

References:

1. Сахарчук Л. И. Методологические проблемы словообразовательного анализа: семантика производного глагола в немецком языке. К. : Вища школа, 1987. 131 с.
2. Степанова М. Д. Словообразование современного немецкого языка [2-е изд., испр.] / под ред. Т. В. Строевой. М. : КомКнига, 2007. 376 с.
3. Ernst P. Germanistische Sprachwissenschaft. Wien : UTB, 2004. 302 S.
4. Langenscheidt 100 Prozent Jugendsprache. München: Langenscheidt, 2020.
5. PONS Wörterbuch der Jugendsprache 2017. Stuttgart : PONS, 2016. 144 S.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-227-2-52>

**INTERNAL VARIATION OF SPEECH LOUDNESS
IN INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSE**

**ВНУТРІШНЯ ВАРІАТИВНІСТЬ ГУЧНОСТІ МОВЛЕННЯ
В ІНСТИТУЦІЙНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ**

Polieieva Yu. S.

*Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor, Associate Professor
at the Department of Foreign Languages,
Taras Shevchenko National University
of Kyiv*

Полєєва Ю. С.

*кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент,
доцент кафедри іноземних мов
Київський національний університет
імені Тараса Шевченка*

Vasik Yu. A.

*Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor, Associate Professor
at the Department of Foreign Languages,
Taras Shevchenko National University
of Kyiv
Kyiv, Ukraine*

Васік Ю. А.

*кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент,
доцент кафедри іноземних мов
Київський національний університет
імені Тараса Шевченка
м. Київ, Україна*

Institutional discourse is a specialized standardised type of communication between people who may not know each other, but must communicate in accordance with the norms of society. Institutional

discourse is distinguished on the basis of two system-forming features: goals and participants in communication. It is clear that the types of institutional discourse have a field structure and intersect, at the same time we can identify the characteristics inherent in each of them at different levels of language. The *goal* of the paper is to consider the internal variation of loudness of pedagogical and political types of English-language institutional discourse at the perceptual level. The choice of pedagogical and political discourses as the *object* of the research is not accidental; both discourses belong to the same type, purposeful and audience-oriented. The purpose of political discourse is the conquest and retention of power; that of pedagogical discourse is the socialization of a new member of society, etc. Participants in institutional discourse are very different in their qualities and patterns of behaviour.

Variability of prosodic characteristics of speech is manifested in the presence of certain markers of perception and interpretation of the voice signal, present in each suprasegmental parameter: tempo, volume, melody. In this study, prosody is interpreted as a complex unity of tonal, temporal, dynamic, timbre parameters, which at the perceptual level correspond to the melody of speech, rhythm, tempo, pause and loudness. These suprasegmental properties of language have a mechanism of communication with each other and are superimposed on linear units of speech.

The effectiveness of language perception depends on its loudness. E. Sheigal notes: “Any movement (and the flow of speech, in our opinion, is nothing more than a linear movement of sounds) passes at one speed or another, the movement is simply unthinkable without this parameter, just as light is always has a certain degree of brightness, and the sound (material side of the sign) – loudness” [4, p. 41].

It is also worth mentioning that loudness correlates with the property of emotions to make changes in the range of intensity of speech segments, which also necessitates the need to determine the characteristics of loudness within our study.

The experimental phonetic methods available today are extremely diverse – from spectrographic and cinematoradiographic to auditory. One of the most important issues related to experimental phonetic research for the experimenter is the choice of the appropriate research method.

Speech loudness is a subjective concept and is based on perception. Accordingly, the choice of auditory or perceptual method of analysis in this study is quite reasonable.

The auditory analysis was performed using a specially designed questionnaire, which contained tasks on the given gradual scales,

substantiated by A. Kalyta [2, p. 97-98]. The following scales of perceptual loudness gradations were used to describe the parameters: *low, decreased, moderate, high, increased*. Perceptual signs are understood as signs that are distinguished by the percipient on the basis of the speech signal perception. As percipients, we engaged a group of phonetic auditors ($n = 5$), who are fluent in English, have deep knowledge in the field of phonetics and phonology of this language, but are not native speakers. The selection of percipients was carried out in accordance with the methodological requirements and was determined by the studied language and the objectives of the experiment. We motivate the involvement of an odd number of auditors by more correct further statistical analysis.

The analysis of the variability of loudness in the experimental speech samples of pedagogical discourse, according to auditors, is as follows: *high* – 24.1%, *increased* – 72.6%, *moderate* – 3.3%; that of political discourse: *high* – 52.8%, *increased* – 44.7%, *moderate* – 2.2%.

As can be seen from the analysis, increased loudness, even with a tendency to high is a relevant characteristic of pedagogical speech. According to the auditors, raising the loudness draws the listener's attention to the message, creates a sense of the importance of information and the lecturer's interest in it. Increasing the loudness also adds dynamism and energy to the discourse, which activates and maintains the attention of information recipients.

It is known that specific sets of prosodic means of realization of a discourse can be expressed by restrictions or even a ban on the use of some of them. One such component for pedagogical discourse is loudness, where there is a ban on shouting as well as whispering. This fact has been confirmed in our work.

It is obvious that loudness in political discourse is a conscious and intentional means of influence, which helps to successfully achieve its goal, i.e. to defend their opinion as the only true one; attract a listener to their side; 'enhance' their image. Paraphrasing L. Postnikova, prosody and loudness, in particular in political discourse, can be considered as a sensitive and subtle indicator of ways of influence that correspond to a given communicative situation and the existing linguistic personality engage in communication [3, p. 115].

In political discourse, the increased assessment of loudness is almost twice lower than the one obtained in the pedagogical discourse, i.e. 72.6% and 44.7%, respectively. At the same time, high loudness prevails (52.8%), as opposed to that in pedagogical discourse (24.1%). Increased loudness is known [1, p. 62] to indicate categoriality, persistence and even obsession,

which is determined by the specific component of the prosodic design of political speech. Changes in loudness in the direction of increase convey the determination and firmness of intentions. However, a constant level of loudness symbolizes strength, and its alternation helps to strengthen certain areas of the message and reduce others by varying degrees of emotionality.

Attention should also be paid to the existence of political speeches, where a moderate level of loudness prevails, which corresponds to the content and nature of the message. If the speech is sad, it affects the intonation parameters, in particular, moderate loudness and slow tempo. This modification of tempo and volume, in our opinion, helps to create an appropriate atmosphere of sadness and grief. The share of moderate volume is insignificant and does not constitute statistically significant differences in both types of studied discourses (2.2% political and 3.3% pedagogical, respectively).

Thus, a comparative analysis of the perceptual characteristics of the internal variation of loudness in institutional discourse proved that the political type of this discourse is characterized by a higher degree of loudness at the perceptual level than pedagogical discourse, where there are certain restrictions, sometimes a ban on shouting and whispering. At the same time, moderate loudness is represented equally in both types of discourse and is their invariant characteristic.

It has been found that statistically significant differences have high and increased loudness, which means that for institutional discourse there is variability within its types and we cannot speak about the universality of prosodic features in particular.

It has been also concluded that loudness as a perceptual characteristic of English-language political discourse correlates with the semantic and communicative-pragmatic load of political speeches and interacts with other parameters (e.g. tempo), which indicates the importance of this component in the prosodic system. From the analysis it is clear that the increased loudness, even with a tendency to high, contributes to the uptake of information in pedagogical discourse. According to the auditors, increased loudness draws the listener's attention to the message, creates a sense of the importance of information and the speaker's interest in it. Increasing the loudness also adds dynamism and energy to the discourse, which activates and maintains the attention of information recipients. Another conclusion is that in pedagogical discourse there is an accentuation of information blocks by increasing or decreasing the loudness: loudness increases on more important segments, decreases on less important ones.

The results of considering the inner variation of speech loudness of English-language institutional discourse on the material of its types –

pedagogical and political discourses indicate the importance of this parameter in the prosodic system and necessitate further acoustic analysis. It is important to compare the objective components of the dynamic subsystem, namely, the intensity – the acoustic volume correlate – within the studied material.

References:

1. Захарова Ю. М. Просодична інтерференція в англomовному дискурсі (експериментально-фонетичне дослідження мови арабо-англійських білінгвів) : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04. Київ, 2004. 270 с.
2. Калита А. А. Фонетичні засоби актуалізації смислу емоційного висловлювання : монографія. Київ : Вид. центр КДЛУ, 2001. 351 с.
3. Постникова Л. Просодия политического дискурса в британской и американской лингвокультурах: URSS, 2011. 200 с.
4. Шейгал Е. И. Интенсивность как компонент семантики слова : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.04 / МГПИИЯ им. М. Тореза. Москва, 1981. 196 с.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-227-2-53>

LEXICOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE OF GERMANIC ELEMENT IN THE EARLY 20th-CENTURY ENGLISH VOCABULARY

ЛЕКСИКОГРАФІЧНИЙ ОГЛЯД ЗАПОЗИЧЕНЬ З ГЕРМАНСЬКИХ МОВ НА ПОЧАТКУ 20 СТОЛІТТЯ В АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Polishchuk G. V.

*Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences,
Associate Professor,
Assistant Professor at the Department
of Germanic Languages and Teaching
Methodology
Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central
Ukrainian State Pedagogical
University*

Поліщук Г. В.

*доктор педагогічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри германських мов та
методик їхнього навчання
Центральноукраїнський державний
педагогічний університет імені
Володимира Винниченка*