

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2021.26.2.7>**АСПЕКТЫ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ ЛИЧНОСТИ ПЕДАГОГА: СТАТИКА И ДИНАМИКА**

Научная статья

Сергеева О.В.¹, Семенова С.Н.²*¹ ORCID: 0000-0002-9950-000X;² ORCID: 0000-0003-3172-9198;^{1,2} Кубанский государственный университет, Краснодар, Россия

* Корреспондирующий автор (sofiya.semenova75[at]yandex.ru)

Аннотация

Цель исследования – выявление статики и динамики как соотносительных характеристик, определенной языковой личности педагога в аспекте ее речевых репрезентаций. Решены взаимосвязанные задачи исследования: 1) определены статические свойства, характеризующие языковую личность педагога; 2) выявлены корреляции между статикой и динамикой в представлении языковой личности педагога. Научная новизна работы заключается в выделении соответствия между статикой и динамикой в речевых репрезентациях языковой личности на примере языковой личности педагога. В результате представленные теоретические выводы заключаются в определенном вкладе в лингвоперсонологию, в уточнении наполнения терминов «статика» и «динамика» в аспекте теории языка.

Ключевые слова: общение, языковая личность, статика, динамика, дискурсивный анализ.

ASPECTS OF TEACHER'S LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY: STATICS AND DYNAMICS

Research article

Sergeeva O.V.¹, Semenova S.N.²*¹ ORCID: 0000-0002-9950-000X;² ORCID: 0000-0003-3172-9198;^{1,2} Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russia

* Corresponding author (sofiya.semenova75[at]yandex.ru)

Abstract

The aim of the study is to identify statics and dynamics as correlative characteristics of a certain linguistic personality of a teacher in the aspect of speech representations. The interrelated tasks were identified in the work: 1) the determination of static properties characterizing the linguistic personality of a teacher; 2) the identification of correlations between statics and dynamics in the representation of the linguistic personality of a teacher. The scientific novelty of the work is to highlight the correlation between statics and dynamics in the speech representations of the linguistic personality on the example of the linguistic personality of a teacher. As a result, the theoretical significance of the obtained data is in a certain contribution to linguistic personology, in clarifying the content of the terms “statics” and “dynamics” in language theory aspect.

Keywords: communication, linguistic personality, statics, dynamics, discourse analysis.

Introduction

At the beginning of the 2010s, a general humanitarian trend is active in language theory. For a linguistic personality, it is essential to understand the connection between language-speech activity and society [1, P. 161], [4], [10], [11]. So, the concept is understood as “an operational unit of information in the mental lexicon, in long-term memory, with the help and on the basis of these units, people organize and store knowledge about the world and human” [3, P. 210], [5], [6].

Thus, the relevance of the chosen problems lies in the interaction of two main epistemological features in the field of language theory. They are connected implicitly and deeply. The first feature is the general significance of the linguistic personality as an object of philological science [9]. Accordingly, the second actualizing epistemological feature is the specificity of the explanatory potential of the “statics-dynamics” correlation.

The authors introduced the conceptual model of the linguistic personality as a starting point of describing the linguistic personality of the teacher and covered some constituents formed in the process of interaction Teacher-Student. Some of the LPT standardized verbal reactions, typical for T-S communication, are meant and under statics.

The descriptive method based on observation and the method of contextual analysis were used in the work.

The results of the present work can be used on linguistic lessons in the process of specialists' preparation and in the further studies of linguistic personality not only of the teacher but other professions.

The characteristic of statics / dynamics

In this regard, we will give the correlation of the considered aspects as conditions of statics / dynamics of the teacher's linguistic personality, which is characterized by such a combination of features: the language personality is represented in the status differentiation, namely teacher-pupil.

We can emphasize that tolerance, defined ethically, is internally related to the linguistic essence of the teacher's linguistic personality, with the features of professional communication. The role of dynamics is determined by the very tolerance diversity.

Linguistic personality of the teacher (hereinafter LPT) communication combines the recognition of the game element and a serious focus on “educational success” – to increase a pupil's (student's) motivation and, as a result, to improve training. This is served by a complex pragmeme, in which the positive interacts with the semantic element of insufficiency, which conveys

the connection of statics with the dynamics of the LPT: “to influence his self-esteem... by saying that today he is much better... if not...”.

The dynamics nature of the LPT thinking in such connection is conveyed by the expressive use of the language medium in a sphere that is extremely static, stable – in the sphere of writing and spelling rules. Graphon is a dynamic expressive means of spelling. It is highly compatible with statics as the basis of its consistency.

The main feature in this segment of the studied material is a systematic, versatile, amplified reflection. It can take on an ironic character, and then the LPT is travestied. Both the statics and the dynamics of the LPT are therefore presented strongly, pointedly. We will illustrate this position with fragments taken from original classical prose and drama by A. P. Chekhov, and then from the novel of contemporary American novelist S. Sheldon.

A. P. Chekhov’s context is:

«Дорогая сестра, позволь мне поздравить тебя с днем твоего ангела и пожелать искренно, от души, здоровья и всего того, что можно пожелать девушке твоих лет. И позволь поднести тебе в подарок вот эту книжку. (Подает книжку.) История нашей гимназии за пятьдесят лет, написанная мною. Пустынная книжка, написанная от нечего делать, но ты все-таки прочти. Здравствуйте, господа! (Вершинину.) Кулыгин, учитель здешней гимназии. Надворный советник. (Ирине.) В этой книжке ты найдешь список всех кончивших курс в нашей гимназии за эти пятьдесят лет.» [2].

At the same time, the description (“*You still read ... Hello ... Kulygin, court adviser*”) (which combines an incentive to one person, Irina, and a greeting with self-characterization, addressed to another person, Vershinin) expresses a systemic connection between statics and dynamics.

The ability to combine the statics and dynamics of the LPT is not limited to the presented combinations. The following situation from S. Sheldon’s novel “Windmills of the Gods” is close to the above given example, partly even verbatim:

«Студенты сидели полукругом лицом к Мэри. Очередь на запись к ней в группу была гораздо длиннее, чем к другим преподавателям. Она была замечательным специалистом, обладала чувством юмора и обаянием, поэтому находиться рядом с ней было удовольствием» [12, P. 33].

In the presentation of the LPT, as in A. P. Chekhov’s context, which is more than a century away from this one, a sense of humor and a versatile emotional positive side is significant. However, in this context, in contrast to the previous one, Chekhov’s self-perception of the LPT is difficult to interact with the specific situation of the lesson, with the reaction of a certain student.

The considered aspects of correlations between statics and dynamics make it possible to see linguistic-pragmatic determinants (educational-influencing and self-identification) as a static characteristic of the LPT, and then a tolerance as a dynamic feature of the teacher’s linguistic personality.

If statics is revealed primarily by the two above-mentioned linguistic-pragmatic determinants, then the dynamics of the LPT is organically correlated with the tolerance. The tolerance is a specifically dynamic characteristic that is manifested through non-verbal means. It is a multisided phenomenon and can contain an educational component. The tolerance turns out to be an ethical and behavioral space that brings together the ideals of the teacher and the student. It means that tolerance has some parameters, which make it closer to statics than dynamics. The weak development of this category actualizes the need for pedagogical research in this direction. Such component of communicative competence as speech communication is distinguished. The ability to speak is an essential condition not only for successful professional activity, but also for activity as a communication carried out in a democratically organized society. So, a personality is characterized by sociability, emotional attractiveness, a friendly attitude to people, the ability to find constructive mechanisms for resolving interpersonal contradictions and conflicts, knowledge of the ethics of communication, etc. and is closely related to the LPT. The teacher’s skill in the formation of speech communication, obviously, is the prerogative not only of specialized school lessons (for example, English), but also of any subject lessons. To teach how to speak correctly, freely and adequately express one’s thoughts is an equally important task for a linguist, as well as for a physicist, biologist, chemist, mathematician, etc. A theoretical development of this concept is necessary to make a program for the formation of communicative competence that is relevant for the LPT. In this sense, the modern researchers’ attention could be drawn to the concept of the “communicative core” of an individual. The structure of this concept includes, firstly, knowledge of the psychology of communication, personality, culture, society, etc.; secondly, the definition of experiences manifested in contact with other people in specific ethnic, social or religious communities; thirdly, the concept of all types of verbal and non-verbal processes.

Important features of successful lesson communication

So, what happens in a class? What form of communication is carried out here, and with the help of what categories can it be expressed? For example, on a math lesson, the speech, of course, is within the framework and in the language of the discipline. However, if we teach just objective knowledge, then mathematical discourse does not become necessary. It is important when not so much total knowledge is transmitted, but the ways of working with it, when the subject of training is: the work process, the link to knowledge or the forms and methods of receiving knowledge.

The ability to create a common communication field and discourse, to create them of a certain character depends on the skill of the LPT. Whether the teacher will ask authoritatively or use the tolerance potential in bringing the student to knowledge in such a way that he would freely and as if independently approach knowledge himself / herself. In any case, the student is the recipient. But it is one fact when the recipient is given an encyclopedic packed subject knowledge (mathematical, biological, historical, etc.), and the other, when he / she joins the discourse, acts freely on the communication field. The concept of the communication field assumes that the student can freely communicate on a given subject [7], [8, P. 59].

The main sources of the teacher’s acquisition of communicative competence are: the sociological normative experience of culture; his / her own life experience; knowledge of the communication language used by folk culture; experience of

interpersonal communication. The use of verbal, nonverbal and paralinguistic signals allow the LPT organizing the communication on two levels: direct and meta-level.

Consequently, the effectiveness of the communication process depends on how developed strategic, tactical and technical components of the teacher's communicative competence work.

Considering the communicative competence of the teacher as a necessary condition for his effective professional activity, the most significant features include the following: 1) sociability, 2) personality brightness, 3) emotional attractiveness, 4) communication skills, 5) need for communication, 6) love for people, 7) understanding, 8) constructive resolution of interpersonal contradictions, 9) communication ethics, 10) awareness. The whole system of given attributes and each one separately is relevant for the LPT.

Communicative culture is considered as the art of social interaction, mediated by pedagogical activity and the characteristics of the teacher's personality, including not only speech skills, ethics, but also the content side of communication. Being an important quality of the teacher's personality, the communicative culture is developed by him / her in a special way with special efforts. It is the communicative culture that determines the communicative potential of the teacher.

The teacher's personality is manifested on the lesson in all types of activities: mental, motor, and speech. In order that the teacher can understand the inner position of the pupil (student), he / she must have a set of psychological qualities, the most important of which is emotional attractiveness.

Since speech activity involves active thinking, it is necessary to activate the thinking process and speech activity of pupils (students) in the process of teaching. This is possible if he addresses real or close-to-reality communication situations. It is necessary to include the language units being studied, the corresponding speech patterns, which could then be included in the system of speech actions. Thus, by creating situations in which the norms of the use of language tools are reproduced, the teacher gets an opportunity to motivate the speech activity of pupils (students).

The system, connected with the manifestations, includes tolerant communication, which is the dynamics of the LPT, requires close attention to a special conceptualization, for example:

“Understand, I'm worried about you. Please be in my position and advise me what to do with such a student?”

The teacher himself takes the place of the student, and he convincingly, naturally puts him in the place of the teacher. This is a significant, versatile, and well-known way of the LPT empathy. However, here he manifests himself, obviously, at a higher level and in specific connections. The empathy is shown reversibly and due to this, the tolerance is important in the LPT.

Such statements confirm the generalization presented in the LPT communication:

“Teachers and students are primarily employees”.

Such contacts create conditions for meaningful solutions to specific, everyday pedagogical tasks, for example:

“Let's calm down. Sit down, let's talk. After all, you are not alone in the class”.

Analysis of results

The communicative abilities of the teacher in the set of pedagogical tools also contribute to the process of pupils' (students') communicative competence forming. The teacher is an integral system of his / her communicative properties and qualities, such as non-standard, flexible thinking, a culture of speech action (literacy of phrase construction, simplicity and accuracy of presentation of thoughts, figurative expressiveness, exact argumentation, adequacy of the communicative situation, tone, dynamics of the voice, intonation, good diction); a culture of self-adjustment to communication and psychologically-emotional regulation of his state; the culture of gestures and movement plasticity (self-management by psychophysical tension and relaxation, active self-activation, etc.); the culture of perception of students' communicative actions; the culture of emotions (as an expression of emotional and non-evaluative judgments in the communication, etc.). The above-mentioned features and the theoretical comments are interrelated.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we would like to note that the politeness that the teacher shows is that he / she takes into account the results of the impact of his speech behavior on the student. He / she constantly monitors and corrects his / her speech behavior in order to optimize communication, success.

In the future, we will continue further research and development of certain aspects of linguistic personology that will be of interest and importance for the theory and practice of discourse analysis.

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Список литературы / References

1. Багиров Х. З. К вопросу о понятиях «родной язык» и «неродной язык» / Х. З. Багиров, З. У. Блягоз // Вестник Адыгейского государственного университета. Серия «Филология и искусствоведение». – 2012. – Вып. 2. – С.161-165.
2. Чехов А. П. Три сестры / А. П. Чехов [Электронный ресурс]. – URL: <https://ilibrary.ru/text/973/p.1/index.html> (дата обращения 19.04.2021).
3. Ерохина Е. Л. Формирование новых мотивов в структуре языковой личности учителя-словесника / Е. Л. Ерохина // Лингвориторическая парадигма: теоретические и прикладные аспекты. – Сочи: СГУ. – 2013. – С. 210–214.
4. Карасик В. И. Языковой круг: личность, концепт, дискурс / В. И. Карасик. – Волгоград: Перемена. – 2002. – 477 с.
5. Караулов Ю. Н. Русский язык и языковая личность / Ю. Н. Караулов. – М.: Наука. – 1987. – 261 с.

6. Караулов Ю. Н. Лингвокультурное сознание русской языковой личности. Моделирование состояния и функционирования / Ю. Н. Караулов, Ю. Н. Филиппович. – М.: Азбуковник. – 2009. – 334 с.
7. Красилова И. Е. Активизация пассивного словарного запаса на уроках английского языка в старших классах / И. Е. Красилова, Т. М. Назаренко // *Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики*. – Тамбов: Грамота. – 2018. – № 6-1(84). – С. 198-202. – doi: 10.30853/filnauki.2018-6-1.44.
8. Подгурецкий Ю. Коммуникативно-деятельностная теория образования. / Ю. Подгурецкий. – М.; Познань: АПСН. – 2012. – 448 с.
9. Семенова С. Н. Когнитивно-прагматическая интерпретация языковой личности (на примере рыночно-экономической терминологии) / С. Н. Семенова, Л. Г. Аксютенкова // *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика*. – 2020. – Т. 11. – №4. – С. 760–774. –doi: 10.22363/2313-2299-2020-11-4-760-774.
10. Сергеева О. В. Языковая личность педагога в статике и динамике / О. В. Сергеева // *Вестник Адыгейского государственного университета. Серия 2: Филология и искусствоведение*. – 2013. – № 1(114). – С. 157–160.
11. Сергеева О. В. Языковая личность педагога: статика и динамика / О. В. Сергеева: Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Краснодар. – 2013. – 187 с.
12. Шелдон С. Мельницы богов / С. Шелдон / Пер. И. С. Коноплевой, С. Л. Коноплева. – М.: АСТ; Астрель. – 2012. – 396 с.

Список литературы на английском / References in English

1. Bagirokov Kh. Z. K voprosy o ponyatiyakh “rodnoy yazyk” i “nerodnoy yazyk” [To the question of concepts “native language” “non-native language”] / Kh. Z. Bagirokov, Z. U. Blyagoz // *Vestnik Adygeiskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Seriya “Filologiya i iskusstvovedenie”* [Bulletin of the Adyge State University. Series: “Philology and Art History”]. – 2012. – Issue. 2. – P. 161–165. [in Russian]
2. Chekhov A. P. Tri sestry. [Three sisters] [Electronic resource]. – URL: <https://ilibrary.ru/text/973/p.1/index.html> (accessed 19.04.2021). [in Russian]
3. Erokhina E. L. Formirovanie novykh motivov v strukture yazykovoy lichnosti uchitelya-slovnica [Formation of new motives in the structure of the language personality of a teacher-wordsmith] / E. L. Erokhina // *Lingvoritoricheskaya paradigma: teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty* [Linguo-rhetorical paradigm: theoretical and applied aspects]. – Sochi: SSU. – 2013. – P. 210–214. [in Russian]
4. Karasik V. I. Yazykovoy krug: lichnost', contsept, diskurs [Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse] / V. I. Karasik. – Volgograd: Peremena. – 2002. – 477 p.
5. Karaulov Yu. N. Russkiy yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost' [Russian language and language personality] / Yu. N. Karaulov. – М.: Nauka. – 1987. – 261 p.
6. Karaulov Yu. N. Lingvokul'turnoe soznanie russkoy yazykovoy lichnosti. Modelirovanie sostoyaniya i funktsionirovaniya [Linguo-cultural consciousness of Russian language personality. Modeling of the state and functioning] / Yu. N. Karaulov, Yu. N. Filippovich. – М.: Azbukovnik. – 2009. – 334 p.
7. Krasilova I. E. Aktivizatsiya passivnogo slovarnogo zapasa na urokakh angliyskogo yazyka v starshikh klassakh [The activation of passive vocabulary in English language classes at senior school] / I. E. Krasilova, T. M. Nazarenko // *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki* [Philological Sciences. Issues of Theory and Practice]. – Тамбов: Грамота. – 2018. – № 6-1 (84). – P. 198–202. [in Russian]
8. Podguretsky Yu. Kommunikativno-deyatelnostnaya teoriya obrazovaniya [Communicate and activity theory of education] / Yu. Podguretsky. – М.; Poznań: APSN. – 2012. – 448 p. [in Russian]
9. Semenova S. N. Kognitivno-pragmaticheskaya interpretatsiya yazykovoy lichnosti (na primere rynochno-ekonomicheskoy terminologii) [Cognitive-pragmatic interpretation of linguistic personality (on the example of market-economic terminology)] / S. N. Semenova, L. G. Aksyutenkova L. G. // *Vestnik Rossiyskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Teoriya yazyka. Semiotika. Semantika* [RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics]. – 2020. – Vol. 11. – №4. – P. 760–774. – doi: 10.22363/2313-2299-2020-11-4-760-774.
10. Sergeeva O. V. Yazykovaya lichnost' pedagoga v statike i dinamike [Linguistic personality of a teacher in statics and dynamics] / O. V. Sergeeva // *Vestnik Adygeiskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Seriya “Filologiya i iskusstvovedenie”* [Bulletin of the Adyge State University. Series 2: Philology and Art History]. – 2013. – №1(114). – P. 157–160. [in Russian]
11. Sergeeva O. V. Yazykovaya lichnost' pedagoga: statika i dinamika [Linguistic personality of the teacher: statics and dynamics] / O. V. Sergeeva: Dis. ... kand. nauk [Dis. ... candidate of Philology]. – Краснодар. – 2013. – 187 p. [in Russian]
12. Sheldon S. Mel'nitsy bogov [Windmills of the Gods] / S. Sheldon / Tr. I. S. Konopleva, S. L. Konoplev. – М.: AST; Astrel. – 2012. – 396 p. [in Russian]