

DOI: 10.12731/2077-1770-2018-2-65-79

UDC 101

## MODELS OF LINGUISTIC COMMUNICATION (SOCIAL-PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS)

*Shmeleva Zh.N.*

**Purpose.** *The article is devoted to the social-philosophical analysis of the main models of linguistic communication and the identification of the dialectical unity of communication and information aspects of the language, as it is the language that is an attribute of social existence in general and human one in particular. The most important “markers” of the language are information and communication. The more complex and branched the society activity is, and the more, in this regard, the amount of the accumulated information (scientific, political, artistic) is, the more important role the language communication plays in its functioning. It makes it possible to communicate between people and their communities, makes the link between generations possible, contributes to the accumulation and transmission of social experience, enrichment, translation of cultural heritage.*

**Methodology.** *During the research, the author was guided by the fundamental principles of dialectical methodology. In particular, they were the principles of the unity of logical and historical, development, universal connection of phenomena, etc. The central place belongs to the method of philosophical reflection, which in this work is expressed in the explication of ontological, epistemological, axiological coordinates of communication and information issues.*

**Results.** *The results of the study are that the author explicates the essence of linguistic models of communication, identifying the factors influencing the understanding in the communication process, and justifies the inter-transition and convergence of information and communicative aspects of the language.*

**Practical implications.** *The results of the study might help to deepen our understanding of the language phenomenon, as well as systematize its information-communicative nature.*

*Keywords: language; information; communication; social-philosophical analysis; model.*

## МОДЕЛИ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ (СОЦИАЛЬНО-ФИЛОСОФСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ)

*Шмелева Ж.Н.*

*Цель.* Статья посвящена социально-философскому анализу основных моделей языковой коммуникации и выявлению диалектического единства коммуникативной и информационной сторон языка, поскольку именно язык является атрибутом социального бытия вообще, и человеческого, в частности. Наиболее важными его «маркерами» являются информация и коммуникация. Чем сложнее и разветвленнее деятельность общества, и чем больше в связи с этим накапливаемый объем информации (научной, политической, художественной), тем более важную роль в процессе его функционирования играет языковая коммуникация. Она обеспечивает связь между людьми и их общностями, делает возможной связь поколений, способствует накоплению и передаче социального опыта, его обогащению, трансляции культурного наследия.

*Методология проведения работы.* При проведении исследования автор руководствовался фундаментальными принципами диалектической методологии. В частности, единства логического и исторического, развития, всеобщей связи явлений и др. Центральное место принадлежит методу философской рефлексии, который в настоящей работе выражается в экспликации онтологических, гносеологических, аксиологических координат проблем коммуникации и информации.

*Результаты.* Результаты работы заключаются в том, что автор эксплицирует сущность лингвистических моделей коммуникации, выявляя факторы, влияющие на понимание в процессе коммуникации, и обосновывает взаимопереход и взаимопроникновение информационных и коммуникативных сторон языка.

***Область применения результатов.** Результаты исследования помогут углубить наши представления о феномене языка, систематизировать его информационно-коммуникативную природу.*

***Ключевые слова:** язык; информация; коммуникация; социально-философский анализ; модель.*

### **Introduction**

With all the variety of communication forms in the modern globalized world that are functioning in human society (sms messages, emails, sign language, body movements, the Internet), the dominant role is given by the author to the language. This phenomenon is the most important area in which the life of any individual is reflected. The most important (language) “markers”, in our opinion, are information and communication. The linguistic communication plays an indispensable role in all the spheres of the social life. So, we consider it very important to present the existing models of linguistic communication and to give their social-philosophical analysis.

### **Literature review**

Having analyzed the domestic and foreign authors, we can distinguish the following scope of sources associated with the intensive development of the information and communication issues:

- the essence, storage, processing, retrieval of information have been researched in the works of domestic and foreign scientists Yu.F. Abramov, V.G. Afanasyev, B.V. Biryukov, M.K. Bocharov, N. Viner, I.I. Grishkin, W. Dembski, D.I. Dubrovsky, V.Z. Kogan, V.Yu. Kolmakov, I.B. Novik, T.I. Orel, E.P. Semenyuk, M.I. Setrov, Yu.N. Stolyarov, A.P. Sukhanov, A.D. Ursul, F. Webster, K.E. Shannon, Yu.A. Schrader, V.A. Stoff;
- the psychology of communication and language communication, taking into account such social factors as the views, purposes of the speaker and the hearer, their social status, ethnicity are researched in the writings of N. D.Arutunova, P. Grice, T.A. Van Dijk, M.S. Kagan, N.T.Kazakova, O.L. Kamenskaya,

V.I. Karasik, V.B. Kashkin, V. Kinch, E.S. Kubryakova, A.A. Leontiev, J. Austin, A.V. Petrovsky, J. Searle, M. Stubbs, P. Strawson, J. Habermas, D. Shiffrin;

- changes the interpretation of the discourse, raising the question of the cognitive model elements, processing and linguistic pragmatics of the text were reflected in the works of T.A. Van Dijk, T.G. Ignatyeva, O.L. Kamenskaya, V.I. Karasik, W. Kinch, M.L. Makarov.

There is an interesting material, which, of course, forms an important basis for further creative research in this area and serves as a source of theoretical material for this article. However, the **purpose** of the author is to conduct a deeper social philosophical analysis of the linguistic communication, its models and the **task** is to show the interconnection of communication with the information.

### **The main material of the article**

As in our works [17] language is considered to be the information-communicative system, so far the phenomena of information and communication are of special interest. Language as a sign system is a versatile tool for the storage, accumulation and transmission of information. The information message is a certain collection of signs and their meanings. We are interested in how and in what forms, information realizes and expresses itself in the language, and why we can identify the language as the information system. Various forms of information organization are the various forms of thoughts expression. We can say that the word (concept) in language is a structural unit of information. The concept of information is fundamental for almost all areas of human activity.

The interpretation of the “information” phenomenon has made a significant evolution. The initial (pre-scientific) view of the information developed in the field of ordinary language on the basis of everyday socio-communicative practices. According to this understanding, information is the message or information that people share with each other in the process of communication. By the mid-twentieth century with the

emergence of the cybernetics science and the extrapolation of its laws to all classes of systems including social, there was the situation where the information became a strictly scientific concept. Therefore, information theory is one of the most rapidly developing branches of contemporary scientific knowledge that permeates many of the sciences of inanimate and animate nature, society, cognition. The debate about the nature and essence of information, during which the scientists discussed a wide range of categories and principles, formed the basis for the development of the general theory of information, which at the suggestion of E.P. Semenyuk and V.I. Siforov, was called informology [12]. The main methodological approaches to the prevailing definition of information, include mathematical (quantitative), program-algorithmic, attributive, reflecting the qualitative characteristics of the information. According to V.Yu. Kolmakov, the principle of fundamental understanding of the information phenomenon is reflected in any methodological environment of philosophical thinking as a requirement for carrying out a logical operation aimed at identifying common semantic basis on which the further development of the specified consequences is constructed [8]. According to K.E. Shannon information may be measured as the degree of order or organization of the system, as negative entropy or negentropy [16, p. 153].

From the author's point of view, the understanding of information is unthinkable without the reference to communication. Any study of language and information relies on a particular communication model.

The term "communication" appeared in scientific literature in the early twentieth century. Communication in the philosophical and psychological literature, is the transmission of information both in the animal world (in this case, the term "bio-communication" is used) and in the human society. The communication can also be realized from one technical device to another [7, 15]. The word "communication" has the Latin origin that means "joint, common, mutual, reciprocal". Hence, it can be concluded that communication, as a necessary element of interaction between individuals involves an exchange of knowledge, information, values, estimates, meanings.

N.T. Kazakova rightly believes that the analysis of the phenomenological bases of human communication problems has not only indirectly theoretical but practical importance [6, p. 134–135]. We can say that without an adequate understanding of the communication concept, it is impossible to investigate the development and functioning of human society, the personality in general and language in particular. We believe that without language communication the constitution of social communities, systems, institutions, and the existence of society is impossible, because it (communication) permeates all aspects of society, social groups and individuals. That is why it is so important to study the nature of communication and its models.

There are many definitions of communication. For example, in the *Dictionary of Modern Western sociology* the concept of communication is interpreted as 1) a communication facility of any objects material and spiritual world; 2) communication, information transfer from person to person; 3) communication and exchange of information in society [13, p. 131]. In the philosophical encyclopedic dictionary, communication is regarded as process of interrelation and interaction of societies, entities (classes, groups, individuals) in which there is exchange of activity, information, experience, abilities, skills, and performance [15, p. 447]. It is one of the necessary and universal conditions of formation and development of the society and the individual. All of these characteristics of this phenomenon become actual exclusively through the language forms of generalization. According to N.T. Kazakova, historically proven is the fact that human development begins with nonverbal communication. But the process of fixing the “human” in the “man” is associated with the emergence and development of language as means of communication [6, p. 136]. In other words, it is the language that conveys everything that cannot be transferred by the bio-code, and so the communicative aspect of communication is the most adequately manifested in the language.

Any study of the language relies on a particular communication model. In linguistics, the first language model was built by R.O. Jakobson, who had experienced a significant influence of the ideas expressed by K.E. Shannon in the information theory. In his (R.O. Jakobson’s) infor-

mation and code model communication involves the sender and recipient. The context in this model is associated with the content of the message, i.e. with the information transmitted, the notion of contact being associated with the regulative aspect of communication [18, p. 306–318; 19, p. 319–330].

We can say that this model and understanding of the language communication is based on two fundamental principles: first, any national language (Russian, German and others) is a specific code; second, these codes relate to thoughts and sounds [10, p. 34]. This model has a primitive inter-subjectivity as its basis, and the aim of communication is the general idea or message. The process of achieving this goal is based on the existence of a common code, identical language skills. Both the model proposed by R.O. Jakobson and its variants are used in linguistics to analyze language features in general and the functioning of its individual units, production of speech and text in particular. However, in our opinion, the information-code model is unable to give a quite adequate description of real processes of communication in the variety of natural languages, because the understanding requires more than just the process of decoding acoustic signals.

So we agree with A. Akmajian, R.A. Demers, A.K. Farmer, R.M. Harnish who call such a model “a message model” [1, p. 305], and put the following arguments in favor of its imperfections. First of all, this model represents the communication process as simply producing, listening to and understanding expressions. It ignores a significant component of the speaker’s communicative intention. Secondly, speech expressions are often ambiguous, and the recipient should know precisely what sense was put by the interlocutor. Thirdly, we do not always speak literally, referring to something quite different from what the words mean (irony, sarcasm, metaphor). Fourth, we sometimes share more than the sentence and the expression mean. For example, when we address the mechanic and say, “I have a flat tire”, we ask him/her to resolve the problem, i.e., to repair the car, although the sentence expressed only the state of the car [1, p. 312–313]. Communication, according to the above-mentioned authors, is successful only when the hearer can recognize the speaker’s

communicative intention [1, p. 314–315]. The heuristic value of the information-code model is limited to semiotic approaches in the study of language and its weakness is revealed in the semantic-pragmatic approach to the study of communication processes.

In this regard, it is necessary to distinguish the “inferential” and “interactional” models of communication [10, p. 35–40]. The inter-subjectivity plays a major role in the inferential language model. If in the information-code model the speaker deliberately sent an idea to the listener, then in the inferential model the speaking subject demonstrates his/her intentions [14, p. 136–137]. The communication process is initiated not by the desire of an individual to convey a thought or some information, but his/her desire to make his/her intentions clear to others. Verbal means for the expression of intentions are statements. The content of the statements is not limited to the representative messages about the state of affairs (as in the information-code model), and may contain extra-linguistic factors, such as emotions. Although intentions themselves are not propositional (they are more similar to the attitudes and motives), the content of the statements is such. So, the intentions determine how one or another propositional content should be interpreted. A. Akmajian, R.A. Demers, A.K. Farmer, R.M. Harnish talk about shared assumptions and inferencing strategies as the basis for successful linguistic communication. These include: linguistic presumption and communicative presumption, the presumption of literalness, relevance, sincerity, truthfulness, quantity and quality [1, p. 316].

Interactional model of communication considers the interaction in the socio-cultural situation as the basic principle. The system of norms of social behavior serves as the basis of linguistic communication. The nature of the (trans)formation of meaning in communication is not due to linguistic code structures, but to communicative and social practices [2, p. 398–405]. The aspects of communication as behavior are placed in the center of the model. Communication occurs not just as a stream of information, or manifestation of intention, but also as a demonstration of meaning, and they are not necessarily initiated and intended for interpretation by the recipient. Any behavior, action, silence, lack of action,



facial flushing, trembling of hands, in a certain situation can be of communicative significance. Therefore, while the individual is in a situation of communication (i.e., he/she is observed by another individual), he/she, regardless of his/her own wish, shows meaning. The great role is given to the activity of the perceiving human, since without the co-participation of communicants in the process of the meanings demonstration and especially their interpretation (which plays the role of criteria of success and main purpose of a communicative act) no communication or joint activity could occur [10, p. 39]. The purpose of this interpretation of meanings that occurs in the process of constant “negotiations”, flexible dialectics of the collective understanding of social reality is the achievement of inter-subjectivity (psychological or phenomenological experience of the commonality of thoughts, interests, emotions, feelings, actions). This inter-subjectivity (community) is a dynamic phenomenon, which is in constant motion, change, and part of the communicative work is always aimed at the reproduction, the achievement and maintenance in each new communicative act. In the interactional model of communication we can observe a strong situational affection, which is expressed in the account of extra-linguistic factors of communication and activities in general, to use a broad socio-cultural context. The researcher is dealing with “background knowledge”, which is conventional in nature, but far from the level of algorithmic language code. The role of common values in the interactional model remains quite high, while the dependence on the code is greatly reduced compared to the information-code model. It seems to us that it is the interactional model that more adequately captures the essence of the communication process, if we recognize the priority of the communication in relation to information.

Modelling of communication is always associated with the pragmatic aspect as the inevitable look at communication from the point of view of its main participant – the person. Knowledge of the language system (e.g., language rules) is only one of the prerequisites for the success of linguistic communication; the other prerequisite is a sufficiently automated strategies and mechanisms of production and processing of expressions, constructed in accordance with this system [4, p. 197–222].

The concepts of “pragmatic context” and “pragmatic understanding” that were introduced by T.A. van Dijk are quite interesting in this regard [3, p. 12–41]. In his opinion, pragmatic understanding is a kind of sequence of processes, the content of which is attributing the statements of the participants of communication special conventional nature of illocutionary force [3, p. 14–15]. Information can come from different sources and through different channels. First, it is the grammatical structure of the utterance, which is defined by rules. Second, paralinguistic characteristics (e.g., gestures, facial expressions, rate of speech, stress, intonation); communication is often successful because of the verbal and non-verbal forms can be used simultaneously, in the course of the primary message. Thirdly, it is knowledge and opinions about the talking, about the features of this and previous communicative situation, knowledge of a general nature (for example, the conventional rules about the interaction), as well as general knowledge about the world. The success of communication is most likely when the parties communicate in a specific context have the same set of pragmatic presumptions, exerting a decisive influence on the wording of the statements, and, consequently, on their interpretation.

The following question arises: can't we make the wrong choice of interpretation of the speech act? After all, the meanings that the individual ascribes to the objects of the understanding, is drawn from his individual inner consciousness that is formed on the basis of language and sensory impressions. Every person gives the statements and the things its own individual meaning, own interpretation. This problem was researched by the famous philosopher and linguist W. Humboldt, speaking of the paradoxes of understanding and misunderstanding in the communication process. How does verbal communication become possible? How consistent is the variety of interpretations with the fact that people nonetheless understand each other, work together and are able to come to a consensus?

The point of view expressed by A.L. Nikiforov seems to be reasonable. He thinks that the answer to these questions is to be sought in the analysis of the nature of the individual semantic context or the spiritual

world identity [11, p. 86]. In other words, despite individual uniqueness, “individual semantic context” has something in common with the semantic contexts of other individuals. This common aggregate context is a reflection of objective reality, i.e. the world in which we live. And since this world is shared, one for all, the individual contexts of different people, reflecting that the objective world needs to be similar to each other. In addition, we are all members of one society, one culture. In childhood we acquire language, that is the means of transmission of culture and spiritual values, we learn to give words and sentences much the same sense, i.e., those which passed at this time, in a particular society.

Communication plays a decisive role, where it acts not just as a process of exchange between processors of information, and as a constitutive factor of behavior and activities of man and society [10, p. 40], that J. Habermas called communicative action. In our case, the communicative action becomes a process of social interaction of subjects of social being and social consciousness. We should mention that the dominant role of one towards another is conditional and relative. More important for us is the fact that according to the law of dialectical synthesis information and communication environment appears that becomes the social space where language experience, gaining structure, coherence, wholeness is filled with significance and meaning. Information tools are becoming part of communication, and their significance is not in relation to other information tools, but in relation to other communicative means. According to M.L. Makarov, the information tools are ideological, discursive deployments and “play a constitutive role in communication, creating the illusion of the knowable world ... and contribute to the knowledge supposedly independent from the interaction of reality” [10, p. 40].

### **Conclusion**

Therefore, considering language models and the relationship of information and communicative aspects of language, we are not inclined to give priority to neither information nor communication and postulate a dialectical unity, the interconnectedness and convergence of informa-

tion and communication of the parts in the language. The basis of dialectical information and communications, from our point of view, is the ability to transition and interpenetration. Justifying dialectical unity and the convergence of information and communicative aspects of the language, we reveal the factors that provide this unity, i.e., globalization, informatization and social mobility in society (changes in individual or group social position, the place occupied in the social structure) as a result of crises occurring in the country in recent decades.

### *References*

1. Akmajian A. *Linguistics: An introduction to Language and Communication*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1990. 508 p.
2. Schiffrin D. *Approaches to Discourse: Language as a Social Interaction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1994. 480 p.
3. Dejk T.A. van. *Jazyk. Poznanie. Kommunikacija* [Language. Cognition. Communication]. Blagoveshhensk. BGK im. I.A. Bodujena de Kurtene, 2000. 308 p.
4. Dem'janenkov V.Z. O formalizacii pragmaticheskikh svojstv jazyka [On the Formalization of the Pragmatic Properties of Language]. *Jazykova-ja dejatel'nost' v aspekte lingvisticheskoj pragmatiki* [Language activity in the aspect of linguistic pragmatics]. M.: INION AN SSSR, 1984, pp. 197–222.
5. Kagan M.S. *Mir obshhenija: Problema mezhsujektnyh otnoshenij* [The World of Communication: The Issue of Intersubject Relations]. M.: Politizdat, 1998. 319 p.
6. Kazakova N.T. Fenomenologicheskie osnovanija chelovecheskogo obshhenija: sushhnost' i sushhestvovanie [Phenomenological Foundations of Human Communication: the Essence and Existence]. *Lichnost', tvorchestvo i sovremennost'* [Personality, creativity and modernity]. Krasnojarsk: Izd-vo Sib.jur.in-ta, 2005. Issue 8, pp. 134–136.
7. *Kollektiv. Lichnost'. Obshhenie.: Slov. social.-psihol. Ponjatij* [The Collective. Personality. Communication: The Dictionary of Social-psychol. Terms]; Pod red. E.S. Kuz'mina, V.E. Semenova. Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1987. 143 p.

8. Kolmakov V.Ju. *Informacija. Informacionnost'. Virtual'nost'* [Information. Information Properties. Virtuality]. Krasnojarsk, Izd-vo SibGTU, 2004. 224 p.
9. Leont'ev A.A. *Psihologija obshhenija* [Psychology of Communication]. M.: Smysl, 1997. 366 p.
10. Makarov M.L. *Osnovy teorii diskursa* [Fundamentals of the Discourse Theory]. M.: Gno-zis, 2003. 276 p.
11. Nikiforov A.L. Poznanie kak otrazhenie i ponimanie [Cognition as Reflection and Understanding]. *Zagadka chelovecheskogo ponimaniya* [Riddle of human understanding]. M.: Politizdat, 1991, pp. 259–264.
12. Siforov V.I. Informologija i problemy informacionnyh setej. Metodologicheskie aspekty i perspektivy nauki ob informacii [Information Studies and Issues of Information Networks. Methodological Aspects and Perspectives of Information Science]. *Informacija i informacionnye seti* [Information and information networks]. M.: Nauka, 1977, pp. 5–31.
13. *Sovremennaja zapadnaja sociologija: Slovar'* [Contemporary Western Sociology: The Dictionary]. M.: Politizdat, 1990. 432 p.
14. Strosen P.F. Namerenie i konvencija v rechevyh aktah [Intention and Convention in Speech Acts]. *Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike* [New in foreign linguistics]. Issue 17. M., 1986, pp. 136–137.
15. *Filosofskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar'* [Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary]. M.: Izd-vo Sovetskaja jenciklopedija, 1983. 840 p.
16. Shannon K. *Raboty po teorii informacii i kibernetike* [Works on Information Theory and Cybernetics]. M.: Izd.in.lit-ry, 1963. 821 p.
17. Shmeleva Zh.N. *Jazyk kak informacionno-kommunikativnaja sistema* [Language as an Information and Communication System]. Krasnojarsk: Izd-vo Krasn. gos. agr. un-ta, 2009. 142 p.
18. Jakobson R.O. *Jazyk v otnoshenii k drugim sistemam kommunikacii* [Language in Relation to Other Communication Systems]. M.: Progress, 1985, pp. 319–330.
19. Jakobson R.O. *Izbrannye raboty po lingvistike* [Selected works on linguistics]. Blagoveshhensk: Izd-vo BGK im. I.A. Bodujena de Kurtene, 1998. 449 p.

*Список литературы*

1. Akmajian A. Linguistics: An introduction to Language and Communication. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1990. 508 p.
2. Schiffrin D. Approaches to Discourse: Language as a Social Interaction. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1994. 480 p.
3. Дейк Т.А. ван. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. Благовещенск. БГК им. И.А. Бодуэна де Куртене, 2000. 308 с.
4. Демьяненко В.З. О формализации прагматических свойств языка. // Языковая деятельность в аспекте лингвистической прагматики. М.: ИНИОН АН СССР, 1984. С. 197–222.
5. Каган М.С. Мир общения: Проблема межсубъектных отношений. М.: Политиздат, 1998. 319 с.
6. Казакова Н.Т. Феноменологические основания человеческого общения: сущность и существование. // Личность, творчество и современность. Красноярск: Изд-во Сиб.юр.ин-та, 2005. Вып.8. С. 134–136.
7. Коллектив. Личность. Общение: Слов. социал.-психол. понятий/ Под ред. Е. С. Кузьмина, В. Е. Семенова. Л.: Лениздат, 1987. 143 с.
8. Колмаков В.Ю. Информация. Информационность. Виртуальность. Красноярск, Изд-во СибГТУ, 2004. 224 с.
9. Леонтьев А.А. Психология общения. М.: Смысл, 1997. 366 с.
10. Макаров М.Л. Основы теории дискурса. М.: Гнозис, 2003. 276 с.
11. Никифоров А.Л. Познание как отражение и понимание. // Загадка человеческого понимания. М.: Политиздат, 1991. С. 259–264.
12. Сифоров В.И. Информология и проблемы информационных сетей. Методологические аспекты и перспективы науки об информации. // Информация и информационные сети. М.: Наука, 1977. С. 5–31.
13. Современная западная социология: Словарь. М.: Политиздат, 1990. 432 с.
14. Стросон П.Ф. Намерение и конвенция в речевых актах // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 17. М., 1986. С. 136–137.
15. Философский энциклопедический словарь. М.: Изд-во Советская энциклопедия, 1983. 840 с.
16. Шеннон К. Работы по теории информации и кибернетике. М.: Изд. ин.лит-ры, 1963. 821 с.

17. Шмелева Ж.Н. Язык как информационно-коммуникативная система. Красноярск: Изд-во Красн. гос. агр. ун-та, 2009. 142 с.
18. Якобсон Р.О. Язык в отношении к другим системам коммуникации. // Избранные работы. М.: Прогресс, 1985. С. 319–330.
19. Якобсон Р.О. Избранные работы по лингвистике. Благовещенск: Изд-во БГК им. И.А. Бодуэна де Куртене, 1998. 449 с.

#### **DATA ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

**Shmeleva Zhanna Nickolaevna**, Docent of the Business Language Department, Candidate of Science in Philosophy, Docent  
*Krasnoyarsk state agrarian university*  
*90, Mira Ave., Krasnoyarsk, 660049, Russian Federation*  
*shmelevazhanna@mail.ru*  
*SPIN-code: 6871- 6102*

#### **ДАнные ОБ АВТОРЕ**

**Шмелева Жанна Николаевна**, доцент кафедры Делового иностранного языка, кандидат философских наук, доцент  
*Федеральное государственное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Красноярский государственный университет»*  
*пр. Мира, 90, г. Красноярск, 660049, Российская Федерация*  
*shmelevazhanna@mail.ru*