

А.В. Алина
Национальный исследовательский
Томский политехнический университет

Linguistic Features of Electronic Discourse

The article is devoted to one of the most relevant topics of functional sociolinguistics, namely the analysis of linguistic and linguocultural features of electronic discourse, and its impact on the development of language. Such concepts as discourse and electronic communication are considered.

Key words: discourse; electronic discourse; Internet; Internet communication; electronic communication.

With the development of digital technology, communication on the Internet is becoming one of the main types of communication. With the help of the Internet, it has become possible to convey and receive the necessary information, regardless of a person's location, time zone of residence or physiological characteristics. In addition, the Internet is not only a medium for communication, but also for carrying out commercial and monetary transactions, entertainment, education and much more. Therefore, it is not surprising that the number of Internet users is growing every day.

Before we move on to the question of the peculiarities of electronic discourse, it is necessary to understand what is meant by the term «discourse».

Discourse is a concept that came into modern Russian from the French language, and the person who decided to spread the term widely beyond the confines of the community of linguists and philologists was the wonderful Russian writer Victor Pelevin [4, p. 14].

To explain in simple words, the closest concept to the word «discourse» is speech; speech is discourse. Speech and ways of organizing speech, a kind of conceptual apparatus. Any communication between people or the thinking process of each individual takes place within the framework of discourse, but this does not mean that discourse is the same for all people on the planet. For example, a European preacher and an Aboriginal African tribesman think within different discourses, even though they may speak the same language. In the Aboriginal discourse there is no such thing as shame about one's own body or the need to wear clothes so as not to be ridiculed by others, while in the discourse of the missionary the idea that eating people is the norm is unacceptable [4, p. 56].

Many people's discourse does not even include the term "discourse" as such. Thus, discourse can be described as a system of interaction of intra-speech concepts among themselves. And the phrase "Human thinking occurs within a certain discourse" means that people think within a certain system of

concepts, which they have been taught since childhood and are supplemented as they grow up, receive new knowledge, education.

Due to the active spread of electronic means of communication, new types of discourse have developed – electronic or computer discourse, network discourse and Internet discourse. However, these concepts are not absolutely synonymous, electronic (computer) discourse means communication in textual form, using a computer or telephone, Internet discourse refers to any communication made through the Internet, and network discourse implies communication not only on the Internet, but also in less global networks [3, p. 8].

Since electronic communication was originally designed for the time difference between the creation of the text by the sender and the perception of the text by the receiver, the sender could think more carefully about sentence construction, build more complex syntactic and grammatical structures, and weed out linguistic inaccuracies in the message according to language norms. Nevertheless, today electronic communication often takes place in real time, which gives it the properties of oral speech, such as spontaneity and linguistic economy, and in electronic discourse is noticed the use of techniques that compensate the lack of non-verbal means, characteristic for live communication and convey mimicry and emotions of the sender [1, p. 148].

Thus, in informal electronic discourse it is typical to use combinations of symbols, describing emotions, called smiley faces, for example: :) – joy, :(– sadness, :P – gloating, :D – laughter.

Linguistic restraint promotes the use of a large number of abbreviations, which can be divided into types:

1. Shortenings:
Fri – Friday; lang – language; bro – brother; sis – sister;
2. Contractions:
Tmrw – tomorrow; nw – now; nxt – next;
3. Clipping:
Hav – have; goin – going; wil – will; smilin – smiling;
4. Replacing a word with a letter, that has a similar sound:
U – You; C – see; R – are; Y – why; N – and; UR – your
5. Replacing a word with a number, that has a similar sound:
1 – one; 2 – too, to; 4 – for; 8 – ate; some1 – someone; any1 – anyone;
gr8 – great; w8 – wait; be4 – before;
6. Using acronyms:
IRL – in real life;
LOL – laugh out loud;
IMO – in my opinion;
IMHO – in my humble opinion;
IDK – I don't know;

ASAP – as soon as possible;
AFAIK – as far as I know;
CMB – call me back;
ROFL – rolling on the floor;
DIKY – do I know you?

In addition, unprepared electronic discourse contributes to the deliberate commission of punctuation errors, such as missing commas and dots, and spelling errors, such as plez, gud, thanx, shud, sum. Causes of such errors can also be typos or simple ignorance of the correct spelling of words [6, p. 215].

Of course, not everyone has such a style of communication. The manner of writing depends on the formality of the message, on the relationship between the addressee and the recipient, and on their ages. Basically, the younger the users, the more saturated their communication is with various abbreviations. The language of electronic discourse is constantly changing, updated, as there are no norms as such, and any person is able to influence its development by inventing new words and abbreviations [5, p. 10].

Due to the plasticity of electronic discourse, many people believe that the language of electronic communication harms the language as a whole, contributes to a decrease in literacy and impoverishment of the language. However, this assertion has no firm ground for belief, because language, which is actively used by society, is inherently evolutionary. The basic function of language is integrative, which implies that language should bring members of social groups together, and if people communicating in the same language do not understand each other, then the question of the continued existence of the language is raised. Moreover, the use of elements of electronic discourse in live speech is most often characteristic of children, while adults have a more responsible approach to the choice of words in contact with other people. Application of electronic language of communications in oral speech in many cases is impractical, as in live communication there is no need in reduction of words for the sake of increase of emotional coloring of the text, as in real communication people can use various gestures of hands, trunk, mimic receptions, change intonation for more successful establishment of communication and understanding [2, p. 7].

Thus, we can conclude that computer discourse, formed in connection with the development of the global Internet, combines the signs of written speech, as it is transmitted exclusively through text and oral speech due to communication in real time. As a consequence, electronic discourse, due to its virtuality, has a number of features, such as spontaneity of speech and linguistic economy.

References

1. Dzhumadil'dinova Zh.S., Madihanova A.B., Rahmetova A.T. Lingvisticheskie osobennosti elektronnoho diskursa // Evrazijskij soyuz uchenyh. 2015. Vol 14. P. 148–150
2. Karasik V.I. YAzykovoju krug: lichnost', koncepty, diskurs. Volgograd: Peremena, 2002. 331 p.
3. Lutovina O.V. Lingvokul'turologicheskie harakteristiki virtual'nogo diskursa. Avtoref. dis. ... doktora fil. nauk: 10.02.19. Volgograd, 2009, 40 p.
4. Makarov M.L. Osnovy teorii diskursa. M.: Gnozis, 2003. 280 p.
5. Moroslin P.V. YAzyk interneta kak ob"ekt lingvisticheskikh issledovanij // Vestnik Rossijskogo universiteta družby narodov. Seriya: lingvistika. 2009. Vol 3. P. 10–17
6. Yuzhakova Yu.V., Antropova L.I., Zalavina T.YU. Lingvisticheskie osobennosti angloyazychnogo elektronnoho diskursa // Kazanskaya nauka. 2020. Vol. 12. P. 214–216

Scientific supervisor: Syskina A.A., Ph.D. of Philology, associate Professor.

А.И. Белоусова, А.Г. Михайлова

Севастопольский государственный университет

Межкультурная коммуникация как межличностное взаимодействие: история возникновения

Рассмотрены исторические предпосылки возникновения теории межкультурной коммуникации. Отмечено, что со времен возникновения самих культур появилась практическая необходимость находить корни проблем, возникающих во время общения представителей различных культур, помогать решать эти проблемы, что и стало результатом зарождения теории межкультурной коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: теория межкультурной коммуникации; межкультурное общение; взаимодействие; культура; дисциплина.

Современная действительность характеризуется расширением взаимосвязей различных стран и народов, что выражается в бурном росте культурных обменов и прямых контактов между государственными институтами, социальными группами, общественными движениями и отдельными индивидами разных стран и культур. Языковые барьеры, отличия в нормах общественного поведения затрудняют эти контакты [7]. Основные причины коммуникативных неудач – в различиях в мироощуще-