

G.N. Smagulova , T.B. Ramazanov\* 

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

\*e-mail: ramazanov.talgat@kaznu.kz

## FEATURES OF SPOKEN LANGUAGE DIALOGUE IN THE LANGUAGE OF YOUTH

The article says that spoken language is not only spoken in real life, but also has its own generalized structural state. In the artistic structure, spoken language changes differently. The pronunciation of spoken language and its use in written language are not the same. Thought in written language is characterized by style, it is systematized with the necessary words and expressed one-sided, in a spoken language, it is suitable for listeners, deviates from the written language model, the difference of speech from written language is explained by examples in the article. It is argued that literary works are directed to the spoken language through dialogues. Although they have their own specific differences, some artistic languages take their place in the stylistic sequence of everyday spoken speech through their dialogues. Despite its specific differences, some works of art occupy a stylistic range of everyday spoken language through dialogues. The relevance of the research work is related to the recognition of the features of the Kazakh dialogue, its communicative aspect. On this basis, dialogues of young people in artistic works and colloquial speech are taken, communicative and pragmatic features are analyzed. In addition, the article also identifies the features and purpose of oral dialogue in the language of youth. The pragmatics and stylistic features of dialogues in the spoken language of youth aged 16-30, the phenomenon of saving language units used in dialogue are also substantiated and explained by examples from the language of youth.

**Key words:** spoken language, artistic work, dialogue, youth language.

Г.Н. Смағұлова, Т.Б. Рамазанов\*

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

\*e-mail: ramazanov.talgat@kaznu.kz

### Жастар тіліндегі ауызекі сөйлеу диалогының ерекшеліктері

Мақалада ауызекі тіл өмірде айтылып қана қоймай, сонымен қатар, өзінің жинақталған құрылымдық қалпы болатындығы айтылады. Көркем құрылымда ауызекі сөйлеу тілі басқаша болып өзгереді. Ауызекі сөйлеу тілінің айтылуы мен жазба тілде қолданылуы бірдей емес. Жазба тілде ой стильдің өзіне тән, оған қажетті сөздерімен жүйеленіп, бір жақты баяндалып отырса, сөйлеу тілінде тыңдаушыларға лайықтанып, жазба тілдік үлгіден ауытқып отырады, сөйлеу тілінің жазба тілден өзгешелігі сөйлеу тілінің ауызша формада жүзеге асып отыратындығы мақалада мысалдар арқылы нақтыланады. Әдеби көркем шығармалар ауызекі сөйлеу тіліне диалогтар арқылы бағытталатыны дәйектеледі. Өзінің спецификалық айырмашылықтары бола тұрса да, кейбір көркем шығарма тілдері диалогтары арқылы күнделікті ауызекі сөйлеу тілінің стилистикалық қатарынан орын алады. Сонымен қатар мақалада, жастар тіліндегі ауызекі сөйлеу диалогының ерекшеліктері мен қолданыс мақсаты айқындалады. Зерттеу жұмысының өзектілігі қазақ диалогының ерекшеліктерін танумен, оның коммуникативтік қырын аңартумен байланысты. Осы негізде жастардың көркем шығарма мен ауызекі сөйлеу тіліндегі диалогтары алынып, коммуникативтік және прагматикалық ерекшеліктері талданады. Жастардың ауызекі сөйлеу тіліндегі диалогтардың прагматикасы мен стилистикалық ерекшеліктері, диалогта қолданылатын тілдік бірліктерді үнемдеу құбылысы да жастар тілінен алынған мысалдар арқылы дәйектеліп, түсіндіріледі. Жалпы тіл біліміндегі диалогтың зерттелімі мен құрылымдық типтеріне, мағыналық жіктелісі мен коммуникативтік ерекшеліктеріне назар аудара отырып, диалог теориясының лингвистикалық қыры сараланады. 16-30 жас аралығындағы жастар диалогының келешегіне қатысты ғылыми пайымдаулар жасалады.

**Түйін сөздер:** ауызекі сөйлеу тілі, көркем шығарма, диалог, жастар тілі.

Г.Н. Смагулова, Т.Б. Рамазанов\*

Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы

\*e-mail: ramazanov.talgat@kaznu.kz

### Особенности речевого диалога на языке молодежи

В статье представлено описание разговорного языка, используемого не только в реальной жизни, но и имеющего собственное «накопленное структурное состояние». В художественной структуре разговорный язык меняется, имеет другую окраску. Произношение и использование разговорной речи в письменном языке – не одно и то же. Мысли в письменной речи свойственны стилю, систематизированы и односторонни, но в устной речи они адаптированы к слушателю и отклоняются от модели письменной речи. Эти особенности в статье поясняются примерами. В статье утверждается, что литературно-художественные произведения ориентируются на разговорный язык посредством диалогов. Несмотря на свои специфические различия, некоторые художественные произведения расширяют стилистический диапазон повседневной разговорной речи через диалоги. В процессе работы определены и выявлены особенности и цели устного диалога на материале языка молодежи. Вместе с тем в статье прагматика и стилистические особенности диалогов в разговорной речи молодежи, феномен экономии языковых единиц, используемых в диалоге, также подкрепляются и объясняются примерами из молодежного языка; анализируются лингвистические аспекты теории диалога, при этом особое внимание уделяется изучению структурных типов диалога, семантической классификации и коммуникативных особенностей в общем языкознании. В статье представлены научные положения относительно перспективы изучения молодежного диалога.

**Ключевые слова:** разговорный язык, художественное произведение, диалог, язык молодежи.

### Introduction

In linguistics, extralinguistic features and linguistic manifestations of dialogue are studied from different angles. Features of dialogue in the written text, oral dialogue, dialogue in the literary genre, dialogue in the journalistic and scientific genres have been studied extensively.

Dialogue is considered a very complex category in its linguistic and extralinguistic terms. In principle, only in dialogue do the semantic meanings of language units come together, forming a special pragmatic structure. In the process of organizing a dialogue, a communicative and pragmatic principle, a communication strategy and language tactics formed by speakers, in short, a communicative environment that combines all external factors, except language is created.

The communicative and pragmatic features of the theory of dialogue have been scientifically analyzed and systematized in general linguistics, including in the works of English scientists. The theoretical model of types of dialogue (Walton and Krabbe, 1995: 42) has been developed in argumentation theory as an instrument for analyzing patterns of ideal and possibly real dialogues. Types of dialogue are abstract representations of the possible conventionalized, purposive joint activities between two speech partners (Walton, 1998: 54) defined based on the joint goals of the interlocutors (Walton and Macagno, 2007:113). On this view, the individ-

ual goals of the interlocutors (such as obtaining information or performing a specific action) are subordinated to a joint one (sharing information, making a joint decision). The types of dialogue are normative frameworks that capture the shared dialogical intentions. However, when such a model is used to analyze and predict the interlocutors' behavior in real communicative practices, several problems arise. Real dialogues are characterized by a 'dynamic process of meaning construction in which nothing is static' (Kecskes, 2013a: 102): interlocutors advance, interpret, negotiate the goal and sub-goals of the dialogue. In this sense, dialogues consist of turn-taking dialogical sequences, namely utterances having specific dialogical goals. The speaker expresses dialogical purposes (Kecskes, 2013b: 141) that the interlocutor can take up, modify, ignore, or subordinate to a different one. In this fashion, dialogues are co-constructed through utterances whose dialogical goals are relevant to the given situational context dialogue (analyzed in Van Eemeren, 2011: 148). If we want to address the problem of analyzing how the specific dialogical sequences and the individual dialogical goals expressed by them are related to a global communicative goal, we need to start from a different viewpoint, namely from the units contributing to and constituting such a joint communicative purpose. In this sense, we need to understand the 'dialogical game' the interlocutors are playing, and the role that utterances play within such a game (Levinson, 1992: 87).

The Polish researcher Fabrizio Macagno in his article «Analyzing the pragmatic structure of dialogues» describes the concept of dialogue movement, intended as the minimum unit for the analysis of dialogues. He proposes an approach to the analysis of discourse based on the pragmatic idea that joint dialogical intentions are also jointly constructed through individual moves and a higher order. The communicative intentions pursued by the interlocutors. From this point of view, he sets the goal – to identify pragmatic structure of dialogue as a complex network of dialogical goals (such as persuasion, discussion, exchange of information, etc.), which represent the communication goals that the interlocutors intend to achieve through their statements. Dialogue movements are shown to indicate the necessary an interpretive relationship between a general description of a dialogic context or type and a syntactic analysis of sentences expressed by individual statements. In the final part of this article, the researcher shows how this method can be used and developed to analyze various types of real dialogues describing possible applications and directions of empirical research based on them (Macagno, 2017: 150).

The theory of dialogue in Russian linguistics was considered by such a group of scientists as L.V.Shcherba, L.P.Yakubinsky, E.D.Polivanov, V.V.Vinogradov, M.M.Bakhtin. The direction of the anthropogenic paradigm in the study of language communication is currently the main channel for considering the problems of linguistics. Dialogue is a natural form of speech. That is, one of the forms of speech emergence into the light. Text, dialogue, discourse, and monologue are also forms of language communication. However, in the theories of Language Communication, Speech Act, forms of discourse and dialogue are of great interest. In turn, M. M. Bakhtin emphasized that «the reality of language is not a solitary, isolated monologue speech, but an interaction of two conversations, that is, a dialogue» (Bahtin M.M., 1972: 472). As a result, this idea of Bakhtin has become a key position, a relevant concept in the study of dialogue.

The advantages of the study of dialogue are shown by two signs: 1) in the dialogue, each conversation has an author and a specific listener; 2) the dialogue takes place in a certain place, within a certain time frame, in contact with the context. This allows the conversation to be perceived and understood correctly. Although dialogue is a form of text, these features distinguish it from other types of text.

In linguistics, the study of dialogue is one of the most difficult problems. Its complexity depends on the following conditions:

✓ people rely on language competence when communicating. Language competence is the knowledge and reasonable use of communicative and language conditions necessary for harmonious communication.

✓ one of the most difficult aspects of the study of dialogue is its connection with social meanings. For example, the youth and adult environment, the gender space.

✓ Also, the third difficulty that arises is related to the distinction between linguistic and non-linguistic factors in the dialogue.

### Material and methods

One of the scientists who studied dialogue in Russian literature, V. E. Khalizev, in his work «Theory of literature», considers and defines the basis of Schlegel's dialogues. For a scientist, dialogue consists of two-sided relationships between different individuals (two or more). The characters participating in the dialogue always change their roles. At a certain point, the characters manifest as an active role, and sometimes manifest as a listener.

In the dialogues of A.P. Chekhov, the influence of the writer is often expressed. However, they do not coincide with the content of communication. At the same time, an objective position is raised, which seeks to maximize the coverage of reality phenomena. The artist's vigilance simultaneously monitors the external environment and the behavior of the characters during speech, as well as their movements.

For Chekhov, dialogue is a scene of communication on a large scale, in general, dominated by its own content, and most importantly, it is a scene of communication on a large scale, connected with eternal life.

M. Bakhtin noted the need to study dialogue at the intersection of philosophy, psychology, linguistics, and literary studies. He said that «the inner world of the individual is a dialogue, a monologue. The dialogical nature of consciousness is the dialogical demand of human life. Life is a dialogue by its nature. To live, that is, to participate in a dialogue with the eyes, lips, hands, soul, whole body, actions. It gives itself up to the word and enters into the dialogical tissue of human life» (Bahtin M.M., 1974:360).

For the first time, the issue of dialogue in Kazakh linguistics was raised by the founders of Kazakh linguistics A. Baitursynuly and K. Zhubanov. For the first time, A. Baitursynov wrote in his work «Literature guide»: «In whatever form the content

of the work is expressed, it is said that it is a form of production. The content of the work is expressed in four forms: 1) in a simple spoken form, 2) in a negotiation form, 3) in a deficit, 4) in a mixed form» (Jubaeva O., 2017:752), – classifies the dialogue according to the content of the work and gives it the name «speech». M. Auezov called the dialogue a «conversation», and professor K. Zhumaliyev, in his work «Theory of literature» makes scientific examinations, noting that dialogue is the main tool of dramatic works, in this genre the image of a person is created through dialogues. In the theoretical research of academician Z. Kabdolov «In the art of the word» the activity of dialogue is clearly analyzed if it is connected with other artistic methods of literature. And then the works of M. Balakayev, M. Sergaliyev, B. Maitanov, B. Shalabayev reveal a number of features and functions of dialogue in a literary work. For example, the opinions of the scientist B. Maitanov, who considered the essence of the complex activity of dialogue on the basis of the works of Kazakh writers, spoke about the best examples of dialogue in the works of Russian writers, are also important. In his works «Kazakh novel and psychological analysis», «Artistic essence», analyzing the Kazakh novel in the literature of the XX century: «The ideological and artistic function of dialogue is as great as the monologue serves for the accuracy and reliability of deep psychologism. Dialogue is a special approach in a witty and rational, concise and meaningful representation of aspects of a person's character, feelings and states at certain moments», emphasizes the function of dialogue in revealing the psychology of characters (Maitanov B., 1987:232).

In the research of M. Sergaliyev, the character-forming function of dialogue is analyzed on the basis of the works of Kazakh writers. The scientist named the components that increase the artistic power of the work: «It has long been known that the main support of any work is a person. Therefore, human intuition, behavior, speech, and compatibility between them are probably the leaders among these components» (Sergaliyev M., 1995:172), which emphasizes this function of dialogue.

The famous scientist H. Adibayev, in his work «Talent. Taste. Fate», focuses on dialogue. Professor T. Rakhimzhanov, in his research paper «The artistic world of the novel», published in 1997, gave examples of dialogues and monologues in S. Mukanov's novel «School of life» and made valuable comments about their role in revealing the image of characters, psychology, and characterization.

In addition, various dissertations related to the problem of dialogue in Russian linguistics were

defended both in literary studies and in linguistics: «Dialogue in the text of a spoken and artistic work: lexical, syntactic and stylistic description» (A.K. Aitbenbetova, 2007), «Typology of dialogue» (on the material of Kazakh and Russian languages. – G.S. Imangalieva, 1999), «Features of the use of dialogues in the novels of S. Mukanov» (R.B. Sultangalieva, 2010), «Pragmatic foundations of syntactic units of the Kazakh speech language» (Z.N. Yernazarova, 2001), «Typology of replica of Kazakh and Russian dialogues» (D.B. Abdykariymova, 1999), «The function of response replication within the framework of a communicative act» (Zh.S. Kanlybayeva, 2006), «Model of the use of dialogues in the novels of Zh.Aimautov» (Sh. Abisheva, 2005), etc.

In Kazakh linguistics, the researcher of dialogue G. Imangalieva, in her work «Typology of dialogues», is guided by the following 4 indicators of dialogue recognition:

- ❖ Dialogue status:
  - time (infinite, finite)
  - character (formal, neutral, literary)
  - situation of discussion (presence or absence of an obstacle)
- ❖ Characteristic features of the speaker:
  - knowledge of the topic of conversation
  - knowledge of the topic of the dialogue
  - the importance of a dialogue topic
  - evaluation of the topic of the dialogue.
- ❖ Characteristic features of the listener:
  - awareness of the topic of conversation
  - evaluation of the dialogue topic
  - the importance of a conversation topic
- ❖ Communication between speakers
  - familiar, unfamiliar
  - social status
  - attitude to his listener (Иманғалиева Г., 1999:128).

A lively and active aspect of the nature of dialogue is spoken language. No matter what goal the speaker sets for himself in the course of oral speech, he always waits for the reaction of the listener. The speaker speaks not for himself, but for others. It is here that the nature of dialogue is widely revealed, which contributes to the emergence of active communication between the speaker and the listener.

The pronunciation of spoken language and its use in written language are not the same. In a written language, thought is characterized by style, systematized with the necessary words and expressed unilaterally, in a spoken language, it is suitable for listeners, deviates from the written language model,

and the difference between a written language and a written language is that the speech is implemented in an oral form.

A. Aitbenbetova, a scientist who studied the indicators of dialogical communication, determined the lexical, syntactic, and stylistic nature of dialogues in spoken language and fiction, said: «In spoken speech, the participatory function of the language is clearly expressed. The use of a spoken word in the form of a dialogue affects its lexical composition and syntactic construction. In colloquial speech, there are forms of speech-signals – speech that are formed to realize the purpose of the speaker. Although they do not convey any message, they create a trusting relationship between speakers and help the listener actively participate in the conversation, thereby giving the speaker a motivating day. Supportive conversations can convey the listener's approval, interest, refinement, take the turn of speech, and give an assessment. In an artistic dialogue sentence, an inter-stylistic syntactic structure is used. However, the interstylistic structure undergoes a transformation in artistic dialogue, which arises from the interaction of oral and written forms of dialect. The influence of oral dialogue leads to the presence of incoherent words, pauses, and special intonations in the activity of the transformative structure» (Aitbenbetova A.Q., 2007:130) – clarifies the features of oral dialogue and artistic dialogue. In addition, the research paper used examples from the works of R. Seysenbayev «Shaitannyń taǵy», Z. Kabolov «Sónbetin ot», materials written in a tone related to the manifestation of youth dialogue in spoken language. The research paper analyzes the dialogue of youth aged 16-30 years.

### Results and discussions

The description of the use of the language of everyday communication directly depends on the age characteristics of the person. The most natural and lively aspect of spoken dialogue is in the language of youth. Young people are representatives of a group that has a certain social status in society, has socio-psychological characteristics, has a socio-historical character, adheres to the cultural and social principles of this society, is actively undergoing socialization processes. Although youth dialogue does not have special linguistic features, youth language is more expressive and emotional. Young people are characterized by leadership qualities, and their speech is dominated by personal thinking and individualistic attitude. Modern young people do not hide their emotions in any way, express their

thoughts clearly, clearly express their values and views.

It is often said in society that such qualities as youth maximalism, the desire for leadership, and self-confidence are the main features of young people. The desire of young people to lead is considered a phenomenon that is reflected both in their speech and in their linguistic communication. In modern times, the concept of being a leader is used to describe a successful person who can set and achieve a goal. Modern young people are also energetic and ambitious in order to fill their career path, the path of goals with maximum achievements and successful moments. Similarly, in everyday life, young people try to show their leadership qualities as much as possible during speeches. Therefore, it also uses aggressive language communication patterns to distinguish itself from the environment around it.

If we compare the speech of young people twenty years ago and the speech of modern youth, we can see that modern young people strive for individuality, their own opinions and views, and try to express their personal point of view to others. Even in Soviet times, since society itself was built not on individualism, but on collective relations, the youth of that time had to take into account the opinion of society, take the language of the elders and obey the orders of the leader. Today's young people are dominated by creativity and personal thinking, do not accept other people's opinions, positions and views, public common principles and rules. And these young people, even when talking to each other, do not attach importance to the principle of cooperation, talk in the form of mutual agreements and agreements, and make decisions. Special efforts are made to show individual character and abilities, to show their superiority in language communication. At the same time, the speech of young people clearly shows the character of modern times and eras.

Young people build relationships freely in the process of building a dialogue between themselves. The dialogue of young people, whose social status, official position and official status have not yet increased, is largely at the informal, domestic level. Since adults are a highly developed social group in terms of socialization, their status has been formed, their official position and social role have been determined, and their official status has increased, communication between such individuals is not as free as in the conversational activities of young people. However, seriousness and calmness, serious, concise speech behavior prevail. Nonverbal relationships are also very restrained.

The role of an adult in society is higher than that of young people, and the main task of an adult among young members of society is to discipline, advise them. This social group is a group that undertakes the socialization of young people.

For example, from the dialogue-conflict between Aidar, described as a bold, businesslike, humble, sociable character and the manipulative Syrym, in the work of R. Seysenbayev «Shaitannyń taǵy», we can clearly see their behavior and the motive of their speech:

- *You're not talented, Syrym. You are a man of the middle hand, who is chasing between subtle knowledge and great workmanship.*

- *Come on, go home.*

- *No, not yet, Syrym... I refused the news. It is owned by Gabbas and you. If Gabbas Nurkenovich is alive, I know that he will put some money.*

- *I'm not chasing money.*

- *You're not chasing money, you're chasing fame, career. Money can only buy the immoral. From whom did the fame and career remain? Who didn't dig a hole? I hate you by the time... Syrym, I hate you...*

In this response, given in the form of a dialogue-conflict, Syrym's remark was short. This is reflected in the back of the head, the calculating character of a person who likes to speak from the outside, and not from the face. In addition, the hero Syrym feels that this argument does not lead to any pragmatic goal, but he wants to finish the dialogue as soon as possible. But the continuation of the dialogue is decided in favor of the second character – Aidar. Aidar's character in the dialogue is clearly expressed in his arrogance, ability to express sharp words and bold thoughts. After a short sentence, each person gives importance to a clear, balanced construction of his sentences in the way of expressing his original purpose, that is, a sense of hatred for him. Despite the pragmatic orientation of the conversation in a different direction, the manipulative Syrym, who wanted to quickly end the dialogue, was able to persistently achieve his communicative goal.

In the following dialogue, we can see that the dialogue between young characters of the same age and the dialogue between the young hero and the adult (professor) is much more relaxed:

*Kaben. Stop right now!*

*Taiman (sighing). Well, okay.*

*Kaben. Did you come to me?*

*Taiman. I came to you.*

*Kaben. Did you come looking for it on purpose?*

*Taiman. I came looking for it on purpose.*

*Kaben. You are lying. You go about your business.*

*Taiman. It is true. I came from the depths of the earth just for you. As long as I can...*

*Kaben (warming the face). Leave the rest. (He hugs Taiman and puts him on a chair). Don't scratch, just sit there. One moment... (turns to the professor).*

*Taiman (to himself). It's funny ... It's like sleeping with me. There is no greetings ... Oh, is it your character, your character ...*

*Professor (to Kaben). Is it okay?*

*Kaben. Certainly.*

*Professor. Shall we defend?*

*Kaben. There is no dispute.*

*Professor. But don't worry! The defense must be successful.*

*Kaben. Certainly.*

*Professor. There are one or two people against me in the Academic Council. If they don't, others will.*

*Kaben (curiously). Who are they? Against what?*

*Professor. Hey, honey, what are you against? The Kazakh said «Cattle are outside, people are inside»...*

*Kaben. I do not understand.*

*Professor. Well, you don't have to understand. (Thinking a little). Someone will ... try harder to understand the relationship and harmony of people of science than science. In the end, they are not scientists, but tyrants.*

*Kaben. I'm sorry, I don't understand yet. Should those who oppose you oppose me?*

*Professor. Probably. (Calm down). That's ridiculous.*

*Kaben. Why? Why ridiculous? Is it ridiculous to be against you? ..*

*Professor (sighs). Well, let's just say ... That's your character ... You always resist anytime, anyway! .. (Z. Kabdolla. Inextinguishable fire)*

We note that the dialogical relationship between two young conversationalists – Kaben and Taiman is established in an expressive, emotional, spontaneous state. In addition, the humor, which is often found in youth dialogue, is clearly expressed. The motive of free speech prevails. And the communication of a young speaker – Kaben with an adult communicant – professor turned out to be restrained, confident. In the dialogue of an adult and a young person, there is a pronounced confidence in youthful fervor, a firmness in one's own affairs. Kaben is sure that he will defend his dissertation. That is why the dialogical lines, in accordance with the nature of youth, end confidently, briefly, strongly.

Here we can see another difference in the dia-

logue between an adult and a young person: an adult approaches hidden, vague, implicit, implied speech. And in the dialogical attitude of young people, pre-suppositional language communication does not occupy much space. Moreover, the implicit structure between an adult and a young person does not allow intellectual understanding on the part of a young communicant. An adult who has accumulated a lot of experience and experience in life, a lot of experience, a lot of work in a particular field, and a great life position can attach a great implicit value to his dialogic response. As a result, a young person who has not passed a certain degree of social maturity, who has little to see and understand in life, does not understand the essence of such implicit structures. Here we see that there is no reference value, no mental connection. When mental communication and reference content are not established, the development of dialogical communication is also delayed. The feverish nature of the young person and his interest in revealing hidden information lead to the further development of dialogue. Now the dialogue of the young hero will develop in the form of a query, in the form of an overlay of questions. An adult begins to build implanted structures again to explain this. On the one hand, it is noted that the professor did not want to explain all the circumstances to the young scientist, on the other hand, he did not want the young hero to understand everything. Young people express their attitude to what is happening in everyday society through colloquial dialogue as follows:

1. Is it better to use the NST (UBT) method or to take an exam?

– *NST (UBT) is a little easier. The exam is oral, there is no time to think.*

\*\*\*

– *I believe in the NST (UBT). But it doesn't seem right... (from the soundtrack)*

2. Do police have to use force on a suspect to confess to a crime?

– *Not, that is not right.*

\*\*\*

– *They are wrong... (from the soundtrack)*

3. Should a fine of 1 million tenge be imposed on those who drive under the influence of alcohol?

– *I think it's wrong ...*

\*\*\*

*It is not necessary ....*

\*\*\*

*Need to think....*

\*\*\*

*Not everyone can afford it....(from the soundtrack)*

4. – What do you give to girls on March 8?

– *We give flowers to our mother... I don't know any girls... I'll take a picture to my mother to the house, and take a perfume... (from the soundtrack)*

As you can see, young people answer the question only briefly or only express their thoughts. Young people express their views on the issue and do not prove it or explain why. In most cases, deixist language units are used. For example, in everyday life, we notice that young people do not speak fully, do a lot of normal deviations. Instead of saying, «We'll have an exam tomorrow at eight o'clock», they simply responds with a short deixist form, «Tomorrow's exam» or informs communicant.

In addition, spoken language dialogue is also directly related to the psychological realities of young people. As a rule, young people communicate only in a certain limited team: intra-school, with friends, family, university, etc. Young people can open up widely only in the environment in which they are trained, in the team. Only in this environment can he behave freely. It has not yet experienced great social trends in communication with other environments. Therefore, even an outsider does not have time to immediately establish communication, including dialogic communication. This also leads to the fact that young people speak less in a particular environment and team, establish short dialogic contacts. In addition, in the colloquial dialogue of these young people, the process of saving the language is clearly and clearly expressed.

G. Smagulova noted that the communicative function of the language is most clearly expressed in the spoken language, justifying the fact that the speech language is implemented in three different conditions: «First, there is no formality between communicators. If formality is born, then the head of the institution immediately changes the style of communication, the form of attention, and the vocabulary when speaking to a subordinate or in a conversation between people.

Secondly, there should be freedom between speakers during communication. Here people speak freely, without mutual compression. At the same time, household vocabulary is most often used in accordance with the theme of speech, and the main elements of speech language are often dialect, jargon, and barbarism.

Third, in oral speech, the word continues to be pronounced as if it was not prepared before, as if it was improvised suddenly» (Smagulova G., 2007:150). The conditions of the communicative function of the language, which the scientist empha-

sizes, are clearly reflected in the dialogue of modern youth and allow them to show their personality.

### Conclusion

Based on the collected examples, we tried to identify the features of the spoken language dialogue of the youth language:

1) The dialogue of young people is very short compared to adults. There can be many reasons for the short-lived dialogue of young people. First of all, young people can express their thoughts only when they have a vocabulary, lecturing apparatus, and lack of extensive information about a particular topic, as well as language experience, which is still in the process of formation and maturation.

Along with the abilities of the psychological and physiological nature of young people, such as speed, sharpness, and agility, the dialogue is short and fast. At the same time, each line reflects its own mood, feelings, anger, and joy. Given that this is a phenomenon inherent in the spoken language, it should be noted that it is revived only through dialogue. About it: «Spoken language is built on dialogue. The dialogue consists of a sequence of repetitions and is short and concise. Especially important will be the intonation.

2) Young people do not try to fit implicit meanings into their dialogical speech. The answer is that he speaks clearly, expresses his thoughts openly. Dialogue replicas are often semantically linked.

This increases its awareness. And in the language of young people, pragmatic connotation of replicas is less common than in adults. At the same time, in the oral dialogue of young people, the use of conversions and conjunctions, especially various reinforcement, inhibition, and interrogative meaningful support, which is used in several ways, is often reflected.

3) Today's young people are passionate about innovation, fluent in the technical language, free from the use of figurative elements of the Kazakh language. This may be due to factors such as their knowledge of several languages, their lack of attention to fiction. Thanks to the knowledge of several languages, it is possible to clearly see the elements of a single dialogue of young people, as well as the language economy.

In summary, the spoken language dialogue of young people is short, their sentences are often not complex, and the phenomenon of saving language units is often reflected. The description of the oral dialogue of young people requires study from different sides. In other words, the analysis of dialogic communication of young people based on these language layers, focusing on lexical, morphological, syntactic, and stylistic features, will be the main core of our future scientific work. At the same time, a great contribution to the development of the language will be the determination of the practical purpose of phraseology and figurative phrases that enter our language through the speech of young people.

### References

- Walton D and Krabbe E (1995) *Commitment in Dialogue*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 33–85.
- Walton D (1998) *The New Dialectic: Conversational Contexts of Argument*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press, pp.48-61.
- Walton D and Macagno F (2007) Types of dialogue, dialectical relevance and textual congruity. *Anthropology and Philosophy*. Vol 8, no (1–2), pp. 101–119.
- Kecskes I (2013) *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 98-150.
- Van Eemeren F (2011) In context: Giving contextualization its rightful place in the study of argumentation. *Argumentation*. Vol 25, no 2, pp.141–161.
- Levinson S (1992) Activity types and language. In: Drew P and Heritage J (eds) *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 66–100.
- Macagno F (2017) Analyzing the pragmatic structure of dialogues. Vol 19, no 2, pp. 148–168
- Бахтин М.М. Проблемы поэтики Достоевского. – М.: Художественная литература, 1972. – 472 с.
- Бахтин М.М. Эстетика словесного творчества. – М., 1974. – 360 с.
- Жұбаева О. А. Байтұрсынұлының тілтанымдық мұрасы. – Астана: Алашорда, 2017. – 752 б.
- Майтанов Б. Қаһарманның рухани әлемі. – Алматы: Жазушы, 1987. – 232 б.
- Серғалиев М. Көркем әдебиет тілі. – Алматы: Мектеп, 1995. – 172 б.
- Иманғалиева Г. Типология диалогов (на материале казахского и русского языков) фил.ғыл.канд....дисс: 10.02.02. – Алматы, 1999. – 128 с.
- Айтбенбетова А.К. Ауызекі және көркем шығарма мәтініндегі диалог: лексикалық синтаксистік, стилистикалық қызметі. Диссер. ф.ғ.к. – Алматы, 2007 ж. – 130 бет.
- Смағұлова Г. Көркем мәтін лингвистикасы. – Алматы: Триумф, 2007. – 150 б.



### References

- Aitbenbetova A. (2007) Aýyzeke jáne kórkem shyǵarma mátinindegi dialog: leksikalıyq sıntaksistik, stilistikalyq qyzmeti. filologia ǵylymdarynyń kandidaty dárejesin alý úshin daıyndalǵan disertasia [Dialogue in the text of oral and literary works: lexical, syntactic, stylistic functions]. dissertation for the degree of candidate of philological Sciences: 10.02.02. Almaty, 130 p. (in Kazakh)
- Bahtın M. (1972) Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo. Hýdojestvennaia literatýra. [Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics]. Moscow: Fiction, 472 p. (in Russian)
- Bahtın M.M. (1974) Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva. [Aesthetics of verbal creativity]. Moscow, 360 p. (in Russian)
- Imangalieva G. (1999) Tipologia dialogov (na materiale kazahskogo i rýsskogo iazykov). disertasia na soiskanie ýchenoi stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh naýk. [Typology of dialogues (based on the material of the Kazakh and Russian languages)]. dissertation for the degree of candidate of philological Sciences: 10.02.02. Almaty, 128 p. (in Kazakh)
- Zhubayeva O. (2017) A.Baitursynulynyń tiltanymdyq murasy. [Linguistic heritage of A. Baitursynuly]. Astana: Alashorda, 752 p. (in Kazakh)
- Kecskes I (2013a) Intercultural Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 98-150. (in English)
- Levinson S (1992) Activity types and language. In: Drew P and Heritage J (eds) Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 66–100. (in English)
- Maitanov B. (1987) Qaharmannyń rýhanı álemi. [The spiritual world of the Hero]. Almaty: Jazýshy, 232 p. (in Kazakh)
- Macagno F (2017) Analyzing the pragmatic structure of dialogues. Vol 19, no 2, pp. 148–168. (in English)
- Sergaliyev M. (1995) Kórkem ádebiet tili. [language of fiction]. Almaty: Mektep, 172 p. (in Kazakh)
- Smagulova G. (2007) Kórkem mátin lingvistikasy. [Linguistics of literary texts]. Almaty: Tríymf, 150 p. (in Kazakh)
- Van Eemeren F (2011) In context: Giving contextualization its rightful place in the study of argumentation. Argumentation. Vol 25, no 2, pp.141–161. (in English)
- Walton D and Krabbe E (1995) Commitment in Dialogue. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 33–85. (in English)
- Walton D (1998) The New Dialectic: Conversational Contexts of Argument. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press, pp.48-61. (in English)
- Walton D and Macagno F (2007) Types of dialogue, dialectical relevance and textual congruity. Anthropology and Philosophy. Vol 8, no (1–2), pp. 101–119. (in English)