

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE PROCESSES IN THE SPEECH OF YOUTH IN KAZAKH

Zh. Baiteliyeva¹, K. Kuderinova²

¹Department of Kazakh language and Turkic studies, Nazarbayev University, Nur-Sultan 010000, Kazakhstan

²Department of Speech Culture, A. Baitursynov Institute of Linguistics, Almaty 050000, Kazakhstan

Abstract

The article presents the results of a comprehensive analysis of the peculiarities of speech in Kazakh language of Generation Z, which differs from the previous generation in linguistic, cognitive, social, and psychological terms. The analysis of unprepared speeches of senior students of Nazarbayev University, leading university in our country, was carried out. Factors such as the social status of students, their major, language environment, educational environment and their impromptu speaking on a topic that was given a little earlier were comprehensively analyzed. The analysis considered the extent to which the topic was covered in general and how it was covered individually by each student. The results were analyzed.

Key words: *Speech of youth, Kazakh language, oral language*

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the 90s of the last century, it is known that the number of native speakers of the Kazakh language in Kazakhstan has increased significantly. This is evidenced by the increase in the number of graduates and students studying in Kazakh schools, Kazakh departments of universities, Kazakh speaking and writing workers, the representatives and listeners of the media broadcasting, especially on the television and radio, in which Kazakh is used in oral. However, the quality of use is increasingly demanding special attention. It is a fact that the quality of oral speech including public and business speeches has decreased among the middle (40-50 years old) and older generation (60-80 years old) of native speakers of the Kazakh language, without mentioning generation Z.

It is safe to say that the words, books and literature that are heard, spoken and read in the daily press, and on some television and radio channels, even threaten the viability of the Kazakh language.

The language of the younger generation repeats the language of the previous generation and is reduced and preserved according to the general laws of language development. If the language is in the shadow of a dominant language, then it falls under the influence of these languages. The Kazakh language is the language that came under the influence of the Russian language, changed and destroyed in the use of the older, middle and young generation, and now is also influenced by the English language in the use of the younger generation. Scientists and sociologists note the strong influence of the English language not only on the Kazakh language but also on world languages [1].

In this regard, in order to study how the language of modern Kazakh youth repeats the language of the previous generation and how it is reduced and saved according to the patterns of development of languages in general, as well as what positive and negative changes, processes occur under the influence of dominant Russian and English languages, the analysis of the non-prepared speeches of students from the best university in the country: Nazarbayev University was carried out. In a comprehensive analysis, words are considered on a free platform for students' speeches on a predetermined general topic, taking into account their social status, major, language and educational environment. The analysis also is done considering the general revealing content of the topic and the structure of the speech of each speaking student. Moreover, the word is analyzed syntactically, phonetically, and morphologically.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Materials

The material of the research work is a video recording of online discussions among students of Nazarbayev University. That is, in order to analyze the oral Kazakh speech of students, their discussion was recorded on video.

Due to the quarantine situation, the discussion was held online. 9 undergraduate students of Nazarbayev University attended the discussion. There were 4 male and 5 female students. This is a sufficient audience for analysis. Students were majoring in Electrical Engineering, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Political Science and History, Computer Science, Biology, and Mathematics. Their age is 18-21 years old. Moreover, these 9 students graduated from a Kazakh school in a Kazakh-speaking environment: Turkestan region, Baiterek district of West Kazakhstan region, Irgiz district of Aktobe region, Kyzylorda region, Almaty region, Kaskelen city, only 2 students graduated from a city school.

A teacher of the Kazakh language led the discussion. The discussion consisted of 2 blocks, and a precondition was agreed upon. In the first block, the question was asked as a general topic: "Is there a need to develop a culture of public speech in the modern Kazakh language?" Upon request, the students were divided into two groups according to the position of yes/no and agreed that in 5 minutes they would answer the question by providing their arguments.

In the second block, a 7-minute video of the most listened-to speaker by students was listened, which was identified as a result of a preliminary survey. After that, specific questions were discussed: "What did you like in the words of this speaker?", "What did you not like in the words of this speaker?", "What especially attracted your attention in the words of this speaker?".

The total duration of the discussion is 1:16. This is the time that allows for receiving an exhaustive answer to the discussion request.

2.2 Methods

Before the start of the research work, permission was obtained from the Nazarbayev University Ethics Committee to conduct this discussion and videotape it. As required by the ethics committee, all members of the research team completed the CITI course.

The purpose of the analysis of students' speech is to identify the level of syntactic, phonetic, and morphological structure in the public speech of students from the best educational institution of Kazakhstan NU, where multilingual youth study, as well as to determine the technique used to convey thoughts in speech and how the language of modern Kazakh youth repeats the language of the previous generation and how it is reduced according to the laws of the development of languages in general. Moreover, the paper studies what positive and negative changes, and processes occur in the Kazakh language under the shadow of the dominant Russian, and English languages. To achieve this goal, one of the main methods of sociolinguistics the method of direct observation was used [2]. That means the discussion of the students was filmed on video. To obtain objective data from this study, a preliminary plan for organizing the discussion was drawn up:

- The content of the work is thought out, and its goals and main stages are defined. The discussion consisted of two blocks: the first block included the discussion on the present question "Is there a need to develop your verbal culture?". To do this, the students were divided into two groups, the first group supported the opinion "Yes, there is" and supported it with arguments. The second group voted for the opinion "No, don't" and provided their arguments. In the second part, the discussion continued by asking specific questions on a sent video to the students participating in the discussion.
- Taking into account social characteristics (age, gender, place of birth, education, specialty, etc.), somewhat identical informants were selected.
- To obtain the necessary information, conditions for discussion have been created. In particular, all participants were invited to express their thoughts on a certain topic in their Kazakh, which they use daily, and take part in the discussion.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first thing that was noticed was that during the discussion students had difficulty expressing their thoughts openly. The second is that the topic was unexpected and given at that particular time, which seems to have surprised and amazed the students at the same time. In this regard, it was noted that, as a representative of Eastern culture, a cautious, respectful answer was given by students who spoke as the son of the Kazakh nation, who would not harm himself and the people, the nation, choosing which answer would be correct. At the same time, the students themselves in the “no” opposition did not object at all, but simply expressed their opinion, because ways were not considered.

In the analysis, first of all, from the point of view of the general text of the stated thoughts of the student considered following points:

- be understandable;
- the content of the word;
- the ability to respond in a given time;
- to be impressive;
- be systematic.

Secondly, an analysis is made of the characteristics of the languages of student youth, including positive and negative changes in languages. Changes are characterized by a link to the social status of the speaker.

Before starting the analysis, first of all, it is important to note the formation of public speech among students, and how the paths of its formation and improvement go.

The interaction of a young person with the external environment begins with the “I”. The close space around the “I” of the student is family, relatives, friends and neighbours (even a neighbour occupies a place in modern urban communication after fellow students and colleagues). We called this close space a “familiar environment”. Linguistic features of communication in a familiar environment are closely related to non-linguistic situations. The subject context, the general, familiar situation in most cases allows for the economy of the word, ellipticization (it is interesting that linguistic communication between family members living in the same house is very small) [3]. Therefore, the main features of communication in a familiar environment can be called a small use of language units, an abundance of profanity, and brevity of short speech statements.

In a familiar environment, the spoken language serves, and in an unfamiliar environment, the literary language is spoken [4]. Communication in modern urban areas is mainly expressed in neutral speech. When 6-8 hours every day of city residents, students are in an educational institution, and only 5 hours at home with their families, we see that the use of literary language in oral communication is especially important for student groups and workers.

We called the distant space, which moves away from the “I”, *the familiar-unfamiliar environment* and *the unfamiliar environment*. For the student environment, unfamiliar groups and fellow students are familiar; public transport, public, cultural, and mass places are unfamiliar. Then a person uses oral speech in a familiar environment, when he/she begins to distance himself/herself from a familiar environment, he/she needs to use a neutral style of speech in a familiar-unfamiliar environment, or literary language in an unfamiliar environment. Thus, the communicative function of the literary language will be associated with strengthening the goal of a person's manifestation of “himself” in an unfamiliar environment through language. Because in an unfamiliar environment, general knowledge, and background knowledge may be completely absent or insignificant among communicators. Therefore, speech, a word in an unfamiliar environment: - a) “like in a book”, in an oral literary language, b) prepared in advance; c) is produced in the system of written speech.

Neutral speech is used in *a familiar-unfamiliar environment*. The neutral language of speech is the basis of the common language and the literary language. Signs of neutral speech: a) lexical, grammatical units and the structure of the literary language are preserved; B) there are no elements of local, simple speech,

another language; c) in the norm of the language, the structure of oral speech is clearly expressed; c) focused on the oral audience; d) the processes of economy, compactness of speech are expressed [5, 6].

The neutral style of speech is often used in everyday communication between a large team, members of an organization, in the educational process, in the process of meetings, in communication between strangers, in business relations, in telephone conversations in the service sector, also between a faculty and a student, the students themselves, a doctor and patient, a bank employee and its client.

Spoken language is used in the colloquial and simple style of speech, except for the considered neutral style of speech. Spoken style has been considered as a style, which is used in an environment where primitive, rude, obscene words are not mixed, the use of elements of another language i.e. barbarism words, which are to a certain extent have become a habit are not included, jargon words have not been used, deviations from the norm of the literary language are obvious, the existence of a dialect word in a familiar environment.

Then the language used by the students of the two universities during the discussions is the neutral language according to the classification. Neutral speech is implemented in oral form.

An oral language is considered as the mobile language in time and space, not having the ability to repeat what was said at the same moment. In oral language, first of all, there will be economy of the word. It:

- the ability of communicators to have a fund of paralinguistic, extralinguistic, suprasegmental techniques: intonation, gesture, intonation, tempo, facial expressions, subject expression, implicit semantics, background;
- the constitution is the basis of communication, having a social context;
- in connection with this, the strength of the semantic connection of words, and the fact that they can be connected without morphological forms, syllables;
- analyticism, from the power of inversion [7];
- comes from the presence in the minds of communicants of hidden content that is not verbalized.

The fact that spoken language is often two-way, that is, the ability of communicators to see each other, mobility, ability to respond, affects its structure. Therefore, there is no unambiguous narration, the phrases are simple [8], the function of influencing the communicant is dynamically open, auto-commentator, repetition of words, hesitation are often used [9]. Due to the fact that the intonation of the same word, which is repeated many times in the same sentence, the timbre is different, the listener perceives it as a different semantic unit.

Although the spoken language is slower for thinking, it is faster than the written language. Therefore, a thought that has entered the internal speech code comes out as it is. Since the external language does not have time to encode the thought into itself, the oral language is more subject to the logical structure than the syntactic one, since in the oral language the communicant has his own will, his own style of speech, and starts the communicative act without preparation. The spoken language will have many new words, new uses of grammatical forms [10]. In the science of any nation, the subject of philological research primarily studies the area of the literary language. It is true that the existence and stability of a literary language is the main indicator of the viability of this language. However, not much is taken into account that the literary language is formed through speech, and active processes and changes in its modern character occur through speech. In fact, as Academician Shcherba says: "In order to understand any text, you must first translate it into the language of speech" [11], the language of speech, that is, oral, should be the first to be taken into as the subject of study. That is why, the neutral speech to analyze positive and negative changes in the language of students has been considered. According to the criteria of the above analysis, it can be said that at first the speech of the students was understandable in general. The words of the female participants were especially clear. In the speech of the male students there was little clarity, understanding, for example, there were the following words that did not sound for the audience: "Э... Жаңа... Жаңа біреудің ойы болған, осы... бар ғой коуч, мотиватор, ораторларға... ораторлар, олар осы... э... халықты... қолдайды деп... (күлді) ол сондай бір аргумент десе болған. Сол үшін..." (Eh ... Just ... Just now someone had the idea that ... there is a coach, motivator, to public speakers ..

public speakers, they are... eh.. the population... supports... (laughs) he said that's one argument. For those...).

The achievement by the listener of any word depends on the relevance of the topic raised and the availability of relevant content. The student who was the first to speak in the discussion on the question asked: "Is there a need to improve the culture of oral language in the Kazakh language?" could not find a supporting argument to answer the question "there is a need". We know that the reason was the unexpectedness of the topic, as well as the lack of thought that such a topic could be. After all, attention translated into the Kazakh language, and, as you know, attention in such an English-speaking university as Nazarbayev University, is not so easy to attract. Therefore, we believe that in the speech of the supporters of the opposition "there is a need" for discussion there was distrust and indifference. Therefore, there were no "hooking" words in the speech, there was no "flow" that could go from one sentence to another.

However, unlike the speech of the older and middle generation, the speech of the student youth can be completed in a given time. All speakers completed their presentations in less than 2 minutes, or the full 2 minutes. This means that the speech of the young students did not have much effect on them, so they fit their time or finished early. This can be an advantage for the previous generation of Kazakh society, for those who speak in the Kazakh language, because today's speakers in any environment do not value the time of the audience, they waste the time of others and themselves. It is best to use only words that are thoughtful to the listener. If you evaluate the effect of speech on a 5-point scale, then you can put 2 points. The impact of the speech was low because the topic was not relevant to the speaker.

We evaluate the sequence of words in terms of the interpenetration of the beginning and end, as well as the development of the word. For example, we can say that in the speech of one student, consisting of 227 units, this structure is preserved.

If the above criteria are an example of the analysis of the word itself as a whole, now the specificity of the language of a young student is analyzed. To do this, the prosodic and the phonetic features of the word are first taken into account:

- intonation of the word;
- word stress;
- rhythm of the group;
- syntagma;
- consonance of language;
- labial vowel harmony;
- pronunciation of vowels;
- combination of consonants;
- shades of sounds.

As a prosodic feature of the student's words, one could name the smallness of intonation expressing emotion. The speed of the movement of the word can be tracked. The accent of words, characteristic of the Kazakh language, does not differ much from the vocabulary of the senior and middle level. Students can speak, dividing words into rhythmic group and syntagma. The reason for this is that if speech is the result of one's own thought, then it can correctly divide words into a rhythmic group and a syntagma. On the contrary, if the word is not their own, then without understanding the content of what was said, it will be difficult to correctly divide.

In addition to this, it can be said that there were many paralinguistic means in the students' speech.

According to the phonetic feature, it can be seen that the orthoepy of the word, the consonance of vowels and the combination of consonants have not been preserved, especially in the language of females. In addition to the spelling norms of the Kazakh literary language, it seems that in the language of modern

Kazakh youth, a compressed pronunciation of open vowels is common. For instance, in the discussion following words: *nige* (*nege*) (*why*), *sibebi* (*sebebi*) (*because*), *suilegsi* (*soilegisi*) (*wish to speak*), *uzekti* (*ozekti*) (*important*), *ute* (*ote*) (*very*), *urushsha* (*oryssha*) (*in Russian*), *uz kizeginde* (*oz kezeginde*) (*in turn*), *ult zhanasyry* (*olt zhanashyry*) (*caretaker of the nation*), *utkendei* (*otkendei*) (*in past*) were too compressed pronunciation of the syllable, especially noticeable in the language of females' pronunciation of the open syllable was the compressed. It could be said that this is the influence of the Russian language on the language of youth, but the student participants graduated from the Kazakh school, grew up in a single Kazakh environment, where everyday speech was designated as the Kazakh language, this cannot be effect of the Russian language. Nevertheless, there may be an echo effect of the Russian language.

In addition, it was noted that consonants, especially hard, cross ones, occurred when a subtle variation of the prelinguistic <t> phoneme fell on the vowel <e>. For example: *t'ereng* (*tereng*) (*deep*), *u'te* (*oto*) (*very*), *qurmett'eu* (*qurmetteu*) (*respect*), *mekt'epter* (*mektepter*) (*schools*), *mart'ebe* (*martebe*) (*status*), *kot'eredi* (*kotorodi*) (*rise*).

Lip voicing was not heard from any of the student's languages. This means that it is gradually fading away from the Kazakh language. It can be assumed that in the future it will not exist at all.

In relation to consonants, there was a reduction in sounds, and sometimes syllables, and not lip voicing: *келед(і)*, *тырысам(ын)*, *ед(і)*, *көтеред(і)*, *қайт(ада)тан*, *ойлайм(ын)*, *қа(л) ан*, *ке(л)ген*, *аша(ал)май*, *берем(ін)*.

Speaking with the “Jy” sound has been considered as a local feature. Except this, any local language features have not been noticed.

One of the negative processes in the pronunciation of students is often pronouncing the sound [n] of the phoneme <ng>, for example, *sozdin* (*sozdng*), *zhana* (*zhanga*), *zhanagy* (*zhangagy*).

If the hissing pronunciation was a morphological exception, then we added it to the phonetic feature, since it is not consonant with the previous one. For example, *bilemiz da* (*we know that*)...

To the next stage of the analysis of the speech, syntactic analysis was taken. Because when a word comes out, it becomes a full-fledged, meaningful thought, which is achieved through prosodic and phonetic sounding and fragmentary mutual formation of thought through sentences.

According to scientists, there are up to 21-55 language units in oral speech [12]. In the discussion of this study, the students' words were between 24 and 30.

As a syntactic feature, many sentences were found to be well-formed, as were sentences in written language, in which the members of the sentence are complete and in the correct word order. This shows that students speak on the basis of written language. For example, a female student expressed her thought with 529 words. Here are the first sentences “«А-ға рақмет, өзінің пікірін, өзінің топ мүшесінің... ойын жеткізгені үшін. Жалпы біз ойлаймыз, қазақ тілінде шаршасыздың... э, дамытудың қатты қажеттілігі жоқ дәл қазіргі таңда деп»” (Thank you ‘A’ (*student's name*) for expressing your opinion, the opinion of your group member. In general, we think that a public speech in the Kazakh language ... er, there is no special need for development at present). Here, the second sentence lacks one or two incomplete connected sentences, the remaining sentences are formed in accordance with the norm, similarly to complex sentences in written speech.

However, even with the correct construction of the same sentence as the basic parts of a sentence, it is observed that there are many redundant structures in the modern youth speech. For example, “«Яғни... қай тілді алып қарасаңыз да, орысша болсын, ағылшын тілін алсаңыз, [мысалы, бізде қазір көп қолданыстағы] онда бір арнайы методика бар. Сондықтан... эм... халықтың көбісі [осы жерде өзінің алдына берсе] міндетті түрде басқа [екі]... орыс тілін, [қазақ]... ағылшын тілін таңдайды, ... э... қазақ тілін емес” (That is, no matter what language you take, Russian or English, [we, for example, have a lot in common] there is one special technique. Therefore ... um ... the majority of the population [here in front of them] is necessarily different [two]. .. Russian, [Kazakh]... selects English, ... er... not Kazakh). Words in square brackets are redundant uses in a sentence.

Apart from the speech of young people, the appearance of excessive use in the language of the older generation, the middle generation, in which speech is embedded, depends on the process of transforming consciousness into words.

Vygotsky argued that “a thought is not reproduced in a word, but is accomplished in a word,” i.e., the scientist recognized thought as a compact, closed action. The conclusion of thought through language showed that “the inner speech of the motive is carried out through the stages of “external speech”, when inner speech becomes a system of external, expanded meanings”. The comprehension of the heard word, the analysis of the syntactic structure and lexical meaning, lies in the fact that its collection and packaging into inner speech occurs through the stages of comprehension of the motive and essence [13]. Luria, who developed this theory in a neurolinguistic direction, notes in thought the subject of a human statement, the predicate content of what to say, how to say about this subject - is realized in inner speech, it is laconic, fragmentary, amorphous. In this sense, inner speech is a mechanism that turns the inner subjective essence into a system of external meanings [13]. The scientist notes that the distinction between external speech and internal speech can be expressed in different ways, therefore, internal speech is invariant, external speech is variable. He said that the lower grammatical structure and inner speech, the upper grammatical structure and outer speech are the same, the lower grammatical structure is so close to human consciousness that the rules for its composition are small, so a small child will quickly master it. In understanding the heard word, the 1st stage speaks of the deprivation of the meaning of the word, i.e., the deprivation of the real meaning from the ambiguity; 2) knowledge of the system of sentences (if the word understands the meaning, and does not know the structure of the sentence, then it remains in the form of a fuzzy understanding); 3) said to understand the whole message. Where 1, 2 steps went within the framework of language rules, and the last one went into the psychology of linguistic thinking.

In contrast to this, it became clear that today's youth cannot control, manage the processes in their inner speech, but can bring to light the entire stage of thinking. It has been established that words in square brackets are not harmful to the relationship of sentence parts, even if they are excluded.

The words of the female students have been analyzed in more detail above. The following is the analysis of the male student's speech. It has been seen that the logical sequence of speech is better in males than in female participants. In his speech, there was the beginning of speech and the way of expressing the development of thought.

Further in the transmission of thought were “bait words” that attracted the attention of the listener, and a flow of words that led from one thought to another.

However, even though there was intention in the student's speech, there was no system in place to make the speech more persuasive. The example he took did not apply to the eloquence of the Kazakh language. However, one of the features of the language of today's youth is that they associate unrelated sentences with the pronouns: *therefore* and *because*. “So... uh... we also think that this is not right”, - the student concluded the words according to his character.

As phonetic feature: using the sound [н] (n) instead of [ң] (ng): *zhana* (*zhanga*), speech with a violation of the consonance of syllables: *apelsinnan* (*apelsinnen*) (*from orange*), *tikele efirga* (*efirge*) (*to live stream*), swallowing syllables: *мынандай – нандай, болып жатыр – боп жатыр*.

The student's speech contained parasitic words from the Russian as *voice audio recording, message*. Thinking in Russian, translating and speaking in Kazakh: *адамдардан* (*from people*) instead of *адамдардың* (*people's*). Hesitations in the forms of *ыыы, ии* which are not suitable for Kazakh were not used, instead *эээ, ууу* were used, which was considered as the influence of the education in English. From grammatical feature was the use of the preposition *да*. It seems that the students used it for expressing following prepositions: *зоһ, емес не, еді*.

4. OUTPUT

Positive changes and processes observed as a result of learning the language of modern Kazakh youth can be called:

- can correctly control the time, can finish his speech in the provided time;
- speaks in a logical sequence of words;
- do not use words that give local features;
- can correctly build sentences as a syntactic feature.

Observed as negative changes, processes:

- on a phonetic basis, the orthoepy of words, non-observance of vowel consonances and combinations of consonants;
- non-observance of harmony of lips;
- pronunciation of the sound [H] [n] of the phoneme <H> [ng];
- multiple use of redundant structures as a sentence parts, even if the sentence is correctly composed;
- incorrect use of prepositions;
- the use of parasitic words from the Russian language.
- thinking in Russian, translating, then speaking in Kazakh.

5. CONCLUSION

Although the number of Kazakh speakers has increased, the quality of the Kazakh language they speak is not encouraging. In the oral speech of young students, which, as was taken as the subject of research, there are currently more negative processes than positive ones. These manifestations were especially often observed at the level of phonetic, morphological, syntactic structures. This, of course, is influenced by many factors. The main ones are the fluency of young people in several languages, in addition, the incorrect use of the Kazakh language, which they hear in society. At present, even the lyrics, films, serials in the Kazakh language are filmed with such misuse that they attract viewers. In the language of young people who hear and see it, these changes are reflected. However, the positive changes observed in the spoken language of young people should be mentioned. English and the written language can be taken as factors influencing these changes. In particular, timely speech, logically correct transmission of thought. At the same time, under the influence of written speech, there is a clear tendency to correctly compose sentences.

In conclusion, the paper addressed the issues presented by young students from the point of view of the general text: intelligibility; content of words; the ability to accommodate at a given time; impressionability; consistency. Secondly, an analysis was made of the characteristics of the languages of student youth, including positive and negative changes in languages. The changes were characterized by a link to the social status of the speaker.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Nazarbayev University for conducting this study and the respondents who participated in the discussion.

Funder Project Reference: 021220FD4351

Department of Kazakh Language and Turkic Studies, School of Sciences and Humanities, Nazarbayev University, Kabanbay Batyr Ave. 53, Nur-Sultan 010000 Kazakhstan

REFERENCES

1. David Crystal, 2000, Language death. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,. P. 208.
2. Belikov V.I., Krysin L.P. 2001, Sociolinguistics. Moscow: Russian State Humanitarian University.
3. Kuderinova K.B., 2016, Importance of studying spoken language // Bulletin of BSMU scientific journal, №4, pp. 202-211.
4. Kuderinova K.B. 2008, Characteristics of modern Kazakh literary language // "Tiltany" journal. №2.
5. Kuderinova K., 2010, Peculiarities of modern oral literary language // International scientific-theoretical conference "Language, literature and translation problems at the junction of cultures" organized by Suleiman Demirel University. Almaty, pp. 342-344.
6. Syzdyk R., 2014, Oral developed literary language. Almaty: Dyke-Press. 242 p.
7. Russian colloquial speech. Phonetics. Morphology. Vocabulary. Gesture, 1983, Moscow: Nauka, 236 p.
8. Amirov R., 1972, Peculiarities of the syntax of Kazakh colloquial speech. Alma-Ata, 180 p.
9. Bubnova G.I., Garbovsky N.K. 1991, Written and oral communication. Syntax and prosody. Moscow: Moscow State University, 272 p.
10. Zemskaya E.A., Kitaigorodskaya M.V., Shiryaev E.N. 1981, Russian colloquial speech. General questions. Word formation, syntax. Moscow: Nauka, p.10.
11. Shcherba L.V. 1957, Selected works on the Russian language. Moscow, p. 30.
12. Lvov M.R. 2002, Basic theory speech. Moscow, 248 p.
13. Luria A.R. 2002, Letter and speech. Neurolinguistic research. Moscow, p. 82.