МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
СУМСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
КАФЕДРА ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ
ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ НАВЧАЛЬНО-МЕТОДИЧНИЙ ЦЕНТР

МАТЕРІАЛИ

XIV ВСЕУКРАЇНСЬКОЇ
НАУКОВО-ПРАКТИЧНОЇ КОНФЕРЕНЦІЇ
СТУДЕНТІВ, АСПІРАНТІВ ТА ВИКЛАДАЧІВ
ЛІНГВІСТИЧНОГО НАВЧАЛЬНО-МЕТОДИЧНОГО ЦЕНТРУ
КАФЕДРИ ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ

«TO MAKE THE WORLD SMARTER AND SAFER»

26 березня 2020 року

Сумський державний університет
(вул. Римського-Корсакова, 2, м. Суми, Сумська обл., 40007)

Суми
2020

Now that you have the basic understanding let's take a look on all the positive sides. Some amazing things that virtual reality could help us with the solving all kinds of conflicts, it can help you to relax. Also some schools have started using it for teaching their students (since you can experience things that you might never encounter in the real world). Now let's get to augmented reality. Thanks to it we will be able to be more productive in our lives and also be able to accomplish things that a human with his biology just can't. For example, about a year ago a German professor was able to a surgery to a person across the globe.

How might virtual reality affect us in the future? Are there any negative sides? Of course, there are some negative sides. They are exactly the same in both realities. The basic and the scariest is probably your brain control. Since it is able to use our nerves, people in the future would easily affect your mind. A powerful example could be commercials. As this technology has the opportunity to read our nerve signals the producers will know what we enjoy, what we dislike and what we feel.

To sum everything up I would like to say that as to any thing in this world there are obviously positive and negative sides. But in my opinion the positive sides of this tech overweigh all the negative parts. And these new technologies can be easily used in any field of our life.

FRAMING AS MEANING ORGANIZATION TECHNOLOGY
L. Okhrimenko – Sumy State University, group JT-91
S. V. Podolkova – EL Adviser

Nowadays technology is changing faster and faster, it touches almost every part of our life. With technology comes change not only in the way we do things, but also change in how we think.

So, the issue how technology will shape our future, is of great interest for us. However, some people consider it very

simple question. They think future technologies will make people's life easier and more productive. There are many technologies that have already changed the way people live. For example, everyone has their own phone thanks to which we can communicate with each other, watch movies, listen to music, entertain ourselves. All this possible only due to technology development.

Today communication is impossible without technology. One of the most popular examples is framing. Framing is a concept that generally means the semantic framework used by a person to understand something and actions within the framework of this understanding, the integrity, within which people comprehend themselves in the world. In other words, framing is a stable structure, cognitive education (knowledge and expectations), and also a presentation scheme. Framing is a metacommunicative definition of a situation based on event-driven principles of organization and involvement in events. In the social sciences, framing comprises a set of concepts and theoretical perspectives on how individuals, groups, and societies, organize, perceive, and communicate about reality.[1]

It affects the perception of information by the audience. Very often framing is used by media, politicians and physicians to attract an audience and to distort the information, presenting it in a favorable light. This can be easily explained with an example of a half-filled glass. There are two variants: half-full glass or half-empty. And each of them sounds differently. The first sounds optimistic, the second, on the contrary, is pessimistic. So, using modern technologies like a channel of information, media often manipulate people and dictate us what to think about, how to think and how to do things.

Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman explored how different phrasing affected participants' responses to a choice in 1981.

Imagine that the United States is preparing for an outbreak of an unusual Asian disease, which is expected to kill 600 people. Two alternative control programs for this disease have been

proposed. Assume that the exact scientific estimates of the consequences of these programs are as follows:

- if program A is carried out, then 200 people (72%) will be saved.
- if program B is carried out, then with a probability of 33.3% everyone will be saved and with a probability of 66.6% no one will survive (28%)/
- if program C is adopted, then 400 people will die (22%)
- if program D is adopted, then with a 1/3 probability no one will die, and with a 2/3 probability, 600 people will die (78%).

The same strategy to combat the epidemic (A and C, B and D, respectively) was perceived differently by the study participants, depending on in which way it was presented. When the emphasis was on a negative outcome (how many people will die), most respondents chose to take risks. And, on the contrary, if it was a guaranteed saving of the lives of 200 people (positive wording), people decided not in favor of the risky second option.[2]

So, expectations are characterized by possible outcomes and probabilities of their receipt. However, the same choice can be determined and described in various ways. For example, the possible outcomes of a situation can be described either as gain or losses, and both variants will affect people differently. This is the effect of framing as a modern technology that is actively used by people to achieve goals.

References

1. Druckman, J.N. (2001). "The Implications of Framing Effects for Citizen Competence". Political Behavior. 23 (3): 225–56.
2. Tversky, A.; Kahneman, D. (1981). The Framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. Science. 211 (4481): 453—458.