sup>2</sup>Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, 010000, Қазақстан Республикасы

<sup>3</sup>Ресей көлік университеті (МИИТ), Шетел тілдері кафедрасы, 101000, Мәскеу, Ресей

*Бұл мақалада достық алмасу контекстінде ағылшын тілінің сөйлесу тәжірибесін талдау арқылы қазіргі мәдениеттегі тұлғааралық қарым-қатынастың құндылығы көрсетілген. Достар, отбасы немесе әріптестер арасындағы қарым-қатынас сияқты бейресми контексттерде зерттеу достық пікірталастың прагматикалық аспектілерін қарастырады. Санта-Барбарадан келген Американдық ағылшын тілінің корпусы әртүрлі шарттарда жазылған нақты ауызекі сөйлеуді талдау үшін қолданылады.*

*Зерттеудің негізін құраған модельді Дж. Геритаж жасаған және бейресми кездесулер үшін өзгертілген. Ол әңгімені орнату, сөйлесу дизайны, жолдар арасындағы ауысулар, қайталанатын үлгілер, қарым-қатынас қиындықтары, институционалдық мүмкіндіктер және жанама байланыс әдістері сияқты компоненттерді қамтиды. Зерттеу кезек күту механикасына, әңгімелесудегі жыныстың рөліне, сөйлеу динамикасына, диалогтарды мұқият талдау арқылы дискурс маркерлері мен хеджирлеу әдістерін жиі қолдануға бағытталған.*

*Достық қарым-қатынас ашықтық пен сенімге ықпал етеді, сонымен қатар рөлдер мен эмоционалдық қолдаудағы теңсіздікті қоса, негізгі әлеуметтік қиындықтарды көрсетеді. Ерлер мен әйелдердің сөйлесу тақырыптары мен тіл үлгілері әртүрлі. Ерлер әдетте каустикалық тілмен бәсекеге қабілетті сөйлеседі, ал әйелдер жеке және отбасылық мәселелерге назар аударады, қолдаушы қарым-қатынастар мен эмоционалдық байланыстарға баса назар аударады. Тұтастай алғанда, бұл зерттеу достық қарым-қатынаста қолданылатын лингвистикалық әдістер, сондай-ақ сөйлесу динамикасына әсер ететін әртүрлі факторлар туралы түсінігімізді кеңейтеді.*

*Кілт сөздер: әңгімелесуді талдау, достық қарым-қатынас, әңгімені талдау үлгісі, әңгімелесуді орнату, әңгімелесу дизайны, ауысулар, қайталанатын үлгілер, қарым-қатынас қиындықтары, институционалдық ерекшеліктер, жанама байланыс.*

#### ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР ТІЗІМІ

- 1 Байкулова А. Н. Достық қарым-қатынас (достардың сөйлеуі және ондағы достықтың негізгі параметрлерінің көрінісі). НМУ хабаршысы. Серия: тарих, филология. 2014. – Т. 13, 2-шығарылым: Филология. – 84-89 б.
- 2 Рягузова Е. В. Достық қарым-қатынастың жеке көріністері. Саратов университетінің жаңалықтары. 2012. – Т. 12. Сер. Философия. Психология. Педагогика, Т. 2. - 76-80 б.
- 3 Курьян М.Л. Достық тұлғааралық қарым-қатынаста жұмыс істеу стратегиясы. И. Я. Яковлев атындағы ЧГПУ хабаршысы. – 2013. – №1(77). 1-бөлім. – 112-118 б.
- 4 <https://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/research/santa-barbara-corpus>
- 5 Du Bois, John W., and Englebretson, Robert. 2004. Santa Barbara corpus of spoken American English, Part 3. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium. ISBN 1-58563-308-9.
- 6 Du Bois, John W., and Englebretson, Robert. 2005. Santa Barbara corpus of spoken American English, Part 4. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium. ISBN: 158563-348-8.
- 7 Улановский А. М. Көп өлшемді әңгіме шындығы: тәсілдер мен зерттеулер. Психология сұрақтары. 2017. №1. – 3-14 бб.
- 8 Сакс Х., Щеглофф Э., Джефферсон Г. Әңгімелесу кезегін ұйымдастырудың қарапайым систематикасы // социологиялық шолу. - 2015.-Т. 14.№1.- 142-202 бб.
- 9 Исупова О.Г. Конверсиялық талдау: әдісті ұсыну // Әлеуметтану: 4М. - 2002. – №15. – Б. 41-42.
- 10 Власян Г.Р. Мена негізгі РН векторы ретінде коммуникативті рөлдер. Шетелдік филология. – 2012. №4(32). – 103-107 бб.
- 11 Кэмерон Д. Сөйлесу дискурсы. Интерпретация және практика / Транс. ағылшын тілінен.- Х.: «Гуманитарлық орталық» басылымы / Вовк Ю.С. – 2015. – 316 б.
- 12 Кенжігожина К.С., Дуйсекова К. К. ағылшын тіліндегі сөйлеуді конверсиялық талдау (достық қарым-қатынас диалогы негізінде) // Герцен оқулары. Шет тілдері: ғылыми еңбектер жинағы/ жалпы ред. Т.Воронцова. - Санкт-Петербург: Басылым. А.И. Герцен. – 2020. – 652 б. ISBN 978-5-8064-2913-2. – 71-74 бб.



13 Блюнева А. А. You know дискурсивті маркері және оның көркем фильмдерді субтитрлеу және дубляждау кезінде орыс тіліне функционалды аудармасы. Саратов. ун-т хабаршысы. Жаңа. сер. Филология. Журналистика. – 2019.Т. 19, Т.3 – 298-304 бб.

14 Блюнева А. А. Well дискурсивті маркері және оның көркем фильмдерді субтитрлеу және дубляждау кезінде орыс тіліне функционалды аудармасы. Полилингвализм және мәдениетаралық тәжірибелер. – Т. 16. №4. – 2019. – 504-514 бб.

15 Стернин и. А. Аға буынмен байланыс. Басылым.4.. – Воронеж: «Шығу Тегі», 2013. – 24 б.

Материал 10.10.2024 баспаға түсті

### **Коммуникативный анализ разговорного английского языка в контексте дружеского взаимодействия**

М.Қ. Қайрова<sup>1</sup>, Қ.С. Кенжигожина<sup>2</sup>, Е.А.Кометиани<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Павлодарский педагогический университет им. Ә. Марғұлан, Павлодар, 140000, Республика Казахстан

<sup>2</sup>Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н.Гумилева, Астана, 010000, Республика Казахстан

<sup>3</sup>Российский университет транспорта (МИИТ), 101000, Москва, Россия

*В данной статье подчёркивается ценность межличностной коммуникации в современной культуре через анализ разговорной практики английского языка в контексте дружеских обменов. Исследуются прагматические аспекты дружеской дискуссии в неформальных контекстах, таких как общение между друзьями, семьёй или коллегами. Для анализа реальной разговорной речи, зафиксированной в различных условиях, используется корпус разговорного американского английского из Санта-Барбары.*

*Модель, которая легла в основу исследования, была создана Дж. Херитижем и модифицирована для неформальных встреч. Она включает такие компоненты, как установка разговора, его дизайн, переходы между репликами, повторяющиеся шаблоны, коммуникативные трудности, институциональные особенности и косвенные техники общения. В исследовании акцентируется внимание на механике очерёдности высказываний, роли, пола в разговорах, динамике речи и частом использовании дискурсивных маркеров и методов хеджирования через тщательный анализ диалогов.*

*Дружеская коммуникация, как правило, способствует открытости и доверию, но также отражает скрытые социальные сложности, включая неравенство в ролях и эмоциональную поддержку. Мужчины и женщины имеют разные тематические линии разговоров и языковые паттерны. Мужчины склонны вести более конкурентные беседы с язвительным языком, в то время как женщины сосредотачиваются на личных и семейных вопросах, подчеркивая поддерживающие отношения и эмоциональные связи. В целом данное исследование расширяет наши представления о лингвистических приемах, используемых в дружеском общении, а также различных факторах, влияющих на динамику разговора.*

*Ключевые слова: анализ разговора, дружеское взаимодействие, модель анализа разговора, установка разговора, дизайн разговора, переходы в очерёдности, повторяющиеся паттерны, коммуникативные трудности, институциональные особенности, непрямая коммуникация.*

### **СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ**

1 Байкулова А.Н. Дружеское общение (речь подруг и проявление в ней основных параметров дружбы). Вестник НГУ. Серия: История, филология. - 2014. - Том 13, выпуск 2: Филология. - С. 84-89.

- 2 Рягузова Е.В. Личностные репрезентации дружеского взаимодействия. Известия Саратовского университета. - 2012. - Т.12. Сер. Философия. Психология. Педагогика, вып. 2. – С.76-80.
- 3 Курьян М.Л. Функционирование стратегии обращения в дружеской межличностной коммуникации. Вестник ЧГПУ им. И.Я. Яковлева. - 2013. - №1(77). - Ч.1. – С.112-118.
- 4 <https://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/research/santa-barbara-corpus>
- 5 Du Bois, John W., and Englebretson, Robert. 2004. Santa Barbara corpus of spoken American English, Part 3. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium. ISBN 1-58563-308-9.
- 6 Du Bois, John W., and Englebretson, Robert. 2005. Santa Barbara corpus of spoken American English, Part 4. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium. ISBN: 158563-348-8.
- 7 Улановский А.М. Многомерная реальность разговора: подходы и исследования. Вопросы психологии. - 2017. - №1. - С.3-14.
- 8 Сакс Х., Щеглофф Э., Джефферсон Г. Простейшая систематика организации очередности в разговоре // Социологическое обозрение. - 2015. - Т.14. - №1. - С.142-202
- 9 Исупова О.Г. Конверсационный анализ: представление метода // Социология: 4М. – 2002. №15/ 41-42
- 10 Власян Г.Р. Мена коммуникативных ролей как основополагающий фактор динамической структуры конверсационного дискурса. Гуманитарный вектор. Зарубежная филология. - 2012. - №4(32). - С.103-107.
- 11 Кемерон Д. Разговорный дискурс. Интерпретация и практики / Пер. с англ.-Х.: Изд-во «Гуманитарный центр»/ Вовк Ю.С. – 2015. – 316 с.
- 12 Кенжигожина К.С., Дуйсекова К.К. Конверсационный анализ английской разговорной речи (на материале диалога дружеского взаимодействия) // Герценовские чтения. Иностранные языки: сборник научных трудов/ под ред. Т.И. Воронцовой. – СПб.: Изд-во РГПУ им. А.И. Герцена. – 2020. – 652 с. ISBN 978-5-8064-2913-2. С.71-74.
- 13 Блюднева А.А. Дискурсивный маркер you know и его функциональный перевод на русский язык при субтитровании и дубляже художественных фильмов. Изв. Сарат. ун-та. Нов. сер. Филология. Журналистика. - 2019. - Т.19, вып.3 – С.298-304.
- 14 Блюднева А.А. Дискурсивный маркер well и его функциональный перевод на русский язык при субтитровании и дубляже художественных фильмов. Полилингвальность и транскультурные практики. – Т.16. №4. – 2019. – С. 504-514.
- 15 Стернин И.А. Общение со старшим поколением. Изд.4.,испр. – Воронеж: «Истоки», 2013. – 24 с.

Материал поступил в редакцию журнала 10.10.2024

SRSTI 16.01.33

DOI: [10.59102/kufil/2024/iss4pp119-132](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2024/iss4pp119-132)

**E. Kemelbekova<sup>1</sup>, G. Buharova<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, 010000, Republic of Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup>Bashkir State Pedagogical University named after M. Akmullah, Ufa, 450000 Republic of Bashkortostan, Russia

## **SEMANTIC DERIVATION OF APPLIED GEOMETRY TERMS IN KAZAKH LANGUAGE**

*This article considers the semantic derivation of applied geometry terms in Kazakh language. The actuality of the topic is conditioned by the fact that in spite of rather extensive research in the field of semantic derivation of both lexicon in general and terms of various sciences, the problem of semantic derivation in the sphere of terms of applied geometry in Kazakh language has not been*