

снижают долю родного языка, так как потребность в нем при эффективном обучении падает.

Таким образом, научно обоснована и оправдана международным педагогическим сообществом на современном этапе разумная доля родного языка при использовании методического приема «sandwiching», двуязычных инструкций, в процессе решения коммуникативных задач – на стадии обсуждения в парах и группах, при предъявлении диалога – драматизация на родном языке, затем на иностранном, во время игры в переводчиков, при аннотировании и перифразе, написании двуязычных субтитров и др.

CATEGORY OF OFFENSIVENESS IN THE ASPECT OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Лавицкий А. А.

Республика Беларусь, г. Витебск
Международный университет «МИТСО»,
заведующий кафедрой иностранных языков
и межкультурных коммуникаций,
кандидат филологических наук, доцент

Legislation regulating speech acts is an integral part of legal culture of a nation in general and of an individual in particular. In their broadest sense its restrictions are defined by two kinds of taboo: for the type of the context of the discourse and for the content of the speech product. In the former case legislation defines certain restrictions concerning the interaction environment or the addressant/addressee (for example, government employees are not advised to take action on anonymous messages or the personnel of state security bodies cannot use open communication channels, etc.). The latter kind of restrictions concerns the content of products of speech, i.e. the text (presence of obscenities, disclosure of certified information, etc.). Restrictions are evident on all institutional levels of verbal interactions and vary in social, gender, age and other parameters. Moreover, there are a number of restrictions which, though not legally mandatory, are firmly established in the mentality of people as part of their cultural code, making them, for example, use the polite «You» when addressing their seniors, or avoid referring to someone who is present using «he» or «she», etc.

To determine the kind of restriction and its qualitative

characteristics in recognizing an act of speech as abusive we should refer to legal interpretations of the concept. The Belarusian and Russian legislation systems define verbal abuse as «*intentional humiliation or degradation of the dignity of another person expressed in an abusive way*» (the Code of Administrative Offences of the Republic of Belarus, art. 9.3) (the Code of Administrative Offences of the Republic of Belarus, 2019)) and «*humiliation or degradation of the dignity of another person expressed in an abusive way*» (the Code of Administrative Offences of the Russian Federation, art. 5.61) (the Code of Administrative Offences of the Russian Federation, 2019)). Thus, to define a speech act as an abuse both legislation systems use the parameters of *attributiveness* and *non-normativity*. These parameters are clearly explained by modern linguistic expertology (*attributiveness* – an act of denouncing another person by diminishing their status with regard to the abuser, *non-normativity* – words labeled in dictionaries as «vulgar», «offensive», «slang» or included in dictionaries of vulgar and obscene language [1, c. 98]. The Belarusian concept of verbal abuse also includes the parameter of *intent*, which lawyers describe as «a person's awareness of the possibility or inevitability and desire for the negative consequences of their illegal actions» [2, c. 58], though in modern linguistic expertology it does not have a generally accepted definition and is, therefore, often interpreted similarly to *factuality*, i.e. to performance of an utterance as a statement of fact (facts). We believe that this situation occurs due to the pragmatic nature of speech, when the locutionary power of a statement can be treated as «an intent, desire or suggestion to do or to commit something» [3, c. 128].

It should also be pointed out that the problem of applying the parameter of non-normativity has not yet been resolved completely. The fact is that in evaluating non-normativity of speech content it is not always sufficient to resort to special stylistic markers as entry labels in various lexicographic publications are often inconsistent and may vary (which also applies to foreign-language publications), and emotional-expressive coloring may be illustrated in the form of the scale *elevated / neutral / colloquial* [4, c. 164] with rather vague borderlines between its levels.

Another issue to consider is the problem of defining certain vocabulary as non-normative since it can include slang, jargon or colloquial words. Such words are quite rare in the public media, however, they do not always carry negative meaning and may serve as a language code within a particular social, age, territorial or gender

in-group. Sub-neutral words raise disapproval when used in public places but their use cannot be legally prosecuted as their communicative purposes are outside the normative regulation. Consequently, the use of slang, argot, colloquial or jargon words cannot be regarded as tangible evidence of insulting behaviour and can be interpreted as «language disguise for the content of a speech act» [5, c. 38]. Moreover, researchers often disagree on such evaluation criteria for stylistically colored vocabulary as 1) its boundaries and volume (opposition of *literary / non-literary*, *coded / non-coded*); 2) correlation of functional and expressive aspects of stylistic coloring; 3) character and type of stylistic coloring; 4) correlation of positive / negative evaluation for printed and spoken speech.

Abuse as a kind of speech act liable for legal prosecution has been included into the areas of concern of the British linguistic expertology, unlike the USA, the legislation of which does not make provisions for criminal or civil responsibility for verbal insults. The judicial system of the United Kingdom, admittedly complicated, has a number of acts that define the attitude of law to verbal abuse. The Public Order Act, 1987, has at least four articles, violation of which can be interpreted as abusive verbal behaviour: 4A “Intentional harassment, alarm or distress”, 5 “Harassment, alarm or distress”, 18 (part 3) “Racial Hatred”, 29B “Hatred against persons expressed on religious grounds or grounds of sexual orientation”.

However, these Acts do not give a clear-cut definition of insulting communicative aggression: “*A person is guilty of an offence if he – (a) uses abusive words or behaviour,(b) displays any writing, sign or other visible representation which is threatening or abusive, within the hearing or sight of a person likely to be caused harassment*”.

In Britain, offences of this kind are tried in special tribunals which often need linguistic expertise on disputable texts. In their current practice linguistic experts examine two parameters: 1) *attributiveness*, i.e. presence of non-normative or negatively-colored words intended to insult a person and 2) *context*, which examines extra-linguistic factors that characterize language behaviour (manner of communication; pitch and tone of voice; situation in which the disputable words occurred; emotional content; body language; institutional component; peculiarities of the personality of the person affected [6, c. 109]. The first parameter is obligatory. The second is measured quantitatively (for example, the context in which disputable words were used is measured as follows: domestic (in a dwelling) – 0 points, outside a dwelling – 1point, in a public place – 2points; the score for the body

language is: no gestures – 0 points, gestures, though present, are not aggressive – 1 point, aggressive gestures – 2 points, etc.), and its total can reach 14 points (the parameter of extra-linguistic factors is considered completed when the total of its points reaches 7).

The visual display of parameterization of abusive speech in the studied linguo-legal discourses (see Table) shows that approaches to determining this phenomenon have both cross-cultural and nationally distinct features.

Table – Parameterization of abusive speech acts in the Belarusian, British and Russian national linguo-legal discourses

<i>Country</i> Parameter	<i>Belarus</i>	<i>Britain</i>	<i>Russia</i>
Attributiveness	X	X	X
Non-normativity	X	–	X
Intent	X	–	–
Context	–	X	–

The shared parameter defining verbal abuse is attributiveness, which is used as an indicator that a speech act contains words intended to humiliate a person. The nationally distinct parameter of detecting verbal abuse is practiced in the British linguo-legal system, which takes into account extra-linguistic peculiarities of the communication (pitch and tone of voice of the abuser; emotional content; body language; institutional component; peculiarities of the personality of the person affected). Also some of the countries regard as important the locutionary power of a statement (Belarus) and the use of taboo words (Belarus, Russia).

References

1. Осадчий, М. А. Русский язык на грани права: функционирование современного русского языка в условиях правовой регламентации речи / М. А. Осадчий. – М. : Книжный дом «Либроком», 2015. – 256 с.
2. Большой юридический словарь / А. В. Малько [и др.] ; под. ред. А. В. Малько. – М. : Проспект, 2009. – 702 с.
3. Новиков, А. М. Педагогика: словарь системы основных понятий / А. М. Новиков. – М. : ФГНУ ИТИП РАО, Изд. центр ИЭТ, 2013. – 268 с.
4. Левин, Ю. И. Об обценных выражениях русского языка :

монография / Ю. И. Левин. – М. : Языки русской культуры, 1998. – 278 с.

5. Васильева, Н. В. Краткий словарь лингвистических терминов / Н. В. Васильева, В. А. Виноградов, А. М. Шахнарович. – М. : Русский язык, 1995. – 175 с.

6. Newman, Ch. Section 5 of the Public Order Act 1986: The Threshold of Extreme Protes / Ch. Newman // The Journal of Criminal Law. – 2012. – P. 105–116.

POWER POINT. ЗА ИЛИ ПРОТИВ?

Лобач Л. Н.

Республика Беларусь, г. Минск

Международный университет «МИТСО»,

доцент кафедры иностранных языков

Термин «межкультурная коммуникация» относится к обмену знаниями, идеями, мыслями, концептами и эмоциями между людьми из разных культур. Существуют другие определения и различные подходы к этим определениям. Основываясь на этом, можно сделать вывод, что межкультурная коммуникация – это особая форма коммуникации двух или более представителей различных культур, в ходе которой происходит обмен информацией и культурными ценностями взаимодействующих культур.

В нашем стремительно развивающемся и изменчивом мире нам часто приходится делать презентации. Под этим обычно имеется в виду первая официальная подача заинтересованной аудитории неизвестной или малоизвестной информации. На своем рабочем месте нам постоянно приходится составлять отчеты о проделанной работе и выступать с ними перед коллегами, предлагать и защищать свое видение каких-то идей, проектов. Во всем этом важно умение доступно, кратко и убедительно изложить обоснованные выводы и предложения. Презентационные навыки являются основной частью универсального рабочего инструмента любого профессионала, особенно если речь идет о сфере общения. А поскольку учебная деятельность – это постоянное общение, то обучающиеся на занятиях выступают с сообщениями, рефератами, представляют свои проекты с использованием дополнительного интересного материала при прохождении учебных тем.

Презентационные умения. Какие они? Какие составляющие в себя включают? Необходимый набор таких навыков включает