



**Վ. ԲՐՅՈՒՍՈՎԻ ԱՆՎԱՆ ՊԵՏԱԿԱՆ
ՀԱՄԱԼՍԱՐԱՆ
ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ
ИМЕНИ В. БРЮСОВА
BRUSOV STATE UNIVERSITY**

**ԲԱՆԲԵՐ
Վ. ԲՐՅՈՒՍՈՎԻ ԱՆՎԱՆ ՊԵՏԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՄԱԼՍԱՐԱՆԻ
ВЕСТНИК ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО УНИВЕРСИТЕТА ИМЕНИ
В. БРЮСОВА
BULLETIN OF BRUSOV STATE UNIVERSITY**

ԼԵՉՎԱԲԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ԵՎ ԲԱՆԱՍԻՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

ЛИНГВИСТИКА И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

LINGUISTICS AND PHILOLOGY

1(56)

**Վ. ԲՐՅՈՒՍՈՎԻ ԱՆՎԱՆ ՊԵՏԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՄԱԼՍԱՐԱՆԻ
«ԼԻՆԳՎԱ» ՀՐԱՏԱՐԱԿԶՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ**

ԵՐԵՎԱՆ - 2021

CONDITIONALS AT THE CROSSROADS OF CONVERGENT AND
DIVERGENT THINKING

MARINA KHARATYAN
LUSIK VARDANYAN

Keywords: *critical thinking, three dimensional approach, accuracy-focused and fluency-focused approach, explicit and implicit grammar, dynamic, deontic and epistemic modality, conditionals, interconnectivity, synergy*

The present research is an attempt to emphasize the current necessity in EFL teaching to reevaluate and reconsider the content of grammar on the discourse level through the core elements of critical and creative thinking. We do not seek to give a resourceful explanation to the concept and theory of critical and creative thinking; our foremost concern is to show how the knowledge of these two types of thinking can be linked to and identified in Grammar instruction.

Driven by the pursuit of the 21st century learning goals and requirements and the urgent necessity of developing students' higher order thinking skills, we seek to explore the impact of these two types of thinking on the quality of students' academic performance in grammar classes through identifying the reciprocal link between grammar and critical-creative thinking. We also seek to evaluate students' grammatical competence through determining the extent to which they acquire and master the core elements of grammar through the core elements of critical and creative thinking. We are free of the bias to regard Grammar as a sentence-level phenomenon as this kind of view is incompatible with the notion of competency-based instruction. Through introducing an integrated approach, we propose teaching Grammar in a variety of contexts with the intent of exposing not only morphological and syntactical peculiarities of a certain grammatical phenomenon but also its sociopragmatic aspects.

What we should call in mind from the outset is that creative thinking is divergent and critical thinking is convergent. Divergent (creative thinking) focuses on a multitude of choices and solutions since it opens up the mind guiding it through different directions and possibilities; convergent (critical

thinking) involves exact information and data, analysis and one possible solution to the problem.

In our estimation, creative thinking is to some extent analogous to proactive thinking because for both types of thinking the most important ingredients are unsuppressed flexibility, mental elasticity, sheer originality and multifaceted reasoning ability. Due to these qualities, creative and proactive thinkers do not limit themselves to one-size-fits-all approach to problem-solving tasks, nor do they follow well-trodden paths in research activities. They prefer to get the answers to the most challenging and intricate questions by seeing them from new angles and do not fear to come up with ideas that might seem unusual or weird to others. Herein lies the power of being a creative and proactive thinker.

According to Stephen Brookfield (Brookfield 1987) the core elements of critical thinking are as follows: identifying and challenging assumptions, recognizing the importance of context, imagining and exploring alternatives, and engaging in reflective skepticism.

<<https://docslide.net/download/link/developing-critical-thinkers-stephen-brookfield-distinguished-university-professor>>

According to Philip B. Bralich “Grammar is itself the result of critical thinking and a presentation of critical thinking in a rather native form (https://www.academia.edu/11732218/Critical_Thinking_and_Grammar).

We define critical thinking as a trigger of, or as a synergetic pathway to the thought and action for formulating one’s own judgments and assumptions, analyzing others’ judgments and opinions in order to understand, accept and discriminate certain concepts and ideas.

According to Martin Luenendonk “The term ‘divergent thinking’ refers to that strategy of solving problems characterized by the proposal of a multiplicity of possible solutions in an attempt to determine the one that works. It usually happens in a free-flowing, spontaneous manner, where multiple creative ideas are engendered and evaluated. A manifold number of potential solutions are studied in a brief span of time, and unconventional connections may be drawn. Once the stage of divergent thinking is complete, information and ideas are structured and organized using convergent thinking. Brainstorming and free writing are two processes that involve divergent thinking” (<https://www.cleverism.com/idea-generation-divergent-vs-convergent-thinking>).

It is an irrefutable fact that any scientific domain, any discipline possesses a number of aspects that seem particularly difficult for teachers to explain efficiently enough to arouse students’ interest or to keep them

motivated and inspired. In this respect, grammar, having an essential role in language teaching and generally acknowledged as a controversial topic in terms of its teaching methods, frequently poses challenges for teachers who are neither ready nor willing to embrace them especially when they are tough or unprecedented. Thus, students, too, encounter a number of hurdles and obstacles that result in the incomprehension and confusion of the concept, which is further compounded by disenchantment and the simultaneous shortage of the learner attention, integration, and participation. Non-native learners of English often experience problems with the regularities, irregularities, and exceptions of the English Grammar as they seem perplexing and interfering on the one hand (as they do not go hand in hand with the regularities of the mother tongue) and weary and dull, on the other hand. Therefore, it is important that we look for ways and approaches that could make grammar classes more intelligible, digestible, and engaging. In order to achieve this goal we should, first of all, try to give answers to a number of questions that include, but are not limited to, "What grammar should we teach?", "How should we teach grammar?", "What is the key to a good grammar explanation?" Consequently, before teaching grammar we should consider the nature of the grammar required, its role and importance in language teaching, and the methods and approaches that will enable language learners to use linguistic forms accurately, meaningfully, and appropriately. Grammar is sometimes described as the "rules" of a language, which is not more or less true. Nor is it right to consider grammar as a discrete set of static structures. If we do strive to enhance our students' grammatical accuracy and proficiency, the mere transmission of grammatical knowledge is definitely not enough to satisfy students' learning needs and expectations.

In the present research, we pursue the following hypothesis: incorporating and increasing the core elements of convergent and divergent thinking in grammar classes may lead to the organization of a more productive, meaningful and thought-provoking classes. And periodically students should be provided with a realistic opportunity, real-life situations and smooth transition from the sentence level to the discourse level to explore and get the understanding of the grammatical concepts and grammatical categories by themselves through analyzing, synthesizing, problem solving, identifying links and similarities, comparing and contrasting. Thus, the subject matter of this article is to highlight the importance of using convergent and divergent thinking techniques to enhance students' learning, to explore and share some insights and ideas on integration of key critical thinking elements in teaching Conditionals within English language teaching context. The article will also

illustrate a number of authentic situations and texts aiming at contrasting and comparing sentence-level description with discourse level description involving some forms, meanings and structures of modal verbs used in Conditional sentences.

Performing in compliance with the present research hypothesis we put forward the following research questions:

1. Why is it essential to develop critical thinking in Grammar classes, and how can we introduce the elements of critical and creative thinking while teaching Grammar in ELT?
2. How can we relate and intertwine the core skills of Grammar to the core skills of convergent and divergent thinking to fulfill the ultimate goal of teaching Grammar?
3. Why doesn't necessarily the explaining of a rule lead to a full understanding of the language point? Which grammar method should be applied in grammar classes?
4. Why is it necessary to reevaluate the content of English grammar at the discourse level.
5. Could there be any techniques that can lead to designing a more effective and student-oriented classes while teaching Conditional sentences in Grammar classes.

In correspondence with a number of studies conducted in this area and on the basis of our experience and research, we assume that one of the reasons of getting grammar gradually into the Cinderella area of linguistics is that grammar rules are seldom contextualized; they do not provide many instances that come from real-life situations; in one word, they do not account for many cases or examples that learners come across in real life. Native speakers are the ones who create and are responsible for the language, and consequently, grammar rules mainly reflect and follow native speakers' language and communication habits.

Many students learn grammar rules and exceptions as they are presented in grammar textbooks but fail to apply them when it comes to language reproduction in authentic communication. As a corollary, rather than reflecting natural language use, students direct their focus towards constructing grammatically accurate utterances without much concern about their meaningfulness and appropriateness in discourse. To this end, before assigning grammar exercises or grammatical models, we think it is important to consider the purpose and the context in which the particular exercise will be carried out. Producing grammatically accurate sentences is not enough to use utterances appropriate in a given context. Different learners perceive the

objective reality differently and it is their subjective cognition that colours that reality, which is later regulated and expressed by cultural and social norms. The latter plays a pivotal role in shaping situationally appropriate grammar when it comes to teaching conditionals with their various syntactic forms, numerous literal and figurative meanings, and even more diverse and puzzling interpretations. In order to get possible answers to a great variety of questions concerning different semantic representations and pragmatic interpretations of the basic conditional patterns (Zero Conditional, Conditional 1, Conditional 2, Conditional 3, and Mixed Conditionals), we need to make use of some tools or strategies in order to have a better picture of these misleadingly simple constructions. Since modality is closely related to tense, mood and aspect features, in this paper we will use it as an effective tool to explore the reciprocal relationship between conditionals and modality, thereby revealing various subtle differences of conditional and modal meanings that “if+will/would” patterns may inherently express or acquire in discourse. “Will” and “would” are rather versatile in terms of their semantic and functional properties and seem highly troublesome to Armenian learners especially when used in if-clauses inasmuch as future in conditional clauses is mainly expressed by present (Zero Conditional; Conditional 1) and past tenses (Conditional 2) which are void of modal colouring. To better understand the futurity-modality interface in “if+will/would” clauses we need to study the interpersonal functions of “will” and “would” from both the speaker’s and the hearer’s perspective which will serve a good base to identify their epistemic, deontic and dynamic meanings and the circumstances under which these meanings may overlap and give rise to various interpretations. Since futurity and modality expressed by “will” and “would” in conditional clauses seem inextricably intertwined and difficult to differentiate, the analysis of the attitudinal functions of epistemic, deontic and dynamic modality (developed by Palmer) in if-clauses will enable us to draw a demarcation line between objective and subjective reality and to more easily distinguish the future and modal readings of these patterns.

As far as nomenclature of conditional sentences is concerned, the subordinate clause is called the antecedent, also called the protasis (*p*) and the main clause is called the consequent or the apodosis (*q*). The conditional (if-then) construction has the “If *p*, then *q*” formula, the symbolic representation of which is $p \Rightarrow q$ in philosophical logic (Rescher 2007: 2).

According to T.V. Leeuwen “Modality is the social semiotic approach to the question of truth. It relates both to issues of representation and to the questions of social interaction (Leeuwen 2006: 160). Modality is a semantic

phenomenon since it is concerned with meaning first of all, and meaning can be realised via a variety of parameters.

Consequently, on the one hand modality relates to the attitude of the speaker/writer to the issue from the point of view of reality-unreality, probability-improbability, obligatory-desirable, politeness-criticism regulator, fact- hypothesis, real-desired or imaginary, and on the other hand “what is regarded as true in one social context is not necessarily true in others. Linguists therefore do not ask “ How true is this?” but “How true it is represented?”(Leeuwen 2006: 160).

So, we, linguists, are not concerned with universal truth, but to what degree the truth is seen and and represented by the speakers/writers and perceived and agreed upon by the listeners/ readers How we see the issue is the result of our personal experience, perception, and interpretation which may not coincide with the listener/reader/s’ perspective. Modality exists on the level of interpersonal meanings and reflects how the speaker /writer is sure about the event: whether it is factual, likely, necessary, inevitable, possible, desirable, or fictitious. However, one must be careful to distinguish between “the speaker’s actual beliefs and his or her portrayal of these beliefs and attitudes” (Sweetser 1996: 318). According to Fillmore’s epistemic stance theory (1990: 137), the coded meaning of the verb forms in a conditional necessarily reveals the speaker’s stance towards the proposition in the protasis. Fillmore defines epistemic stance as “the epistemic relationship which the speaker has to the world represented by the conditional sentence: the speaker might regard it as the actual world, might regard it as distinct from the actual world, or might not know whether the alternative world represented in the conditional sentence is the actual world or not”(Fillmore 1990: 140-142). As regards hypotheticality, it is a common feature of some types of conditionals, notably of those considered outside of any discourse context; thus, hypotheticality is not part of the semantic content encoded in the form of a conditional marker like ‘if’ (Schwenter 1999: 45).

Thus, in this very research, combining the crossroads of convergent and divergent thinking, we will try to especially focus on the interpersonal dimension of the modality in conditional clauses which will enable us to regard this or that issue not as a matter of “true” or “wrong”, but to what degree something is true or wrong.

According to the Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics, “Epistemic modality is the area of mood concerned with knowledge and belief, including at least the expression of possibility, probability and certainty as perceived by the speaker. Deontic modality is the area of mood concerned with

permission, obligation and prohibition. Dynamic modality is the area of mood concerned with physical or mental ability.”(Trask 2003: 76). According to Facchinetti (2003: 300-302), “Epistemic modality deals with opinions, with reference to the speaker’s degree of knowledge of what is said. Deontic modality deals with facts controlled by the willingness/intentionality of the speaker; it is the modality of obligation, imposition, and permission. Dynamic modality deals with the subject’s physical or mental powers, and with situations which are determined by circumstances external to the subject.” Deontic and Epistemic modals are also called intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic modality refers to actions and events that humans (or other agents) directly control: meanings relating to permission, obligation, or volition (or intention); extrinsic modality refers to the logical status of events or states, usually relating to assessments of likelihood: possibility, necessity, or prediction (Biber et al. 1999: 485).

Hence, of the three functional components of the semantic system of the language (ideational, interpersonal, textual) it is the interpersonal component that would allow us to categorize epistemic and non-epistemic interpretations of ‘will’ and ‘would’ in different situational contexts since “the interpersonal component is concerned with the social, expressive and conative functions of language, with expressing the speaker’s ‘angle’: his attitudes and judgments, his encoding of the role relationships in the situation, and his motive in saying anything at all” (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 26-27). According to Butt et al. (2003: 5) “the interpersonal metafunction uses language to encode interaction, to show how defensible we find our propositions, to encode ideas about obligation and inclination and to express our attitudes.”

As regards the interpersonal functions of the modal auxiliaries “will” and “would” in P-clauses, they can express a number of non-epistemic meanings that include, but are not limited to, obstinate insistence; an inherent quality or capacity of a thing; willingness, intention and refusal; a polite request or invitation (Declerck & Reed 2001: 205-207). Dancygier (2006: 120-122) distinguishes two types of ‘if +will’ constructions: the first type expressing volition, as in “If you will look after our luggage, I’ll go and get a taxi”, and the second type expressing insistence, as in “If you will watch TV in the dark, what can you expect?” Comrie (2009: 77-79) claims that non-volitional uses of ‘will’ in if-clauses may vary depending on the nature of sequentiality and causal relations between the clauses. He notes that sentences in which ‘will’ appears in ‘contextually-given P-clauses’ are not sequential, as in “If he won’t arrive before nine, there is no point in ordering for him”. The future protasis of conditional constructions may give rise to a ‘bicausal’ interpretation as in “If it will amuse you, I’ll tell you a joke” due to the inverse causal relations between

the P-clause and Q-clause (prospective amusement causes telling a joke; the joke causes amusement). According to Michael Swan (1997: 259-260), “If +will can be used in polite requests. In this case, will is not a future auxiliary; it means are willing to. Would can be used to make a request even more polite. Stressed will can also be used after if when it expresses the idea of insistence. If + will may also mean if it is true that.” Dancygier and Sweetser in their book “Mental Spaces in Grammar” (2009: 89) write “Future ‘will’ is acceptable in epistemic or speech-act conditional protases, because the protasis in both is not related to the apodosis on the level of content (so reference times are not coordinated in the usual way), and secondarily also because most of these conditionals are not construed as involving predictions by the speaker”. Fillmore (1990: 137) has noted that the use of ‘non-future will’ may go beyond a meaning of volitionality to cover cases expressing the speaker’s ‘positive interest’, as in “If this rain will just hold off, I can get the lawn mowed”.

If we analyse the examples given below, we notice that the “if + will/would” patterns are predominantly dealing with polite behaviour which is characteristic of dynamic modality. However, if we consider the context, the relations between the interlocutors, and the speaker’s intent, we realize that the utterances in the if-clauses give rise to not only a dynamic or a deontic interpretation, but sometimes two or even three readings (dynamic, deontic, epistemic) at a time depending on whose perspective we analyse the utterances from: the speaker’s or the hearer’s. Another no less important distinguishing factor is whether the speech acts in those examples are expressed explicitly or implicitly, the latter demanding a critical approach to the decoding process on the whole.

(1) “Well, **if you’ll excuse me**, I’ll go.” (Th. Dreiser, 50)

As is seen, the P-clause is a hedge regarded as an etiquette regulating politeness and, therefore, does not implicate dynamic, deontic or epistemic meanings. We consider it hedging as in this context “will” is outside the structural and semantic levels, and is within the communicative domain of the utterance. If we consider the P-clause a formulaic phrase serving as a starting point for the utterance of the Q-clause, the P-clause does not express a deontic or dynamic meaning. But if we consider this hedge as a polite request asking for permission, it definitely implicates a deontic meaning.

(2) *You are the essence of everything beautiful to me. It is in your power to strew flowers in my path **if you will**.* (Th. Dreiser, 135)

We can’t but agree with one of Declerck’s interpretations of the verbal gesture “if you will”, which is old-fashioned in the sense of “if you like”, but still survives in current English, in approximately the sense of “if you will accept

my expressing it in these terms” or “if you prefer to express it in these terms” (Declerck & Reed 2001:208). Here, the speaker is tentatively negotiating with the hearer trying to redress the face threatening act with positive politeness, which attends the positive face, the need to be accepted and liked by the hearer, treated as a member of the group. (Yule 2002:152). In this example, deontic and dynamic meanings of the P-clause are conceived at the same time: deontic modality (permission to be granted by the speaker) and dynamic modality (the hearer’s willingness to grant the speaker that permission). This utterance can be totally regarded as a piece of diplomatic persuasion using the praise as a starting point.

(3) *Mrs. Gerhardt listened with a strong hope for a betterment if their miserable life creeping into her heart. If Bass would only do this. **If he would go and get work, and come to her rescue, as a strong bright young son might**, what a thing it would be! They were in the rapids of a life which was moving toward a dreadful calamity. If only something would happen.* (Th. Dreiser, 93)

(4) *Lester came to himself sufficiently after a time to add:*

“Well. Just what did he tell you?” you would get nothing at all.

*“He said that if you married me, you would only get ten thousand a year. That if you didn’t and still lived with me. **If you would leave me, or I would leave you**, you would get all of a million and a half. Don’t you think you had better leave me now?”* (Th. Dreiser, 290)

The “if + would” clauses in examples (3) and (4) stand in close opposition due to their marked semantic and attitudinal connotations acquired in the context. “If he would go and get work, and come to her rescue, as a strong bright young son might” (example 3) undoubtedly implies an epistemic meaning and can be looked upon as the speaker’s (Mrs Gerhardt) great wish and desire towards the realization of something unreachable covered by the “veil of uncertainty”. Here the slightly expressed willingness is not associated with either a polite request or invitation unlike that of the P-clause (example 4), which is accompanied by the act of encouragement and incentive ensuring the possible fulfillment of the desired event. According to the speaker’s conviction, the deal offered would be beneficial for both entities equally. Thus, we may deduce that both the examples have epistemic reading overlapping with deontic reading in example 3 and with deontic and dynamic readings in example 4.

(5) *“All well and good,” said Robert, “but who’s going to convince him? I’m sure I don’t want the job.”*

"I hope to," said old Archibald, "eventually; but you'd better go up and try, anyhow. It can't do any harm. He might come to his senses."

*"I don't believe it," replied Robert. "He is a strong man. You see how much good talk does down here. Still, I'll go **if it will relieve your feelings any**. Mother wants it."*

"Yes, yes," said his father distractedly, "better go." (Th. Dreiser, 197)

The P-clause in this example stands out from all the others analyzed in this paper in that it is not concerned with the semantic content of the Q-clause. Rather, it indirectly casts doubt on the pragmatic presupposition of the Q-utterance. In essence, this P-clause expresses dynamic meaning through the speaker's unwillingness to accept the truthfulness of the proposition under consideration. However, the P-clause may also tentatively express epistemic meaning if considered from the speaker's firm and inflexible standpoint: Robert's unwillingness to go and his misgivings about the successful outcome of the operation emphasizes his obstinate reluctance to negotiate.

(6) Bass waited a little while before making up his mind but finally announced his purpose.

"I believe I'll go up to Cleveland," he said to his mother one evening as she was getting supper.

"Why?" she asked, looking up uncertainly. She was rather afraid that Bass would desert her.

"I think I can get work there," he returned. "We oughtn't to stay in this darned old town."

"Don't swear," she returned reprovably.

*"Oh, I know," he said, "but it's enough to make any one swear. We've never had anything but rotten luck here. I'm going to go, and maybe if I get anything we can all move. We'd better off **if we'd get some place where people don't know us**. We can't be anything here." (Th. Dreiser, 93)*

In this passage the P-clause "*if we'd get some place where people don't know us*" directly and indirectly expresses three modal meanings at a time. According to its epistemic reading, Bass hopefully expresses his wish to find better living conditions for the family (this wish might or might not be realized though); in the meantime, he respects his mother's expectations and feelings and politely gets her involved in something she would hardly be able to do. Without direct imposition, Bass tactfully replaces "I" with "we" to showcase his wish to negotiate and to consider his mother's willingness to become part of the drastic change they expect to make in their lives. This seemingly small pronoun change has a great pragmatic value and is a means to implicitly express both deontic and dynamic modality inasmuch as they are both based on Bass's

mother's attitude which stems either from Bass's (the speaker) indirect imposition or permission to act (external force related to deontic reading) or from her own willingness (the hearer) to cooperate with her own son (internal force related to dynamic reading). As is seen from this analysis, these three different interpretations of the same P-clause may be possible when the situational context is thoroughly analyzed from different perspectives and if the author's (Th. Dreiser) idiosyncrasy is conceived as an added semantic value. The author's preference of "would" to "will" can be seen as a modality-intensifying device to increase the level of uncertainty and doubt in case of epistemic modality (this is the first meaning the P-clause expresses explicitly) and to highlight the degree of tentativeness and politeness when deontic and dynamic meanings are concerned (these implicitly expressed modal meanings are discovered through critical and judgemental thinking only).

The author's individual style is also important to consider while trying to explain the difference(s) between the two "if only" patterns in sentences (7) and (8) given below.

(7) *There's only one answer to your problem, and it isn't such a bad one, if you'll only believe me.* (Th. Dreiser, 143)

(8) *If only something would happen.* (Th. Dreiser, 93)

Two questions are bound to arise here:

- Are the constructions "If only...." and "If.....only....." the same or different as far as their meanings are concerned?
- Is the position of the focusing adverb "only" in "if only" constructions merely attributed to the author's idiosyncrasy and does not bring about big semantic changes, if any?

The above cited exercises and examples illustrated the need and priority of teaching grammar at the discourse level with the key elements of convergent-divergent thinking.

Thus, we come to the conclusion that adhering to the educational and instructional needs and requirements of the 21st century, grammar teaching should meet the following standards:

- ✓ It should be multidisciplinary: on the one hand it should integrate all the aspects of the competency based teaching: linguistic and extra-linguistic layers of the language (intradisciplinary); on the other hand, it should synthesize language with convergent -divergent thinking (interdisciplinary).
- ✓ It should go beyond the sentence level and organizational level, prioritizing the links between grammatical (morphology + syntax) and rhetorical and sociopragmatic aspects of the language to develop greater awareness and sensitivity to the ways in which the language can be used.

- ✓ It should be multifunctional directed not only to developing learners' knowledge, skills, and abilities, but also to enhancing their personal and professional fulfillment and growth.

REFERENCES

1. Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan, *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman 1999.
2. Butt D., Fahey R., et al., *Using Functional Grammar, An Explorer's Guide*, National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University, 2003.
3. Comrie, B., *On Conditionals*. In Elizabeth C. Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judy S. Reilly and Charles A. Ferguson (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
4. Declerck, R., Reed S., *Conditionals, A Comprehensive Empirical Analysis*, Mouton de Gruyter, 2001.
5. Dancygier B., *Conditionals and Prediction, Time, knowledge and causation in conditional constructions*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
6. Dancygier, B., and E. Sweetser, *Mental Spaces in Grammar: Conditional Constructions*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
7. Dreiser Theodore, Jennie Gerhardt, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1972.
8. Facchinetti, R., *Modality in Contemporary English*. In R. Facchinetti, M. Krug, F. Palmer (eds.), *Topics in English Linguistics 44* (edited by B. Kortmann, E. Traugott), Mouton de Gruyter, 2003.
9. Fillmore, Charles J., *Epistemic stance and grammatical form in English conditional sentences*. CLS 26. 1990.
10. Halliday, M.A.K., and Hasan, R., *Cohesion in English*. English Language Series, Longman Group Ltd 1976.
11. Leeuwuen, T.V., *Introducing Social Semiotics*. Routledge. Taylor and France Group, 2006.
12. Palmer, F.R. *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge University Press, 1986
13. Rescher, N., *Conditionals*. A Bradford Book. The MIT Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts / London, England., 2007.
14. Schwenter, S. A., *Pragmatics of conditional marking: implicature, scalarity, and exclusivity*. Garland Publishing, Inc., New York & London. 1999.
15. Swan, M., *Practical English Usage*, Oxford University Press. 1997.
16. Sweetser, Eve E., *Mental spaces and the grammar of conditional constructions*. *Spaces, worlds, and grammar*, edited by Gilles Fauconnier and Eve Sweetser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1996.

17. Trask, R. L., A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics, Routledge. 2003.
18. Yule, G., Explaining English Grammar, Oxford University Press. 1998.

INTERNET RESOURCES

19. Bralich, B Critical Thinking and Grammar at https://www.academia.edu/11732218/Critical_Thinking_and_Grammar
20. Brookfield, S Developing Critical Thinkers at <https://docslide.net/download/link/developing-critical-thinkers-stephen-brookfield-distinguished-university-professor> (Accessed March 2019)
21. Ellis, R., Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective at <https://docslide.net/documents/current-issues-in-the-teaching-of-grammar-an-sla-perspective-rod-ellis.html> (2016, (Accessed January 2019).
22. Luenendonk, M. Idea generation: Divergent vs Convergent Thinking (<https://www.cleverism.com/idea-generation-divergent-vs-convergent-thinking>).
23. Philip B. Critical Thinking and Grammar at <https://www.academia.edu/11732218/> .

ՄԱՐԻՆԵ ԽԱՌԱՏՅԱՆ, ԼՈՒՍԻԿ ՎԱՐԴԱՆՅԱՆ - ՊԱՅՄԱՆԻ ՀԱՐԱԲԵՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ԱՐՏԱՀԱՅՏՈՂ ԿԱՌՈՒՅՑՆԵՐԸ ԿՈՆՎԵՐԳԵՆՏ ԵՎ ԴԻՎԵՐԳԵՆՏ ՄՏԱԾՈՂՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ԽԱՉՄԵՐՈՒԿՈՒՄ

Հիմնաբառեր՝ քննադատական մտածողություն, եռաստիճան մոտեցում, խոսքի ճշգրտությանն ուղղված մոտեցում, խոսքի սահունությանն ուղղված մոտեցում, էքսպլիցիտ և էմպլիցիտ քերականություն, դինամիկ, դետոնթիկ և էպիստեմիկ եղանակավորություն, պայմանի հարաբերություն արահայտող կառույցներ, փոխկապակցում, համագործակցություն

Սույն հոդվածում փորձ է արվում ցույց տալ, թե ինչպես կարելի է ներդնել քննական (կոնվերգենտ) և ստեղծագործական (դիվերգենտ) մտածողության հիմնական տարրերը բարձրագույն լեզվական հաստատություններում անգլերենի քերականության դասավանդման պրոցեսում: Մենք ավելի քան համոզված ենք, որ քերականությունը ոչ միայն արդյունավետ միջոց է զարգացնելու և ամրապնդելու քննադատական և ստեղծագործական մտածողության տեսակները, այլ նաև վերջիններիս կրողն է:

Առաջնորդվելով 21-րդ դարի կրթական սկզբունքներով և պահանջներով, ինչպես նաև սովորողների մոտ ավելի բարձր մակարդակի

քննական մտածողության հմտություններ զարգացնելու անհրաժեշտությամբ՝ հողվածում ուսումնասիրվում են քերականության և քննական ու ստեղծագործական մտածողությունների փոխկապակցությունը և վերջիններիս ազդեցությունը սովորողների ակադեմիական առաջադիմության վրա քերականության դասընթացներին:

Հողվածում ուսումնասիրվում, զուգադրվում և համեմատվում են “will” և “would” եղանակավորող բայերով պայմանի պարագա երկրորդական նախադասությունները նախադասության և խոսույթի մակարդակում: Չ.Դիքենսի ստեղծագործություններից վերցված նախադասությունների վերլուծության արդյունքում մեզ հաջողվել է դասակարգել “will” և “would” բայերով պայմանի պարագա երկրորդական նախադասությունները՝ ըստ եղանակավորության երեք տիպերի (դինամիկ, դեոնթիկ և էպիստեմիկ): Մենք եկել ենք այն եզրակացության, որ նույն ասույթը՝ պայմանավորված կոնկրետ խոսքային իրադրությամբ, կարող է արտահայտել ոչ միայն մեկ, այլ նաև երկու և որոշ դեպքերում նույնիսկ երեք եղանակավորող իմաստ միաժամանակ:

МАРИНА ХАРАТЯН, ЛУСИК ВАРДАНЯН - УСЛОВНЫЕ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ НА ПЕРЕКРЕСТКЕ КОНВЕРГЕНТНОГО И ДИВЕРГЕНТНОГО МЫШЛЕНИЯ

***Ключевые слова:** критическое мышление, трехмерный подход, подход ориентированный на точность и беглость воспроизведения, эксплицитная и имплицитная грамматика, динамическая, деонтическая и имплицитная модальность, условные предложения, взаимосвязь, синергия*

В данной статье делается попытка интеграции ключевых элементов критического (конвергентного) и творческого (дивергентного) мышления в процессе обучения грамматике английского языка в высшей языковой школе. Мы более чем убеждены, что грамматика – это не только эффективный способ развития и укрепления двух видов мышления, но и что сама грамматика является моделью критического и творческого мышления.

Руководствуясь образовательными принципами и требованиями 21-го века и необходимостью развития у студентов навыков мышления более высокого уровня, мы исследуем влияние этих двух типов мышления на качество академической успеваемости студентов на уроках грамматики, а также взаимную связь между грамматикой и критическим и творческим типами мышления.

В статье анализируются, сопоставляются и сравниваются некоторые значения и структуры модальных глаголов “will” и “would” в условном

наклонении на уровне предложения и на уровне дискурса. В результате анализа ряда условных предложений, взятых из произведений Ч. Диккенса, мы смогли классифицировать условные придаточные предложения с “will” и “would” по трём типам модальности (динамическая, деонтическая и имплицитная). Мы пришли к выводу, что одно и то же высказывание может иметь одно, а иногда два или даже три модальных значения, которые ситуационно обусловлены и оформлены.

Ներկայացվել է՝ 10.03.2021
Գրախոսվել է՝ 10.03.2021