

**How to Cite:**

Shapran, N. V., Novoseletska, S. V., Koliada, E. K., Musiichuk, T. I., & Simak, K. V. (2021). Communicative-functional components of discourse. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 1325-1339. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS4.1784>

## **Communicative-Functional Components of Discourse**

**Nataliia V. Shapran**

National University of Ostroh Academy, Ostroh, Ukraine

**Svitlana V. Novoseletska**

National University of Ostroh Academy, Ostroh, Ukraine

**Elina K. Koliada**

Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, Lutsk, Ukraine

**Tetiana I. Musiichuk**

National University of Ostroh Academy, Ostroh, Ukraine

**Kateryna V. Simak**

National University of Ostroh Academy, Ostroh, Ukraine

**Abstract**--The article considers the main types of semantic-sigmatic and communicative-functional transformations of lexical units against the background of changes in certain parameters of discourse and analyzes the fundamental motives for changing the load of lexical units in modern space. The relevance of this work is determined by modern transformations of linguistic study of different types of discourse, which occur on the basis of the study of communication and the search for universal foundations of linguistic interaction. Language is considered as a complex communicative and cognitive phenomenon that determines the state of intercultural communication. The components that directly affect the communication process and the success of the modern language formation must be identified. The aim of this study was to analyze the semantic-sigmatic and communicative-functional components of discourse and the theory of their understanding in modern communication. The theoretical and methodological basis of the study included the works of scientists in the field of modern methods of communication. The objective method was the analysis of documents (monographs, articles, statistics, scientific papers and textbooks on the selected topic).

**Keywords**---communication, communicative functional, information, language, linguistics.

## Introduction

Recently, due to the obvious shift in the boundaries of linguistics, especially in real and, above all, cognitive research, we can observe the convergence of linguistic problems with the problems of other disciplines, although with similar knowledge, such as literature. This indicates a general trend in the current stage of development of linguistic science, when the need to go beyond language ability became clear (Echeverri, 2020). The lack of rules regarding the use of accumulated linguistic information has led to the emergence of functional branches focused on people. Inclusion of language units in the scientific model, for different parameters of linguistic cases, contributed to the development of communication theory and linguistic interaction, which led to the occurrence of new directions in linguistics (theory of linguistic acts, discourse theory, theory of ideas and word theory), with the study of the new in human as a subject of linguistic communication, creator and user of language, which becomes one of the central features of communicative-pragmatic language. This article considers the semantic-sigmatic and communicative-functional components of the study of discourse. The dynamism of the term “discourse” in the emergence of its semantic variation is quite legitimate, because in recent decades it has become the most widely used in the linguistic field. It is possible that this was facilitated by the lack of a clear and generally accepted definition of language, covering all cases of use (Widana et al., 2020; Oviogun & Veerdee, 2020).

Currently, the functional-communicative approach considers the word as a basic form of everyday human practice and defines it as a phenomenon of communicative complex, which includes, in addition to the text, extra linguistic factors (knowledge of the world, views, attitudes, goals), necessary to understand the text (Egorchenkova et al., 2019). Defining the term “discourse” presents significant difficulties due to the fact that it has received support in a number of disciplines, such as linguistics, anthropology, literature, science, ethnography, sociology, sociolinguistics, philosophy, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology, and some others. It is natural that the ambiguity of the term “discourse” and its use in different areas of humanities give rise to different approaches to the interpretation of the meaning and essence of this concept. However, we can say that thanks to the efforts of scientists from different fields of language theory, it is now formulated as an interdisciplinary field that reflects the general trend towards integration into the development of modern science. From the very beginning, in the framework of the study, which consistently examines the organization of the text of the language, there was no dispute about the definition of the terminological object of study, or about the field of linguistics that studies the text. Initially, the term “textual linguistics” seemed unsuitable, and in some linguistic studies, the text of coherent speech is called ‘speech’ (Atabekova, 2020; Durbin, 2020).

The term “discourse” is fixed in many dictionaries and gives several definitions. The most important are those which claim that the discourse is: coherent text;

oral form of the text; dialogue; a group of statements related to each other in definite terms; oral work (Bansal, 2018). The emergence of discourse theory marked a qualitative leap in the development of the science of language and made it difficult for researchers to linguistically describe language. The theory of language, which originated in the framework of textological linguistics, never lost touch with it, but constantly tried to distinguish between the subjects of its research, to distinguish between the terms “text” and “discourse.” Discourse is a text, but it consists of communicative units of phrases - languages and their associations into larger units, which are in a continuous semantic connection, that allows perceiving it. The text as a language material is not always a consistent speech, i.e., speech. Text is a more general concept of language. Discourse is always a text, but to say the opposite would be wrong. Not all texts are speech ones. Discourse is a special case of the text (Abramova & Sherekhova, 2020). The purpose of this study is to analyze the semantic-sigmatic and communicative-functional components of discourse and the theory of their understanding in modern communication (Atmowardoyo & Sakkir, 2021; Putrayasa, 2017).

### **Materials and Methods**

Analysis of the topic “Semantic-sigmatic and communicative-functional components of discourse” showed that, in modern scientific works, there is an interest in the study of issues of discourse and all its components. The work of many modern linguists are devoted to the study of the components of modern discourse – these are works of the scientists such as Abramova & Sherekhova (2020); Atabekova (2020); Baker et al. (2020); Bergenholtz (2016); Etxebarria et al. (2016), and many others. The study of semantic and communicative-functional components of discourse was conducted in several stages. At the first stage, the primary concepts such as “discourse,” “intercultural communication,” “language communication,” “speech activity,” structure, and some of the main components of discourse were described, and the essence and specificity of all the above terms and definitions found in this article were defined. The main difficulties in the formation and implementation of these components in the modern linguistic field of study were identified (Menaka & Sankar, 2019; Atmowardoyo & Sakkir, 2021).

To understand the place of semantic-sigmatic and communicative-functional components of discourse in modern communication, the following research methods were used: theoretical (analysis of scientific literature, philological, pedagogical and linguistic printed materials for study), method of analysis and method of synthesis, induction and deduction, logical analysis, as well as positions of objective research and classification of information. In accordance with the objectives of this stage of the study, an analysis method was used, the attractiveness of which lies in extraction and obtaining any information (related to the topic of study), usually from a printed scientific source (or publication in electronic format), which will then be used for analysis on the next research stages of this topic. The topic of analysis of scientific sources is related to the characteristics and attributes of the studied object or phenomenon that meet the goals and objectives of the study. The method of analysis of scientific sources is the most used in many modern scientific studies. At the second stage of the research, with the help of the position of logical analysis, as well as scientific

objectivity and systematization, the logic of introduction and use of semantic and communicative-functional components of discourse from the point of view of modern linguistics as a science was analyzed (Cargile et al., 1994; Friederici & Gierhan, 2013).

This method allowed mastering partial aspects of the phenomenon and object, creating a consistent series of scientific abstractions. The next combination determines the study of the deepest essence of the whole. This method is used to study complex objects or facts. Also, at this stage, the theoretical improvement of the whole research was carried out, the semantic-sigmatic and communicative-functional components of discourse in modern communication were generalized, and the consequences of their use for modern linguistics were analyzed. Throughout the research work, processing, theoretical generalization, and systematization of research results were carried out, as well as development of relevant educational and methodological material. Motivation and substantiation of the conclusions of the research on the topic "Semantic and communicative-functional components of discourse," the use of this approach in modern institutions provided methodological and theoretical validity of all starting points. There is the integrity of research methods and analysis of semantic and communicative-functional components of discourse in modern communication (Piantadosi et al., 2012; Rapert et al., 2002).

## Results

In modern linguistics, the concept of discourse is considered ambiguous. Different approaches to language definition may differ. Communicative-functional approach implies language as verbal communication (language, use, functioning of language), whether it is about dialogue or conversation, i.e., dialogue of the type of language or as language from the position of the speaker in relation to the story, which does not take into account this attitude. In the context of the communicative approach, the term language is seen as a kind of sign structure that makes language its object, place, time, circumstances of manufacture (production). Structural-syntactic approach understands language as a part of the text, i.e., the formation of a sentence above the level (unit of phrase, complex syntactic set, and paragraph). Language is understood as two or more sentences that are in significant connection with each other; communication is considered one of the main characteristics of language. Structural and stylistic approach implies language as a non-contextual organization of spoken language, characterized by blurred division, dominance of associative connections, spontaneity, situationality, high context, stylistic specificity. Semantic-sigmatic approach considers the elements of discourse by the semantic meaning of language units and the relationship between the sign and the object of reflection. Language signs are names, designations of objects of display. The latter are a designator of linguistic signs. Semantics and sigmatics represent a prerequisite for syntactic; all three of them are a prerequisite for pragmatics (Abend, 2018).

This classification suggests that the nature of language has changed: one side tends to pragmatics, typical communication situations, while the other - to the processes occurring in the minds of participants, as well as to the characteristics of consciousness, and the third - to the text itself. The identified approaches are

partially contradictory. The concept of discourse is realized in inseparable connection with the concepts of language and text. Language as a phenomenon of communication is a mediator between speech as verbal communication, as an activity, on the one hand, and a specific text recorded in the course of communication, on the other. In simpler contrast, the word should be understood as a cognitive process associated with the production of real language, with knowledge of the production of language and text – as the end result of the process of language activity, which leads to a certain final form. This opposition of real discourse to its result leads to the realization that the text can be interpreted as a discourse only when it is perceived realistically and enters the current consciousness of the person experiencing it (Egorchenkova et al., 2019). The concept of discourse was introduced as a result of the growing need in science to take into account not only the characteristics of the text as such depending on its specifics and interior, but also the text as a message addressed to someone and expressing the special needs of the recipient and author. A word is an empirical object that a linguist encounters when identifying traces of the object of the act of utterance, formal elements that indicate to the speaker the purpose of language.

An essential characteristic of language includes, in a broader sense, the correlation of language with specific subjects of the act of communication, i.e., the speaker and the listener, as well as the communicative intention of the speaker to influence the listener in one way or another. The structure of the conversation is a series of stages of communicative actions of the person who came into contact, sounding, exposing the original subject of conversation and statement, changing roles during the communicative act, changing the topic of conversation, exit from the communicative act, each due to a number of internal and external factors. The communicative aspect of discourse is seen as a category of language materialized in the form of oral or written linguistic work, relatively complete in semantic and structural sense, the length of which is potentially variable: from the chain most separated from language to mass significant work (story, conversation, description, instructions, lectures, etc.) (Baker et al., 2020). The concept of discourse is characterized by the parameters of completeness, integrity, coherence, and others. A definition that reflects the functional nature of a word and deepens previous definitions is as follows: discourse is an arbitrary part of a text that does not consist of a single phrase or a separate part of a sentence (Bakhlova & Bakhlov, 2020). Often, but not always, it revolves around a reference concept; it creates a general context that describes the actors, objects, circumstances, moments, actions, and so on. It is determined not so much by the order of the sentences as by the general world for the creator of the word and its translator, which is constructed during the unfolding of the word (Meltzoff, 1999; Akyildiz et al., 2008).

The initial structure of language and elements of language implies described events, their participants, i.e., the circumstances that accompany the events; context that explains events; evaluation of event participants; information linking language to events (Zan et al., 2018). The core of this definition can be considered the provision according to which language is defined as the appropriate volume of text or even, as implied in the above definitions, is synonymous, but much broader. In the socio-pragmatic approach, the main attention is paid to language activities, the participants of which have certain types of language personalities

who found themselves in certain circumstances and conditions of communication. The definition of discourse as a linguistic unit of communication implies that for any unit of language it is a characteristic of a sign as a set of certain material properties and ideals. Each sign in itself is an object of real life, so it is impossible to study it regardless of the environment in which it exists. There is verbalization and objectification on a particular issue, present in the act of speech, the signs of working with information, the cognitive process that leads to the processes of cognition and perception of the world. All units of language serve either to express information or to disseminate or, finally, to extend the flow of information and thus serve as an idea in human consciousness and help to take into account the experience of mankind as a whole, determine the results of interconnection and cognition of reality (Baker et al., 2020). It is best to use the term concept for the interpretation of certain elements of the situation. Completions, concepts, and notions are strictly distinguished by both the phenomena of the universal concept and the phenomena of language (semantics).

A token is semantics, conceptual meaning (Etxebarria et al., 2016). Information about the cognitive structures associated with sign language that precedes speech is important: if a person knows sign language, he also knows its meaning in the negative, and in cases where a signal is created, one must also place the sign in a certain category - moreover , an act of assignment that cannot take place. Language also confirms the structure of information and the form in which it was used (Abramova & Sherekhova, 2020). The integrity of the word is directly related to its information, as the exchange of information is one of the conditions for the implementation of the act of communication. In that case, if the mediator does not receive the expected information, the behavior of the voice participant becomes informative. Dialogic language also demonstrates such features of communication as the presence of two or more partners and the active nature, which is manifested in inter subjectivity and internationality. The recipient's language can be the language of the individual for any communicative role in which the author's language is directed to the influence of language. Here, one can see intertextuality of the word to be interpreted in its relationship with previous and subsequent works. The creation and understanding of language largely depends on the use of the language of memory in the oratory of other people who previously created and uttered or recorded in writing. For certain types of language, we can talk about the category of power and law, science, the principle of scientific language. In this case, power is considered one of the pragmatic categories, which is manifested in the use of proverbs, catchphrases, quotes, references to the opinions of famous people or the results of tests aimed at generally accepted truths and principles (Sher & Lee, 2004; Catenaccio et al., 2011).

The previous language is, in fact, a very detailed, transformed, and hypertrophied metaphor. The text of the previous one is not yet a concept, socio-psychological formation is characterized by multidimensionality and the meaning of value (Atabekova, 2020). It is also worth to note such significant features of language as the interpretation of the result within conditionally annotated limits, the possibility of radically different ways of filling and maintaining a formal macro- and microstructure, and some others (Etxebarria et al., 2016). Thus, like any unit of language, the word is universal and has individual, ideoethnic characteristics.

The first includes: integrity and coherence, which is always manifested, continuity of meaning, chronotopia, which is embodied in the representation and perception of spatial and temporal relations, informativeness, intersubjectivity, intentionality. The categories of power and jurisprudence are probably individual, as they are not observed in all types of language. Currently, the classification of conversations proposed by scholars representing different fields of knowledge and their areas is very heterogeneous, due to the diversity of the phenomenon of discourse and the possibility of studying from different positions, such as pragmalinguistics, psycholinguistics, linguoculturology, linguistics, structural studies, linguistics, and structural studies. It is planned that it will be at the level of cognitive reflection, at the level of values, the type of group that has a more or less established structure, position and role, according to a set of activities (according to goals and topics of communication), indicators, directly or indirectly related to the level of formality, structure and ritual, cooperation and conflict, socio-psychological, integration, unity and diversity of perception, spatial and temporal localization, rules and order of interaction (Canagarajah & De Costa, 2016; Berwick et al., 2011).

In this regard, the typology of linguistic personalities is taken as a basis for the classification of language, which, in turn, depends on the use of certain vocal techniques on their part. The reasons can be classified by the number of languages, the efforts of their authors, and the amount of information fund for the surrounding world to invest in them. The type of discourse, wording or informality depend on the components of linguistic communication: the context and situation of communication, the social roles of communication, the type and purpose of communication, the nature of the relationship between communications. The nature of the relationship between the participants of communication determines the specifics of communication: the employee may be determined by the performance of certain functions of social communication. These can be meetings, presentations, business negotiations, controversial court appearances, interviews, negotiations and briefings. A large percentage of this communication is occupied by oral features: facial expressions and gestures. Oral communication in this case sometimes complements nonverbal communication. The participants of the communication pronounce most of the moments of time independently, most often in order to overcome the logical and structural purpose of the statement, to pronounce them freely and without ambiguity. The lexical background of such statements is characterized by the presence of abbreviated slang vocabulary (Abbas et al., 2018). Everyday language has a detailed character and is extremely rich in meanings, all kinds of language used on the basis of literary language. Existential communication covers everything monologue and is represented by works of art and introspective philosophical and psychological texts.

In existential language, direct and indirect one are distinguished. This is simply from everyday linguistic representation, which is classified into two opposite types: semantic transference and semantic discovery. In the field of formal communication, an institutional discourse based on communication within the framework of state-role relations stands out. We present an approximate list of institutional types of discourse, which differ in two characteristics of the system: goals and participants in communication, determined by the presence of social

institutions: political, diplomatic, administrative, legal, military, educational, religious, mystical, medical, commercial, advertising, sports, science, graphics and media (Ek & Wiren, 2019). There are some other classifications of meetings, including by scope: at scientific conferences, seminars, symposia, meetings of scientific councils, conferences of political parties, plenary sessions, rallies (Echeverri, 2020). Language as a first-order linguistic unit is characterized by a wide range of different methods, including structural design, which focuses on the organization of proposed and conditional or verbs and methods. The unit of language analysis in this study is defined as illustration, speech act, act of communication, language, stage language. Subjective part of speech is important here, manifested in actively represented performative and post-social expressions.

## Results

Language as a language unit is characterized by universal and specific features. The main universal features of language are its integrity and consistency. The integrity of the word is manifested in the constant semantic connection of its components and consists of some structural elements of the content, which are recognized as a result of the perception of the word as complex. Linguistic communication is manifested by discriminatory continuity and is determined by specific laws, norms that underlie the formation of complex units of linguistic communication. This can be seen in terms of: intonation-rhythmic, logical, semantic and formal-grammatical design, which are determined by special indicators of incorrect or characteristic nature. Linguistic chronograph is integrated into the representation and perception of spatial and temporal relations and is realized mainly from verbs and attachments. Classes of objects displayed in languages with a relatively homogeneous category with nouns and sentences, quantum manifestations of flows are associated with very different and even sharply contrasting units, such as sentences tasks, verbs (their lexical meaning), temporal and modal forms of predicates, general and specific names of objects, names of words, names of words and sentences (Abbasi & Allahviranloo, 2019). The integrity of the word is directly related to its informativeness, as the exchange of information is one of the necessary conditions for the act of communication. If the expected information is not received from the interlocutor, the behavior of the voice partner itself becomes informative.

Voice interaction is always aimed at transmitting or receiving information, it is another matter that the information drawn in this way is sometimes not recognized as such. It should be noted that the criteria for information are currently not clearly defined, which is related to issues concerning the definition of the term, measuring the level of information, defining forms, standards of information presentation in language, the difference between old and new, which is perception information. Dialogue also reflects the features of communication, such as the presence of two or more partners and the nature of the activities embodied in the relationship of ownership and intention. The recipient of the language can be a linguistic person with any communicative role (listener or reader, etc.), in which the author of the speech emphasizes the influence of the word. The claim is of a procedural nature. Signs of process and interactivity are reflected in the definition of this word. Communication is a process of mutual coordination of activities through verbal and nonverbal semiotic systems. A

communicative event is a process, it is continuous, but it can be divided into units. At the same time, the space of language, as points in an unlimited continuum of language activity, is in itself strongly and internally divided. It consists of vocal units of different communicative states, vocal forces with different vectors and focus on the addressee or recipient of the speech (Fan et al., 2016). Distinguishing units have associated integrity functions. Continuity and modularity of speech are its constituent properties.

Discourse as a linguistic feature of a higher order is also characterized by the dominance of one or more parameters of their linguistically real spaces. They speak intelligently in accordance with the personal concepts of the authors reflected in them, they focus on the three-dimensional material) activities of the addressee. Thus, the reason for the desire is motivated and has the ultimate goal of forming the desire of the addressee through the mind and anticipation of its author. The ability of the relationship is based on the action of the force of accumulation and is aimed at obtaining any information from the recipient: sigmatic, semantic or realistic. The intertextuality of the word is manifested in its relationship with previous and subsequent works. In relation to certain types of language, we can talk about the category of authorities and precedents (for example, the principle of advertising language, and the principle of scientific language). The category of authority is recognized as one of the most important elements of the communication process. The principle in this case is defined as one of the real categories, which is manifested in the use of proverbs, phrases, quotations, references to the opinions of experts associated with recognized truths and principles. The authors seem to be based on already recognized principles. The origin usually comes from the extra linguistic environment represented in the advertising text by catch proverbs and phrases, references to test results and laboratory tests depending on the celebrity, which scientists call a qualitative increase in exposure (Bokare et al., 2021).

While, in the use of catch proverbs and expressions, wisdom inherent in them is imperceptibly transmitted in the advertising text and implicitly present in it, the results of tests and statements of experts and celebrities about the advertised object is a clear expression of the category of power. As for language, this category is rarely expressed in the means of explicit grammar. This category is expressed mainly in speech activities (such as introductory sentences, references, attached texts, quotations, etc.). Its content is usually post-social, which means that the reference function is minimal here, while the normative function that follows the communication process is clearly expressed. The previous reason is actually a very detailed, transformed and hypertrophied transmission. The previous text, however, forms a certain concept, socio-psychological formation, characterized by multidimensionality and value. Thus, like any language unit, the word has universal and individual features. The first includes: integrity and consistency, manifested in the constant continuity of concepts, chronograph, embodied in the representation and perception of spatial and temporal relations, information, intersociality, intention. Categories of authorities and precedents are likely to be individual and ideological, as they are not observed in all types of discourses. In relation to the communicative-functional component of discourse, it allows analyzing different levels: the level of goal planning (pragmatics); levels of development of ideas and concepts for development (semantics and stigma); levels

of phonetic manifestation of these processes in terms of linear text (syntax) (Durbin, 2020).

Linguistic activity is indefinite and boundless in the continuum, the definiteness and limitation of which is manifested in the spatial reasons that force linguistic personalities to create and interact there. Each of the spaces as systems of personal value is the ability to distinguish and produce meaning. Forces can be seen as functions of personal language. Language systems of personal significance interact with each other and form a systemic and functional formation of so-called language activities. The dialectic of language activity is the continuity of the expression of the unity of opposites-systems, which distinguish meanings and generate in languages. They act as a result of the reflection of objective and subjective categories. Language is the end result of human activity to reflect the environment (in the form of using the nominal function of language) in the process of communication (with the implementation of communicative functions of language). The disadvantage of the analysis of linguistics of language production from the standpoint of psychology and psycholinguistics is the speculative conceptual apparatus, which is used to describe the inner world of communication. Linguistics of speech production is not intended to describe either the mental processes of speech production by the author of the language, or the processes of understanding the language by the addressee. Concepts in the field of psychology are used in communicative and functional analysis of the field, which is subordinate to language and is the purpose of description. More precisely, the functional description and the language itself included language, which means that they are grouped on the basis of certain parameters according to the similarity of their form of drawings, material, and communication, taking into account their potential impact on the recipient's inner world (Fahrutdinova et al., 2014).

The aspect that should be taken into account in relation to the area of the addressee's inner world is to establish the relationship of language units with the solution of a specific problem in the language of communication. Analysis of this problem leads to the consideration of at least two main parameters of the voice of action, which are important for the implementation of description and language: the desired end result of the voice of action, which may be to stimulate certain activities, materials or mental abilities of the recipient; ways to influence the situation and language-optimal for the recipient's personality. The first parameter is the traditional study of the material. As a result of the study, a list of non-standard states, which are provided by phonetic acts, was compiled. The approach is realistic because it aims to describe the hypothesis put forward by the act of speech. From the point of view of the exam, it is a sign language that allows performing such actions. Depending on the predominance of methods of influencing the addressee, the speeches are divided into motives and motivation. Based on this analysis of the language units that make up the language, we can present a global picture of the dominant forces of language influence at different stages of language development. The elementary influences of linguistic forces ultimately represent the unification of the communicative force of discourse as a whole. Communicative-functional, discursive analysis consists of two processes of interaction: language development through signs of a certain type and by recognizing all their features, syntactic, semantic, sigmatic and realistic work of

the hierarchy of transition from the level of form (syntax) to the basis of state message (semantics), and then by default the situational content plan; there is a conditional meaning (sigmatics) and, finally, it's due to the communication plan (Bazhenova et al., 2014).

In this regard, there is a mastery of semantics in syntax and pragmatics in semantics, determination on the basis of distribution of speech specific signals with the text for establishment of their semiotic functions of a place for revealing of the information of speech activity representing the finished language about action of the corresponding language. The first step is to analyze the syntactic, semantic, sigmatic and realistic features of the components of language units, and to establish its integrated system features. Analyzing the production of language from a linguistic point of view, we systematically describe the hierarchy of relationships between aspects of the functioning of sign language, phonetic acts of a certain level – from secondary to dominant. The first step is to determine the relationship between semantics and syntax. The second stage reveals the relationship between semantics and sigmatics. Finally, the description includes consideration of the pragmatic aspect of the functioning of sign language in relation to other features. Understanding the distribution of the text as a set of units, we turn to a general description of the integrated communicative ability of language as a holistic vocal action. Speech can be considered as a communicative situation that includes the consciousness of accomplices and the text created in the process of communication. It consists of clock cycles, quanta (van Oers et al., 2008).

Language reflects fragments of reality – external situation in relation to discourse, which is the subject environment of communicators in time and space in the process of linguistic interaction. The space of speech activity of language is multidimensional. The multifaceted development of the conceptual foundations of semiotics in linguistics has made it possible to expand, taking into account the peculiarities, the basic characteristics of the description of a linguistic sign for its functioning in real communication. Such characteristics of a language sign include, first of all, aspects of the description of relations in which it enters with objects of linguistic reality: sigmatic, semantic, pragmatic, syntactic. The first of them expresses the connection of a language sign with the object of the environment reflected in it, the second – the connection with its meaning, the third – the creation and use of a language sign by people, the fourth – the connection of a language sign with language signs. As for the language model, the aspects of the language sign can be considered both in the communicative and in the functional plan as coordinates of production (communicative development) of language. Sigma is the coordinate of the communicative development of the personal meaning of the recipient, taking into account its correlation with the surrounding reality, based on his own experience of cognitive activity (Baker et al., 2020).

These values have the nature of personal opinion. The semantic coordinate describes the section of meaningful interpretation of the sign, which reflects the relationship of the sign with its mental equivalent (meaning) and carries a set of knowledge about the world through a system of ideas established and used in society. The difference between semantic and information is focused on the

address and is observed during the verbal interaction with a particular addressee. The tools of language activity that underlie argumentation and motivation at the proposed level of speech organization are general and can be called semantic. The pragmatic coordinate connects the creation and use of a unit of language activity in the language flow with the expected impact of the relevant text on the addressee and his linguistic and nonverbal activity in response. The syntactic coordinate describes the general linguistic influence of the sequence of units of speech activity in the language on the addressee. The communicative-functional space of language unites the linguistic forces influencing the above-mentioned coordinates and describes the general linguistic influence on the addressee made by the author of the speech.

## **Conclusions**

The study of modern discourse in the system of communication, its various components have been used in linguistics for many years. During the solution of the tasks of the theoretical part of the research, the following conclusions were made. The category of modern discourse is one of the basic and core concepts of communicative linguistics. This term allows for many scientific interpretations, according to many modern scientists. In this article, an attempt was made to determine the detailed content of the semantic and communicative-functional components of discourse in modern linguistics. The widespread use of discourse as a general category in relation to the terms text, speech, and dialogue is becoming increasingly common, for example, in linguistic literature. The structure of communication contains interdependent components that are in constant interaction and mutual influence: speech as verbal communication (language, use, functioning of language), whether it is about dialogue or conversation, i.e., dialogue of speech type or as a speech from the position of the speaker in relation to the story which does takes into account this attitude.

In the context of the communicative approach, the term speech is seen as a kind of sign structure that makes language its object, place, time, circumstances of production and considers elements of discourse in the semantic meaning of language units and the relationship between sign and object of reflection. The article analyzes the components of discourse, identifies their differences, and substantiates their relationships. It was found that mixing the components is not appropriate enough, as they complement each other, but are not completely interchangeable. The article also considered the views of various scientists on this issue and made conclusions about the nature of the subject. The text and discourse were considered in terms of oral and written use, as well as phenomena that are part of two components: expanded (so-called explanatory) and hidden, implicit.

## **References**

- Abbas, A., Zhou, Y., Deng, S., & Zhang, P. (2018). Text analytics to support sense-making in social media: A language-action perspective. *MIS Quarterly*, 42(2).
- Abbasi, F., & Allahviranloo, T. (2019). New operations on pseudo-octagonal fuzzy numbers and its application. *Soft Computing*, 23(19), 9761-9776.

- Abend, M. (2018). *Effective teaching and learning: Perspectives, strategies and implementation*. Hauppauge: Nova Science Publishers.
- Abramova, I. E., & Sherekhova, O. M. (2020). Teaching dialogue and polylogue to non-linguistic students: Competence-based approach. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii*, 29(6), 102-110.
- Akyildiz, I. F., Brunetti, F., & Blázquez, C. (2008). Nanonetworks: A new communication paradigm. *Computer Networks*, 52(12), 2260-2279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2008.04.001>
- Atabekova, A. (2020). Language representation of youth health concept in international institutional discourse. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(12), 1417-1427.
- Atmowardoyo, H., & Sakkir, G. (2021). Effects of best-practice based materials in receptive language learning behaviours in improving receptive language skills. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S1), 1313-1334. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS1.1604>
- Atmowardoyo, H., & Sakkir, G. (2021). Effects of best-practice based materials in receptive language learning behaviours in improving receptive language skills. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S1), 1313-1334. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS1.1604>
- Baker, D. L., Santoro, L., Biancarosa, G., Baker, S. K., Fien, H., & Otterstedt, J. (2020). Effects of a read aloud intervention on first grade student vocabulary, listening comprehension, and language proficiency. *Reading and Writing*, 33, 2697-2724.
- Bakhlova, O., & Bakhlov, I. (2020). Patriotism as a component of the policy of nation-building (the experience of the eaeu countries). *Sovremennaya Evropa*, 100(7), 46-55.
- Bansal, G. (2018). Teacher discursive moves: conceptualising a schema of dialogic discourse in science classrooms. *International Journal of Science Education*, 40(15), 1891-1912.
- Bazhenova, E. A., Kondakov, B. V., Burdina, S. V., & Danilevskaya, N. V. (2014). Text-forming through the sense dynamic aspect. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(2), 125-130.
- Bergenholtz, H. (2016). On the Metalexigraphic genre of dictionary reviews, with specific reference to LexicoNordica and Lexikos. *Lexikos*, 26, 60-81.
- Berwick, R. C., Okanoya, K., Beckers, G. J., & Bolhuis, J. J. (2011). Songs to syntax: the linguistics of birdsong. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 15(3), 113-121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2011.01.002>
- Bokare, A., Chinnusamy, S., & Erogbogbo, F. (2021). TiO<sub>2</sub>-Graphene Quantum Dots Nanocomposites for Photocatalysis in Energy and Biomedical Applications. *Catalysts*, 11(3), 319.
- Canagarajah, S., & De Costa, P. I. (2016). Introduction: Scales analysis, and its uses and prospects in educational linguistics. *Linguistics and Education*, 34, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2015.09.001>
- Cargile, A. C., Giles, H., Ryan, E. B., & Bradac, J. J. (1994). Language attitudes as a social process: A conceptual model and new directions. *Language & Communication*, 14(3), 211-236. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309\(94\)90001-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(94)90001-9)
- Catenaccio, P., Cotter, C., De Smedt, M., Garzone, G., Jacobs, G., Macgilchrist, F., ... & NewsTalk&Text Research Group. (2011). Towards a linguistics of news

- production. *Journal of pragmatics*, 43(7), 1843-1852. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.09.022>
- Durbin, A. P. (2020). Historical discourse on the development of the live attenuated tetravalent dengue vaccine candidate TV003/TV005. *Current opinion in virology*, 43, 79-87.
- Echeverri, P. (2020). Value-forming micro-practices of managerial coaching. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 13(2), 191-208.
- Egorchenkova, N. B., Korobova, O. V., & Smirnova, Z. V. (2019, March). The specifics of academic discourse while training translators as professional staff for work in the chemical industry. In *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering* (Vol. 483, No. 1, p. 012034). IOP Publishing.
- Ek, A., & Wirén, M. (2019). Distinguishing narration and speech in prose fiction dialogues. In *Digital Humanities in the Nordic Countries 4th Conference (DHN), Copenhagen, Denmark, March 5-8, 2019* (pp. 124-132). CEUR-WS. org.
- Ettxebarria, A., Gaminde, I., Romero, A., & Iglesias, A. (2016). Development of prosodic competence in reading aloud: importance of pauses. *Ocnos: Journal of Reading Studies*, 15 (2), 110-118.
- Fahrutdinova, R. A., Yarmakeev, I. E., & Fakhrutdinov, R. R. (2014). The Formation of Students' Foreign Language Communicative Competence during the Learning Process of the English Language through Interactive Learning Technologies (The Study on the Basis of Kazan Federal University). *English Language Teaching*, 7(12), 36-46.
- Fan, Z., Li, Z., & Zhang, M. (2016, August). Finding arguments as sequence labeling in discourse parsing. In *Proceedings of the CoNLL-16 shared task* (pp. 150-157).
- Friederici, A. D., & Gierhan, S. M. (2013). The language network. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, 23(2), 250-254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2012.10.002>
- Meltzoff, A. N. (1999). Origins of theory of mind, cognition and communication. *Journal of communication disorders*, 32(4), 251-269. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9924\(99\)00009-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9924(99)00009-X)
- Menaka, G., & Sankar, G. (2019). The language learning assessment using technology for the second language learners. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 5(4), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v5n4.674>
- Oviogun, P. V., & Veerdee, P. S. (2020). Definition of language and linguistics: basic competence. *Macrolinguistics and Microlinguistics*, 1(1), 1-12. Retrieved from <https://mami.nyc/index.php/journal/article/view/1>
- Piantadosi, S. T., Tily, H., & Gibson, E. (2012). The communicative function of ambiguity in language. *Cognition*, 122(3), 280-291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2011.10.004>
- Putrayasa, I. B. (2017). The semantic study of languages politics. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 3(2), 7-13. Retrieved from <https://sloap.org/journals/index.php/ijllc/article/view/199>
- Rapert, M. I., Velliquette, A., & Garretson, J. A. (2002). The strategic implementation process: evoking strategic consensus through communication. *Journal of business research*, 55(4), 301-310. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(00\)00157-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(00)00157-0)

- Sher, P. J., & Lee, V. C. (2004). Information technology as a facilitator for enhancing dynamic capabilities through knowledge management. *Information & management*, 41(8), 933-945. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2003.06.004>
- Van Oers, B., Wardekker, W., Elbers, E., & Van der Veer, R. (Eds.). (2008). *The transformation of learning: Advances in cultural-historical activity theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vysotki, V. M., Patalashko, E. V., Stepanenko, V. E., Makarova, T. V., & Balabanova, I. A. (2021). Language as a communication resource and its place in the representation of world practices: philosophical and linguistic approach. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 574-584. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS3.1621>
- Widana, I.K., Dewi, G.A.O.C., Suryasa, W. (2020). Ergonomics approach to improve student concentration on learning process of professional ethics. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, 12(7), 429-445.
- Zan, L., Yu, B., Yu, J., & Yanholds, H. (2018). *Heritage Sites in Contemporary China*.