LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN THE CONTEMPORARY PARADIGM OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE

SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

9

ԼԵԶՈՒՆ ԵՎ ԳՐԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ ԳԻՏԱԿԱՆ ԻՄԱՑՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԺԱՄԱՆԱԿԱԿԻՑ ՀԱՐԱՑՈՒՅՑՈՒՄ

ԳԻՏԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՆԴԵՍ

9

ԲՈՎԱՆԴԱԿՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

ԼԵԶՎԱԲԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

ԼԵԶՎԱԲԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

THE FUNCTIONAL INTERPRETATION OF *OK?* IN ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Nare Hakobyan

Yerevan State University

The aim of the paper is to analyze what role *OK?* plays in lectures at the level of the SUBSIDIARY discourse. The answer is possible to get through the functional interpretation of the question based on the extra-linguistic features of the question's use which is a path to gain realistic and objective results on how the question functions in the SUBSIDIARY discourse. The results will help us reevaluate the role of the question as a discourse marker and reapply it more productively as a teaching tool.

Key words: *OK?, pause, gestures, facial expressions, extra-linguistic reality, function.*

Introduction

The analysis on the functional interpretation of the question has been carried out through the non-verbal features that accompany the question. In this manner the results have been assumed to be more realistic and objective. Moreover, through the features it becomes viable to substantiate the functional interpretation more rigorously. Additionally, the consideration of the extra-linguistic features has enabled us to classify the question into four types which comprehensively reflect the functional entity of the question.

As extra-linguistic features we have focused on pause, gestures/facial expressions and/or the context. Pause has been defined as the silence of at least two seconds after the question. At least 2 seconds is the desirable "wait time"(Rowe 1978) because, as Rowe has stated, when the time after the question is less than 3 seconds the audience's interaction is not high and the responses are short and poor. But in our case the average pausing time during which a response has been provided has been at least 2 seconds which makes us consider the duration of at least two speechless seconds as a manageable pause period to elicit feedback. As for the gestures and facial expressions, the most common ones have been looking through the audience to see whether any hands or any gestures have been missed out or not, stretching the hand as a sign to offer the turn or nodding the head to signal the possibility for interaction expressed by turning to the audience, raising the eyebrows. The concept of the context is interpreted through the "Interaction phase" (Young 1994) when the question directly addresses the audience and requires its feedback, no matter there is a pause or not.

Taking into account those features, we have classified the question into four types: *OK?* with pause to elicit feedback, *OK?* with pause not to elicit feedback, *OK?* without

pause not to elicit feedback and *OK?*without pause to elicit feedback. This classification is quite effective because it shows the diverse applications of the question which make us behave less categorically in our functional interpretations. For instance, Camiciottoli has focused only on *OK?*without pause in her research and has arrived at the conclusion that it is not *a true question* (Camiciottoli 2008: 1221, quoted in Fortanet-Go'mez and Ruiz-Madrid 2014:210) but the reflection of the lecturers' habits. In this sense, we cannot blindly agree with her as in the research we have come across not only the cases when the question has been applied with pause as a conventional question, but also the contexts when the question has not been followed with pause but still has functioned as a true question to elicit feedback. And it is only due to the extra-linguistic features that it has been possible to put together all the pieces of the mosaic and unmask different functional variations of the same question, this way avoiding being unilateral or categorical.

Material and Method

The research is based on the analysis of 70 lectures on Natural Sciences delivered by 70 different specialists who are basically native speakers of English. The lectures are uploaded by the world's prominent universities (Yale, MIT, Oxford, University of California, etc.) that have the goal of making their contribution to education in the world.

In the research the question has not only been analyzed pragmatically by conducting contextual analyses but also empirically as we have examined other works on the same question. It means that the functional interpretations have not only been substantiated by the consideration of the extra-linguistic features but also through the literature review on the same question.

In addition, pause has been marked with '---'which has been followed with the figure of how it has lasted. The absence of pause is represented with '+++'. These symbols have facilitated our work with the transcripts.

The Notion of SUBSIDIARY Discourse

SUBSIDIARY discourse is one of the planes of the discourse which "reflects back on, modifies, evaluates and comments on the MAIN discourse" (Montgomery 1977:100) by acting as GLOSSING ("bear a more tenuous relationship to the main discourse" (ibid.)) or ASIDES. As far as in the research the question has not functioned as ASIDES and does not have "a more marked degree of PLANE CHANGE" (ibid.), we will concentrate on the GLOSSING activity only.

The GLOSSING activity "reflects back on, modifies, evaluates and comments on the MAIN discourse'"through its main functions which are RESTATEMENT, QUALIFY and COMMENT (ibid.:100). Each of the functions has its definition, and they are dependent on the MAIN discourse and are viewed "in the context of what has gone before" (ibid.:104). To put it simply, the SUBSIDIARY discourse is the immediate process of interaction and is not complete either structurally or content-wise but is on

that way. We are interested in understanding what role the question may play in this plane and how the immediate interaction benefits from its use.

OK as a Conventional Question to Elicit Feedback
OK? withPause to Elicit Feedback

This is the question type when *OK?* is applied as a conventional question that aims at getting its feedback. The existence of the question type has been disclosed thanks to the pause and the extra-linguistic reality which point out that the question is a conventional one, otherwise it will either be ignored (Camiciottoli 2008) or misinterpreted. Fortanet-Gómez and Ruiz-Madrid have also considered *OK?* as a true question, and the conclusion has been fortified with the existence of "the appropriate stress, gestures and pauses" (Fortanet-Gómez and Ruiz-Madrid 2014:220) that accompany the question.

In the research we have come across 49 similar occurrences of the question. E.g.:

> *… And then anybody who receives an announcement can 32:02 decide it's not going to be in the MIS and it outputs out 32:05 because it knows it has a neighbor that's in the MIS. 32:10 So if you decided in or out at this phase, you're done. 32:15 You become inactive. 32:16 And only the remaining active guys 32:18 continue to the next phase. 32:20 Make sense?---9sec* **OK?—2sec** *Any questions about how the algorithm works?---2sec Yes, no?+++OK...* (Lynch 2015)

As we see in the instance the question is followed with pause, and there is the eye contact with the audience. The context of questioning and immediately addressing the audience are another feature. All of them lead to the undeniable interpretation that the question is applied to elicit feedback. Another example is this:

> *…Well, you say maybe the probability is just small, 22:10 it's not zero. But I am telling you that 22:14 probability is zero, zip, zilch, nada, 22:17 nix, cipher, nought, goose egg. 22:20 Anybody else got another one?+++ [LAUGHTER] It is zero. 22:25 It is not small. It is just zero.* **OK?---2sec** *22:30 That is an interesting question. 22:32 And the answer to that question is that it's not an appropriate 22:38 question. OK?---2sec…* (Ceyer 2005)

The existence of the pause, the eye contact and passive posture by waiting for the response are the clues to decode the question's function correctly by regarding it as a question that requires its feedback.

To go ahead and stress the importance of the extra-linguistic reality once more, we will point at the contexts where the question has been followed with pause but there are not the gestures/facial expressions or the context that allow us to interpret it as a true question. Instead we decode its function as a means to "provoke thinking" (Thompson 1998; Morell2004; Querol-Julian 2008; Chang 2012; Camiciottoli 2008). E.g.:

> *And you'll say to yourself, what could be going on here, 43:26 you know?+++ 43:27 Why is it that they're not concordant, right?+++, 43:31 when they're mapped, but they're in the same region 43:35 of the genome?---2sec 43:38 And then you think to yourself, well, 43:40 what happens if I map this successfully here correctly 43:45 to the reference genome and this correctly 43:47 to the reference genome here, but this individual actually 43:52 had a chromosome that had a deletion right here?—3sec **OK?**--- **2sec** 44:01 Then what would happen would be that all these reads down 44:03 here are going to be misaligned, all of these bases 44:06 are going to be misaligned with the reference…*   (Gifford 2014)

In the instance the lecturer is not looking throughout the audience to observe whether he has missed out the reaction of any students or ignored any hands or not. There is not an eye contact or hand motion to signal that he is offering his turn but a glance at the left side only where he has been looking at before asking the question. No signs for feedback. It follows that the function of the question is to impact the audience with the question and make them think about the preceding idea.

OK? without Pause to Elicit Feedback

This is another question type which has been possible to distinguish only through the consideration of the extra-linguistic features of the question's use. In these instances the question is without pause but is accompanied with the gestures/facial expressions and the context which do not leave an empty space to doubt that it is used to elicit feedback. This question type as variation to *OK?* with pause to elicit feedback has not been mentioned before because Camiciottoli (2008) has not considered *OK?* without pause a question at all while it is a true question even though it is without pause. Though Fortanet-Gómez and Ruiz-Madrid have considered it as a true question "with the appropriate stress, gestures and pauses"(Fortanet-Gómez and Ruiz-Madrid 2014:220), there is not any pause at all but the gestures and facial expressions and/or the context that help to bring the conventional entity of the question into light. This question type has not been frequent in the lectures as well and has come across only 7 times in 70 lectures.

For these cases the question's attendant gestures and facial expressions that have signaled the turn offer have been looking through the audience to see whether they have ignored any hands or any gestures, stretching the hand as a sign to yield the floor to the students or nodding the head to signal the possibility for the interaction expressed by turning to the audience, raising the eyebrows. As for the context, it has been "Interaction phase" (Young 1994) when there is the immediate questioning and answering phase where the addressivityof the information does not assume another interpretation except for eliciting feedback. Let me bring an example,

> PROFESSOR: *Pardon?—1sec 47:51*
>
> AUDIENCE: *[INAUDIBLE] 47:53*
>
> PROFESSOR: *Each of them will oscillate 47:54 with the same frequency, for sure, but what 47:56 do youthink it's going to be?---2sec 47:57*
>
> AUDIENCE: *That one. 47:59*
>
> *PROFESSOR: It's going to be that one. 48:01 So off we go. 48:03 So let us hope that yours, truly, program worked. 48:16 Here we go. 48:17 Oh, look at that. 48:19 [INAUDIBLE], please interpret that for me. 48:21 What do you see there?—2sec 48:24 Hang on a second. 48:25 Let me blow it up so you can see it. 48:27 Ooh, isn't that pretty?+++ 48:30 And I believe the blue is X1 and the green is X2. 48:42 See?+++**OK?+++** 48:43 Everybody agree?+++ 48:44 Everyone appreciate what's going on?+++ 48:46*　　　　　　(Gossard 2011)

The case illustrates that we have an immediate addressivity initiated by the lecturer in order to "check the comprehension" (Thompson 1998; Morell, 2004; Querol-Julian 2008; Chang 2012; Camiciottoli 2008) of the audience. This is understood due to the context because the questions *See?* in the meaning "*Is it clear?*" or "*Do you understand?*" and "*Everybody agree?*" are the indicators that the lecturer elicits feedback and immediately addresses the audience for getting the response. Here is another example:

> *The amount of stretch, however, is unique. OK?+++16:09 It's associated with that direction. 16:11 So you have an amount of stretch. 16:12 And you have a direction. 16:13 And that describes the eigenvector-eigenvalue pair. **OK?+++**16:20 Is this clear?---2sec 16:22 You've heard of eigenvalues and eigenvectors before?---2sec 16:24 Good. OK. 16:27.*　　　(Swan 2015)

The application of the question is similar to that of "Modal question tags" (Schleef 2009) when the lecturer needs confirmation to the question, although in his research it is not stated whether Modal question tags are followed with pause or not. We have

decoded the function due to the eye-contact maintenance with the whole audience and looking through the audience not only signaling that he is offering the turn but also detecting whether any feedback has been missed out or not. Moreover, the question "*Is it clear?*" with the pause of two seconds is a sign for the Interaction phase where the lecturer has brought about the immediate addressivity through the question.

OK? without Pause not to Elicit Feedback

This question type is the most intriguing because it stirs much controversy about its functional value. This is the case when Camiciottoli (2008) has not considered it a question at all and Fortanet-Gómez and Ruiz-Madrid (2014) have also come across such similar contexts in their research. The problem is we have a discourse marker in the interrogative form that is not accompanied with the appropriate extra-linguistic features, or at least, with pause that will eliminate the controversy and give us the chance to think that it is a conventional question that "initiates interaction in lectures" (Long 1983; Swain 1995; Thompson 1998; Morell 2007; Camiciottoli 2004; Chang2012; Garcia 2010, et al.). But, unfortunately, we do not have those attendant conditions which quite objectively puts forward the question why OK? is actually used and how it functions.

The best way to answer the questions is to observe the contexts and analyze how *OK?* functions in them. E.g.:

> *So first of all, the norm squared of a product of things 52:12 is the product of the norm squared s. 52:14 So I can do that. 52:16 And this overall phase, the norm squared of a phase is just 1, 52:21 so that's just 1. 52:25 So now we have the norm squared of 1 plus a complex number. OK?---2sec 52:32 And so the norm squared of 1 is going to give me 1.52:34 The norm squared of the complex number is going to give me 1. 52:37 And the cross terms are going to give me the real part-- 52:39 twice the real part-- of e to the i b minus 52:41 a, which is going to be equal to cosine of b minus a. **OK?+++** 52:47 And so what you see here is that you 52:49 have a single frequency in the superposition. Cool?+++ OK.*
>
> (Adams 2013)

As we see we have a context where the question does not come up similarly to the contexts above, hence we cannot call it as *atrue question*that elicits feedback. Instead, the question is closely related to the preceding idea and has to be analyzed through its connection to the idea. First of all, we assume that the question is a means to focus the audience's attention on the importance of the idea. This idea has been mentioned by Schleef as well who has stated that *OK?* as a tag question may come up as "Progression checks*"*that "focus the listeners' attention on the preceding information and mark it as important or potentially hard to understand"(Schleef 2009:65). From our perspective, its role is to help the audience pick up more prominent ideas from the less prominent ones this way guiding the audience (Harden & Crosby 2000).

Moreover, we think that the question type multifunctions in this context as there are other equal functions realized in parallel. As Chang has stated "the more common the question form was, the more variable its functions were" (Chang 2012:110, quoted in Dafouz Milne and García 2013:136). Therefore, there is another function realized with the same form, that is to create the illusion of involvement. There is the tendency of making lectures student-oriented through questions (Goffman 1981, reported in Malavska 2016:67; Cazden 2001; Cutting 2002; Lynch 1991; McCarthy 1996; Thompson 1998; Seedhouse 1996; Sinclair & Coulthard 1975; Yu 2009; reported in Vivekmetakorn and Thamma 2015; Dafouz Milne and Garci'a 2013; Young 1994; Hyland 2005, etc.) but in this case the mechanism of how the question makes lectures interactive is different. In reality, the lecturer makes use of the interrogative form of OK because the interrogative form of any statement has the power to attract attention (Hoffeld 2016). It is connected to our subconsciousness when the brain gets concentrated on the question and cannot do anything else but to ponder over the question if it has been heard. Besides the reasoning of the behavior in neuroscience, all the scholars who have investigated questions in lectures have also noticed the power of questions to hold attention (Cloe and Chang 1987, reported in Westwood 1996:73; Camiciottoli 2008; Querol-Julian 2008 and Chang 2012, reported in Fortanet-Go'mezand Ruiz-Madrid2014:209-210; Vivekmetakorn, Thamma 2015; Bamford 2005). Now what we say is that yes, lecturers involve the audience through *OK?* but this involvement is not authentic but is illusionary or deceptive because in reality they do not offer the turn which is understood because of the absence of the appropriate extra-linguistic features. It follows that the use of the question creates the illusion of involvement through the interrogative form of the question. The illusion helps the lecturer make the audience feel addressed, which keeps them focused on the lecture. Bamford has also expressed a similar approach on *self-answered* questions that "serve to induce the student into thinking that what is taking place is an interactive sharing of ideas and information" (Bamford 2005, quoted in Chang 2012:126, quoted in Dafouz Milne andGarcía 2013:140). In our case, "induce to think" is interpreted as creating the illusion because we take lectures as pedagogues who know how to work with the audience with the right method and skills to teach.

Then, the question acts as a means not to sound overbearing. The behavior of being overbearing may occur if the lecturer talks all the time during the lecture and shows their dominance in terms of knowledge which makes the audience feel inferior and less knowledgeable, and this will bring to despair. But with the use of the question the lecturer makes up the atmosphere that he needs some information, and that may be provided by the audience only. This generates the feeling of "common group membership" (Hyland 1998). But the aforementioned function does not work in that manner truly because the turn is not offered but the illusion of addressivity is created because the turn is not offered but the illusion of addressivity is created. In some sense our interpretation of the question is similar to that of "Modal question tags*"* proposed by Schleef who has characterized them as questions that "request information or confirmation" (Schleef 2009:65). Of course, there is a difference in the functions in the

way that in our case we have witnessed that no turn has been offered but what is common is that the question is a modal (Schleef 2009) one that helps the lecturer not be authoritative but treat the audience with the sense of equality and "group membership" (Hyland 1998).

Furthermore, there is one more equal function that is realized in the context, and it is to verify the truthfulness of the preceding idea. In this case the lecturer does not seek for confirmation similar to "Modal question tags" (Schleef 2009:64) or "Cpmprehension checks" (Long and Sato 1983; Thompson 1998; Morrel 2004) but confirms the idea himself in order to eliminate the possible doubts about the data truthfulness and sound more 'persuading' (Brown & Manogue 2001:240; Hyland 1998). He makes use of one of the meanings *OK* has, that is "confirmation", and uses it in the interrogative form instead of an affirmative one in order to "make a strong claim about the correctness of the preposition and sounding more persuasive" (Hyland 1998). Of course, this idea is still connected to the nature of questions to create interactions. From that perspective, we regard the question as a "booster" that "emphasizes the certainty and constructs rapport by marking involvement with the topic and solidarity with the audience" (Hyland 2005, quoted in Fortanet-Go'mezand Ruiz-Madrid2014:206). This means that the question has the function of stressing the truthfulness of the preceding idea once more still making up the illusion of involvement and reserving the "interpersonal aspects of language use" (Hyland 1998:357).

To comment on the last three functions, we want to add that the matter of creating the illusion of involvement is not random in lectures on Natural Sciences. It is conditioned with the "characteristic of knowledge production which has made the professors in these fields develop a less interactive style of lecture discourse" (Chang 2012:113, quoted in Dafouz Milne and Garci'a 2013:139) by defining the issues clearly and indicating directly how the current claim is different from the conventional ones (Hyland 1998).

By the way, it is worth adding that not only the question type is high in its occurrence (1509) but also those four functions compared to the other functions fulfilled by the other types of the question:

Verify the preceding idea	Focus the attention	Create the illusion of involvement	Not sound overbearing
1517	1512	1516	1516
			Total 1519

But the functions of this question type are not confined to the ones presented above. They are completed with some not frequent ones, that similar to the ones mentioned above, may come up together, in parallel to the aforementioned ones or alone. The functions with their number of occurrences are as follows:

Signal the upcoming idea	Intensify the preceding idea	Have a humorous effect	Attract attention
4	3	3	1
			Total 1519

OK? with Pause not to Elicit Feedback

This is the most interesting question type (94 occurrences) because if not the extra-linguistic reality, it might not be interpreted as a question at all, and even worse, might be ignored. It is the extra-linguistic reality indicates that this question type exists as a variation of *OK?* with pause to elicit feedback in lectures. The question type is unique in the way that the question is followed with pause which may stand as a sign for eliciting feedback but the complementary extra-linguistic reality decodes that the pause does not stand for the turn shift but is a means to fulfill an action that will upgrade the lecture's quality while the question functions similar to *OK?* without pause not to elicit feedback. E.g.:

> *... 61:53 It has to be close to millions. 61:55 But in practice, if you use a lot more powerful tool 62:00 of estimating it, it should only be hundreds or at most 62:05 thousands.**OK?---3sec** 62:13 So the tool you'll use there is moment-generating functions, 62:15 something similar to moment-generating functions. 62:18 But I will not go into it. 62:20 Any questions?---3sec 62:23 OK...* (Lee 2013)

The example points out that *OK?* is used with pause but not for eliciting feedback. The conclusion has been arrived at due to the non-verbal behavior when the pause has been used for pulling the clean board down. At the same time *OK?* functions as a separate unit to make the information more reliable, to focus attention on the preceding idea, to create the illusion of involvement and to sound not overbearing. Another similar function is as follows:

> *...We could do it in a moment, but it's 14:51 useful to just kind of imagine what scale might it be. 15:15 All right?+++ This is a way of-- we can go up as high as we want. 15:18 You can continue it on and this is all in units of picanewtons. **OK?---2sec**15:26 Once again, it's useful to make guesses 15:28 about your intuition on these things 15:29 just so you have some notion of where we might be. 15:34 And of course, in this case, nobody wants to guess anything, right?+++, 15:37 because they feel-- all right, I'll 15:42 give you 10 seconds just to make your best guess...* (Gore 2014)

In this context the lecturer makes the pause in order to stop his glasses from falling down. As for *OK?*, it is used similarly to the example above.

For the sake of interest we would also like to discuss the case when the question has been applied for filling in the silence:

> *OK, let me give you another example.11:52 The electron is x and p, some position. 11:55 Is it happy?---2sec11:57 Right?+++ so there are still questions you can't answer. 12:00 The point is, complete knowledge of the system 12:02 to answer any physically observable question--12:04 any question that could be meaningfully turned 12:06 into an experiment, the answer is 12:10 contained in knowing the state of the system. Cool?---2sec* **OK?---3sec***12:17*
>
> *But this can't possibly be true in quantum mechanics, 12:20 because…*

<div align="right">(Adams 2013)</div>

In this context the use of *OK?* with pause not to elicit feedback is a matter of filling in the silence because after *Cool?* the lecturer looks at the audience to check whether there is any feedback or not, turns back saying *OK?*, looks through his notes and walks to the board to draw a line and to speak. Contextually *OK?* is used to fill in the silence from *Cool?* till *But* because he has turned back by saying *OK?* and not looking at the audience, which means that *OK?* has not been intended for the audience but for filling in the silence between *OK?* and *But*. If it were said before turning back the interpretation would be different as well: it was used to elicit feedback.

Conclusion

As we have stated at the beginning the basic aim of the paper has been to point out how the question functions in the SUBSIDIARY discourse. The only way to understand it has been to analyze the question's functions. But as we have got reassured the interpretations become incomplete or unrealistic without the consideration of the extra-linguistic features of the question's use. These features help to dig out all the possible functional variations of the questions and make the interpretation solid and rigorous.

So with the outcomes acquired we arrive at the conclusion that the major role of the question in the discourse is to provide the discourse continuity by eliminating the possible barriers on the way of the discourse development: realizing tiredness, holding attention, eliminating doubts, interacting when necessary, etc. It contributes to the progress of the discourse and has the function of a RESTATEMENT in the GLOSSING activity. This conclusion makes the question an invaluable tool in lecturing and teaching because it is viewed as an excellent means to make the discourse continuous

through the removal of a number of barriers typical of the genre by impacting the process of knowledge construction and knowledge perception.

REFERENCES

1. Brown, G. & Michael, M. (2001) *AMEE Medical Education Guide No. 22: Refreshing lecturing: a guide for lecturers*. // Medical Teacher, Vol. 23, No. 3.
2. Dafouz-Milne, E.; García, D.S. (2013) *'Does Everybody Understand?' Teacher questions across disciplines in English-mediated university lectures: An exploratory study*. // Language Value. Volume 5, N. 1, pp. 129-151.
3. Fortanet-Go'mez, I.; Ruiz-Madrid, M.N.(2014) *Multimodality for Comprehensive Communication in the Classroom: Question in Guest Lectures*. Ibe'rica 28: 203-224, ISSN: 1139-7241/e-ISSN:2340-2784. Available at:
   <http://www.redalyc.org/html/2870/287032049010/> [AccessedAugust 2017].
4. Hoffeld, D. (2016) *The Science of Selling: Proven Strategies to Make Your Pitch, Influence Decisions, and Close the Deal*. Penguin Publishing Group: a division of Penguin Random House LLC.
5. Hyland, K. (1998) *Boosting, Hedging and the Negotiation of Academic Knowledge.TEXT*, 18(3), pp. 349-382.
6. Montgomery, M.M. (1977) *Some Aspects of Discourse Structure and Cohesion in Selected Science Lectures*. Unpublished MA Dissertation. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
7. Schleef, E. (2009) *A Cross-Cultural Comparison of the Functions and Sociolinguistic Distribution of English and German Tag Questions and Discourse Markers in Academic Speech Included in Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Academic Discourse*.// Pragmatics and Beyond New Series, ISSN 0922-842X; V. 193. / Ed. by Suomela- Salmi, E.; Dervin F. The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
8. Thompson, S. (1998)*"Why Ask Questions in a Monologue? Language Choice at Work in Scientific and Linguistic Talk"*. // Language at Work. / Ed. byS. Huston.Selected papers from the Annual Meeting of the British Association of Applied Linguistics, pp. 137-150.Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

SOURCES OF DATA

1. Adams, A. (2013) *MIT*. Available at: <http://youtube.com/watch?v=Ei8CFin00PY> [Accessed July 2017].
2. Ceyer, S. (2005) *MIT*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G5q1_zhG 86g> [Accessed October 2017].
3. Gifford, D. (2014) *MIT*. Available at:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KYQ2dP W5nEU> [Accessed November 2017].
4. Gore, J. (2014) *MIT*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cT855rp X8bc&t=1s> [Accessed November 2017].

5. Gossard, D. (2011) *MIT.* Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v= 9CPA6WG 6mRo> [Accessed October 2017].
6. Lee, Ch. (2013) *MIT.* Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f9XFM8 YLccg&t=13s> [Accessed November 2017].
7. Lynch, N.A. (2015) *MIT.* Available at:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v =mUBmcbbJNf4> [Accessed November 2017].
8. Swan, J. (2015) *MIT.* Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=txKXRtlr FfI&list=PLUl4ucNGP6152YvEOa6i6L3axPx0IkIO> [Accessed October 2017].

OK?-ի գործառութային մեկնաբանությունը
ակադեմիական դիսկուրսում

Աշխատանքի նպատակն է ուսումնասիրել, թե ինչպիսի գործառույթներ է իրականացնում *OK*-ն իբրև հարց երկրորդական դիսկուրսում: Այդ նպատակով հարցն ուղեկցող արտալեզվական հատկանիշները լս ներառվել են ուսումնասիրության մեջ: Նման ձևով փորձել ենք ձեռք բերել ավելի իրատեսական և օբյեկտիվ արդյունքներ:

Коммуникативно-функциональная интерпретация
высказывания *Ok?* в академическом дискурсе

Работа посвящена **коммуникативно-**функциональной интерпретации **высказывания** *Ok?* как вопроса во время лекций. Цель статьи – изучить **коммуникативно-**функциональные реализации вопроса и понять, является ли *Ok?* обычным вопросом или нет. В статье также описываются особенности употребления *Ok?* в тексте и дискурсе.

Մեր հեղինակները

Ալինա Պետրոսյան – ԵՊԲՀ օտար լեզու-
ների ամբիոնի դասախոս, բ.գ.թ.
էլ. հասցե՝ alina.petrosyan@yahoo.com

Անահիտ Հակոբյան – ԵՊՀ արտասահ-
մանյան գրականության ամբիոնի ասպի-
րանտ
էլ. հասցե՝
anahit.hakobyan1988@yandex.ru

Անի Տեր-Պետրոսյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիական
բանասիրության ամբիոնի դասախոս
էլ. հասցե՝ aniterpetrosyan@ysu.am

Աննա Կնյազյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիական բա-
նասիրության ամբիոնի դոցենտ, բ.գ.դ.
էլ. հասցե՝ annaknyazyan@ysu.am

Աստղիկ Մխիթարյան – Վաղարշապա-
տի Մ.Գորկու անվան հ.5 ավագ դպրոցի
ուսուցչուհի
էլ. հասցե՝ asto7@rambler.ru

Արեզա Համբարձումյան – ԵՊՀ արտա-
սահմանյան գրականության ամբիոնի
ասպիրանտ
էլ. հասցե՝ orbisenglish@gmail.com

Արմենուհի Մարտիրոսյան – ԵՊՀ
դիվանագիտական ծառայության և մաս-
նագիտական հաղորդակցման ամբիոնի
ասիստենտ
էլ. հասցե՝ arm.martirosyan@ysu.am

Գայանե Մուրադյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիական
բանասիրության ամբիոնի դոցենտ,
բ.գ.դ.
էլ. հասցե՝ g.murad@ysu.am

Գոհար Հարությունյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիա-
կան բանասիրության ամբիոնի դոցենտ,
բ.գ.թ.
էլ. հասցե՝ goharharutyunyan@ysu.am

Համլետ Առաքելյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիական
բանասիրության ամբիոնի ասպիրանտ
էլ. հասցե՝ hamlet.araqelyan@gmail.com

Հասմիկ Ղաջոյան – ՀԱՊՀ օտար
լեզուների ամբիոնի դասախոս
էլ. հասցե՝ hasmikghajoyan@mail.ru

Հասմիկ Մկրտչյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիական
բանասիրության ամբիոնի դասախոս
էլ. հասցե՝ hasmikmkrtchyan@ysu.am

Մարիամ Առաքելյան – ՀՊՄՀ օտար
լեզուների դասավանդման մեթոդիկայի
ամբիոնի հայցորդ
էլ. հասցե՝ mariamarakelyan89@mail.ru

Մարիամ Գևորգյան – ԵՊԼՀ ընդհանուր
լեզվաբանության ամբիոնի ասպիրանտ
էլ. հասցե՝ miriamgevorgian@gmail.com

Մարիանա Սարգսյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիա-
կան բանասիրության ամբիոնի դոցենտ,
բ.գ.թ.
էլ. հասցե՝ marianasargsyan@ysu.am

Մարիկա Տոնյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիական բա-
նասիրության ամբիոնի դոցենտ, բ.գ.թ.
էլ. հասցե՝ marikatonyan@ysu.am

Մարինե Մկրտչյան – ԵՊՀ դիվանա-
գիտական ծառայության և մասնագի-
տական հաղորդակցման ամբիոնի
դասախոս
էլ. հասցե՝ m.mkrtchyan@ysu.am

Նաիրա Մկրյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիական բա-
նասիրության ամբիոնի դոցենտ, բ.գ.թ.
էլ. հասցե՝ nairamkryan@ysu.am

Նատալյա Գոնչար-Խանջյան – ԵՊՀ ար-
տասահմանյան գրականության ամբիո-
նի դոցենտ, բ.գ.թ.
էլ. հասցե՝
natalie.goncharkhanjyan@ysu.am

Նարե Հակոբյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիական բանասիրության ամբիոնի ասպիրանտ
էլ. հասցե՝ narekaytser@gmail.com

Նարե Մկրտչյան – Հայ-Ռուսական (Սլավոնական) համալսարանի արտասահմանյան գրականության ամբիոնի ասպիրանտ
էլ. հասցե՝ mkrtchyan.nare@gmail.com

Նարե Չոբանյան – ԵՊՀ թարգմանության տեսության և պրակտիկայի ամբիոնի ասպիրանտ
էլ. հասցե՝ nare.chobanyan@gmail.com

Նարե Ջաբաղյան – ԵՊՀ թարգմանության տեսության և պրակտիկայի ամբիոնի դասախոս
էլ. հասցե՝ narejabaghyan@ysu.am

Ջեմմա Միլիտոնյան – ԵՊՀ Իջևանի մասնաճյուղի անգլերեն լեզվի և զակառության ամբիոնի դասախոս
էլ. հասցե՝ jemmamilitonyan@yandex.com

Ռուզաննա Առաքելյան – ԵՊՀ անգլիական բանասիրության ամբիոնի դոցենտ, բ.գ.թ.
էլ. հասցե՝ ruzanna.arakelyan@ysu.am

Սիրարփի Կարապետյան – ԵՊՀ թարգմանության տեսության և պրակտիկայի ամբիոնի դասախոս, բ.գ.թ.
էլ. հասցե՝ sirarpikarapetyan@ysu.am

Ի ԳԻՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ՀԵՂԻՆԱԿՆԵՐԻ

«Լեզուն և գրականությունը գիտական իմացության ժամանակակից հարացույցում» գիտական հանդեսը լույս է տեսնում տարին մեկ անգամ: Հանդեսում տպագրվելու համար կարող են ներկայացվել հոդվածներ հայերեն, անգլերեն և ռուսերեն լեզուներով **Sylfaen** տառատեսակով, լուսանցքները` 2 սմ, վերնագիրը` 14 տառաչափով (աջ կողմում, գլխատառերով, թավատառ), հիմնական տեքստը և ենթավերնագրերը (ձախ կողմում, թավատառ), հեղինակի անուն, ազգանունը (աջ կողմում, թավատառ), աշխատավայրը (աջ կողմում, շեղատառ)` 12 տառաչափով,  բոլոր տողերի միջև տարածությունը` 1.5: Հոդվածին անհրաժեշտ է կցել հայերեն, անգլերեն և ռուսերեն ամփոփագրեր` 60-80 բառի սահմաններում, 7-10 բանալի բառեր (հիմնական տեքստի լեզվով), հեղինակի մասին համառոտ տեղեկություն` աշխատավայր, կոչում, պաշտոն, էլ. հասցե, հեռախոսահամար (հայերեն):

- Տեքստը բաժանել հետևյալ մասերի` ներածություն, ենթաբաժիններ և եզրակացություն:
- Այլ հեղինակների մեջբերումները` չակերտների մեջ, որպես տեքստի շարունակություն /եթե կարճ է/ կամ նոր տողից /եթե երկար է/:
- Այլ հեղինակների աշխատությունների վերնագրերը` չակերտների մեջ:
- Փաստացի օրինակները`շեղատառ, առանց չակերտների: Եթե օրինակները ներկայանում են մեկից ավելի նախադասություններով, առանձնացնել տեքստից` վերևում և ներքևում թողնելով մեկական տարածություն: Օրինակի մեջ ուշադրության արժանի բառերը կամ բառախմբերը ներկայացնել թավատառ:
- Տեքստում աղբյուրը ներկայացնել հետևյալ ձևով` փակագծերում տալ հեղինակի ազգանունը և հրատարակչության տարեթիվը: Եթե մատնանշվում է էջը` տարեթվից հետո դնել հայկական վերջակետ, նշել էջը: Օրինակ` (Svartvik 2005) կամ (Bronfen 1992:330):
- Ծանոթագրությունները` հոդվածի վերջում, գրականության ցանկից առաջ:
- Գրականության ցանկը ներկայացնել **այբբենական կարգով**` խստիվ հետևելով ներքոնշյալ կանոններին`
  հեղինակի ազգանունը, անվանատառերը, (հրատարակման թվականը), աշխատանքի վերնագիրը (շեղատառերով, առանց չակերտների), հրատարակման վայրը, հրատարակչությունը, հայկական վերջակետ:

Օրինակներ`

1.Զախուլյան, Գ.Բ. (2003) *Շարահյուսական ուսումնասիրություններ*. Երևան: Աստղիկ հրատարակչություն:
2.Eisenstein, E.L. (1979) *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*. Cambridge: CUP.
3.Myer, T. (1997) *The Language of Science*. Available at: <http://www.sfsite.com> [Accessed June 2012]
4.Redbury, M. (2003) *Language and Discourse.* // Investigations in Linguistics. / Ed. by R.K. Smith. New York: Redgate Inc.
5.Svartvik, J. (2005) *A Life in Linguistics.* // The European English Messenger. / Ed. by J.A. Stotesbury. Vol.14 (1). Portugal: Grafica de Coimbra.
6.(1998) *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: OUP.

- Հոդվածի էլեկտրոնային տարբերակը ուղարկել afajournal@ysu.am էլ. հասցեին: