

5. Кравченко Ю. Про деякі інтерактивні методи на заняттях з англійської мови у ВНЗ. №3, 2012. С. 4-8.
6. Кузнецова Н. Дослідно-експериментальне навчання англійського діалогічного мовлення обдарованих учнів старшої школи. Наука і освіта. №6, 2013. 154–158 с.
7. Куріч М. Використання інтерактивних технологій на уроках іноземної мови, 2012. С. 2–7.
8. Максименко Л. Експериментальна перевірка ефективності методики навчання професійно спрямованого англійського діалогу майбутніх менеджерів невиробничої сфери. Київський національний лінгвістичний університет. №6, 2015. С. 8–19.
9. Брецько І. Діалогічне мовлення — основа для розвитку здібностей міжособистісного спілкування. Педагогические науки, 2016. С. 39–42.
10. Baker J. Essential Speaking Skills. Westrup Heather: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2003. 170 с.

УДК 811.111'36

О. В. Гурин

*Житомирський державний університет імені Івана Франка
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент*

Latest Grammatical Tendencies in English

It is common knowledge that almost any natural live language undergoes changes [1]. English as one of them displays the same features, however its levels: phonetic, lexical and grammatical are characterized by a different rate of change. Scopes of new vocabulary enter a language virtually on a daily basis. As far as phonetics is concerned, every generation has its pronunciation peculiarities [9]. Grammar, namely morphology and syntax, are subject of considerably slower change [4], the former being more flexible though than the latter. We conclude from available linguistic research [3, 4] that systemic morphological changes happen in English once in several hundred years (200-300 – the time between sub-periods in the chronological periodization of the English language development) and syntactic – in 500-700 hundred years (the shift towards analytization, grammaticalization etc.)

Grammatical and semantic analysis of literary works of various genres as well as contemporary oral speech suggests that the 20th century saw certain social and cultural

events, that brought about numerous grammatical changes to English in late 20th – early 21st centuries.

The aim of this paper is to define and systematize recent morphological changes in English

Methods. This research suggests some linguistic issues, which should be considered while tracing morphological change, as well as the usage of the scientific methods of analysis, synthesis, description, statistical analysis, and comparison, as well as linguistic methods of semantic analysis and substitution in order to illustrate the trends in recent morphological change.

Results and Discussion. As it has been noted, English grammar gradually evolves as sometimes there are certain historic and cultural events that accelerate the change [6]. However certain processes happen naturally due to internal linguistic factors.

Let's take one subtle change which is difficult to explain, why it happened, but maybe there is no need to do it. There is a number of verbs that take an object in either the gerund form or the infinitive form. Both of these constructions are still in use, but there has been a steady shift over time from the "to" to the "-ing" complement.

When comparing the language of E. Hemingway (first half of the 20th c.) and Ben Mezricz (beginning of the 21st c.) a shift in constructions like *they started to walk* towards *they started walking* becomes obvious. Indicatively *start +infinitive* in Hemingway's short stories [2] was attested in 60 instances, whereas *start + gerund* – in 12 (83% and 17% respectively).

By contrast in Ben Mezrich's novel the ratio is 26/13 [67% and 33% respectively]

(1) *If he had been better with women she would probably have started to worry about him* [2:28]

(2) "We can start interviewing people, throw the word around that we're looking for someone" [7:30].

Similar trend is observed regarding "*begin*", "*like*," "*love*," "*hate*," and "*fear*" saw However, not all verbs in such constructions have participated in the shift: "*stand*," "*intend*," and "*cease*" display the shift towards the infinitive as a complement.

Some changes however we can try and explain and in finding the reason, we can precisely see a definite direction in which the language is moving thus causing systemic novelties in the language. They are those, caused by primarily extralinguistic factors, which took place in the middle and second half of the 20th century. Among others we define acceleration of democratization and humanization as post-war, post-colonial social features introduced or reinforced by a number of historic events: failures of nondemocratic systems (fascism, nacism, communism), passage of the 1964 Civil

Rights Act in the USA, loss of major colonies by Great Britain, France, Netherlands, Portugal etc. Basically all these events have a common thread – in all of them in the centre there stands a human being, a personality, whose dignity and rights must be acknowledged and respected by others. Thus the principles of consideration and politeness in communication stand out among others.

We will understand politeness as practical application of good manners or etiquette so as not to offend others. Linguistically speaking politeness is generally associated with interjections like “Please”, “Thank you” and “You’re welcome”, whereas impoliteness or rudeness suggests the absence thereof and/or the presence of vulgarisms, obsolescences etc. All the mentioned means belong to the lexical level of the language. As far as the phonetic level is concerned, it’s intonation, namely pitch, stress and tempo, which can render offensive or comforting messages.

Grammatical level is often overlooked in search of “polite” linguistic means. The following table with the screenshots of seemingly polite and impolite negative comments to various posts in social media can serve an illustration of how a statement can seem offensive without the usage of vividly expressive lexical and phonetic means.

As the comparison with the non-offensive comments suggests, sentences (5), (6), (8), (10) contain “disrespectful” grammar. Here I am using this adjective in quotes, as by themselves, the following grammatical phenomena have neutral semantics (neither positive nor negative), but in the argumentative discourse they obtain offensive patronizing meaning:

- imperative sentences (examples (5), (8));
- semantics of modals – reproach (example (6))
- non-hedged categorical statements (example (10)).

The list and the examples above are naturally non-conclusive. Contemporary oral and written speech provide evidence that grammatical means, aimed at expressing non-offensive statements, can be:

- the use of tag questions instead of direct statements (*You were here yesterday, weren't you?*)
- the use of negation in that part of the sentence which refers to the speaker, rather than to the addressee (I don't think you know me rather than *I think you don't know me*)
- the use of various types of hedges, which were specified in Hyryn 2020 [5].

Polite disagreement comments	Impolite disagreement comments
<p>Please vaccinate. I have no desire to learn the entire Greek alphabet.</p>	
<p>(3) So scientifically speaking, virus mutate within unvaccinated hosts only?</p> <p>(4) Well, you don't have to</p>	<p>(5) Open your mind and learn it, it may do you good</p> <p>(6) Well, you are a doctor you should already learned Greek alphabet on the first place....🙄</p>
<p>Map Ranks Languages From Least To Most Difficult To Learn.</p>	
<p>(7) Would love to see this with signed languages added</p>	<p>(8) Try to learn Danish...</p>
<p>Magnificent Linguistic Family Tree Shows How all Languages are Related.</p>	
<p>(9) I majored in Linguistic and English & American Studies in Japan. This tree is, I see, quite closer to the accurate theories and historic data. Unfortunately the roots and the relation among East Asian languages both in spoken and written systems which are very old from ancient times, for example, are still not clear.</p>	<p>(10) It actually shows that not all languages are related. Uralic has its own tree. Where are the rest of the languages? Also their own tree and not related? It's a cool image but a bit anti climatic. It says all the languages are related. It's not all the languages. And they're not all related.</p>

Democratization and humanization however cause not only shifts in the language towards more polite semantics of grammatical units, but also towards the accountability for one's actions or absence thereof. This could be best shown by the change in the use of some modal verbs and modal expressions in the recent decades.

Negative form of the modal verb can serve a vivid example of this humanization shift.

Can't – among other meanings (physical impossibility, prohibition) has a meaning of theoretical improbability/disbelief, thus rendering the idea that something is 100% impossible to happen or be happening [Mur:56]. In the whole novel by B. Mezrich the latter meaning wasn't attested not even once. It can be explained by the idea that stating that something is definitely impossible suggests that it is beyond someone to do it, but

since human beings within the newest paradigm are in the centre of the Universe [10], everything is possible for them.

A similar shift has occurred in the use of modal phrase *to have (got) to*. Its basic meaning of circumstantial necessity and obligation [8: 62] (i.e. when one has no choice but comply with the conditions, suggested by the environment) contradicts to the assumption of the “almighty human” and thus is replaced by the verb *to need*, thus suggesting that the necessity is not caused by the environment, but comes from within, (i.e. whatever one is doing – it is their decision). In the analyzed 21st c. novel [7] *to have to* was attested in 1 sentence, *to have got to* – in 3, *got to* – in 2 sentences, whereas *to need* – was registered in 70 instances.

Conclusion. Both intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors are capable of initiating semantic shifts in the language, affecting not only the lexical level of a language, but also grammatical. The second half of the 20th and the early 21st century is the time of such changes, which have shifted accents in interpersonal communication thus emphasizing humanistic and democratic approach to speech.

REFERENCES

1. Bybee J. *Language Change*. Cambridge University Press, 2015. pp. 10–11.
2. Hemingway E. *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: The Finca Vigia Edition*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, 1998, 650 P.
3. Hogg R., Denison D. *A History of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press, 2006. — 495 p.
4. Hollmann W. B. Grammatical change. In Jonathan Culpeper, Francis Katamba, Paul Kerswill, and Tony McEnery (eds.), *English language: description, variation and context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009, pp. 314-333.
5. Hyryn O.V. Lexical and Grammatical Hedging as the Means of Author’s Modality / Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка. Філологічні науки. 2020, Випуск 2 (93), С. 96-103
6. Mantiri O. Factors Affecting Language Change, 2010. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2566128> (ref. date: 25.01.2022)
7. Mezrich B. *The Accidental Billionaires: The Founding of Facebook: A Tale of Sex, Money, Genius and Betrayal*. New York, Toronto, 2009, 210 P.
8. Murphy R. *English Grammar in Use*. 4-ed. 2012. URL: <https://online.fliphtml5.com/lhxm/ezwh/> (ref. date: 25.01.2022)

9. Robinson J. Phonological change in the English language, 2019. URL: <https://www.bl.uk/british-accent-and-dialects/articles/phonological-change-in-the-english-language> (ref. date: 25.01.2022)

10. Shermer M. Why Humans Prefer to Be the Center of the Universe. Science contemplates the incomprehensible, 2017. URL: <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/why-humans-prefer-to-be-the-center-of-the-universe/> (ref. date: 25.01.2022)

УДК 373.5.091.33:811

Т. В. Глазунова

*Вінницький державний педагогічний університет
імені Михайла Коцюбинського
канд. пед. наук, доцент*

М. П. Раджагопал

*Вінницький державний педагогічний університет
імені Михайла Коцюбинського
студентка факультету іноземних мов*

Врахування вікових та психологічних особливостей старшокласників у навчанні іноземних мов

Студентоцентризований підхід до навчання іноземних мов передбачає врахування психологічних чинників, які значною мірою впливають на вибір навчального матеріалу, методів та навчальних прийомів. Ці чинники можна умовно поділити на дві групи: 1) чинники, пов'язані з суб'єктами навчальними діяльності (учнями) та 2) зовнішні чинники (ситуація навчання – характер навчального матеріалу, методи та навчальні прийоми). До першої групи дослідники відносять мотивацію, інтереси, афективні стани, які впливають на ставлення учнів до предмета (висока тривожність, низька самооцінка), провідна сенсорна система / модальність сприйняття [1; 6]. При цьому мотивації належить вирішальна роль – можна привести учня до ситуації учіння, але не можна змусити його вчитися. Розвиток внутрішньої мотивації до вивчення іноземної мови можна забезпечити шляхом відбору цікавого навчального матеріалу, який дає простір до дискусії, а також створення позитивної навчальної атмосфери, що сприятиме зниженню психологічних бар'єрів та підвищенню самооцінки учнів.