

DOI 10.31865/2414-9292.23.2025.334912

UDC [378.147:81'27]:811.111

**THEORETICAL SUBSTITUTION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF FORMING
DISCURSIVE COMPETENCE IN THE SPHERE OF
WRITTEN COMMUNICATION OF APPLICANTS OF
PHILOLOGICAL FACULTIES OF UNIVERSITIES**

Viktoriia Slabouz

PhD in Philological Sciences, Associate Professor
the Department of Foreign Languages,
SHEI "Donbas State Pedagogical University"
Sloviansk, Ukraine
ORCID ID 0000-0003-1810-4054
queen_viktoriya28@ukr.net

Nataliia Nikitina

PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Head of the Department of Foreign Languages,
SHEI "Donbas State Pedagogical University"
Sloviansk, Ukraine
ORCID ID 0000-0002-0653-7453
nikitina_sdpu@ukr.net

Daryna Kazmina

Stakeholder of the Educational (Educational-Vocational)
Program for Specialty 014.02 Secondary Education
(Language and Foreign Literature (English, German))
Teacher of the Municipal Institution "Kharkiv Lyceum № 73
of Kharkiv City Council"
Kharkiv, Ukraine
leaffyfox@gmail.com

Abstract. In accordance with the state policy and state documents of Ukraine in the field of education, the priority direction of language education is the formation of a linguistic personality capable of navigating in various communicative situations freely and solving communicative tasks successfully. One of the most important qualities of a linguistic personality, which he/she acquires both in the process of natural communication and specially organized training, is communicative competence. Following the goals of discourse studies, to develop communicative abilities and skills is not enough to work only with the linguistic fabric of the text; the most favorable conditions for solving a number of problems of linguistic didactics, in particular, the formation of a linguistic personality, are inherent in the ability to study and analyze a text in a non-linguistic context. The contradictions that arose between the lack of special investigations on the problem raised, the theoretical and methodological underdevelopment of the topic in linguodidactics of higher education, and at the same time the need to ensure the proper level of discursive competence of future philology

teachers, have determined the relevance of the article. The analysis of publications once again has proved the need to study a comprehensive theoretical and practical level in the field of written communication. As practice shows, the greatest difficulties experienced by applicants in the process of text creation and text perception are in the field of written communication. The purpose of the research is to substantiate the principles of forming discursive competence in the field of written communication of applicants to philological faculties theoretically, and to determine the pedagogical conditions for its implementation. The results of the scientific work have revealed a number of serious problems. The essence and structure of the discursive competence of applicants to philological faculties have been scientifically clarified and substantiated, the criteria, indicators and levels of formation of discursive competence in the field of written communication of applicants to philological faculties have been defined, the psychological and pedagogical conditions for the effective formation of discursive competence in the field of written communication of applicants to philological faculties have been determined.

Discursive competence, which is one of the most important components of communicative competence, is considered as the ability of a linguistic personality to build and perceive holistic discourses of various types (oral and written) in accordance with the communicative intention within a specific communicative situation, taking into account the specifics of their semantic-pragmatic and grammatical organization at the macro- and micro-levels, and the relationship between extralinguistic and linguistic components. The characteristic features of written discourse determine the specifics of the formation of discursive competence in the field of written communication, in particular, the need to take into account the peculiarities of the functioning of the extralinguistic context, grammatical categories, pragmatic factors of the creation of written discourse, a peculiar set of genres and norms of their construction. The use of discourse in the educational process of training future philologists creates favorable conditions for familiarizing applicants with examples of speech and non-speech behavior implemented in the context of the situation, and for developing skills in correlating language tools with specific situations, conditions, and communication tasks.

Keywords: applicants of higher education; communicative competence; discourse; discursive competence; linguodidactics; principles; oral and written communication; philological faculties.

The problem setting in general. In accordance with the National Doctrine of the Development of Education in Ukraine in the 21st Century, the Law on Higher Education, the Concept of Language Education in Ukraine, the Pan-European Recommendations on Language Education, and the Concept of Teaching the State Language in Schools of Ukraine, the priority direction of language education is the formation of a linguistic personality who is able to navigate in various communicative situations freely and solve communicative tasks successfully.

As practice shows, applicants experience the greatest difficulties in the process of creating and perceiving text in the field of written communication. This is due to the peculiarities of actualizing extralinguistic, pragmatic, and grammatical aspects of written discourse. Hence, the interest of methodologists in working with text has been revived, both in the system of speech training for schoolchildren and for future teachers of language and literature, especially foreign ones. Despite the undoubted significance of the aforementioned interest, the problem of forming discursive competence of applicants of philological faculties in written speech has not received proper coverage

in teaching methods of foreign languages.

Thus, the contradictions that arose between the lack of special investigations on the problem raised, the theoretical and methodical underdevelopment of the topic in linguistic didactics of higher school, and at the same time, the need to ensure the proper level of discursive competence of future philology teachers, determined **the relevance** of the article “Theoretical Substitution of the Principles for Forming Discursive Competence in the Sphere of Written Communication of Applicants of Philological Faculties of Universities”.

Analysis of recent studies and publications. In defining the theoretical basis on which the psychological-pedagogical and methodical concept of the formation of discursive competence is based, the works of domestic and foreign scholars in the field of discourse studies/ discursology have been fundamental (Benvenist, 1978; van Dijk, 1981; Selivanova, 1999; Chomsky, 1968). The analytical review of the key issues of discursive linguistics allowed identifying the main aspects of studying the structure of written discourse: grammatical (Selivanova, 1999; Kovalyk, 1994), extralinguistic (Batsevykh, 2004; Selivanova, 1999), pragmatic (Batsevykh, 2004; Selivanova, 1999), semantic (van Dijk, 1981; Selivanova, 1999) and typological (Batsevykh, 2004; Kusko, 2001; Nikitina, 2005, 2006), which, in fact, determine the peculiarities of the formation of discursive competence in the field of written communication of future philology teachers. The psychological and psycholinguistic justification of the problem under study is based on the works of Ukrainian scientists (Zasiekina & Zasiakin, 2006; Kuranova, 2012; Petryk, Prysiashniuk & Kompantseva, 2011; Kholod, 2008a, 2008b, 2014).

The purpose of the article is to substantiate the principles for forming discursive competence in the field of written communication of applicants of philological faculties theoretically, to determine the pedagogical conditions for its implementation. The implementation of the purpose set requires solution of the following **tasks**:

a) to clarify and substantiate the essence and structure of the discursive competence of applicants of philological faculties scientifically;

b) to determine the criteria, indicators, and characterize the levels of formation of discursive competence in the field of written communication of applicants of philological faculties;

c) to determine the pedagogical conditions for the effective formation of discursive competence in the field of written communication of applicants of philological faculties.

Methods of investigation. The theoretical methods employed include an

analysis of psychological and pedagogical, linguistic, educational, and methodical literature on the problem of forming discursive competence for applicants of philological faculties of universities. The empirical methods involve administering questionnaires to applicants and observing the educational process to clarify the possibilities of implementing methods of discursive competence for applicants of philological faculties of universities, the pedagogical experiment (the diagnostic and formative stages) to determine the levels of formation of discursive competence in the field of written communication, the formation of discursive competence of applicants of philological faculties; the statistical method (the quantitative and qualitative analysis of experimental data). In the article presented the authors are to analyze the theoretical methods employed.

Results and discussion. Traditionally, discourse is viewed as a complex communicative phenomenon containing linguistic and extralinguistic components, based on which discourse and text are interpreted as generic and specific concepts. The most significant difference between discourse and text is the fact that discourse, in addition to the linguistic parameters inherent in text, contains extralinguistic components. On the one hand, discourse is closely connected with the speech situation, with the conditions of communication, and on the other hand, with its participants, speakers, reflecting their intentions, motives, experience, and ideas. Therefore, work with discourse is always based on the study of the relationship between the language code and the external context – social, socio-cultural, psychological, situational, and ethnographic.

The primary role in the generation of speech is played by the motive that prompts the speaker to speech activity and which, in a certain way, arises based on the existing communicative situation. In addition to the goals and intentions that are reproduced in the memory of the participants of communication by situational models, an important place in the construction of discourse is occupied by the situational context, which is simultaneously created and analyzed by speakers, taking into account the situation and conditions of communication. The cognitive image of the contextual situation correlates with the situational models available in the speaker's consciousness and finds its further implementation in the discourse, determining its type and structure. The socio-cultural information used in speech, which is also organized in the form of frames, is included in the cognitive image, thus influencing the choice of discourse, but under the condition that "people understand the situation or the discourse about the situation" (van Dijk, 1981:91).

Discourse is the result of the cognitive activity of a specific individual, or to be more exact, a linguistic individual, who appears in two guises, "on the one hand, as a

subject of discourse – the bearer of a certain style of verbal behavior, and on the other, as the “owner” of a unique conceptual and linguistic picture of the world and an individual cognitive style” (Bondarenko, 2002:4). A linguistic personality manifests himself/herself in speech activity, implementing his/her communicative tactics and strategies. Strategies/tactics are divided into two main types: discourse generation and understanding. A communication strategy is defined as the creative implementation by communicators of a plan for constructing their speech behavior to achieve a general, so to speak, global language/non-language goal of communication in a speech event. Tactics contribute to the implementation of strategies and the obtaining of the desired result. In accordance with the strategic plan, language tools are selected that would contribute to achieving the set goal. They are determined, as shown by scientific studies, by the following factors: a) dominant motivation; b) surrounding afferens, which is formed under the influence of the external context of communication; c) a model of the future, which is formed by previous experience, previously obtained information, and a series of trials and errors.

Summarizing the above, the main factors that influence the organization of discourse can be highlighted: 1) a motive, goals, and intentions that motivate the speaker to speech activity; 2) an analysis of the existing communicative situation, which involves taking into account the place, time and other conditions and external contexts of communication, creating a model of the addressee (orientation on his/her social status, degree of acquaintance, profession, age, ethnicity, his/her knowledge, previous expectations, etc.), that is, an analysis of situational, social, sociocultural, ethnographic, psychological contexts is carried out; 3) creation of a cognitive image of a contextual situation, which correlates with situational models, frames, and social scenarios available in memory; 4) activation of the selected situational model, which is filled with relevant information and according to which a strategy and plan of speech action are selected and a certain type of discourse is implemented.

The act of perceiving and interpreting discourse also begins with the analysis of the communication situation and the creation of a model of the speaker by the addressee, constituting a complex process of inferences, among which the following play an important role: 1) understanding the meanings (contexts) explicitly and implicitly encoded by the speaker; 2) juxtaposition of the expected information with that expressed by the addressee; 3) comparison of the received information with the existing fund of knowledge, establishment of correspondence between the speaker's and the addressee's worldview; 4) prediction one's (the speaker and the addressee's) plan of presentation. The communicative situation and the corresponding text evoke emotional, aesthetic, and other reactions in the addressee and prompt a response in

verbal or nonverbal form. Inconsistency or misinterpretation of what is said or written by the speaker, according to the above points, can cause a situation of misunderstanding and communicative failure. For successful communication, communicants in the phenomenological field must have a set of contextual propositions – a common presuppositional fund, without which the joint activity of generating and perceiving discourse is difficult or impossible. Presupposition is qualified as a common fund of knowledge and ideas, common experience, and common thesaurus, which communicants possess.

Along with the term presupposition, the concept of “apperception base” (Bulatov, 2002) is found, that is, common prior knowledge, common life experience of communicants. Presupposition and context, forming the macrocognitive layer of communication, form the communicants’ ideas about the contextual conditions of actualization of statements in discourse and ensure their interpretation, thus influencing the successful course of communication. The commonality of presuppositions at personal, social, and national-cultural levels is an important condition for perceiving and understanding discourse, which activates a number of knowledge, ideas, and skills of communicants, emphasizing the specificity of discourse as a communicative phenomenon containing linguistic and extralinguistic plans.

The factors considered are only a snapshot, a separate scene of a larger discourse, the implementation of which is possible in the presence of: 1) a speaker; 2) an addressee; 3) a communicative situation; 4) a common communicative code; 5) a communication channel.

A communicative situation is a dynamic system of interacting specific factors of the objective and subjective plans (including speech), which encourage a person to verbal communication and determine his/her speech behavior within the framework of one act of communication, both as a speaker and as a listener. In the process of communication, there is a continuous analysis of individual components of the situation and their comparison with cognitive models, with previously obtained information within the framework of a specified discourse, which acts as the driving force of the communication process and confirms the dynamic nature of the development of the discourse.

Cognitive scientific achievements in the field of discourse studies have allowed delving into the internal nature of discourse, the essence of which is that cognitive models take a direct part in the organization of discourse, influence the choice of the appropriate type of discourse, and on the other hand, discourse is the main source of their renewal and expansion (van Dijk, 1981; Selivanova, 1999). On this basis, the authors substantiated the need for applicants of philological faculties to master various

types of discourses, knowledge about which is stored in the form of cognitive structures that constitute a hierarchy of linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge about the organization of these types of discourses. It is well-known that students are a social group characterized by a pronounced professional orientation and social activity, therefore, for them, in addition to personal ones, institutional types of discourses also play a special role, in particular those ones related to professional activities. Therefore, for future teachers of language and literature, the level of formation of discursive competence is not only an indicator of their language and speech culture, but also an appropriate level of professional training.

The phenomenon of communicative competence in domestic linguistic didactics was studied by A. Bogush, L. Skurativskiy, etc. In general, scientists consider communicative competence as the ability of a speaker to communicate in various communicative situations, and in its structure, they distinguish basic components, among which special attention is paid to linguistic, speech, pragmatic, sociocultural, linguistic regional studies, and other types of competences. Along with this, the analysis of linguodidactic investigations on the structural organization of communicative competence and, on occasion, regulatory documents on the implementation of the communicative-activity approach to language learning allowed delving into the essence of the concept of discursive competence. Based on the general principles of the theory of speech activity, the following discursive skills have been identified: 1) to analyze the communication situation and its components, 2) to take into account the context of communicative interaction, 3) to design communication, determining the model of discourse construction and the linguistic means of its implementation, 4) to highlight linguistic and extralinguistic parameters of discourse, 5) to establish and realize the connection of linguistic means with extralinguistic aspects of communication. Discursive competence is understood as the ability of a linguistic individual to build and perceive holistic discourses of various types (oral and written) in accordance with the communicative intention within a specific communication situation, taking into account the specifics of their semantic-pragmatic and grammatical organization at the macro- and micro-levels and the relationship between extralinguistic and linguistic components.

To address a number of practical methodical issues in the structure of discursive competence of applicants of philological faculties, a set of relevant knowledge and skills has been identified, including: 1) linguistic knowledge about the organization of discourse at the macro level (text construction schemes in connection with extralinguistic parameters) and micro level (knowledge of the semantic and syntactic organization of various types of discourse); 2) extralinguistic knowledge about types

of situations, contexts and other elements of discourse construction. Based on the acquired knowledge, applicants develop the following skills: 1) to identify linguistic and extralinguistic parameters of discourse, 2) to establish and realize the relationship between language tools and extralinguistic aspects of communication; 3) to choose a type of discourse; 4) to recognize and use key markers of different types of discourses; 5) to perceive and build holistic discourses taking into account the extralinguistic parameters of the situation and the peculiarities of their semantic-pragmatic and grammatical organization.

The key features of written discourse, related to the linguistic, psychological and psycholinguistic characteristics of the written form of speech, determine the specifics of the formation of discursive competence in the field of written communication, in particular the need to take into account the peculiarities of the functioning of the extralinguistic context (the spatio-temporal parameters of written discourse are discrete), grammatical categories (mostly explicit, clearly expressed text categories), as well as pragmatic factors (the enhanced role of the categories of address and modality, a high degree of formality and planning), and a peculiar set of genres and the norms of their construction.

In linguistic didactics, the concept of “communicative skills” is traditionally considered by referring to the theory of speech activity (O. Biliaiev, S. Karaman, V. Melnychenko, M. Pentyliuk, L. Skurativskyi, and others). Discourse finds its expression in various manifestations of speech activity and speech behavior of a person, which, like other types of human activity, consists of phases or stages that contribute to the development of thought into discourse. The following phases of speech activity exist: 1) motivation of the statement; 2) intention of the statement; 3) realization of the intention; 4) comparison of the realization of the intention with the intention itself.

Motivation forms the communicative intention of a speech personality, his/her readiness for communicative actions, and therefore, the attitude to a certain typical situation of social interaction of people, to a specific speech genre, and defines in general terms the purpose of communication. The next stage is the stage of planning. This general idea is further transformed, that is, the mechanism of recoding, translation of meaning from the language of images and schemes to a specific national language, begins to work. This stage can be described as a phase of planning, programming, and internal linguistic organization of speech activity using its means and methods. In other words, the selection of means and methods of forming and formulating thoughts in the process of speech communication takes place. Without going into detail about the stages of developing the main idea into a coherent statement, it should be only noted

that the attunement to a certain type of situation and genre of speech determines the choice of appropriate syntactic constructions and lexical units. The last stage – the implementation of the statement – necessarily includes operations of control over the result.

Delving into the internal processes of generating and perceiving discourse, one cannot avoid the concept of “discursive thinking.” In philosophy and logic, discursive thinking is used as a synonym for the concept of “logical thinking” and is contrasted with intuitive thinking, which in modern research is most often defined as being part of discursive thinking. Traditional psychology views discursive thinking as: 1) connected with and mediated by the past experience of the individual; 2) verbal thinking; 3) developing based on mastering speech, knowledge, and logical operations; 4) a process of logical reasoning, to which intuitive processes are also added when solving creative problems.

Investigating the process of formation of discursive thinking, one can distinguish such features as servicing the processes of generation and semantic perception of discourses, genre character, and formation of communicative competence of the linguistic personality, including, undoubtedly, discursive competence. The development of discursive thinking involves the assimilation of different types of discourses and the gradual awareness of their division into institutional and personal. The more genre stereotypes (frames) a linguistic personality masters, the higher the level of his/her discursive competence is. It is known that the process of socialization of the personality occurs simultaneously with the mastery of various types of activities, forms of communication, and social norms. In general, the process of socialization of the personality is a triune process of language acquisition, appropriation of socio-historical experience (development of cognitive processes), and the formation of the personality psyche. In the process of socialization, an individual acquires only a certain amount of social experience that allows him/her to participate in certain types of activities, that is, the individual acquires language in accordance with his needs in a particular activity.

In modern linguistic didactics, one can clearly trace the distinction between language competence as knowledge of the language and communicative competence as language proficiency. In our opinion, the outlined dichotomy originates from the theory of N. Chomsky, who consistently contrasted language competence as knowledge of the language and language use as “the real use of language in specific situations” (Chomsky, 1985, p. 9), which enabled his followers to introduce and contrast the concepts of “language ability” and “language activity”. The movement from research on language ability to language activity led to the widespread

introduction of a communicative approach in language teaching, which attested to “a reorientation from form to function, from linguistic competence to communicative, from linguistic correctness to spontaneity and authenticity” (Fedorenko, 2002, p. 63).

Communicative competence is the ability to carry out speech activity, implementing speech behavior on the basis of philological, lexico-grammatical, sociolinguistic and country studies knowledge, and skills, and with the help of skills related to discursive, illocutionary and strategic competence, in accordance with various tasks and situations of communication. In general, communicative competence is the ability of a speaker to communicate in various situations. But communication is a complex process, during which all the smallest components of communication are important, playing a decisive role in achieving mutual understanding and the set communicative goal. It is no coincidence that communicative competence is considered as a complex formation, in the structure of which basic components are distinguished, the number of which varies in scientific research, on the one hand, making it difficult to create a single clear classification, and on the other hand, expanding our understanding of the phenomenon in question (State Standard of Secondary comprehensive Education, 1997; Karaman, 2000; Leshchenko, 2007; Linguodidactics in Modern Institutions of Education, 2001; Simonenko, 2007; Skurativskyi, 2005; Reference dictionary of Ukrainian linguodidactics, 2003).

Therefore, for successful communication, speakers must: a) know the language means of transmitting information, which is provided by the speaker’s linguistic and speech competence; b) take into account the sociolinguistic context of communication, which is provided by sociolinguistic competence; c) take into account the peculiarities of the country, culture, history, knowledge of which is the basis of country-specific competence; d) take into account the personal characteristics of the interlocutor, the speaker’s communicative intentions, the situation of communication, and also be able to correlate the statement with situational conditions, which is provided by pragmatic competence; e) be able to embody communicative intentions in the statement, achieve the set communicative goal, directing the course of the conversation in the desired direction, which is the basis of illocutionary competence; f) be able to choose the right behavioral strategy to increase the effectiveness of communication, which is provided by strategic competence; and, finally, g) organize and structure the message, which is the basis of discursive competence (Horina, 2007; Leshchenko, 2003).

Communication always takes place in a specific situation and within a certain situational context. Different life situations require knowledge of the appropriate rules of conversation and adequate forms of their expression, that is, the speaker must possess examples of speech and non-speech behavior in a particular situation. Entering

into communication, the speaker, in order to implement the set communicative goal, chooses a specific model of speech behavior from among the available ones, taking into account the communicative situation and choosing a specific strategy for conducting a conversation. Therefore, taking into account only the content of the utterance does not always guarantee a situation of success; to achieve mutual understanding, there is a need to enter the extra-linguistic plane. As T. van Dijk notes, the text is understood only when the situation in question is understood. At this level, it is more appropriate to operate with the concept of discourse, and accordingly, the concept of “type of discourse”, which is associated with the allocation of discursive competence, the essence of which is based on the understanding of communicative competence.

Taking into account the specifics of working with applicants of philological faculties, it is necessary to include in the content of training such knowledge about discourse that, from the standpoint of cognitology, would contribute to the formation of the concept of the specified concept in their consciousness. In our opinion, this is knowledge of the main features and categories of discourse, the general structure and nature of discourse, and the semantic-pragmatic organization of various types of discourse. Thus, on the basis of the acquired knowledge, applicants develop the skills to identify linguistic and extralinguistic parameters of discourse, to establish and realize the relationship between language means and extralinguistic aspects of communication; to choose a type of discourse; to recognize and use key markers of various types of discourse; to build and perceive holistic discourses taking into account the extralinguistic parameters of the situation and the features of their semantic-pragmatic and grammatical organization. These skills are closely related to the ability to analyze the communication situation and its components, to take into account the context of communicative interaction, on the basis of which to determine the model of discourse construction and language tools for its implementation.

Psychological, psycholinguistic, and linguistic characteristics of oral and written forms of speech determine the features of the formation of discursive competence in the field of oral communication and in the field of written communication. When working with oral discourse, the main attention is paid to stable speech phrases, prosody, gestures in discourse, features of the structure of oral discourse, and its division into elementary discursive units, the technique of transcribing discourse is distinguished. When working with written discourse, issues of grammar and the study of discursive factors of linguistic phenomena come to the fore. Features of the functioning of the context in oral and written discourses affect the nature of work with them. Thus, the situational context in oral discourse is perceived directly, since oral

discourse unfolds in the “here and now” plane, while for written discourse, the situation of creation and the situation of perception are remote, that is, the spatio-temporal parameters of written discourse are discrete (separated). The above also affects the work with the pragmatic context, in particular with the concept of “speech addressee”.

The absence of direct contact enhances the role of the categories of address and modality in written discourse, requiring their clear expression. The author must think through, and in some cases even foresee, the “virtual” interaction that is possible between him and the reader in the process of the latter’s perception of the text. Therefore, the role of the pragmatic context in written discourse is more complicated than in oral discourse, this is manifested, for example, in the selection of linguistic phrases, in the choice of apt formulations, communicative strategies to achieve the set goal, in an attempt to influence the views, emotional state, actions of the addressee, and to predict possible reactions of the reader. In relation to the subject of speech, the pragmatic context covers issues related to its goals, intentions, and attitudes. From this perspective, written discourse is characterized by a greater degree of thoughtfulness, awareness, motivation, and preparation. The outlined characteristics are fundamental for written discourse and determine the specificity of the text component. As O. Selivanova (1999) emphasizes, “written discourse is characterized by a high degree of formality and planning, while oral discourse is characterized by a lesser degree of these features” (Selivanova, 1999, p. 135).

Accordingly, for written discourse, such categories as coherence, integrity, and consistency acquire special importance, which help the author to achieve the set goal in the absence of a direct addressee of speech. In addition, one should take into account the set of genres and norms of their construction characteristic of oral and written discourses, as well as the explicitness and expressiveness of text categories. Thus, working with oral and written discourses is somewhat complicated by the need to take into account their typical features. For example, in the formation of discursive competence in oral speech, the role of the extralinguistic context increases, as a result of which not only the situational context but also many other factors characteristic of natural spoken speech, such as paralinguistic means, intonation, prosody, etc., become the focus of analysis. This leads to difficulties in recording oral discourses. Although there is a generally accepted transcription system, such a (transcribed) text is difficult to read and perceive by the recipient. However, when working with written discourse, there are difficulties associated with the isolation and analysis of the extralinguistic context; the main attention is paid to the textual aspect, that is, understanding the text in the discourse.

Accordingly, when forming a discursive competence in the field of written

communication, the main unit of learning is the text in combination with the extralinguistic factors of its creation, the text and the effective space in which it functions. The organization of the process of forming discursive competence in applicants of philological faculties contributes to the solution of a number of important issues. Firstly, it ensures the development of a linguistic personality, for whom the ability to build coherent statements in accordance with the canons of a certain genre to achieve a set communicative goal, to possess socially oriented discourses, and to act competently in various communication situations is one of the most important parameters of its education. Secondly, the need for proper speech training of a future teacher-linguist is due to purely professional reasons, because only then can be formed the highest levels of linguistic personality in sufficient numbers when an appropriate body of teachers-linguists who have been trained to solve such tasks is prepared. The level of speech preparation of schoolchildren, their awareness of genre norms, and their readiness to communicate in various communicative situations depend on the level of formation of the philologist's discursive competence.

Conclusions. Thus, the scientific development of the problem of the formation of discursive competence was based on the modern theory of discourse, which defines the latter as a complex communicative phenomenon containing linguistic and extralinguistic components. Discourse and text are defined as generic concepts; in fact, text is a component of discourse. Distinctive features of discourse include those associated with the extralinguistic properties of the act of communication and the situation; therefore, work with discourse is always based on the study of the relationship between the language code and the external context.

Discursive competence, which is one of the most important components of communicative competence, is considered as the ability of a linguistic personality to build and perceive holistic discourses of various types (oral and written) in accordance with the communicative intention within a specific communication situation, taking into account the specifics of their semantic-pragmatic and grammatical organization at the macro- and micro-levels and the relationship between extralinguistic and linguistic components. The characteristic features of written discourse determine the specifics of the formation of discursive competence in the field of written communication, in particular, the need to take into account the peculiarities of the functioning of the extralinguistic context, grammatical categories, pragmatic factors of the creation of written discourse, a peculiar set of genres and the norms of their construction.

Discourse theory is a relatively young field of knowledge, and therefore has broad opportunities for solving a number of issues in communicative and functional linguistics, cognitive psychology, and linguodidactics. Accordingly, it can be seen the

prospect of further research in the continuity and continuity of mastering the concept of discourse, ensuring interdisciplinary connections in the formation of discursive competence, creating educational and methodological kits, workshops on discourse theory and discursive text analysis to meet the requirements of the system of education in higher education in Ukraine.

REFERENCES

1. Batsevykh, F. S. (2004). *Osnovy komunikativnoi lingvistyky: Pidruchnyk [Fundamentals of communicative linguistics: Textbook]*. Kyiv: Akademiia [in Ukrainian].
2. Bohush, A. M. (2001). *Linhvodydaktyka v suchasnykh zakladakh osvity [Linguistic didactics in modern educational institutions]*. Odesa: PNTs APN Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].
3. Bohush, A. M. (2008). *Pedahohichni vymiry Vasylia Sukhomlynskoho v suchasnomu osvithnomu prostori: monohrafiia [Pedagogical dimensions of Vasyl Sukhomlynskiy in modern educational space: monograph]*. Kyiv: Vyd. Dim "Slovo" [in Ukrainian].
4. Horina, Zh. D. (2007). Dyskursyvnyi komponent komunikativnoi kompetentsii maibutnikh slovesnykiv [Discursive component of communicative competence of future linguists]. *Nauka i osvita – Science and Education*, 3, 125–128 [in Ukrainian].
5. *Zahalnoievropeyski rekomendatsii z movnoi osvity: vyvchennia, vykladannia, otsiniuvannia [Pan-European Recommendations on Language Education: Study, Teaching, Assessment.]*. (2003). Scientific Editor of the Ukrainian Edition S. Yu. Nikolaieva. Kyiv: Lenvit [in Ukrainian].
6. Zaciekina, L. B., & Zaciekin, S. V. (2008). *Psykholingvistychna diahnostyka [Psycholinguistic diagnostics]*. Lutsk: PBB "Vezha", Volyn. nats. un-t im. Lesi Ukrainky [in Ukrainian].
7. Zlatic, L. M. (2000). Formuvannia u studentiv filolohichnoho fakultetu umin sprymaty i vidtvoriuvaty zmist naukovo-navchalnoho tekstu [Formation in students of the Philological Faculty of the ability to perceive and reproduce the content of a scientific and educational text]. *Candidate's thesis*. Ternopil [in Ukrainian].
8. Zlatic, L. (2004). Formuvannia komunikativnykh umin i navychok u studentiv filolohichnykh fakultetiv [Formation of communicative skills and abilities in students of philological faculties]. *Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli – Ukrainian Language and Literature at School*, 4, 57–59 [in Ukrainian].
9. Leshchenko, H. (2003). Komunikativna ukrainomovna kompetentsiia shkoliariv u konteksti suchasnoi movnoi osvity [Communicative Ukrainian-language competence of schoolchildren in the context of modern language education]. *Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli – Ukrainian Language and Literature at School*, 7, 2–5 [in Ukrainian].
10. Kovalyk, I. I., Matsko, L. I., & Pliushch, M. Ya. (1984). *Metodyka lingvistychnoho analizu tekstu: Navch. posib. dlia instytutiv [Teaching methods of linguistic text analysis: Textbook for institutes]*. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola [in Ukrainian].
11. Kusko, K. Ya. (2001). Problemy dyskursnoi lingvistyky [Problems of discursive linguistics]. *Inozemna filolohiia – Foreign Philology*, 112, 158–164 [in Ukrainian].
12. Kusko, K. Ya. (2001). Tekstolinhvistyka, tekst i dyskurs: aktualni ta virtualni tendentsii rozvytku [Textolinguistics, text and discourse: actual and virtual trends of development]. *Visnyk Cherkaskoho universytetu bulliten of Cherkasy University*, 24, 60–66 [in Ukrainian].
13. Kukharchuk, I. O. (2006). Komunikativno-dialnisnyi pidkhid do vyvchennia syntaksysu u movnii osviti vchyteliv ukrainskoi movy i literatury [Communicative-activity approach to studying syntax in language education of teachers of Ukrainian language and literature]. *Extended Candidate's abstract*. Nats. ped. un-t im. M. P. Drahomanhova. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].

14. *Metodyka navchannia inozemnykh mov i kultur: teoriia i praktyka: pidruchnyk dlia stud. linhv. un-tiv i fak. in. mov vyshch. navch. Zakladiv [Teaching methods of foreign languages and cultures: theory and practice: a textbook for students of linguistic universities and faculties of foreign languages of higher educational institutions]*. (2013). O. B. Bihych, N. F. Borysko, H. E. Boretska et al. S. Yu. Nikolaiev (Ed.). Kyiv: Lenvit [in Ukrainian].
15. Palamar, L. M., & Katsavets, H. M. (1995). *Mova dilovykh paperiv: Prakt. Posibnyk [The Language of Business Papers: Practical Manual]*. Kyiv: Ly-bid [in Ukrainian].
16. Selivanova, O. O. (1999). *Aktualni napriamy suchasnoi linhvistyky (analytychnyi ohliad) [Current trends in modern linguistics (analytical review)]*. Kyiv: Fitosotsiotsentr [in Ukrainian].
17. *Suchasni tekhnolohii navchannia inozemnykh mov i kultur u zahalnoosvitnikh i vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladakh: kolektyvna monohrafiia [Modern technologies of teaching foreign languages and cultures in general and higher educational institutions: collective monograph]*. 2015. S. Yu. Nikolaieva (Ed.). Kyiv: Lenvit [in Ukrainian].
18. Fedorenko, Yu. (2002). Komunikatyvna kompetentsiia yak naivazhlyvishyi element uspishnoho spilkuvannia [Communicative competence as the most important element of successful communication]. *Ridna shkola – Native School*, 1, 63–65 [in Ukrainian].
19. Kholod, O. M. (2014). *Metodolohiia doslidzhen sotsialnykh komunikatsii [Methodology of Social Communications Research]*. Lviv: PAIS [in Ukrainian].
20. Kholod, O. M. (2008). Nootsentryzm yak nova metodolohiia psykhlinhvistyky [Noocentrism as a new methodology of psycholinguistics]. *Materialy I mizhnarodnoho sympoziumu "Svit linhvistyky", 15–16 kvitnia 2008 roku – Proceeding of the 1st International Symposium "World of Linguistics", April 15–16, 2008*. Kryvyi Rih: Mizhnarodnyi doslidnyi tsentr «Liudyna: mova, kultura, piznannia», 20–31 [in Ukrainian].
21. Chomsky, N. (1968). *Language and mind*. New York, Harcourt [in English].
22. Chomsky, N. (1985). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 14th printing. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1985. 66 p. URL: <http://www.colinphillips.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/chomsky1965-ch1.pdf> [in English].
23. Dijk, T. A. van. (1981). *Studies in the pragmatics of discourse*. The Hague: Mouton [in English].
24. Harris, Z. S. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language*, 28(17), 1–30 [in English].

ТЕОРЕТИЧНЕ ОБҐРУНТУВАННЯ ЗАСАД ФОРМУВАННЯ ДИСКУРСИВНОЇ КОМПЕТЕНЦІЇ У СФЕРІ ПИСЕМНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ ЗДОБУВАЧІВ ФІЛОЛОГІЧНИХ ФАКУЛЬТЕТІВ УНІВЕРСИТЕТІВ

Вікторія Слабоуз

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,

доцент кафедри іноземних мов,

ДВНЗ «Донбаський державний педагогічний університет»

м. Слов'янськ, Україна

ORCID ID 0000-0003-1810-4054

queen_viktoriya28@ukr.net

Наталія Нікітіна

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент,

завідувач кафедри іноземних мов

ДВНЗ «Донбаський державний педагогічний університет»

м. Слов'янськ, Україна
ORCID ID 0000-0002-0653-7453
nikitina_sdpu@ukr.net

Дарина Казьміна
Стейкхолдер освітньої (освітньо-професійної)
програми за спеціальністю 014.02 Середня освіта
(Мова та зарубіжна література (англійська, німецька))
Вчитель Комунального закладу «Харківський ліцей № 73
Харківської міської ради»
Харків, Україна
leaffyfox@gmail.com

Анотація. Згідно з державною політикою та державними документами України в галузі освіти, пріоритетним напрямком мовної освіти є формування мовної особистості, здатної вільно орієнтуватися в різних комунікативних ситуаціях та успішно вирішувати комунікативні завдання. Однією з найважливіших якостей мовної особистості, якою вона опановує як у процесі природного спілкування, так і спеціально організованого навчання, є комунікативна компетентність. Згідно з дискурсознавством, для розвитку комунікативних здібностей та навичок недостатньо працювати лише з мовною тканиною тексту; найсприятливіші умови для вирішення низки проблем лінгводидактики, зокрема формування мовної особистості, притаманні вмінню вивчати та аналізувати текст у позамовному контексті. Суперечності, що виникли між відсутністю спеціальних досліджень з порушеної проблеми, теоретичною та методичною нерозробленістю теми в лінгводидактиці вищої школи, та водночас необхідністю забезпечення належного рівня дискурсивної компетентності майбутніх викладачів філології, визначили актуальність статті. Аналіз публікацій ще раз довів необхідність вивчення всебічної теоретичної і практичної площини в галузі писемного спілкування. Як показує практика, найбільші труднощі здобувачі відчують у процесі текстотворення та сприйняття тексту в галузі писемного спілкування.

Мета розвідки полягала в теоретичному обґрунтуванні принципів формування дискурсивної компетентності у сфері писемного спілкування здобувачів філологічних факультетів, визначенні педагогічних умов її реалізації. Результати наукової роботи розкрили низку серйозних завдань. Науково з'ясовано та обґрунтовано сутність і структуру дискурсивної компетентності здобувачів філологічних факультетів, визначено критерії, показники та охарактеризовано рівні сформованості дискурсивної компетентності у сфері писемного спілкування здобувачів філологічних факультетів, визначено психолого-педагогічні умови ефективного формування дискурсивної компетентності у сфері писемного спілкування здобувачів філологічних факультетів.

Дискурсивна компетентність, яка є одним із найважливіших компонентів комунікативної компетентності, розглядається як здатність мовної особистості будувати та сприймати цілісні дискурси різних типів (усних та письмових) відповідно до комунікативного наміру в межах конкретної комунікативної ситуації, враховуючи специфіку їх семантико-прагматичної та граматичної організації на макро- та мікрорівнях та взаємозв'язок між екстралінгвістичними та лінгвістичними компонентами. Характерні риси писемного дискурсу визначають специфіку формування дискурсивної компетентності у сфері писемного спілкування, зокрема, необхідність врахування особливостей функціонування екстралінгвістичного контексту, граматичних категорій, прагматичних факторів створення писемного дискурсу, своєрідного набору жанрів та норм їх побудови. Використання дискурсу

в навчальному процесі підготовки майбутніх філологів створює сприятливі умови для ознайомлення їх із прикладами мовленнєвої та немовленнєвої поведінки, що реалізується в контексті ситуації, формування навичок співвідносити мовні засоби з конкретними ситуаціями, умовами та завданнями спілкування.

Ключові слова: здобувачі вищої освіти; комунікативна компетентність; дискурс; дискурсивна компетентність; лінгводидактика; принципи; усне та писемне спілкування; філологічні факультети.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Бацевич, Ф. С. (2004). Основи комунікативної лінгвістики: Підручник. Київ: Академія.
2. Богуш, А. М. (2001). Лінгводидактика в сучасних закладах освіти. Одеса: ПНЦ АПН України.
3. Богуш, А. М. (2008). Педагогічні виміри Василя Сухомлинського в сучасному освітньому просторі: монографія. Київ: Вид. Дім «Слово».
4. Горіна, Ж. Д. (2007). Дискурсивний компонент комунікативної компетенції майбутніх словесників. *Наука і освіта*, № 3, 125–128.
5. Загальноєвропейські рекомендації з мовної освіти: вивчення, викладання, оцінювання. (2003). Наук. ред. укр. видання С. Ю. Ніколаєва. Київ: Ленвіт.
6. Засекіна, Л. В., Засекін, С. В. (2008). Психолінгвістична діагностика. Луцьк: РВВ «Вежа», Волин. нац. ун-т ім. Лесі Українки.
7. Златів, Л. (2004). Формування комунікативних умінь і навичок у студентів філологічних факультетів. *Українська мова і література в школі*, № 4, 57–59.
8. Златів, Л. М. (2000). Формування у студентів філологічного факультету умінь сприймати і відтворювати зміст науково-навчального тексту. Дис. ...канд. пед. наук: 13.00.02. Тернопіль.
9. Лещенко, Г. (2003). Комунікативна україномовна компетенція школярів у контексті сучасної мовної освіти. *Українська мова і література в школі*, № 7, 2–5.
10. Ковалик, І. І., Мацько, Л. І., Плющ, М. Я. (1984). Методика лінгвістичного аналізу тексту: Навч. посіб. для інститутів. Київ: Вища школа.
11. Кусько, К. Я. (2001). Проблеми дискурсивної лінгвістики. *Іноземна філологія*, № 112, 158–164.
12. Кусько, К. Я. (2001). Текстолінгвістика, текст і дискурс: актуальні та віртуальні тенденції розвитку. *Вісник Черкаського університету*, Вип. 24, 60–66.
13. Кухарчук, І. О. (2006). Комунікативно-діяльнісний підхід до вивчення синтаксису у мовній освіті вчителів української мови і літератури: Автореф. дис. ...канд. пед. наук: 13.00.02. Нац. пед. ун-т ім. М. П. Драгоманова. Київ.
14. Методика навчання іноземних мов і культур: теорія і практика (2013). підручник для студ. лінгв. ун-тів і фак. ін. мов вищ. навч. закладів. О. Б. Бігич, Н. Ф. Бориско, Г. Е. Борецька та ін.; під загальн. ред. С. Ю. Ніколаєвої. Київ: Ленвіт.
15. Паламар, Л. М., Кацавець Г. М. (1995). Мова ділових паперів: Практ. посібник. Київ: Либідь.
16. Селіванова, О. О. (1999). Актуальні напрями сучасної лінгвістики (аналітичний огляд). Київ: Фітосоціоцентр.
17. Сучасні технології навчання іноземних мов і культур у загальноосвітніх і вищих навчальних закладах (2015). колективна монографія. Під загальн. ред. С. Ю. Ніколаєвої. Київ: Ленвіт.
18. Федоренко, Ю. (2002). Комунікативна компетенція як найважливіший елемент успішного спілкування. *Рідна школа*, № 1, 63–65.
19. Холод, О. М. (2008). Нооцентризм як нова методологія психолінгвістики.

Матеріали I міжнародного симпозіуму «Світ лінгвістики», 15–16 квітня 2008 року. Кривий Ріг: Міжнародний дослідний центр «Людина: мова, культура, пізнання», с. 20–31.

20. Холод, О. М. (2014). *Методологія досліджень соціальних комунікацій*. Львів: ПАІС.

21. Chomsky, N. (1968). *Language and mind*. New York, Harcourt.

22. Chomsky, N. (1985). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. *Massachusetts Institute of Technology*. 14th printing. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 66 p. URL: <http://www.colinphillips.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/chomsky1965-ch1.pdf>

23. Dijk, T. A. van (1981). *Studies in the pragmatics of discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.

24. Harris, Z. S. (1952). *Discourse analysis*. *Language*, Vol. 28. № 17, 1–30.

Матеріали надійшли до редакції
02.11.2024 р.