

<<

>>

1.	3
2.	6
3.		
	7
4.		
	15
5.		
	16
	17
	. ..	18
	.	
	19
	20
	. .	21
	22

1.

45.04.01

45.04.02

,

«

» (4.2-07-2014),
(-2014).

,

.

,

.

,

,

.

,

,

,

.

.

,

.

,

,

.

,

.

,

,

,

.

,

,

,

,

,

.

,

.

,

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.

()

2.

— (:).
: <http://webstyle.sfu-kras.ru/uchenye-stepeni;>

— ();
— () (45.04.02);
— ();
— ;
— ;
— ;
— ;
— ().

— ;
— , , , ;
— ;
— . 15

1 12 (Times New Roman)
1.

, (,) (,)

()

(- 2-4), /

(- 1-2),

17
12
() ()
2 3 ()

3.

-2 ., -3⁻ .,)-1,25 .

-1,5. (

(,).

« » , «

», «ABSTRACT» «

»,

« » , «
« »

»,

1», «

2»

«

1. -

- 1.1.; 1.2.; 1.3. . . -
- 1.1.1.; 1.1.2.; . . . -

(,).

...
...
« ..., ...».

« ... » (« »). « ... » (« ») – « ... » (« ») ; « ... » –

60 « ... ».

[, 2000], [, 2007: 306],
[, 2007; 2006].

[Searle; . : , 2007: 283],
().

« » (), « » [, 2015: 228]. , « » [: 234].

[Baumrid, 1978a; 1978].

Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2006. 291 p.

„ : „ , 2011. 268 .
 / :
 , 2009. 359 .
 /
 [.]; . . . ; - ,
 . 2- . . . , 2001.
 231 .

Wodak R. et al. The discursive construction of national identity. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 2009. 276 p.

// : . // 80- /
 . - , . . . : - ,
 2011. . 239–257.

// :
 : 16. : . . - , 2012. . 224–
 230.

.. // .
 . 2011. .10. . 6. . 85–92.

van Dijk T.A. Knowledge in parliamentary debates // Journal of Language and Politics. 2003. 2:1. P. 93 – 129.

Kulikova L.V., Detinko Iu.I. Construction of Political “Others” Through Multimodal Texts (Cartoons) in British Press // Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities and Social Sciences. 2014. 7 (8). P. 1381–1392.

.. « » // , ,
 : / :
 , 2009. . 15–35.

.. // /
 : /
 . 4- . . :
 « » , 2010. . 278–339.

Fairclough N., Wodak R. Critical discourse analysis // Discourse as a social interaction. Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction. Vol. 2 / ed. by

T.A. van Dijk. London: SAGE Publications, 2004. P. 258–284.

... : ... : 20.02.19.
, 2014. 22 .
: ... - : 10.02.19. ., 2005. 45 .
... « »
« » :
: : 10.02.19. ., 2007.
158 .

Boettger R.K. What Are the Most Common Title Words in Technical Communication Publications? [] // IPCC, 2014. P. 1–7. URL: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/login.jsp?tp=&arnumber=7020350&url=http%3A%2F%2Fieeexplore.ieee.org%2Fiel7%2F7002495%2F7020333%2F07020350.pdf%3Farnumber%3D7020350> (: 06.09.2015).

Google.

Google Url Shortener <http://goo.gl/>

(<http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/login.jsp?tp=&arnumber=7020350&url=http%3A%2F%2Fieeexplore.ieee.org%2Fiel7%2F7002495%2F7020333%2F07020350.pdf%3Farnumber%3D7020350> → <http://goo.gl/> → <http://goo.gl/s9iG14>)

Boettger R.K. What Are the Most Common Title Words in Technical Communication Publications? [] // IPCC, 2014. P. 1–7. URL: <http://goo.gl/s9iG14> (: 06.09.2015).

[]. 2009. URL: <http://lingvisticheskiy-slovar.ru/description/kosvennaia%20rech/284> (: 18.12.2015).

[]. 2009. URL: <http://goo.gl/0ASmO7> (: 18.12.2015).

王宏源。字里乾坤：汉字形体源流。北京：华语教学出版社，2000。[

,

.

.

.

(, , , , , , ,),

.

.

,

.

,

,

.

4.

.

.

.

.

,

,

,

.

,

,

,

.

5.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.

:

.

,

/

.

.

.

,

.

.

«

»

1

_____ . . .
« _____ » _____ 2018 .

-

-

(_____ - **«LARRY KING NOW»**)

45.04.02

45.04.02.01.00

_____ . . .

_____ - . . . , . . .

_____ . . .

_____ . . .

2018

1

«Larry King now»).

120 , 2 108 , 15 , 25 ,

:

, , ,

:

: 1)

, 2)

, 3)

, 4)

, 5)

, 6)

:

, ,

- .

:

1. -

:

2. ,

3. -

4. -

, ,

-

- .

: 1)

, - , 2)

-

-

3)

, 4)

« - », « - », « - ».

», « - ».

ABSTRACT

Title: Cognitive-pragmatic features of the talk show discourse organization (on the basis of the talk-show “Larry King now”). The thesis is presented on 120 pages, it includes 2 tables, 15 illustrations, the reference list consisting of 108 sources, 25 of which are in foreign languages.

Key words: TALK SHOW DISCOURSE, THE CONCEPTUAL ORGANIZATION OF THE DISCOURSE, REPRESENTATION OF KNOWLEDGE, INTRODUCTIVE KNOWLEDGE COMPLEMENTARY KNOWLEDGE, KNOWLEDGE OF THE CONTENT OF THE TALK SHOW.

Aim: the analysis and description of cognitive-pragmatic features in knowledge organization of the talk show discourse.

Objectives: 1) to examine the scientific approaches to the definition of discourse and to systematize the main characteristics of discourse, 2) to describe the specifics of cognitive-pragmatic approach to discourse, 3) to identify and analyze the basic components of discourse within the cognitive-pragmatic approach, 4) to consider the discursive characteristics of talk show, 5) to identify and describe the specifics of the representation and organization of knowledge in the discourse of talk shows according to their type, 6) to systematize the linguistic means of knowledge representation of different types in the talk show discourse.

Practical value: possibility to use the results of this research in theoretical and practical courses on discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics, media discourse analysis.

Main conclusions and results:

1. Talk show discourse consists of different types of participants' knowledge: introductory and complementary as well as knowledge of the discursive content.
2. The interviewer with his vision of talk show system is a subject of representation, activation and organization of all knowledge.
3. Organization of talk show discourse depends on the interviewer's intention of producing a pragmatic correlation between participants' cognitive bases.
4. Identified system of verbal and non-verbal means and models of knowledge representation and activation, has its cognitive-pragmatic potential and serves the interviewer's intention of focusing viewers on various aspects of the talk show content and knowledge about the participants of talk show.

Perspectives of further research: 1) the consideration of the specifics and ways of organizing and presenting knowledge in different types of talk show discourse, 2) the consideration of national and cultural features of communicants' cognitive behavior in talk shows of different linguaculture, 3) the investigation of linguistic personalities of interviewer and interviewee in talk show discourse, 4) the investigation of participants' orientation on cognitive bases of interaction partners through dichotomies “interviewer – interviewee”, “interviewee – interviewer”, “interviewee – viewer”, “viewer – the interviewee”, “interviewer – the viewer”.

		4
1.			
		6
1.1.		6
1.1.1.		6
1.1.2.	.		
		7
1.2.		11
1.2.1.		11
1.2.2.		..	13
1.3.		...	17
1.3.1.		17
1.3.2.		20
1.3.3.	24
1.4.			
		27
	1		29
2.			
		30
2.1.	116	.	30
2.2.	74	.	41
2.3.	73	.	53
	2		71
			72
		
		77
	.	.	81
	.	.	82

(,) _____

() _____, ,

1.	,				
2.	,				
3.					
4.	/				
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.	/ ,				

(,) (_____)

• , ! •

(,) _____

() _____ ,

				.	.
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.	()				
8.	(60)				
9.					

(,)

()

• , •

!