

Документ подписан простой электронной подписью

Информация о владельце:

ФИО: Рукович Александр Владимирович

Должность: Директор

Дата подписания: 05.06.2025 12:55:10

Уникальный программный ключ:

f45eb7c44954caac05ea7d4f32e08d7d0b5cb9dae6d9b4bda074akdanb7031

Министерство науки и высшего образования Российской Федерации

Федеральное государственное автономное образовательное учреждение высшего образования

«СЕВЕРО-ВОСТОЧНЫЙ ФЕДЕРАЛЬНЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНИ М.К. АММОСОВА»

Технический институт (филиал) ФГАОУ ВО «СВФУ» в г. Нерюнгри

Кафедра филологии

ФОНД ОЦЕНОЧНЫХ СРЕДСТВ

по дисциплине (модулю)

Б1.В.ДВ.04.02 Аудирование и интерпретация текстов СМИ
(код и наименование дисциплины (модуля))

45.03.01 Филология
(код и наименование направления подготовки/ специальности)

Зарубежная филология (Английский язык и литература)
(наименование профиля/ специализации)

бакалавр
(квалификация)

Нерюнгри, 2022 г.

УТВЕРЖДЕНО на заседании кафедры филологии

«25» 04 2022 г., протокол № 9

Заведующий кафедрой С.В. Кар
(подпись)

М.А. Яковлева

«25» 04 2022 г.

СОГЛАСОВАНО:

Эксперты:

Яковлева А.Г. зам. преподаватель каф. филологии М.А.

Ф.И.О., должность, организация, подпись

Ф.И.О., должность, организация, подпись

Составитель: Н.В. Зотова, доцент кафедры филологии Н.В.

Паспорт фонда оценочных средств
по дисциплине (модулю) Б1.В.ДВ.04.02 Аудирование и интерпретация текстов
СМИ

№	Контролируемые разделы (темы)	Код контролируемой компетенции (или ее части)	Требования к уровню усвоения компетенции	Наименование оценочного средства
	<p>Тема 1. Различие между серьёзной и таблоидной прессой</p> <p>Тема 2. Новостные телевизионные программы (развитие навыков аудирования)</p> <p>Тема 3. Структура газеты</p> <p>Тема 4. Структура статьи</p> <p>Тема 5. Стил ь и язык текстов СМИ. Типы лексики политического ст иля</p> <p>Тема 6. Анализ медийных средств</p> <p>Тема 7. Типы новостей. Устойчивые выражения</p> <p>Тема 8. Интерпретация текстов СМИ (устных/письменных)</p>	<p>УК-4.5</p> <p>УК-5.2</p> <p>УК-5.3</p> <p>ПК-1.4</p>	<p>Знать:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - лексические особенности английских/американских газет; - особенности употребления грамматических конструкций в текстах общественно-политического характера; - семантические особенности газетной лексики. <p>Уметь:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - воспринимать на слух иноязычную речь, используя различные стратегии аудирования: аудирование с извлечением основного содержания аудио/видеотекста, аудирование с полным пониманием содержания аудирования, аудирование с выборочным извлечением информации; - излагать статьи на иностранном языке общественно-политического характера; - излагать на иностранном языке содержание русской газетной статьи общественно-политического характера; - вести беседу по предлагаемой проблеме. <p>Владеть методиками и практическими навыками:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - лексическим минимумом иностранного языка и грамматическим минимумом, включающим грамматические структуры, необходимые для устной и письменной форм общения; - культуры общения, способностью излагать его результаты в письменной и устной форме. 	<p>Работа на практическом занятии</p> <p>Контрольная работа</p> <p>Экзамен</p>

Министерство науки и высшего образования Российской Федерации
ФГАОУ ВО «Северо-Восточный федеральный университет имени М.К.Аммосова»
Технический институт (филиал) в г. Нерюнгри

КАФЕДРА ФИЛОЛОГИИ

Контрольная работа

Темы для написания контрольной работы:

1. Структура газеты
2. Структура статьи
3. Стилъ и язык текстов СМИ. Типы лексики политического стилиа
4. Типы новостей
5. Устойчивые выражения

Критерии оценки контрольной работы:

На «отлично» (28-27 баллов) оценивается работа, выполненная правильно на 95% и более (допускается не более 5% ошибок от общего объема материала).

На «хорошо» (26–22 балла) оценивается работа, выполненная правильно на 77-94% от общего объема материала.

На «удовлетворительно» (21–17 баллов) оценивается работа, выполненная правильно на 59-76% от общего объема материала.

На «неудовлетворительно» (16 баллов и менее) оценивается работа, выполненная правильно менее, чем на 59 % от общего объема материала.

КАФЕДРА ФИЛОЛОГИИ

Практические задания на экзамен:

Render the following text:

Foreman in Rialmo trial feels 'hoodwinked' by question that negated jury's verdict against cop in shooting lawsuit

The 23rd floor of the Daley Center courthouse was pitched into confusion Wednesday night by a jury's response to a legal mechanism little-known to the public — a “special interrogatory,” a specific question posed to jurors.

Capping a closely watched trial, jurors found that [Chicago police](#) Officer Robert Rialmo fatally shot 19-year-old Quintonio Le Grier without justification and awarded the family just over \$1 million. But in answering an interrogatory introduced by the city's lawyers, jurors held that Rialmo reasonably believed he had to fire to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm. Faced with the contradictory findings, Judge Rena Marie Van Tine ruled for the city and Rialmo, wiping away the verdict and damages.

Jury foreman Dave Fitzsimmons told the Tribune that jurors believed the shooting wasn't justified and didn't think their answer to the special interrogatory would negate the verdict.

While jurors did not feel Le Grier's parents should get a big payday, they did want to send a message, said Fitzsimmons, who indicated the outcome bothered him “a great deal.”

“We wanted to make our point about this shooting not being justified and to get justice for Quintonio Le Grier,” he said Thursday night. “I feel hoodwinked.”

The jury's determination marked a strange finish to a trial over one of the most divisive incidents in recent Chicago police history. The shooting happened as Rialmo and his partner responded to a domestic disturbance on the West Side in 2015. Le Grier approached officers with a bat and Rialmo fired, hitting the teenager five times and also killing 55-year-old bystander Bettie Jones. The city averted trial with her family by reaching a tentative \$16 million settlement earlier this month.

The trial over Le Grier's death focused on conflicting accounts of whether the teen presented an immediate threat to the officers. After sitting through a week-and-a-half of evidence and testimony — ranging from dramatic re-enactments to numbing recitations of experts' qualifications — the jury deliberated for about 3 ½ hours before reaching a verdict.

Fitzsimmons said jurors paid attention and took copious notes. There was dissent in the jury room early on, he said, but the panel didn't take long to unanimously decide that the physical evidence showed that Le Grier was a significant distance from the officer and the shooting wasn't warranted.

The result threw a spotlight on special interrogatories, a common feature in civil trials, according to veteran lawyers. The questions are supposed to ensure that jurors clearly understand the legal basis of their verdict and that their findings are consistent with the law, attorneys said.

“This is more to make sure that there isn't confusion about the law, so when (jurors) go through and they check these boxes, it should add up to be on one side or the other,” said attorney Ronald Safer.

Attorney Basileios Foutris, who represents the Le Grier family, said he regards special interrogatories as confusing to jurors. He said he plans to seek to reinstate the \$1.05 million verdict.

“No jury on this planet is gonna go against a police officer and award more than a million dollars if they think that it was a perfectly appropriate shoot,” Foutris said.

Rialmo's lawyer, Joel Brodsky, disagreed and said the judge's ruling should stand. He pointed to a state law that holds that a special interrogatory trumps a verdict when the two don't match.

Bill McCaffrey, spokesman for the city's Law Department, confirmed that the special interrogatory was introduced by private lawyers handling the case for the city.

The Le Grier case marked the second time in recent history that a lawsuit over a Chicago police shooting was thrown into uncertainty by a conflicting jury finding. In 2015, a Cook County jury found that an officer shot and killed 19-year-old Niko Husband without justification and awarded \$3.5 million in damages. But the jury answered a special interrogatory and said the officer reasonably believed Husband presented an immediate threat of death or great bodily harm.

The judge wiped away the verdict, but the Illinois Appellate Court overturned her decision and reinstated the verdict in February. The decision turned on the fact that the interrogatory did not ask jurors if the use of force was "necessary to prevent" imminent death or great bodily harm. The appeals judges ruled that asking jurors whether the shooting was necessary to avert the threat was "indispensable."

In the Le Grier case, the special interrogatory included that language and closely resembled the state law on justifiable shootings by police.

McCaffrey said that the city's lawyers adjusted the language to account for the appellate ruling from the Husband case. McCaffrey confirmed that private attorney Brian Gainer worked for the city on both cases.

Veteran lawyer Terry Ekl said he believed that adjustment in the interrogatory's language likely means the judge's ruling will hold up on appeal.

Fitzsimmons said the result felt like "dirty pool." The jurors understood the question to relate to Rialmo's perspective but didn't view their answer as undermining the other parts of the verdict, he said.

Wednesday night's ruling will not be the final word on the Le Grier shooting, as the Chicago Police Board has yet to rule on whether Rialmo should be fired. The officer, who is on paid desk duty, also remains under investigation for a December 2017 bar fight in which he punched two men in the face in an altercation caught on security video. Brodsky has said Rialmo was defending himself (Chicago Tribune, 30/06/2018).

Media and communications

By David Goddy (Associate Editor, Scholastic Update)

The public's right to know is one of the central principles of American society. The men who wrote the Constitution of the United States resented the strict control that the American colonies' British rulers had imposed over ideas and information they did not like. Instead, these men determined, that the power of knowledge should be placed in the hands of the people.

"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance," asserted James Madison, the fourth president and an early proponent of press freedom. "And a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives."

THE FIRST AMENDMENT

To assure a healthy and uninhibited flow of information, the framers of the new government included press freedom among the basic human rights protected in the new nation's Bill of Rights. These first 10 Amendments to the Constitution of the United States became law in 1791. The First Amendment says, in part, that "Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press ..."

That protection from control by the federal government meant that anyone — rich or poor, regardless of his political or religious belief — could generally publish what he wished. The result, Madison declared, was that the power to decide what was harmful behavior "is in the people over the Government and not in the Government over the people."

Ever since, the First Amendment has served as the conscience and shield of all Americans who reported the news, who wished to make their opinions public, or who desired to influence public opinion. Over the past two centuries, however, the means of communication — what we now call the "media" — have grown immensely more complex. In Madison's day, the media, created by printing presses, were few and simple — newspapers, pamphlets and books. Today the media also include

television, radio, films and cable TV. The term "the press" has expanded to refer now to any news operation in any media, not just print. These various organizations are also commonly called the "news media."

This media explosion has created an intricate and instantaneous nerve system shaping the values and culture of American society. News and entertainment are beamed from one end of the American continent to another. The result is that the United States has been tied together more tightly, and the media have helped to reduce regional differences and customs. People all over the country watch the same shows often at the same time. The media bring the American people a common and shared experience — the same news, the same entertainment, the same advertising.

Indeed, Americans are surrounded by information from the time they wake in the morning until the time they sleep at night. A typical office worker, for instance, is awakened by music from an alarm-clock radio. During breakfast, he reads the local newspaper and watches an early morning news show on TV. If he drives to work, he listens to news, music and traffic reports on his car's radio. At his office, he reads business papers and magazines to check on industry developments. Perhaps he helps plan an advertising campaign for his company's product. At home, after dinner, he watches the evening news on TV. Then he flips through the over 20 channels offered by cable TV to find his favorite show or a ballgame or a recent Hollywood movie. In bed, he reads himself to sleep with a magazine or a book.

Our typical office worker, like most Americans, takes all this for granted. Yet this dizzying array of media choices is the product of nearly 300 years of continual information revolution. Technological advances have speeded up the way information is gathered and distributed. Court cases have gradually expanded the media's legal protections. And, because the news media in the United States have been businesses which depend on advertising and sales, owners have always stressed appealing to the widest possible audiences.

Don't blame TV
Jeff Greenfield

Many critics argue that television plays a role in shaping our social mores — that rising crime rates can be traced to the violence depicted on prime-time programs and that racial divisions in our society are exacerbated by the stereotypical images of minorities we see in the entertainment and news media. In the following selection, though, Jeff Greenfield challenges these assumptions about television's effects. "Powerful as it is," he says, "television has shown little — power over the most fundamental values of Americans."

Jeff Greenfield, a political and media analyst for ABC News and a nationally syndicated columnist, has offered commentary on a wide variety of issues, including media coverage of presidential campaigns, new reporting and editing techniques, libel suits against the press, and the television ratings system. He won a 1986 Emmy Award for background analysis on "Nightline's" South Africa series.

One of the enduring pieces of folk wisdom was uttered by the nineteenth-century humorist Artemus Ward, who warned the readers: "It ain't what you don't know that hurts you; it's what you know that just ain't so."

There's good advice in that warning to some of television's most vociferous critics, who are certain that every significant change in American social and political life can be traced, more or less directly, to the pervasive influence of TV.

It has been blamed for the decline of scores on scholastic achievement tests, for the rise in crime, for the decline in voter turnout, for the growth of premarital and extramarital sex, for the supposed collapse of family life and the increase in the divorce rate. This is an understandable attitude. For one thing, television is the most visible, ubiquitous device to have entered our lives in the last forty years. It is a medium in almost every American home, it is on in the average household some seven hours a day, and it is accessible by every kind of citizen from the most desperate of the poor to the wealthiest and most powerful among us.

If so pervasive a medium has come into our society in the last four decades and if our society has changed in drastic ways in that same time, why not assume that TV is the reason why American life looks so different?

Well, as any philosopher can tell you, one good reason for skepticism is that you can't make assumptions about causes. They even have an impressive Latin phrase for that fallacy: *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*. For instance, if I do a rain dance at 5 p.m. and it rains at 6 p.m., did my dance bring down the rains? Probably not. But it's that kind of thinking, in my view, that characterizes much of the argument about how television influences our values.

It's perfectly clear, of course, that TV does influence some kinds of behavior. For example, back in 1954, Disneyland launched a series of episodes on the life of Davy Crockett, the legendary Tennessee frontiersman. A song based on that series swept the hit parade, and by that summer every kid in America was wearing a coonskin cap.

The same phenomenon has happened whenever a character on a prime-time television show suddenly strikes a chord in the country. Countless women tried to capture the Farrah Fawcett look a decade ago when "Charlie's Angels" first took flight. Schoolyards from Maine to California picked up — instantly, it seemed — on such catch phrases as "Up your nose with a rubber hose!" ("Welcome Back, Kotter"), "Kiss my grits!" ("Alice") and "Nanunanu!" ("Mork & Mindy"). In the mid-1980s, every singles bar in the land was packed with young men in expensive white sports jackets and T-shirts, trying to emulate the macho looks of "Miami Vice"'s Don Johnson.

These fads clearly show television's ability to influence matters that do not matter very much. Yet, when we turn to genuinely important things, television's impact becomes a lot less clear. Take, for example, the decline in academic excellence, measured by the steady decline in Scholastic Aptitude Test [SAT] scores from 1964 to 1982. It seemed perfectly logical to assume that a younger generation spending hours in front of the TV set every day with Fred Flintstone and Batman must have been suffering from brain atrophy. Yet, as writer David Owen noted in a ... book on educational testing [None of the Above: Behind the Myth of Scholastic Aptitude (1985)], other equally impassioned explanations for the drop in scores included nuclear fallout, junk food, cigarette smoking by pregnant women, cold weather, declining church attendance, the draft, the assassination of President Kennedy, and fluoridated water.

More significant, SAT scores stopped declining in 1982: they have been rising since then. Is TV use declining in the typical American home? On the contrary, it is increasing. If we really believed that our social values are determined by news media, we might conclude that the birth of MTV in 1981 somehow caused the test scores to rise.

Or consider the frequently heard charge that the increase in TV violence is somehow responsible for the surge in crime. In fact, the crime rate nationally has been dropping for three straight years [1983 — 1985]. It would be ludicrous to "credit" television for this: explanations are more likely to be found in the shift of population away from a "youth bulge" (where more crimes are committed) and improved tracking of career criminals in big cities.

But why, then, ignore the demographic factors that saw in America an enormous jump in teenagers and young adults in the 1960s and 1970s? Why assume that television, with its inevitable "crime-does-not-pay" morality, somehow turned our young into hoodlums?

The same kind of problem bedevils those who argue that TV has triggered a wave of sexually permissible behavior. In the first place, television was the most sexually conservative of all media through the first quarter-century of its existence. While Playboy began making a clean breast of things in the mid-1950s, when book censorship was all but abolished in the "Lady Chatterly's Lover" decision of 1958, when movies began showing it all in the 1960s, television remained an oasis — or desert — of twin beds, flannel night-gowns, and squeaky-clean dialogue and characters. In fact, as late as 1970, CBS refused to let Mary Tyler Moore's Mary Richards character be a divorcee. The audience, they argued, would never accept it. Instead, she was presented as the survivor of a broken relationship.

Why, then, do we see so many broken families and divorces on television today? Because the networks are trying to denigrate the value of the nuclear family? Hardly. As "The Cosby Show" and its imitators

show, network TV is only too happy to offer a benign view of loving husbands, wives, and children. The explanation, instead, lies in what was happening to the very fabric of American life. In 1950, at the dawn of television, the divorce rate was 2.6 per 1,000 Americans. By 1983, it had jumped to five per thousand; nearly half of all marriages were ending in divorce. The reasons range from the increasing mobility of the population to the undermining of settled patterns of work, family, and neighborhood.

What's important to notice, however, is that it was not television that made divorce more acceptable in American society; it was changes in American society that made divorce more acceptable on television. (Which is why, in her new sitcom, Mary Tyler Moore can finally play a divorced woman.) In the mid-1980s, divorce has simply lost the power to shock.

The same argument ... undermines most of the fear that television has caused our young to become sexually precocious. From my increasingly dimming memory of youthful lust, I have my doubts about whether young lovers really need the impetus of "Dallas" or "The Young and the Restless" to start thinking about sex. The more serious answer, however, is that the spread of readily available birth control was a lot more persuasive a force in encouraging premarital sex than the words and images on TV.

We can measure this relative impotence of television in a different way. All through the 1950s and early 1960s, the images of women on TV were what feminists would call "negative"; they were portrayed as half-woman, half-child, incapable of holding a job or balancing a checkbook or even running a social evening. (How many times did Lucy burn the roast?) Yet the generation of women who grew up on television was the first to reject forcefully the wife-and-homemaker limitations that such images ought to have encouraged. These were the women who marched into law schools, medical schools, and the halls of Congress.

The same was true of the images of black Americans, as TV borrowed the movie stereotypes of shiftless handymen and relentlessly cheerful maids. We didn't begin to see TV blacks as the equal of whites until Bill Cosby showed up in "I Spy" in 1966. Did the generation weaned on such fare turn out to be indifferent to the cause of black freedom in America? Hardly. This was the generation that organized and supported the civil rights sit-ins and freedom rides in the South. Somehow, the reality of second-class citizenship was far more powerful than the imagery of dozens of television shows. I have no argument with the idea that television contains many messages that need close attention: I hold no brief for shows that pander to the appetite for violence or smarmy sexuality or stereotyping. My point is that these evils ought to be fought on grounds of taste and common decency. We ought not to try and prove more than the facts will bear. Television, powerful as it is, has shown precious little power over the most fundamental values of Americans. Given most of what's on TV, that's probably a good thing. But it also suggests that the cries of alarm may be misplaced.

University of Colorado Retiring Its Mascot, a Buffalo Named Ralphie V

By Sandra E. Garcia

Nov. 17, 2019

The Philadelphia Flyers have Gritty, the New York Mets have Mr. Met, and the Boston Red Sox have Wally the Green Monster.

But some mascots are more than animated, cartoon versions of the essence of a particular team. Some mascots are the real deal.

Consider, for instance, Ralphie V, a buffalo who has been the mascot for the University of Colorado's Buffaloes for a dozen seasons. The tradition of having a live buffalo lead the team onto the football field is in its 53rd season.

Age has not slowed Ralphie V, and that's become a problem, the school's athletic director, Rick George, said.

"With past Ralphies, as they aged, their speed typically decreased," the university said in a statement. "With Ralphie V, she has been so excited to run, that she was actually running too fast, which created safety concerns for her and her handlers."

As a result, the university announced that Ralphie V will be retiring to a ranch where she will live with other buffaloes and be replaced with another buffalo, who will be named Ralphie VI.

Ralphie V was not consistently responding to cues from her handlers, the university said, adding that “her temperament was such that she was held back from leading the team out for CU’s last two home games against USC and Stanford.”

In the team’s history, five buffaloes have led the players onto the field 296 times at Folsom Field in Colorado and 355 times in other games. There were only 13 times in which the Colorado Buffaloes were not led onto the field by a buffalo.

While Ralphie V is not the only animal used as a team mascot — the University of Texas has Bevo, a longhorn steer, for instance — the announcement about her retirement did spotlight a debate about the use of animals at sporting events.

“Live animals don’t belong at sporting events, unlike star athletes who are making the choice to be there,” said Ashley Byrne, an associate director with People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, who is a University of Colorado graduate. “Mascots don’t get to choose anything about the way they live. They spend time in the middle of stadiums with drunk rowdy screaming crowds.”

In a blog post on the PETA website, the organization quotes professional athletes making the case for using costumed humans as mascots.

Rory Smith On Soccer: Our correspondent covers the tactics, history and personalities of the world’s most popular sport.

Ms. Byrne said the use of Ralphie V was not natural. “Not only are you forcing a buffalo into a very stressful situation, you are putting everyone in that stadium within their range in danger,” she said.

Male buffaloes weigh up to 2,000 pounds, and females up to 1,000 pounds. Buffaloes are notoriously antisocial animals, preferring to have little contact with humans.

“You feed them, you give them water, you leave them alone, and they get happy,” said Dorreen Ossenkop, who runs the Adirondack Buffalo Company of North Hudson, about 100 miles north of Albany, with her husband, Steve. At their business, people can see their herd of 28 buffaloes from the safety of a deck.

“They are very territorial and very much don’t like people,” she said, adding that they are fairly calm as long as they are left alone.

“You don’t rile them up,” Ms. Ossenkop said. “They will get very aggressive and very nasty and they’ll attack anything.” She also noted that they are extremely strong and agile.

“The buffalo is one of the few animals that can pivot on any foot,” she said. “The only other animal I have seen that is more agile is a cat.”

The university’s Ralphie live mascot program manager, John Graves, has been close to Ralphie V since she was 6 months old. The program costs more than \$60,000 annually and is fully funded by donors, the university said.

“As one of the biggest and fastest Ralphies, her love for running and power was showcased every home game during her career,” Mr. Graves said in a statement. “It’s almost like she knew she was the queen of campus and she loved to show that fact off when she ran onto the field and at her public appearances.”

Ralphie V will make her last appearance on Nov. 23 during the final home game of the season. She will not run but her “career will be celebrated,” the university said.

Denver Radio Host Fired in Mid-Show After Criticizing Trump

By [Vanessa Swales](#)

Nov. 17, 2019

Craig Silverman had clearly worn out his welcome on KNUS, a conservative talk-radio station in Denver. Midway through his three-hour show on Saturday, after a segment criticizing President Trump, the station suddenly cut away to a news report, and the station’s operations manager walked into the studio and told Mr. Silverman, “You’re done.”

But it was less clear which had bothered his employers more — the negative views of Mr. Trump that he voiced on the air, or the fact that he had also gone on competing stations’ programs to express them.

Like many talk-show hosts, Mr. Silverman, a lawyer and former chief deputy district attorney, likes to debate and push boundaries. His constant on-air arguments with a co-host, Dan Caplis, helped make the duo's former show on another Denver station [one of the most popular in the city](#).

But Mr. Silverman said in an interview on Sunday that he sees himself as an independent analyst, not a partisan conservative — and that may have made him increasingly unwelcome at KNUS. Mr. Silverman said the station's owner, the Salem Media Group, which focuses on conservative and Christian programming, is "100 percent behind Donald Trump."

Neither Salem Media nor the operations manager at KNUS, Kelly Michaels, responded to requests on Sunday for comment.

Mr. Silverman said he supported Mr. Trump in 2016, taking a chance that he would shake things up for the better in Washington. But after seeing Mr. Trump's performance in office, he said, he "stepped back off the Trump train" and rebranded his show as the "Island of Independence." As the investigations of Mr. Trump and his associates accelerated toward an impeachment inquiry, he said, he tried to concentrate on discussing the facts objectively, "and not go down various rabbit holes or engage in any what-about-isms."

The station management never told him what to say on the air, Mr. Silverman said. But he started to notice that the other hosts on the station gradually stopped inviting him to appear on their shows. He said he thought it was because he was the "only non-Trumpster."

"I think it makes great radio when people can disagree," he said. "But something about Trump and impeachment — my colleagues don't want to discuss it, and they don't want any disagreements."

He said he became frustrated at feeling frozen out on KNUS. "I expressed myself on Twitter, but I was hoping to be able to express myself on my own radio station, but that wasn't available," said Mr. Silverman. "So, other media outlets asked me on."

Editors' Picks

[How Many Snowbirds Will Be Flying South for the Winter?](#)

The Celebrity Gossip You Won't Find in the Tabloids

'I Had to See That Owl': Central Park's New Celebrity Bird

He said that angered the station's managers, who warned him last week that if he continued to speak on competing shows, his job would be jeopardy.

"I canceled going on, and then I met with them on Thursday," Mr. Silverman said. "I explained that under my contract, I have a right to go on other media. And they said, well, we don't want you to do it."

In addition to dropping Mr. Silverman from the air, KNUS has also apparently removed all of his content from its website, including more than five years' worth of podcasts.

Elizabeth Skewes, a professor at the University of Colorado-Boulder who teaches media law and ethics, said that while "to some degree, Craig Silverman was doing what he was hired to do, express his opinion," the station was well within its rights to dismiss him if it no longer wanted to put those opinions on the air. The First Amendment protects free speech only from government censorship, she said, not from private business decisions.

Even so, she said, she saw it as part of a problematic trend.

"We've become less tolerant of alternative viewpoints as media has become more polarized," Professor Skewes said. "The more narrow it gets, the worse off we are as a democracy."

Others working in broadcasting have seen their careers abruptly deflected over whether they were supportive of Mr. Trump. When Jerry Bader, a conservative radio host in Green Bay, Wis., was fired in 2018 after 18 years at the station, [he said it was over his criticism](#) of the president. In October, the Fox News anchor Shepard Smith, who had frequently aired reports critical of Mr. Trump, [abruptly resigned](#) after publicly clashing with a staunchly pro-Trump host on the network, Tucker Carlson.

And James Bunner, a reporter for KTTC-TV, an NBC affiliate in Rochester, Minn., [was fired in October](#) for wearing a "Make America Great Again" hat while covering a Trump rally.

Trump Retreats From Flavor Ban for E-Cigarettes
By Annie Karni, Maggie Haberman and Sheila Kaplan
Nov. 17, 2019

WASHINGTON — It was a swift and bold reaction to a growing public health crisis affecting teenagers. Seated in the Oval Office in September, President Trump said he was moving to ban the sale of most flavored e-cigarettes as vaping among young people continued to rise.

“We can’t have our kids be so affected,” Mr. Trump said. The first lady, Melania Trump, who rarely involves herself publicly with policy announcements in the White House, was there, too. “She’s got a son,” Mr. Trump noted, referring to their teenager, Barron. “She feels very strongly about it.”

But two months later, under pressure from his political advisers and lobbyists to factor in the potential pushback from his supporters, Mr. Trump has resisted moving forward with any action on vaping, while saying he still wants to study the issue.

Even a watered-down ban on flavored e-cigarettes that exempted menthol, which was widely expected, appears to have been set aside, for now.

On a flight on Nov. 4, while traveling to a political rally in Kentucky, Mr. Trump was swayed by the advisers who warned him of political repercussions to any sweeping restrictions. Reviewing talking points on the ban aboard the plane with advisers, Mr. Trump decided to cancel the administration’s rollout of an announcement, which included a news conference that Alex M. Azar II, the health and human services secretary, was planning to hold on the issue the next day. Instead, another meeting was proposed.

The discussion aboard the Nov. 4 flight was first reported by The Washington Post.

White House officials pushing for action were still holding out hope that there would be an announcement of a ban on flavored e-cigarettes, with an exemption for menthol, last week.

The proposed ban had gathered significant support this fall, as the crisis over teenage vaping, with year-over-year increases, coincided with a sprawling outbreak of severe lung injuries. While most of the illnesses, now affecting more than 2,000 people and causing more than 40 deaths, have been attributed to vaping THC products, the e-cigarette industry also became the target of criticism for luring minors into using its products.

A lack of federal action prompted several states to try to institute bans on flavored e-cigarettes, spurring the vaping and tobacco industries to mount legal challenges and lobby lawmakers and the White House against regulatory restrictions that would impede adult e-smokers.

Juul Labs, the largest seller of e-cigarettes in the country and the target of several federal investigations, had taken most of its flavors off the market in anticipation of a national flavor ban. The company had said that its mint-flavored pods made up about 70 percent of its sales; menthol was 10 percent; and two tobacco flavors accounted for 20 percent. But many other look-alikes, in flavors like chai and melon, have sprung up to fill the void left by Juul’s actions.

Editors’ Picks

How Many Snowbirds Will Be Flying South for the Winter?

The Celebrity Gossip You Won’t Find in the Tabloids

‘I Had to See That Owl’: Central Park’s New Celebrity Bird

Mr. Trump has since decided to follow the advice of political advisers to stall on the issue and meet with more groups.

The Morning: Make sense of the day’s news and ideas. David Leonhardt and Times journalists guide you through what’s happening — and why it matters.

On Nov. 11, Mr. Trump tweeted that he would be “meeting with representatives of the vaping industry, together with medical professionals and individual state representatives, to come up with an acceptable solution to the vaping and E-cigarette dilemma.”

ImageProtesters gathered on the Ellipse outside the White House to show their opposition to a proposed ban on flavored e-cigarettes.

Protesters gathered on the Ellipse outside the White House to show their opposition to a proposed ban on flavored e-cigarettes. Credit...Jose Luis Magana/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images

The announcement on Twitter took West Wing advisers by surprise, and one senior official said no meeting had been scheduled. One adviser who spoke to Mr. Trump recently said the president was simply overwhelmed by other issues, including the televised impeachment hearings that began last week, distracting him from deciding what the administration should do about restricting e-cigarette flavors.

But he is concerned about his chances in 2020, and allies working for the vaping industry have told Mr. Trump of battleground state polling of his own voters that showed the issue costing him support.

One such poll was commissioned by John McLaughlin, one of the Trump campaign pollsters, for the Vapor Technology Association. The poll, which surveyed battleground state voters who vape, showed negative results for Mr. Trump if he went ahead with a ban, and was passed around to a number of people in Mr. Trump's circle, including Brad Parscale, his campaign manager, and senior White House officials.

Tony Abboud, the executive director of the group that commissioned the poll that has helped influence the president, said they were encouraged by "what appears to be a move in the right direction for adult smokers and their families."

"Bans don't work," he said. "They never have."

Mr. Trump has also been under an intense lobbying campaign over the past seven weeks, waged by tobacco and vaping companies, along with conservative organizations, like Americans for Tax Reform, which are opposed to regulatory limits that would affect retailers, small businesses and adult consumers of e-cigarettes. Some have promoted enforcing sales restrictions to protect minors, or raising the national age to 21 for sales of all tobacco products.

The trajectory of the flavor ban — from a bold pronouncement of swift action to a fizzle after the political realities of taking such an action emerge — is similar to Mr. Trump's stance on gun legislation. Months after back-to-back mass shootings in El Paso and in Dayton, Ohio, when Mr. Trump said he wanted to pass "very meaningful background checks," warnings from gun rights advocates and Republican lawmakers about the political fallout that would result from doing that ultimately led to no action on the issue.

Inside the White House, the flavor ban has also become a proxy issue for how his advisers see Mr. Trump's path to re-election. In one camp are those who believe he should try to win back suburban women, including mothers of teenagers who would presumably worry about their children becoming addicted to nicotine. In the other are those who advise him to assume that voting bloc would not favor him anyway and to focus only on energizing his base.

Mr. Parscale had flagged to Mr. Trump after he first announced his intention to ban most flavored e-cigarettes that it would hurt him with his base. Mr. Parscale and other advisers warned Mr. Trump to slow down, and announce he was going to take time studying the issue, telling him that a ban could depress turnout in critical states.

Those political concerns were not without merit: E-cigarette users have held protests outside the White House and outside Trump rallies that they may have attended under other circumstances. Protesters have also raised concerns about the potential closing of thousands of vape shops, which they said would hurt the economy and cost jobs across the country.

But it is not clear whether pro-vaping activists are one-issue voters.

While some advice to Mr. Trump was grounded in polling, some was based on a gut-level understanding of Trump voters: Taking away the right to smoke or vape would be something akin to taking away firearms.

In the opposing camp is Kellyanne Conway, a top White House adviser and Mr. Trump's 2016 campaign manager, who has been telling colleagues and the president that it is a mistake to assume, as Mr. Parscale and others have done, that suburban moms who care deeply about a public health crisis for teenagers have deserted Mr. Trump for good.

Those advisers, including Mr. Azar, have been pushing the administration to address the issue, as parents and schools as well as public health experts have grown increasingly concerned about the rise in teenage vaping. Mr. Azar had told the president that about more than one-fourth of high school

students reported vaping e-cigarettes within the previous 30 days, according to this year's survey of tobacco use among youths.

The Metaphysics of Kylie Cosmetics Being Sold to Coty

By Vanessa Friedman and Jessica Testa

Published Nov. 19, 2019 Updated Oct. 28, 2020

On Monday, Kylie Jenner sold 51 percent of her cosmetics and skin care brand to Coty for \$600 million, a price tag that values the enterprise at \$1.2 billion.

Whether we agree that she is self-made or not — and you can argue that in many ways she is mom-made — you can't dispute where she is now, or the effect the success her business, and that of her extended family, has had on the way we shop, and even think about shopping.

Which suggests that this move may have repercussions for us all. Someday we may study them in school, but for now, it's even more interesting to engage in the Kardashian-Jenner equivalent of fantasy football. Let's play.

Vanessa Friedman This is actually a big deal for two reasons: It not only makes Kylie, by some estimates, the first Kardashian-Jenner billionaire, it also makes her, I believe, the first Kardashian-Jenner to officially become part of the old-school fashion-beauty establishment. Milestones!

And yet part of what I have loved about watching this family build its empire(s) is the outside-the-system nature of the whole thing.

At the beginning, the system kind of turned up its collective nose at them. They, of course, have been laughing their way to the bank ever since. But I wonder if this Coty-Kylie deal is going to undermine that appeal. Is it the final K-J triumph, or the beginning of the end? What do you think?

Jessica Testa Oh, it's just the beginning — not of the end, of the next stage. The Kardashian-Jenner family — or more accurately, Kris — has worked hard to position Kylie as the Entrepreneur of the bunch (maybe to Kim's chagrin). I think selling to Coty only strengthens that image.

In July, we learned that Kylie Cosmetics sales were declining, and that the brand wasn't attracting loyal customers. Now is the perfect time for Kylie to hand off the business to a well-respected international conglomerate and do something else with her time. (Rise and Shine, the baby brand?) That's the K-J M.O.: Start a business, then start another one.

But does this sale make Kylie part of the system now? That's a trickier question. The Kardashian-Jenners have created their own establishment, and it's become so large and unwieldy that I'm not sure it'll ever fully fit into the confines of the traditional establishment. At this point, do they really need it to?

Editors' Picks

How Many Snowbirds Will Be Flying South for the Winter?

The Celebrity Gossip You Won't Find in the Tabloids

'I Had to See That Owl': Central Park's New Celebrity Bird

VF I would say absolutely not. In fact, they derive part of their power from having created a system of their own. But maybe at a certain point what they need is the infrastructure. Kylie famously makes so much profit from her lip kits, and so on, because of her tiny staff and low overhead.

Smarter Living: The best advice from The Times on living a better, smarter, more fulfilling life.

But after a while you probably need more people to handle volume, and Coty can give her that. Do you really think the sale means she's getting out while the getting's good?

Both sides have paid lip service (no pun intended) to the idea that Kylie will remain as involved as ever. And I can't imagine her followers continuing to buy — literally — into the whole idea if she doesn't keep up the posting volumes.

Which brings up the question of what effect going larger will have on them, the superfans, the ones that lined up for hours before the Kylie Cosmetics pop-up drops. Is it going to grow their numbers, or actually turn some of them off? After all, part of Kylie's appeal is that she is cooler than Max Factor and CoverGirl.

JT I totally expect Kylie to remain the public face of the company — to keep announcing product drops in dribbling Technicolor on Instagram. But it makes sense for Coty to take the business reins, managing logistics and expansion.

And that's great news for Kylie, a celebrity! She can cash out and focus on expanding her personal Kylie brand beyond beauty and skin care.

This should excite Kylie superfans, especially if they're indeed more loyal to the woman than to her lip kits. (One market research firm found that from roughly 2016 to 2019, more than half of all her customers made just one purchase.)

The question for me is whether Coty will double down on Kylie's coolness, or apply its more time-tested sales models to bring in a new type of customer — shoppers who don't really care about her. (Imagine!) Will we start seeing lip kits in the CVS beauty aisle?

And what about the rest of the Kardashian-Jenner businesses? Do you think this sale speaks to the future of Khloe's Good American jeans, or KKW Beauty or Fragrance, or Skims (the shapewear line formerly/controversially known as Kimono)? Or, uh, Arthur George?

VF In other words, is this a new model for their empire? Will Warnaco buy Skims? Or what about PVH, which owns Calvin Klein underwear, a brand that once famously featured the whole Kardashian-Jenner clan in an ad campaign? I can easily imagine that scenario, just as I imagine Estée Lauder is watching what happens with one eye on Coty and one eye on KKW.

For a while, the big trend in beauty was celebrity fragrances, and there was an arms race among the big groups to sign as many famous names as they could. Maybe these direct-to-followers beauty brands will be next — not just Kim's, but also Lady Gaga's Haus Laboratories.

In this possible future, Kylie becomes the sharp end of the spear in which the Kardashian-Jenner brands and their ilk begin to infiltrate any number of big groups, liberating the family to move on to new ventures, like Kim's dream law firm. Just think of the twist if, in a few years (and after passing the bar), KKW sells her beauty brand to Lauder or L'Oréal for another half billion, and then uses the windfall to set up a pro bono venture dedicated to wrongful convictions. What an idea that would be.

But it also makes me wonder if this is an acknowledgment that the influencer model only takes you so far, and then you really do need the backing of a classic bricks-and-mortar operation, just as so many digital brands like Warby Parker and Moda Operandi have opened physical locations.

If the future of influencing (terrible word) is really in the micro-selling game as opposed to the big-brand game, so that the actual big brand is always the personal brand, as opposed to any specific product. In which case, entrepreneurs like Kylie and co. just keep creating and offloading, creating and offloading, since what they are really selling is themselves.

Or is that reading too much into what is just a standard acquisition?

JT Let's look at the great Jaclyn Cosmetics disaster of 2019. In May, the makeup artist and YouTube personality Jaclyn Hill introduced a line of 20 nude lipsticks. By June, she was offering refunds after customers complained that the product was subpar (uneven textures) and unsanitary (allegations of mold).

Introducing a beauty brand is hard! Especially as a solo influencer. Backing from a bricks-and-mortar operation could undeniably make it easier, even if it removes some autonomy and makes you seem a little less cool. But first that operation has to come calling.

That's why it's impossible to apply lessons from the Coty-Kylie sale to the rest of the influencer world. Most influencers are not Kardashian-Jenners. The clan exists on a different plane; they may sometimes look and act and sell weight-loss tea like influencers, but their fame and wealth has propelled them into a stratosphere where giant brands orbit them and social media controversies blow over in a relatively short time.

Jaclyn Hill, who recently announced a comeback, does not exist on that plane. She's down here with the rest of us, still dealing with her backlash. What I know is this: Kylie has more cash to expand her empire today than she did yesterday.

And the Kim Kardashian fantasy pro bono firm will do wonders for Kanye West's 2024 presidential campaign.

Критерии оценки экзамена:

Компетенции	Характеристика ответа на теоретический вопрос / выполнения практического задания	Количество набранных баллов
УК-4.5 УК-5.2 УК-5.3 ПК-1.4	Обучающийся адекватно передал содержание статьи; лексическое, грамматическое и стилистическое оформление речи соответствует нормам языка.	28 – 30
	Обучающийся адекватно передал содержание статьи; в целом лексическое, грамматическое и стилистическое оформление речи соответствует нормам языка, однако имеются отдельные отклонения от нормы.	23 – 27
	Обучающийся не полностью адекватно передал содержание статьи; лексическое, грамматическое и стилистическое оформление речи не соответствует нормам языка, однако это не мешает пониманию.	15 – 22
	Обучающийся неадекватно передал содержание статьи; лексическое, грамматическое и стилистическое оформление речи затрудняют восприятие информации <i>или</i> Ответ на вопрос полностью отсутствует <i>или</i> Отказ от ответа	0 – 14