

**Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное
учреждение высшего профессионального образования**

**Московский государственный университет имени М.В. Ломоносова
Факультет журналистики**

**РАБОЧАЯ ПРОГРАММА ДИСЦИПЛИНЫ
«ИНОСТРАННЫЙ ЯЗЫК»
(АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК)**

**Рекомендуется для направления подготовки
42.06.01 «Средства массовой информации и информационно-
библиотечное дело»**

Квалификация выпускника:

Исследователь. Преподаватель-исследователь

Профиль – Журналистика

Форма обучения: очная, заочная

Москва-2019

Рабочая программа дисциплины разработана и утверждена (выписка из протокола заседания Ученого Совета факультета журналистики МГУ №12 от 07 июля 2017 г.) с изменениями и дополнениями (выписка из протокола заседания Ученого Совета факультета журналистики МГУ №8 от 06 июля 2018 г.; выписка из протокола заседания Ученого Совета факультета журналистики МГУ №9 от 03 июля 2019 г.) в соответствии с самостоятельно установленным МГУ образовательным стандартом для реализуемых образовательных программ высшего образования – программ подготовки научно-педагогических кадров в аспирантуре по направлению подготовки 42.06.01 «Средства массовой информации и информационно-библиотечное дело» (утвержден приказом МГУ от 23 июня 2014 года №552, в редакции приказа МГУ от 31 августа 2015 года № 831).

ИНОСТРАННЫЙ ЯЗЫК (АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК)

Аннотация

Дисциплина «Иностранный язык (английский язык)» предназначена для формирования у аспирантов устойчивых навыков использования английского языка как средства научной коммуникации. Программа курса предусматривает овладение общенаучной лексикой, понятиями и терминами в сфере медиаисследований; формирование умения анализировать и интерпретировать научные тексты, а также продуцировать авторские тексты научного характера на английском языке, выступать с научными докладами и сообщениями и участвовать в научных дискуссиях.

1. Цели и задачи дисциплины.

Целью освоения дисциплины «Иностранный язык (английский язык)» является формирование у аспирантов профессиональных навыков использования английского языка как средства профессиональной коммуникации в научно-исследовательской и преподавательской работе.

Основными задачами являются формирование у студентов устойчивого навыка профессионального владения иностранным языком на уровне не ниже C1 по универсальной общеевропейской шкале; овладение навыками самостоятельной академической работы с иноязычными текстами, овладение терминологией, принятой в сфере медиаисследований на международном уровне; овладение навыками продуцирования авторского текста на иностранном языке как в устном, так и в письменном виде, ведения дискуссии и дебатов; овладение навыками создания презентации, написания докладов и статей на иностранном языке с целью обеспечения интеграции молодого исследователя в актуальную парадигму современного научного процесса.

2. Место дисциплины в структуре ООП

Дисциплина «Иностранный язык (английский язык)» входит в перечень дисциплин базовой части ООП подготовки в аспирантуре.

Для эффективного усвоения дисциплины необходимо владение иностранным языком на уровне B2 по общеевропейской шкале.

3. Требования к результатам освоения дисциплины

Процесс усвоения дисциплины направлен на формирование следующих универсальных и общепрофессиональных компетенций, предусмотренных Образовательным стандартом аспирантуры МГУ:

- готовность использовать современные методы и технологии научной коммуникации на иностранном языке (УК-5).

В результате освоения данной дисциплины аспирант должен:

Знать: иностранный язык (английский) на уровне не ниже C1 по общеевропейской шкале оценивания.

Уметь: поддерживать как письменную, так и устную коммуникацию на профессиональные и научные темы; продуцировать самостоятельные иноязычные тексты на профессиональные темы академической направленности.

Владеть: навыками реферирования, анализа и продуцирования устной и письменной речи академической направленности.

4. Структура и содержание дисциплины

Общая трудоемкость дисциплины составляет 6 з. е. (216 часов), из которых 3 з.е. (108 часов) отводится на аудиторную работу, 3 з.е. (108 часов) – на самостоятельную работу аспиранта.

4.1. Структура дисциплины

№	Раздел дисциплины	Формы текущего контроля
1	Чтение, перевод и анализ англоязычного текста академической направленности	Перевод специализированного текста
2	Реферирование англоязычного текста академической направленности	Реферирование статьи академической направленности
3	Анализ и применение академической терминологии	Составление тезауруса академической направленности
4	Продуцирование самостоятельного текста академической направленности	Подготовка и презентация самостоятельного академического текста (тезисов статьи)
		Экзамен кандидатского минимума

4.2. Содержание разделов дисциплины

№ п/п	Наименование раздела дисциплины	Содержание раздела
1	Чтение, перевод и анализ англоязычного текста академической направленности	- отработка навыков различного типа чтения на материале статей академической направленности; - отработка техники перевода текста профессиональной направленности; - анализ различных типов текстов академической направленности.
2	Реферирование англоязычного текста академической направленности	- отработка навыков реферирования профессиональных текстов; - составление кратких аннотаций и тезисов статей по выбранной академической тематике.
3	Анализ и применение академической терминологии	- анализ академических текстов с точки зрения профессиональной терминологии; - применение научных терминов при анализе и продуцировании текста.
4	Продуцирование самостоятельного текста академической направленности	- составление аннотаций, тезисов и написание самостоятельных научных статей по тематике исследования аспиранта; - устная презентация научного сообщения/доклада по выбранной тематике.

5. Рекомендуемые образовательные технологии

Семинарские занятия, индивидуальные и групповые консультации, подготовка презентаций, продуцирование самостоятельного научного текста.

6. Учебно-методическое обеспечение самостоятельной работы студентов. Оценочные средства для текущего контроля успеваемости, промежуточной аттестации по итогам освоения дисциплины

Самостоятельная работа студентов обеспечивается подготовленным преподавателем списком литературы с указанием адреса электронного доступа к большинству монографии и статей из списка дополнительной литературы, а также доступностью электронных версий презентаций (.ppt) по лекционным материалам и кейсам, которые преподаватель выкладывает на согласованный со студентами общедоступный интернет-ресурс.

В самостоятельную работу аспиранта входит выполнение контрольных заданий по всем разделам учебной дисциплины:

- чтение, перевод и реферирование оригинальной монографической и периодической научной литературы по специальности;
- составление академического тезауруса, включающего как общенаучную, так и узкоспециальную лексику, а также аббревиатуры, используемые в аутентичных научных текстах;
- составление списка англоязычных источников для включения в теоретический обзор научной литературы по теме диссертации;
- подготовка презентации по материалам исследования, проводимого аспирантом (подготовка устного выступления с РР-слайдами с соответствующей структурой и языковым оформлением);
- написание тезисов научной статьи с соблюдением норм, присущих этому виду академического текста.

Оценочные средства для финальной аттестации по дисциплине «Иностранный язык»

Структура экзамена

Предполагается предоставление после окончания изучения дисциплины выполненных и проанализированных заданий по четырем разделам учебной дисциплины и презентации по теме диссертационного исследования.

Кандидатский экзамен по английскому языку состоит из:

- 1) составления тезисов к статье/фрагменту статьи академической направленности (объем статьи/фрагмента статьи – приблизительно 10 000 печатных знаков (3-4 страницы);
- 2) перевода выделенного фрагмента статьи академической направленности (объем текста – 2 500 печатных знаков);
- 3) пересказа и анализа содержания статьи академической направленности.

Шкала оценивания знаний аспиранта/соискателя на экзамене:

Максимальная оценка: 100 баллов

Текущая работа аспиранта/соискателя: 40 баллов (по 10 баллов за каждый раздел)

Экзамен: 60 баллов (по 20 баллов за каждый аспект)

Оценки:

85-100 – отлично

75-84 – хорошо

60-74 -удовлетворительно
0-59 - неудовлетворительно

Образец экзаменационного задания:

1. Прочитать статью, составить тезисы.
2. Перевести письменно выделенный фрагмент статьи.
3. Пересказать и проанализировать прочитанную статью.

Making Sense of the Mediatization of Politics

Jesper Stromback and Frank Esser

At heart, mediatization refers to a social change process in which media have become increasingly influential in and deeply integrated into different spheres of society (Asp 1986; Hjarvard 2013; Mazzoleni 2008a; Strömbäck and Esser 2009). Mediatization should thus be distinguished from the related concept of mediation, which refers to the more neutral act of transmitting messages and communicating through media (Mazzoleni 2008b; Strömbäck 2008). The undisputed fact that more messages and experiences than ever are transmitted and experienced through media – that is, mediated – is important and a key part of mediatization, but mediatization is a broader and more dynamic and process-oriented process and concept (Couldry and Hepp 2013; Esser 2013; Hjarvard 2013; Strömbäck and Esser 2009). With ramifications for most parts of modern society, mediatization has also been conceptualized as on par with other large-scale transformative processes such as globalization (Kriesi et al. 2013).

In terms of theory, despite the broad consensus that mediatization refers to a process of increasing media importance and influence, thus far mediatization has the character of a theoretical perspective or framework rather than a proper theory. This holds true both for mediatization in general and the mediatization of politics. Although great progress has been made during the last few years, much work remains before it can be considered a full-blown, elaborated theory. To note this is not to diminish its value, only to say the obvious that much work remains to be done and caution against overstating our understanding of this process.

In terms of politics, the mediatization of politics has been defined as a long-term process through which the importance of the media and their spill-over effects on political processes, institutions, organizations and actors has increased (Strömbäck and Esser 2014). This definition highlights four essential features of the mediatization of politics. First, it is a long-term and dynamic process. Second, the essence of mediatization is increasing importance and influence of media. Third, mediatization affects all parts of politics, including the processes as well as the political institutions, organizations and actors. Fourth, many of the media-related influences may be indirect rather than direct, and result from how political institutions, organizations and actors more or less reactively or proactively adapt to the media and their own needs to communicate through the media.

Following Strömbäck (2008), the mediatization of politics is a process where four distinct albeit highly related dimensions could be identified. The first dimension refers to the degree to which media constitute the most important source of information about politics and society. This dimension thus deals with the extent to which politics is mediated. The second dimension refers to the degree to which media have become differentiated and independent from other social and political institutions. Although all institutions, from a social systems perspective, should be perceived of as interdependent, for the media to have an independent influence in politics, they have to form an institution in their own right. The third dimension refers to the degree to which media and the coverage of politics and current affairs is guided by media logic or political logic. Thus, this dimension deals with the extent to which the media's own needs and standards of newsworthiness, rather than those of political actors, organizations or institutions, are decisive for what the media cover and how they cover it. The fourth dimension refers to the extent to which political institutions, organizations and actors are guided by media logic or political logic. It thus deals with the interaction between media and politics and the very essence of the mediatization of politics, that is, the direct as well as indirect and ripple effects of media in political processes and over political actors, organizations and institutions (see also Strömbäck 2011a; Strömbäck and Esser 2009, 2014).

Important to note is that mediatization along each of the dimensions is a matter of degree. Media can, for example, be more or less independent from political institutions, and media content as well as political institutions, organizations and actors can be more or less guided by media logic as opposed to political logic. There might consequently be variations across different media and different political actors, organizations and actors, both within and across countries. Ultimately, the mediatization of politics is always shaped by the practices of different media and different political institutions, organizations and actors, and should not be perceived as an exogenous factor influencing all institutions, organizations and actors in an equal or uniform fashion.

Within this framework, the media that matter most are news media conceived of as socio-technological organizations and institutions. In essence, this means organized journalism at newspapers, radio, television and news magazines in either their traditional or digital formats or, to the extent that they are organized and operate as institutional news media, purely digital news providers. While technology matters, what is most important here is not the particular technology, but whether these different news media are organized as institutional actors, which pursue certain goals and act in the interest of reaching these goals, whether it is to make a profit or provide high-quality journalism (Allern and Blach-Ørsten 2011; Cook 2005; Esser 2013; Sparrow 1999).

Not only do single news media organizations constitute institutional actors. Because of the great similarities across news media in terms of how they operate and their rules, routines, norms and news values—what Cook (2005, 64) defined as the media's "transorganizational agreement on news processes and content"—different news media can also be grouped together as an interorganizational field and be conceived of as a singular news media institution (Cook 2005; Esser 2013; Sparrow 1999). Different news media constitute the building blocks of the news media as an institution, but the rules and norms that govern the news media as a whole are considered more important than what distinguishes one news media company, outlet, type, etc., from another (Altheide and Snow 1979; Cook 2005; Esser 2013; Hjarvard 2013; Strömbäck 2008).

This notion of the news media as a single institution is important, as it highlights the relative autonomy and differentiation of the news media from political institutions and as the idea of increasing media importance and influence presumes that the news media are not subordinate to other institutions. In essence, it is through the functional and structural differentiation of the news media from other institutions that they have come to form an institution in their own right, and it is through becoming an institution in their own right that the news media have come to increase their importance and influence (Hjarvard 2008, 2013; Esser 2013; Strömbäck 2008, 2011a).

Media Influence and the Concepts of Media Logic and Political Logic

Another key part of this understanding of the mediatization of politics is related to how media influence is conceptualized. As noted by Schulz (2004, 88–90), at least four processes of social change arising from media-driven transformations can be identified: extension, substitution, amalgamation and accommodation. All these processes follow from the combination of the characteristics of different media technologies, what social, cultural or political needs these media technologies might serve, and the increasing presence and importance of media in all parts of social and political life. Media influence in the context of mediatization is thus a broader concept than media effects and "both transcends and includes media effects" (Schulz 2004, 90). For example, most media effect theories assume that media effects follow from content, whereas mediatization also includes how media through their very existence and semistructural properties exert influence. Traditional media effects theories also cannot account for anticipatory effects, for example when political actors behave in a certain way or abstain from certain behaviors because of how they anticipate the news media's reactions. Rather than restricted to traditional media effects, media influence in the context of the mediatization of politics refers to all activities and processes that are altered, shaped or structured by media or the perceived need of individuals, organizations or institutions to communicate with or through the media (Strömbäck and Esser 2014). These changes need not be imposed upon politics, but might as well be self-initiated in the face of a media environment that is perceived as omnipresent and influential. How influential media are perceived to be may thus have significant consequences for how politics is affected by the media (Cohen, Tsifti, and Sheaffer 2008; Strömbäck 2011b).

Two key concepts in this context are media logic and political logic, as mediatization along the third and fourth dimension deals with the extent to which media content and political institutions, organizations and actors, respectively, are guided by media logic as opposed to political logic. The more media content or political institutions, organizations and actors are guided by media logic, the more influential the news media are, and the further mediatization has progressed.

Both these concepts, and in particular media logic, have been criticized. Among the most common criticisms of the concept of media logic are that it is too elusive and vague, that it suggests a linearity and singularity that is not there, that it lends itself to technological determinism, or that it may hide important patterns of social interactions (see e.g.

Couldry 2008; Lundby 2009; Landerer 2013). Some of this criticism may be justified—but it also depends on how media logic and political logic are understood.

From our perspective and focusing on news media logic rather than a general media logic (Strömbäck 2011a), the basic idea behind the concepts of news media logic and political logic is that media and politics constitute two different institutional systems that serve different purposes and that each has its own set of actors, organizations and institutions, rules and procedures, and needs and interests. These institutional rules and procedures can be formal as well as informal, and together form a certain “logic of appropriateness” (March and Olsen 1989) within each sphere. Neither media logic nor political logic is thus set in stone, and may evolve in accordance with institutional as well as significant contextual changes, but neither is arbitrary. Both have evolved to serve as guidelines for appropriate behavior and thinking within each institutional sphere and based on each sphere’s purposes, interests, needs and institutional structures (Strömbäck and Esser 2014).

Both news media logic and political logic should, furthermore, be conceptualized as formed by three dimensions, respectively (Esser 2013). With respect to political logic, these are polity, policy and politics. Polity refers to the system of rules regulating the political process in any given country, including the institutional structure. Policy refers to the processes of defining problems and forming and implementing policies within a certain institutional framework. Politics refers to the processes of garnering support for one’s candidacy, party or political ideas, including the self-presentational side of politics (Esser 2013; see also Meyer 2002; Pennings, Keman, and Kleinnijenhuis 2006). With respect to news media logic, the three dimensions are professionalism, commercialism and media technology (Esser 2013; see also Strömbäck and Esser 2014). Professionalism refers to the extent to which journalism is differentiated as an institution and set of professional practices and norms that sets it apart from other institutions, in particular politics. Commercialism refers to the persistent fact that most media are commercially driven, which has significant implications for all processes of news production, news selection and news presentation. Media technology refers to how the various communication platforms shape content in production and reproduction processes, and the processes of finding or reshaping news to fit the socio-technological formats of different media.

From this perspective, neither political logic nor news media logic are cast in stone and fully consistent across time, countries, or political or media institutions within countries. Instead, both political logic and news media logic have a partly situational and dynamic character, and there are tensions within the component parts of both logics. For example, there might often be tensions between policy and politics, as well as between journalistic professionalism and media commercialism. How such tensions are played out and resolved might have a significant influence on the exact nature of political logic or news media logic in particular processes, but may also change from time to time or vary across political actors, organizations and institutions, or between different news media (see further Esser 2013; Strömbäck and Esser 2014). This does not change the tension between political logic and news media logic, and that the news media as well as political institutions, organizations and actors regularly find themselves in situations where they have to decide to what extent they should let political logic or news media logic guide or govern their behavior. The more they let news media logic guide their behavior, the more mediatized they are.

Contributions and Criticisms of the Mediatization Perspective

While the relationship between media and politics has been at the center of research on political communication and news journalism for decades, and many important theories have been developed, tested and refined, overall the field is characterized by a lack of more general theories. It is in this context we believe the theoretical framework of mediatization is highly important. More specifically, we see at least four reasons where the theoretical framework of mediatization has great potential to contribute to further research on the relationship between media and politics and our understanding of the processes that during the last decades have transformed and still continue to transform democracies around the world.

First, the theoretical framework of mediatization has the potential to develop into a general theory on the dynamic relationship between media, politics and democracy, including how that relationship evolves and changes over time. Second, we believe the framework of mediatization has great potential to integrate other theories related to the relationship between media and politics. This includes theories that are related to each of the four dimensions of mediatization, ranging from media consumption patterns to the institutional relationship between media and politics, factors and processes shaping the media coverage of politics and society including the coverage itself, and the extent to which political actors, organizations and institutions are influenced by media or guided by media logic. Third, in contrast to most theories on media and politics, the mediatization perspective has the potential to link micro-level processes and phenomena to meso- and macro-level processes and phenomena. Fourth, and this is also important, the mediatization framework raises many normative questions about the relationship between media, politics and democracy, without in itself being normative (for a wider discussion of these points, see Esser and Strömbäck 2014a).

If the framework of mediatization has great potential, it is also true that much work remains to be done and that there are reasons to be critical of how the mediatization concept is often used. First, mediatization still has the character of a theoretical perspective rather than a proper theory, and it remains more of a “sensitizing” than a “definitive” concept (Hjarvard 2013, 4–5). As such, it is more loosely defined and used as an exploratory tool than a carefully defined concept that lends itself easily to precise operationalizations that can be used in empirical research. Second, too often mediatization is vaguely defined, referred to rather than empirically investigated, and treated as a fact rather than as a process or phenomena to be investigated. Here we agree with Waisboard who, when writing about mediatization in general, notes that

Yes, mediatization is a metaprocess that has spearheaded epochal transformations over the last century. But this should be considered a point of analytical departure or an intriguing affirmation to be tested rather than a conclusion. This is necessary to avoid deterministic conclusions which assume that the availability of media technologies inevitably transforms the society without closer inspection of the kind and magnitude of the changes. (Waisboard 2013, 7)

Third, the mechanisms of mediatization and the linkages between micro-, meso- and macro-level phenomena and processes remain rather poorly investigated, analyzed and understood. In addition, we also need to “understand better the factors that bind, steer and shape mediatization” (Waisboard 2013, 7), both in general and with respect to the mediatization of politics. Fourth, and more in general, there are still too few empirical studies on the mediatization of politics that operationalize mediatization in a theoretically coherent and strong fashion. Consequently, there is a need not only for more empirical research on the mediatization of politics, but also for the development of empirical indicators of mediatization along each of the four dimensions and the linkages between different aspects and mechanisms of mediatization. This weakness in conceptual and empirical terms had mainly motivated us to initiate this edited collection.

Source: Journalism Studies, 2014 Vol. 15, No. 3, 243–255, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2014.897412> © 2014 Taylor & Francis

7. Учебно-методическое и информационное обеспечение дисциплины

а) Основная литература:

Учебники:

1. British Council (2015). *English for Academics*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Dollahite N. (2006). *Academic English from Sources*. US: Thomson Heinle.
3. Moore J., Storton R. (2017). *Oxford Academic Vocabulary Practice (B2-C1)*. Oxford University Press.
4. Grussendorf M. (2015). *English for Presentations*. Oxford University Press.
5. Herzfeld-Pipkin N. (2006). *Destinations. Grammar for Academic Success*. US: Thomson Heinle.
6. Wallwork A. (2011). *English for Writing Research Papers*. London: Springer Science + Business Media.

Научные журналы и базы:

1. Journalism Studies - <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rjos20>
2. Journalism Practice - <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rjop20>
3. Journal of Communication - [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1460-2466](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1460-2466) и другие издания базы Wiley - <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/>
4. Архив журналов Cambridge University Press - <http://journals.cambridge.org/>
5. Архив журналов Oxford University Press - <http://www.oxfordjournals.org/>
6. Журналы и книги Metapress - <http://metapress.com/>
7. Журнальные коллекции JSTOR - <http://www.jstor.org/>
8. Project MUSE - <http://muse.jhu.edu/>
9. Журналы издательства Elsevier - <http://www.sciencedirect.com/>
10. SAGE (STM&HSS) – <http://online.sagepub.com/>
11. Springer: книжные серии, журналы и электронные справочники - <http://link.springer.com/>

12. Scimago Journal & Country Rank - <http://www.scimagojr.com/>

6) Дополнительная литература:

1. Altheide D.L., Snow R.P. (1991). *Media Worlds in the Postjournalism Era*. Aldine De Gruyter
2. Bell A. (1991). *The Language of News Media*, Oxford: Blackwell.
3. Downing J.D., McQuail, D., Schlesinger P., Wartella, E. (2004). *The SAGE Handbook of Media Studies*, Thousand Oaks, SAGE Publications.
4. Eadie W.F. (2009). *21st Century Communication*. A Reference Handbook. SAGE Publications.
5. Lievrouw L.A., Livingstone S. (2006). *The Handbook of New Media*, Thousand Oaks. SAGE Publications.
6. Lundby K. (2009). *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences*. NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
7. Astorga, M. C. (2007). *Teaching academic writing in the EFL context: Redesigning pedagogy*. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 2(4), pp.251-267.
8. Carter, R. Vocabulary. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (2001). *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
9. Dong, Y. R. (1998). *Non-native graduate students' thesis/dissertation writing in sciences: Self-reports by students and their advisors from two U.S. institutions*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17(4), pp.369-390.

8. Материально-техническое обеспечение дисциплины

1. Аудитория, оснащенная проекционным оборудованием (проектор, экран или интерактивная доска, связанная с компьютером преподавателя), с возможностью выхода в интернет.
2. Согласованный со студентами общедоступный электронный ресурс: <https://app.schoology.com/course/1891713086/materials?f=148647442>

Программа составлена в соответствии с требованиями ОС МГУ с учетом ФГОС по направлению подготовки 42.06.01 «Средства массовой информации и информационно-библиотечное дело», профилю – Журналистика.

Разработчики

Факультет журналистики МГУ	доцент	И. А. Муратова
Факультет журналистики МГУ	доцент	З. В. Костанян
Факультет журналистики МГУ	ст. преподаватель	Т. В. Краснова
Факультет журналистики МГУ	ст. преподаватель	А. Р. Акчурина