

necessity. The micro contexts of avoidance strategy are presented by negative imperative constructions indicating prohibition, and less emotionally colored modal verb *should*. The Indicative Mood and the modal verbs *should* and *can*, within the meaning of “prevention” and “possibility” are presented in the internet comments of English-speaking youth as representatives of the passive strategy.

Conclusion. In the course of the study we found the following aims of communicators: to show the presence of the enemy in different spheres of youth activities; to recognize correctly a real threat and its consequences; to warn and protect to avoid dangerous situations using mainly peaceful means; to fight with the manifestation of the enemy forces.

From our point of view we fully achieved the aim of our research as the main ways and means of the strategy of reification have been identified.

In addition, the students of our Gymnasium wrote their own comments on the most exciting issues on the English-speaking youth Internet forum “Voices of Youth”.

In the long term it is possible to conduct a research on the representation of the “enemy image” in English and Russian / Belarusian Internet discourse.

References

1. Белоусова, Ю. В. Создание образа врага на страницах российских СМИ (на примере российско-грузинского конфликта в августе 2008 года) / Ю. В. Белоусова // Вестн. ВГУ. Сер. Филология. Журналистика. — 2011. — № 1. — С. 112—114.
2. Дюмаева, С. М. Технологии формирования образа внешнего врага [Электронный ресурс] / С. М. Дюмаева, Н. Саакашвили // Информационная политика. — Режим доступа: <http://www.rc-analitik.ru/file/%7Ba1d62e2d-270f-4943-91b4-e91f030ad259%7D>. — Дата доступа: 15.11.2016.
3. Козырев, Г. И. «Враг» и «образ врага» в общественных и политических отношениях / Г. И. Козырев // Социолог. исслед. — 2008. — № 1. — С. 32.
4. Маслаков, С. И. Формирование «образа врага» как средство манипулятивного воздействия на социальные группы / С. И. Маслаков // Риски в изменяющейся социальной реальности: проблема прогнозирования и управления : материалы междунар. науч.-практ. конф., Белгород, 19—20 нояб. 2015 г. / редкол.: Ю. А. Зубок [и др.]. — Воронеж : ПТ., 2015. — С. 507—512.
5. Молодыхенко, Е. Н. Создание образа врага как персуазивная стратегия американского политического дискурса [Электронный ресурс] : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.04 / Е. Н. Молодыхенко. — Режим доступа: <http://cheloveknauka.com/sozdanie-obrazavraga-kak-persuazivnaya-strategiya-amerikanskogo-politicheskogo-diskursa>. — Дата доступа: 15.11.2016.
6. Русанова, А. Г. Молодежный дискурс в свете тезаурусного подхода [Электронный ресурс] / А. Г. Русанова. — Режим доступа: <http://www.zpu-journal.ru/e-zpu/2008/9/Rusanova>. — Дата доступа: 15.10.2016.
7. Филинский, А. А. Критический анализ политического дискурса предвыборных кампаний 1999—2000 гг. : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.19 / А. А. Филинский. — Тверь, 2002. — 144 л.
8. Чабаненко, М. Г. Молодежный дискурс как реализация типовой и индивидуальной языковой личности [Электронный ресурс] : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.01 / М. Г. Чабаненко. — Режим доступа: <http://refdb.ru/look/2153782.html>. — Дата доступа: 15.11.2016.
9. Чабаненко, М. Г. Тематическое пространство молодежного дискурса как экспликатор коллективной языковой личности / М. Г. Чабаненко // Вестн. Кемер. гос. ун-та. Сер. Филология. — 2015. — № 4-4 (64) — С. 245—249.
10. Voices of Youth Discussion Forum [Electronic resource] // VoU (UNICEF). — Voices of Youth, 2016. — Mode of access: <http://www.voicesofyouth.org/en/connect/our-debates>. — Date of access: 01.12.2016.

UDC 81:39

I. A. Selezneva

Tambov State University named after G. R. Derzhavin, Tambov, Russian Federation

ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOUR: SIMILARITIES AND DISTINCTIONS

Introduction. Language, mentality and culture are inseparably linked with each other. They function as the whole. As a result, people who belong to different nationalities have particular communicative behavior. Everyone who had an opportunity to speak with a foreigner can mention some specific features of communication with them. Distinctions can be found in speech etiquette, subjects of speaking, manner of arguing etc. Specific national character is typical of both common cultural norms (attracting smb's attention, greeting, farewell, acquaintance, apology etc.) and situational norms which work when communication is determined by the status of the speakers, the topic of communication or situation [1, p. 9].

Nowadays it is very important to know specific features of communicative behavior of representatives of a foreign culture. Even perfect knowledge of language cannot improve an awkward situation which is caused by ignorance of these features. It is necessary to learn what communicative behavior of a foreigner is like in order to prevent awkward situations, distortion of communicative cultural view and to minimize negative consequences of culture shock.

The main part. In this article we will describe the main similarities and distinctions between English and Russian behaviour. Comparison will be based on several parameters: establishing the contact, ending the communicative contact, maintaining the contact, sociability, formal/informal way of communication, communicative self-presentation, politeness, use of imperative form, discussion of disagreements, the subject of communication, direction of attention toward an interlocutor, non-verbal organization of communication, communicative need for information.

This comparison is based on the research of Yu. E. Prohorov and I. A. Sternin. The following characteristics are very much generalized and relative.

The establishment of contact. English greeting is characterized by a pronounced friendliness and the communicative accessibility of high-status individuals is very high. The Russians are different in this respect. An English broadcaster, journalist and writer Jeremy Clarkson shares his impressions about Russian people after visiting Russia:

“...It is strange because we, the British, are ready to waste many hours every day on affectation and senseless chatter with people we don't know. Our obsession with good manners means that we feel obliged to discuss weather with a postman and a vacation with a hair-dresser. We write absurdly long letters expressing thanks to people we have already thanked orally. In business correspondence we use expressions that are really unnecessary – it is just necessity to be polite. If we want a hint we always begin like that: “Excuse me. I am afraid to seem annoying but...”

I stop it all because recently I was in Russia. It is a country where good manners seem to be non-existent. When a hotel receptionist asks you to give her your passport, she doesn't say “Would you mind showing me your passport, sir?” She says: “Passport”. And if you fail to find it in three seconds she adds: “Quickly” [2].

However, unlike for Russians, for the English the level of familiarity plays a great role in establishment of contact. Compared with the British, the Russians have a fairly high level of freedom of coming into contact with strangers.

Finishing the communicative contact. Softness of finishing the communicative contact is compulsory for the English and not compulsory for the Russians. Moreover, the English often use change of the subject to do it. The Russians use it too but they do not resort to it so often.

The maintenance of contact. Demonstrative communicative affability is not typical of the Russians while it is of high importance for the English. High level of everyday and business smiling is typical of the latter. A smile is something intimate for the Russians that is why they don't smile at everyone in everyday life. However, now business smiling begins to spread among Russian people because of globalization. The eye-contact is very important both for the English and the Russians but it is not compulsory for the latter.

Sociability. The Russians are quite sociable and open-hearted. Unlike the English, they show much interest in certain categories of interlocutors (foreigners, famous or new people etc.). Both the Russians and the British have a low desire to expand the circle of communication, but in the Russian it is more conspicuous.

Formal/Informal way of communication. Russian communication has quite an informal nature. Heart-to-heart conversation and the establishment of friendly contacts are important for the Russians. English communication is quite formal. However, unlike for the English, informal addressing or greeting are not acceptable for the Russians, if there is difference in social status or social distance.

Communicative self-presentation. Both the Russians and the English are not disposed to self-praise. However the Russians like sharing achievements of their relatives or friends with others.

Politeness. Politeness of Russian children in communication with the adults is high. However, courtesy of Russian adults to children is quite low. In such situations, the English level of politeness is normative. The Russians show accentuated courtesy to women, older people and to people higher in rank. This type of courtesy is not typical of the English.

Using of imperative form. Using of imperative form is frequent in Russian communication and not frequent in English. For example, Russian: “Give me the book!”; English: “Can you give me the book?”

The English use a question instead of the imperative form.

Discussing disagreements. Emotional dispute, conflict themes and categorical expression of disagreement are acceptable for the Russians, but not for the English.

The subject of communication. High intimacy and broad range of shared information are typical of the Russian communication and limited in the English. A share of humour in communication is equal for both the Russians and the English.

Direction of attention toward an interlocutor. Both the Russians and the English pay much attention to what an interlocutor talks about.

Non-verbal organization of communication. Comparison is shown in the Table 1 [1, p. 195—196].

Table 1 — Non-verbal organization of communication

Parameters	Russian CB	English CB	Parameters	Russian CB	English CB
Distance of communication	short	extended	Intensity of facial expression	medium	not high
Space of communication	tight	extended	Emotionality of gesticulation	high	low
Amount of gesticulation	marked	small	Loudness of conversation	medium	low
Intensity of gesticulation	medium	not high	Tempo of communication	medium	medium

Communicative need for information. The Russians want to get new information all the time. Insisting on giving information is typical for them. The English are completely opposite. For example:

English:

X: “Hello! How are you?”

Y: "Hi! I'm fine. And you?"

X: "Good, thanks"

Russian:

X: "Hello! How are you?"

Y: "Hi! It is awful! I couldn't get the ticket to the concert and..."

Summarizing the aforesaid, there are following main similarities: the importance of eye-contact, low desire to expand the circle of communication, reluctance to self-praise, high level of courtesy, the amount of humour in speech is marked, paying much attention to what an interlocutor talks about, some restraint in intensity of gesticulation and facial expression, tempo of communication.

Main distinctions: role of the level of familiarity in the establishment of contact; softness of ending the communicative contact; demonstration of communicative affability; meaning of smile; the level of sociability and open-heartedness; the establishment of friendly contacts; permissibility of informal communication, if there is distance in social status or age; normative or emphatic politeness; level of using imperative forms; acceptability of emotional dispute, categorical expression of disagreement; intimacy and amount of information; willingness to get much information; distance of communication; space of communication; emotionality of gesticulation.

Conclusion. To sum it up, despite quite many similarities, Russian and English communicative behaviour has a lot of significant distinctions which, however, are not striking. Nevertheless it is necessary to know these distinctions and be able to employ this knowledge to establish successful contact and to prevent awkward situations and conflicts.

References

1. Прохоров, Ю. Е. Русские: коммуникативное поведение / Ю. Е. Прохоров, И. А. Стернин. — Изд. 2-е, испр. и доп. — М. : Флинта : Наука, 2006. — 238 с.
2. Джереми Кларксон о русских [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <http://www.adme.ru/articles/dzheremi-klarkson-o-russkih-586755/>. — Дата доступа: 08.03.2017.
3. Как вежливо просить на английском [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <http://10-steps-to-learn.info/kak-vezhlivo-prosit-na-angliyskom/>. — Дата доступа: 08.03.2017.
4. Переговоры с англичанами [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: http://life-prog.ru/1_26070_peregovori-s-anglichanami.html. — Дата доступа: 08.03.2017.