

**PROBLEMS OF THE USE OF SYNTACTIC UNITS IN COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES*****Kulzat K. Sadirova****Aktobe K.Zhubanov Regional State University (Aktobe, Republic of Kazakhstan).****Zhanna O. Tektigul****Aktobe K.Zhubanov Regional State University (Aktobe, Republic of Kazakhstan).****Akmaral A. Kuzdybajeva****Aktobe K.Zhubanov Regional State University (Aktobe, Republic of Kazakhstan).****Gulmira K. Kushkarova****Aktobe K.Zhubanov Regional State University (Aktobe, Republic of Kazakhstan).****Raushan B. Zhazykova****Aktobe K.Zhubanov Regional State University (Aktobe, Republic of Kazakhstan).****Munir I. Karabaev****Bashkir State University (Ufa, Russian Federation)*

**Abstract.** The article reveals the problems of the use of syntactic units while implementing communicative strategies since the study of the speech strategy is an urgent issue in many academic fields. Broadly speaking, the speech strategy comprises planning of the speech communication process in specific conditions depending on the communicant's individual type. Apart from it, the research analyses the influence of the national culture communication norms on the choice of syntactic units in the process of the speech strategy and tactics. Kazakh interrogative sentences are analyzed as language material. The urgency of the research is caused by the increasing interest in the language and culture interaction, strengthening of cross-cultural contacts, the necessity of understanding of axiological and speech and behavioral peculiarities of communication for various communities. The purpose of this work is the research of ethnocultural peculiarities of the creation of speech strategy and speech tactics in the process of implementation of communicative tasks. The scientific novelty of the research consists in the study of the communicative strategy and tactics in the Kazakh language as up to the present moment there are no fundamental scientific works on the study of this language phenomenon in the Kazakh linguistics

**Keywords:** speech strategy, speech tactics, choice of language units, communicative norms.

**1. Introduction**

Many questions of human speech activity in theoretical and descriptive terms require further study and detailed consideration. Thus, certain ways of formation of the speech strategy and tactics in the Kazakh language are insufficiently unveiled and studied. In particular, it concerns the influence of the communicative norms of the national culture on the choice of syntactic units while implementing speech strategy and tactics. Speech strategy and tactics fully depend on the communicative purpose of interlocutors and make up the main condition of ensuring successful realization of speech activity. These values have been preserved in such set expressions of the Kazakh language as "Andamay soylegen auyrmay oledi" ("The rash word is deathlike"), "Til tas zharady, tas zharmasa, bas zharady" ("Language splits up a stone, if not a stone, then the head"), "Aytylgan soz – atylgan ok" ("A word spoken is like a shot"), "Baska pale tilden" ("A man's ruin lies in his tongue"). Thus, speech strategy and tactics are the conditions of providing successful and unsuccessful human speech activity [1]. Correspondence to the people's communicative requirements is a universal feature of all existing languages. Consequently, the strategy and tactics of human speech activity, i.e. peculiarities of the discourse genre created in the Kazakh society imply the use of internal opportunities of this or that language to define the new syntactic constructions in the realities of life of each nation.

**2. Methods and basic concepts**

Maintaining features of the discourse genre created in the Kazakh society is the communicative purpose of each carrier of genres of the Kazakh discourse.

Any genre of speech is carried out by means of the speech strategy, which, in its turn, is formed by means of speech tactics.

According to O.N. Parshin's definition, direction (strategy) is concrete relations, actions at the revealed anticipated reference points allowing to achieve the objectives of communication [7].

We understand the activating means of speech strategy solving communicative problems step by step and directly as speech tactics.

The speech strategy is a complex of speech activities directed to the solution of communicative tasks. Planning of language relations and implementation of speech activities under the plan made is a part of the speech strategy. It is implemented in concrete communicative personal situations [11].

The definition of speech strategy is influenced by an ultimate goal, desire (intention) of the participants, caused by the social and psychological situation. The choice of the word strategy is also influenced by the speech tone, the language description of a real situation and the created stylistic norms of the communication participants. The analysis of speech strategy will be correct if we take the conversation as a whole. In the analysis of the speech strategy each dialogue step of the conversation is considered. Knowledge of the regularities of the interlocutors' general mutual

understanding is the purpose of the definition of the speech strategy. Speech tactics is an opportunity to carry out the speech strategy by means of one or several actions [3]. Methods of the speech tactics provide transition of modality during the conversation (offense, admiration, doubt, etc.) of the dialogue steps making up a dialogue. For example, the speech tactics designating the strategy of refusal of assistance can be expressed in various ways:

- 1) it beyond his competence or he cannot help (*kisideginin kilti aspanda*),
- 2) to refuse due to the lack of time (if I have time, I will see), (as luck would have it),
- 3) to refuse without any reason (Why do I have to do it?),
- 4) to give indistinct (*solkyldak*) answer or to avoid the answer,
- 5) to specifically express assistance refusal (*komekten bas tartatynyn nakty bildiru*).

All methods of the speech tactics are directed to the independent collaborative relations. But the choice of a word by the method of speech tactics is carried out differently.

### 3. Main part

Speech strategy and tactics are formed under the customs and standards of behavior of certain national relations. These approved distinctions find the reflection in the national language. As for the Kazakh people, these reflections are traced in peculiar folk customs – norms created over the centuries and developed in their language consciousness. Such expressions as *ake turyp ul soilegennen*, *sheshe turyp kyz soilegennen bez* (In the presence of the father the son has to be silent. In the presence of mother the daughter has to be silent) can be referred to such language units reflecting specific features of the national relations. This language unit contains such concepts preserved in the relations of Kazakhs as *You must not interrupt a conversation of adults; adults, including parents are the first to speak*. But such specifics of the Kazakh relations does not mean that adults' statements (opinion, words) will be immediately approved and accepted as postulates. The following language units can be given as an example and correctness of our opinion: *bas kespek bolsa da, til kespek zhok* (*the head can be cut off – the tongue cannot*), *ake turyp ul soilese, er zhetkeni bolar, sheshe turyp, kyz soilese boi zhetkeni bolar* (*If the son speaks in the presence of his father, it means he is mature. If the daughter speaks in the presence of her mother, it means she is mature*).

If it is time for a person to say (*kara kyldy kak zharar, adil coz aitu*) the final word, he will say it, despite his age, sex, social status and financial condition[17].

If a young man speaks up, he will ask for a special permission to speak and for this purpose he uses certain language units which were already created in the ancient relations of the Kazakhs, for example: *datym (aytarym) bar* (*Can I speak?*), *ruksat etseniz* (*Let me speak*) or *bas kespek bolsa da til zhok kespek* (*the head can be cut off – the tongue cannot*), *cozime kulak salsanyz* (*Listen to me*) or *mal da mauyzdalar aldynda tuyak serper, magan datymdy aituga mursat beriniz* (*Even the cattle kicks before death, so let me also say the last word*). In this case the request of the applicant is satisfied and he is given an opportunity to speak. Besides, in the Kazakh relations there are such expressions as "Ozi iilgen basty kylysh shappas" (the bowed head is never cut off) where the people who admitted the guilt must be forgiven. A similar meaning can be found in the expression "Adaskannyn aiyby zhok, kaita uirin tapkan son" (It is possible to forgive a vagabond man who has admitted his guilt). Therefore each Kazakh who knows this principle tries to be tolerant in his actions. It is also confirmed by the language units "Aldyna kelse, attany kunin kesh" ("If a man acknowledges his guilt, he deserves forgiveness"). In this regard, Kazakh interlocutors use the method of *acknowledging the fault* in their speech tactics [4].

The following expressions present one of the main principles in strategy and tactics of a word in the relationship of the Kazakhs: "El ne deidi? Zhurttan uyat bolar." (What will people say? It is a shame before people.). This principle regulates the speech strategy and tactics in the relations of the Kazakhs. According to these principles the applicant will adjust his speech strategy and follow the tactics. This meaning is preserved in the language discourse practice, for example: "Undemegen uidei paleden kutylady" ("a person who keeps silence will avoid a lot of problems"). Thus, silence can be referred to one of ways of communication. For the Russian people "silence is the sign of consent", while for the Kazakh people, in the first case, silence is the way to refuse, avoid the answer, to stand aside, in the second case, silence is a negative verdict, the sign of a protest. Such behavior can be seen in case the applicant is younger or is inferior in the social status. In case of the violation of similar behavior it will be considered "betten alu", "bad manners". The opposite language units "Undemegen uidei paleden kutylady" ("a person who keeps silence will avoid a lot of problems") (in the first case) or "Undemegennden uidei pale shygady" (Still waters run deep) (in the second case) prove the same [12].

Generalizing the principles of the speech strategy of the the Kazakh relations, they can be divided into the following groups:

1) Age and social level of the applicant of the relations (*Ake turyp, ul soilegennen, sheshe turyp, kyz soilegennen bez*. - In the presence of the father the son has to be silent. In the presence of mother the daughter has to be silent).

2) The general principles in the relations: to be tolerant (*Ozi iilgen basty kylysh shappas, Adaskannyn aiyby zhok, kaita uirin tapkan son*. - It is possible to forgive a vagabond man who has admitted his guilt).

3) "El ne deidi?", "Zhurttan uyat bolar" (*Basy nan soz asyrmau – bad manners, unsiz kalu – to keep decency, but not to agree, Undemegen uidei paleden kutylady*)

4) *Bas kespek bolsa da, til kespek zhok* (honesty to keep a word, to refuse)

In N. Uali's research it is noted that the speech strategy provides reconciliation of the parties (to find a common language) and dialogue cooperation of communicants [8]. Thus, division of the speech strategy into friendly and unfriendly one is established.

*Belief, diligence, reality, charity, etc.* belong to friendly strategies, for example:

- Ishegim shuryldap barady (to get hungry – karnym ashyp tur).
- Onda shai kainataiyn. (Daiyn as zhok, birak shai kainataiyn). I will put a kettle on. (There is nothing to eat/there is no ready meal).
- Meiliniz (Tea is enough. Shai bosa da bolady.)
- or
- Will you come, sonny?
- If I can, I will come. I will try to come. If I don't, don't worry. Kele alsam, keluge tyrysamyn, birak kelmesem, alandamanyz .
- What time will you come? Neshede kelesin?
- I don't know exactly, but, perhaps, I will come at 6 o'clock. Anyk belmei turmyn, birak altylarda bitetin shygar.

In these examples the conversational situation helps to define the mutual coherence on interlocutors and their interest in the conversation.

*Scandal, quarrel, to frighten, intimidate, deceive, to avoid the direct answer, etc.* belong to unfriendly speech strategy. For example:

- Ishegim shuryldap barady (to get hungry).
- Tamaktanyp shykpadyn ba? Myna zherde askhana bar, sogan bar, men ketip bara zhatyrmyn. (I have no time for you) or
- Will you come, sonny?
- Yes.
- What time will you come?
- I don't know. (The son avoids the direct answer).

In unfriendly speech strategies the second party of the participants enters the dialogue unwillingly. This unwillingness to enter the dialogue can be seen in the conversation of two communicants [5]. There can be many reasons for it: bad mood, a disease or misunderstanding, etc.

In scientific research classification of the speech strategy is presented according to the genres of speech.

For example, in imperative expressions the strategy of a word can be divided into two groups:

1) *intensional strategy* which, in its turn, classifies the following strategies:

- a) the strategy influencing the emotional will power according which such methods, speech tactics, as a compulsory action method, an emotion proof method are used;
- b) the strategy of expressing emotions, according to which such methods as the method designating a psychological and emotional state and the method expressing desire, necessity are used;
- c) the strategy of the emotional relation (assessment) is the strategy consisting of such methods as the method of the subjective valuation of a situation, the method of subjective forecasting of future actions, the method of the subjective valuation of the addressee's action, the strategy of the sender in definition of his/her role and estimation of himself/herself;

2) *situational or dialogue strategy* which, in its turn, is classified into the following:

- a) the strategy of delivery of imperative type, the strategy consisting of such methods as a way mitigating the order (command), the method of strengthening the order, the method of neutralizations of the order.
- b) the strategy of regulation of intensity of making the order – the strategy using such methods as the method of increasing the rate of the order, the method of reduction of intensity of the order [2].

In Kazakh there are some set language units using the method of compulsory actions and such concepts of the Kazakh language as *honor, conscience, pride* played a certain role in their formation [6].

The Kazakhs have always valued honor and conscience above all. The set expressions in the Kazakh language: *malym zhanymnyn, zhanym arymnyn sadagasy (for the sake of life I sacrifice the cattle, and for the sake of honor I sacrifice life), bala ber, bala bersen, sana ber, sana bermesen, ala ber (send me a sensible child), balasy zhamandy tuiie ustinen it kabar (if you have a bad son, a dog will bite him even if he sits on a camel), etc.* In the Kazakh relations there are such tabus as *mynany isteme, uyat bolady (don't do it, it will be a shame), korgensyzdin isin isteme (don't repeat shameful deeds)*, originating from certain aims and forming the above-stated language expressions [13].

According to the speech strategy and the method of tactics of interlocutors it is possible to define the mutually grouped syntactic units. For example, we will analyze the strategy and tactics of speech according to their use in questions of informal conversation. It turns out that in Kazakh questions are used not only for obtaining the answer (the similar language phenomena were repeatedly considered by researchers of the Kazakh syntax) [9]. For example, the applicant asks a question designating an impulsive question (turtki surak) as "*Ui kurgyr azynap ketti goi, tagy birdeme tauyp zhagasy ba? (B. M.)*" (*It has got cold at home, can you find something for a fire*) in order to bring the listener to such main idea – *ui suyk, otty zhagynkyra (It is cold at home, make a fire)*. But the applicant expresses his idea to the listener indirectly without ordering, but kindly, politely, in the form of a wish. Thus, according to the norms of

communication it is found out that the applicant is young (a young man cannot send older people somewhere for something) and he has the right to order, but however this order is expressed in a polite form or the person informed on the shortage of firewood does not wish to disturb the daughter-in-law once again [16].

If this sentence is pronounced by an elderly person in a direct imperative form the sentence changes its structure: *Ui kurgyr azynap ketti goi, tagy birdeme tauyp zhak* (It has got cold at home, find something else for the fire). This is an imperative sentence. If we compare two situations expressed as a part of an interrogative sentence with an impulsive question, it is possible to define that the applicant in communication used the method of neutralization of the order, command, imperative. In the second case the applicant in communication uses the method of increase in rate of the order, command. The speech strategies of the applicants are identical, the purpose of communicants is to warm the cold house (*azynap turgan uidi zhylyttyru*). If we analyze the syntactic unit chosen by this method the impact of power on the part of the listener is dual: in the first case, it is pleasant in the relation or, the listener can speak about the opportunity to get firewood and to warm the house, or about a difficult situation due to the lack of firewood. Here the relation between two people is at the level of understanding each other. In the second case the listener's opportunity to reply is limited as he will answer and it will lead to offense, dissatisfaction because if he knew about the lack of firewood beforehand, it can make him feel helpless, cause dissatisfaction and his failure to fulfill the order can result in other unpleasant actions, circumstances. In this situational strategy it is possible to use the method of easing off the command, the order, and the above-named sentence structure will be transformed as follows: *Ui kurgyr azynap ketti goi, tagy birdeme tauyp zhakshy*. This sentence implies the imperative sentence expressing a wish, a request. Addition of the affix - **shy** eases the imperative meaning and turns it into a precatory one. The method of reduction of the rate of the command is formed in the language with the help the expression *zhaksy bolar edi* (it would be good). For example, the above-stated offer can be changed under the following structure: *Ui kurgyr azynap ketti goi, tagy birdeme tauyp zhaksan zhaksy bolar edi* (a compound sentence of the reason) // *Ui kurgyr azynap ketti goi, tagy birdeme tauyp zhakpasan* (a compound sentence of condition). These structures are also widely used in advertizing texts [17].

According to the speech strategy and the method of the speech tactics in advertizing texts of the Kazakh language syntactic units are formed under the following structures:

- a) structures with the meaning of order: Do not smoke! There is no way to drugs!
- b) can be found in the structure of a rhetorical question: Who will help but us? (from the advertizing text, appealing to help orphan children).
- c) positive statements based on the facts having direct impact on emotions, positive expressions, reasonable facts, for example, Cigarettes kill!
- d) sentence structure, where the form is negative, but the meaning is positive: We do not train workers! (from an advertisement of Pavlodar Polytechnical College).[18]

If we analyze the use of syntactic structures according to the speech strategy, the reasons can be grounded in such form: *Zhetim korsen, zhebei zhur* (Who will help but us?) (from an advertizing text, appealing to help orphan children) is a rhetorical question substantiated with the use of the method of the national principle (both I, and you can help, let's help) of the national principle [15].

We do not train workers! (from an advertisement of Pavlodar Polytechnical College) – in the structure of the sentence the meaning is positive, the form is negative [14]. They are substantiated with the method of associating urgent social issues (*bizde okyp diplom alsanyz, zhumyska ornalasasyz* (if you gain the diploma with us, you will be able to get a job).

These problems were considered in the research of the founders of the Kazakh linguistics, for example, A. Baytursynov. However, in his works this construction is not called "speech strategy and method of speech tactics", but is classified as "an optative sentence" (tilekti soilem). A. Baytursynov calls them optative sentences (tilekti soilem) and distinguishes 4 types:

- 1) imperative type (*Kelinder, boz balalar, atty alyndar!* Go here, young people, take a horse),
- 2) requesting type (*Dausyndy tym bolmasa, bir shygarshy!* At least once, say it aloud!),
- 3) propaganda (instructive) type (*Balalar, okuga bar, zhatpa karap!* Children, go to study, do not be idle),
- 4) simple optative type (*Zhortkanda zholyn bolsyn, zholdasyn kydyr bolsyn!* Have a safe trip and let angels protect you!) [10].

As a part of an optative sentence specified by A. Baytursynov, the sentence "Have a safe trip!" (*Zhortkanda zholyn bolsyn!*) is not always used in the optative meaning. For example, the question "Where are you going?" is sometimes replaced with the sentence "Have a safe trip!" (*Zhortkanda zholyn bolsyn!*). In that case, the second party of interlocutors perceives it as the question "Where are you going?". [19]

When a question is formed not in its direct meaning but and in a figurative form as an optative sentence, it will also belong to the method of speech tactics.

#### 4. Conclusion

Thus, the illustrated examples show that in the Kazakh language the use of syntactic units is formed according to the speech strategy by means of the interlocutors' speech tactics. In this regard, , exclamatory and imperative sentences are used interchanging each other in concrete communicative situations in accordance with the purpose of the communicant's statement, strategy and tactics of a word, the peculiarities of relationships of the Kazakhs.

## References

1. Ali Zangoei, Esmaeel Nourmohammadi, Ali Derakhshan (2014). 'The Effect of Consciousness-Raising Listening Prompts on the Development of the Speech Act of Apology in an Iranian EFL Context'. *SAGE Open*. 2014;4(2) DOI [10.1177/2158244014531770](https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014531770)
2. Long, M. H. (1983). 'Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input'. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126–141. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.126>  
<https://academic.oup.com/applij/articleabstract/4/2/126/167518?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
3. Milevskaya T. V. (2015) 'Proper Names and Their Functions in the Text Coherency Formation (at the Material of the Novels "The Twelve Chairs" and "The Little Golden Calf" by I. Ilf and E. Petrov)'. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Seriya 2. Azykoznanie*. 2015;29(5):114-119 DOI [10.15688/jvolsu2.2015.5.13](https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2015.5.13)<https://doaj.org/article/000145ec1a0b4cc0a3489e72a5bbad45>
4. Karabaev M.I., Sadirova K.K., Tektigul Zh.O., Zhuminova A.B., Terekova F.E. (2018) 'The Conversion Of Syntactic Units Into Bashkir And Kazakh Words'. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*. Vol. 8, Issue 5, May, 2018, pp. 112-121.
5. Ryabova M. (2015) 'Politeness Strategy in Everyday Communication'. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 206, 90–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.033>
6. Viviane Seyranian (2014). 'Social identity framing communication strategies for mobilizing social change'. *The Leadership Quarterly* Volume 25, Issue 3, June 2014, Pages 468-486 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.013>
7. Parshin O.N. (1996). 'Theoretical revolutions and a methodological mutiny in XX century linguistics' [Linguistics Questions] 1996. pp. 23-29.
8. Uali N.(2011). 'Turmystyk discurstyn formaldy kommunikativtyk erekshelikteri'. "*Diskurs teoriyasynyn ozekti maseleleri*" *khalyqaralyk gylymi konferentsia materialderynyn zhinagy*. Aktobe, 2011. pp. 146-158.
9. Omir R.(2002). 'Zhay soilem sintaksisi'. Almaty.
10. Baytursynov A. (2002). 'Til tagylymy'. Almaty.
11. Goikhman O.J., Nadeina T.M. (2008) "Speech communication": textbook. Moscow.
12. Issers O.S. (1999) Communicative strategies and tactics of Russian speech. Omsk.
13. Klyuev E.V. (2002) Speech communication: Success of speech interaction. Moscow.
14. Makarov M. L. (2003) 'Fundamentals of discourse theory'. Moscow.
15. Skovorodnikov A.P. (2004) 'On the need to distinguish between the concepts of "rhetorical technique", "stylistic figure", "speech tactics", "speech genre" in the practice of terminological lexicography'. Smolensk.
16. Trufanova V.Ya. (2000). A way to social interaction (2000): Intensive. course of speech adaptation. Moscow.
17. Formanovskaya N.I. (2005). 'Culture of communication and speech etiquette'. Moscow.
18. Franco, Johann Pirela Morillo Yamely Almarza, and Nelson Javier Pulido Daza. "Proyección social en Sistemas de Información, Bibliotecología y Archivística. Balance y propuesta." *Opción* 34.86 (2018): 696-730.
19. Abbas, M., & Đorić, D. (2010). Common fixed point theorem for four mappings satisfying generalized weak contractive condition. *Filomat*, 24(2), 1-10.