

For example: The man walked out. - The person went out (direction); The man stood by. - A man was standing nearby (place). [10]

The number of combinations has been accumulating for centuries. Their meaning could change beyond recognition. For example, the adverb out over several centuries has acquired new meanings. In the IX century. it had only a literal meaning - "moving out", for example, walk out. Around the 14th century added the value "to erase the sound", for example, cry out (to shout). In the XV century. the meaning "cease to exist" appeared – die out (to die out). To the XVI century. the meaning "distribute equally" appeared, for example, pass out (to distribute), and by the XIX century. the value "clear from contents" was added, for example, clean out. [11, 146-149]

In conclusion, it should be noticed that the use of phrasal verbs incredibly expands the vocabulary of someone who is studying English. Thanks to the knowledge of phrasal verbs, we can more accurately convey the shade of emotion and feelings that we use.

### References:

1. Кондрашова Е. С. Фразовые глаголы: что нужно знать, чтобы усвоить // Молодой ученый. — 2018. — №16. — С. 286-289. — URL <https://moluch.ru/archive/202/49461>
2. Ball W.J. Conversational English: an analysis of contemporary spoken English for foreign students, with exercises. – London: Longmans, Green, 1953. – 284 p.
3. Англо-русский словарь общей лексики АББYY Lingvo-Online [Электронный ресурс]. М.: АББYY, 2016. URL: <http://www.lingvo-online.ru/ru>
4. Jagger H. J. English in the Future. London: Press Ltd., 1945. 231 с.
5. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., & Leech, G. (1985). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London: Longman.
6. Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). Longman grammar of spoken and written English. Harlow: Longman.
7. Greenbaum, S., & Nelson, G. (2002). An introduction to English grammar (4 ed.). New York: Routledge.
8. Берлизон С.Б. Глагольно-наречные сочетания и их роль в обогащении словарного состава современного английского языка: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.04. М., 1955.
9. Поуви Д. Английские фразовые глаголы и их употребление: Учеб. Пособие. - М.: Высш. шк., 1990. - 176с.
10. [https://skyeng.ru/articles/vse-sekret-y-frazovyh-glagolov-v-anglijskom\(21.03.2020\)](https://skyeng.ru/articles/vse-sekret-y-frazovyh-glagolov-v-anglijskom(21.03.2020))
11. Talmy L. Lexicalisation Patterns: Semantic Structure in Lexical Form // Language Typology & Syntactic Description. - Vol. 3: Cambridge, 2016. p. 57-149.

## LINGUISTIC MEANS OF FORMULATING RESOLUTION IN DEBATE

Maratova A.M.

scientific director: M.I. Kudritskaya Candidate of Ped. Sciences  
Kostanay State Pedagogical University n.a. O.Sultangazin

Abstract. Today, debates are very popular and play an important role in various spheres of public life. When entering a debate, the speaker must convince the audience of the correctness of his speech by supporting rhetorical criticism. There are different topics in the debate, such as sociology, political, religious, and science and fiction. These days, new terms or phrases are appearing. For debaters, it is difficult to find their meaning in fifteen minutes.

Резюме. Сегодня дебаты очень популярны и играют важную роль в различных сферах общественной жизни. Вступая в дебаты, оратор должен убедить аудиторию в

правильности своей речи, поддерживая риторическую критику. В дебатах участвуют самые разные темы, такие как социология, политика, религия, наука и фантастика. В наши дни появляются новые термины или фразы. Для спорщиков трудно найти их смысл за пятнадцать минут.

Түйіндеме. Бүгінгі күні дебат өте танымал және қоғамдық өмірдің түрлі салаларында маңызды рөл атқарады. Дебатқа түсе отырып, оратор аудиторияны риторикалық сынды қолдай отырып, өз сөзінің дұрыстығына сендіруі тиіс. Пікірталасқа әлеуметтану, саясат, дін, ғылым және фантастика сияқты әртүрлі тақырыптар қатысады. Спикерлер үшін олардың мағынасын он бес минут ішінде табу қиын.

**Key words:** debate, resolution, rhetoric, motion, speaker

The history of debate begins with ancient times. In ancient Greece, the philosopher Socrates used debate as a way of understanding the world by drawing out answers from his followers. In ancient history the greatest Orator was without doubt Cicero although Caesar was within the same sort as league I will give Cicero this since Caesar dominated so many fields and this was Cicero's main area of renown. At this time, philosophy was discussed. The appearance of the earth, various stories about the gods. In these centuries, people reasoned and sought to study the surrounding world of man, starting with nature and ending with the thoughts of man. The rhetoric from these times is still being studied. Real speakers must take a look at these great people and their advice about performing on stage. In 1858, the debates for an Illinois Senate seat between Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas were famed for their skill and ability to get to the heart of the argument. [1,1] They have in turn inspired a whole type of modern debating.

From this time on, the real sphere of debate begins.

The first televised debate between John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon during the 1960 us presidential election brought a new surge of attention to the debate.[2,2]

Debate is now used in many areas from schools to presidential politicians. And here the question arises why is the debate so developed? After all, everyone can argue and disputes have a certain status in our world. We agree with this opinion but not every debater is a speaker. We can draw this conclusion if everyone has read famous authors before.

In modern society, debates take place in parliaments and on TV screens, in universities and schools, and often in everyday life. In this case, a debate is understood as a debate-a discussion of an issue in the presence of different points of view, views on it. Such debates are usually informal and conducted without rules. Debates that have certain rules and regulations are designed to eliminate this shortcoming. Now the debate is very developed. There are many types, depending on the format the debate can be American parliamentary, British parliamentary, Lincoln-Douglas and Karl Popper format. [3,3]

The difference between an argument and an argument is that the speech consists of:

- Definition
- Status of the quo
- Arguments (each argument must have a short title, explanation, relevance of the argument, support, and ending)
- Conclusion.

In this case the speaker must explain within seven minutes and at the same time make a rebuttle on the opponent

Every debater should be calm and tolerant. The debater should not judge the contestants. They are debaters only in the game, and after the game they remain friends.

To win a debate, the speaker must own the audience and have a rhetorical critique. "Making use of his subjective power he aims to influence the attitudes, the beliefs, the

opinions and the other participants' behavior towards the rhetorical act." [4,168] According to Rüdiger J. Seitz we differentiate three different categories of beliefs. They are empirical, relational and conceptual. Empirical beliefs develop upon first exposure to concrete objects outside of conscious awareness and do not rely on language. [5,136] The speaker must behave freely in the audience. When his time begins, the entire audience listens only to the speaker. In his speech, the speaker explains the relevance of the topic and argues for each step. The speaker's speech must be clear and well explained.

There are three types of motions in any parliamentary debate, depending on how specific or broadly defined it is. These are known as *open*, *semi-closed* and *closed* motions, of whom regardless of the type of motion, the terms are always defined by the Prime Minister.

An *open motion* is a motion or resolution that is broad and can be defined quite liberally. For example, a motion like *This house would pay* can be defined on a wide range of topics, from African countries paying their debts to lender countries to paying one's personal debt to a friend to the German government paying compensation for atrocities committed during the Nazi regime. However, given that open motions are so ambiguously worded that they tend to lead to much confusion among teams and debaters, as well as the propensity for abuse (such as defining the motion based on personal experience), they are rarely given in tournaments today.

A *semi-closed motion*, like an open motion, is also broad in scope. However, the context for which the motion is set is more limited than in an open motion. Such a motion could be worded as *This house would pay compensation to victims of abuse*. In such a motion, the terms *compensation* and *victims of abuse* would still have to be defined, while clearly stating that the motion calls for the compensation of abuse victims.

Lastly, a *closed motion*, unlike the previous two types of motions, is a motion that is usually specific in scope while still leaving room for interpretation. For example, *This house would make Germany compensate victims of Nazi atrocities* is a closed motion. In this case, the motion is specifically defined as forcing Germany to compensate victims of Nazi atrocities, although the term *Nazi atrocities* is still left to interpretation.

Within those types of motions include *policy* and *value-judgment* motions, which respectively are about policies and values. In some cases, these types of motions overlap each other, forming motions that have semblances of both the policy and value-judgment types. An example of this is *This house believes that the government should fund exclusively homosexual schools*. In the motion, while it is worded to that of a value-judgment motion, it also calls for a proposal.[6]

The topic of the debate is currently extensive:

- Educational
- Political
- Social
- Environmental
- Technology

Several examples of resolutions from the last debate:

"This House believes that the feminist movement should support the narrative that "beauty does not matter" over the narrative that "all bodies are beautiful".

"This House would abolish primary and secondary school grades/years that group children based on age, and instead group them by competency and intelligence."

"This House regrets the Humanization of Villains in Film and Media [i.e Joker]."

[7,7]

These are resolutions from the official website. Each resolution has a specific form. Now we understand how these resolutions are structured what do they have in common?

House - an organization that makes laws, or its meeting place [8,8] This is a General term used in all political resolutions meaning that every speaker who defends this resolution speaks from the name of the government. The opposition must show the disadvantages and irrelevance of this resolution. The sentence should be written clearly in the text. There are no rhetorical questions or exclamation points. The resolution should not contain unclear questions. All words are used in the direct meaning, as polysemous words confuse speakers. There are also a lot of terms here, as not everyone knows. Terms appear from problematic issues. That is, if a new event appears, then the terms also appear to give the name.

#### Anaphora and coreference resolution

Anaphora resolution is an intra-linguistic terminology, which means that it refers to re- solving references used within the text with a same sense (i.e., referring to the same entity). Also, these entities are usually present in the text and, hence, the need of world knowledge is minimal. CR, on the other hand, has a much broader scope and is an extra-linguistic terminology. Co-referential terms could have completely different grammatical structure and function (e.g., gender and part of speech) and yet, by definition, they could refer to the same extra linguistic entity. Here, entity could be a single object in a world or a group of objects which together form a new single entity. CR treats entities in a way more similar to how we understand discourse, i.e., by treating each entity as a unique entity in real time. From the above explanation, it may seem that AR is a subset of CR. However, this claim though commonly fails in some cases as stated by Mitkov in his example: Every speaker had to present his paper . Here, if “his ”and “every speaker ”are said to co-refer (i.e., refer to the same entity), the sentence is interpreted as “Every speaker had to present Every speaker’s paper ”which is obviously not correct. Thus, “his ”here is EntityResolutionCoreferenceResolutionAnaphoraResolutionDefinitePronominalDefiniteAnaphoraIdentityReferencesCataphoraDefinitePronominalCataphoraIdentityReferences an anaphoric referent and not co-referential, hence demarcating the two very similar but significantly different concepts. This is a typical case of the bound variable problem in entity resolution. Hence, the often made claim that AR is a type of CR, fails in this case. Some researchers also claim that coreference is a type of AR. However, this can often be seen as a misnomer of the term “anaphora ”, which clearly refers to something that has occurred earlier in a discourse. CR, on the other hand, spans many fields like AR, cataphora resolution, split antecedent resolution, etc. For example: If he is unhappy with your work, the CEO will fire you . Here, the first reference is not anaphoric as it does not have any antecedent, but (1) is clearly co- referent with. What we see here is the occurrence of the cataphora phenomenon. Thus, this claim too fails to capture this phenomenon adequately. Though these two concepts have a significant degree of overlap, they are quite different. There is a clear need for redefinition of the CR problem. We find that standard datasets like CoNLL 2012 fail to capture the problem to its entirety. To address the fuzziness involved in the terminologies used in entity resolution, we suggest that the datasets created for the task explicitly specify the coreference type they have considered for annotation and the ones they have not. We also insist that future entity resolution (CR, AR, etc.) models also perform exhaustive error analysis and clearly state the types of references which their algorithms fail to resolve. This serves two purposes: firstly, it helps future researchers focus their efforts on specific types of references like co-referent event resolution, which most models fail to resolve, and secondly, this helps in highlighting some issues in the way we currently define the task. [8,140]

There are many events around us. If we did not know about online learning before, now we are masters of it. If earlier people thought that all nature is studied and nothing is explored, new species of animals or mutations of plants appear. To get used to the news, the state must make a decision in advance and think about the people. In the debate, such topics

are raised to then help in the state. Only good speakers can speak to the people and explain their strategies. This is the importance of the debate and the resolution for the debate.

#### References:

1. <https://www.history.com/news/5-things-you-may-not-know-about-lincoln-slavery-and-emancipation>
2. <https://www.history.com/topics/us-presidents/kennedy-nixon-debates>
3. <https://www.debate-motions.info/debate-formats/american-parliamentary-debate-format/>
4. “Rhetorical Critic's Role and Mission in Communication” - Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 197 ( 2015 ) 167 – 174
5. Belief formation – A driving force for brain evolution - Rüdiger J. Seitz, Hans-Ferdinand Angel, Brain and Cognition 140 (2020) 105548
6. «Winning Debates» Steven L. Jonson. 2009. 136
7. <http://hellomotions.com/motions2019>
8. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/house>
9. Anaphora and coreference resolution: A review – Rhea Sukthanker a , Soujanya Poria b , Erik Cambria c , Ramkumar Thirunavukarasu d. Information Fusion 59 (2020) 139–162

УДК 908

### ДЕМОГРАФИЧЕСКОЕ РАЗВИТИЕ КОСТАНАЙСКОЙ ОБЛАСТИ В ДОВОЕННЫЙ ПЕРИОД

Молдахметова А.А.

Костанайский государственный университет им. А.Байтурсынова,  
г. Костанай

Научный руководитель: Исмаилов С.С.

Костанайский государственный университет им. А.Байтурсынова,  
г. Костанай

Аннотация: Бұл мақалада Қостанай облысы аумағында соғысқа дейінгі кезеңде халық қоныстандыру мәселесі қарастырылады. Осы кезеңде облыстың жеке әкімшілік құрылым ретінде қалыптасуы жүрді. Сол уақыттың басты мәселелерінің бірі географиялық-шаруашылық ерекшеліктеріне сәйкес халықты бөлуде аудандық бірліктерге нақты бөлу және теңдестірілген тәсіл болды.

Түйін сөздер: Қостанай, облыс, демография, қазақтар, орыстар, украиндар, аудандар, халық қоныстануы.

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматривается проблема народонаселения на территории Костанайской области в довоенный период. В данный период шло становление области, как отдельной административной структуры. Одним из главных вопросов того времени было четкое разделение на районные единицы и сбалансированный подход в распределении населения в соответствии с географико-хозяйственными особенностями.

Ключевые слова: Костанай, область, демография, казахи, русские, украинцы, районы, народонаселение.

Annotation: This article discusses the problem of population in the territory of Kostanay region in the pre-war period. In this period was the establishment of a region as a separate administrative structure. One of the main issues of that time was a clear division into