

9. 대한민국헌법. 국가법령정보센터. 1987. URL: <https://www.law.go.kr/lsInfoP.do?lsiSeq=61603#0000> (дата звернення: 13.03.2021).

References:

1. Belova T. (2015) Sistema obrazovaniya v Yuzhnoy Koree perioda VI Respubliki. Vestnik Nizhegorodskoho universiteta im. N.I. Lobachevskoho, 3, 9–18.
2. Zakon Ukrayini “Pro vishchu osvitu” 2014. Ofitsiyiny vebportal parlamentu Ukrayini Zakonodavstvo Ukrayini. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18#Text> (data zvernennya: 01.03.2021).
3. Zakon Ukrayini “Pro osvitu” 2017. Ofitsiyiny vebportal parlamentu Ukrayini Zakonodavstvo Ukrayini. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19#Text> (data zvernennya: 01.03.2021).
4. Konstitutsiya Ukrayini 1996. Natsional'niy yuridichniy informatsiyiny tsestr. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/254k/96-vr#Text> (data zvernennya: 04.03.2021).
5. Economic indicators of the world. World Bank. URL: <https://data.worldbank.org/country> (data zvernennya: 09.03.2021).
6. 고등교육법 1997. 국가법령정보센터. URL: <https://www.law.go.kr/LSW/lsInfoP.do?lsiSeq=224361&ancYd=20201222&ancNo=17656&efYd=20210623&nwJoYnInfo=N&efGubun=Y&chrClsCd=010202&ancYnChk=0#0000> (data zvernennya: 12.03.2021).
7. 고등교육법 시행령 2013. 국가법령정보센터. URL: <https://www.law.go.kr/LSW/lumLsLinkPop.do?lsptninfSeq=56838&chrClsCd=010202> (data zvernennya: 26.02.2021).
8. 교육기본법 1997. 국가법령정보센터. URL: <https://www.law.go.kr/LSW/lsInfoP.do?lsiSeq=205788&ancYd=&ancNo=&efYd=20190619&nwJoYnInfo=Y&ancYnChk=0&efGubun=Y&vSct=#0000> (data zvernennya: 10.03.2021)
9. 대한민국헌법 1987. 국가법령정보센터. URL: <https://www.law.go.kr/lsInfoP.do?lsiSeq=61603#0000> (data zvernennya: 13.03.2021).

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2020.7.2.3>

MIĘDZYKULTUROWE BŁĘDY PRAGMATYCZNE MIĘDZY JĘZYKAMI ETYKIETY W JĘZYKU CHIŃSKIM I ANGIELSKIM

Xiong Yuxiang

aspirant Instytutu Filologii

Kijowskiego Uniwersytetu Narodowego imienia Tarasa Szewczenki (Kijów, Ukraina)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9940-2987

Adnotacja. Ten artykuł przedstawia historię badań nad komunikacją międzykulturową w Chinach i krajach anglojęzycznych od lat 80. do lat 90. i bada niektóre pragmatyczne błędy Chińczyków w stosowaniu angielskiej etykiety. W głównym rozdziale artykułu autor najpierw wymienia zasady angielskich terminów etykiety, a następnie porównuje niektóre przyziemne rozmowy Chińczyków i Anglików, aby spróbować przeanalizować przyczyny pragmatycznych błędów.

Głównymi metodami badawczymi tego artykułu są metoda dokumentacji i metoda badawcza, w tym analiza tekstu i badania porównawcze. Metodą argumentu logicznego jest indukcja. W tym artykule zobaczymy, że aby poprawić umiejętności komunikacyjne i bardziej poprawnie wyrażać myśli, musisz nie tylko nauczyć się prawidłowego używania słów etykiety w języku, ale także zrozumieć różnice kulturowe między tymi dwoma językami.

Słowa kluczowe: pragmatyczny błąd komunikacji, język etykiety, komunikacja międzykulturowa, zasady etykiety, język chiński, język angielski.

CROSS-CULTURAL PRAGMATIC FAILURE BETWEEN CHINESE AND ENGLISH POLITE LANGUAGE

Xiong Yuxiang

Postgraduate Student

Institute of Philology

of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9940-2987

e-mail: xyxmaldini@gmail.com

Abstract. This article introduces the history from the 1980s to the 1990s of cross-cultural communication studies in China and English-speaking countries and explores some of the Chinese people's pragmatic failure in using English polite language. In the main chapter of the article, the author first lists the principles of English politeness terms and then

compares some daily conversations between Chinese and English to try to analyze the causes of pragmatic errors. The main research methods of this article are documentation method and investigation method, including text analysis and comparative studies. The method of logical argument is induction. Through this article, we will see that to improve language communication skills, it is not only necessary to learn the correct expression of polite words in the language, but also to understand cultural differences and learn to use the language more appropriately.

Key words: pragmatic failure, polite language, cross-cultural communication, polite principle, Chinese language, English language.

МІЖКУЛЬТУРНІ ПРАГМАТИЧНІ ПОМИЛКИ МІЖ МОВАМИ ЕТИКЕТУ В КИТАЙСЬКІЙ ТА АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Сюн Юйсян

аспірант

Інституту філології

Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка (Київ, Україна)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9940-2987

e-mail: yuxmaldini@gmail.com

Анотація. Ця стаття наводить історію досліджень міжкультурної комунікації в Китаї та англomовних країнах із 1980-х до 1990-х років та досліджує деякі прагматичні помилки китайців у використанні англійської мови етикету. У головному розділі статті автор спочатку перелічує принципи англійських термінів етикету, а потім порівнює деякі буденні розмови китайців і англійців, щоб спробувати проаналізувати причини прагматичних помилок.

Основними методами дослідження цієї статті є метод документації та метод дослідження, зокрема й аналіз тексту та порівняльні дослідження. Методом логічного аргументу є індукція. Через цю статтю ми побачимо, що для вдосконалення навичок спілкування та більш коректного вираження думок потрібно не лише навчитися правильно вживанню слів етикету в мові, а й зрозуміти культурні відмінності між двома мовами.

Ключові слова: прагматична помилка спілкування, мова етикету, міжкультурна комунікація, принципи етикету, китайська мова, англійська мова.

Introduction. Intercultural communication refers to the communication between people with different cultural backgrounds. In the study of cross-cultural communication, the focus is on country studies, focusing on the mainstream culture of a country, rather than an empty comparison of communication between any two people. Cross-cultural communication studies have shown that various cultural differences will have an impact on cross-cultural communication and cause various communication difficulties. Psychologist Michael Argyle believes that “there are six main problems or difficulties in intercultural communication: (1) language include polite language; (2) Non-verbal communication; (3) Social code of conduct, including giving gifts, etc.; (4) The relationship between family and colleagues; (5) Motivation and motivation to do things; (6) Ideas, including ideas that are influenced by politics” (Argyle, 1991: 113).

This means that when people communicate, they not only need to know the rules that conform to the language form, but they also need to know the rules that conform to the culture. The communicator is often affected by the thinking mode, expression habits and cultural customs of the mother tongue, which makes the communicative language lack of appropriateness, thus showing abruptness and disrespect. This kind of pragmatic conflict caused by cultural conflict is called pragmatic failure. Jenny Thomas classified pragmatic failures into two types in the book “Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure”. “The first is “pragma linguistic failure”, which refers to the pragmatic failure caused by foreign language learners applying the pragmatic meaning of a certain word or structure of the native language to the foreign language. The second type is “social-pragmatic failure”, which refers to pragmatic errors due to different cultural backgrounds, which involve what should be said and what should not be said, the distance of interpersonal relationships, people’s rights and obligations, related to the values” (Thomas, 1983: 113).

Main text.

I. English politeness principle

Before the famous British scholar Leech (1983) put forward the “Polite Principle”, the American philosopher Grice (1975) put forward the “cooperative principle”. He believes that in all language communication, the speaker and the listener should follow certain principles, so that the process of communication develops in the direction of tacit understanding and cooperation. “There are four criteria for the specific content of the principle of cooperation: (1) Quantity Maxim: The amount of information provided must meet the requirements of the conversation, no more, no less; (2) Quality Maxim: What you say must be based and truthful; (3) Relevant Maxim: What you say should be related to the previous content; (4) Manner Maxim: Speak concisely, clearly, methodically, and unambiguously” (Grice, 1975: 228).

However, people do not strictly abide by these rules in communication, that is to say, the principle of cooperation cannot fully cover various forms of conversation. To this end, Leech supplemented, developed and enriched Grice’s cooperation principles, and proposed a systematic Politeness Principle, which made up for the lack of cooperation principles and increased the expression of courtesy. Leech pointed out that the principle of cooperation is to guide what we should say to achieve the desired goal, and the principle of politeness can help maintain a friendly

relationship between both parties. In this way, the principle of cooperation and the principle of politeness complement each other and jointly restrict people's conversational activities.

“There are six principles of politeness principle: (1) Tact Maxim: Try to make others suffer as little as possible; Try to benefit others as much as possible; (2) Generosity Maxim: Let yourself benefit as little as possible; let yourself suffer as much as possible; (3) Approbation Maxim (Approbation Maxim): Minimize demeaning others; praise others as much as possible; (4) Modesty Maxim: Try to minimize the praise of yourself; try to exaggerate the criticism of yourself; (5) Agreement Maxim: Minimize the differences between the two parties; Try to increase the consistency of the two parties; (6) Sympathy Maxim: Minimize resentment toward others; Try to increase sympathy for others (Leech, 1983: 133). Leech's Principle of Politeness is undoubtedly a great contribution to pragmatics, which has been affirmed by many linguists.

In 1987, Brown and Levinson conducted in-depth research on English politeness principles. They believed that politeness strategies are divided into positive face and negative face. *“There are two types of negative face. A positive face refers to the communicator's desire for his own opinions and behaviors to be accepted; a negative face refers to the communicator's need for freedom of behaviors not to be affected to the greatest extent. They also believe that during the conversation, the face of both parties will be attacked, so the function of polite language is to protect the positive face and negative face of both parties”* (Brown, Levinson, 1987: 122).

II. Pragmatic failure in polite language between Chinese and English

Due to the differences between Chinese and English cultures, different understandings of politeness principles, and different usage habits and norms of polite language, it will cause obstacles and misunderstandings in cross-cultural communication, and cause pragmatic errors, which are mainly manifested in the following aspects:

1. Meeting words and greetings: People usually greet each other, especially among acquaintances, as a sign of courtesy. Except occasionally using gestures to express, most of them use meeting greetings. However, people of different cultural backgrounds use very different greetings when meeting.

People living in different cultural environments have different outlooks on life, values, social behaviors, and ethics. If they are not familiar with the differences in these cultural values, pragmatic errors will occur in communication. For example, a foreign teacher returned to China after leaving China for a few years. A former Chinese friend greeted her enthusiastically, “Hello! Haven't seen you for ages! You haven't changed at all!”. Unexpectedly, this sentence made this foreign friend very unhappy. Progress, change, and development are the main characteristics of Western cultural values. She did not understand the meaning of this sentence “You still look young!” (You are still so young and energetic!).

In Chinese, you can generally use a title instead of greetings. For example, when you meet an old friend of your father on the street, you will call “Uncle Wang!” or “Uncle Li!” However, if you call “Uncle Brown!” or “Professor Smith!” at a Westerner, they will stop and answer: “Yes?” because he thinks you have something to ask him and need his help. In English, you can use simple “Hi!” or “Hello!” to greet someone, or you can add the other person's name after “Hi” and “Hello”, such as: “Hi, Carol!”. Also, greetings can be met with greetings, such as: “Good Morning, Good Afternoon, Good Evening, Good Day, Good Night” and so on.

2. Titles to call others in a conversation: There are different appellation systems in different cultures. The appellation in Chinese is more complicated. When Gu Yueguo discussed the appellation criteria in his *“Five Principles of Chinese Politeness”*, he thought: *“Chinese people regard greetings as polite, and greetings must have appropriate addressing terms. Chinese addressing terms are more complicated and can mainly be summarized as positions. Name, title name, occupation name, politeness markers, names and relative words. The salutation criterion is to use appropriate salutations to proactively greet each other”* (Yueguo, 1992: 96–98).

According to one of the “principles of cooperation” proposed by the American philosopher Grice, that is, the Quality Maxim: The amount of information provided must meet the requirements of the conversation, no more, no less. Therefore, in English, social appellations are relatively simple and stable. Generally, an administrative job or occupation is not added before the surname to call someone's name, such as “Manager Smith”, “Director White”, “Teacher Black”. From the point of view of native English speakers, “title” is not the most important thing. What is important is a person's name and ability. They believe that a simple “Mr. Smith” has already provided enough information in the communication. And titles like “Director Liu, Manager Wang, Director He” and so on, which are often used by Chinese people, provide too much useless information. However, it is worth mentioning that the names of professionals such as “Professor” and “Doctor” are added in front of the surname. Such titles reflect respect for professionals.

The complicated appellation of family members is also a prominent example of Chinese culture, which embodies the principle of politeness everywhere. “尊敬老人zun jing lao ren” (respect for seniority) The polite principle of “respecting the seniority” is not only valued in Chinese families but also reflected in social situations. Even if there is no blood relationship, the younger generation cannot directly call the elder's name, otherwise, they will be regarded as poor manners and lack of education. Instead, it should be called “爷爷ye ye/grandpa, 奶奶nai nai/grandma” or “叔叔shushu/uncle, 阿姨a'yi/aunt” according to age. For people of the same generation, you should call men older than yourself “哥哥gege/elder brothers” and women older than yourself “姐姐jiejie/elder sisters”. But in English, there is no principle of “respect for seniority” in social situations. Students can directly call the teacher's name, employees can directly call the manager's name, and younger people directly call the older person's name. In the family, the members of the children's generation can directly call their parents' names, or even their grandfather and grandma's names. The difference between these appellations in English and Chinese shows that native English

speakers try to eliminate the strong differences in social status and age. Desire means that interpersonal relationships tend to be equalized and simplified.

3. Compliments and modesty.

The compliment is a common language phenomenon in English, and it is a common language behavior, which is conducive to making new people and establishing interpersonal relationships. When people use compliments, they have their own specific occasions and situations. The social status and mutual relationship of the complier and the complimented by others are different, and the goals and words of the compliment are also different. But as an act of polite language, the polite way of being complimented by others is to follow Leech's "*principle of agreement*" (to reduce the inconsistency of opinions between oneself and others, that is, to minimize differences between the two parties and increase the agreement between the two parties as much as possible). To cater to the compliment from the other party, say "Thanks!" or "Thank you!" to accept the compliment.

Such as: A: You look much younger in this dress. B: Thank you!

And the Chinese people's answer to the above example is usually: "No, this dress is old and not beautiful, and I am not young anymore". Because Chinese people are always used to deny the other party first when they are complimented by others. Praise and belittle yourself again to show self-humility. If you accept compliments, it means feelings of arrogance and complacency. In English, this type of refusal answer is regarded as rude to the conversation partner and should be avoided as much as possible. "*The person who is complimented by others bluntly denies the other's evaluation. This kind of language behavior violates the rules of conversation and is the most destructive to the relationship between the two parties. It damages the unity between the communicators and is not conducive to the development of interpersonal relationships*" (Wolfson, 1983: 62).

Humility is originally a virtue in interpersonal relationships. However, excessive modesty will make people feel hypocritical and insincere and will dilute the feelings between each other. The excessive modesty of the Chinese makes it unbearable for native English speakers and often causes their discomfort and misunderstanding. For example, a Chinese host invites a British tour group: "Would you honor me by coming to my humble home for a simple meal on Sunday evening?" The British would not understand very much: they would think such an invitation is an insult, because since the house is not good (humble home) and the food is not good (simple meal), why invite us? Also, if we go there and find that the house is good and the food is good, then why does the Chinese host who invited us to say this? If you are too humble, they think is hypocritical.

If the Chinese host simply said: "I'd like to have you come over for dinner Sunday evening". Then there will be no unnecessary misunderstandings. In addition, according to the fourth "cooperation principle" proposed by the American philosopher Grice (Manner Maxim), he clearly pointed out that in interpersonal communication, in order to make the process of communication development in a tacit and cooperative direction, the speaker must speak Simple and clear. Therefore, in the above example, the speaker can completely follow this approach and try to be as concise and clear as possible, omitting unnecessary words like "honor", "humble", and "simple".

Conclusions. The Reasons for the Cross-Cultural Pragmatic failure in politeness language between Chinese and English in Cross-cultural Communication:

(1) differences in thinking modes: There is a close relationship between thinking mode and language expression, and the cultural differences between China and English-speaking countries also have a direct impact on cross-cultural communication. These influences include differences in the way of language communication, the organizational structure and form of conversation. Different thinking patterns between cultures can easily lead to conflicts in communication. The thinking mode of native English speakers is linear. Whether it is talking to others or writing articles, they will express their thoughts straightforwardly and will not be ambiguous. Because of the influence of the traditional Confucianism "Doctrine of the Mean (中庸Zhongyong)", the Chinese writing styles are gentle, circuitous and implicit. When communicating with others, the language point of view is relatively mild, and will not directly express the central idea of what is said. This requires both parties to understand the meaning of the other party's expression through guessing or inferring the deep meaning of the language;

(2) different understanding of individualism: The different understanding of individualism between China and English-speaking countries is also the reason for the difference in polite language. In Europe, especially in English-speaking countries, the dominant values since the Renaissance and Enlightenment are individualistic values. Individualism usually refers to individual independence, rights and freedom. This is difficult to understand for the Chinese who have long been edified in Confucianism. From a European perspective, sometimes the Chinese way of communication is too enthusiastic. For example, when Chinese people eat, they put the cooked food on a plate, and everyone uses chopsticks to eat it. And Europeans are not used to eating on the same plate with other people. Everyone has their own plate because they think it is more hygienic. Through this example, we can see that different ways of eating also have different understandings of individualism.

Wolfson once said: "*In contact with foreigners, native speakers can generally tolerate phonetic or syntactic errors. On the contrary, violating the rules of speech is often considered impolite, because the natives do not recognize the relativity of sociolinguistics*" (Wolfson, 1992: 62).

Everyone who studies cross-cultural communication should remember this sentence, carefully understand cultural differences, pay attention to the cultivation of language and communication skills, and be aware of the unique languages and habits of different cultures. In communication, try not to show abrupt, rude, and disruptive atmosphere, try to overcome cultural differences in the conversation protocol, and try to reach agreement between the two parties.

References:

1. Michael Argyle. (1991). *Cooperation: The Basis of Sociability*. New York : Routledge. P. 113.
2. Jenny Thomas. (1983). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure*. London : Oxford University Press. P. 112.
3. Grice H.P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation in Cole*. New York : P& Morgan. P. 228.
4. Leech G.N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London : Long man. P. 133.
5. Brown. P and Levinson. S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. P. 122.
6. Gu Yueguo. (1992). *Limao, yuyong yu wenhua (Polite, Pragmatist and Culture)*. Beijing, Wai yan chu ban she. P. 96–98 [in Chinese].
7. Wolfson N. (1983). *Rules of Speaking in Language and Communication*. London : Long man. P. 62.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2020.7.2.4>

PODSTAWOWE ZASADY ZAWODOWEJ LINGWODYDAKTYKI JAKO NIEZALEŻNEJ GAŁĘZI NAUKI PEDAGOGICZNEJ NA UKRAINIE

Oleksandr Khomenko

doktor nauk pedagogicznych, profesor Katedry Języka Angielskiego

Wydziału Tłumaczy Kijowskiego Narodowego Uniwersytetu Lingwistycznego (Kijów, Ukraina)

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2539-837X

Adnotacja. Znaczenie artykułu wynika z potrzeby opracowania teoretycznych i metodologicznych podstaw krajowej lingwodydaktyki zawodowej na podstawie integracji interdyscyplinarnej. Celem artykułu jest przedstawienie i uzasadnienie podstawowych zasad współczesnej krajowej lingwodydaktyki zawodowej jako narzędzia realizacji innowacyjnych pomysłów pedagogicznych w dziedzinie zawodowego szkolenia obcojęzycznego. Dla osiągnięcia celu badania zastosowano zestaw metod, m.in.: analizę, uogólnienie oraz konkretyzację i usystematyzowanie wiedzy teoretycznej. Analizowane są podejścia do definiowania nomenklatury zasad i ujawniania ich treści. Podkreśla się potrzebę uwzględnienia psychologiczno-pedagogicznych wzorców aktywności poznawczej, konkretnych celów i warunków realizacji zawodowego szkolenia obcojęzycznego, przestrzeni edukacyjnej instytucji szkolnictwa wyższego i tym podobnych. Należy zauważyć, że zasady zawodowej lingwodydaktyki powinny być odpowiednie dla nowoczesnych warunków i cech procesu edukacyjnego jako całości i procesu profesjonalnie zorientowanego szkolenia obcojęzycznego w wyższej szkole Ukrainy w szczególności; strategicznym celem takiego szkolenia jest kształtowanie zawodowej osobowości językowej. Podkreśla się, że przedstawione zasady współczesnej krajowej lingwodydaktyki zawodowej odzwierciedlają kurs na jakościową aktualizację zawodowo zorientowanego obcojęzycznego szkolenia przyszłych specjalistów, którzy by odpowiadały światowym standardom względem kwalifikacji; na głoszenie zawodowo zorientowanego obcojęzycznego szkolenia sprawiedliwym i równorzędnym elementem szkolenia specjalistów.

Słowa kluczowe: szkolenia obcojęzyczne, lingwistyka zawodowa, klasyfikacja zasad, podejścia.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF PROFESSIONAL LINGUODIDACTICS AS AN INDEPENDENT BRANCH OF PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCE IN UKRAINE

Oleksandr Khomenko

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences,

*Professor at the Department of English Language
of the Faculty of Translation and Interpreting*

Kyiv National Linguistic University (Kyiv, Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2539-837X

e-mail: Alexander.khomenko@gmail.com

Abstract. The relevance of the current paper is determined by the need to develop both the theoretical and methodological foundations for professional linguodidactics on the basis of interdisciplinary integration. The purpose of the paper is to present and substantiate the basic principles of modern professional linguodidactics as the tools for implementing innovative pedagogical ideas in the field of professionally oriented foreign language training. To achieve the goal of the study, a set of methods has been applied, in particular: analysis, generalization, as well as specification and systematization of theoretical knowledge. The approaches to defining the nomenclature of principles and disclosing their content have been analyzed. So the author has argued the selection of specific principles of professional linguodidactics having considered some psychological and pedagogical patterns of the students' cognitive activity, specific goals and conditions for the implementation of professional foreign language training etc. The principles of professional linguodidactics should