

Communicative and Functional Approach and Discourse Theory for Terminological Field Research

Dilyara M. Sadykova, Olga V. Akimova, Alfiya N. Zaripova

Kazan Federal University, Institute of International Relations, History and Orient Studies, Kazan, Russia

Abstract

The rationale for the problem of investigating terminological units through communicative and functional approach lies in that this way can give an opportunity to promote integral character of the research providing the analysis of the properties of terms which are not available when exploring only semantic and structural features. The basic aim is going into the effective use of communicative and functional approach to terminological field research along with discourse analysis. The paper presents first, some theoretical foundation concerning professional and specialised communication, and, second, the results of the practical research of Civil Aviation Radioexchange terminology within terminological field and professional discourse, the outcome of which may be revealed in discourse types and methodology of communicative and functional approach application. Also, the results may be exploited for the intra- and inter-linguistic analysis of other terminologies and further for the description of a professional language personality.

Key words: Linguistics, Term, Terminology, Communication, Discourse, LSP, Sublanguage, text

INTRODUCTION

Thematic Justification

In modern linguistic science the principle of anthropocentrism points out that scientific objects are studied first of all for their significance regarding the person, their place in his vital activity, their function for the development of the person and his improvement. Functioning of language in various extralinguistic situations including industrial, defines the importance of communicative and functional approach to language (Avrorin, 1975; Pismichenko, 1994; Kubryakova, 1995; Richards, 2006; Lee 2016).

Similar tendencies are of current concern in the research of language subsystems named sublanguages or languages for special purposes (LSP), which include units designating concepts of specialised areas of knowledge (terms) and form technical, scientific and other terminologies.

A very important aspect of learning languages for special purposes includes learning and translating words and word-groups belonging to the terminological system of a corresponding sphere (Bobyreva, 2015). Awareness and responsibility in terminology are concepts relevant to the whole community of speakers of a language. Although at various levels, it is crucial in science, professions, also in governmental, scientific and educational administration, and for the speakers of the language in general (Fóris, 2014). Terms perform communicative function in the specialised and professional communicative environment of experts and reflect aspiration of the person for dialogue rationalisation and optimisation in various specialised fields of human activities in society. Moreover, only functioning in professional dialogue, in its written (text) and oral forms, terms show their true properties and qualities (Danilenko, 1986). Hence, the structural and semantic analysis of terms in the framework of terminological systems is expedient to be accompanied by the research of their functions in professional discourse.

Conducting research of terminological units as a part of a terminological field, it is necessary to consider, that though in the sphere of specialised dialogue terms are basic units of nomination and transference of specialised and professional concepts, all of them are not the only units of the language, used by specialists in

Access this article online



www.ijss-sn.com

Month of Submission : 04-2017
Month of Peer Review : 05-2017
Month of Acceptance : 06-2017
Month of Publishing : 09-2017

Corresponding Author: Olga V. Akimova, Kazan Federal University, Institute of International Relations, History and Orient Studies, Kazan, Russia. E-mail: lelpan@mail.ru

professional communication. Therefore investigation of a terminological field separately, without its connection with other subsystems of language and sublanguage, seems incomplete. But thus the dominance of the term over other units making up specialised communication should be admitted as the term expresses special concept most precisely, thereby being more desirable for use in the communication of specialists and professionals. Hence, the study of a terminological field is put as the primary goal of terminological research and as one of the ways of its achievement the correlations of terms with non terminological lexicon is taken into consideration.

Basic Notions

Each developed enough branch of knowledge or activity, including the professional ones, is provided with sublanguage. The sublanguage is one of variants of public language application, used by the limited group of its users under conditions of both formal and informal dialogue. Professional sublanguages are organised as common language, but are much smaller and professionally orientated.

The basic part of a professional (specialised) sublanguage, as a rule, is also made up by terminological units which answer specific conditions and requirements of communication within a certain area of human activity, and within the limits of specialised dialogue terms perform communicative function, what means that they express concepts and objects of a certain professional sphere by language means corresponding to them.

Along with terms structural units of a professional sublanguage, or its components, are also nomenclative units, or nomens (also pragmonyms), which have lost the connection “word-concept” and designate various grades and types of the objects from the given kind of activity. Also, it is necessary to consider, that the professional communication which is provided by people, cannot be made only by means of terms characterised by strict unambiguity and absence of connotations. Various situations, in which communication of professional sphere is held, can cause occurrence of emotionally coloured equivalents of the terms which do not possess stylistic neutrality. Hence, it is possible to say that units of professional popular speech are also included in the dialogues of a professional sublanguage. The presence of expressional analogues of terms in specialized and professional dialogues is explained by different situations characterised by various conditions of mutual relations of the participants of the communicative process, and studying professional languages it is necessary to consider not only purely stylistic, but also social and situational conditions of their use. Without these language units there

may be a difficulty in delimitation between normative, standard terms and non-normative, non-coded colloquial units that can lead further to occurrence of questions and problems at streamlining of terms, their standardisation and unification, and also at compilation of lexicographic works and manuals.

The research of a terminological field should be obligatorily carried against the background of all the elements of a corresponding sublanguage, namely terms, as a basic part of a sublanguage and, accordingly, the specialised dialogue they serve; nomens and pragmonyms, as accompanying the terms, specifying the names of objects; units of professional popular language equivalent to terms and having expressive and connotative components in their structure; and also units of common language, serving as binding elements of specialised units for construction of professional communication.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Field Model of Terminological Systems

To explore the system of language including terminological systems is possible through modelling, that is by means of structure relations establishment within system elements. One of such models is the field model of language according to which the language system can include a set of semantic fields and represent continuous set of them, intertwining with their peripheral zones and having multilevel character, thereby showing, that the lexico-semantic system appears as set of groups of units united on the basis of certain properties.

For the term a field is terminology to which it belongs to and in whose frameworks it realises its characteristics and properties. For understanding terminology as a structural element of language, first of all, it is necessary to distinguish fields accurately: terminological where the term is essentially neutral, and nonterminological where the term necessarily loses the neutrality. Beyond the term field the term ceases to be the term and can get, as a usual lexical unit, connotative colourings which combine the function of nomination and designation of subjects and concepts with the function of the characterisation of words themselves that conducts to emotional or stylistic colouring of usual or occasional character; thus the term becomes a common unit of language with rather indistinct denotatum.

The terminological field, representing a special type of a semantic field which is understood as any compact part of lexicon covering a certain conceptual sphere, keeps properties of the latter, but thus possesses some special distinctive characteristics. In one terminological field

units with the various linguistic system organisation can be collected and, on the contrary, units with the same language organisation can concern different terminological fields. Being an extralinguistic reality, the terminological field creates conditions for formation, functioning and transformations of terminological systems as certain language categories (Superanskaya, 2009).

Professional communication is based on terminological fields of various parts of speech characteristics, founded on semantic ordering of grammatically diverse lexical material which corresponds with the same typical situation, and characterised by qualitative variety and extensiveness of the structure, and also by strict systematisation. The structure of such fields is communicatively focused, as represents a set of functionally heterogeneous language units of similar semantics (Gaisina, 1990).

At the heart of grouping in a terminological field semantic and paradigmatic relations are laid, the basis for which are provided with hyperonymic and hyponymic relationship, also with polysemy, homonymy, synonymy, conversion, antonymy. Though it is considered, that «the ideal term» should not be polysemantic or have synonyms, but actually for terminologies the so-called interdisciplinary homonymy, categorial polysemy, and also synonymic and antonymic relations of terminological units are inherent.

Thus, the terminological field is the linguistic environment for term existence in which it can realise all its characteristics and carry out the main function of nominating a special concept.

The Communicative Function of Terminological Units

Functioning of terms is performed in the course of professional work by professionals where the term can be exposed to various structural transformations, thus finding various syntagmatic relations with other terms, together with non-terms. The sphere of functioning of terms in professional speech of specialists is a certain environment which as much as possible provides safety of conceptual contents of the term and its definition. However, it can be only when professionals own all the conceptual fund of the given terminology, then terms will fulfill communicative function among speakers, that is to express concepts and objects of a certain professional sphere with language means corresponding to them.

Considering functioning of the term in speech, or the syntagmatic approach, means an establishment of correlations between units of the terminological field and other systems and subsystems of language. At the given approach the context, situation and immediate environment of the term, and its distribution are taken into

consideration. This way of terminological field exploring is capable to specify in a number of laws functioning of terms in speech as it is important to show how field elements in the statement are realised, co-operate with each other and with the elements of other fields, joining the concept of the statement.

The term is a functional notion, not structurally substantial. In speech terms can get alternative, expand and narrow the structural borders, change the meaning and develop ambiguity. Research of communicative function of terms and the communicative and functional approach to language in general is represented expedient and perspective as foundation for understanding of the main function of language – communicative, and also structures and substances of the language itself. The study of problems of term functioning and the problem of efficiency of the communication connected with it in the professional environment is important and conducts to professional communication perfection process and aspiration for mutual understanding at national and international levels.

Communicative and Functional Approach to Terminological Field

The communicative and functional approach in the research of terminological field means analysis of terminological units in the communicative processes which can be presented in the texts understood as oral or written coherent and integral sequences of verbal signs, united by semantic communication. Communication consists of communicative acts, being units of communication, in which communicants participate, generating statements or texts and interpreting them. The basic components of the certificate of communications are communicants, processes of coding and sending information, processes of decoding or receiving information. O.T. Yokoyama has offered four sets of knowledge for realisation of a minimum unit of dialogue: two communicants, each of whom represents a set of knowledge about the world and himself; two sets of knowledge, relevant for each of the communicants at present.

It is necessary to notice, that the more spheres of the cogitative contents of communicants coincide, the more is the probability of coincidence of transferred and perceived sense, and, hence, of an adequate understanding of the information and corresponding reaction. Here follows the dialogue coordination of communicants as language persons: from the level of the cumulative language person of ethnosociety to level of the professional language person – individual or cumulative – within one language. Hence, a professional of any branch as the language person is a professional language person; and a professional collective

thereby is capable to form the cumulative language person of micro-society – generalised mental correlate of the notion of the professional (Karaulov, 2007).

Communication can be built up on different types of relations of communicants. It is possible to distinguish the so-called vertical and horizontal relations of communicants which define types of communication. Relations of communicants, based on hierarchical positions (the head – the subordinate), are called vertical relations; relations of communicants, based on equal positions (employees of one level), are called horizontal relations.

Discourse in Specialised Spheres

Discourse is understood as a set of verbal and cognitive acts of communicants, connected with knowledge, judgement and world presentation by the speaker and judgements, reconstruction of a language picture of the world by the recipient. The dynamic approach allows to answer the question about research units significant for text linguistics: the text is a product of the given discourse until the recipient does not initiate the end-point of the communication, that is the text is a certain stage of a discourse which can be of any extension within two end-points in communication. Change of communicative roles is treated as the system of interaction guaranteeing continuous course of conversation, maintenance by both speakers and listeners of conditions and corresponding signals (verbal and non-verbal) to transfer to someone of the participants the right to the next speech contribution. Discourse is interactive identity-based communication using language (Gee, 2014).

Functional and linguistic approach to discourse analysis stipulates the dynamic character of discourse as a designing process in speaking or writing and an interpretation processes in listening or reading. Pragmatic factors and discourse context (reference, presupposition, implicature, conclusions), a situation context, a topic and theme, information structure (given – new), cohesion and coherence, knowledge of the world (frames, scripts, scenarios, schemes, mental models) are considered in the analysis. Possible danger of misunderstanding is possible in intercultural communication due to social and cultural conditionality of the frameworks. Professional discourse analysis explores the constrained nature of the discourse among those at work, especially in terms of lexicogrammar and pragmatic features (Flowerdew, 2014)

The discourse as a process is opposed to the text as a speech product. The text is understood as an abstract, formal design, the discourse is the various kinds of its actualisation considered from the point of view of mental processes and in connection with extralinguistic factors,

that is, an integral unit of the information stipulated by linguistic and extralinguistic parameters». In specialised spheres discourse approach to text is reduced to the analysis of speech taking into account heterogeneous extralinguistic factors, not excepting paralinguistic ones. As terms are created to provide professional communication in different spheres they are supposed to reflect accurately the results of experience and practical activity (Gainutdinova et al, 2016). “Language and its various structures are analyzed as the result of action needs in human communication” (Ehlich, 2014).

RESULTS

Terminological Field “Civil Aviation Radioexchange”

The research material comprised one-word and multi-word terms of the terminological macrofield “Civil Aviation Radioexchange” (further CA Radioexchange) in the Russian and English languages (totally more than 5000 terms) and texts-dialogues of the sublanguage CA Radioexchange in Russian and English.

The terminology CA Radioexchange represents a complex formation of terminological units which can be modelled in the form of a terminological macrofield with complex internal structure; in each of the investigated languages the macrofield CA Radioexchange consists of several fields which are exposed to more accurate structurization: «Action», «Space», «Situation», «Time», «Object». Relations of the units of the terminological macrofield CA Radioexchange are based on semantic and paradigmatic correlations, the main from which are hyperonymic and hyponymic relationship causing a hierarchical structure of the investigated macrofield. Also, among the important correlations of the terminological units in the investigated field there are antonymic relations, as indicators of opposite specific concepts, characteristic of CA Radioexchange terminology owing to the recurrence of flight operations reflected in the process of radioexchange.

The terminological macrofield CA Radioexchange from the point of view of its functioning is expedient for considering in the sphere of communication in which it is realised, namely within the limits of radio negotiations of the aviation specialists carrying out and co-ordinating flights. The communicative environment for CA Radioexchange terminology is the activity of radioexchange applied on aircrafts of civil aviation, which is characterised by a number of features: the radioexchange of a civil aircraft does not represent a separate trade with a number of specialities and qualifications; CA Radioexchange is dependent on aviation business co-speciality for the aviation specialists, necessarily included in their training;

the tool of the given activity is the special sublanguage serving radio exchange CA Radioexchange and whose absence leads to cancellation of the activity as that. The sublanguage CA Radioexchange is characterised by use of special lexicon, peculiar use of nonspecial lexicon, character and style of communication, specifics of construction of communicative units-statements, and also the subjects of the latter.

Discourse “Civil Aviation Radioexchange”

The discourse CA Radioexchange represents the dialogue of two (less often more than two) communicants: the representatives of land dispatching services and the commander (or other members) of the crew of an air vessel. The communication process in CA Radioexchange is characterised by the following linguistic parameters: laconicism, unambiguity, accuracy; relative freedom of construction of statements, especially in non-standard situations and with horizontal relations of communicants; typical special phraseology which means maximum use of standard words and phrases, their accurate and clear pronunciation, verbosity avoidance. In non-standard situations it is probable to use non-standard language units; strict thematic orientation of the maintenance which concerns flight and air traffic control performance. The radioexchange concerning other topics of communication is forbidden.

The relations of communicants in CA Radioexchange discourse can be defined by two types: vertical and horizontal. Vertical relations assume domination of one communicant over another, that the control and coordination of air movement can be shown in the leading part of the representatives of the land dispatching services presiding. Horizontal relations mean less officialism in the coordination of pilots controlling an aircraft and dispatchers managing air movement owing to closer interpersonal relations of the communicants, established both prior to and during the flight operation.

The communicative situation depending on the conditions in which the flight is operated can be standard and non-standard. The first type means smooth, safe for life and health of people, flight without any complications caused by various factors of the environment, the human factor, the technical factor and others. The non-standard communicative situation arises just in the presence of the factors set forth above.

Proceeding from the types of the communicative situation and relationships of the communicants, four types of CA Radioexchange discourse are distinguished: AI (standard situations and vertical relations), BIII (standard situations and horizontal relations), AII (non-standard situations

and vertical relations), BIV (non-standard situations and horizontal relations). To each type of the discourse there is corresponding inventory, syntactic types and communicative purposes.

DISCUSSIONS

In research terms are subjected to the complex analysis both as units of a terminological field, and as discourse units; constituent signs of the terminological units and parameters of CA Radioexchange discourse are defined and described; four types of CA Radioexchange discourse in the English and Russian languages are established; the methodology of intralinguistic and interlinguistic integrated contrastive comparison of the texts of various types within professional discourse is developed.

CONCLUSION

The research of a terminological field is expedient to provide in an integrated way, taking into account all its features: structural and grammatical, semantic and paradigmatic, and functional. Exploring only structural and semantic parameters of terminological units can lead to unilateral representation of terminological nomination characteristics. The analysis of communicative and functional properties promotes complete perception of the term in a language system. Communicative and functional analysis of the term is possible to implement in a professional discourse analysis where the term is used as a main and basic communicative unit. Professional discourse helps to see the term not simply as a language unit but as an integral special unit of language closely connected with other language constituents. The “isolated”, out of a professional discourse, consideration of the term cannot provide such possibilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis of the term characteristics in a terminological field and a professional discourse promotes designation of specific features of the professional language personality. Also, the material of the research and methodology of contrastive comparison of terminological fields and professional discourse can be used in further investigations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

1. Avrorin, B.A. (1975). The Problems of Investigating into the Functional Aspect of Language, Leningrad.
2. Bobyreva, N.N. (2015). Peculiarities of Teaching English as a Foreign Language to Technical Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 182, 13 May 2015, Pages 104-109. Available at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815030190?via%3Dihub>
3. Bobyreva, N.N., Latypov, N.R. (2015). Special Purpose Languages as a Tool of Modern Linguistic Education. *Journal of Language And Literature*, Volume 6, 3, pp.119-122.
4. Danilenko, V.P. (1986). *Modern Trends in Linguistic research of Russian Terminology*, Moscow.
5. Dijk van, T.A. (1985). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 4 vols. London Orlando: Academic Press.
6. Dudley-Evans, T. (2006). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes*, Cambridge.
7. Ehlich, K. (2014). *Text and Discourse. The Discourse Studies Reader: Main currents in theory and analysis*, Johannes Angermuller, Dominique Maingueneau, Ruth Wodak, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
8. Flowerdew, J. (2014). Context in spoken professional discourse: Language and practice in an international bridge design meeting. *Discourse in Context: Contemporary Applied Linguistics*, Volume 3, A&C Black.
9. Fóris, Á. (2014). Terminology and LSP in higher education in Hungary. *Terminologen nr. 2 – Terminologi ansvar og bevissthet*. 90-100. Available at: http://eaft-aet.net/fileadmin/files/EAFT_Summit_2012/Proceedings_EAFTSummit2012.pdf
10. Gainutdinova, A., Mukhametzyanova, R. (2016). The Problem of Teaching Technical Terms in the Field of Engineering at University, *INTED2016 Proceedings*.
11. Gaisina, R.M. (1990). Comparative description of lexical fields, Ufa.
12. Gee, J.P. (2014). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. Routledge (Taylor and Francis).
13. Grinyov, S.V. (1993). *Introduction to Terminology*, Moscow.
14. Hutchinson, T., Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Karaulov, Yu.N. (2007) *The Russian language and linguistic identity*, Moscow.
16. Kubryakova, E.C. (2004) *The Language and the Knowledge*. Moscow: "The Languages of the Slavic Culture Inc."
17. Lee, V.S. (2016). About the Subject of the Anthropocentric Paradigm in Modern Linguistics. *GISAP: Philological Sciences*, No. 11. Available at <http://journals.gisap.eu/index.php/Philological/issue/view/119/showToc>
18. Leichik, V.M. (2007). *Terminology. The subject methods, structure*, Moscow.
19. Malathi, A. Ratna, (2014). Integrated Communicative and Functional Approach to Teaching English Proficiency Course (October 1, 2014). *The IUP Journal of English Studies*, Vol. IX, No. 1, March 2014, pp. 87-95. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2503832>
20. Novikov, L.A. (2003). *Modern Russian Language*, Saint Petersburg.
21. Richards, Jack C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge University Press.
22. Superanskaya, A.V., Podolskaya, N.V., Vasilyeva N.V. (2009). *Common terminology. Problems in the theory*, Moscow.
23. Yokoyama, O.T. (1986). *Discourse and Word Order. Companion series (Tom 6). Pragmatics & beyond companion series (Tom 6)*, John Benjamins Publishing, Amsterdam.

How to cite this article: Sadykova DM, Akimova OV, Zaripova AN. Communicative and Functional Approach and Discourse Theory for Terminological Field Research. *Issse*:19-24.

Source of Support: Nil, **Conflict of Interest:** None declared.