

- pedahohika, menedzhment : zbirnyk naukovykh prats.* Kyiv, Ukrayina, 2014. Kyiv: TOV "NVP "Interservis"
10. Yashanov, SM., 2010. 'Systema informatychnoyi pidhotovky maybutnikh uchyteliv trudovoho navchannya: monohrafiya (The system of informational training of future teachers of labor studies: a monograph)'. V: M. I. Zhaldak, red. Kyiv, Ukrayina, 2010. Kyiv: *Vyd-vo NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova*.
  11. ArgoUML. [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupu: <http://prospo.ru/linuxmat/1301-argouml-uml->.
  12. eUML2 Studio is a powerful setoff tools developed from scratch for Eclipse. [Electronic resource.]. – Access mode: <http://www.soyatec.com/euml2/>.
  13. Free Pascal. [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupu: [http://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free\\_Pascal](http://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free_Pascal).
  14. Gantt Project. [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupu: <http://proektoved.com/instrumenty/ganttproject.html>.
  15. Lazarus. [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupu: <http://infosvit.if.ua/lazarus-bezkoshtovnyj-analoh-delphi/>.
  16. National Instruments Corporation. [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupu: <http://www.ni.com/company/>.
  17. Open Proj [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupu: <https://proektoved.com/instrumenty/openproj.html>.
  18. Proteus. [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupu: <http://www.labcenter.com/index.cfm>.
  19. Star UML. Rukovodstvo pol'zovatelya. (Star UML. User guide). [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupa: [http://staruml.sourceforge.net/docs/user-guide\(ru\)/user-guide.pdf](http://staruml.sourceforge.net/docs/user-guide(ru)/user-guide.pdf).
  20. Zend\_Framework. [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupu: [https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zend\\_Framework](https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zend_Framework).

**УДК 37.016:81:004.38+801.8**

## COMPLEX METHODOLOGY ANALYSIS OF HYPERTEXT IN COMPUTER DISCOURSE

### КОМПЛЕКСНА МЕТОДИКА АНАЛІЗУ ГІПЕРТЕКСТУ В КОМП'ЮТЕРНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

**O.V. Kotovska**

***Urgency of the research.*** The article investigates the integrated method of studying hypertext in the computer discourse as a whole and its individual units. The analysis of the study helped to standardize the main characteristics of hypertext.

***Актуальність теми дослідження.*** Стаття присвячена дослідженню комплексної методики вивчення гіпертексту в комп'ютерному дискурсі як єдиного цілого та його окремих одиниць. Аналіз дослідження дозволив уніфікувати основні характеристики гіпертексту.

**Target setting.** To identify the main methods of study of hypertext and to choose for further study in computer text as the model of the computer world.

**Actual scientific researches and issues analysis.** Computer discourse is analyzing [2; 6; 10; 11; 12; 17; etc.] with a help of traditional for linguistic research methods 1) discourse analysis (discourse study) [3; 10; 17; 20; etc.]; 2) distributional and transformational analysis [13; 17; etc.]; 3) conversation analysis [16; 17; etc.]; 4) traditional and critical discourse analysis [16; 25; 26; 27].

**The research objective** of this article is to define the constitution signs of computer speech; select the basic methods to research of hypertext in the computer world; describe the basic features of genre typologies of hypertext communication; outline the criteria used for classify the analysis of hypertext second and third in the web.

**The statement of basic materials.** We pay special attention to the structure and stratification of computer discourse and the classification criteria of the second web and the third web. Determine basic characteristics for the linguistic analysis of the first, second and third web. Allocated creolese of the third semantic web and basic problems for its analysis.

**Conclusions.** Therefore take into account the foregoing we come to conclusions that a special kind of discourse is a computer one, which is analyzed with the help of traditional methods for linguistics, which allowed us look upon the computer discourse as an unified whole and its individual units: 1) as unified whole: traditional and critical discourses-analysis; 2) as its individual features: distributive and transformative

**Постановка проблеми.** Виокремити основні методики дослідження гіпертексту та обрати методики подальшого дослідження комп'ютерного тексту як моделі комп'ютерного світу.

**Аналіз останніх досліджень і публікацій.** Комп'ютерний дискурс аналізується [2; 6; 10; 11; 12; 17; та ін.] за допомогою традиційних для лінгвістики дослідницьких методів: 1) аналіз дискурсу (дискурсологія) [3; 10; 17; 20; та ін.]; 2) дистрибутивний та трансформаційний аналізи [13; 17; та ін.]; 3) конвєрсаційний аналіз [16; 17; та ін.]; 4) традиційний та критичний дискурс-аналізи [16; 25; 26; 27].

**Постановка завдання** даної статті є: визначити конститутивні ознаки комп'ютерного дискурсу; виокремити основні методики дослідження гіпертексту в комп'ютерному світі; описати основні особливості жанрової типології гіпертекстової комунікації; окреслити класифікаційні критерії для аналізу гіпертексту другого та третього вебу.

**Виклад основного матеріалу.** Особливу увагу ми приділяємо структурі та стратифікації комп'ютерного дискурсу та класифікаційним критеріям другого, третього вебу. Виділяємо креалізованість семантичного третього вебу як основну проблему для його аналізу.

**Висновки.** Особливий вид дискурсу – комп'ютерний, аналізується за допомогою традиційних для лінгвістики дослідницьких методів, які дозволяють розглядати комп'ютерний дискурс як єдине ціле та його окремих одиниць: 1) як єдине ціле: традиційний та критичний дискурс-аналізи; 2) за окремими одиницями: дистрибутивний та трансформаційний аналізи сфор-

*analyses which are formed on the structural method; 3) as unified whole and by the individual features: conversational analysis. Main methods of hypertext researchers by modern researcher are method of linguistic analysis, (which has a deal with the first, the second and the third types of hypertext), discourse-analysis of computer texts and analysis of genre formats is offered.*

**Keywords:** *hypertext, computer discourse, creolese text, linguistic analysis, modeling technique, method of design.*

*мовані у межах структурного методу; 3) як єдине ціле та за окремими одиницями: конwersаційний аналіз. Основними методами дослідження гіпертексту сучасні дослідники обирають: метод лінгвістичного аналізу (який розглядає перший, другий, третій типи гіпертексту), дискурс-аналіз комп'ютерних текстів та аналіз жанрових форматів запропонований.*

**Ключові слова:** *гіпертекст, комп'ютерний дискурс, креалізованість тексту, лінгвістичний аналіз, методики моделювання та конструювання.*

The computer discourse is a new feature in the form of language [23], one of its constructive is a hypertext [7]. In modern linguistics lexical and syntactical organization of computer text has changed essentially [8; 9], that is why the **target setting** of contemporary researchers of applies linguistics is alignment of evaluation method directed to hypertext research in computer world. The raised question is in a great necessity of abstruse and careful comprehension, substantiating the **urgency** and perspective to the given research.

Computer discourse is analyzing [2; 7; 11; 14; 15; 21; etc.] with a help of traditional for linguistic research methods 1) *discourse analysis (discourse study)* [11; 21; 22; 25; etc.]; 2) *distributional and transformational analysis* [13; 21; etc.]; 3) *conversation analysis* [19; 21; etc.]; 4) *traditional and critical discourse analysis* [6; 17; 19; 20].

Hypertext's analysis methods: *linguistic analysis* [8; 9], *discourse analysis of computational* [2; 26], *analysis of genre peculiarities* [21], give an opportunity to give into focus correlative of hypertext and degree of saturation by hyperlinks and hypertext references.

For further research of hypertext as a method of computer world we choose the next methods in three stages: 1) on the first stage – method of *transformational analysis* [13; 21; 23]; 2) on the second stage – *simulation technique* [1; 2; 27]; 3) on the third stage – *constructive method* [1; 8; 10; 24; 27].

**The research objective** of this article is to define the constitution signs of computer speech; select the basic methods to research of hypertext

in the computer world; describe the basic features of genre typologies of hypertext communication; outline the criteria used for classify the analysis of hypertext second and third in the web.

*Discourse-analysis* speaks mostly for to the verbal and writing forms of linguistic communication in the natural terms of the “real world”. M. Makarov marks: “A discourse-analysis ideologically basis on three branches, three more important categories: actions, structures and variations. When people talk or write something they do social actions. Concrete properties of these social actions are determined by how the verbal speech or the writing text is built, by which one resources, selected by the speaker from all varieties of language means, functional styles, rhetorical receptions, among others. From one side, a process of construction of the speech is interesting. From the other side, a verbal discourse or writing text is intertwined to the living fabric of a social activity and interpersonal cooperation, their variation incarnate the feature of different social active contexts and intentions of the authors [19, p.81]”.

Z. Kharrys says that discourse analysis can be performed by methods of linguistic research of the structural method: *distributive and transformational analyses* [14].

*Distributive analysis*, as M. Kocherhan marks: “relies on the situation, that different linguistic elements have a different environment (distribution). The surroundings of each element are original, specific and unique, on the basis of which it is perfectly possible to learn the probed linguistic element. Having texts, we can study distributive properties of the linguistic unit (sound, morpheme, word).” [13, P.13-14].

The essence of *transformational analysis* M. Kocherhan determines that linguistic units have the capacity or inability to be transformed into other units. “A transformation analysis finds practical application in applied linguistics (different syntactic constructions are transformed into base, invariant and already invariant are translated into another language)”. [13, p.15].

The basis of the discourse analysis O. Selivanova considers in *conversational analysis* [21, p.627], represented by a set of procedures empirical researches of dialogue of the oral conversation.

At the beginning of the application of conversational analysis, the attention of researchers was primarily focused on the description of the rules and order of conversation, in particular, the change in interactive moves, which were described in the study of living speech [21, p.628].



Subsequently, the conversational analysis began to investigate standardized forms of conversation, conditioned by appropriate patterns of social action, specificity and extraneous factors of transition from one speech to another, and also to simulate and predict the course of communication, the ability to control the behavior of a partner. Conversational analysis procedures are used to justify the speakers' choice of linguistic and non-linguistic means of communication, taking into account the previous knowledge and expectations of the addressee, as well as explaining possible violations of the change in communicative roles, the transition from one move to another [21, p.628].

As A. Selivanova notes, conversational analysis involves characterizing three categories of communication: *the macro level* (the phases of conversation, the main, and the secondary), *the intermediate level* (steps, or replicate) of *the micro level* (the means of different language levels involved in creating the speech act). Communication is seen as an exchange or mutual exchange of two active participants, each of which chooses one of several alternative actions, leads to the creation of favorable or unfavorable conditions for their interaction. This choice leads to a corresponding communicative move, which can be superimposed on the corresponding speech act, although it does not coincide with it [21, p. 628]. The communicative move has three parts: the first establishes the relation to the previous move, the second transfers the content to the move for which it is carried out, the third establishes the relation to the next move.

*Traditional discourse analysis* is often separated from conversational analysis based on methodological differences. For example, S. Levinson, preferring conversational analysis, denies discourse analysis as misconceived (false) [17, p. 288]. Shyfrin believes that the conversational analysis can be considered as a component of the discourse analysis and successfully integrated with the latter within the framework of discourse [20]. Common problems of conversational analysis and analysis of discourse are the way of texts technical recording and standardization of transferring ways the sound image to paper (transcription); the volume of theoretical sampling of the material, sufficient for conclusions about the real functioning of the language in different societies; The way of recording non-verbal communication components and the overall composition.

The direction of *critical discourse analysis* oriented to empiric research of relations between speech and social or cultural state of society, and also by their development [21, p.629], was formed under act of

functional structure of J. Firth, which combined the functional study of language with the analysis of factors of personality and society [5]; in a cultural and sociological theories, combine the research of linguistic communication with the methods of the ethnographic field work. By main positions of *critical discourse analysis* of O. Selivanova determines those: 1) the processes of creation of texts and their consumption reproduce and change socium and culture; 2) speech not only creates the social world but also social practices create discourses; 3) physical objects acquire the defined value due to discourse; 4) a subject is unbalanced, his speech displays are determined by dominating speech which depends on dominating ideology of power; 5) a subject is able to creative operate and convert social practices and discourse through the critical revision of values by dominating discourse [21, P.629-630].

A *critical discourse analysis* is based on philosophical conception of M. Foucault in relation to power as force which creates subjects and agents of actions [6], and also on positions of linguistic philosophy in relation to perception of reality on the basis of language, which not only represents reality but also constructs it. The main representative of this direction of speech analysis is T. Van Dijk, which heads the social and cognitive flow of critical discourse analysis; but it goes out from conceptions of Britannic tradition, which is concentrated on the study of language policy, expression in the language of ideological and political imagination [3].

The problems of discourse analysis are a structure and stratification of speech, establishment of his signs, units, categories and types. Right behind O. Halichkina, we select computer speech as separate type of speech, she determines him as «intercourse in computer networks», and determines as a constitutional signs: 1) electronic signal as channel of intercourse; 2) virtuality; 3) distance, section in space and time; 4) intermediation (carried out by hardware); 5) high feet of insiding; 6) presence of hypertext; 7) creole of computer texts; 8) after advantage of status equality the rights of participants; 9) transmission of emotions, facial expression, senses by «emoji»; 10) combination of different speech types; 11) specific computer vocabulary [7, p.59].

Computer discourse and intercourse inside, O. Halichkina marks, is characterized the presence of hypertext. This concept which appeared comparatively recently arose up in connection with the study of electronic texts [7, p.58]. O. Halichkina select a hypertext as unit of computer discourse. [7, p.59].

The method of *linguistic analysis* of hypertext is evaluated in the work by Olena Horoshko, the author selects four basic stages; when the credible paradigm shift in the development of conceptions of computer discourse has happened or will happen [8, p.15]. The *first*, what it marks is the birth stage of the Internet, such as “aggregates of network technologies”. The *second* is the creation of the global web or the first web, when the possibility of multiple accesses arose from the content of the network of many users. The *third* is the origin of the second web design and the increase of content development on the Internet. *The fourth* is development itself, literally in our eyes, conceptions of the third semantic web, when users estimate and recommend the content created by them [8, p.15].

The transition in the development of hypertext, as described by Kharhadon, of the *first passive and static web*, content that professionally created an internet association and practically did not undergo changes to the *second web*, was predefined the line of factors such as: economic, technological and social. In this second web the contents began to be generated by the users, and as proof, practically any user has access to reading, as its correction could be conducted simultaneously by unlimited amount of people, as a result, caused the need to provide other approaches to development in the Network [12]. O. Horoshko points out that although the design of the second web does not have a clear purpose, it is possible to select some general lines of communicative services, which belong to the second web: fast creation of users content; possibility of simultaneous and simultaneous editing; a joint process of any text or project; possibility of practically permanent exchange; storing large volumes of information directly on the network, but not on the electronic device; there is lightness in the processing of a content; Distribution of different interfaces, friendly to users; strengthening of the audiovisual format (Creole) of transmission and presentation of information; a mixture of private and public borders on the Internet, when traditional private information is made public and accessible by all concerned persons [9].

As Olena Horoshko describes that the second Internet network, which allows communication and work on the internet, was initiated by a special type of photography. This new type created an environment and the terms where this event occurred. And he began to distinguish this hypertext by raising the level of collective and photographic co-author of Creole and high-level hybridization (combining verbal and nonverbal

elements as well as different genres, service platforms and within the framework of a resource web, lightness of maintenance update, increasing role of audiovisual information in its creation and perception, and consequently, its understanding. "

In 2007 as a response to supersaturation and overloading on the Internet of non-professional content, the idea of the third *semantic web* was born, which predicted that the user individually attracted to the content development process, would now not only create for him but would also have partners in a collective creation process; what helped him (instruction specialists), leaders of ideas networks, who train and assist professionally. Semantic Web user status can be changed to expert, as well as content developer and platform developer collaborator [27].

All conceptions of developing that are mentioned above, as Lutovinova explains, led to uprising of a specially hypertext, which is notable for high level of creolization, hybridism, interactivity and liveliness [18, p.54]. Moreover, this text functions in digital world or in conditions of the progress of communicative process in the environment which is changeable, with variable scope of information in creole hypertext. Also for this new type of hypertext characterize [8, p.17]: high significance of paragraphic resource and broaden options of their choice ("visual design" of the text (print, color, lay of text information on electronic page and methods of navigations on it)); compact preservation of bid capacity of different semiotic information, including text; time features of deployment of the text in front of the communicators (chat feed, forum, or consistency of comments on the blog); opportunity to change the text regularly and group authorship of plenty of text, which are placed in network; realization of instant replicas of text material, high speed distribution and editing of hypertext; simultaneous work with the text of a great number of people; high stage of integration of the text in other semiotic systems. [9; 10].

For the analysis of the first, the second and the third webs O. Horoshko determines the following characteristics: 1) text volume length of network resource, which is a part of hypertext space; 2) text's number, which are a part of hypertext space on the start page of the web resource; 3) numerosity of inbound and outbound hyperlink with hypertext space; 4) degree indicator of creolization of the text, which calculated on length ratio of text to amount of visual information which is contained on given resource (visual information is measured in file units) [8, p.17].

Researching of linguistic analysis of hypertext which describes



O. Horoshko, showed the following: 1) the second hypertext has the highest indicator of the level of readiness of integration in world web, as exactly from it “comes” and includes the largest number of hyperlinks; 2) the most comprehensive hypertexts inherent to first web; 3) highest level indicator of level of creolization in hypertext in semantic web; 4) in hypertexts of second web is contained the biggest hypertext space of one or another domain; 5) hypertext of second web have the most rich color palette [8, p.17].

Seriously problem in methodology of linguistic analysis which notes O. Horoshko, causes high degree of hypertext’s creolization.

Methodological basis of *discourse-analysis of computer texts* which describes Ye. Volkova in her research became a fundamental principles of language understanding as socio-cultural phenomenon. The methodology of hypertext research of computer discourse is developed not enough, that’s why Ye. Volkova described typology and ethical features of linguistic and cultural consciousness formed substantive provisions of computer discourse phenomenon in the framework of intercultural communication; she reviewed phenomenon of mutual relationship and cultural in the framework of a new kind of communication – computer one [26, p.28].

Giving an account of the main theory ideas and methodological base, Ye. Volkova deals research method of discourse- analysis of computer texts – DACT as interdisciplinary method of computer communication analysis, the subject of it is language as such and language in usage in computer environment. Under the concept “language in use” is understood “language as material of communication act” or “language in written or oral form, what is used for achievement of pragmatic meaning”, in computer discourse [26, p.29].

Let’s consider two types of variables, by which A. Baranov and Ye. Volkova undertook the analysis: *variable ways of information transfer* – tech specs of computer communication system, including interface design and *variables situational features of social context* in which take place communication. Variables of information data transfer methods include: synchronicity, transmission unit (gesture, message); size of the message; display data channel; message anonymity; filters; citation etc. Situational variables include: taking part in communication; member’s characteristics; purpose; theme; tune, norm, linguistic code [2; 26].

In DACT’s framework they are exploring next structures, Ye. Volkova: 1) linguistic – typography, orthography, word choice, proposition structure,

message organization; 2) sense bearing of symbols, words, phrases, dialogs etc; 3) interactive – order of speeches exchange, transmission channels, ways to hold conversation, theme extinction; 4) social – identify markers, belonging to the group, humor and game, image maintaining, conflict, influence in conversation etc.

“DACT what is based on a classic discourse-analysis is a new methods which is directed on the new discourse type learning computer one.”[26, p.30] and give push to circumscription of the next methodology, that is method of *genre formats analysis*.

The *functional method* is formed by L. Kompantseva within the pale of cognitive-pragmatic approach, he allow to appeal to discourse-analysis and to develop the method of *analysis of genre formats* [14, p.14].

Accomplished analysis of genre hypertext formats, which is described by L. Kompantseva, allowed to select such cognitive and pragmatic, linguocultural features of genre typology of communication: 1) communicational goals of lingual genres of virtual communications may be different, but they are closely related with pragmatic installation of visitors on network, aimed at, above all, on self expression and self-presentation of personality; 2) concept of the addressee which takes an active position in relation to the network communication and hypertext, meaningful for every virtual verbal genres. The addressee not only determines his attitude to communication, but also modulate different communicative strategies: zapping (forming of informational palette from one hypertext link to another), surfing, ignor (refusal from communication by any user etc). Members of virtual communication, network communities as integral communicative systems may be meaningful from the position of pragmalinguistic [14, p.14].

On the basis of genre format analysis by L. Kompantseva outline the main characteristics of hypertext [14, p.15]: 1) virtual communication mostly devoid of direct contacts, that's why linguistic activity of members has pronounced expressive character. The role of silent member is always semiotic: user log on to the chat of virtual conference etc, may be incognito for a long time, observing the situation of communication and doesn't join to the process of communication. Network communities and moderators quite strictly keep watch over the observance of network communicational norms, offenders or fall from grace in the act of communication, or go offline, or get high personal status. 2) “Cucko” and “eavesdropper” (definition by V. Karasik [11]) – model of cognitive representation of

discoverers network, which wish get carried away the ideas of that or those virtual cooperative, to master all the nuances of virtual communicative genre. The updating of personal position in the network always testifies about psychological self-determination and self realization of personality [14, p.15]. 3) The sigh of popularity degree of that person, who talk isn't a relevant for internet communication beginning. Virtual familiar in a real life may have absolutely another characteristics than their virtual personalities. Psychological liberty, feeling of permissiveness, anonymity, conditioned of virtual situation of communication, weaken harsh statutory boundaries of representation. 4) In virtual environment addressee may be determined by the feature of lingual genre. In literary texts (or that, which are pretending to be literary), which are creating in network, type of the addressee is determining by social, discourse, psychological, cognitive communication characteristics. Then appear the situation of general address and empathy (an example may be Alive Magazine). 5) The detachment of addressee as feature of measure (communication tete-a-tete, in numerical chat or in virtual room, virtual conferencing) it is one of defining genre characteristic [14, p.15].

The main feature of hypertext, as researcher sais, is not the length, but correlative structure, the intension by multiple connections: 1) communicative situation of virtual space is dynamical and have a property for quickly re-accentuation. Hypertext makes it possible to fast hopping with one of the virtual genre to other for mixing genres of different spheres. 2) Lingual genres, which exist in realities of life, are used in computer discourse too, in which they have different moves. Users from the first minutes of network communication see its genre form, expect possible text composition and corpus. Comfortable staying in network connect directly with proficiency of user to posses and orient in virtual realization of lingual genres [14, p.15].

Researching complex methodology of hypertext researching as a model of computer world, on the first stage we choose method of *transformational analysis*, which M. Kocherhan explain as a component of structural method [13, p.13]. O. Selivanova as a main means of language analysis in structural paradigm represented by various methods of synchronous analysis of lingual phenomenon as elements variants of the all language system – invariants, which are in denoted inner hierarchy attitude. It geared towards knowledge of inner language organization as a system with reside to it invariant elements, what in the speech are relevant

to restricted concrete realizations; attitude between the elements, which are arranging elements in hierarchy of linguistic levels [21, p.56].

The methodology of *transformational analysis* aimed at definition of similarity and difference between syntactic construction on the basis on rule regulation and modifying their nuclear structure and selection such transformations on conditions that vocabulary construction preservation and syntactic links of their elements. The transformational analysis is meant to be used in derivation (singes, sentences) words on conditions that syntactic similarities of derivational processes; in lexical semantics to division shades of word meaning; in grammatical semantics characteristics by the right of transformational potential of morphological and semantic lexical features, item`s belonging to some classes and categories; in applied linguistics, in machine translation etc. [21, p.57].

*Simulation technique* is described by O. Selivanova as a complex of idealization features and abstracting with the aim of thoughtful and formalized presentation (originals) researching and learning on the ground of this introduction of events, attributes, connections, previsions and regularity existence clarification and objects` function. The simulation is applying by the condition of impossibility, or more difficult ways of original researching in environment for determination of their characteristics, optimization of administration and objects` usage [21, p.50]. The model is every system, in our case is hypertext, that has intellectual image, is materially realized and has capability to replace researching object in such way, that its research gives us new information about this object. Simulation technique regardless of all its universality has some qualifications. Yu. Apresian underlines that that object internals are modeling good, that have deal with its structural organization. He underlines the models of oral activity, models of exploratory activity of the linguist, and that, which have in modeling object linguistic describing [1, p.79, P.99-113]. A. Baranov characterizes such types of the models of theoretical linguistic in such way: *componential* (from what this object is consists of); *predicted* (provide the behavior of the object in different circumstances); *imitate* (overt behavior of the object); *diachronic* (how and why the object is changing in the passing of the time) [2, p.9].

On the third stage we are going to use *constructive method* which provides for forming-up and formation of the researching object in the form of simplify, hypothetic abstract scheme of hypertext. The method of remote syntactic structure modeling, formation of transformations and



limitations on it, principles and criteria of inborn base of linguistic knowledge, positional scheme modeling of modern semantic syntax, case grammar by C. Filmor [4], conceptions of logical lingual analysis. In linguistic semantic they apply constructive methodologies of meaning interpretation by dint of determination of constituents connections between them (semantics graphs), combinational sets [1], semantics primitives [24], models of cognitive semantics [3]. In modern cognitive and computer linguistics this method is using on the ground of meaningful symbol codes of logic and mathematic, different languages of linguistics, they use methodologies of formation predictably accentuate frameworks in case of grammar by C. Filmor [4], predicative thematic structures' modeling, offers, prepositional schemes in semantic syntax and logical analysis of native language, textual frame [4], diagrams, scene, scripts and graphs of conceptual dependence, conceptual graphs, methodologies of semantic portraiture [1], situational and semantics imagine of information in automated synthesis systems and recognition of native language [1; p.17; 23].

Therefore take into account the foregoing we come to **conclusions** that a special kind of discourse is a computer one, which is analyzed with the help of traditional methods for linguistics, which allowed us look upon the computer discourse as an unified whole and its individual units: 1) as unified whole: traditional and critical discourses-analysis; 2) as its individual features: distributive and transformative analyses which are formed on the structural method; 3) as unified whole and by the individual features: conversational analysis. Main methods of hypertext researchers by modern researcher are method of linguistic analysis, (which has a deal with the first, the second and the third types of hypertext), discourse-analysis of computer texts and analysis of genre formats is offered. Further researching of hypertext will be analyzed with the help of transformational analysis, the simulation technique, the method of hypertext construction as a model of the world.

The perspective of the further researching we mean in creating a hypertext typology on the basis of classification criteria and hypertext as a model of possible world.

## References

1. Apresyan, Yu.D., 2009. 'Issledovanie po semantike i leksikografii (A study on semantics and lexicography)', T. 1 - *M.: Yazyki slovyanskikh kultur*, 568 p.

2. Baranov, A.G., 1997. 'Kogniotipichnost zhanra (Cognotypy of the genre)', *StyUstika. VI. – Opole*, p. 331-343.
3. Dijk, v. T.A., Lakoff, R., 1973. 'The logic of politeness', *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic society. – Chicago*, p. 292-305.
4. Fillmore, Ch., 1984. 'Remarks on Contrastive Pragmatics', *Contrastive Linguistics: Prospects and Problems. – B. etc. : de Gruyter*, p. 119–142.
5. Firth, J.R., 1957. 'The Technique of Semantics [Text]', *Papers in Linguistics 1934-1951. –London : Oxford University Press*, p. 5-38.
6. Foucault, M., 1971. 'L'ordre du discours', *Paris*, 274 p.
7. Galichkina, Ye.N., 2004. 'Kharakteristiki kompyuternogo diskursa (Characteristics of computer discourse)', *Vestnik Orenburgskogo un-ta.*, p. 55-59.
8. Goroshko, Ye.I., 2010. 'Gipertekst kak obekt lingvisticheskogo issledovaniya (Hypertext as an object of linguistic research)', *Materialy Vserossiyskoy nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii s mezhdunarodnym uchastiem, 15 marta 2010 g. – Samara: PGSGA*, p. 14-18.
9. Horoshko, O.I., 2009. 'Vid psikholinhvistyky 2.0 do psikholinhvistyky 3.0: Quo Vadis? (From Psycholinguistics 2.0 to Psycholinguistics 3.0: Quo Vadis?)', *Psikholinhvistyka: [zb. Nauk. prats DVNZ «Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi derzhavnyi pedahohichnyi universytet imeni Hryhoriia Skovorody»]. – Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi: PP «SKD»*, p. 108-124.
10. Ilina, I.A., 2009. 'Problema izucheniya i vospriyatiya giperteksta v multimedijnoy srede Internet (The problem of studying and perception of hypertext in a multimedia environment the Internet)', *Avtoref. dis. kand. filol nauk: 10.01.10. – M.*, 20 p.
11. Karasik, V.I., 2004. 'Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs (Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse)', *Volgograd*, 477 p.
12. Khargadon, S., 2008. 'Web 2.0 – eto budushchee obrazovaniya (Web 2.0 is the future of education)', [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupa: <http://www.websoft.ru/db/wb/2FF50B0C29518A87C32574DD003290BC/doc.htm>.
13. Kocherhan, M.P., 2000. 'Vstup do movoznavstva (Introduction to linguistics)', *K.: Vydavnychiy tsentr «Akademiia»*, 368 p.
14. Kompantseva, L.F., 2009. 'Internet-linhvistyka: Navchalnyi posibnyk (Internet Linguistics: Tutorial)', *K.: Nauk.-vyd. viddil NA SB Ukrainy*, 275 p.
15. Kostomarov, V.G., Burvikova, N.D., 1999. 'Izuchenie i prepodavanie ruskogo yazika ot Pushkina i do nashikh dney (The study and teaching of the Russian language from Pushkin and to this day)', *Materiali konf. i seminarov. Volgograd: Izd-vo Volgogr. gos. un-ta*, p. 7-14.
16. Lakoff, Dzh., 1985. 'Pragmatika v estestvennoy logike (Pragmatics in natural logic)', *Novoe v zarubezhnoy lingvistike.-M.*, p. 439-471.
17. Levinson, S.C., 2000. 'Pragmatik', *Tubingen*, 480 p.
18. Lutovinova, O.V., 2009. 'Lingvokulturologicheskie kharakteristiki virtualnogo diskursa (Linguistic and cultural characteristics of virtual discourse)', *Volgograd: Izd-vo VGPU «Peremena»*, 477 p.
19. Makarov, M.L., 2003. 'Osnovy teorii diskursa (Fundamentals of Discourse Theory)', *M.*, 200 p.
20. Schiffrin, D., 1994. 'Approaches to Discourse', *Oxford*, 195 p.

21. Selivanova, O.O., 'Suchasna linhvistyka: napriamy ta problemy: Pidruchnyk (Modern Linguistics: Directions and Problems: Textbook)', *Poltava: Dovkillia-K*, 712 p.
22. Sheygal, Ye.I., 2000. 'Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa (The Semiotics of Political Discourse)', *M.-Volgograd*, 368 p.
23. Stepanov, Yu.S., 1996. 'Alternativnyy mir. Diskurs. Fakt i printsip prichinnosti (Alternative world. Discourse. The fact and principle of causality)', *Yazyk i nauka kontsa 20 veka. - M.*, p. 35-73.
24. Vezhbitska, A., Goddard, K., 2002. 'Diskurs i kultura (Discourse and Culture)', *Zhanry rechii. - Saratov*, p. 118-157.
25. Vodak, R., 1997. 'Yazyk. Diskurs. Politika. (Language. Discourse. Policy.)', *Volgograd: Peremena*, 139 p.
26. Volkova, Ye.V., 2007. 'Kulturnaya obuslovlennost elektronnoho diskursa inofonov (Cultural conditioning of electronic discourse of inophones)', *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, seriya «Filologiya i iskusstvovedenie»*. - *Chelyabinsk*, p. 28-38.
27. 'Web 3.0', *Material iz Vikipedii – svobodnoy entsiklopedii*. [Elektronnyy resurs]. – Rezhim dostupa: [http://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Web\\_3.0](http://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Web_3.0).

### УДК 378.011.3-051:004.738.5(043.3)

#### КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТІ ВИКЛАДАЧА, ЯК КЕРІВНИКА: КРИТЕРІЇ ЕФЕКТИВНОСТІ

#### TO THE COMPETENCE OF LECTURER, AS A LEADER: CRITERIA OF EFFICIENCY

**В. В. Шевченко**

**Актуальність дослідження.** Можливість кар'єрного зростання для багатьох фахівців-керівників є стимулом до підвищення їх професійної ефективності. Також доведено, що наявність в педагогічній установі прикладів руху по кар'єрних сходах впливає на лояльність персоналу і корпоративну культуру компанії. Проте існує аспект, який часто зупиняє керівників від використання внутрішнього кадрового резерву. Річ у тому, що співробітник, що претендує на позицію керівника, може володіти знаннями, але не володіти характеристиками, необхідними для успішної діяльності в новій іпостасі.

**Urgency of the research.** The potential for career growth for many senior executives is an incentive to enhance their professional efficiency. It is also proved that the presence in the educational institution of movement examples in the career ladder affects the staff loyalty and corporate culture of the company. However, there is an aspect that often stops managers from using the internal staffing reserve. The fact is that an employee who claims to be a manager can have knowledge, but not possess the characteristics necessary for successful activity in the new hypostasis.