



THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF DEVELOPING ARGUMENTATIVE-COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

MPHTH 14.01.01

Pak Y.S.¹

¹ Abylay Khan Kazakh University of International Relationship & World Languages. Almaty, Kazakhstan.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF DEVELOPING ARGUMENTATIVE-COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Abstract

The article is considered the concepts of “argument”, “argumentation” and to clarify the types of arguments and argumentation in the field of learning foreign languages. Developing an argumentative-communicative competence in the process of learning a foreign language is fundamental in line with the priority of communicative approach. . Argumentation is conceptualized as a conversation type in which the participants attempt to find a solution to a controversial issue (requirement) by means of a partner/listener-oriented exchange of views (process) that is based on (good) reasons (goal) and made acceptable to all participants (in a cooperative manner) (goal).

Keywords: argumentation, identification, construction, evaluation, validity, soundness, rigour, formal proof, inference rules of formal logic, clear causality.

Introduction

The trends of globalization of the economy process require solving the problems of professional training of graduates of educational institutions of higher and secondary education, their readiness for effective functioning in developing socio-economic conditions and confident behavior in the labor market. Changes occurring in the world in the field of education aims, correlated, in particular,

with the global task of ensuring human entry into the social world, its productive adaptation in this world, necessitate the provision of a more complete, personally and socially integrated result. As a general definition of such an integrated phenomenon as a result of education, the notion of “competence” has become. Scientists discuss the concepts of “competence” and “competency”, offer a variety of key (universal) competencies,

including communicative competence. Formation of professional competence of a specialist is explored by many teachers and psychologists from the standpoint of unity of personality, consciousness and activity, interrelation of the processes of activity and communication (K.A. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, B.G. Ananyev, A.A. Bodalev, V.V. Davydov, L.S. Vygotsky, P.Ya. Halperin, I.A. Zimnyaya, A.A. Leontyev, A.N. Leontyev, S.L. Rubinstein, etc.) [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6].

Methods

Future specialists, by the nature of their professional activities, will have to demonstrate such skills of professional communication as building a reasoned monologue speech and conducting a reasoned discussion in a foreign language, creating foreign texts in accordance with existing international standards, as well as the ability to think critically and analyze information coming from various types of sources. Specialists of new formation should be able to logically and convincingly form their thoughts in oral form. Also, in accordance with the general requirements for education of a specialist, it is assumed to have a culture of thinking and public speaking and participating in discussions on professional issues. These skills, without any doubt, will require a graduate to have knowledge of the fundamentals of the theory of argumentation, that is, a variety of ways to change the position or beliefs of the other side, and the ability to build and conduct adequate verbal argumentation in a foreign language in professional communication.

Results

Currently, there is an insufficient degree of development of foreign language argumentative skills; the inability to

structure the constituent parts of the argument in accordance with the basic laws of logic make all the attempts of graduates to solve certain communication problems arising in the sphere of their professional activities ineffective.

We believe that teaching the argumentative process is particularly important in the field of learning foreign languages. Developing an argumentative-communicative competence in the process of learning a foreign language is fundamental in line with the priority of communicative approach. With a sufficiently high degree of mastering the technique of using the necessary verbal forms, the argumentative-communicative competence increases, ensuring greater freedom in speech interaction in a foreign language.

Authors of theoretical approaches assume that argumentation can be supported successfully when learners are building arguments actively and based on criteria, when they represent typical elements of arguments and argument chains within their memory, and when they use context cues for building arguments. Learning how to argue represents no major issue in traditional teacher education, although there are effective courses available [7].

Discussion

It is important to analyze the concepts of “argument”, “argumentation” and to clarify the types of arguments and argumentation. An argument is a set of statements that attempts to demonstrate the truth of something by providing reasons in support of its main claim. However, the set of statements involves a particular sequence in which the statements are arranged. The statements are linked, one to another, in a specific

way so that the final statement can be seen to rest clearly on those that went before it. In an argument, each statement leads to or implies the final statement. Argument can be either a process or a product. Argument is examined as a product, a line of reasoning that justifies a claim. Argument is examined as a social process that people engage in when they debate opposing claims. The two kinds of argument are not unrelated, however. Arguments as products contain implicit two-sided process arguments that weigh support for and against a claim, compared to support for and against alternatives to the claim [8].

An «argument» is something that can be stated as proof or as confirmation of a statement [9]. There are some criteria for a good argument:

- validity;
- soundness;
- rigour;
- formal proof;
- based on inference rules of formal logic;
- clear causality.

«Argumentation» represents a process in which arguments are developed and stated through the usage of language. The concept of argumentation is the process of developing or presenting an argument. Argumentation is the study of how humans can, do, and should reach conclusions through logical reasoning, that is, claims based on premises.

The construct of argumentational integrity (fairness) specifies criteria for an ethical evaluation of contributions to argumentational discussions that have been theoretically explicated and empirically validated in the form of conditions, characteristics, and standards of (un)fair argumentation [10], [11].

The explication of the construct

of argumentational integrity is based on a (primarily) prescriptive use of argumentation. Argumentation is conceptualized as a conversation type in which the participants attempt to find a solution to a controversial issue (requirement) by means of a partner/ listener-oriented exchange of views (process) that is based on (good) reasons (goal) and made acceptable to all participants (in a cooperative manner) (goal).

To potentially reach the two (prescriptive) characteristics of rationality and cooperation, which are contained within the specifications of the two goal dimensions, we suggest that contributions to argumentative discussions must meet the following four conditions:

- formal validity,
- sincerity/ truth,
- justice on the content level, and
- procedural justice.

The adherence to these conditions was defined as fair argumentation, their conscious violation as unfair argumentation.

According to LeBlanc [12] and Walton [13] for successful argumentation, the following elements are necessary:

a) to identify arguments and their elements, i.e., simple and complex statements (negation, conjunction, disjunctions, and conditions), their relationships (equality, contradiction, and independence) and their positions within arguments (premises and conclusions);

b) to construct arguments and their elements, i.e., to produce complete chains of arguments, especially to build main conclusions and to add missing (or implicit) premises or conclusions; and

c) to evaluate arguments and their elements, i.e., to proof the relevance, validity, reliability, truth, etc. of an

argument; to identify criteria for evaluation in respect to their relevance for application; and to find and prevent from formal and informal errors in argumentation (invalid arguments, vicious circles, etc.).

There are four characteristics of unfair argumentation that specify what classes of speech acts constitute violations of the integrity criterion [14]:

- faulty arguments,
- insincere contributions,
- unjust arguments, and
- unjust interactions.

The definition of unfair argumentation as the conscious violation of the argumentational conditions implies that an unfairness evaluation necessarily presupposes the presence of the two components:

- argumentational rule violation and
- subjective awareness.

Valence of argumentational rule violations includes distortion of meaning, hindrance of participation, discrediting of others, etc.) and subjective facts (degrees of subjective awareness in committing a rule violation). Consequently, not every combination of objective and subjective facts leads to an evaluation as unfair. The negligent use of a faulty argument might not be considered as unfair whereas the intentional use of such an argument might well be so.

The valence (severity) of an argumentational rule violation and the degree of subjective awareness in committing such a violation were designated as basic components of the unfairness evaluation, which is conceptualized as a verdict in the sense that the respective speaker is regarded as being guilty of having violated the argumentational rules. It was demonstrated that the probability of an unfairness verdict increases with the

severity of a rule violation and the degree of subjective awareness [15].

Linear Argumentation:

- Fact – opinion – sentiment
- Fact – opinion – sentiment – invitation – resonance – sequence

Complex (dialectical) Argumentation

- Analogy – contrast – contiguity

Rebutting of the Argument

The speaker criticizes the opponent's reasoning, type of argumentation, thesis, arguments or conclusion.

In this article it is important to know the theoretical basis for developing argumentative-communicative competence; to define the essence of such concepts as "argument", "argumentation"; to reveal the phenomenon of argumentation in linguistic studies. The competencies of argumentation are an important because these competencies are necessary both to understand and participate in discourse. The concept of argumentation shows many connections to basic research in the field of cognitive psychology, philosophy, and linguistics, especially to research programmes of «inductive and deductive logical reasoning», «causal reasoning», «abductive reasoning», «Bayes reasoning», «adaptive thinking», or «intuitive deciding» [16].

Conclusion

In conclusion intercultural competence, as the aim and the result of foreign language education, is an integrated unity, including as its components argumentative-communicative subcompetence that should be owned by specialists of the new formation in the process of professional interaction with representatives of another linguocultural society. It is still possible to state, however, that the majority of our students lack argumentation skills. For this reason,

a great number of them experience frustration whilst defending their opinion in public. We need to teach students to learn how to perform argumentative reasoning, how to conduct interviews, how to debate, to participate in a dispute, how to negotiate, etc. Thus argumentative-

communicative competence has a direct influence on the successful human career path, enables him/her to work effectively, communicate reasonably, and to lead an intellectually active life.

Reference

- 1 Vyigotskiy, JI.C. Sobranie sochineniy: v 6 t. / Pod red. L.S. Vyigotskiy. – M.: Pedagogika, 1983. – T. 3. – 368 s.
- 2 Galperin I. R. Tekst kak ob'ekt lingvisticheskogo issledovaniya / Pod red. I. R. Galperin. – M.: Nauka, 1981. – 138 s.
- 3 Zimnyaya I. A. Klyuchevyye kompetentsii – novaya paradigma rezultata obrazovaniya // Vyisshie obrazovanie segodnya. – 2003. – # 5. – S. 34-42.
- 4 Leontev A. N. Problemy razvitiya psihiki / Pod red. A. N. Leontev. – M., 1959. – 345 s.
- 5 Leontev A. A. Yazyk i rechevaya deyatelnost v obschey i pedagogicheskoy psihologii: Izbrannyye psihologicheskie trudy / A. A. Leontev. – M.: Mosk. psihologo-sotsialnyy institut; Voronezh: NPO MODEK, 2001. – 448 s.
- 6 Rubinshteyn S. L. Osnovy obschey psihologii. – M.: Pedagogika, 1989. – 328 s.
- 7 Astleitner H. Conditions of learning how to argue, Salzburger Beiträge zur Erziehungswissenschaft – 2003. – № 1. – P. 15-25.
- 8 Kuhn D. The skills of argument. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. – 324 p.
- 9 Leitao S. Analyzing changes in view during argumentation: A quest for method // <http://www.qualitativresearch.Net> (date of access: 16.03.2017).
- 10 Groeben N., Schreier M., Christmann U. Fairness in argumentation: Argumentational integrity as a value concept within an ethics of argumentation // Linguistische Berichte. – 1993. – № 147. – P. 355-382.
- 11 Schreier M., Groeben N., Christmann U. That's not fair! Argumentational integrity as an ethics of argumentative communication // Argumentation. – 1995. – № 9. – P. 267-289.
- 12 LeBlanc J. Thinking clearly: A guide to critical reasoning. – New York: Norton, 1998. – 328 p.
- 13 Walton D. N. Informal logic: A handbook for critical argumentation. – Cambridge: University Press, 1989. – 302 p.
- 14 Schreier M., Groeben N. Argumentationsintegrität (III): Rhetorische Strategien und Integritätsstandards [Argumentational integrity (III). Rhetorical strategies and the standards of fair argumentation] // Sonderforschungsbereich 245. – Heidelberg: Psychologisches Institut der Universität, 1990. – Report № 30.
- 15 Groeben N., Nüse R., Gauler E. Diagnose argumentativer Unintegrität. Objektive und subjektive Tatbestandsmerkmale bei Werturteilen über argumentative Sprechhandlungen [The diagnosis of unfairness in argumentation: Objective and subjective facts in evaluating contributions] // Zeitschrift für experimentelle und angewandte Psychologie. – 1992. - № 39. – P. 533-558.
- 16 Gigerenzer G. Adaptive thinking: Rationality in the real world. – Oxford: University Press, 2001. – 360 p.

Пак Ю.С.

*Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері
Университеті. Алматы, Қазақстан*

ЗАМАНАУИ ШЕТ ТІЛДЕРІН ОҚЫТУДАҒЫ АРГУМЕНТТІ-КОММУНИКАТИВТІК ҚҰЗЫРЕТТІЛІКТЕРДІ ДАМУДЫҢ ТЕОРИЯЛЫҚ НЕГІЗДЕРІ

Аңдатпа

Мақалада «аргумент», «дәлел» түсініктері талқыланып, шет тілдерін үйрену саласындағы дәлелдер мен дәлелдердің түрлері түсіндіріледі. Шет тілін оқыту үдерісінде аргументативті және коммуникативті құзыреттілікті дамыту коммуникативтік тәсілдің басымдылығына негізделеді. Аргумент (жақсы) себептерге (мақсатқа) негізделген және барлық қатысушылар үшін қолайлы болатын пікір алмасуға бағытталған (тыңдаушыларға) серіктес / тыңдаушы арқылы таласатын мәселені (талапты) шешуге тырысатын (бірлесу түрі ретінде тұжырымдалады) (мақсат).

Трек сөздер: дәлелдеу, сәйкестендіру, құрастыру, бағалау, формализация, сенімділік, қатаңдық, формалды логиканың шығару тәсілдері, нақты себептер.

Пак Ю.С.

*Казахский Университет Международных Отношений и Международных Языков
имени Абылай хана. Алматы, Казахстан*

ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ РАЗВИТИЯ АРГУМЕНТИРОВАННО-КОММУНИКАТИВНЫХ КОМПЕТЕНЦИИ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ ИНОСТРАННЫХ ЯЗЫКОВ

Аннотация

В статье рассматриваются понятия «аргумент», «аргументация» и уточняются виды аргументов и аргументации в области изучения иностранных языков. Развитие аргументативно-коммуникативной компетенции в процессе изучения иностранного языка является основополагающим в соответствии с приоритетом коммуникативного подхода. Аргументация осмысливается как тип разговора, в котором участники пытаются найти решение спорного вопроса (требование) с помощью партнера / слушателя, ориентированных на обмен мнениями (процесс), который основан на (хороших) причинах (цель) и сделано приемлемым для всех участников (в кооперативном порядке) (цель).

Ключевые слова: аргументация, идентификация, конструирование, оценка, достоверность, обоснованность, строгость, формальное доказательство, правила вывода формальной логики, ясная причинность.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Пак Юлия Сергеевна - Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері Университетінің оқытушысы-білім ғылымының магистрі. Алматы, Қазақстан.

e-mail: sunshine379@inbox.ru

Сведения об авторах:

Пак Юлия Сергеевна - Магистр педагогических наук, преподаватель Казахского Университета Международных Отношений и Международных Языков имени Абылай хана. Алматы, Казахстан.

e-mail: sunshine379@inbox.ru

Aauthor's date:

Pak Y.S. - master of pedagogical Sciences, Ablay Khan Kazakh University of International Relationship & World Languages. Almaty, Kazakhstan.

e-mail: sunshine379@inbox.ru