КВАЛІФІКАЦІЙНА РОБОТА МАГІСТРА

МОВЛЕННЄВИЙ ЕТИКЕТ В ОНЛАЙН СПІЛКУВАННІ

Студентки групи МЛа 56-20

факультету германської філології

освітньо-професійної програми

Сучасні філологічні студії

(англійська мова і друга іноземна мова)

лінгвістика та перекладознавство

за спеціальністю 035 Філологія

Калінчук Вікторії Ігорівни

Допущена до захисту

«_____» _____ року

Завідувач кафедрии доктор

філологічних наук, професор

<u>Шутова Марія Олександрівна</u>

_____

(підпис)   (ПІБ

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів:_____

Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Науковий керівник:

кандидат педагогічних наук,

доцент **Соколець Ірина Іллівна**

Київ – 2021

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY

Professor G.G. Pocheptsov Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Master's Thesis

ETIQUETTE BEHAVIOR IN ONLINE COMMUNICATION

VIKTORIA KALINCHUK

Group MLa 56-20 (LLe)

Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. **Sokolets I.I.**

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv –2021

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Internet, a global network, as a powerful way of mass information and communication significantly amplifies people's communicative opportunities, offering various forms of virtual communication, such as an information web system, conversational forums, chats, the programs of quick connection, etc.

Today virtual communication is studied in the theory of information, mass communication, psychology, sociology, political science, cognitive science, linguistics, literature and many others.

With every coming year the multicultural auditorium of the Internet users becomes larger, therefore the study of principles, laws and rules of interaction in virtual space becomes more and more important. Recommendations and advice concerning proper behavior on the Internet got the name "netiquette" or "network etiquette".

Etiquette is studied by linguists (N.I. Formanovska, D. Crystal, A. Burkhardt, L. F. Kompantseva, E. Poust, V.E. Goldyn, O. Ilchenko), semiotics (G. G. Pocheptsov, T.V. Tsyvyan), ethnographers (A.K. Baiburin, A. L. Toporkov, S. Girt), philosophers (O.P. Protsenko) and other experts. Every year the attention to research on successful communication in the Internet increases, netiquette including. It should be mentioned that netiquette concerns not only speech communication in the Internet but also covers other technological, organizational, ethical, legal and education issues.

So, the actuality of the topic of the research is determined by the increased attention of modern linguists to the study of online communication, as well as the fact that the prerequisite for successive communication is the observance by communicants of the generally accepted rules of netiquette.

The object of the research is virtual communication in different Internet genres as the unity of verbal, graphic and visual components.

The subject of the research is speech etiquette in the genres of virtual communication, specifically English speech etiquette formulas used in them.

The aim of the Master's Qualification Paper is to identify English speech etiquette formulas and the peculiarities of their use in online communication.

The aim of this study is achieved by the fulfillment of the following **tasks**:

- to generalize information about traditional types of discourse;
- to identify genres of Internet communication;
- to analyze characteristic features of Internet discourse and of Internet language;
- to research speech etiquette, its features and functions;
- to reveal the netiquette concept, define its characteristic features, basic rules and functions in virtual communication;
- to define speech etiquette formulas and peculiar features of their use in the genres of online communication.

Material of the research is online communication in forums (tripadvisor, fodor), social networking sites (Facebook) and emails.

The total number of the speech etiquette formulas chosen by the method of continuous sampling is 135 statements.

In the course of the research the following **methods** were used: the method of continuous sampling; methods of description, generalization and systematization.

The scientific novelty of the obtained results is the description of netiquette as a coordinate system; identification of speech etiquette formulas and peculiarities of their use in online communication, namely messengers, social networks, chatlines and forums.

The practical value of the research is the possibility of using the results of the research to improve the communicative competence of the Internet users and their etiquette speech behavior in the virtual space.

The Master's Qualification Paper consists of Introduction, two Chapters, Conclusions, Resume, List of reference sources.

Introduction outlines the topicality, aim, main tasks, theoretical and practical value of this research.

Chapter I deals with the linguistic concept of online communication. The notion of Internet discourse, its characteristic features, genres and language used are investigated.

Chapter II is devoted to speech etiquette in genres of online communication

General conclusions summarize and generalize the obtained results.

CHAPTER ONE. LINGUISTIC CONCEPT OF ONLINE COMMUNICATION

1.1 The notion of discourse and approaches to its definition

The term "discourse" has a long history. It is known, that far back in the Latin language the term "discourse" appeared and meant "to run back and forth" that time (В. Демьянков, 2007, p. 87). In the middle of the last century the term discourse was reborn with the introduction of structural linguistics to nominate mainly the oral dialogical speech when linguists were interested in oral speech, which had not been pretty much investigated before. In the end of the 20th century the term became ingrained in all the humanities and political studies and is still keeping its development in different spheres of human knowledge.

The emergence of the new scientific paradigm was marked in the end of the 20th century. It was functionalism together with cognitive science, that were recognized as a new turn in linguistics. The efficiency of every new knowledge paradigm is invariably linked to reconsideration of heritage, which it gains from the previous paradigms and mostly from the fundamental ideas comprising the topical area in science.

Such situation has also influenced the definition of language per se within the cognitive science which considers it as an access arrangement to the brain's functions, mental activity and processes performed by the person. Olga V. Aleksandrova mentioned that "Under the new paradigm the language is understood as a specific sign system which allows the human to treat their own kind for the purpose to exchange information or to apply it any other way and which provides us with different types of human behavior studies in general" (O. Aleksandrova, 2005, p. 298). Through this perspective the language serves as a means to a certain cognitive end within communicative processes, or as a medium of communication aimed at the solution of particular communicative tasks. A constant relationship between cognition and communication alongside with their permanent interaction emphasized in this definition requires a clarification of a long-standing opinion that the language is interwoven into almost all the kinds of human activity and

claim that in all these cases we actually observe a simultaneous performance of cognitive and communicative – or discursive – functions of the language.

Differentiation and, particularly, opposition of the mentioned functions is entirely conventional and determined rather by epistemological focuses in researches on such a complex object as the language than by ontological circumstances. According to these views, to adequately characterize any linguistic phenomenon we must consider it "at the crossroads of cognition and communication" and discursive activity must, first and foremost, be defined as verbal and cogitative one.

It should be noted that in the second half of the 20th century the term "discourse" was addressed through social and ideological meaning, but not only the linguistic one (E. Malyuga, D. Maksimova, M. Ivanova, 2019, p. 311). It was that time, when the researchers made their attempts to define the discourse and mark it off the text. There are numerous definitions of the term "discourse", still none of them is recognized as precise, complete and comprehensive. For instance, E.S. Kubryakova notes that discourse is a term which covers not just a new linguistic reality, but even its higher reality in the sense that it is discourse that stays at the top of linguistic hierarchy (Е. Кубрякова, 2004, p. 87). One more definition is given in the Cambridge Dictionary: "a speech or piece of writing about a particular, usually serious, subject (78). For instance, Petrey manifests discourse as text and talk in social practices (Petrey, 2016, p. 78). That is, the focus is on the medium for interaction, but not on language as an abstract entity such as a lexicon and set of grammatical rules. D. Schiffrin suggests a similar opinion about discourse, especially the written discourse (D. Schiffrin, 2001, p. 217). According to him, it is an interactive process between authors, readers or audiences.

N.A. Aharkova gives a linguistic definition of discourse and describes discourse as "a text dipped into the life" (Агаркова, 2012, p. 45). Such an inclusive definition that allows analyzing discourse as a phenomenon going far beyond any philological frames has made it most acceptable for the wide range of researchers.

The studying of discourse involves the occurrence of new research areas, such, for example, as the conceptual view of the world and its reflection in the language, the problems of inference, intertextuality, etc. Certainly, discourse studies relate to the whole range of linguistic and speech phenomena, and, consequently there is a new paradigm for their analysis which E.S. Kubryakova called a cognitive-discursive one (Кубрякова, 2004, p. 311). Many contemporary scholars note that the analysis of discourse is focused on the linguistic knowledge based on the level above words, phrases or sentences and, mainly, on the context of not only linguistic, but also extralinguistic nature. Of course, the language is not just a simple mirror reflection: the language reflects the world, but, at the same time, influences the environment around us. A fundamental point in the discursive analysis is that it considers the language as a basic part within the constructive human life perspective. Therefore, to examine discourse it is necessary to understand that the environment is created by the discourse which we use. L.Wood and R. Kroger mention that the main condition for the discursive analysis is that a socio-political world around us does not exists apart from us, from people, who create it (Wood, Kroger, 2000, p. 56). To create a particular discourse we should take into consideration the following: what we create a certain text for and what its goal is; how and what for this goal is achieved; what social context there will be as a space for the speech act. It is also important to identify its place and genre.

The analysis of oral communicative products was in the Steger's focus of attention. He examined features of different situations and identified six types of discourse: presentation, message, report, public debate, conversation and interview. Such factors as presence or absence of interaction, number of speakers and their relation to each other (their rights, or as Steger names it "rank"), flexibility of topic along with selection and attitude of interlocutors towards the subject matter were the criteria of this division.

However, it should be mentioned that oral discourse might change its character in some way, for instance in the process of presenting a lecture, students

may start asking questions and as a result the type may change to an interview, or even to a conversation.

Apart from evident differences between speech and writing, for example, that writing includes some medium which keeps record of the conveyed message while speech involves only air, there are certain dissimilarities that are less apparent. For instance, the speaker who chooses the speed of his speech that is suitable for him, even if it may not be appropriate for the listener and though a request for repetition is possible, it is difficult to imagine a conversation in which every sentence is to be rephrased. On the other hand, talking might be spontaneous which results in mistakes, repetition, sometimes less coherent sentences, and stutters or pauses might be meaningful. The speaker understands who the listener is and it helps the speaker to adjust the register. As interlocutors are most often in face-to-face encounters (unless using a phone), they also use extralinguistic signals like grimaces or gesticulation. Some specific expressions such as *here, now,* or *this* are used. Another feature of oral discourse is availability of nonsense vocabulary, slang and contracted forms *we're, you've* and inability to conceal mistakes made while speaking. It is also important to mention rhythm, intonation, speed of uttering as significant features of speech.

As for writing, it develops space, so it needs means to carry the information. The author of the text cannot adjust to readers' specific expectations, because he/she does not often know who is going to read the text. The writer has time to consider the content of his work and as result it becomes more coherent, having complex syntax. The writer also has some time to check his text and correct some mistakes. As a response the reader might ask for clarification of some unclear items. The division into paragraphs and layout are of vital importance to make comprehension easier. Y. Turdiyeva mentions that "naturally, this division into two ways of producing discourse is quite straightforward, yet it is possible to combine the two like, for example, in case of a lesson, when a teacher explains something written on the blackboard, or when a speaker prepares detailed notes to be read out during his/her speech" (Y. Turdiyeva, 2018, p. 138). Moreover, it

should be mentioned that some of the foregoing features are not compulsory in sophisticated, formal speech or a friendly letter.

In modern linguistics, discourse is interpreted ambiguously and there are several approaches to the study of discourse, among them communicative, structural-syntactic, structural and stylistic, and socio-pragmatic.

1. Communicative (functional) approach studies discourse as verbal communication (speech). From the point of view of the communicative approach, the term "discourse" is interpreted as "a kind of sign structure, that made discourse by its subject, object, place, time, circumstances of creation (production)" (Л.Ф. Формановская, 2005, p. 187).

2. Structural-syntactic approach describes discourse as a fragment of a text, (over-phrasal unity, complex syntactic whole, paragraph). Discourse is understood as two or more sentences that are in semantic connection with each other. One of the main features of discourse is coherence.

3. Structural and stylistic approach considers discourse as a non-textual organization of colloquial speech, characterized by uncertain division into parts, the dominance of associative links, spontaneity, situationalism, high contextuality, and stylistic specificity.

4. According to the socio-pragmatic approach discourse is a text immersed in a situation of communication or a social or ideologically limited type of utterance, but presented as a special social datum with its own texts.

This classification makes it possible to understand that the core of discourse is threefold. One is pragmatics, typical situations of communication, the other one is the processes, which take place in the minds of the participants of communication, and the characteristics of their consciousness, and the third one is the text itself.

Those approaches are contradictory in some way. The concept of discourse is comprehended in inseparable connection with the concepts of speech and text. V. Labow in his work mentioned: "Discourse as a communicative phenomenon is an intermediate link between speech as verbal communication, as an activity, on

the one hand, and a specific text recorded during communication, on the other"
(V. Labow, 1973, p. 245).

So, discourse should be understood as a cognitive process associated with real speech production, and text – as the end result of the process of speech activity, verbalized in a certain completed form. The dominant approaches in discourse analysis in order to study the use of language for social, expressive and referential purposes may be the theory of speech acts, pragmatics, ethnomethodology, interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication and variational sociolinguistics.

1.2 Internet discourse and its characteristic features

Communication in the Internet has become available relatively recently, but computer networks are rapidly getting the status of the main means in interpersonal communication. Internet communication and Internet discourse are the subject of study of many disciplines: sociology, psychology, management, rhetoric, journalism and some others. But the linguistic aspect of Internet discourse is not developed enough.

Since the beginning of 2000, Internet discourse has come to replace many other forms of communication. Being a universal means of mass and individual communication, Internet discourse enabled the instantaneous transmission of information regardless of distance and geographic location. A huge virtual area of the Internet offers the user a wide range of platforms: media, blogs, information sites, cinema, literature, wikis projects, shops and auctions, advertising, payment and search engines, e-mail, chats, forums, messengers, social networks, radio, television, information portals, etc.

For this new interpersonal communicative environment, scholars use different terms. For instance, L.F. Kompantseva considers that Internet communication is a special environment, the place of the language implementation that has never existed before but has allowed to thoroughly study the communicative potential of the language, its tendencies of functioning in a specific

linguocultural environment (Компанцева, 2007, p. 19). Foreign researchers use the term "computer-mediated communication" or "computer-mediated discourse", also "virtual discourse", "computer discourse", "electronic discourse", "network discourse" and others (Herring, 1996, p. 47). The terms "computer discourse" and "electronic discourse" are absolute synonyms because they imply communication with the help of the computer. Internet discourse is understood as communication via the Global Network and as a kind of network discourse. Thus, these types of discourse are in hyper-hyponymic relations, where the computer "electronic discourse" acts as a hyperonym and the communication environment is determined by the communication channel (Калініна, 2012, p. 63).

As far as computer and virtual discourses are concerned, it is considered that virtual discourse is narrower since the latter is not only communication with a computer but also communication with a computer. Also, computer discourse is characterized by the direct contact between communicators, which is not the case with virtual communication, where the communication partner largely deludes our consciousness. On the other hand, Internet discourse is interpreted broader than computer discourse, since virtual reality communication is created not only by computer but also by other means of communication (Лутовинова, 2009, p. 128). There are also researchers who use the concept of 'hypertext as a model for organizing an electronic text, characterized by a specific structure and complex system of programmatically supported intertext and intertext transitions, suggesting the possibility of interactive activities that affect the sequence of composite units reproduction. For instance, I. Ilina believes that the reason for hypertext studies in the humanities is the postmodernist direction of the philosophical thought (И. Ильина, 2009, p. 17).

Other ideas are proposed, for instance, by M.S. Ryzhkov, who points that Internet discourse is a cognitive-communicative space of the Global Network, in which communicative interaction, characterized by replacing the real image with fictional is conducted by means of the electronic data transmission channel and

hypertextual mechanism of their structuring by verbal means (М. С. Рижков, 2009, p. 339).

N. Aharkova considers that Internet discourse is the process of creating texts in conjunction with pragmalinguistic, socio-cultural, and psychological factors; this purposeful social action includes the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (Агаркова, 2012, p. 46). P. Kondrashov suggests that the Internet discourse is a complex text system due to extralinguistic, socio-cultural factors and the specific situation of entering into speech contact with a computer and other electronic devices either by users with each other on the Internet or users with the discursive Internet space (П. Кондрашов, 2004, p. 98).

It should be noted that the peculiarity of all the given definitions is the synthesis of traditional linguistic knowledge and a new field of research – Internet communication. Such a synthesis makes it possible to determine the relationship between the established scientific knowledge and the innovative field of research presented in lexical markers to existing linguistic terms.

L.F. Kompantseva mentions that specific criteria of rule-making are formed in Internet communication. Internet discourse is a communicative event of the Network, a communicative situation recorded in hypertext; a systemic process of correlation of symbolic-linguistic communication of online communicators, a way of representation of virtual linguistic personalities in the unity of psychological, social, national, ethical and other characteristics (Компанцева, 2007, p. 20). The process of the formation of the term Internet discourse points to the formation of the linguistic paradigm of Internet communication, the formation of a terminological system.

The main requirements for the organization of information construction within the Internet discourse is the clear division of the text field into certain segments and ensuring internal links between them, which is possible due to hypertext – a kind of text document, some parts of which are linked by hyperlinks (Варламова, 2006, p. 10). Hyperlinks and message texts as structural elements of hypertext acquire a linguistic representation in the form of an electronic document.

Internet discourse hyperlinks are the list of keywords or phrases; underlined and highlighted keyword (phrase). The main function of the hyperlink is to provide the ability to navigate the electronic text (Лукашенко, 2006, p. 8).

The features of Internet discourse are diverse. Like virtual reality itself, internet discourse presupposes the obligatory presence of communicants, manifesting their illocutionary attitudes; it is created at the moment "here and now"; it absorbs referential and pragmatic semantics, as it correlates with the participants in the speech act, their social status, the nature of interpersonal relations, etc. Internet discourse always requires immediate feedback but at the same time it is psychologically comfortable, as the component of convention removes the feeling of responsibility for actions committed online and allows the individual to realize the illocutionary attitudes hidden in the real world for a moment.

The user can voluntarily initiate communication and optionally terminate the communication at any time. Another characteristic feature is the lack of the emotional component of communication, accompanied by a persistent desire for emotional filling of the text using special icons for marking emotions or describing emotions in words (Schegloff, 1981). Internet users are almost completely devoid of extra-linguistic aids, including voice, gestures, facial expressions. This emotional shortage is compensated by the introduction of substitute emotional reactions – "emoticons" into the virtual discourse (Л.Ф. Компанцева, 2005, p. 19).

The lack of transmission of color, sound, etc. on the Internet is replaced by symbolic analogs – exclamation marks, means of other language genres. There may also be some difficulty in describing the research material, as the electronic text stored on the network servers may be modified to update the information in any way, and then the link to this text becomes inactive (D. Crystal, 2001, p. 178).

The category of hypertextuality has a dual nature: on the one hand, it is a means of formalizing the discreteness of the text, and on the other – hypertext ensures the integrity of the perception of the text. It creates the effect of resonance

(mutual reinforcement), through which such texts are combined into a single semantic and sense whole (Назарова, 2009, p. 119).

Therefore, the most effective means of creating hypertext is a computer, because the whole set of texts recorded on the network in the written electronic form and associated with the perceived message, using a link device, is within easy reach of the recipient.

It should be noted, that hypertexts, "technically" connected to each other by reference apparatus, must be distinguished from thematically and organizationally (but not "technically") combined sequence of texts, such as a set of remarks of all participants in any discussion group. One of the most important features of the Internet language is the gradual deployment of hypertext. The full scheme of its deployment is the following: title (link) - title with annotation - part of the text (several parts can be opened sequentially) - full text (Malyuga, 2011, p. 22). Thus, Internet discourse is characterized by specific principles of structural organization, defined by hypertext.

The purpose of the Internet communication, of course, intersects with the goal of communication in general, but there are also quite significant differences. The Internet communication can be passive, for example, viewing news sites, reading various text information, visiting various net resources, downloading files, etc., or active like direct participation in communication, commentary on articles, use of social networks, etc. Being artificially created, virtual discourse is not just a technical communication channel, like a phone, but is, in essence, a new medium of communication in which communicants are unknown; however, there is a direct and diverse communicative influence (AbuSa'aleek, 2013). That is why virtual discourse acquires many distinctive features, while preserving the properties characteristic of discourse as a whole. The virtual discourse is characterized by the absence of visible social, gender and age gradation. Polyphony, hypertext and interactive features of the Network, anonymity and distantness are inherent in it.

Internet discourse, like any other type of discourse, is characterized by a number of structural and lexical-grammatical features. Among its own characteristic features, which distinguish it from other types of discourse, are:

1) electronic signal as a channel of communication;

2) virtuality;

3) distance, that is, separation in space and time;

4) mediationality (carried out with the help of technical means);

5) a high degree of permeability;

6) the presence of hypertext;

7) creolizality of a computer text;

8) primarily status equality of participants;

9) the transfer of emotions, facial expressions, feelings with the help of "emoticons";

10) a combination of different types of discourse;

11) specific computer ethics (Галичкина, 2001, p. 98).

Though Internet discourse is an independent type of discourse, it has similar features with spoken and written discourses as they influence each other.

Spoken discourse is characterized by a number of features, for instance the same time and space of the parties must be compulsory but only in case of a phone conversation or a voicemail, however these do not constitute an idealized spoken discourse, but rather are missing certain paralinguistic cues associated with the spoken discourse, such as gesture and facial expression. Of course, the information can be transported by the interlocutor who smiles and exclaims, *Great!* with the rising intonation and it differs from the situation when an interlocutor rolls the eyes and says, *Great!* with the falling intonation.

Laughter, a paralinguistic cue, is also a spoken discourse feature. D. Provine examined recordings of anonymous conversations in public places and found that laughter occurred during natural pauses, at the end of phrases and sentences. It was called the "punctuation effect" by D. Provine, because laughter occurred instead of punctuation in a written representation of the conversation (D. Provine,

1993, p. 293). Repairs can be made immediately because both interlocutors are present at the moment of communication. "An interlocutor can repeat a mispronounced word, or a listener can ask for clarification on an ambiguous or confusing statement or question, outline a number of turn taking principles of spoken discourse" (Schegloff, Jefferson, Sacks, 1972, p. 362).

Common dyadic or triadic exchange structures should also be mentioned. Dyadic structures include some adjacency pair exchange, for instance, greetings or farewells, questions and answers. As for a triadic structure, it includes some kind of feedback, it can be, for instance, a teacher's communication with a pupil: when the teacher first asks a question, the pupil responds, and finally the teacher either agrees or disagrees with the response (Sinclair, Coulthard, 1975, p. 57). The feedback is obviously an important part of spoken discourse. It can be represented in the form of laughter, nodding, or words like *uh huh* or *yeah*, but they give important information to the interlocutor. Schegloff notices that such feedback serves two functions (Schegloff, Jefferson, Sacks, 1972, p. 362). First, responses like *uh huh* can be interpreted as a request for more information. Secondly, *uh huh* can be used to pass on repairs. An interlocutor may pause and wait for the response, so the listener will not be confused and will understand everything.

It is of interest that some Internet discourse features can recreate the properties of spoken discourse, though the forms and techniques used are unique to Internet discourse. Emoticons are used to simulate facial expressions (Hentschel, 1998). A wide variety of emoticons, including smiley faces, frowny faces, surprised faces, and blushing faces can more or less recreate any facial expression. Expressions can also be recreated by naming the expression offset by asterisks, for example *grins.* This technique can also be used to denote onomatopoeias like *gluckgluckgluck* recreating the sound of a quick drinking (Fullwood, Martino, 2017).

Interlocutors can verbally hug, kiss, offer each other coffee, yawn, and pop champagne through the use of offsetting these gestures in asterisks, as Hentschel

found (Hentschel, 1998). Physical objects can be symbolized, for example a rose @}-'-,-'---, recreating the physical context of spoken discourse.

Prosodic cues from spoken discourse can also be recreated in Internet discourse. Periods, hyphens, and other punctuation signs are used to denote tempo (C. Werry, 1996, p. 220). Phonetic qualities of spoken discourse can be replicated through the creative orthography. Reduplication is used for emphasis, not necessarily mirroring natural possibilities of pronunciation. While they could be used to recreate the phonetic properties of spoken discourse, they do not serve the same purpose of holding the floor as they would in a spoken conversation.

Though some of these same features function differently in spoken discourse. Nonstandard spellings of words can be used for brevity and ease of typing. Competition for attention, screen size, average typing speed, the desire for minimal response times, channel population, and the fast pace of conversation – all motivate brevity in Internet relay chats. The phonetic spellings of sounds often correlate to a shorter form. Sometimes, words are even further reduced to forms such as *u* for *you* and *c* for *see* in English. Common words are often abbreviated by convention such as *pls* for *please* in English. Also, a wide range of acronyms are commonly used, including *lol* for *laugh out loud*, *rofl* for *rolling on the floor laughing, brb* for *be right back,* and *g2g* for *got to go.* Emoticons also can serve for functions other than simply recreating facial expressions. They can be used to exert illocutionary force on the statements they accompany.

Dresner and Herring give the example of a person posting about a recent flare-up on fibromyalgia on a Yahoo! support forum (Dresner, Herring, 2010). He ended his message with a smiley face emoticon, clearly not indicating that he was happy with his condition, but rather as a way to soften the sadness or negativity of his statements. According to Dresner and Herring, emoticons are used to demarcate a joke or to soften commands. They equate emoticons used in this way as comparable to gesture or facial expression that change the meaning of a phrase in spoken discourse or to punctuation such as question marks and exclamation marks that change the meaning of a phrase in written discourse.

Emoticons can also convey socio-emotional information. F. Fullwood and E. Martino examined the effects of emoticons on perception of the personality. (F. Fullwood, E. Martino, 2017, p. 10). Participants asked prompted questions through an instant messenger and received pre-determined answers, either containing emoticons or not. After completing the "conversation", the participants were asked to rate their conversation partner on their extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience. Those who received responses, including emoticons, rated their partners as being more extraverted and agreeable than those who did not receive responses with emoticons.

Turn taking principles are also significantly altered in Internet discourse, as compared to spoken discourse. An interlocutor can hold the floor by entering small chunks into a conversation in an Internet relay chat or instant messaging conversation. C. Hentschel found that these chunks were often incomplete sentences or phrases, helping to indicate that the interlocutor had not finished their turn (Hentschel, 1998). Also, turns do not need to be taken in a sequential manner. While turns are typically sequential, disrupted turn adjacency does not negatively impact cohesion or comprehension of the conversation for either interlocutor. The written form of the conversation takes advantage of these turn taking principles, allowing for non-linear flow and incomplete text entry.

Also maximizing the written form, C. Werry (1996) found that multiple conversations took place simultaneously in Internet relay chat, leading to rapid topic changes. In addition, while instant messaging and Internet relay chats are typically synchronous, they can be used asynchronously, or an interlocutor can excuse himself from a conversation and come back at whim. N. Baron examined instant messaging conversation and was surprised by a low number of turns per minute, suggesting that interlocutors were not directing their attention solely to the conversation, or that they were leaving the conversation for short periods of time (Baron, 2004, p. 398). She also found anecdotal evidence that they were multitasking while participating in the conversations. In this way, an interlocutor

can enter a turn and come back to the conversation later, picking up where the conversation left off.

As far as written discourse is concerned, it is considered to be, in its idealized form, an asynchronous form of communication. The writer is removed in both time and space from the reader. One of the features of written discourse is the exploitation of its visual nature. It means that font and colour can be used to change the general feeling of the writing. But what is more important, a writer also has the ability to edit the work as much as he needs, when a speaker is obliged to produce speech until the idea is complete. On the other hand, a writer has no opportunity for immediate repairs and has to accurately judge the prior knowledge of the reader to communicate successfully, while a speaker can easily add more information if the listener does not understand. The syntax of written discourse is substantively more structured than that of spoken discourse (Brown, 2015, p. 330). In spoken discourse there are many incomplete sentences, often just a series of phrases, while written discourse is characterized by complete and grammatically correct sentences. Another feature of written discourse is a great deal of relative clauses and subordination, in contrast to spoken discourse. There are a lot of complementizers *that*, temporal markers *when/while*, and logical connectors *despite, since, besides, however,* etc.) in organizing the more elaborately syntactically structured sentences of written discourse. A much smaller set of typical organizers, such as *and, but, then* and *if* is common for spoken discourse. Another feature of written discourse is that passive constructions are not rare while spoken discourse is less syntactically complicated.

Of course, a significant amount of communication occurs outside the realm of the idealized informal conversation of spoken discourse and the formal academic writing or letter writing of written discourse. As already mentioned, voice messages lack the feedback of a listener. Notes passed back and forth may take a more informal nature than written discourse. An oral presentation usually contains more formal sentence structure than spoken discourse. Even in an informal conversation, a speaker that spends a significant amount of time reading,

may incorporate elements of written discourse in his/her speech, while someone who rarely reads may use informal elements of spoken discourse in their writing.

The influence of spoken discourse on Internet discourse was also investigated by scientists. For example, K. Ferrara, H. Brunner, and G. Whittemore (1991) found out that conversations had a dyadic exchange structure, typical of spoken discourse. In addition, informal discourse particles are often used in informal speech, such as, for instance, *okay, sure, sorry* and *now*. R. A. Al-Sa'di and J. M. Hamdan (2005), analyzing internet relay chats, mentioned that interlocutors use the feature of spoken discourse, making immediate repairs, responding to a clarification question from another interlocutor.

R. Provine, R. Spencer and D. Mandell (2007), examining postings on net-site message boards, focused on the usage of laughter verbalized by the acronym *LOL,* meaning *Laughing Out Loud,* and smiley emoticons. Laughter can be found either alone or at the beginning or end of questions and phrases, used like some kind of mimicking – the punctuation effect of laughter in spoken discourse.

Internet discourse is influenced both by spoken discourse and by written discourse. In the visual context of Internet discourse, we can easily see the influence of written discourse, because Internet discourse is a written form of communication.

Like in written discourse, the interlocutors are physically, temporally separated. E-mail, list-serves, and wall posts are included in asynchronous forms of Internet discourse. Chat rooms (Internet relay chats) refer to synchronous forms and their aim is to interchange instant messages. Hentchel analyzed a number of internet relay chats and made some conclusions, among them that capital letters were often used to denote yelling or usage of a raised voice – it is the same technique that is used in written discourse to provide the same kind of emphasis. Emoticons are often used to simulate facial expressions (Hentschel, 1998). Smiley faces, frowny faces, surprised faces, and blushing faces, which more or less recreate any facial expression, are used as part of Internet discourse.

Filler words are also present in Internet discourse, while they could be used to recreate the phonetic properties of spoken discourse, they do not serve the same purpose of holding the floor as they would in a spoken conversation. Nonstandard spelling of words can be used for brevity and ease of typing. The phonetic spelling of sounds often correlates to a shorter form.

So, though Internet discourse has many features of its own, it has much in common with spoken and written discourse, such as, for instance, punctuation effect of laughter, informal language, typical of spoken conversation, meaningful non-word sounds, new word formation mimicking the flexibility of informal speech. Written discourse also showed a significant influence on Internet discourse: contractions were found to be common, and similarly to informal and vague language, capital letters for emphasis of particular words and phrases, complementizers indicating a certain level of formality in the syntactic structuring of sentences and phrases, logical connector similarly indicating a higher level of syntactic structuring, orthographic shortenings, etc.

Researches devoted to this problem, for instance that of K. Ferrara found many uses of non-word speech sounds that carried meaning such as *hmmm* and *eh* (Ferrara, 1991, p. 20). These words may be used for the purpose of orthographically representing the metalinguistic sounds present in a spoken conversation. Conglomerations between phonetic and acronymic abbreviations were also identified. Phrases like *ttu later* combine an acronym for *talk to you* with a phonological shortening of the word *you* to *u* forming the abbreviation *ttu*. Misspellings were also found not to affect conversation in a negative way. Words were often not capitalized when they would have been in written discourse. This, too, apparently had no negative effect on the ability for interlocutors to communicate clearly with one another.

Punctuation was also found to be different from the conventional written discourse. Periods were not necessary for the clear organization of ideas and were replaced with commas, emoticons or laughter. Ellipses were used frequently and for both temporal spacing, as C. Werry found, to connect complete sentences or

ideas and to indicate that the interlocutor wished to hold the floor (Werry, 1996, p. 199).

Taking into account the aforementioned, we are not inclined to agree with the researchers who describe synchronous online communication as "interactive written discourse". This term expresses two elements: first, and most explicitly, the written form of the conversation, which is emphasized, asserting a similarity to written discourse; second, the conversational nature of online conversation is expressed by the term "interactive", describing the semi-synchronous form of Internet discourse. However, interactive written discourse as a whole is not a representative term for Internet discourse. It may be that Internet discourse has more in common with spoken discourse due to the informal features of online conversation than with written discourse.

Though different discourses can influence each other, Internet discourse should be considered as an independent form of discourse, sufficiently distinct from spoken and written discourse, taking into account its semi-synchronous form and ability to flexibly change words through new word formation and reduplication, to create hybrid abbreviations, and also its unique usage of punctuation.

Internet discourse expresses emotion fundamentally differently from spoken and written discourse. The use of emoticons and the expression of emotions and gestures offsets between asterisks cannot be accounted for by either spoken or written discourse. A pervasive lack of capitalization is unlike even informal written discourse. New word formation, hybrid forms of abbreviations indicate the unique ability of Internet discourse as well as the rules of punctuation, which are different for Internet discourse in comparison with the written one (Hewes, 2016).

As far as the difference from the spoken discourse is concerned, Internet discourse is semi-synchronous, whereas spoken discourse is fully synchronous. A spoken conversation cannot continue if both parties are not listening, on the other hand, an online conversation records turns and so an interlocutor can "listen" and "talk" as they allow conversation partners to devote only limited attention to each

other while performing other tasks. Reduplication also functions distinctly in Internet discourse, allowing for reduplication in ungrammatical and unpronounceable forms.

1.3 Genres of online communication

In recent years linguists have come to realize that the Internet is a new multifaceted field of language. According to many researchers, the language of the network, due to its functional dynamism, a number of new trends in communicative-pragmatic organization can be defined as a special type. The terms e-language, E-talk, wired-style, geekspeak, netspeak, Internet language are actively used in the English-language research of the Network (Crystal, 2001, p. 189). The language of the Internet is opposed as another kind of language to the generally accepted norms of oral and written communication.

Earlier, there were only verbal and non-verbal types of communication, but now there is another more effective form of communication – online communication. It is extremely prevalent in our current society. Almost everyone participates in some form of computer-mediated communication. Internet communication allows a person to communicate with another person half way around the world, send a message that can be answered later, or one that has to be responded immediately. There are also some disadvantages that include the loss of conversational depth during the process of electronic communication, that can be found in offline communication and that could lead to unintended interpretations and outcomes. Even video conferencing is not a complete substitute for offline communication (Hoey, 1984, p. 117).

Moreover, there is a lot of information for the user to read online. The process of transporting everything online has made a situation when everything is being done online, including not only banking, reserving tickets, booking travel, planning travel, purchasing any and every kind of things, teaching, conducting meetings and seminars, one on one or group discussions, dating, sending information. Nowadays every other activity which is possible is being done online.

The growth of online communication is fast and rapidly replacing traditional communication methods, and paper-based communication has reduced a lot since the evolution of online communication.

The Internet discourse has a complex structure, it consists of a multitude of independent thematic centers: politics, economics, sports, culture, agriculture, medicine, entertainment, music, cooking, education, etc.

There are several systems of classifications of Internet genres, depending on the time of communication, the type of subjects, the openness or closeness of the community, from multimedia and whether this genre may exist outside the Internet space or not. The most popular Internet-based genres are e-mail, chat, forum, blog, social networks. Besides, users' comments, guest books, electronic bulletin boards, various games and entertainment projects, as well as multimedia applications that support audio and video transmission, as well as file sharing between users can be distinguished. In the discursive aspect, computer communication includes plot and message, statement and reasoning, argumentation and evidence, that is, the whole terminology of scientific, business and other styles (Petrey, 2016). From the standpoint of the sociolinguistic approach, we can talk about the Internet discourse as a complete linguistic category, which combines the signs of personality-oriented and status-oriented discourse (Кондрашов, 2004, p. 113).

Internet discourse is a global poly-discursive generic phenomenon, which includes a large number of sub-discourses. Sub-discourse is a local element of the global discourse of the Net, characterized by thematic, genre, and linguistic design of messages submitted to any site on the Internet. Virtual genres have not completely formed yet; they will evolve and change in the minds of the development of Internet technologies. At present, we can distinguish the following most common genres of Internet discourse: chat, ICQ, social network, Internet blog, community (network communities) and others.

D. Crystal points the genre formats of electronic discourse, which combine smaller forms of language genres (Crystal, 2001, p. 88). Genre formats of virtual discourse include e-mail (including various mailings, spam, viruses), synchronous

(chats, ICQ) and asynchronous (forums, conferences, virtual diaries) discursive practices, electronic boards, virtual worlds.

The genre formats of the network are based on the following cognitive-pragmatic genre-creating parameters: communicative purpose of the genre, author's concept, addressee's concept, event content, communicative past factor, communicative future factor and linguistic embodiment; communication situation, organizations of language genres, communicative register of discourse, implementation in the structure of hypertext, ethnocultural representation, the possibility of global interactive development of the genre, etc. (Лутовинова, 2012).

There are multiple forms of online communications that people have been using for the past years. While the communication started from email, today, numerous methods are used in online communication.

One of the first and most popular forms of electronic communication is email, which allows users to send messages and files over the Internet. Emails are considered to be the first forms of communication developed in an online communication method. It is one of the fastest ways and is deemed to be professional everywhere, used both for personal and professional goals.

Gmail, Yahoo mail, Microsoft Outlook, and Protonmail are a few popular mailing applications and services. One of the best things about email is that one does not have to wait for weeks to receive it. This type of mail arrives moments after it has been sent. According to recent statistics, teenagers regard email as a more formal mode of communication and they usually use it for school or exchanging messages with adults. Teenagers find emails to be too slow and time consuming, compared to instant messaging.

A small size of the mobile phone screen and a limited number of characters have led to the emergence of the "sms language" (from the English sms "short message service"). It is suggested to be short and instant, usually with 160

characters. They are typically transmitted from the sender to the receiver with the help of a phone or the Internet.

The style of the SMS has many features in common with the style of communication in the Internet. Both types of electronic communication most often implement a written form of the conversational style. However, SMS are more concise, as they have technical limitations in the number of characters per message and its corresponding value.

Instant messengers have been recently evolved, and it is one of the most popular methods of online communication. It is spread more among youngsters and college students and alphanumeric characters – pictorial messages known as emojis are considered to be the feature of instant messengers (Baron, 2004). Another specific feature is that in this form of online communication the receiver is online or is available to continuously receive messages. The sender sends messages, and the receiver simultaneously types and replies to the messages making it an instant messenger. WhatsApp, Facebook messenger, Yahoo chat are a few of the famous examples of the instant messenger.

Social media is a powerful tool that empowers people to communicate with family and friends in any part of the world. Social networking services vary in format and the number of features. They can incorporate a range of new information and communication tools, operating on desktops and on laptops, on mobile devices such as tablet computers and smartphones. They may feature digital photo/video/sharing and diary entries online (blogging) (Boyd, Ellison, 2007). Online community services are sometimes considered to be social-network services by developers and users, though in a broader sense, a social-network service usually provides an individual-centered service whereas online community services are group-centered.

Social networking sites and phone applications like Twitter, Facebook, Telegram, WhatsApp, Tumblr, Pinterest, Viber are leading social media sites that are interactive and engaging for global audiences and allow users to share ideas, digital photos, videos, posts and to inform others about online or real-world

activities and events with people in their network. While in-person social networking – such as gathering in a village market to talk about events – has existed since the earliest development of gathering of communities, so the net enables people to connect with others who live in different locations, ranging from across a city to across the world.

Undoubtedly, social media is one of the popular modes of Internet communication. Here are the major benefits of using social media for communication:

- faster and easier communication with target customers – it provides responsive service for their queries and problems;

- business can enhance organic visibility in multiple channels;

- a great way to redirect traffic on one's landing page and netsite to create brand awareness;

- a tool for holistic customer engagement, social media platforms help businesses interact with customers; it provides real-time feedback to increase loyalty and customer lifetime value;

- social media portals help in advertising, promotions, and market research.

Another type of online communication are forums, also called discussion boards, which are usually conducted online. Multiple users are present, and each of the users interacts with each other by posting messages on the same trail of messages. It is considered useful to have debates on multiple topics. It is yet another format that has been picked up by Facebook and introduced on its social media site.

Internet forums differ from chat rooms, as messages are often longer than one line of the text, and are at least temporarily archived. So, the main difference is that forum is almost never live and can be read at any time. Also, depending on the access level of a user or the forum set-up, a posted message might need to be approved by a moderator before it becomes publicly visible.

Forums have a specific set of jargon associated with them, for example a single conversation is called a "thread", or "topic". Most common topics on forums include questions, comparisons, polls of opinion, as well as debates.

Whiteboards is an application that usually works like a physical whiteboard in which one person, a presenter, shares the board with other viewers, and he/she can draw or write while others can see it. It is prevalent in educational institutions and is excelled for one-way communication. Google has recently introduced its whiteboard by the name of Google Jamboard.

Whiteboards have evolved in some fun and entertaining ways. Entire walls can be turned into drawing boards with dry erase wall print, providing bigger spaces to doodle on. And although some still consist of expensive, bulky equipment, interactive version have combined the convenience of the whiteboard with the functionality of a computer. Now, whiteboard apps are available and have overcome portability, budget, and sharing limitations, allowing businesses to take advantage of the power of the pen and draw in audiences of all sizes no matter where they are located.

Chat refers to the process of communicating, interacting and/or exchanging messages over the Internet. It involves two or more individuals that communicate through a chat-enabled service or software. Chat may be delivered through text, verbal, audio, visual or audio-visual communication via the Internet.

Chat and instant messaging are quickly becoming two of the most popular methods of online communication. The convenience of an instant response has helped fill the communication gap left between e-mail and traditional conversation methods such as phone calls and offline communication. Instant messaging can be accessed from handhelds, cell phones, and pagers (Al-Sa'di, Hamdan, 2005). It is also a good method of meeting new people and widening one's social circle. The ambience of a chat room can vary from support group, technical chat, and church group to a singles bar. In each of these situations, a person can enter a crowded room and participate, usually only identified by as much or as little information as they wish to provide.

1.4 Language of Internet

The language of the Internet combines the features of written and spoken speech, and also has its own properties mediated by computer communication, so the language of the Internet is a new kind of communication, a new type of discourse. Though it combines the features of oral and written forms of speech, it is different from them.

D. Crystal characterized the essence of this type of communication with the original formula: "oral form of speech + written form of speech + signs mediated by the computer" (Crystal, 2001, p. 152). This means of communication is more than just a hybrid of writing and oral speech. Electronic texts are not like other texts. They detect impermanence, synchronicity (being available on many computers at once), they have permeable boundaries (due to the possibility of the text being combined within other texts or containing links to other texts). All these features are imprinted on the language, and together with the features inherent in the oral and written form of speech, make the language of the Internet a real third means of communication.

Also, D. Crystal points that Netspeak is a radically new linguistic medium. According to him, "the fact that the Internet is an electronic, global, and interactive medium is crucial for the kind of language used on the Internet" (Crystal, 2001, p. 89). Netspeak is believed to be functional enough, as long as it is borne in mind that "speak" here actually involves both writing and speaking, as well as the receptive elements of listening and reading. D. Crystal argues that "the electronic medium presents us with a channel which at the same time facilitates and constraints the human ability to communicate in ways rather different from any other situations" (Crystal, 2001, p. 89). It is a dynamically developing world of the Internet, characterized by a special Internet lexicon, semantic processes in vocabulary, features of word usage and syntax.

Internet communication is an inherent side of cooperation and includes numerous means of representation among which we can distinguish the most wide-spread – Internet slang. In the process of interaction on Internet itself, it is not so

necessary to concentrate on the means that are used, the main point is to bring the intentions to the logical happy end, especially if the chat-speak is analyzed. The biggest amount of linguistic units which can be included into the area of Internet slang are the following: abbreviations, acronyms, shortenings, jargons and magnificent memes. Many scientists have devoted their works to the researches connected with the Internet slang and its means, among them we can name the following: D. Crystal, R. Dawkins and many others.

The well-known abbreviations, acronyms and shortenings have started their existence in cyberspace in times of the mail presentation, when the need in chatting increased. Shortenings can substitute and even replace the words. Abbreviations and acronyms can easily substitute the whole phrases keeping the meaning unchanged. Moreover, some of them have already become independent words with various meanings in different languages.

David Crystal, in his work "An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Languages" has explained the concept "acronym" as abbreviation which is formed from its first letters and can be read in accordance with their alphabet sounds as it is in *TGIF (Thanks God It is Friday)*, *NFL (National Football League)*, *NSN (Never Say Never)* and others, as well as in the accordance to the rules of orthoepy – *UNICEF (United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund)*, etc. (Crystal, 2001).

According to The Cambridge Dictionary the abbreviation is a shortened word and can be formed from the first letters of the word or phrase (78). In these situations, we pronounce each letter or, in some cases, each word omitting the first letters only – *OMG* for *Oh, My God,* which is pronounced letter by letter and *CU* for *See You,* which is pronounced word by word. The acronyms are the words which are also formed from the first letters of words but are pronounced as full words – NATO which is pronounced as a separate word. Thus, every unit of the mentioned above can be named abbreviation, but only some abbreviations can be named acronyms due to their form of pronouncing.

Abbreviations and acronyms being Internet slang help to spread and introduce it in numerous spheres, for instance, professional, educational, etc.

Although, such units originate from the colloquial style of writing in cyberspace, they can be easily transformed into the independent words in everyday communication. It is possible to hear people saying *OMG, LOL* and hundreds of other units to express their feelings, emotions and ideas. In this way Internet users influence the development of language. Such transpositions can lead to 2-dimensional existence of definite abbreviations and acronyms – as Internet slang in cyberspace, and as words in live face-to-face communication.

The next and one of the most wide-spread are shortenings. They enrich cyberspace, as well as speaking comprehension, simultaneously and evenly. Shortenings become an integral part of interaction. The most significant feature of this linguistic phenomenon is the possibility to convert any independent word into its relative shorter form. These representatives of Internet slang can be coined out in three different ways:

a) separating consonants only: *lvl* for *level, pls* for *please;*

b) leaving the first letters of the word only: *mil* for *million, pic* for *picture, pres.* for *President*, etc.;

c) leaving the beginning of the word and its last letters: *inet for Internet,* etc.

Some shortenings have partially or fully substituted the original words. Some of them have rooted the language at such a high level that not so many people can find out the initial version at the first sight or cannot even agree that there is any at all: *fridge* for *refrigerator, bike* for *bicycle, flu* for *influenza, ad* for *advertisement* and others. Shortenings can substitute the original unit in several cases – due to its being archaic, complicated or out of use.

But there are the shortenings which have Latin origin and which are allowed to be easily used in formal interactions. Mainly, such shortenings represent usual words or word-combinations among them it is possible to highlight: *for example – eg. (exempli gratia), namely – i.e. (id est), against smth. – vs. (versus), and so on – etc. (et cetera), after midday – p.m. (post meridiem), before midday – a.m. (ante meridiem),* and so on. These shortenings are used without any limits connected with age, gender, Internet skills, education, etc.

Almost all genre formats of online communication, among them email, chats, forums, instant messaging and others, use typical means of online communication, such as slang, abbreviations, acronyms and shortenings, etc.

Conclusions to Chapter One

In modern linguistics discourse is interpreted ambiguously. There are several approaches to the study of discourse, among them are communicative, structural-syntactic, structural and stylistic, socio-pragmatic and others. The concept of discourse is comprehended in inseparable connection with the concepts of speech and text. So, discourse can be identified as a communicative phenomenon, an intermediate link between speech as verbal communication, as an activity, and a specific text, recorded during communication.

Internet discourse is an independent type of discourse, being an array of electronic, audio, and video texts combined with extralinguistic factors linked by a system of hyperlinks accessed the Internet through a computer or alternative multimedia devices. Internet discourse is a cognitive-communicative space of the Global Network, in which communicative interaction, characterized by replacing the real image with fictional, is conducted by means of electronic data transmission channel and hypertextual mechanism of their structuring by verbal means.

It is a complex text system due to extralinguistic socio-cultural factors and the specific situation of entering into speech contact with a computer and other electronic devices either by users with each other on the Internet or users with the discursive Internet space.

The features of Internet discourse are diverse: it presupposes the obligatory presence of communicants, manifesting their illocutionary attitudes; it is created at the moment "here and now"; it lacks the emotional component of communication, accompanied by a persistent desire for emotional filling of the text using special icons for marking emotions or describing emotions in words. In addition, Internet users are almost completely devoid of extra-linguistic aids, including voice, gestures, and facial expressions.

The Internet is a synthesis of the ideas of virtuality, hypertext, multimedia, universal information network and network society. While communication in the Internet started from email, today numerous methods are used in online communication, such as emails (mailing application and services), SMS (instant

messengers), social networking sites (Twitter, Facebook, Telegram, WhatsApp, Tumblr, Viber, Pinterest), forums, whiteboards, and chats. The genre formats of online communication are based on a number of cognitive-pragmatic genre-creating parameters, among which are the communicative purpose of the genre, the author's and the addressee's concepts, the event content, the communication situation and the communicative register of discourse, implementation in the structure of hypertext, ethnocultural representation, the possibility of the global interactive development of the genre, linguistic embodiment, etc.

Internet communication is a special environment, the place of a language implementation that has never existed before, which functions in a specific linguo-cultural environment. Though Internet discourse is an independent type of discourse, the language of the Internet combines the features of written and spoken speech, and also has its own properties mediated by computer communication, so the language of the Internet is a new kind of communication, a new type of discourse. Almost all genre formats of online communication, among them email, chats, forums, instant messaging and others, use typical means of online communication, such as slang, abbreviations, acronyms, shortenings, which have started their existence in cyberspace.

CHAPTER TWO.
SPEECH ETIQUETTE IN GENRES OF ONLINE COMMUNICATION
2.1 Speech etiquette, its features and functions

Speech etiquette is included in the linguistic cultural picture of the world. Possession, understanding and choice of formulas of speech etiquette depends on the behavior of the people. Without speech etiquette it is impossible to enter into communication, to maintain communication, or to complete it.

Speech etiquette is a set of requirements to the form, content, order, character and situational relevance of statements adopted in a particular culture. Speech etiquette, in particular, includes words and expressions used by people to say goodbye, to express requests, apologies, accepted in various situations or forms of treatment, and intonation features that characterize polite speech, etc. Compliance with speech etiquette is an integral part of any polite person's behavior regardless of age, sex or nationality. It is an important indicator of human culture (Сахарчук, 1992). It is speech etiquette that makes the basis of successful business negotiations, creates conditions for mutual understanding between different people and even may be the basis of resolving political and economic issues at the international level.

Speech etiquette is an integral part of general etiquette. By etiquette we understand a peculiar code of good manners and rules of behavior in the society, selected in the course of time, the knowledge and compliance with which creates conditions for effective and respectful communication between people. Traditionally, linguistics prefers to interpret this term as "adherence to the stable linguistic norms of spoken and written literary language, as well as conscious, unforced, purposeful, skillful use of linguistic and expressive means, depending on the purpose and circumstances of communication" (Murphy, 2016, p. 57). For example, Formanovska states that speech etiquette rules regulate speech behavior (Формановская, 2005, p. 105).

Rules and principles of behavior of people in the process of communication can be found since ancient times. For instance, Egypt, India, China, and Greece

were the countries where speech etiquette started. Greek etiquette, which relied on the softness and delicacy of linguistic behaviour was considered as an international standard.

Modern linguistics focuses on the issues of the language of communication, principles of modeling communicative acts, and functioning of the language in all spheres of social activity. The main feature of communication as a process is interaction. The process of communication includes social interaction of the members of the society in their cooperative activity. Rules and regulations that govern communication differ, depending on its purpose and means (Яковлюк, 2015).

So, we can identify speech etiquette as a specific element of the general human culture, which consists of a set of rules of conversation and contains a number of requirements concerning the use of the most appropriate speech formulas and other components of speech behavior in a given situation.

A complex of all possible formulas is an essence of the speech etiquette system. It has its own structure defined by the following basic elements of communicative situations: appeal, greeting, forgiveness, apology, gratitude, wishes, request, acquaintance, congratulation, invitation, offer, advice, consent, refusal, sympathy, compliment, oath, praise, etc. A number of typical features are part of standardized speech behavior. Situational, regulatory, and coherent can be highlighted among them.

Situational feature is declared in focusing speech etiquette and it depends on a specific person, a certain moment of communication. Regulatory is another feature of speech etiquette, which presupposes adherence to the norms of speech etiquette and puts the addressee and addressor of speech in one or another position in the hierarchy (relative to the interlocutor) and depends not only on the situation of manifestation of speech etiquette, but on certain characteristics of interlocutors (social background, age, etc.). When we talk about coherence of speech etiquette we suppose that etiquette is at least known to all participants of communication and, as a maximum, is used by all of them.

The formulas of speech etiquette are conventional. There are certain elements that organize speech etiquette, for example, a greeting at a meeting, *Hello* or *Yes, I am listening* at the beginning of a telephone conversation, etc. The listed features are important, but they may be realized in different ways.

Speech etiquette performs several important functions in communication. The main ones, according to N. Formanovska, include:

- attracting attention of an interlocutor (addressing function);
- establishing contact with an interlocutor (contact function);
- demonstrating respectful attitude to him/her (courtesy function);
- influencing an interlocutor (imperative function);
- manifesting emotions during communication (emotional expressive function) (Формановская, 2005, p. 142).

Communicative and cognitive functions are interrelated. The existence of the first function is beyond controversy, but the second manifests itself to a lesser extent. The communicative function distinguishes contact, conative, regulatory, imperative, and emotionally-expressive functions. Contact function displays itself in situations where the interlocutor tries to attract attention, and begin communication with the interlocutor. Conative (politeness) function is mainly connected with the traditional principles of communication (Козулина, 2016).

Depending on the social characteristics of the interlocutors and the communication environment, the speakers resort to the use of strictly defined units of speech etiquette. Regulatory function sets the relationship between the addressee and the addresser, taking into account both the status differences (boss/subordinate, senior/junior), and the degree of familiarity (familiar/unfamiliar). In imperative, voluntary (influence) function, the formulas of speech etiquette are designed to have a response (verbal, gestural) from the interlocutor. The two functions are interconnected, since contacting the interlocutor and attract his/her attention is already having some effect. As far as emotionally-expressive (emotive) function is concerned, some units of speech etiquette have additional emotionally expressive elements.

2.2 The concept of netiquette in online communication

The Internet communication is becoming popular enough in the 21st century and that creates conditions for the use of Netiquette. The formulas of speech netiquette are very different from those that are common in private conversations. This is due to the following reasons. Firstly, the chance to stay anonymous in communication. Very often, communicating in social networks, people use false names; secondly, the availability of simultaneous access to a huge number of interlocutors; thirdly, the formation of communities based on shared interests and topics of communication; fourth, a significant acceleration of information exchange when the foreground is not so much formal as a meaningful aspect of the subject of communication; fifth, the lack of opportunity to fully show the emotional component in written communication (Лазар, 2006, p.177).

The specific feature of the Internet written speech is that it acquires a predominantly spoken character and, realizing a high-quality environment, begins to change its qualitative characteristics. Spelling and punctuation norms are no longer strict and binding. Online communication in terms of its characteristics approaches spontaneous oral speech, in connection with which the economy of speech efforts begins to operate, which implies a desire for economic expression. The illusion of the presence of the addressee affects the process of creating the text. Editing text in online communication is minimized, since a delay in response is equivalent to a long pause in oral speech (Мечовская, 2006).

The confusion of oral and written speech in the net environment determines such immanent tendencies in the formation of the etiquette of written speech on the Internet as the continuity of the traditions of oral and written speech etiquette, on the one hand, and its liberalization, on the other. However, it should be taken into consideration that these trends are formed not only under the influence of sociolinguistic but also general ethical factors reflecting the "social consequences of the new environment" (Варламова, 2006). The specificity of netiquette is primarily due to such properties of net communication, highlighted by the American philosopher Deborah Johnson, as the ability to interact "many with

many" on a global scale, reproducibility of electronic "traces" of communication and certain anonymity. These properties, in their own way contradicting each other, transform the ethical views of people, set, along with the usual, new patterns of speech behavior on the Net.

In situations of online communication, the user faces a choice – to employ or not employ etiquette forms, the use of which is considered to be a manifestation of politeness (Searle, 1985). The questions about the communicative boundaries of the personal and public spheres, about the admissibility and inadmissibility of discussing intimate details in the public space of communities are still open. The use of spoken vocabulary, and slang in particular, is seen as a reflection of distance convergence between communicants. (Галичкина, 2001, p. 235). In some communities, the lack of novelty in messages is regarded as a violation of speech etiquette.

In general, our society considers the Internet as an extension of society, like a new dimension of the world around us. So, in some way there are the same standards there. All the values of society that are not inherent in it, like hate speech and bigotry, copyright violations and other forms of theft also remain in the net. In contrast, such values as courtesy, kindness, openness, and treating others with the same respect we wish to receive are welcomed.

The Internet space has formed its own rules of conduct, certain traditions, kind of culture of communication. The Internet is not a zone without values, the formation of the content of its resources and services is influenced by human values. The online world should follow online laws. This means that today one does not need to invent a new set of values for the Internet or other types of electronic communication, because almost all the problems that arise in the process of electronic communications can be solved by laws and regulations in real life (Наумов, 2002). Respect for national and local cultures plays a significant role, because the Internet is now a global phenomenon, it belongs to everyone, and that is why the network is influenced by various value systems. And last but not least, the ethics on the Internet is also a living response to the user's opinion. This means

that the user has the right to have an idea of the network and influence the content of its resources and services (Радевич-Винницький, 2001).

The rules of speech etiquette on the Net need to comply with the traditional rules of speech etiquette, and this compliance at the present stage of development of society is more advisory than mandatory and depends primarily on the moral position of the user. In general, the provisions of the netiquette can be divided into three categories:

- psychological, emotional (appeals, the use of emoticons, support for newcomers or ignoring them, etc.);

- technical (use of lines of a certain length, restrictions on the size of letters, their signatures, the admissibility of writing in uppercase, the admissibility of formatting, italics, color, etc.);

- administrative (rules of names (titles) of topics, citation rules, admissibility of advertising, admissibility of flame, the need to adhere to the theme of the community).

The rules of speech etiquette are necessary for the formation of online communities. They contribute to the internal organization of the community. On the one hand, following the rules provides for the possibility of each community member's active self-presentation; on the other hand, the rules ensure the stability of interpersonal communication links. The participant's situational communicative intentions include: informing (notifying, training, instructing) or phatic (game), supporting communicative connection with other participants by means of comic (Hallahan, 2007). The realization of these goals is valuable for communicants.

Speech etiquette in online communities is a system of verbal and non-verbal resources, the use of which in dialogical communication allows participants to maintain comfortable involvement in communication as they contribute to the achievement of the following tasks:

a) regulation of the participant's inclusion in the communication environment;

b) conventionalization of the speech form of the author's self-expression, prohibition of some forms of speech behavior and imposing sanctions for the violations of those prohibitions;

c) preservation of the author's high communicative status in different ways and providing each participant admitted to communication with freedom for creative self-expression;

d) on the one hand, stimulation of contact establishment with suitable partners according to different criteria; on the other hand, regulation of contact proximity with them according to the wish of its initiator;

e) providing an opportunity to give/receive different forms of response to a particular activity of the communication initiator;

f) the indication of the behavior deviance, restrictions on deviations from the speech behavior rules existing in the networked society, until the records are removed (Яковец, 2016).

Therefore, in order to comply with the requirements in social networks, it is important to maintain communicative values shared by the whole community during the entire interaction; to detect communication threats in time and neutralize them with condemnation or even imposition of sanctions.

Along with significant changes in the norms of writing etiquette, new forms of its violation (along with traditional ones) appear in the net environment. D. Johnson classifies the violation of netiquette as one of the types of problematic behavior along with destructive (hacker activities, spread of viruses) and unlawful (cyber fraud, theft, persecution, dissemination of defamation). Its forms primarily include flame and spam (Dresner, Herring, 2010, p. 251).

Flame means a long, offensive dispute in the electronic community, "war of words" (Ferrara, Brunner, Whittemore, 1991, p. 11). A flame begins with a heated discussion of a topic, during which some people (flamers) become personalized, which leads to verbal battles. It ends either due to the intervention of the moderator or the onset of fatigue of the participants. According to the flamer type, the initiative (intentional) and reactive (reactionary) flames are distinguished. Initiative

assumes the presence of a provocateur, reactive – inadequately reacting interlocutors. The classic types of reactive flame include: a flame about clogging the Network, a flame addressed to ignorant newbies, a war of edits (in response errors in the text), a flame in response to advertising messages. Some types imply the very reason for which the flame flared up (clogging the Net, questions that are easy to find an answer to, sending out advertising messages), so the response seems to be quite logical (albeit unethical), and the best way to avoid it is to put someone's boots on of recipients when sending messages (Trevino, 2016). In response to this kind of flame, one should apologize and not repeat such a mistake in the future. Others (war of edits, a flame against ignorant newcomers), on the contrary, indicate a violation of ethics by the interlocutors, however, they also require a tactful reaction: ignoring the message, a polite reminder of the unethical flame, or gratitude to the advisor for a worthy remark in case of its presence (Бергельсон, 2002, p. 66).

The initiative type of flame is also called trolling. The types of trolling include: mass provocations (flares up, as a rule, about "slippery" topics); clashing people by sending a message regarding warring groups; "Scientific and artistic" flame (based on the placement of falsified scientific or artistic materials); rude flame (intentionally aggressive, unreasonable). The most adequate reaction to trolling can be a one-time, calm statement about one's own position with the subsequent termination of the dialogue (polylogue), a complaint to the moderator, if possible, adding the interlocutor to the "black list". If one wants to express him/herself emotionally, it is recommended to enclose the message in quotation marks "flame on" (at the beginning) and "flame off" (at the end of the line). Possible, although not the best, way to react to the flame is also ignoring, which does not always stop the provocateur (Малюк, 2011, p. 105).

Violations of net speech etiquette, representing the sending of unnecessary information, include flooding and spam. Flood is filling a communicative resource with unnecessary, useless information by repeating the same replicas, sending bulky messages, messages off topic. Flood differs from spam in a smaller volume,

non-advertising nature of information, and a place of concentration (various communication groups).

Similarity with traditional forms of violation of speech etiquette is manifested in the use of obscene language, which, as a rule, continues to be taboo on the Internet by site administrators and is perceived as unacceptable. However, the widespread development of the language game on the Net has led to the emergence of euphemisms (words and phrases replacing more rude synonyms). These euphemisms are perceived rather calmly (Поуст, 1991, p. 24).

There are also types of violations of net etiquette that are considered serious: deception of Internet users under the guise of a virtual personality; spoofing emails and messages; distribution of "chain letters"; hoaxes and pranks on the Net; spreading rumors; harassment via email; bombardment by emails; spying in the workplace. Most often, the violation of netiquette is understood as insults and the transition to personality, malicious deviation from the topic (oftopic), advertising, self-promotion in inappropriate places. Defamation or other malicious misinformation or plagiarism can also be a violation of netiquette.

There are simple general rules for different types of electronic communications that each of its participants can follow. As Netiquette is a set of rules for acceptable online behavior, similarly, online ethics focuses on the acceptable use of online resources in an online social environment. A few main principles are underlying this overall concept of socially responsible internet use, but there are the details that are still under discussion.

The Internet space has formed its own rules of conduct, certain traditions, a kind of culture of communication. The concept of netiquette appeared in the mid-80s of the last century. First of all, users must realize that the Internet is not a zone without values, the formation of the content of its resources and services is influenced by human values. Secondly, the online world should follow online laws. This means that today one does not need to invent a new set of values for the Internet or other types of electronic communication because almost all the problems that arise in the process of electronic communications can be solved by

laws and regulations in real life. Thirdly, respect for national and local cultures plays a significant role because the Internet is now a global phenomenon, it belongs to everyone, and that is why the network is influenced by various value systems. And last but not least, the ethics on the Internet is also a living response to the user's opinion. This means that the user has the right to have an idea of the network and influence the content of its resources and services.

Therefore, in order to comply with speech etiquette in social networks, it is important to maintain communicative values shared by the whole community during the entire interaction; to detect communication threats in time and neutralize them with condemnation or even imposition of sanctions. Most often, the violation of netiquette is understood as insults and the transition to personality, malicious deviation from the topic (offtopic), advertising, self-promotion in inappropriate places. Defamation or other malicious misinformation or plagiarism can also be a violation of netiquette. Flame, flood, spam, offtopic are the main concepts that should be avoided.

2.3 Speech etiquette formulas used in genres of online communication

Speech etiquette is indispensable in communication, since it helps to enter it, maintain and complete it. Speech etiquette is a set of requirements to the form, content, order, character and situational relevance of statements adopted in this or that particular culture. Speech etiquette, in particular, includes words and expressions used by people to greet each other, to say goodbye, express requests, apologies, forms of treatment accepted in various situations, that characterize polite speech.

In the process of communication, communicative situations are repeated and they usually turn into the standard ones, both offline and online. Among them are: greeting, apology, request, consent, refusal, approval, gratitude, farewell and others. There exist words and expressions used by people in these situations. They are called speech etiquette formulas – specific words, phrases and fixed

expressions used in a conversation that implement the policy of politeness in typical communication situations.

To study how Internet users follow the rules of etiquette behaviour and to identify and analyze means of speech etiquette used by them we have chosen such Internet genres as forums **(tripadvisor.com, fodor.com),** social networking sites **(Facebook), emails** in which we have analyzed these means and peculiarities of their use.

Greeting is one of the most important communicative situations, that starts interaction and on which further communication depends a lot. So, we started with greeting and have chosen topics for discussion on the **tripadvisor.com** forum to analyze SEF used in this communicative situation.

***Hi** I'm planning to come to Paris by late august for my honeymoon. A big part of the reason is that Paris is the only European city to offer a direct flight from our hometown of Cincinnati. (Hi, I am planning to come…).*

The greeting ***Hi*** is informal and is used in the sentence, in which punctuation marks are absent, and that is a typical feature of the Internet communication (if it is not a problem to understand the general writer's idea). Contraction here is used in order to give a response quicker.

***Hi all** Might be a odd question but need to ask (Hi all, It might be an odd question but I need to ask). Can anyone recommend touring pitches with lake access within walking distance.*

***Hi** all Might be a odd question but need to ask We will need a test after 2 days there, which also could serve as our airline-required test. Does anyone know how easy it is to get a test in London? Do you need an appt or can it be a walk-in? (Hi all, It might be an odd question but I need to ask).*

In these examples with the greeting ***Hi*** punctuation marks are absent too, besides there is also a grammatical mistake in the sentences – the article *a* is used instead of the article *an.* These examples are elliptical sentences, without subjects.

Hey everyone! My husband and I (the grandparents) are doing very advanced planning for a trip with our two oldest granddaughters who will both be 10 (almost 11) at the time of travel in 2023.

This greeting formula ***Hey everyone*** is informal too and is not usually used in formal style but it is used in the Internet community, even in the situation when the Internet user visits this community for the first time.

The following examples also confirm that in most dialogues informal greetings *Hi, Hey* and *Hello* are used:

Hi, howdy? *I'm planning to come to Paris by late august for my honeymoon. I'm planning to go to Paris and take the train from Paris to Barcelona and then fly back home. I need a third destination between the two cities. My total vacation is about 16 days. We plan to spend it like this: 5/6 days in Paris 5/6 days in Barcelona. Can you recommend me where to spend the other 4/5 days in between? Should I go to southern France or somewhere in Spain (Hi, howdy? I am planning to come…).*

Hey everyone, how are ya? *Some people told me a lot of places won't accept cash these days in London. some other people told me they had no problem paying in cash anywhere. can you share from your experience?*

Hey! *I'm coming to your city in October. Does anyone know roughly how long it will take to clear customs and exit the airport. Hand luggage only so I won't be waiting at baggage claim. (Hey! I'm coming to your city in October).*

It should also be mentioned that there have been found examples in which greeting formulas are not used at all:

Has anyone been to the Yosemite Valley in the last couple of weeks? What was it like? We have plans to go over Labor Day weekend, staying at one of the hotels in the valley, but my understanding is that air quality is poor there right now due to local fires.

How's life? *I am coming to your city in <u>October</u>. Would you recommend black cab at airport or private firm? Thank you. (How's life? I am coming to your city in <u>October</u>).*

Elliptical sentences, typical of the Internet communication, are used to save time.

Speech formulas of apology are very often used in the process of communication. An apology in etiquette situations is not always associated with some wrong action, misconduct, but it is a polite form of justifying the need to contact someone. Apologizing speech formulas are used if violations occur in the personal space of another person or in situations associated with misunderstanding of a matter.

Analyzing formal e-mails, we have distinguished some formal formulas of apology:

*I am writing this letter to accept my mistakes (that I have misplaced the samples and didn't remember) and **to apologize for** being so irresponsible. I will surely change my working strategy.*

*This is to acknowledge that the cancellation of your purchase order has been taken this matter to the management. **I do apologize** about misunderstanding that led to this cancellation.*

Formal formulas of apology have complete sentences and verbalized with specific introductory words *apologize* that is not common for informal style.

As for the informal style, apology formulas were identified and analyzed in the topics for discussion on the **fodors.com.** The analysis showed that the apologizing formulas are mostly expressed by *sorry* and *sorry to say,* which are used in elliptical sentences. Their subjects and the parts of predicates are missed, but the members of the Internet community can understand the general idea, so the incomplete structure of the sentence it is not a problem for them.

*Last year we were caught mid-voyage by the outbreak of the pandemic. It was touch and go getting home safely, and we were seriously spooked. **I'm sorry, but** Dayenu, currently cruising still seems like too much of a crapshoot to me (I am sorry to say, Dayenu, currently...);*

***Sorry,** my mistake Stu (I am sorry, it was my mistake Stu);*

***Sorry,** Dave, I can imagine how scary that would be! And I agree, November is too early. I am thinking of something simple and small, a RT out of San*

Francisco without flying. There are more cruises from April on, I can wait. Just not going anywhere for 4 years (not just covid, but also my injury and husband's death) is difficult for me. (I am sorry, Dave, I can imagine how scary that would be!);

Sorry to say, but there seems to be two Henry hotels, the one I book at is not River Gauche but the Residence Henri IV (I am sorry there seems to be two Henry hotels...).

R**equest** in online communication accompanies address to emphasize politeness. Motivating speech action is often mitigated by the use of interrogative constructions. The question does not contain a request for information, but expresses the question in a polite manner. It is assumed that request should be extremely polite in form.

We have analyzed e-mails with formal formulas of request and they are characterized by complete sentences, which include a full description of the request.

I am contacting you today to request information on your company's specific products that we are interested in.

I would like on behalf of the ABCElementary PTO to request a donation of bottled water for our annual fast run scheduled for September 15.

The following examples of request formulas include greeting, a form of address to the administrators of the forum, which contain *please* and *thank you* – to emphasize politeness.

Hello, moderators, please delete my email address, or the whole reply. Thank you!

The following example of request contains the introductory word to show politeness. Other features are absence of punctuation marks and the use of contraction:

Please If you have any other hotel suggestions, I'm open to hear them (Please, If you have any other hotel suggestions, I am open to hear them).

In the following example request is expressed using imperative mood, but not to be so rude, the word *please* is added:

Add links to trip reports for your tours within the UK to this thread please (add links to trip reports for your tours within the UK to this thread, please);

In this example request is used to add a link to watching the film. Though there is no verb in it, everyone understands what is meant because the message was left in the community on **Facebook** connected with movies and the title is known to everyone. The word *please* was added to sound politely:

After and after we collided please…

This example of request has a similar meaning with the previous one, but it is interesting to analyze it because it contains contraction *pls = please* that is very common in the Internet. Also, the word *2gether* was shortened with the help of *2* instead of *to* because it sounds the same way:

Pls admin still 2gether the movie.

In this example a shortened form of the word please is used – *plssss*, but then additional symbols were added – it is a sign that the user has some kind of habit to write in such way:

Help me plsss.

This example is characterized by the absence of punctuation marks, a grammatical mistake and the use of the article *a* instead of *an*. It is an elliptical sentence without subjects. All these are typical features of Internet communication:

Might be a odd question but need to ask (It might be an odd question but I need to ask).

This example of request formula presents interest, since request formulas usually include polite words, but there is none of them in the example:

Someone help me download I'm struggling.

In the Internet communication **the consent** speech formulas are used in situations of a positive response.

We have analyzed the language of the members of the community "England National Football Team" on **Facebook**. In their dialogue they used different

formulas of consent to answer the mediator's question: *The two best English players of all time. Do you agree?*

The analysis has shown that in the process of communication members of the Internet community used different formulas of consent but all of them had specific features, inherent in Internet communication.

This is the example of response with contraction, which underlines the informal style of conversation:

I`m right there with you (I am).

As it has already been mentioned, elliptical sentences and short simple sentences are often used to save time and to answer immediately. To answer the question in the post, users just used elliptical sentences in their answers:

of course (instead of course, you are right);

absolutely (it is absolutely true);

true (it is true);

absolutely good talk (it is absolutely good talk);

totally agree (I am totally agree);

you not wrong there (you are not wrong there);

Oh definitely;

Yes, same here (Yes, I have the same meaning here).

Another feature which was noticed is **capital letters**, used to attract attention and to make the response more emotional.

We have analyzed the example: *YES*. The author wanted to underline the fact that he totally agrees with the post.

Refusal is opposite in meaning to consent, but the situation can be similar. Rejection from the standpoint of speech etiquette is a complex speech action. Introductory words and constructions are used very often and emphasize the impossibility of fulfilling the request or the impossibility of answering, etc. and show regret. Refusal formulas usually combine politeness and persuasiveness.

In formal letters the author usually gives the reason of refusal, but not just the short answer.

I am sorry to inform you that the board decided to decline your proposition to accept the proposal of another provider with lower administrative fees.

In refusals, elliptical sentences and short simple sentences are often used:

Not really a legend (He is not really a legend);

No (No, I don`t agree, No, I don`t);

Short sentences used to answer quicker and to share the opinion of the user:

No way;

Never;

Example of the contraction:

That's not true (That is not true);

Example of the punctuation mistakes: the user wanted to answer quickly:

No, I don't agree (No, I don't agree);

Here there is a punctuation mistake and a contraction, and a slang word in addition:

Nah we don`t want Harry (No, we don`t want Harry).

The example of an elliptical sentence with a punctuation mistake:

Dont agree (I don`t agree);

No ridiculous (No, it is ridiculous).

Example of the elliptical sentence with slang:

Nope, over rated (No, it is over rated).

We have also found an example of a complete sentence that is not very popular in the Net:

No player is worth that sort of money;

Refusal formulas with introductory words to show politeness:

Sorry, I'm afraid I can't help you there, but you might want to check with your airline to make sure they will accept your paperwork.

The mediator wanted to be very polite doing his job:

Apologies of this but it isn`t allowed.

In the process of Internet communication, it is important to be able to express **approval** of the words or actions of other participants. Approval is based

on a positive assessment of something. Approval formulas include a compliment, which presupposes the uttering of kind words addressed to the interlocutor.

We have analyzed topics for discussion on the forum **fodors.com** and distinguished some approval formulas. Their specific feature is that they are represented by short sentences. Some of them are exclamatory sentences used to add more emotions to the response:

That's great info, thanks!

Great! Glad you were successful!

Some of them are also exclamatory by their structure but they do not have an exclamatory mark at the end. The structure shows the aim of the response but the author wanted to answer quicker:

Well done;

Respect;

Good talk;

What a brilliant post;

Great idea;

Awesome.

The Internet language has its own specific contractions that look like grammar mistakes, and such constructions are not often used in written speech:

Your amazing (You are amazing);

Your a star (You are a star).

Gratitude conveys feelings of gratitude to underline sympathy, they indicate a high assessment of someone's actions. Speech formulas of gratitude are used for etiquette completion of speech interaction quite often, and they may include etiquette formulas of farewell.

Gratitude formulas are also characterized by the absence of punctuation marks:

Thank You Russ (Thank you, Russ);

Thank you Jean for your reply (Thank you, Jean, for your reply);

Thanks in advance Ian (Thanks in advance, Ian);

All examples of gratitude formulas start with special introductory words to show gratitude. Some of them are more formal:

Thank you very much;

thank you all;

Thank you, Moderator 8 for removing one of my replies per my request (for those who missed it, but are curious what happened – I put my email address in the reply, and was advised by another Fodorite it may be not safe to do that, so I asked to delete);

Thank you all for your insightful replies.

Some of them are less formal, but in the Internet communication they have the same meaning:

Thanks again for your great help;

Thanks for your insightful reply;

Thanks so much for posting your experience, russ-in-LA!

Also, how bad is the crossing on the ferry? Many thanks

Abbreviation is also used in the informal formulas of gratitude:

Tks; it's what I figured but I wanted to double/triple check it out.

Shortened *you* with *U* instead, but they sound the same way:

***Thank u** for so many great suggestions! JanisJ I love the York suggestion! I also found a fabulous hotel in the Lake district that speaks to both my husband and I. And I've added in Liverpool because we've never been there and my sister-in-law loved it.*

Another example of the formula of gratitude with the abbreviation. The writer used it to show gratitude but in a fast way:

***Ty** for the information. I love the Bologna idea potentially! I did a roadtrip through south of France two years ago and it's what inspired this one. We went from town to town stating in Antibes.*

The example of a misprint, though all the participants of the conversation understood the meaning:

Thank uo. I think this is what I needed to see and hear. I am going to make an adjustment and cut down the travel

To emphasize politeness the author added more symbols*:*

Thankiieee admin.

In formal communication the formulas do not differ much, but they do not include contractions or abbreviations:

Thank you for your consideration. We are waiting for your response.

Hope, you will be able to help us in drawing their attention and resolving this matter. Thanking you.

A farewell is one of the most important parts of etiquette communication. The end of the conversation, in terms of speech etiquette, should be benevolent as it was at the beginning of the process of communication. It should be conducive to continue communication and develop relationships. The farewell formula should not sound completely unexpected to the interlocutor. Usually, parting is preceded by some indication of the end of communication.

In this example the author wanted to underline his positive attitude to other members of the community, so he used capital letters and a lot of exclamatory marks:

BYE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Parting, using an abbreviation as a specific feature of the Internet communication:

brb, do not get bored! (be right back)

A farewell with slang is very often used to underline the informal style of communication:

see ya (see you);

Communication in forums is mostly informal, so farewells that in real life are used only with friends are quite common:

bye-bye.

In formal letters we have distinguished specific formulas that are not common in informal communication:

I am very dissatisfied with your service and I want to have the refund. I look forward to our next meeting.

Thank you for your consideration. We are waiting for your response. Have a nice day!

So, we can state that **slang,** feature, characteristic of the informal style of Internet communication, is often used in it, since the atmosphere in the Internet communities is very informal; it is very popular and almost every participant understands this "special" language:

Yeah.

Yep.

In the process of our analysis we have also found examples that are not typical of Internet communication – complete sentences with no contraction or abbreviation, which are typical of written discourse:

I *agree with you;*

I get what you are saying;

Okay, so I might have forgotten that little detail.

We have also identified another typical feature of the Internet communication: the writers do not often use capital letters at the beginning of the sentence. General idea can be understood by the members of the community, so the absence of capital letters is not a problem for them:

exactly! Going to make it hard to know.

One more specific feature of the Internet language is that the users can write the other user's name without the capital letter and it does not matter. The participants of the conversation understand that it is not a sign of disrespect, but it is just the economy of time:

I kind of agree, janis.

We have noticed that in the user's response punctuation marks are not very important and most users do not pay attention to this:

Oh yes, I feel satisfied with my decision. (Oh yes! I feel satisfied with my decision).

There are also many examples with **abbreviations**, which are typical of the Internet communication, for instance:

Omg well said (omg= Oh my God).

OK, forget whatever I said before (OK = okay);

It seems that the author wanted to sound emotional but he did not want to waste time, so he used abbreviations.

Most typical speech etiquette formulas, used in real and virtual communication in greeting, apologizing, request, refusal, approval, gratitude and farewell communicative situations are presented in the tables below.

Greeting Speech Etiquette Formulas	
Real Communication	**Virtual Communication**
Hello!	*Hey!*
How do you do?	*Hi!*
What are you doing?	*Howdy?*
Good day! Good morning!	*What's up?*
Good evening! Good afternoon!	*How's life?*
How are you today?	*How are ya?*
Pleased to meet you!	
Very nice to meet you	
It's an honor to meet you	

In the greeting communicative situation in the Internet communication participants often use emoticons to express their emotions. For example, after *hey* they add the emoticon in the form of a waving hand.

Apologizing Speech Etiquette Formulas	
Real Communication	**Internet Communication**
My apologies	*Sorry!*
I apologize for	*Sorry to say, but*
I am sorry to inform you	*I'm sorry, but*
Terribly sorry	*Excuse me*
Must do apologize	
I do apologize	
Pardon/Pardon me	
I beg your pardon	
I'm sorry I hurt your feelings	
I'm sorry about the mean thing I said	

In the communicative situation of apology in the Internet communication, participants may use a special face-shaped emoticon with flushed cheeks to show shame or abashment.

Request Speech Etiquette Formulas	
Real Communication	**Virtual Communication**
Could you possibly	*Please*
I would like to request	*Help me*
Why don't we	*Help me plsss*
I would also be grateful if you could send me	*Pls (please)*
Do you mind being quiet?	
Why don't you be quiet?	
Could you lend me your phone?	
Could you therefore, please	
I would like to ask you	
I am contacting you to request	
I would like to request your attention	

After expressing request with the help of words participants of the Internet communication often add an emoticon showing hands that are put together, meaning begging and reinforcing the request.

Consent Speech Etiquette Formulas	
Real Communication	**Virtual Communication**
I'm right there with you	*Yes*
That feels awesome	*True*
I want to keep doing this	*Of course*
Let's do that more	*Absolutely*
I'm enjoying this	*Oh definitely*
I'm really interested in doing	*Totally agree*

How do you feel about..?	
That sounds great	

Refusal Speech Etiquette Formulas	
Real Communication	**Virtual Communication**
I'm not sure	*No*
I can't/ I won't	*Nah (No)*
I wish I could	*Nope (No)*
I would like to, but	*No I don't*
I hope you will understand	*Sorry*
I'm not really sure	*No way*
Unfortunately, I'm not interested	
I'm sorry to inform you	
I'm sorry to say I'm not interested	
I don't think I can	

In order to show refusal in the Internet communication users often add an emoticon showing a person who raises his hands, meaning not having an opportunity or lack of interest.

Approval Speech Etiquette Formulas	
Real Communication	**Virtual Communication**
I really like the way	*That's great info*
I love the way	*Well done*
I accept your offer	*Good talk*
What a success	*Respect*
That sounds great/ amazing/	*Awesome*
fantastic/excellent	*Ok (okay)*
Go agead	

I approve of	
You couldn't have done better	
Sounds pretty good	
I am all for it	
We favour the offer	

In the communicative situation of approval in the Internet communication participants often use an emoticon in the form of thumbs-up, a finger raised up, meaning super. Also, they use emoji in the form of fire icon in order to demonstrate the highest estimation.

Gratitude Speech Etiquette Formulas	
Real Communication	**Virtual Communication**
I'm grateful for	*Thank you*
I'm thankful for	*Thank u*
I'm filled with happiness	*Thank uo*
You are a blessing	*Ty (thank you)*
I'm indebted to you	*Thankiieee*
My sincere thanks	*Thank you all*
You've been very helpful	*Thanks*
I thank you from the bottom of my heart	*Tks (thanks)*
If anyone deserves thanks, it's you	*Many thanks*
Taking the time to help me was a very nice thing for you to do	

To express gratitude in Internet communication users often add to a message a special emoji in the form of a positive smiling face with reddened cheeks from embarrassment.

Farewell Speech Etiquette Formulas	
Real Communication	**Virtual Communication**
See you again	*Bye!*
See you later (soon)	*bye-bye*
I have to run going now	*g2g (got to go)*
Goodbye!	*brb (be right back)*
Have a nice day!	*see ya (see you)*
I look forward to our next meeting	*CY (see you)*
Catch you later	*tty later (talk to you later)*
It was nice seeing you	
Take care	
Peace out	

Emoticons are often used to express farewell in Internet communication. For example, having agreed on something participants often use a special emoticon in the form of a handshake.

So, having compared speech etiquette formulas used in real and virtual communication in greeting, apologizing, request, refusal, approval, gratitude and farewell communicative situations, we have come to the conclusion, that in virtual communication their number is less numerous, they are often informal, contracted or abbreviated, and slang variants are rather popular.

Online informal communication is characterized by elliptical sentences, sentences with no punctuation marks, contractions and abbreviations, slang and swear words.

Conclusion to Chapter Two

Speech etiquette is one of the indispensable components of human communication and an integral part of general etiquette. It is a peculiar code of standardized speech forms, which are stereotypes of speech, ready-made formulas with a certain syntactic organization and lexical content. These specific words, phrases and fixed expressions, used in conversation, implement the policy of politeness in typical communicative situations. In the process of communication, communicative situations are repeated and they usually turn into the standard ones, both offline and online. Among them are: greeting, apology, request, consent, refusal, approval, gratitude, farewell and others.

Just like etiquette is a code of polite behavior in society, netiquette is a code of appropriate behavior on the Internet, and it governs communication on the Internet. It is a set of rules for acceptable online behavior, which encourage appropriate and courteous online behavior to prevent miscommunications and help one understand what is socially acceptable in online communication.

The Internet space has formed its own rules of conduct, certain traditions, kind of culture of communication. The Internet is not a zone without values, the formation of the content of its resources and services is influenced by human values. The online world should follow online laws. The rules of speech etiquette on the Net need to comply with the traditional rules of speech etiquette, and this compliance at the present stage of development of the society is more advisory than mandatory and depends primarily on the moral position of the user.

The analysis of greeting, apologizing, request, consent, refusal, approval, gratitude and farewell communicative situations in forums **(tripadvisor, fodor)**, social networking sites **(Facebook)** and **emails** showed that the main feature of virtual communication is its informal style, characterized by the use of different communicative types of sentences, elliptical sentences, contractions and abbreviations, slang, swear words, capital letters, incorrect grammar and punctuation and even absence of punctuation marks. Emotions in the analyzed communicative situations are often expressed with the help of special emoticons,

since the input from facial expressions and body language is absent in online communication, thus emoticons (emojis) are used to clarify facial expressions and other nonverbal emotional cues.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Internet communication is a special environment, the place of a language implementation that has never existed before but has allowed to thoroughly study the communicative potential of the language, its tendencies of functioning in a specific linguo-cultural environment.

The features of Internet discourse are diverse. Like virtual reality itself, internet discourse presupposes the obligatory presence of communicants, manifesting their illocutionary attitudes; it is created at the moment "here and now" and requires immediate feedback but at the same time it is psychologically comfortable, as the component of convention removes the feeling of responsibility for actions committed online, and it allows the individual to realize the illocutionary attitudes hidden in the real world for a moment.

The most popular Internet-based genres of communication are e-mail, chat, forum, blog, instant messaging, social networks. Besides, users' comments, guest books, electronic bulletin boards, various games and entertainment projects, as well as multimedia applications that support audio and video transmission and file sharing between users can be distinguished.

Speech behavior of the Internet users has been analyzed in greeting, apology, request, consent, refusal, approval, gratitude and farewell communicative situations in forums (**tripadvisor, fodor**), social networking sites (**Facebook**) and **emails** to identify their adherence to the rules of speech etiquette and the use of speech etiquette formulas, since speech etiquette is an integral part of communication, both real and virtual.

While speech etiquette is an integral part of general etiquette, netiquette governs communication on the Internet. Netiquette is a code of policies, a set of rules used to regulate polite behavior on social media platforms, online chatting sites, web forums, and other online engagement websites to prevent miscommunications and help one understand what is socially acceptable in online communication.

This policy of politeness is implemented with the help of speech etiquette formulas – specific words, phrases and fixed expressions. Having compared speech etiquette formulas used in real and virtual communication in greeting, apologizing, request, consent, refusal, approval, gratitude and farewell communicative situations, we have come to conclusion, that in virtual communication their number is less numerous, they are often informal, contracted or abbreviated, and slang variants are rather popular. It can be explained by the main feature of virtual communication – its informal style. Since the input from facial expressions and body language is absent in online communication, emoticons (emojis) are used to express emotions and clarify facial expressions and other nonverbal emotional cues.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра присвячена дослідженню особливостей етикетної мовленнєвої поведінки в онлайн спілкуванні.

Актуальність даного дослідження полягає в тому, що інтернет створює принципово нову культуру спілкування, яка відрізняється своїми характеристиками, і таким чином породжує нове, малодосліджене середовище.

Об'єкт дослідження — онлайн спілкування в різних інтернет жанрах.

Предмет дослідження — використання мовленнєвого етикету учасниками онлайн спілкування.

Головним принципом функціонування сучасної інтернет-комунікації є раціональне використання часу і речових засобів. У зв'язку з цим, кожний мовний рівень зазнає значних змін для успішного розвитку інтернет-спілкування.

В ході дослідження було здійснено аналіз мовленнєвої поведінки користувачів різних жанрів Інтернет-спілкування, визначені формули мовленнєвого етикету у типових комунікативних ситуаціях та специфічні риси їхнього вжитку. У роботі використані такі методи дослідження, як компаративний або зіставний, контекстуально-інтерпретаційний, описовий та аналітичний.

Робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів з висновками до кожного з них, загальних висновків, резюме та списку використаних джерел. Загальний обсяг роботи складає 76 сторінок.

У першому розділі визначено поняття дискурсу з точки зору різних концепцій та підходів до його визначення, особливості та типи дискурсу; описані характерні риси інтернет-дискурсу, а також жанрів та мови інтернет спілкування.

Другий розділ присвячено мовленнєвому етикету, нетикету як мережевому етикету у віртуальній комунікації, аналізу мовленнєвої поведінки учасників онлайн спілкування в типових комунікативних

ситуаціях (привітання, вибачення, запиту, відмови, схвалення, вдячності і прощання) та використанню ними формул мовленнєвого етикету.

Ключові слова: *інтернет дискурс, типова комунікативна ситуація, мовленнєвий етикет, формули мовленнєвого етикету, нетикет, скорочення, емотикон,*

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. AbuSa'aleek A.O. (2013) *Linguistic Dimensions of Initialisms used in Electronic Communication. Studies in Literature and Language*. Issue 3, 1-16.

2. Aleksandrova O. V. (2017) *On the Problem of Contemporary Discourse in Linguistics.* Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences №3, 298-302.

3. Al-Sa'di, R. A. &Hamdan, J. M. (2005) *Synchronous online chat. England: Computer-mediated communication.* World Englishes, №24, 409-424.

4. Baron N. (2004) *See you online: Gender issues in college student use of instant messaging.* Journal of Language and Social Psychology № 23, 397-423.

5. Boyd M. Ellison B. (2007) *Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship.* Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. Volume 13. Issue 1, 210-230.

6. Brown G., Yule G. (1983) *Discourse analysis.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 283.

7. Brown P. (2015) *Politeness and language. The international encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences,* 326-330.

8. Burkhardt A. (2010) *Speech acts, meaning and intentions: Critical approaches to the philosophy of John R.* Searle. De Gruyter, 438.

9. Coulthard M. (2014) *An introduction to discourse analysis.* London, UK: Routledge, 213.

10. Crystal D. (2001) *Language and the Internet.* Cambridge: CUP, 284.

11. Dresner E. Herring S. (2010) *Functions of the nonverbal in CMC: Emoticons and illocutionary force. Communication Theory*, 249-268.

12. Elena Malyuga, Daria Maksimova, Maria Ivanova (2019) *Cognitive and Discoursive Features of Speech Etiquette in Corporate Communication.* International Journal of English Linguistics. Vol. 9. №3, 310-318.

13. Evans D., Hopkins A., Potter, J. (2000) *Management gurus.* Pearson Education Limited. London: Pearson Education Limited, 40.

14. Ferrara K., Brunner H., Whittemore G. (1991) *Interactive written discourse as an emergent register. Written Communication*, №8, 8-34.

15. Fullwood C. Martino O. (2017) *Emoticons and impression formation.* Applied Semiotics, № 19, 4-14.

16. Hallahan K., Holtzhausen D., Van Ruler B., Verčič D., Sriramesh K. (2007) *Defining strategic communication.* International Journal of Strategic Communication, №1, 3-35.

17. Herring S. (1996) *Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social and crosscultural perspectives.* John Benjamins Publishing, 47-63.

18. Hewes D. E. (2016) *The cognitive bases of interpersonal communication.* New York: Routledge, 270.

19. Labov W. (1973) *Sociolinguistic patterns.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 362.

20. Malyuga E. N. (2011) *Gender factor in national varieties of English.* International Journal of English Linguistics, №1, 30.

21. Hoey M. (1984) *On the Surface of Discourse.* London: George Allen&Unwin, 175.

22. Murphy M. L. (2016) *(Un)separated by a common language? Are American/British differences unimportant?* English Today, №32, 56-59.

23. Petrey S. (2016) *Speech acts and literary theory.* London: Routledge, 175.

24. Provine R. R. (1993) *Laughter punctuates speech: Linguistic, social and gender contexts of laughter.* Ethnology, № 95, 291-298.

25. Provine R. R., Spencer R., Mandell D. (2007) *Emotional expression online: Emoticons punctuate website text messages.* Journal of Language and Social Psychology, №26, 299-307.

26. Sacks H., Schegloff E., Jefferson G. (1974) *A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation.* Language, 696-735.

27. Schegloff E. (1981) *Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences.* Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk, 71-93.

28. Schegloff E., Jefferson G., Sacks H. (1971) *The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation.* Language, №53, 361-382.

29. Schiffrin D., Tannen D., Hamilton H. E. (2001) *The handbook of discourse analysis.* Malden, MA: Blackwell, 874.

30. Searle J. R. (1985) *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts.* Cambridge University Press, 201.

31. Sinclair J., Coulthard R. M. (1975) *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 163.

32. Tarasenko S. (2017) *Speech etiquette in business negotiations.* Зб. наук.праць: матер. XXIV міжнар. наук.-практ. інтернет-конф. Переяслав-Хмельницький, Вип. 24, 321-326.

33. Trevino L. K., Nelson K. A. (2016). *Managing business ethics: Straight talk about how to do it right.* Hoboken: John Wiley&Sons, 496.

34. Turdiyeva Y. (2018) *Types of discourse in linguistic*. Достижения науки и образования, 138-139.

35. Werry C. (1996) *Linguistic and interactional features of Internet Relay Chat*

36. Wood L., Kroger R. (2000) *Doing Discourse Analysis: Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text.* London

37. Агаркова О. А. (2012) *Социальные факторы в речеэтикетных формулах русского и французского языков.* Вестник Череповецкого государственного университета, № 2. Т. 1., 44-47.

38. Бергельсон М. (2002) *Языковые аспекты виртуальной коммуникации.* Вестник Московского университета, №1, 66-67.

39. Богдан С. К. (1998) *Мовний етикет українців: традиції і сучасність.* Київ: Рідна мова, 475.

40. Буторина Е.П. (2014) *Русский язык и культура речи: учебное пособие.* Москва: ФОРУМ, 288.

41. Варламова Е. В. (2006) *Особенности германского леворадикального Интернет- дискурса:* автореф. дис. … канд. филол. наук: 10.02.04 Москва, 26.

42. Галичкина Е. Н. (2001) *Специфика компьтерного дискурса на английском и русском языках:* автореф. дис. … канд. филол. наук:10.02.20 Астрахань, 212.

43. Демьянков В. З. (2007) *Текст и дискурс как термины и как слова обыденого языка.*Вопросы филологии, 86-95.

44. Дробот Н. (2014) *Культура спілкування та значення етикету в англійській мові.Теоретична і дидактична філологія.* Переяслав-Хмельницький. Вип. 17, 272-281.

45. Ильина И. А. (2009) *Проблемы изучения и восприятия гипертекста в мультимедийной среде интернет:* автореф. дис. … канд. филол. наук: 10.01.10, Москва, 20.

46. Колокольцева Т.Н., Лутовинова О.В. (2012) *Интернет-коммуникация как новая речевая формация:* колл. монография / науч. ред. – М.: ФЛИНТА: Наука, 328.

47. Калініна К. В. (2013) *Особливості функціонування комп'ютерного дискурсу.* Обрії сучасної лінгвістики. Луганськ, №4, 62-64.

48. Козулина Н. С. (2016) *Морально-этический аспект экологического образования будущих специалистов профессионального обучения. Наука и образование: опыт, проблемы, перспективы развития.* Красноярск: Краснояр. гос. аграр. ун-т, 246.

49. Компанцева Л. Ф. (2007) *Інтернет-комунікація: когнітивно-прагматичний та лінгво-культурологічний аспекти:* автореф. дис. … д-ра філол. наук:10.02.02. Інститут мовознавства імені О.О. Потебні, Київ, 36.

50. Компанцева Л. Ф. (2005) *Проблема виртуального жанра.* Ученые записки Таврического Национального Университета им. В.И. Вернадского. Симферополь, №18 (57), 18-22.

51. Кондрашов П. Е. (2004) *Комп'ютерний дискурс: соціолінгвістичний аспект*: дис. …канд. філол. наук:10.02.15. Київ, 189.

52. Кубрякова Е. С. (2004) *На пути получения знаний о языке*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 560.

53. Лазар М. Г. (2006) *Этические основания регулирования виртуальной коммуникации.* Ученые записки. СПб, № 1, 176-189.

54. Лукашенко Н. Г. (2006) *Іспаномовний Інтернет-дискурс: комунікативно-прагматичний та лінгвостилістичний аспекти* (на матеріалі форумів з проблематики родинних стосунків): автореф. дис. … канд. філолог. наук: 10.02.05. Київ, 22.

55. Лутовинова О. В. (2009) *Лингвокультурологические характеристики виртуального дискурса.* Волгоград: Перемена.

56. Малькова Е. Ю. (2004) *Этические проблемы виртуальной коммуникации*: автореф. дис. … канд. филос. наук:09.00.05. СПб., 19.

57. Малюга Е. Н. (2001) *Функционально-прагматические аспекты английских вопросительных предложений*. Москва: Макс Пресс, 294.

58. Малюк А.А. (2011) *Этика в сфере информационных технологий*. Москва: Горячая линия-Телеком, 344.

59. Манакін В. М. (1995) *Контрастивна лексикологія і національна – мовна картина світу.* Матеріали Всеукр. конф. «Проблеми зіставної семантики». Київ: КДЛУ, 20-22.

60. Мечовская Н.Б. (2006) *Естественный язык и метаязыковая рефлексия в век Интернета.* Русский язык в научном освещении. Москва, № 2 (12), 165-185.

61. Назарова Л. В. (2010) *Гипертекст и Инернет-дискурс.* Текст – Дискурс. Гипертекст – Интернет-дискурс. Сборник научных статей. СПб.: Изд-во СПбГУЭФ, 118-136.

62. Наумов В.Б. (2002) *Право в Интернет. Очерки теории и практики.* М.: Книжный дом «Университет», 432.

63. Тарнопольський О.Б., Димова Л.С. (1999) *Обучения этикету иноязычного повседневного, педагогического и делового общения в языковом вузе ///* Іноземні мови, №1, 29-31.

64. Пінчук О. Ф. (1992) *Мова, людина, нація. Актуальні проблеми соціолінгвістики.* Київ: НМК ВО, 34-37.

65. Поуст Е. (1991) *Американський етикет: мистецтво розмови.* Тернопіль: Юніверс, 62.

66. Протанская Е.С. (2016) *Профессиональная этика психолога.* СПб.: Алетейя, 233.

67. Радевич-Винницький Я. (2001) *Етикет і культура спілкування.* Львів: Сполом, 223.

68. Рижков М.С. (2009) *Людемы Интернет-дискурса.* Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н. И. Лобачевского, №6, 338-345.

69. Сахарчук Л. І. (1992) *Соціальний аспект мовної діяльності. Актуальні проблеми соціолінгвістики.* Київ: НМК ВО, 16-21.

70. Селіванова О. О. (2010) *Лінгвістична енциклопедія.* Полтава: Довкілля, 844.

71. Фабіан М. П. (1998) *Етикетна лексика в українській, англійській та угорськіймові:* Ужгород: Інформаційно-видавниче агентство «ІВА», 255.

72. Фаенова М.О. (1991) *Обучение культуре общения на английском языке*: [науч.-теор. пособие]. Москва: Высшая школа, 144.

73. Формановская Н. И. (2005) *Культура общения и речевой этикет.* Москва: Издательство ИКАР, 250.

74. Формановская Н. И. (1987) *Русский речевой этикет: лингвистический и методический аспекты.* Москва: Русский язык, 158.

75. Яковец Т. Я. (2016) *Национальная специфика французского речевого этикета.* Наука, образование и инновации: сб. статей международной

научно-практической конференции. Уфа: МЦИИ «ОМЕГА САЙНС», 136-139.

76. Яковлюк А.А. (2015) *Социолингвистические особенности интернет-дискурса: на материале немецкого языка:* дис. …канд. фил.наук: 10.02.04. Москва, 164.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

77. Hentschel E. (1998) *Communication on IRC. Linguistik Online*, №1, http://www.linguistik-online.de/irc.htm (дата звернення: 26.08.2021).

78. Cambridge dictionary https://dictionary.cambridge.org/

79. Facebook https://www.facebook.com/

80. Fodor`s travel https://www.fodors.com/

81. Tripadvisor https://www.tripadvisor.co.uk/