

Olga Mitchuk: Culture of Airtime Speech

Modern society cannot exist without competent speech - the most important means of communication, expression of ideas and information transfer for recipients. It is of great importance to study and use the correct language means of giving a view depending on the purpose and content of one's utterance. Language regularity in a media-text is, first of all, observance of those literary norms, which are a fixed model for the native speakers of this language.

Theoretical and practical principles of speech culture are the process of linguistic activity realization, the unique objective display of the language. A speech concept includes such concrete aspects of language as verbal aloud utterance, to talk without the articulation perceived by the ear, and writing, that is the fixing of utterances in the process of their forming, and also texts of mass communication entails the result of utterance processes or their written reflection in printed mass media (means of mass communication).

Speech as the general process of public linguistic activity consists of individual speech acts of every member of a linguistic collective. As the individual speech acts are the transmitters of certain concrete data for conscious perception by other members of the linguistic collective. A speech concept involves also concrete semantics of every utterance - verbal or written. In modern linguistic science the speech concept, according to F. de Saussure, is examined in contrast with the language concept, which refers to the linguistic system as a well-organized aggregate of structural language units - phonemes, words, grammatical forms, syntactic charts, word combinations and sentences.

The two contrasted aspects of mass media language activity usually emphasize the differences between the dynamic, subjectivity, individualization, arbitrariness, purposefulness, situation conditionality of speech and passivity, statistical, objectivity, public allocation, obligatoriness, and independence from the situation system of language. In such a contrasted linguistic system (language) it is not often placed on a unique ontological level with speech, as one of two, with equal rate, but as an autonomous linguistic display. But speech is quite often examined as the realization of a linguistic system. In this case it is not the linguistic system that is only the internal property of language that is available only as a language.

As a real concrete display of language speech is a much more complex phenomenon since it is considerably more difficult to research than the abstract linguistic system. In contrast to the paradigmatic nature of the linguistic system, in which the structural elements of language are only distinguished, and contrasted to each other and united according to their structural features into groups of relatively invariant units of the same types, speech has a syntagmatic nature of a linearly formed construction within the limits of which structurally different units of language unite and co-operate and in these terms acquire a wide variety. Varying in the field of lexical unit, semantics is the most widespread.

The sound sphere of language assumes numerous variants such as phonemes, prosodic descriptions of words, intonation arrangement of sentences. A variety of linguistic units in the processes of speech depend on three basic directions of extra-lingual and inter-lingual nature:

- situation and spheres of speech function (social relation to professional environment, a special purpose direction of speech);
- individual features of a speaker (age, education, profession, sex);
- phonetic and lexical context.

A separate type of divergence between the inversions of the linguistic system and various displays of speech allows for a typical colloquial practice of deviation from the standardized linguistic norms and casual individual errors in speech.

Use of the physical reflections of linguistic signs in the processes of intellection - words and sentences - without pronouncing them aloud and without their written fixed form is called internal speech. The internal speech is accompanied by the hidden articulation of linguistic sounds, which is brought forward as an instrument of registration.

The internal speech in the process of thinking and the creation of journalistic texts differs from the external speech through its conciseness, fragmentariness, considerable semantic meaning of separate words, possibility of replacement of concrete images of certain words, and word combinations by their schematic pictures or their functions in the structure of a thought. But in a correct creation of internal speech the speech culture plays a greater role.

The culture of speech is the observance of certain verbal and written literary pronunciation, and also conscious, purposeful, skilful use of linguistic expressive means depending on a purpose and means of intercourse. Ontology, language stylistics (functional and expressive estimation of language means), speech stylistics are important component parts of speech culture (degree of expedience of the languages refers to use in a text).

The low culture of speech is characterized by violation of rules of word usage, grammar, pronunciation and accent, and writing. For example, journalists often make mistakes using in their speech loan translations from foreign languages adapted to Ukrainian instead of real Ukrainian words and phrases. Radio and television journalists often use the wrong accents. Deafening of voiced consonants at the end of words is a sign of low culture of speech used by journalists, and the soft pronunciation of a hushing sound. The culture of speech is estimated in relation to its exactness, quality, expressiveness, stylistic accuracy, linguist skills in the use of lexical, grammatical symbols, and in the selection of utterance variants.

There are syntactic means of making the culture of speech more expressive. They are rhetorical questions, addresses to the listeners, varied forms of conversational language, which give expressive richness, emotionality, ease, playfulness to journalistic speech. The high journalist culture of speech is the mastering of the stylistic richness of language, avoidance of stock phrases, bureaucratic clichés, and dialecticisms in linguistic practice, and an achievement of such verbal and writing form of intercourse that would precisely reproduce the idea. Linguistic stereotypes, and negligence in the utterance is a sign of poverty within journalistic thought.

The journalist culture of speech is directly related to the state of setting norms, literary language fixing,

reflected in the dictionaries, grammars, practical language courses, where the managed function of speech culture consists, in particular, in achievement of dialectical balance between historical grammar, and the theoretical and practical courses of language. In a different way it is a reaction to the regularities of well-educated circles of social verbal intercourse, which is rich in variants compared to the culture of written speech.

The culture of speech is an appreciating category, but individual tastes have to be based on public linguistic practice. Bases of speech culture are laid in preschool and school education. Linguistic etiquette is formed here, and the standards of linguistic conduct are polished in the process of cultural intercourse among native speakers of a language. The language is mastered and the individual work on speech culture continually improves and lasts a lifetime.

Speech culture education is the development of a sense of language in the process of cognition of the best artistic and aesthetic language patterns, and the mastering of linguistic cultural traditions within a nation. The mastering of the culture of speech depends on the level of linguistic standard. For most nations of Europe a literary language to some extent is remote from the real linguistic practice. In addition to regional features there is a slang of social groups and different strata of society. The phenomenon of diglossia is widely used when the same speaker depending on the situation chooses different languages or dialects.

The language of mass media and modern Ukrainian literature lives according to the new stylistic laws. Clear signs of official business and artistic style are not inherent. Formerly the «exemplary» journalists' speech absorbed a variety of spoken language vocabulary. Depending on the genre, works of modern authors are saturated with criminal jargon and young people's slang, and as original linguistic laboratories, demonstrate an elemental development of the language.

There is the problem of normativity within the young people's social slang in Ukrainian linguistics. The question is not only about journalistic creative work, when the author decides if it is expedient to enter uninformative lexeme in a text. The editor has a much more difficult choice: to correct an uninformative word or to admit it into the linguistic space.

The problem of the functioning of slang vocabulary in the language of mass media is current that is why we will consider the normativity of stylistic aspects within the functioning of slang, which focuses upon the vivid aesthetic broadcasting and unprintable curse.

The word "surzhik", which is a mixture taken from two languages, has been known in the Ukrainian language for a long time and also in the media-linguistic space. Nowadays, the wretched, degraded spiritual world of a man is called "surzhik". Confessedly, to use a mixture from two languages is one of the most anxious phenomena of journalistic character. The disfigured language makes a man dull, erects its thought towards the primitive. Finally, this mixture from two languages has taken a considerable place in the subculture of the younger generations, where it began to penetrate from the 1970s from the level of the underground and finally became firmly established on the first festival "Chervona Ruta" in 1989. This began to emerge together with the entrance of a mixture from two languages in the media through linguistic aggression, which is found in the displays of some media texts with the help of various slang expressions

within the anti-cultural layers of society.

The culture of speech, as a social and linguistic discipline depends on a linguistic policy, public functions of language, and the distribution of the prestige of literary language through the publishing activity of mass media. In the language of mass media there is in practice a noticeable violation of norms of the literary forms of Ukrainian. Linguistic science must propagandize the best standards of practical realization of literary Ukrainian.

During the difficult times of the dominant influence of Russian in colloquial practice the question of the perfection of the language was considered important. It is impossible to attain it without studying the norms of modern literary forms of Ukrainian. Facilities of mass communication, which act in greater part in development of the literary language, must promote the distribution and strengthening of literary norms, in enriching its dictionary, in the lexical and grammatical setting of norms, and in opening its stylistic possibilities. Taking into consideration the responsibility of the radio and television workers and their linguistic registration intended for the transmission of materials, every error of the announcer inflicts harm and widens the gap between those fighting for the preservation of cultural broadcasting.

Professional skills of television and radio announcers must represent the norms of literary Ukrainian, because they are the exemplary transmitters of ideology and language of the home country. Television is an important informative channel, which has an unlimited influence on a spectator, and the same entails the perfection. In the programs featuring on television it is often possible to look for a violation of orthoepic norms. The speech of radio announcers often warp the ear with phonetic errors. It is possible to explain it with the dominant influence of colloquial Russian, which influences the features of pronunciation of sounds and also defects the pronunciation related to the construction of journalist or announcer linguistic device. In the process of the development every language is filled with new words created after present models in one's own language or adopted from other languages.

A grammatical tidiness is the sign of speech culture. The observance of rules regarding a change of words and their creation, constructions of word combinations and suggestions, tidiness and appropriateness of word usage, enters here. A space, speech volume and professional linguistic etiquette are also important aspects in the work of an announcer or television journalist.

Every person is characterized by his or her own speech, which is unique. Linguistic etiquette is the totality of verbal forms of courtesy that people accepted in a certain circle, in a certain society, in a certain country. Linguistic etiquette affects a person, directs his communicative activity by forming a linguistic personality on the whole. It is here you can personally observe the influence of language on a man's behaviour.

A language extraordinarily and sensitively reacts to the changes in social life. The question is not only about the names of denoting linguistic concepts, and social factors set in motion by potential forces which are fixed in the language system. The Ukrainian of the 90s, as well as, other languages of post-totalitarian societies, is characterized by the processes of democratisation and liberalization. First of all, this is to be observed in the language of the mass media.

Research in the changes of a language in general and in the language of MASS-MEDIA on a comparatively short modern segment must take into account social factors, conditions, in which language lives and the time requirements of language. On the other hand, there are internal regularities, which focus upon the changes in language space, and are directly unconnected with social terms. Consequently, the language of modern mass media depends not only on the development status of national language but also on the difficult co-operation of external and internal forms.

With the flow of time, and foremost in the unique literary processes of the last half-century, those communicative rules were formed, that are fixed in the consciousness of the Ukrainian people as "Russianness", slang, and jargon. But let us characterize the linguistic picture of our present-day society. In fact the phenomenon of "avoidance" of the Ukrainian language in Ukraine acquired widespread development, and the phenomenon of bilingual aspect has civilized development in newspapers.

By the regulation of the Constitutional Court of Ukraine concerning the application of official language by state authorities, by the bodies of local self-government and its use in an educational process in educational establishments of Ukraine, confirmed that in Ukraine the official language is Ukrainian.

However, the discussion as to the possibility of introducing a bilingual concept in our state is not completed, and negatively influences the creation of the culture of language and its function. There are two aspects of this problem: on the one hand, it is the expansion of Russian-language editions; on the other - it is an unwillingness of people in some regions to speak Ukrainian, especially in everyday life. Although this prevails somewhat in an official sphere and in the sphere of state life, too. The language is used in state and administrative documentation.

What is considerably important for the fate of the language? What is done in other spheres of public life, but above all, in the field of culture and mass media? Here an official language loses its position. About 90% of television and wireless stations (mainly private) recently registered, do not feature the transmissions in the Ukrainian language, but in the Russian language; when from 214 national newspapers in Ukraine 78 is published in the Ukrainian language only, which forms 32% of the total.

Indisputably, to forbid the representatives of Ukrainian nationalities or Russian-speaking Ukrainians to speak, read, listen to programs or go on the air using their mother tongue is not forbidden. Because our legislation foresees the presence of television and radio programs in Russian and in languages of other nationalities for a large amount of Russian-speaking population in the places of their compact residence. However, each of us must realize that our duty is to respect an official language, study, and popularise it, because it is one of the basic attributes of the state system.

There is no language, and consequently, there is no nation - every conscious Ukrainian will agree with it. An official language unites people in an integral society, creates a spiritual culture. The language culture of man is an indicator of its general cultural level, the level of education.

In connection with the noticeable weakening of requirements of the observance of normative principles of literary Ukrainian language from the end of 1980s there is a considerable strengthening of the use of jargon,

slang, vulgarisms and improper vocabulary in mass media. For example, we can observe this on "STB", "New channel", "Our radio". An interesting display of general democratisation of literary Ukrainian is the use of jargon and elements from argot.

Today, through the given circumstances one pays attention to jargon which does not show the integrity: the language of different mafia groups, drug abusers and others; fortunately, it has not yet become Ukrainian. Considerable part of slang is created and functions in the environment of intellectual young people, who know a literary language. Jargonism penetrates from the Ukrainian Argo past epochs (beggarly, thievish), territorial dialects, urban jargon, from the Russian jargon vocabulary, and jargons of the English-language groups. We want it or do not want, but they penetrate the mass media.

Jargonism in the language of the mass media executes a different function: it underlines saying, promotes the attention of the reader (listener), and creates a tone of ease. We very often meet the words of innormative vocabulary, which give the vividness to saying, but litter a language.

Mass media should open up actively with regard to increasing the cultural word, and the prestige of the language.

Mass, unsystematic penetration of Russian elements in the Ukrainian communicative structure within the conditions of a protracted unequal contact generated by the phenomenon of Russian and Ukrainian linguistic "unliterary language" as one of the forms of Ukrainian common speech. Sociologists defined the use of "unliterary language" in the sphere of culture as a means of a comic element that is perceived in various forms: on the one hand, cases of dissatisfaction by the Ukrainian intelligentsia on the surplus thrusting of these features of linguistic Ukrainian portrait, on the other, it is a positive attitude toward a linguistic confusion by the nationally irresponsible Ukrainians.

In the language of humorous monologues, which are transmitted over the television, radio, Tarapunka and Schtepsel have used "unliterary language". From the beginning of the 90s the genre of "unliterary language" has become almost the basic means of humor. According to psychologists, such programs do not belong among the good ones; we do not laugh about a language, and do not twist it on purpose. Besides, rolling our colloquial and everyday speech in the riverbed of marginalia is not simply a defect, but a misfortune and disease. Wicked people laugh at a misfortunate illness; decent people do not take the liberty to do so.

Every citizen has to know the national language well, love it, and also to accept the languages of other people. The knowledge of languages will promote an informative safety, and the information will pass exactly, without linguistic distortions, twisting, and only then will we be able to select that corn from the straw, because mass media is one of the powerful facilities of influence on the consciousness and the perception of the human being.

The citizens of our state, as well as, every other, have linguistic duties, which consist in defending and preserving the mother tongue. Protecting the mother tongue is the most natural and the simplest, the easiest and the most necessary method of national revival and self-affirmation. The mother tongue is not a merit, but the duty of every conscious linguist. That is why, the process of linguistic ecology, cleaning the language of unliterary language forms, and jargons must begin with the concrete person and be carried out

by the original person's speech at all levels' of usage. That is why each and every one of us must take care of the culture of the language and require others to do so, as well.

The greatest poetess of our epoch, Lina Kostenko said: "In the beginning of creation and creating the world there was the Word. In the beginning of creating a nation there must also be the Word". Remember this. Then nobody will say anything bad about the Ukrainian nation and its speech.