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According to V.P.Glukhov psycholinguistics is a field of science studying human speech activity psychological and linguistical aspects, social and psychological aspects of the language usage in the speech communication processes and individual speech-mental activity [Glukhov, 2005, p.14]. Thus, we can state the speech activity as the system of expressive ability of definite people and language as a speech activity fulfilling means to be the psycholinguistics subject.

Language is a universal sign system. It is peculiar to definite people which can be defined as a linguo-cultural society. The unity of this society knowledge all the speakers of this language own forms a cognitive basis.

The cognitive basis consists of the basic elements called precedent phenomena. I.V. Zhakharenko, V.V. Krasnykh, D.B. Gudkov, and D.V. Bagayeva suggest the following definition of a precedent phenomenon: “We consider a precedent phenomenon to be a phenomenon significant for a definite personality in cognitive and emotional aspects having superpersonal features, i.e. well known to the personality environment including his predecessors and coevals, and addressing to which proceeds continually within the present language personality discourse”. [Zhakharenko, Krasnykh, Gudkov, Bagayeva, 1997, p.35] Thus, a precedent phenomenon in the broad sense is a verbal model actualizing standard contents.

According to Chistova S.S. precedent phenomena comprise language clichés, rubber-stamps, stereotypes, frame-structures. [Chistova, 2009, p.2]

Mental stereotypes are more frequently discussed in the field of psycholinguistics, to which peculiar rubber-stamps and conscious clichés are correlated. From the T.V. Romanova’s point of view, conscious stereotypes are frequently connected with given subjects, events and occurrence assessment on the level of “peculiar” or “foreign”. With the help of speech clichés and rubber-stamps being used within this assessment linguocultural societytolerance level and stereotypes existing in its conscious can be defined. In the present article we try to distinguish clichés and rubber-stamps concepts. [Romanova, 2016, p.11]

T.M. Dridze determines clichés to be speech stereotypes, ready figures of speech, being used as easily reproduced in definite conditions and contexts standards. [Dridze, 1980, p.87]

According to Y.V. Kukhareva the “cliché” concept involves a broad spectrum of stereotype expressions mechanically reproduced in typical speech contexts and situations whereas they can serve a cognitive and linguistic basis for national mentality studying. [Kukhareva, 2015, p.17]

V.N. Yartseva states a cliché is to be used while text and speech structuring. [Yartseva, 1990, p.3]

On the basis of the aforecited statements we notice a positive character of a cliché concept description.

A rubber-stamp concept on the contrary does not have a positive meaning: T.M. Dridze stipulates a language rubber-stamp to be the cliché having lost for some reason its initial or text informative sense for an interpreter, and therefore being senseless, and unsignificant for the information recipient, i.e. being dysfunctional. [Dridze, 1980, p.92]

Krasnykh V.V. determines that a rubber-stamp does not assume “apposition” of the real and the precedent situations, it does not have any semantic sense. [Krasnykh, 2010, p.120]

However, based on most linguists opinions such as V.V. Vinogradov’s, G.A. Zolotova’s, Y.F. Petrishcheva’s and others, we can state that both concepts of a cliché and rubber-stamps are assessment expression means relating to the basic lexical level. Their usage is necessary for gaining mutual understanding and collaboration inside the “peculiar” social or sex-age group.

Therefore, we can regard axiological constituent part to be a common feature for the present concepts.

The difference between a cliché and a rubber-stamps is in functional aspect as rubber-stamps do not take part in language manipulating or language game, and also do not make additional social sense. Also rubber-stamps entwinement to a definite situation can be noticed, where they are to describe this situation, their dependence on it, where as clichés are more independent unit. Thus, a rubber-stamp does not have informative importance in a text and its usage in the speech is undesirable. The example is F. Binder’s point of view where he insists on cliché “damaging human thinking and education”. [Binder, 2011, p.58]

A cliché, in comparison with a rubber-stamp, is considered by most linguists to be informatively more important, bearing positive-assessing significance while text structuring. The same point of view V.N. Yartseva, D.E. Rozental, A.A. Barchenkov, T.M Dridze have. In whole, the present position is that while using clishes the aim forming in the communication process is successfully reached. Reproducing clichés in different situations does not cause the recipient’s negative reaction while using a rubber-stamp is always connected with the recepient’s negative feedback. Thereat, a rubber-stamp is a trite phrase with faded lexical meaning and blurred usage expressivity, which is to avoid especially in a daily speech.

V.G. Kostomarov states that “too frequent repetition of one and the same word or expression dilutes its sense turning it into a vox”. [Kostomarov, 1960, p.33] The present definition determines the cliché among the communicative units having text functional sense. It is the sense that bears informative-necessary character, i.e. a cliché includes necessary for the communication participants information. Also A.A. Barchenkov reveals informative-necessary character of a cliché. [Barchenkov, 1975, p.178] Studying the present problem in the aspect of stylistics he concludes that a cliché is “a stereotype collocation with structural, semantic, and stylistic features, important for newspaper text structuring”. It is A.A. Barchenkov who tries to solve the problem of clichés and rubber-stamps information value, stipulating that there are dialectic attitudes expressing in functional unit features, turning from clichés into rubber-stamps and vice versa. The present statement confirms clichés and rubber-stamps appropriateness into one category – stereotypes.

Thus, we can conclude that the difference between a cliché and a stamp is in informative and functional aspects.

We consider precedent phenomena usage in considering of ethno-linguo-cultorological competence.

Based on A.A. Podgorbunskikh analysis we can add that ethno-linguo-cultorological competence defines the ability to be ready for an adequate mutual understanding and interaction with another ethnic, linguistic and, therefore, cultural society representatives in terms of possessing awareness of these ethnoses mentalities, cultures difference reflecting language units and forming a cognitive communication foundation. [Podgorbunskikh, 2011, p.8]

Thus, the ethno-linguo-cultorological competence concept comprises knowledge constituent part about definite ethnic society culture and cultural value, ability of operating this knowledge in any kind of activity. Therefore, ethno-linguo-cultorological competence is a personality’s integrative feature comprising knowledge, abilities and skills of possessing different means of verbal and non-verbal communication with other ethnic and linguistic society representatives. Forming of this kind of competence is a task-oriented process.

Taking into account that clichés and rubber-stamps both being precedent phenomena though differ in informative and functional aspects, we can reveal their usage features.

Thus, clichés and rubber-stamps usage in speech is available on the definite level of language acquisition: rubber-stamps usage in speech is habitual for the people with low linguo-culturological competence, whereas clichés usage reveals developed and high level of language mastering.
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