

Phonetic features of spoken English and Kazakh languages (theoretical and experimental research)

Karlygash Kenzhigozhina – Karlygash Nurmuhametova – Makhabbat Berkutbayeva – Assem Meiramova – Taniya Kapesova

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2020.13.02.14

Abstract

This article depicts the phonetic features of spontaneous colloquial speech in English and Kazakh languages of youth living in the city of Nur-Sultan. The analysis was carried out on the basis of audio recordings of speech in English and Kazakh languages of young people aged 18 to 35 years of different social backgrounds. The study revealed the most striking features of youth speech in English and Kazakh languages in phonetic aspects. Among the phonetic features of speech, other language inclusions were noted, which is natural in the conditions of bilingualism, where switching codes in the process of spontaneous speech comes naturally.

At the same time, in connection with the increasing modern fashion breezing of the Kazakh society, the use of words with new trends in English significance is observed. In the phonetic aspect, signs of progressive-regressive and progressive assimilation are revealed. It is also noteworthy that, according to the pronunciation of youth representatives, we can determine the regional affiliation of the speakers. The results of this work can find their practical application in teaching a course on the culture of speech, practical phonetics, while audio materials can also serve as the basis for creating the sound corpus of modern linguistics.

Key words: phonetic, features, spoken, English, Kazakh, languages, theoretical, experimental, linguistics

Introduction

This study is devoted to one of the pressing problems of modern linguistics, namely the study of the phonetic features of the conversational variety of sounding speech since the most important processes of language development and updating arise in the field of live communication (Berkner, 1978). One of such processes that affect phonetic development and functioning can be considered the action of the principle of language economy (reduction).

The phenomenon of the economy is closely related to the concept of redundancy; in a single language, both phenomena form a dialectical unity (Martine 1963; Malchenko 1976; Monakhov 1989). At the speech level, the principle of reduction is manifested in the form of linguistic compression. The problems of phonetic features have repeatedly been the focus of research by many domestic and foreign linguists (Schleicher 1956; Paul 1960; Delbrück 1956; Saussure 1977; Martinet 1960, 1963; Sepir 1993; Bloomfield 1968; Baudouin de Courtenay 1963; Serebrennikov 1988; et al.).

However, it should be noted that the phonetic level of manifestation of language economy (especially on the material of various national variants of the English and Kazakh languages) has not yet been sufficiently reflected in the scientific literature. For many socio-economic reasons, English has recently become the language of intercultural communication. This, in turn, contributed to even more intensive development of bilingualism and the creation of a whole series of variations on the theme of the English language with its many variations, known as New English or World English (Crystal, 2001).

Variability is known to be a fundamental property of any living language. It is characteristic of units of various levels: phonological, lexical, morphological,

syntactic, etc. The language system is mobile, and therefore changeable due to the variability of units of all language levels. Changes in language are made according to certain laws of phonetic, lexical, and syntactic variation in any natural language. An important role is played by both linguistic and extralinguistic factors. The variability inherent in the linguistic system as a whole is most pronounced in terms of interference resulting from the interaction of either two different languages (bilingualism), or the norm and dialect of the same language (diglossia) in the speaker's speech. Differences in contacting language systems produce changes in real speech due to the effect of one system on another (Phonetic variation: bilingualism and diglossia 2000).

Our focus is on the national variation of the English language. We conducted the study of particular factors and obtained its importance due to the global spread of English in the modern world, leading to even greater interaction and expansion of language contacts, the emergence of new variants of the English language.

Based on the foregoing, the study of the phonetic features of English colloquial speech from the point of view of the action of a pinch of compression in it, it seems relevant both theoretically and in practical terms. Therefore, the phonetic features of English compressed speech became the subject of a special linguistic study in this work. English colloquial speech (based on the material of the English language) was chosen as the object of study, in which the effect of the principle of language economy at all levels of the language system is clearly manifested.

The main objective of this study is to describe the linguistic, especially phonetic, characteristics of spoken English, reflecting the effect of language economy (based on the material of the English language). The phenomena of compressed English speech were described considering the factor of national variability of modern English and the situation of classroom bilingualism (English-Kazakh language contact).

In accordance with the goal, the following **research questions** were put forward:

What is the current state of the theory of colloquial speech?

What are the difficulties of perception of compressed English colloquial speech in the conditions of Kazakh interference?

At first glance, the colloquial speech seems to be one of the most developed sections in the field of communication. At the same time, it constantly attracts research interest and is the object of modern linguistic research. In the context of the new approach to many problems of linguistics, the problem is the establishment of not only the status of colloquial speech but also its definition. At the present stage of the development of linguistics, colloquial speech as a bipolar category is studied as a linguistic category and manifests itself as a means of communication and performs a communicative function.

One of the problems in the study of colloquial speech is the functioning of phonetic means in colloquial speech, which requires an appeal to phono stylistics - a new area of linguistics. The aim of the work is a theoretical and experimental study of the phonetic features of the spoken English and Kazakh languages using the method of conversion analysis.

To achieve this goal, the following tasks have undertaken:

- the theoretical justification of the problem of speaking research;
- definition of research methods;
- collection of audio materials;
- Conversion analysis;

- conducting auditory and acoustic analyses based on English materials;
- conducting auditory and acoustic analyses based on the materials of the Kazakh language;
- sociolinguistic interpretation of experimental results.

The study material was audio materials for speaking in a relaxed-every day and official-household styles, analyzed using the Praat audio signal processing computer program.

In accordance with the purpose and objectives of the research, a set of experimental-linguistic research methods was applied:

1. The method of linguistic observation, which involves the fixation of audio materials on sound recording devices;
2. method of conversion analysis;
3. audit analysis of audio materials with the participation of native speakers and phonetic specialists;
4. acoustic analysis of audio materials to identify their physical characteristics;
5. sociolinguistic analysis of the results of theoretical and experimental research.

Methods

The following experimental methods of recording spontaneous speech were used in the study: the observation method and the included observation method, subjective research methods, such as auditory observation, or perceptual analysis. The researchers decided to use the included observation method, i.e. "Inclusion in the linguistic existence of the speaker." (E.V. Ivantsova , E.V. Solomina, 2014).

When applying this method, the researchers by themselves acted as an interlocutor, which allowed the researcher to change the topic of conversation and ask those questions that, in his opinion, would be best revealed the speech features of informants. (M.P. Dvorzhetskaya et al., 1991).

The main conditions of this method are the establishment of friendly relations between the researcher and the subjects, which implies that the researcher is aware of the subject's lifestyle, his family, and his outlook on life.

It is known that the intervention of the researcher in the conversation of the subjects can significantly affect the relaxed nature of the conversation, thereby provoking the subjects to use the standard norm of pronunciation forms. (M.P. Dvorzhetskaya et al., 1991).

In the study of the phonetic features of colloquial speech, it is important that the speech of informants was unprepared. In this case, three necessary conditions must be observed:

- “1. Speech communication should be unprepared.
2. Speech communication should be direct, i.e. directly with the listener.
3. Between the speakers, there should be unofficial - friendly, friendly, relations of good friends.” (M.P. Dvorzhetskaya et al., 1991).

In view of the above, it can be argued that we met all three conditions during the study. All subjects behaved naturally. There was no stiffness, even in communication with unfamiliar people. Before starting an experiment with unfamiliar or unfamiliar people (for example, talking with a taxi driver), the researcher created a friendly atmosphere: the researcher was the first to enter into a conversation, for example, starting from a discussion of the latest news of the country and the capital, gently asked questions about the subjects' hometown, family relationships, hardships life in the capital, etc. All this disposed the interlocutor to a friendly and open conversation.

Results

The conventional conversation is perhaps one of the ways to use the language socially, as well as the most basic way of learning the languages that

diversity of understanding of this linguistic category. In this regard, it is necessary to disclose the content of the concept of “spoken language” to identify the linguistic and extralinguistic characteristics of spoken language.

Next, we present the results of a conversation analysis of the dialogue of friendly interaction on the material of the English American language. The dialogue takes place between four friends at the home of one of the informants in San Francisco.

According to H. Sachs, there are three mechanisms for the distribution of communicative roles: 1) the current interlocutor selects the next participant; 2) the next interlocutor chooses himself as the next; 3) the current interlocutor can continue the conversation himself until another participant makes self-selection (Sachs, 2015).

We will give an example of one of those mechanisms using examples from the dialogue.

1) selection of the current interlocutor:

JAMIE: Aren't you guys gonna stick up for me?
and beat up on him or something?

MILES: He's bigger than [I am]. (Du Bois, 2005)

As can be seen from the fragment, the participant during a comic conversation asks a question that requires an answer and receives it from one of the interlocutors. Since the question was not asked for a specific interlocutor, here, we can observe the self-choice of one of the participants. From a linguistic point of view, we can observe a phonetic reduction in colloquial speech.

As the history of linguistics testifies, the concepts of language and speech often did not differ: either language was reduced to the speech activity of the individual, or speech and its influence on the language were completely ignored. Meanwhile, language and speech, forming a single phenomenon of the human language, are not identical to each other. The problem of the correlation between language and speech was first posed by V. Humboldt and I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay.

F. de Saussure highlights various aspects of language and speech, believing that language and speech are interconnected. In his opinion, language is social, and speech is specific to every individual. Speech is generated by each individual, while language “is perceived in the form in which it was bequeathed to us by previous generations.” Normative facts are fixed in the language, and random phenomena and individual deviations are characteristic of speech. In this regard, F. de Saussure considered it important to study each side of speech activity separately, proposing to distinguish between linguistics of the text and linguistics of speech. (Berezin F.M., 1984.- 319 p.)

Continuing the ideas of F. de Saussure, L.V. Shcherba believed that language is enriched through speech, and all the richness of language is realized in speech. Speech is a product of people’s activities, focused on solving certain problems, motivated. The speech is mobile and dynamic, and any changes in society are reflected at all language levels, at the same time, the language is static. Changes in society, accumulating over time, are reflected in the language much later. Language unites the people, the state, and, unlike speech, does not consider the individual speech characteristics of speakers. (Shcherba L.V., 2004.)

Distinguishing language and speech, V.A. Zvegintsev expressed the idea that speech, in contrast to language, is situational, emphasizing the importance of extralinguistic factors. (Zvegintsev V.A., 2001)

According to Y. Skrebnev, language is a real object - a set of associations of ideas about the elements of reality characteristic of the individual psyche of the individual with representations of their iconic representatives. However, language, unlike speech, is not only unobservable from the outside, but cannot even serve as an

object of introspection, since only acts of internal speech are available to self-observation, and not the language system as such (Y. Skrebnev, 2003).

Kazakh linguist A.E. Karlinsky considered language as “a complex mental-structural formation, the result of a person’s cognitive activity, an invariant scheme that does not change its attributes depending on the forms of material organization.” Speech, in his understanding, is a means of using the language not by a specific speaker, but by each representative of the human race. AE Karlinsky draws a parallel between the concepts of speech and communication, which is also a speech of a specific person using non-verbal signals. In his opinion, the reason for all changes in the language should be sought in speech, and all the properties of the language can be found through the study of speech. (Karlinsky A.E., 2009).

According to G.Ya. Solgannik, speech is “a concrete speaking, occurring in sound or in writing, this is all that is said and written.” Speech, unlike language, is concrete and material; it is possible to feel it visually and to sense it with hearing. Each speaker and listener choose those means of communication that are familiar to them. That is, the situation of communication determines the choice of language tools. The speaker can introduce language innovations into his speech, use an individual style of communication. (Solgannik G.Ya, 2017).

At the present stage of the development of linguistics, there are two points of view on the nature of colloquial speech:

1) colloquial speech is considered as a linguistic category and is a kind of national language (Zemskaya E.A., Sirotinina O.B., Matveeva T.V., Goikhman O.Ya.);

2) colloquial speech is a stylistic category and is included in the system of functional styles as an independent colloquial style (Golub I.B., Kozhina M.N.).

O.B. Sirotinina, in her work “Good speech: shifts in the idea of the standard,” defines colloquial speech as “speech in direct, personal, mainly unofficial communication, or as an oral form of spontaneous dialogical speech.” To identify the definition of the essence of colloquial speech, a study of the work of American linguists showed that this subject of study is too diverse. Western linguists have difficulty in clearly articulating such a thing as colloquial speech. Nevertheless, they highlighted its most common characteristic features that distinguish colloquial from literary. It is emphasized that colloquial speech requires the mandatory presence of more than one participant (Sirotinina, 2000).

British sociolinguists D. Miller and R. Weinart believe that the variety of forms of colloquial speech, which depends on the situation of verbal communication, suggests the possibility of their style differentiation (Jim Miller and Regina Weinert, 1998).

Spontaneous speaking has the following properties:

1. spontaneous speech is made in real time without the possibility of editing or correction, while written speech is made with the possibility of reflection, there is the possibility of editing;

2. spontaneous speech is made by people who participate in a direct conversation with personal contact in a specific situation;

3. spontaneous speech includes amplitude, rhythm, vibration and voice quality;

4. spontaneous speech that occurs during personal contact is accompanied by gestures, eyes, facial expressions, body movements, which serves as signaling information;

5. spontaneous speech is less grammatically dependent in contrast to written speech and is characterized by simple sentences;

6. The vocabulary of spontaneous speech is less diverse compared to written speech

7. Structures found in spoken language cannot be used in written language, and vice versa (Jim Miller and Regina Weinert, 1998).

Thus, colloquial speech has several extralinguistic characteristics: unpreparedness, ease, spontaneity, direct participation of speakers in a speech act. An equally important factor is the psychological and emotional state of the communicants. Among the external conditions that affect speech, it is the gender of native speakers. "Speech communication" includes the use of gestures, facial expressions, signs, abbreviations.

Conclusion

The scientific novelty of the research is that the features of colloquial English and Kazakh languages are first studied using modern electro-acoustic methods (Praat). The theoretical significance of the work is that the results of the research can be used in further studies of the prosodic system of different levels of English and Kazakh spoken language. When compiling textbooks on the theoretical and practical phonetics of the Kazakh language.

The results of the study can be applied in the development of topical issues of phonostylistics, in particular, in compiling a special course on phonostylistics of English and Kazakh colloquial speech, and teaching university disciplines in the style and culture of speech in English and Kazakh languages. The analyzed audio recordings can be used to create the oral corpus of the linguistics.

The study of the linguistic features of the compressed type of colloquial speaking is necessary not only from the point of view of forming the skills of perception and production of foreign speaking but also in terms of an intercultural communication since on the basis of authentic material (spontaneous and quasi-spontaneous dialogs, etc.), we can learn the culture of the studied language. Promising, in our opinion, is a further detailed study of regional variation in the mentioned languages, that is, the problems of the ratio of the norm and dialects.

An attempt was made to describe some features of linguistic (primarily phonetic) compression in English and Kazakh colloquial speech on the material of bilingual speakers. The theoretical basis of the study was made by the concepts of domestic and foreign linguists on issues of language economy, colloquial speech (especially its dialogical form), language variability, and national variability (based on the material of bilingual speakers). During the study, language facts were used from the lexicographic and written sources of the SPE, an auditory analysis of JIPP of this option was carried out, its sociolinguistic status was assessed, a special study of the segment and suprasegmental characteristics of the manifestation of linguistic compression in JIPP SPE was carried out, part of the narrow body of the experimental material was subjected to acoustic analysis, performed an auditory analysis of sounding material with the assistance of phonetic experts. An experiment was conducted on the perception of SPE by native speakers of different national variants of the English language (BrE, ATE, AusE), as well as Kazakh-speaking bilingual students studying English at a special faculty of the university. Thus, interest in the language of youth is explained by the fact that youth is a part of society, exerts its influence on it, and makes its own innovations. Moreover, the language of youth affects the general language standard.

After analyzing the audio recordings, we concluded that in the modern Kazakh language, there are their own peculiarities: the presence of interference inclusions and interjections, which is a natural phenomenon in the conditions of bilingualism in Kazakhstan. It is known that with prolonged language contacts over time, most of the population begins to understand and speak the language of their neighbors. Thus, language contact is made through "individual bilingualism (or bilingualism) of some part of the speakers, which creates a situation of bilingualism."

What actually happened on the territory of Kazakhstan, especially, places the effect of bordering countries.

As for the phonetic aspects, phonetic reductions in words, in particular verbs, can be noted. Pronunciation gives us information about the regional origin of the subjects. Another feature that I would like to note is a small number or lack of slang and foreign language in speech.

The reduced forms deserve special attention, and in modern linguistics, one should change one's attitude towards them and "recognize them as a fact of the evolution of the language," since without familiarity with such forms, listening to the Kazakh language and also reading texts in the Kazakh language can be difficult. The results of the study are of great practical importance since they can be used in classes on the culture of speech for students of humanitarian specialties, practical phonetics of the Kazakh language.

I would like to note that this article is only an attempt to highlight those striking features that are characteristic of the speech of modern Kazakh-speaking urban youth. However, in further studies, we have to give a full description of those features that take place in the phonetic aspect of colloquial speech of youth. In particular, to distinguish various positional and combinatorial phonetic modifications, which phonetic changes operate with varying degrees of intensity, also one of the objectives of the study is to identify the sociophonetic features of spontaneous speech depending on social characteristics such as gender, age, social status, regional affiliation, education, and occupation.

Bibliographic references

- BERKNER, S.S. 1978. Problems of development of spoken English in the XVI-XX centuries. Voronezh,
- BEREZIN, F.M. 1984. History of linguistic teachings. A textbook for philological special universities.-2-ed. Corrected. And additional. In: Higher school, 319 p. / pp. 183 -185
- BLOOMFIELD, L. 1968. Language In: Transl. from English M.,
- BOGDANOVA, N.V. 2010. Reduced forms - damage to language or the fact of its evolution? In: Phonetics today: Mater. reports and communications of the VI int. scientific conf. Moscow, pp. 17-20
- BAUDOUIN DE COURTENAY I.A. 1963. Selected Works on General Linguistics. T.1. M.,
- CRYSTAL, D. 2001. Language and the Internet. Cambridge In: Cambridge University Press.
- DELBRUCK, B. Introduction to the study of Indo-European languages In: Dvorzhetskaya, M.P., Steriopolo E.I., Valigura O.R. et al. Methods of experimental-phonetic research of sounding speech: textbook on theor. phonetics of foreign language
- DU BOIS, JOHN, W. – WALLACE, L. CHAFE – MEYER, CH. – THOMPSON, S.A. – ENGLEBRETSON, R. – MARTEY, N. 2000-2005. Santa Barbara corpus of spoken American English, Parts 1-4. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium.
- ESPEKOVA, L.A. 2014. Phonetics of modern Kazakh language. Almaty In: Evero Baspas, 104 p.
- FREEBORN, D. 1993. Varieties of English. An Introduction to the Study of Language. London: the MACMILLAN PRESS LTD 4, pp. 151-163
- IVANTSOVA, E.V. – SOLOMINA E.V. 2014. On effective methods of recording spontaneous oral speech in the study of a linguistic personality In: West. Tomsk SU, n. 3 (29), pp. 14-27.
- ISABAEVA, S. 2017. What influence — positive or negative — does religion have on public life? Available online: <https://camonitor.kz/26501>

- KALIEV, B.A. 2014. Phonetics of Kazakh language: a book. - Almaty: "Evero", 168 p.
- KARLINSKY, A.E. 2009. Methodology and paradigms of modern linguistics. - Almaty, 352, pp. 30-33
- LABOV, W. 1972. Sociolinguistic patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. pp. 84-87.
- MAKAEV, E.A. 1962. The concept of system pressure and the hierarchy of language units In: VYA, n. 6.
- MALCHENKO, A. A. 1976. On the question of compression and redundancy of colloquial speech In: Theory and practice of the linguistic description of colloquial speech. 4.2. n. 7. Gorky,
- MARTIN, A. 1960. Principles of economy in phonetic changes (problems of diachronic phonology) / Per. with fr. M.,
- MARTIN, A. 1963. Fundamentals of General Linguistics In: New in Linguistics. n. III.
- MATROSOVA, N.N. 2004. Some aspects of the implementation of the economy-redundancy category in the English monological text (within the framework of the organizing function of speech intonation): Author. diss. cand. philol. sciences.
- MECHKOVSKAYA, N.B. 2000. Social linguistics: a manual for students' humanity. universities and students of lyceums / NB Mechkovskaya N.B. - 2nd ed., Rev. In: Aspect Press, 207 p.
- MILLER, J. – WEINERT, R. 1998. Spontaneous spoken language. Syntax and discourse. In: Clarendon press, Oxford, 457 p.
- NYMAN, E.A. 2004. Sociolinguistics: lecture course - Tomsk State University, 220 p.
- PAUL, G. 1960. Principles of the History of Language / Per. with him.
- ROMAINE, S. 1994. Language in Society. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (33-66). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SAUSSURE, F.DE. 1977. The course of general linguistics In: Transactions in Linguistics / Transl. with fr.
- SACHS, H. – SCHEGLOFF, EA. – JEFFERSON, G. 2015. The simplest systematization of the organization of the order in the conversation In: Sociological review. vol. 14, n. 1, pp. 142-202.
- SCHLEICHER, A. 1956. German Language (Extracts), A reader on the history of linguistics of the XIX-XX centuries.
- SEPIR, E. 1993. Selected works on linguistic and cultural studies / Per. from English SOLGANNIK, G.Ya. 2017. Text Stylistics: Textbook In: G.Ya. Solgannik. - 13th ed., Sr. - In: Flinta: Nauka, 256 p.
- SHCHERBA, L.V. 2004. Language system and speech activity. Ed. 2nd, stereotyped. M: URSS editorial, 432 p.
- SIROTININA, O. B. 2000. Good speech: shifts in the idea of the standard In: Active Linguistic processes of the late XX century.
- SULEIMENOVA, E.D. 2011. Vitality of the Kazakh language and language planning (second article) In: West. KazNU. - Ser. Philologist, n. 2 (132), pp. 7-13
- SKREBNEV, YU.M. 2003. The basics of the English style: textbook / Yu.M. Screbnev. - 2nd edition, revised. - Moscow: Astrel: AST, 221 p. ISBN 5-17-004697-9. - ISBN 5-271-01141-0.
- STERIOPOLO, E.I. – VALIGURA, O.R. et al. 1991. - K.: MGPII, 76 p.
- WARDLAUGH, R. 1998. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, pp. 99-115.
- ZVEGINTSEV, V. A. 1956. A reader on the history of linguistics of the XIX-XX centuries.
- ZVEGINTSEV, V. A. 2001. Language and Linguistic Theory. In: Editorial URSS, 248 p.

Words: 4976

Characters: 32 592 (18,11 standard pages)

Karlygash Kenzhigozhina
L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University
Department of Foreign Philology
Nur-Sultan city
Kazakhstan
nurtugan.erzhanuly@bk.ru

associate professor Karlygash Nurmuhametova
Kostanay State Pedagogical University named after Umirzak Sultangazin,
street Tauelsizdik 118, Kostanay city,
Kazakhstan

Makhabbat Berkutbayeva
Kazakh State Women's Teacher Training Institute
ul. Aiteke bi, 99, Almaty
Kazakhstan

assistant Professor Assem Meiramova
Kokshetau Technical Institute Committee for emergency
Situations of the Ministry of Internal affairs
st. Akan-Seri 136, Kokshetau
Kazakhstan

associate professor Taniya Kapesova
Zharokova 210, Almaty
Kazakhstan