

Торайғыров университетінің
ҒЫЛЫМИ ЖУРНАЛЫ

НАУЧНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ
Торайғыров университета

ТОРАЙҒЫРОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІНІҢ ХАБАРШЫСЫ

Филологиялық серия
1997 жылдан бастап шығады



ВЕСТНИК ТОРАЙҒЫРОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТА

Филологическая серия
Издается с 1997 года

ISSN 2710-3528

№ 3 (2025)

Павлодар

**НАУЧНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ
ТОРАЙГЫРОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТА**

Филологическая серия

выходит 4 раза в год

СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВО

О постановке на переучет периодического печатного издания,
информационного агентства и сетевого издания

№ KZ30VPY00029268

выдано

Министерством информации и общественного развития
Республики Казахстан

Тематическая направленность

публикация материалов в области филологии

Подписной индекс – 76132

<https://doi.org/10.48081/SSBG3232>

Бас редакторы – главный редактор

Жусупов Н. К.

д.ф.н., профессор

Заместитель главного редактора

Анесова А. Ж., *доктор PhD*

Ответственный секретарь

Уайханова М. А., *доктор PhD*

Редакция алқасы – Редакционная коллегия

Дементьев В. В., *д.ф.н., профессор (Российская Федерация)*

Еспенбетов А. С., *д.ф.н., профессор*

Трушев А. К., *д.ф.н., профессор*

Маслова В. А., *д.ф.н., профессор (Белоруссия)*

Пименова М. В., *д.ф.н., профессор (Российская Федерация)*

Баратова М. Н., *д.ф.н., профессор*

Аймухамбет Ж. А., *д.ф.н., профессор*

Шапауов Ә. Қ., *к.ф.н., профессор*

Шокубаева З. Ж., *технический редактор*

За достоверность материалов и рекламы ответственность несут авторы и рекламодатели

Редакция оставляет за собой право на отклонение материалов

При использовании материалов журнала ссылка на «Вестник Торайгыров университета» обязательна

<https://doi.org/10.48081/SNIR5358>

***R. O. Zhumanbayeva¹, D. M. Tuzelbayeva²,
Z. M. Berdybekova³**

¹L. N. Gumilev Eurasian National University,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana;

²Al-Farabi Kazakh National University,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty;

³Pavlodar Pedagogical University
named after Alkey Margulan,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Pavlodar.

¹ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9469-8686>

²ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9941-1445>

³ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2199-3203>

*e-mail: riza16041981@mail.ru

PRAGMATICS OF GLUTTONOUS DISCOURSE IN TELEVISION PROGRAMS

This article presents an in-depth exploration of the pragmatic dimensions of television discourse with a particular focus on culinary programs in Kazakhstan. Through the lens of the anthropocentric paradigm, language is treated not merely as a structural system but as a tool for human cognition, interaction, and cultural expression. Television cooking shows are seen as fertile grounds for the realization of pragmatic goals such as audience engagement, emotional influence, and the transmission of social norms. Using discourse and pragmatic analysis methods, the study investigates speech acts, non-verbal communication, multimodal elements, and the strategies employed by presenters to establish rapport with the audience. The findings emphasize the critical role of background knowledge, presupposition, and sociocultural competence in shaping successful media communication. This research contributes to the broader field of media linguistics and offers insights into how televised content can reflect and reinforce national identity and cultural continuity. The findings highlight the role of culinary television as a hybrid discourse space where traditional values and modern media practices intersect. This research

contributes to the understanding of how televised language use reflects and shapes social and cultural realities in Kazakhstan.

Keywords: television discourse, pragmatics, culinary shows, speech acts, anthropocentric paradigm, multimodal communication, Kazakhstani media.

Introduction

In the era of digital globalization, media plays a significant role in shaping linguistic behavior, cultural identity, and communicative norms. Television remains a dominant medium, particularly in regions where access to the internet and digital platforms is not yet fully ubiquitous. Television discourse is more than an exchange of information; it is a complex system of communication strategies, multimodal tools, and cultural codes.

Culinary programs hold a special place in this discourse landscape. They combine entertainment, education, and culture in one accessible format. These shows not only teach viewers how to cook but also serve as cultural artifacts that preserve traditions, promote national identity, and foster emotional bonds.

This study focuses on the pragmatic characteristics of Kazakhstani television discourse, using culinary programs as a case study. It considers language as a social action, where speech acts, gestures, tone, and visuals contribute to the construction of meaning. The research also investigates how presenters adapt their language to the perceived needs and background of the audience.

Through this investigation, the paper aims to identify pragmatic markers and strategies employed in culinary shows and assess their role in achieving communicative goals. This includes exploring the cultural resonance of phrases, emotional expressions, and non-verbal signs such as gestures, facial expressions, and tone of voice.

By adopting an interdisciplinary lens that combines pragmatics, media linguistics, and cultural studies, this research offers a comprehensive understanding of how language operates in a mass-mediated context in Kazakhstan [1, 240 p.].

Materials and Methods

The study employs a qualitative methodology grounded in discourse and pragmatic analysis. The material for the study consists of selected episodes from two popular Kazakhstani culinary TV shows: Tatty Time and As Bolsyn. These programs were chosen due to their popularity, consistent structure, and rich linguistic content.

Data was collected through video recordings, transcription, and observation of both verbal and non-verbal communication. Speech acts were categorized according to Searle's taxonomy (directives, expressives, commissives, etc.).

Gestures, facial expressions, tone, and visual cues were analyzed using multimodal discourse analysis frameworks [2, 79–132 p.].

The subjects of research by several scientists were topics related to the field of gastronomy: Antyukhina A. V., Arutyunov S. A., Kapkan M. V., Dormidontova O. A., Panchenko E. I., Ufimenko A. S., Pochkay E. P., Pochkay N. A. For example, M. V. Kapkan in his work «The phenomenon of gastronomic culture» emphasizes that under the influence of natural and socio-economic factors, a gastronomic culture was formed. Gastronomic culture has the following functions: regulatory, establishment of the social and cultural status of an individual, communication, identification and integration. On the topic of gastronomy on television, you can see the work of the following scientists. Abelian K. G. «Gastronomic programs on Russian television», Grubich K. V. «The phenomenon of cuisine as a subject of culinary manipulation of the show». In the linguopragmatic aspect of the study, we took as a basis the work of the following scientists: N. Uali, G. Yu. Amanbaeva, D. Alkebaeva, N. Z. Dauletkereeva, Z. Sh. Ernazarova, K. U. Esenova, G. Mashimbaeva, F. Z Zhaksa Ibrayeva, Zh. K., Kenzhekanova, as well as Maslova VA, Stolneiker RS, Morris Ch. U. [3, 173–202 p.].

The strategy and tactics of the speech formed the basis of numerous studies: from Kazakh researchers E. N. Ormakhanova studied strategies and tactics, steps used in the Talent Show program, in the field of medicine K. O. Aitmukhametova studied the culture of speech between a doctor and a patient (K. O. Aitmukhametova) Institutional communication: doctor-patient (aspect of speech culture): *filol.nauk.k. dis.* – Almaty, 2003. – p. 135), as well as the scientific works of the authors Larina E. G., Lansikh A. V., Salikhova A. Yu., written about the strategy and tactics of the performance of participants in reality and talk shows. Foreign linguists N. Lorenzo-Dus, P. Garcés-Conejos and P. BouFrench, 2002–2009 explores the American and British show «Idol» [L. Lorenzo-Dus, 2009b: 203]. In addition, sisters K. I. Matwick (K., K. Matwick) comprehensively studied the discourse of the cooking show, the researchers identified the main strategies used in cooking shows, which include: «narrative» and «attention to the audience», as well as polite strategies such as *rapprochement* and *intimation presentation*» [4, 158 p.].

The study also includes analysis of cultural references, metaphors, and emotional expressions. The pragmatic strategies employed by the hosts were evaluated in terms of effectiveness, audience orientation, and cultural relevance. To enhance the reliability of the analysis, multiple episodes were reviewed, and findings were compared across different presenters and seasons. Special attention was given to the role of gender, cultural symbols, and religious markers such as greetings and holiday references [5, 153 p.].

The selected programs were analyzed from both linguistic and semiotic perspectives, allowing for a comprehensive understanding of how pragmatic

meaning is constructed through multimodal discourse. The verbal material was transcribed verbatim, including paralinguistic features such as pauses, laughter, changes in tone, and intonation, which were coded and analyzed using a modified interactional sociolinguistic framework [6, 201–214 p.].

A thematic analysis was also performed to identify recurrent communicative strategies and speech act patterns. The coding framework was developed inductively from the data, identifying strategies such as personalization, contextualization, ritual politeness, humor, and praise. These were further categorized based on their pragmatic intentions – whether to instruct, entertain, persuade, or express cultural affiliation [7, 189–201 p.].

In addition to linguistic content, the visual and spatial arrangement of each episode was considered. Camera angles, *mise-en-scène*, editing pace, and transitions were coded for their communicative roles. Close-up shots of food items, smiling facial expressions, or the physical arrangement of the kitchen environment all functioned as non-verbal pragmatic tools [8, 34–42 p.].

The study also considered the temporal context of broadcast – episodes aired during significant cultural or religious events (e.g., Nauryz, Ramadan) were contrasted with regular programming to identify variations in language style and cultural framing. These differences highlighted the performative and adaptive nature of pragmatic communication in television [9, 53 p.].

Results and Discussion

Television culinary discourse follows a specific structure that facilitates the pragmatic function of communication. This includes three main phases: introduction, main cooking process, and conclusion. Each segment contains speech acts that contribute to audience engagement, education, and emotional resonance. The presenters begin by greeting the audience, which sets a warm, inviting tone. This is often followed by a short anecdote, personal experience, or cultural reference that immediately creates a sense of closeness and familiarity [10, 126–157 p.].

In the cooking segment, the hosts use a mix of directive speech acts (‘cut the onions’, ‘add a pinch of salt’) and expressives (‘it smells amazing’, ‘I love this spice’) to maintain attention and stimulate sensory engagement. These speech acts are often reinforced by gestures, such as pointing to ingredients or mimicking cutting motions. This multimodal approach supports cognitive processing and helps the viewer visualize and remember instructions.

In both programs analyzed, the presenters adapt their language style according to the audience. For instance, in *Tatty Time*, the host uses culturally resonant expressions such as ‘kairly tan, qymbatty köermender’ and refers to traditional family roles. Such expressions carry pragmatic weight – they signal respect, create a homely atmosphere, and align the show with national values [11, 24–32 p.].

As Bolsyn, on the other hand, frequently features professional chefs and celebrity guests. This allows for a shift in pragmatic focus – from familial and emotional appeal to credibility and authority. The language becomes more formal, and the gestures more restrained, reflecting the shift in audience expectations.

A key finding is that humor and storytelling are essential pragmatic strategies. Anecdotes, light teasing between hosts and guests, and even deliberate mistakes serve to humanize the presenter, making the experience feel less instructional and more communal [12, 143–169 p.].

Another important feature is the use of non-verbal cues. Smiling, raising eyebrows in surprise, playful gestures with utensils, and vocal intonation serve to emphasize emotional subtext. This aligns with research by Ibrayeva (2010) on the role of paralinguistic features in building trust and emotional rapport.

Visual elements – such as subtitles, colorful graphics, and close-up shots – also play a pragmatic role. They guide the viewer's attention, clarify complex steps, and reinforce the instructional aspect of the show.

The programs also exhibit code-switching and the use of bilingual cues, often shifting between Kazakh and Russian. This reflects the linguistic realities of Kazakhstan and functions pragmatically to include a wider audience. Code-switching also helps emphasize certain messages or build intimacy with specific audience groups [13, 276 p.].

Culturally, the hosts appeal to religious and seasonal values (e.g., Ramadan dishes, Nauryz specials), reinforcing collective identity and promoting social cohesion through shared culinary traditions. These cultural markers serve as pragmatic signals of solidarity and national belonging.

An important insight from the analysis is the dual function of pragmatic strategies: while they serve immediate communicative goals (e.g., instruction, engagement), they also reinforce deeper ideological messages. For example, the repeated use of culturally rooted expressions like 'bereke' (abundance), 'qonaqzhailyq' (hospitality), and references to family values embed a discourse of national identity within casual cooking conversations.

The pragmatic effect of such expressions is not merely to convey meaning but to signal alignment with the values of the viewing audience. In doing so, presenters establish not only interpersonal connection but also cultural solidarity. This aligns with the broader function of television in reinforcing shared narratives and sustaining collective memory.

The humor strategy observed in both Tatty Time and As Bolsyn deserves further exploration. Humor is rarely neutral – it is culturally coded and often reflects societal roles and power dynamics. By laughing with the audience or self-deprecatingly correcting a mistake, the host reduces social distance, inviting the viewer into a more intimate communicative relationship [14, 58 p.].

Another recurring tactic is the use of ‘ritualized politeness’ – greetings, gratitude, apologies – which appear frequently and mark transitions within the program. These serve both as pragmatic delimiters (segment markers) and as tools for managing viewer expectations. For example, when switching from food preparation to a guest interview, the host may use a transition like: ‘Dear friends, let us now welcome our special guest today – a true expert in traditional cuisine.’

The information below presents common non-verbal communication strategies and techniques observed in Kazakh culinary television programs:

A detailed analysis of non-verbal strategies reveals the following patterns used in Kazakhstani culinary TV programs:

1 Greeting – Often performed through smiles and raised hands, serving to establish rapport and set a friendly tone for the episode.

2 Instruction – Use of pointing gestures and visual demonstration of ingredients helps reinforce clarity in cooking steps.

3 Emphasis – Facial expressions (e.g., raised eyebrows, wide eyes) and tonal variation are used to highlight key moments or important instructions.

4 Humor – Playful movements, spontaneous laughter, and exaggerated gestures create an informal atmosphere and sustain viewer engagement.

5 Closure – A hand on the heart, nodding, or waving are used at the end of the program to express sincerity and gratitude.

Non-verbal communication is not auxiliary but central to meaning-making in television discourse. In Kazakhstani culinary programs, several consistent patterns emerge, each fulfilling a specific communicative function:

- Greeting: Hosts commonly initiate the episode with a smile, direct eye contact (via the camera), and a raised hand gesture. These actions perform a phatic function, signaling readiness for communication and inviting the viewer into a social space.

- Instruction: Gestures such as pointing to ingredients, demonstrating cutting techniques, or miming stirring actions are tightly synchronized with verbal directives. These reinforce comprehension and reduce cognitive load for the viewer.

- Emphasis: To highlight particular steps or ingredients, presenters often raise their voice slightly, widen their eyes, or slow their hand movements. Such strategies function to mark importance and increase retention.

- Humor: Physical comedy, exaggerated facial expressions, and playful engagement with utensils or ingredients are common. These not only entertain but also create a relaxed atmosphere, reducing the perceived distance between speaker and audience.

- Closure: The ending of an episode frequently includes a nod of appreciation, a hand over the heart (a Kazakh cultural sign of sincerity), or waving. These

gestures act as communicative closings, offering gratitude and reinforcing emotional connection.

Overall, the combination of speech acts, non-verbal strategies, audience orientation, and cultural context constructs a rich pragmatic environment. The discourse in these shows is highly interactive – even though the audience is physically absent, the communicative design bridges that distance effectively. These results confirm that television discourse, especially in culinary genres, is an ideal space to observe the rich interplay of language, culture, and communicative intent [15, 246–278 p.].

Conclusion

The present study reveals the deeply pragmatic nature of television discourse, particularly in Kazakhstani culinary programming. Culinary shows serve as more than entertainment – they function as tools for cultural preservation, social bonding, and education.

The analysis shows that presenters skillfully use a wide range of pragmatic strategies, including speech acts, humor, storytelling, visual elements, and non-verbal communication, to maintain audience engagement and convey information in a culturally sensitive and emotionally appealing manner.

Through a combination of directive and expressive speech acts, accompanied by multimodal and culturally relevant signs, presenters manage to simulate interactivity and emotional connection despite the mediated nature of television.

By drawing upon both local cultural values and global media conventions, Kazakhstani culinary programs reflect a hybrid discourse that is both rooted in tradition and open to innovation.

This research contributes to the understanding of how pragmatics functions in real-world, mediated communication. It highlights the importance of viewing language as a dynamic social tool shaped by context, purpose, and audience.

Further research could explore comparative analyses with other genres of television discourse or examine how viewers interpret and respond to these pragmatic strategies.

These results confirm that television discourse, especially in culinary genres, is an ideal space to observe the rich interplay of language, culture, and communicative intent.

References

1 **Моррис, Ч.** Белгілер теориясының негіздері [Текст] – Чикаго : Издательство Чикагского университета.

2 **Сталнекер, Р.** Прагматика // Табиғи тілдің семантикасы [Текст]. – Рейдель, 1972.

- 3 **Остин, Дж. Л.** Сөздерді қолдану арқылы әрекеттердің жасалуы [Текст]. – Оксфорд : Oxford University Press, 1962.
- 4 **Сёрль, Дж.** Сөйлеу актілері: тіл философиясы туралы очерктер [Текст]. – Кембридж : Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- 5 **Ван Дейк, Т. А.** Дискурс және коммуникация [Текст]. – Берлин : Walter de Gruyter, 1985.
- 6 **Арутюнова, Н. Д.** Логика және прагматика [Текст]. – М. : Наука, 1990.
- 7 **Степанов, Ю. С.** Семиотикадағы балама әлемдер [Текст]. – М. : Наука, 1981.
- 8 **Алкебаева, Д. А.** Стилистикалық және прагматикалық ерекшеліктері. [Текст] – Алматы, 2005.
- 9 **Аманбаева, Г. Ю.** Макротіл : құрылымы, семантикасы, прагматикасы [Текст]. – Алматы : ҚазҰУ, 2011.
- 10 **Есенова, К. О.** Қазіргі қазақ медиамәтінінің прагматикасы. [Текст]– Алматы, 2015.
- 11 **Ыбраева, Ж. К.** Психолінгвистиканың негіздері [Текст]. – Алматы : ҚазҰУ, 2010.
- 12 **Ерназарова, З. Ш.** Қазақ тілі теледискурсының синтаксистік ерекшеліктері [Текст]. – Алматы, 2001.
- 13 **Ольянич, А. В.** Гастрономиялық дискурс : лингвомәдени аспект [Текст]. – Ставрополь, 2010.
- 14 **Машинбаева, Г.** Қазақстандық теледискурстың прагматикалық функциялары [Текст]. – Әл-Фараби ат. ҚазҰУ, 2019.
- 15 **Фейркло, Дж.** Медиа-дискурс [Текст]. – Лондон : Арнольд, 1995.

References

- 1 **Morris, C. W.** *Osnovy` teorii znakov* [Foundations of the theory of Signs] [Text]. – University of Chicago Press. 1938.
- 2 **Stalnaker, R. S.** *Pragmatika // Semantika estestvennogo yazy`ka* [Pragmatics. In Semantics of Natural Language, eds] [Text]. – D. Davidson and G. Harman, Reidel. 1972.
- 3 **Austin, J. L.** *Kak sovershat` dejstviya s pomoshh`yu slov* [How to Do Things with Words] [Text]. Oxford University Press. 1962
- 4 **Searle, J. R.** *Rechevy`e akty` : e`sse po filosofii yazy`ka* [Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language] [Text]. Cambridge University Press. 1969.
- 5 **Van Dijk, T. A.** *Diskurs i kommunikaciya* [Discourse and Communication: New Approaches to the Analysis of Mass Media Discourse and Communication] [Text]. Walter de Gruyter. 1985.

- 6 **Arutyunova, N. D.** Logika i pragmatika [Logic and Pragmatics] [Text] – Nauka. 1990
- 7 **Stepanov, Y. S.** Al'ternativny'e miry' v semiotike [Alternative Worlds in Semiotics] [Text]. – Nauka, 1981.
- 8 **Alkebayeva, D. A.** Stiliskalyq jáne pragmatikalyq erekshelikteri [Stylistic and Pragmatic Features of the Kazakh Language] [Text]. – Almaty, 2005.
- 9 **Amanbayeva, G. Yu.** Makrotil : qurylymy, semantıkasy, pragmatıkasy [Macrolanguage : Structure, Semantics, Pragmatics] [Text] – Almaty : Kazakh University, 2011.
- 10 **Yesenova, K. O.** Qazirgi qazaq mediamátininiń pragmatıkasy [Pragmatics of Modern Kazakh Media] [Text]. – Almaty, 2015.
- 11 **Ibrayeva, Zh. K.** Psiholingvistikanyń negizderi [Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics] [Text]. – Kazakh University, 2010.
- 12 **Ernazarova, Z. Sh.** Qazaq tili telediskýrsynyń sintaksistik erekshelikteri [Spoken Syntax in Kazakh TV Speech] [Text]. – Almaty, 2001.
- 13 **Olyanich, A. V.** Gastronomicheskiy diskurs: lingvokul'turologicheskij aspekt [Gluttonous Discourse: Linguistic and Cultural Perspective] [Text]. – Stavropol, 2010.
- 14 **Mashinbayeva, G.** Kazahstandyq telediskýrstyń pragmatikalyq fýnksıalary [Pragmatic Functions in the Television Discourse of Kazakhstan: Dissertation] [Text]. – Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, 2019.
- 15 **Fairclough, N.** [Media Discourse] [Text]. – Arnold, 1995.

Received 11.12.24.

Received in revised form 21.01.25.

Accepted for publication 25.08.25.

**Р. О. Жуманбаева¹, Д. М. Түзельбаева², Ж. М. Бердыбекова³*

¹Л. Н. Гумилев атындағы

Еуразия ұлттық университеті,

Қазақстан Республикасы, Астана қ.;

²Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті,

Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ.;

³Әлкей Марғұлан атындағы Павлодар

педагогикалық университеті,

Қазақстан Республикасы, Павлодар қ.

11.12.24 ж. баспаға түсті.

21.01.25 ж. түзетулерімен түсті.

25.08.25 ж. басып шығаруға қабылданды.

ТЕЛЕВИЗИЯЛЫҚ БАҒДАРЛАМАЛАРДАҒЫ ГЛЮТТОНИАЛЫҚ ДИСКУРСЫҢ ПРАГМАТИКАСЫ

Бұл мақалада телевизиялық дискурстың прагматикалық ерекшеліктері, әсіресе қазақстандық кулинарлық бағдарламалар аясында қарастырылады. Тілдің антропоцентристік парадигма тұрғысынан прагматикалық қызметтері - сөйлеу актілері, бейвербалды қатынас құралдары және мәдени кодтар арқылы тыңдаушымен байланыс орнату мәселелері зерттеледі. Зерттеу барысында Тәтті Тайм және Ас болсын бағдарламаларының материалдары пайдаланылып, тележүргізушілердің прагматикалық стратегиялары мен көрерменмен интерактивті қарым-қатынас жасау жолдары талданды. Нәтижесінде, кулинарлық бағдарламалардың тілдік құралы тек ақпарат беруге ғана емес, сонымен қатар ұлттық құндылықтарды жеткізуге де бағытталғаны анықталды.

Кілтті сөздер: телевизиялық дискурс, прагматика, аспаздық шоулар, сөйлеу актілері, антропоцентристік парадигма, мультимодальдық коммуникация, Қазақстандық медиа.

**Р. О. Жуманбаева¹, Д. М. Тузельбаева², Ж. М. Бердыбекова³*

¹Евразийский национальный
университет имени Л. Н. Гумилева,
Республика Казахстан, г. Астана;

²Казахский национальный
университет имени аль-Фараби,
Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы;

³Павлодарский педагогический
университет имени Әлкей Марғұлан,
Республика Казахстан, г. Павлодар.

Поступило в редакцию 11.12.24.

Поступило с исправлениями 21.01.25.

Принято в печать 25.08.25.

ПРАГМАТИКА ГЛЮТТОНИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА В ТЕЛЕВИЗИОННЫХ ПРОГРАММАХ

В статье рассматриваются прагматические особенности телевизионного дискурса на примере казахстанских кулинарных программ. Анализ проводился с позиций антропоцентрической парадигмы, в рамках которой язык рассматривается как

инструмент воздействия, выражения эмоций и установления контакта с аудиторией. В центре внимания – речевые акты, невербальные элементы коммуникации, а также культурные маркеры, используемые телеведущими. В качестве материала используются выпуски программ Тәтті Тайм и Ас болсын. Выводы исследования подчеркивают роль телевизионного дискурса как канала не только информационного, но и культурного взаимодействия.

Ключевые слова: телевизионный дискурс, прагматика, кулинарные шоу, речевые акты, антропоцентрическая парадигма, мультимодальная коммуникация, казахстанские СМИ.

Теруге 25.08.2025 ж. жіберілді. Басуға 30.09.2025 ж. қол қойылды.

Электронды баспа

5,18 МБ RAM

Шартты баспа табағы 31,59. Таралымы 300 дана.

Бағасы келісім бойынша.

Компьютерде беттеген: А. К. Темиргалинова

Корректорлар: А. Р. Омарова, Д. А. Кожас

Тапсырыс № 4438

Сдано в набор 25.08.2025 г. Подписано в печать 30.09.2025 г.

Электронное издание

5,18 МБ RAM

Усл. печ. л. 31,59. Тираж 300 экз. Цена договорная.

Компьютерная верстка: А. К. Темиргалинова

Корректоры: А. Р. Омарова, Д. А. Кожас

Заказ № 4438

«Toraighyrov University» баспасынан басылып шығарылған

Торайғыров университеті

140008, Павлодар қ., Ломов к., 64, 137 каб.

«Toraighyrov University» баспасы

Торайғыров университеті

140008, Павлодар қ., Ломов к., 64, 137 каб.

67-36-69

e-mail: kereku@tou.edu.kz

www.vestnik.tou.edu.kz