

## Argumentative Discourse as a Psychological Factor of Organizing Facilitative Interaction at the Lessons at a Secondary School

### Аргументативний дискурс як психологічний чинник організації фасилітативної взаємодії на уроках у загальноосвітній середній школі

**Nataliia Hupavtseva**

Ph.D. in Psychology, Assistant Professor, Rivne State University of the Humanities, Rivne (Ukraine)

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8883-7686>

Researcher ID: AAC-2156-2019

E-mail: [natalahupavceva@gmail.com](mailto:natalahupavceva@gmail.com)

**Наталія Хупавцева**

Кандидат психологічних наук, доцент, Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет, м. Рівне (Україна)

#### ABSTRACT

*The author of the article explained the meaning of «argumentative discourse» from the point of view of cognitive psychology. It was shown that argumentative discourse was a complex of communicative phenomenon that included, in addition to the text, extra-linguistic factors (knowledge of the world, thoughts, settings, goals of the partner of communication) which were necessary for understanding the text.*

*In this research argumentative discourse was shown from the standpoint of cognitive psychology. The author highlighted three stages in people's behavior:*

---

Address for correspondence, e-mail: [kpnu\\_lab\\_ps@ukr.net](mailto:kpnu_lab_ps@ukr.net)

Copyright: © Hupavtseva Nataliia



The article is licensed under **CC BY-NC 4.0 International**  
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

© Hupavtseva Nataliia

DOI (article): <https://doi.org/10.32626/2227-6246.2019-46.394-419>

*a situation, a discourse and argumentation of the first one. It was proved that argumentative discourse was a psychological implementation of a coded relevant constituent and recipient of information. It consists of three components: a plot, a dialect (oriented on geographical, time and social factors) and a dialogue-type (discourse field, discourse register, discursive modus and phases of discourse implementation, general design of phrases, structuring, content presentation, conclusions, evaluation, interactions). The latter indicates that argumentative discourse can be understood as a speech act.*

*The author of the article also identified three approaches to the concept of «argumentative discourse». It was shown that the first approach, taken from the standpoint of cognitive psychology, defined discourse as two or more sentences connected in content. The second approach provides a functional definition of argumentative discourse as «any other use of sense». This approach determines the conditionality of the analysis of the functions of discourse by studying the functions of phrases in a broad socio-cultural context. The third approach defines argumentative discourse as the utterance and puts on the interaction of a form and functions of argumentation. In this case, argumentative discourse is understood not as a primitive set of isolated units of the linguistic structure «bigger than sentences», but as an integral set of functionally organized, contextualized units of language use, which have their unique sense.*

*It was used the psycho-diagnostic method of content-semantic analysis (CSA) of discursive thinking by I. Semenov with the purpose to study the levels of «argumentative discourse» of teenagers. It was shown that the CSA method was used to reconstruct and to analyze thought processes in situations of solving small creative tasks. The last was meant by the author as psychological factor of effective facilitative interaction. It was proved that the process of solving a person's creative task was meant as a problem-conflict situation. It was determined by the ambiguity of the conditions of the problem, which provoked the use of stereotyped means of solution that did not lead to the achievement of the result. At the same time, the problem arises in the process of meaningful transformation of the conditions of this problem, when the intellectual means of the individual, which are not enough for its solution, characterize the intellectual sphere of thinking. Cognitive dissonance characterizes the personal aspect of facilitative interaction and shows itself as a special emotional state of a person, which arises when it is a collision of the latter with a problem, which cannot be solved with the help of an existing means-stereotype. The person's experience of inadequacy in a problem situation blocks his/her intellectual activity, so the*

*result cannot be achieved. On the other hand, the problem is the condition of active cognitive activity, and the conflict is the presence of contradictions.*

*Also the author of the article proposed levels of the formation of the argumentative discourse of adolescents.*

**Key words:** *argumentative discourse, facilitative interaction, cognitive psychology, method of content-semantic analysis of discursive thinking, creative tasks, cognitive dissonance.*

## Introduction

In the psychological literature (Glenn, 1983; Mykhalchuk, Ivashkevych, 2015) it was showed that facilitative interaction develops logical thinking of pupils, especially the ability to think and to conclude. But even here facilitative interaction has some kind of danger when abusing it. It can develop a very harmful habit of a pupil of juggling his/her thoughts, paying more attention to the form, rather than to the content of thinking (Онурієва, 2013).

We totally agree with these authors (Hoffman, 1961; Onufrieva, 2015) who think that facilitative interaction is a heuristic way of presenting a new material and it can have a good effect, when the teacher thinks about psychological characteristics of children. Effective facilitative interaction makes sense only when the pupils themselves, under the guidance of teachers, draw conclusions. Therefore, it is required from the teacher to ask questions so that they stimulate the pupils' opinion and direct the discussion into the way of argumentative discourse (Lakin, 1972). The last problem is the subject of our research.

So, **the aim** of our article is to describe the content of argumentative discourse, to show the ways of its implementation in the process of facilitative interaction.

## The tasks of the research

1. To explain the meaning of «argumentative discourse» from the point of view of cognitive psychology.

2. To identify three approaches to the concept of «argumentative discourse».

3. To use psycho-diagnostic method of content-semantic analysis (CSA) of discursive thinking by I. Semenov to study the levels of «argumentative discourse» of teenagers.

4. To propose levels of the formation of the argumentative discourse of adolescents.

### **Methods and methodical instrumentation of the research**

The following methods were used in our research: a categorical method, a structural-functional method, the methods of: analysis, systematization, modeling, generalization. In order to study the degree of formation of argumentative discourse of adolescents, we propose to use various methods, traditional for psychological experimental researches (questionnaires, tests, creative activities of pupils, conversations, written interviews, observations). The basis for our research is the method of content-semantic analysis (CSA) of discursive thinking by I. Semenov (Семёнов, 1976).

### **The results of the research and their discussion**

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

© Hupavtseva Nataliia

the concept of discourse is rarely used in relation to ancient texts).

Argumentative discourse is not isolated textual or dialogical structure, because much more meaning within it acquires paralinguistic accompaniment of a language that performs a number of functions (psychological, psycholinguistic, semantic, emotional, evaluational, etc.). Also we think that argumentative discourse is an essential component of socio-cultural facilitative interaction.

The use of mechanisms of argumentative discourse in the process of studying is necessary, because as one of its important functions is to familiarize those who learn a foreign language in a paradigm of a different culture in different situations.

Argumentative discourse is also important for language learning, which needs to be studied not in isolation, but in a context, that is, with a help of discourse we can show how a certain language phenomenon is used in one or another speech situation.

Throughout the term's existence, the concept of «argumentative discourse» was interpreted ambiguously. So, I. Malzman (Malzman, 1956) considered argumentative discourse to be a coherent text. Other scientists (Hoffman, 1961) regard it as a type of discussion. Some other scientists, for example, Rose (G. Rose, 1992) calls discourse a collection of texts of a certain thematic direction: 1) *special discourse* is in texts of monographs; 2) *popular science discourse* is in popular scientific magazines and texts; 3) *psychological discourse* is understood at psychological texts and textbooks; 4) *legal discourse* is in texts of the country's legal system.

Argumentative discourse is also called a process associated with a real speech production, which unfolds in some time and in some space in a certain way. Argumentative discourse is also interpreted as a dialogue (Mykhalchuk & Ivashkevych, 2015), and as a category of speech, materializing in the form of oral or written texts, completed from the semantic and structural

point of view. There is a definition of argumentative discourse as a social and communicative object, basic linguistic characteristics of which are determined by contacts with the practical actions necessary for providing argumentative discourse into teaching practice.

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

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

organized, contextualized units of language use, which have their unique sense.

The expansion of the sphere of use of the concept of «argumentative discourse» led to the fact that it could also be used in the theory of teaching foreign languages. According to scientists, the borrowing from the linguistics of the term «argumentative discourse» (Rose, 1992) and then the application of discursive analysis in psychology is important. This allows for a better distribution of foreign language discursive structures that are the main characteristics of a particular sphere of communication, since argumentative discourse helps to select and make the whole structure of necessary texts, defines the categories of different documents. Some psychologists, in particular L. Onufriieva (Онуфрієва, 2013), believe that discursive analysis also allows a specialist who has come across a communicative situation to acquire necessary skills to transfer the discursive competence from one discursive space to another (Гончарук & Онуфрієва, 2018).

Consequently, the introduction of the concept of «argumentative discourse» in the theory of cognitive psychology was not an accidental use of this term. The notion of «argumentative discourse» is used by a number of sciences who think about it from different perspectives. The understanding of argumentative discourse as a speech act is important for the theory and practice of teaching, for example, a foreign language, which is not limited to specific language expressions, but also has certain extra-linguistic parameters (personal and social characteristics).

In order to study the degree of formation of argumentative discourse of adolescents, we propose to use various methods, traditional for psychological experimental researches (questionnaires, tests, creative activities of pupils, conversations, written interviews, observations). The basis for our research is the method of content-semantic analysis (CSA) of discursive thinking by I. Semenov (Семёнов, 1976).

The CSA method is used to reconstruct and to analyze thought processes in situations of solving small creative tasks. The last we mean as *psychological factor of effective facilitative interaction*. Within the framework of this tradition, the process of solving a person's creative task is meant as a problem-conflict situation. It is determined by the ambiguity of the conditions of the problem, which provokes the use of stereotyped means of solution that do not lead to the achievement of the result. At the same time, the problem arises in the process of meaningful transformation of the conditions of this problem, when the intellectual means of the individual, which are not enough for its solution, characterize the intellectual sphere of thinking. Cognitive dissonance characterizes the personality aspect of facilitative interaction and shows itself as a special emotional state of a person, which arises when it is a collision of the latter with a problem, which cannot be solved with the help of an existing means-stereotype. The person's experience of inadequacy in a problem situation blocks his/her intellectual activity, so the result cannot be achieved. On the other hand, the problem is the condition of active cognitive activity, and the conflict is the presence of contradictions.

In our experimental research 103 pupils of secondary school №15 in the town of Rivne were participated. The experiment was organized from September 2018 to March 2019. Its goal was to establish the degree of the development of argumentative discourse of schoolchildren on the basis of patterns of manifestation of the interconnection of perceptual, contextual, integrative images, which were formed at different stages of comprehension of the novel content in the situation of internal discursive solving creative tasks in conditions of a diverse English-speaking environment.

Experimental and control groups were formed by the method of randomization (103 pupils):

– experimental groups:

E1 (37 pupils) – 9-A form, school № 15;



E2 (27 pupils) – 9-B form, school № 15;

– control groups:

C1 (33 pupils) – 9-C form, school № 15;

C2 (36 pupils) – 9-D form, school № 15.

The statement of the relationship of argumentative discourse and the English-speaking environment, as well as the specifics of the latter, was established by us by comparing the data of two groups of pupils. One of them (experimental class E1 and control class C1) consisted of pupils studying English 7 times a week, another (experimental class E2 and control class C2) – teenagers who had English lessons 3 times a week. So, the difference between programs acts as a variable value of the English-speaking environment.

The degree of formation of the argumentative discourse of schoolchildren at the first stage of experiment was determined by the following criteria: the reflection by adolescents of the situation of perception of the problem as a communicative situation; stability in the implementation of a communicative position; reflection of the specificity of literary imagery and creativity. All these factors we mean as psychological ones of facilitative interaction.

Levels of the formation of the argumentative discourse of adolescents at the stage of the experiment were characterized as:

– *a high level* – a stable communicative position taken by a pupil in the perception of the literary task, the combination of rational and emotional factors in the perception of the literary image, the presence of semantic interpretation;

– *a medium level* – instability of reflection by secondary school pupils of the situation of communication with English literature as a situation of facilitative interaction, uncertainty of the semantic interpretation of the novel proposed by the teacher;

– *a low level* – lack of pupil's understanding the subject of communication, as well as misunderstanding of the content of the novel.

Based on the communicative position taken by the pupils, four groups of pupils were formed. ***The tasks consisted of three issues:***

1. What does the author express in this novel?

This question was asked with the aim to reveal the pupil's understanding of the novel as a whole and implicitly includes information on the way of penetration into the content of the novel from the standpoint of its author.

2. Why do events in a novel unfold precisely in such a sequence?

3. What does this novel mean?

The second and the third questions focus pupils on certain meaningful moments of the novel and allow to identify the ability of adolescents to comprehend and interpret these points of view. In addition, they could be the basis for creating a content model for the answer to the first question.

The results of *the first stage of the experiment* showed that in groups of pupils only some compositions were corresponded to a high level of the development of argumentative discourse. In compositions of schoolchildren who have the criteria of a high level of the development of argumentative discourse, there is a correlation between the position of the author and the pupil's own position, as well as comprehension of literary and artistic speech as a kind of language of communication, which provides the most complete (in comparison with compositions of the middle and low levels) representation of the literary layer: «subjectively», «emotionally personal», «figurative representations», «literary-historical» ones). It is necessary to note the imagery of the speech of pupils, who have developed the ability to imaginative perception of a novel. The use of a high-level vocabulary is an indicator of the fact of a creative process of comprehension of the literary image and of the means used by pupils in compositions.

Compositions of the middle and low levels are marked by a sharp imbalance of the components of the novel (substantive

basis and semantic interpretation), which correspond to the lack or instability of pupils displaying the situation of reading a novel as a process of facilitative interaction. Pupils with a high level of the development of argumentative discourse attempted to abstract from the author's personality of the novel. Sometimes they replaced themselves with a certain abstract subject (for example, the hero of the novel), but in interpreting the content of the pupils did not depart from the events depicted by the author. Pupils, being in the position of the author of the novel, made an attempt to understand it in a broader literary context. The literary-historical context in the form of knowledge of a pupil from the position of the author of the novel, the history of his / her writing, played a different role in the process of understanding the content of the novel: in some cases, the pupil is limited by his / her understanding of the knowledge of this novel and did not expand the literary layer (in particular, his / her operational and substantive components) or did not correlate the content of the novel with his / her own ideas that arose in his/her perception, that is, he / she did not depart from the position specified by the author of the text.

The distribution of solving literary creative tasks by pupils according to the levels of understanding of the content of the novel, as well as the levels of the developing of the argumentative discourse of adolescents is presented in Table 1.

*Table 1*

Percentage of solving literary creative tasks by pupils according to the levels of understanding the content of the novel (the first stage of the experiment)

| Levels of the development of argumentative discourse | Groups         |                |                |                |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|  | E <sub>1</sub> | E <sub>2</sub> | C <sub>1</sub> | C <sub>2</sub> |
| A high level   | 14             | 17             | 15             | 16             |
| A middle level                                       | 23             | 24             | 20             | 25             |
| A low level  | 63             | 59             | 65             | 59             |

The analysis of the results in Table 1 allows us to draw the following conclusions. The influence of the pupil's communicative position on the character and the depth of understanding of the content of the novel and on the ability of adolescents to make dialogues are established. This was evidenced by a high level of the development of argumentative discourse, fixed in the performance of tasks in which pupils were included into the situation of communication with a novel. The largest number of such pupils were in the third and the fourth groups (pupils were divided into groups during the analysis), that is, when the pupils were in the position of the hero and the author of the novel, although in general the number of adolescents with a high level of the development of argumentative discourse in all groups was insignificant.

So, it was very difficult to reach a communicative position for pupils of all groups. We can assume that the experience of pupils according to this type of thinking is insignificant. This is confirmed by the refusal of some pupils to perform this task (for example, 13,8% in group E1 and 25,7% in group C2). The latter, however, requires a more detailed examination, which emphasizes the need to study the procedural side of the functioning of the argumentative discourse of schoolchildren, including their mediating communicative and personal moments. This task was the main at the second stage of the experiment.

*The second stage of the experiment* had the aim to study the functioning of a comprehensive system of argumentative discourse of pupils at secondary school in solving creative tasks by them, which was the main psychological factor of facilitative interaction at the English lessons. An adequate means at the same time was to use a conceptual model of discursive creative thinking in general and in the interconnection of all its components. The study of the system of reflection was of particular importance as a mechanism for rethinking various types of stereotypes (intellectual, personal, communicative), which

cause problem-conflict situations in the process of facilitative interaction.

The effectiveness of the proposed system of facilitative interaction on the development of argumentative discourse of adolescents was determined on the basis of comparison of the initial and final stages of the experiment made by the method of content-semantic analysis of the solution of creative tasks by pupils at the lessons of the English language. Thus, the development of argumentative discourse was determined taking into account the values of the component of «monologue utterances»:

$$MV = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^n mv_i \times 100,$$

where MV is the specific weight of the indicator of «monological statements» in %;

$mv_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) is the number of monological statements in the process of solving by  $i$ -pupil a creative task;

$N$  is the total number of all pupils' statements when solving the problem.

Similarly, the values of other indicators that characterize the components of thinking activity were also counted.

The creative tasks at the second stage of the research were taken by adolescents who compiled two samples: group 1, which included pupils of the experimental classes E1, E2; group 2, which includes pupils of C1, C2, who study by the traditional program of studying English. Pupils were offered a creative task: to organize a heuristic conversation after reading the text «A Modern Comedy», book 1, by J. Galsworthy (Galsworthy, 1956). The effective aspect of solving the problem by pupils had different expressions: problem-solving gave pupils new knowledge (a content aspect), overcoming the cognitive dissonance due to the need to choose a certain personal position regarding the English language, finding creative opportunities for the development of pupils' person.

The ambiguity of the conditions of the task determined the plurality of directions in the thinking search and determined the multiplicity of answers. The last ones were redrawn by us in the following way (to propose these levels we took into account the strategies of combination as a mental mechanism for solving a creative mathematical problem, described by L. A. Moiseienko, O. M. Vytvytska, H. M. Kulinich (Мойсеєнко, Витвицька & Кулініч, 2018)):

**Level 1.** Pupils do not understand the content of a creative task, do not attempt to solve it or even to analyze it. Pupils, as a rule, can not understand the main idea of the problem, do not agree to make discussions, do not contact with other adolescents, etc.

**Level 2.** Pupils only repeat the content of the teacher's creative task and concentrate their attention on the questions having been formulated, do not attempt to understand or to analyze the problem contained in the task, express and justify their own points of view according to this problem.

**Level 3.** Communication of pupils at this level has a clear focus on a particular novel, which, in the opinion of adolescents, can contribute to the solution of a creative task. Studying the problem, pupils compare the content of the task with the plot of a particular novel, that is, the process of solving the problem is of a formal nature, fixed on the subjective level of the literary layer. Pupils analyze or simply explain the choice of ways to solve the problem or proposed conclusions, correlating their opinion with only one particular novel, therefore, the process of solving the problem is not creative, but the decision can not be considered by their own, because it was based on the conclusions drawn in a critical literature that corresponded to the basic idea of a novel (in such a way schoolchildren do not express their own judgments, but only repeat ideas from English literature or a text).

**Level 4.** The analysis of the problem situation is carried out only on a superficial level. Pupils analyze only the content

of the proposed task, do not attempt to concentrate their attention and attention of other schoolchildren on the problem. Therefore, the answers of schoolchildren are of a purely superficial nature, they can not draw conclusions about the problem and, based on this, outline ways of creative problem solving. Given this, one can not speak of the presence of a tolerant attitude towards the thoughts of partners of communication in the process of such a discussion, because the superficial nature of judgments does not provide opportunities for organizing productive communication of adolescents in order to organize creative problem-solving.

**Level 5.** Pupils are actively involved into the process of discussing the problem of a creative task proposed by a teacher or attempting to solve it independently, in the process of individual activity. Teenagers analyze the problem, which includes a creative task, compare their own points of view with the views of other pupils, have tolerant attitude to the partners of communication. But, at the same time, adolescents do not sufficiently justify their own positions and, therefore, do not attempt to develop them for further creative decision-making. Consequently, the process of solving the problem is limited only to the analysis of its content and comparison of expressed thoughts by pupils.

**Level 6.** Pupils explain and attempt to substantiate their own points of view on their proposed creative tasks, while actively collaborating with their partners of communication, saying their opinions and solving tasks offered by the partners in a tolerant way. But teens, analyzing their own statements and comparing them with the judgments of communication partners, do not lead the process of solving the creative task to the logical end.

**Level 7.** Pupils clearly justify their positions by analyzing their own points of view and judgments, comparing them with the thoughts of other partners in the process of communica-

tion. At the same time, pupils display tolerance in relation to others, even quite opposite statements and means of solving creative tasks by adolescents. Pupils actively argue their positions, logically explaining and justifying them. Pupils do not deny cooperation with their partners in communication in the process of solving problematic creative tasks within small microgroups and the whole class.

First of all, it should be taken into account that 87% of pupils in group 1 and 83% of group 2 did not perceive proposed situation as problematic one and only after several explanations of teachers attempted to make the continuation of the task. The percentage distribution of answers of adolescent by their types was proposed in Table 2.

*Table 2*

Distribution of adolescents' answers when they were solving a creative task (in %)

| The type of answers | Percentage distribution of answers |         |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
|                     | Group 1                            | Group 2 |
| Level 1             | 31                                 | 20      |
| Level 2             | 28                                 | 21      |
| Level 3             | 11                                 | 23      |
| Level 4             | 16                                 | 21      |
| Level 5             | 9                                  | 7       |
| Level 6             | 2                                  | 8       |
| Level 7             | 3                                  | 0       |

As Table 2 shows, pupils of groups 1 and group 2 did not succeed in solving this task, because they did not understand the meaning of the problem situation, did not realize its meaning, so attempts to complete the task did not lead to a positive result. Teens (despite different English language programs) can not creatively approach their own decision-making, make unconscious steps, although having a certain orientation, do not



contribute to the logical completion of the problem-solving task proposed by the teacher.

The degree of the development of discourse of adolescents is the results of the comparison of the coefficients of the integrative, modified and contextual images in the stories of schoolchildren (the more often the pupils show in the story the integrative image in relation to the contextual and modified, the higher the degree of the development of the argumentative discourse of the pupil). We considered the contextual image that clearly coincides with the present way in this context. A modified image was created on the basis of the proposed creative task, that was a logical continuation of the contextual image. An integrative image arises as a result of a combination of contextual and modified images, in addition, the pupil draws it with elements of imagination and creativity.

The coefficient of the integrative image was calculated by the formula:

$$I = \frac{N_i}{N} \times 100,$$

where  $N_i$  is a number of pupils' sayings which include the integrative image;

$N$  is a number of all statements in the pupil's story.

The coefficients of modified (M) and contextual (C) images were calculated by analogy.

The average values of the coefficients of modified, contextual and integrative images in two groups of pupils depending on the type of their answers were shown in Table 3.

As one can see from Table 3, in pupils' stories, schoolchildren of group 1 and group 2 used mainly contextual, that is, given by the teacher, images, as well as modified images, which are a logical continuation of the contextual ones. Integrative images occurred only in some stories of schoolchildren. Therefore, we can conclude that, generally speaking, the low level of the development of argumentative discourse of schoolchildren

of groups 1 and 2 is not connected with specialized program of studying English.

*Table 3*

Average values of coefficients of modified, contextual and integrative images (in%) in groups 1, 2 depending on the type of answers of adolescent (the second stage of the experiment)

| Type of the answer | Group 1               |                  |                   | Group 2               |                  |                   |
|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------|
|                    | Value of coefficients |                  |                   | Value of coefficients |                  |                   |
|                    | modified image        | contextual image | integrative image | modified image        | contextual image | integrative image |
| Level 1            | 0                     | 100              | 0                 | 0                     | 100              | 0                 |
| Level 2            | 35                    | 65               | 0                 | 32                    | 68               | 0                 |
| Level 3            | 24                    | 69               | 7                 | 38                    | 51               | 11                |
| Level 4            | 23                    | 69               | 8                 | 27                    | 61               | 12                |
| Level 5            | 41                    | 44               | 15                | 38                    | 49               | 13                |
| Level 6            | 35                    | 49               | 16                | 26                    | 60               | 14                |
| Level 7            | 27                    | 55               | 18                | 31                    | 57               | 12                |

So, facilitative interaction requires active reflection with the aim to solve creating problem situations that should be solved on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of these situations, suggestions, comparisons, etc. Facilitative interaction is used mainly at the stage of comprehension of new material. Based on the questions of this type of conversation, pupils establish internally objective connections between the objects themselves. The question should be put in relations to real facts obtained in the process of observation, when reading the textbook or reference materials.

### Conclusions

A significant place is taken by facilitative interaction in the process of generalization and systematization of knowledge.

Exercises with the component of facilitative interaction can also be proposed for pupils' homework. Usually, on the basis of such exercises, pupils are led to find the correct answer, solve the problem, make necessary conclusions.

The most expedient facilitative interaction is proved that all pupils have mastered the training material well and the whole class participated in it. A facilitative interaction is useful when it is based on subjective and abstract visibility (tables, diagrams). Also problematic questions make contradictions between the facts available to pupils about the knowledge and new facts, which can not be explained on the basis of this knowledge. To solve such contradictions pupils need new knowledge which they find on the basis of their own research – objective or logical ones.

In organizing the facilitative interaction, it is important not only to emphasize on the content of the questions, but also on their form. Questions should be short and accurate, their task is to orient pupils to reproduce knowledge or to search a creative answer. Alternative questions need to be answered «yes» or «no» should not be formulated; questions should not give pupils a correct answer. If the pupils did not understand the question, it is necessary to formulate it shorter, more accessible. Asking questions, the teacher carefully, without interrupting, listens to the answer, then turns to the class with a proposal to complete or correct the mistakes.

In other our articles we'll show the dependence of the development of argumentative discourse of pupils according to modified, contextual and integrative images.

### Literature

Гончарук Н., Онуфрієва Л. Психологічний аналіз рівнів побудови комунікативних дій. *Psycholinguistics. Психолінгвістика. Психолінгвістика*. 2018. Вип. 24 (1). С. 97–117. DOI 10.31470/2309-1797-2018-24-1-97-117.

Мойсеєнко Л. А., Витвицька О. М., Кулініч Г. М. Стратегія комбінування як мисленнєвий механізм розв'язування творчої матема-

- тичної задачі. *Проблеми сучасної психології: Збірник наукових праць Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка, Інституту психології імені Г. С. Костюка НАПН України*. Кам'янець-Подільський : Аксіома, 2018. Вип. 40. С. 250–261.
- Онуфрієва Л. А. Дослідження психологічних детермінант розвитку професійної самосвідомості та особистісної зрілості майбутніх фахівців соціально-економічних професій. *Науковий вісник Миколаївського державного університету імені В. О. Сухомлинського: Зб. наук. праць / за ред. С. Д. Максименка, Н. О. Євдокимової. Серія «Психологічні науки»*. Миколаїв : МНУ імені В. О. Сухомлинського, 2013. Т. 2. Вип. 10 (91). С. 227–233.
- Семёнов И. Н. Опыт деятельного подхода к экспериментальному исследованию мышления на материале решения творческих задач. *Методологические проблемы исследования деятельности*. Москва : ЗПИИТЗ, 1976. С. 148–188.
- Galsworthy, J. (1956). *A Modern Comedy. Book I: The White Monkey*. Moscow : Foreign Languages Publishing House. 328 p.
- Glenn, S. M. (1983). Nursery rhymes and early language acquaintance by mentally handicapped children. *Exceptional children*, 51 (1), 72–74.
- Hoffman, L. (1961). Cognitions for creative problem solving. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 52, 2, 83–89.
- Lakin, M. (1972). *Interpersonal encounter. Theory and practice in sensitivity training*. New York : Penguin Books. 302 p.
- Malzman, I., Eisman, E., Broks, L. D., & Smith, W. A. (1956). Task instructions for anagrams following different task instructions and tracing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 51, 418–420.
- Mykhalchuk N. O., Ivashkevych E. Z. Crosscultural communication as a way to develop intercultural competence. *Актуальні проблеми філології та методики викладання гуманітарних дисциплін: Зб. наук. пр.* Рівне : РДГУ, 2015. С. 3–8.
- Onufriieva L. A. The psychological potential of socio-economic specialists' personal progress in the light of family education. *Проблеми сучасної психології: Зб. наук. праць Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка, Інституту психології імені Г. С. Костюка НАПН України*. Кам'янець-Подільський : Аксіома, 2015. Вип. 30. С. 448–457.
- Rose, G., & Gilbert, J. (1992). *The power of form: A psychoanalytic approach to aesthetic form*. Madison : International University Press. 262 p.

## References

- Honcharuck, N., & Onufriieva, L. (2018). Psykholohichnyi analiz rivniv pobudovy komunikatyvnykh dii [Psychological analysis of levels of communicative actions construction]. *Psycholinguistics. Psykholinhvistyka. Psiholingvistika – Psycholinguistics. Психолінгвістика. Психолінгвістика*, 24 (1), 97–117. DOI 10.31470/2309-1797-2018-24-1-97-117 [in Ukrainian].
- Moiseienko, L. A., Vytvytska, O. M., & Kulinich, H. M. (2018). Stratehiia kombinuvannia yak myslennievyyi mekhanizm rozviazuvannia tvorchoi matematychnoi zadachi [The strategy of combination as a mental mechanism for solving a creative mathematical problem]. S. D. Maksymenko, L. A. Onufriieva (Eds.). *Problemy suchasnoi psykholohii – Problems of Modern Psychology: Collection of research papers of Kamianets-Podilskyi National Ivan Ohienko University, G. S. Kostiuk Institute of Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine*, 40, 250–261. Kamianets-Podilskyi : Aksioma [in Ukrainian].
- Onufriieva, L. A. (2013). Doslidzhennia psykholohichnykh determinant rozvytku profesiinoi samosvidomosti ta osobystisnoi zrilosti maibutnykh fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnykh profesii [The research of psychological determinants of the development of professional self-consciousness and personal maturity of future socionomic specialists]. S. D. Maksymenko, N. O. Yevdokymova (Eds.). *Naukovyi visnyk Mykolaiivskoho derzhavnogo universytetu imeni V. O. Sukhomlynskoho – Scientific Bulletin of Mykolaiiv V. O. Sukhomlynskyi National University: Collection of scientific issues. Series «Psychological Sciences»*, 2, 10 (91), 227–233. *Mykolaiiv* : MNU imeni V. O. Sukhomlynskoho [in Ukrainian].
- Semenov, I. N. (1976). Opyt dejatel'nogo podhoda k jeksperimental'nomu issledovaniju myshlenija na materiale reshenija tvorcheskih zadach [The experience of an active approach to the experimental study of thinking on the material of solving creative problems]. *Metodologicheskie problemy issledovanija dejatel'nosti – Methodological problems of research activities* (pp. 148–188). Moskva : ZPIITZ [in Russian].
- Galsworthy, J. (1956). *A Modern Comedy*. Book I: The White Monkey. Moscow : Foreign Languages Publishing House.
- Glenn, S. M. (1983). Nursery rhymes and early language acquaintance by mentally handicapped children. *Exceptional children*, 51 (1), 72–74.
- Hoffman, L. (1961). Cognitions for creative problem solving. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 52 (2), 83–89.

- Lakin, M. (1972). *Interpersonal encounter. Theory and practice in sensitivity training*. New York : Penguin Books.
- Malzman, I., Eisman, E., Broks, L. D., & Smith, W. A. (1956). Task instructions for anagrams following different task instructions and tracing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 51, 418–420.
- Mykhalchuk, N. O., & Ivashkevych, E. Z. (2015). Crosscultural communication as a way to develop intercultural competence. *Aktualni problemy filolohii ta metodyky vykladannia humanitarnykh dystsyplin – Topical Issues of Philology and Teaching Methods in the Humanities: Collection of research papers* (pp. 3–8). Rivne : RDHU.
- Onufriieva, L. A. (2015). The psychological potential of socioeconomic specialists' personal progress in the light of family education. *Problemy suchasnoi psykholohii – Problems of modern psychology: Collection of research papers of Kamianets-Podilskyi Ivan Ohienko National University, G. S. Kostyuk Institute of Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine*, 30, 448–457. Kamianets-Podilskyi : Aksioma.
- Rose, G., & Gilbert, J. (1992). *The power of form: A psychoanalytic approach to aesthetic form*. Madison : International University Press.

**Хупавцева Наталія. Аргументативний дискурс як психологічний чинник організації фасилітативної взаємодії на уроках у загальноосвітній середній школі**

## АНОТАЦІЯ

У статті обґрунтовано значення аргументативного дискурсу з точки зору когнітивної психології. Було показано, що аргументативний дискурс – це комплекс комунікативних засобів, який включає, крім тексту, екстралінгвістичні чинники (пізнання світу, думки, настанови, цілі партнера спілкування), які необхідні для розуміння тексту.

У дослідженні поняття «аргументативний дискурс» було висвітлено з позицій когнітивної психології. Виокремлено три етапи поведінки людей: ситуацію, дискурс і аргументацію першого. Доведено, що аргументативний дискурс – це психологічна реалізація закодованого відповідного складника одержувачем певної інформації. Він складається з трьох компонентів: сюжету, діалектичних засобів (зорієнтованих на географічні, часові та соціальні чинники) й діалогового типу реалізації аргументативного дискурсу (парадигма дискурсу, реєстри дискурсу, дискурсивний модус і фази реалізації дискурсу, загальне проектування фраз, структу-

© Hupavtseva Nataliia

рування, презентація контенту, висновки, оцінки, особливості взаємодії). Останнє свідчить про те, що аргументативний дискурс слід розуміти як складний мовленнєвий акт.

У статті також визначено три підходи щодо концепції «аргументативного дискурсу». Показано, що перший підхід, який орієнтується на парадигму когнітивної психології, визначає дискурс як два чи більше речень, щільно пов'язаних за змістом. Другий підхід забезпечує функціональне визначення аргументативного дискурсу як «будь-якого іншого використання сенсу». Цей підхід визначає зумовленість аналізу функцій дискурсу шляхом вивчення функцій фраз у широкому соціокультурному контексті. Третій підхід актуалізує значення аргументативного дискурсу як висловлювання і робить акцент на взаємодії форми та функцій аргументації. У цьому випадку аргументативний дискурс розуміється не як примітивний набір ізольованих одиниць мовленнєвої структури, «більший за речення», а як цілісний набір функціонально організованих, контекстуальних одиниць використання мови, які мають своє унікальне значення.

В емпіричному дослідженні використано психодіагностичний метод змістово-сислового аналізу (ЗСА) дискурсивного мислення І. Семенова з метою вивчення рівнів аргументативного дискурсу підлітків. Було показано, що метод ЗСА застосовувався для реконструкції й аналізу мисленнєвих процесів у ситуаціях розв'язання невеликих творчих завдань. Останні авторка статті розглядала як психологічний чинник ефективної фасилітативної взаємодії. Було доведено, що процес розв'язання творчих задач підлітки розцінюють як проблемно-конфліктну ситуацію. Останнє визначалося неоднозначністю умов проблеми, що провокувало використання стереотипних засобів розв'язання, які не призвели до бажаного досягнення результату. Водночас, у підлітків виникали непорозуміння у процесі змістового перетворення умов цієї проблеми, коли інтелектуальних засобів особистості було зовсім недостатньо для її розв'язання. Зазначено, що когнітивний дисонанс характеризує особистісний аспект фасилітативної взаємодії і проявляє себе як особливий емоційний стан людини, що виникає у випадку зіткнення останньої з проблемою, яку неможливо розв'язати за допомогою добре відомого учневі засобу-стереотипу. Також доведено, що переживання підлітком неадекватності в проблемній ситуації значно блокує його інтелектуальну діяльність, тому позитивного результату досягти неможливо. Наголошено, що, з іншого боку, проблему слід розглядати як умову здійснення активної пізнаваль-



ної діяльності, а конфлікт – як наявність суперечностей. Останнє підкреслює функціональний аспект аргументативного дискурсу.

Автором статті запропоновано рівні сформованості аргументованого дискурсу підлітків, розкрито їх зміст.

**Ключові слова:** аргументативний дискурс, фасилітативна взаємодія, когнітивна психологія, метод змістово-сислового аналізу дискурсивного мислення, творчі завдання, когнітивний дисонанс.

### **Хупавцева Наталія. Аргументативний дискурс как психологический фактор организации фасилитативного взаимодействия на уроках в общеобразовательной средней школе**

#### **АННОТАЦИЯ**

В статье обосновано значение аргументативного дискурса с точки зрения когнитивной психологии. Было показано, что аргументативный дискурс – это комплекс коммуникативных средств, который включает, помимо текста, некоторые экстралингвистические факторы (познание мира, мысли, установки, цели партнера по общению), необходимые для понимания текста.

В исследовании понятие «аргументативный дискурс» рассмотрено с позиций когнитивной психологии. Автором выделены три этапа поведения людей: ситуацию, дискурс и аргументацию первого. Доказано, что аргументативный дискурс – это психологическая реализация адресантом закодированного соответствующего компонента определенной информации. Аргументативный дискурс состоит из трех компонентов: сюжета, диалектных средств (ориентированных на географические, временные и социальные факторы) и диалогового типа реализации аргументативного дискурса (парадигма дискурса, реестры дискурса, дискурсивный модус и фазы реализации дискурса, общее проектирование фраз, структурирование, презентация контента, выводы, оценки, особенности взаимодействия). Последнее свидетельствует о том, что аргументативный дискурс следует понимать как сложный речевой акт.

В статье также определены три подхода в парадигме концепции «аргументативного дискурса». Показано, что первый подход ориентируется на парадигму когнитивной психологии; он определяет дискурс как два или более предложений, плотно связанных по смыслу. Второй подход обеспечивает функциональное определение аргументативно-

© Hupavtseva Nataliia



го дискурса как «любого другого использования смысла». Этот подход определяет обусловленность анализа функций дискурса путем изучения функций фраз в широком социокультурном контексте. Третий подход актуализует значение аргументативного дискурса как высказывания и делает акцент на взаимодействии формы и функций аргументации. В этом случае аргументативный дискурс понимается не как простой набор изолированных единиц речевой структуры, предложений, а как целостный набор функционально организованных, контекстуальных единиц использования языка, которые имеют свое уникальное значение.

В эмпирическом исследовании использован психодиагностический метод содержательно-смыслового анализа (ССА) дискурсивного мышления И. Семенова с целью изучения уровней аргументативного дискурса подростков. Было показано, что метод ССА применялся для реконструкции и анализа мыслительных процессов в ситуациях решения небольших творческих задач. Последние автор статьи рассматривала как психологический фактор эффективного фасилитативного взаимодействия. Было доказано, что процесс решения творческих задач подростки расценивают как проблемно-конфликтную ситуацию. Последнее определялось неоднозначностью условий проблемы, провоцировало использование стереотипных способов решения, которые не привели к желаемому достижению результата. В то же время, у подростков возникали недоразумения в процессе содержательного преобразования условий этой проблемы, когда интеллектуальных средств личности было совершенно недостаточно для ее решения. Отмечено, что когнитивный диссонанс характеризует личностный аспект фасилитативного взаимодействия и эксплицирует себя как особенное эмоциональное состояние человека, которое возникает в случае столкновения последнего с проблемой, которую невозможно решить с помощью хорошо известного ученику средства-стереотипа. Также доказано, что переживания подростком неадекватности в проблемной ситуации значительно блокирует его интеллектуальную деятельность, поэтому положительного результата достичь невозможно. Отмечено, что, с другой стороны, проблему следует рассматривать как условие осуществления активной познавательной деятельности, а конфликт – как наличие противоречий. Последнее подчеркивает функциональный аспект аргументативного дискурса.

Автором статьи предложены уровни сформированности аргументированного дискурса подростков, раскрыто их содержание.

**Ключевые слова:** аргументативный дискурс, фасилитативное взаимодействие, когнитивная психология, метод содержательно-смыслового анализа дискурсивного мышления, творческие задачи, когнитивный диссонанс.

Original manuscript received September 21, 2019

Revised manuscript accepted October 21, 2019