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1. **Область применения и нормативные ссылки**

Настоящая рабочая программа дисциплины устанавливает минимальные требования к знаниям и умениям аспиранта, а также определяет содержание и виды учебных занятий и отчетности.

Программа предназначена для преподавателей, ведущих данную дисциплину, и аспирантов (соискателей) направления подготовки 39.06.01 «Социологические науки», профиль «Социальная структура, социальные институты и процессы».

Рабочая программа дисциплины разработана в соответствии с:

* Образовательным стандартом НИУ ВШЭ по направлению подготовки 39.06.01 «Социологические науки»
* Образовательной программой по направлению подготовки 39.06.01 «Социологические науки», профиль «Социальная структура, социальные институты и процессы
* Учебным планом образовательной программы по направлению подготовки 39.06.01 «Социологические науки», профиль «Социальная структура, социальные институты и процессы».
1. **Цели освоения дисциплины**

Основной целью изучения иностранного языка аспирантами является достижение практического владения языком, позволяющего использовать его в научной работе.

Практическое владение иностранным языком в рамках данного курса предполагает наличие таких умений в различных видах речевой коммуникации, которые дают возможность:

– свободно читать оригинальную литературу на иностранном языке в соответствующей отрасли знаний;

– оформлять извлеченную из иностранных источников информацию в виде перевода или резюме (summary);

– делать сообщения и доклады на иностранном языке на темы, связанные с научной работой аспиранта;

– вести дискуссию по тематике научного исследования.

В задачи дисциплины «Иностранный язык» входят совершенствование и дальнейшее развитие полученных в высшей школе знаний, навыков и умений по иностранному языку в различных видах речевой коммуникации.

Предусматривается достижение такого уровня владения языком, который позволит аспирантам успешно продолжать обучение и осуществлять научную деятельность, пользуясь иностранным языком во всех видах речевой коммуникации, представленных в сфере устного и письменного общения. Знание иностранного языка облегчает доступ к научной информации, использованию ресурсов Интернет, помогает налаживанию международных научных контактов и расширяет возможности повышения профессионального уровня аспиранта.

1. **Компетенции обучающегося, формируемые в результате освоения дисциплины**

В результате освоения дисциплины студент осваивает следующие компетенции:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Компетенция  | Код по ОС ВШЭ | Дескрипторы основные признаки освоения (показатели достижения результата) | Формы и методы обучения, способствующие формированию и развитию компетенции | Форма контроля уровня сформированности компетенции |
| готовность участвовать в работе российских и международных исследовательских коллективов по решению научных и научно-образовательных задач | УК-3 |

|  |
| --- |
| умеет критически оценивать научные академические тексты на английском языке и аргументированно излагать собственную позицию |

 | практические занятия, самостоятельная работа (реферирование, аннотирование, рецензирование текстов  | Проект исследовательской работы  |
| готовность использовать современные методы и технологии научной коммуникации на государственном и иностранном языках  | УК-4 | умеет находить необходимые источники на английском языке, правильно их использовать при анализе и написании научных текстов  |

|  |
| --- |
| аудиторные занятия, самостоятельная работа (подбор источников по теме докладов и письменных работ)  |

 | Проект исследовательской работы |
| способность планировать и решать задачи собственного профессионального и личностного развития | УК-6 | умеет планировать и расставлять приоритеты в профессиональной области, способен ставить цели и достигать их решения | самостоятельная работа | Проект исследовательской работы |

1. **Место дисциплины в структуре образовательной программы**

Дисциплина «Иностранный язык» предусмотрена для изучения в аспирантуре в качестве обязательной дисциплины базовой части образовательной программы. Данный курс является подготовительным этапом для последующих академических курсов на английском языке, читаемых для аспирантов в НИУ ВШЭ, для научной работы аспирантов.

1. **Тематический план учебной дисциплины**

Общая трудоемкость дисциплины составляет 5 зачетных единиц. Общее кол-во часов 190, из них аудиторная работа – 64, самостоятельная - 126

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| № п/п | Название темы | Всего часов | Аудиторные часы | Самостоятельная работа |
| 11 | Функциональный стиль научной литературы (лексико-грамматическиеособенности).Языковые особенности научного текста. | 24 | 8 | 16 |
| 22 | Структура академической статьи. Особенности поиска академических источников, организация и стратегии работы с аутентичными академическими источниками.Формулировка темы научного исследования. Исследовательский вопрос. Тезис.Составления плана исследовательской работы. | 42 | 16 | 26 |
| 33 | Различные виды чтения.Стратегии чтения научной литературы. | 18 | 4 | 14 |
| 44 | Аннотирование и реферирование научных текстов. Обзор литературы. Описание методики и результатов исследования. Abstract. | 42 | 16 | 26 |
| 55 | Особенности академической презентации. Подготовка презентации научного исследования.  | 36 | 12 | 24 |
| 66 | Обсуждение вопросов научного исследования. Стратегии устного изложения и ответов на вопросы. | 28 | 8 | 20 |
| Итого | 190 | 64 | 126 |

1. **Образовательные технологии**

На занятиях используются интерактивные и активные формы проведения занятий – академические презентации и их панельное обсуждение, разбор практических задач и кейсов, учебные конференции по темам исследования аспирантов, симуляции предстоящих экзаменов .Для максимальной активизации студентов широко применяется парная работа и работа в мини-группах. Используются образовательные ИКТ технологии.

**7. Формы контроля знаний аспирантов**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Тип контроля | Форма контроля | 1 год | Параметры |
| 1 полугодие | 2 полугодие |
| Текущий | Домашнее задание | 1 |  | Проект исследовательской работы 4000 – 5000 слов, применяются критерии оценивания письменной работы (см.п.8) |
| Итоговый | Кандидатский экзамен | 1 |  | См. п.8 |

**8. Оценочные средства**

**Текущий контроль** – домашнее задание в форме проекта исследовательской работы

**Требования к проекту**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Структура (терминология на русском языке) | Структура (терминология на английском языке) |
| Научно-исследовательская работа на английском языке | A **research paper** is a concise and coherent summary of your research. It sets out the central issues or questions that you intend to address. It outlines the general area of study within which your research falls, referring to the current state of knowledge and any recent debates on the topic. It also demonstrates the originality of your research. |
| Название  | **Title**  |
| Аннотация  | **Abstract** (a concise statement of your intended research of no more than **200 words**)  |
| Введение (обоснование работы, актуальность, новизна, цели и задачи) | **Introduction**  **(1 – 2 pages, 500 – 800 wds)*** **research context,** a brief overview of the general area of study within which your research falls, summarising the current state of knowledge and recent debates on the topic,
* **the thesis statement and the research question** (the central aims and questions that will guide your research, one or two main questions, from which you can then derive a number of secondary research questions. The proposal should also explain your intended approach to answering the questions: will your approach be empirical, doctrinal or theoretical etc?)
 |
| **Обзор литературы**, предполагающий не просто реферат основных работ по теме, описание понятийного аппарата, но их сравнение, указание на достоинства и недостатки, слабость или основательность доказательств. Обоснование актуальности исследовательского проекта на основе выявления лакуны в существующей литературе – основная задача критического обзора литературы. 5- 6 оригинальных академических источников (статей, монографий, глав книг, официальных докладов и отчетов) | **Preliminary Literature Review** **(4-5 pages, 2000 – 2500 wds)**critical review of what others have down in your area, and what you propose to do. You need to write around two pages in which you cover the following:• The major issues or schools of thought• Gaps in the literature (in more detail than is provided in the introduction)• Definitions of key terms, provided either when you introduce each idea, or in a definition sub-section• Questions arising from the gaps that can be the focus of data collection or analysis* the theoretical framework that describes the model that you are using in the thesis to demonstrate your point.
 |
| **Методы исследования**описание инструментария и методов исследования | **Proposed Research Methodology (1- 2 pages, 500 – 800 wds)**You do not have to describe the methodology to be used in great detail, but you should justify its use over other methodologies. For example, you could explain the reasons for using:• a certain paradigm or theory• qualitative or quantitative research• a case study of a specific kind• surveys, correlational experiments, field studies, specific statistical measurements, etc.• certain dependent or independent or moderating variables • a particular sampling frame and the size of a sampleYou could also explain how you are proposing to:• have access to the data• analyse the data If  your proposed research is library-based, you should explain where your key resources (e.g. reports, journal articles) are located. If you plan to conduct field work or collect empirical data, you should provide details about this (e.g. if you plan interviews, who will you interview? How many interviews will you conduct? Will there be problems of access?). This section should also explain how you are going to analyse your research findings. |
| **Предполагаемые результаты исследования** Описание предполагаемых результатов обусловлено исследовательским вопросом | **Expected or Preliminary Findings (1- 2 pages, 500- 800 wds)*** present any results you already have obtained or expect to obtain
* discuss how they fit in the framework of your research
 |
| **Заключение** В заключении предполагается не только формализация результатов, но и оценка предложенных в работе решений, выявленных закономерностей и оценка перспективных решений в соответствии с поставленным исследовательским вопросом | **Conclusions and Implications (1- 2 pages, 500 – 1000 wds)** |
| Библиография | **References (5 – 10)** |

**Требования к оформлению**

Работа оформлена в соответствии со стилем APA.

**Требования к стилю и языку**

Материал желательно излагать в настоящем времени. В Работе не допускается использование разговорной и неформальной лексики, сокращений. На лексическом уровне рекомендуется использование специальных терминов и устойчивых сочетаний, характерных для английской академической речи.

**Критерии оценивания проекта и правила выставления оценки за текущий контроль**

Оценка за проект выставляется в форме зачтено/не зачтено, что является основанием для допуска/недопуска к кандидатскому экзамену.

Оценка зачтено выставляется если аспирант выполнил работу в соответствии со следующими требованиями:

**-** *Структура проекта* **-** обязательно наличие всех структурных элементов и их последовательность. Соблюдены рекомендации по содержанию, способу изложения и объему структурных элементов;

**-** *Логичность изложения материала и связность текста -* проектсодержит тезисы, аргументы и выводы; логичность и связность соблюдены на лексическом и синтаксическом уровне;

*- Грамматическая правильность языка* **-** текст проекта в целом соответствует грамматическим правилам английского языка, включая пунктуационные правила;

*Академичность стиля и владение профессиональной лексикой* **-** использованы синтаксические конструкции и лексические единицы, характерные для академического стиля английского языка; использована профессиональная лексика;

*Оформление -* проект оформлен в соответствии со стилем АРА. Правильно использованы приемы парафраза и прямого цитирования.

Вместо проекта исследовательской работы аспирант может представить опубликованную научную статью на английском языке, подготовленную на основе исследования, или текст доклада на английском языке по тематике исследования на научной конференции (приложить программу конференции). Выпускники англоязычных магистерских программ могут представить текст выпускной квалификационной работы на английском языке. В этих случае аспирант получает зачет автоматически.

**Методические рекомендации по написанию проекта исследовательской работы**

При изложении материала следует придерживаться культурно-прагматических конвенций построения аргументированного текста в английском языке, то есть содержать такие элементы, как тезис, аргументы и вывод. Общий принцип изложения - движение мысли от общего к частному.

Связность текста обусловлена логичностью изложения материала. Связность должна быть соблюдена как на лексическом, так и на синтаксическом уровне. На лексическом уровне это достигается использованием выражений со значением перечисления, причинно-следственной связи, указанием на различные аспекты и т. д. (signposting words). Значительную роль играют глаголы, указывающие на логические связи, например, lead to, result in и т. д. На синтаксическом уровне связность текста достигается использованием сложноподчиненных предложений. Однако следует избегать очень сложных грамматических конструкций, затрудняющих восприятие материала. В таком случае предлагается разбить сложные предложения на несколько простых.

Текст должен быть написан в настоящем времени (Present Simple). В тех случаях, когда необходимо подчеркнуть законченность действия, рекомендуется использовать Present Perfect. Следует избегать личных местоимений. Использование личных местоимений допускается в том случае, если необходимо сделать акцент на личной позиции автора. Не допускается использование сокращенных форм.

**Итоговый контроль по дисциплине**

**Кандидатский экзамен**

**Требования к сдающим кандидатский экзамен по иностранному языку**

На кандидатском экзамене аспирант должен продемонстрировать умение пользоваться иностранным языком (английским) как средством профессионального общения. Он должен владеть орфографическими, лексическими и грамматическими нормами иностранного языка и правильно использовать их во всех видах речевой деятельности, представленных в сфере культурного, профессионального и научного общения.

 **Допуск к кандидатскому экзамену**

Допуском к кандидатскому экзамену является наличие зачета по текущему контролю.

**Виды речевой деятельности**, проверяемые на кандидатском экзамене

*- Чтение и письмо* - контролируются навыки изучающего чтения. Экзаменуемый должен продемонстрировать умение читать без словаря оригинальную литературу по специальности, максимально полно и точно воспринимать, анализировать и обобщать прочитанное, опираясь на профессиональные знания и навыки языковой и контекстуальной догадки. Уметь создать письменно вторичный текст (аннотацию) к прочитанному, учитывая принятые в научной среде требования к содержанию и форме данного вида текста.

***-*** *Говорение и аудирование*- на экзамене аспирант должен показать владение неподготовленной диалогической речью в ситуации официального общения в пределах узкоспециальной тематики по избранному направлению исследования, продемонстрировать умение адекватно воспринимать речь и давать логически обоснованные развёрнутые и краткие ответы на вопросы экзаменатора.

**Структура экзаменационного билета и критерии оценивания**

1. Беглое чтение оригинального текста по направлению подготовки (без словаря). Объем - 40 000 печатных знаков. Время выполнения работы - 45-60 минут.

1) написание аннотации (150-200 слов)

2) составление списка ключевых слов (5-7 слов).

*Оценивается умение максимально точно и адекватно извлекать ключевую информацию, содержащуюся в тексте, умение определить круг рассматриваемых в тексте вопросов, выявить основные положения автора и изложить их в краткой форме, проводить обобщения и анализ, письменно на английском языке.*

2. Беседа с экзаменаторами на иностранном языке по вопросам, связанным с прочитанными статьями по тематике исследования и научной работой аспиранта.

*Оцениваются навыки владения неподготовленной диалогической речью с точки зрения адекватной реализации коммуникативного намерения, логичности, связности, нормативности высказывания.*

*Критерии оценки устного высказывания по вопросам, связанным с научным исследованием во время беседы с экзаменаторами*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Оценка** | **Содержание высказывания** | **Организация высказывания** | **Языковое оформление** |
| 5отлично | Освещены основные вопросы исследования, ответы на вопросы по содержанию научной работы полные и развернутые. | Высказывание связно, логично. Эффективно используются дискурсивные маркеры для организации высказывания (explanation, opinion,argument,exemplification и т.п.). | Эффективное, свободное владение общей, академической и профессиональной лексикой, использованы разнообразные грамматические конструкции, быстрая выразительная речь.  |
| 4хорошо | Освещены основные вопросы исследования, ответы на вопросы по содержанию научной работы не всегда полные и развернутые. | Высказывание в основном связно, логично. Недостаточно используются дискурсивные маркеры для организации высказывания (explanation, opinion,argument,exemplification и т.п.). | Достаточно свободное владение общей, академической и профессиональной лексикой, речь грамматически правильно оформлена, темп речи достаточный, имеется ряд ошибок, не препятствующих пониманию. |
| 3удовлетворительно | Вопросы исследования освещены частично, ответы на вопросы по содержанию научной работы неполные и неразвернутые. | Высказывание в целом связное, но имеются ошибки в логике высказывания. Дискурсивные маркеры для организации высказывания (explanation, opinion,argument,exemplification и т.п.) используются ограничено. | Имеются затруднения в использовании общей, академической и профессиональной лексики, используются однообразные грамматические конструкции, темп речи замедленный, имеются ошибки, препятствующие пониманию. |
| 2,1неудовлетворительно | Вопросы исследования освещены в недостаточной степени, ответы на вопросы по содержанию научной работы вызывают затруднение и не позволяют составить представление о научной работе. | Высказывание не связное, имеются многочисленные ошибки в логике высказывания. Дискурсивные маркеры для организации высказывания (explanation, opinion,argument,exemplification и т.п.) не используются. | Имеются значительные затруднения в использовании общей, академической и профессиональной лексики, используются однообразные, простые, грамматические конструкции, темп речи замедленный, имеются многочисленные ошибки, препятствующие пониманию. |

Критерии оценивания Аннотации

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Оценка | **Содержание** | **Структура и объем** | **Владение основными стратегиями и приемами академического письма (summarizing, paraphrasing)** | **Стилистическое оформление** | **Языковое оформление****(лексика, грамматика, орфография, пунктуация)** |
| 5 | Текст аннотации эффективно отражает содержание источника. На основе источника отобрана и представлена необходимая и достаточная информация (постановка проблемы, исследовательский вопрос, теоретическая база, методы, результаты исследования и т.п.). | Текст аннотации оформлен в 1 абзац (за исключением особых требований в рамках дисциплины), структурно завершен, информация изложена логично. Объем соответствует заданию (150-200 слов).Присутствует необходимое и достаточное кол-во ключевых слов. | В тексте аннотации продемонстрированы умения пользоваться основными стратегиями и приемами академического письма (summarizing, paraphrasing): информация представлена в сжатой форме, отсутствуют прямые заимствования из текста источника. | В тексте аннотации продемонстрировано эффективное использование профессиональной и академической лексики. Текст полностью соответствует академическому стилю. | В тексте аннотации продемонстрировано свободное владение лексикой. Безошибочное пунктуационное и орфографическое оформление.Полное отсутствие грамматических ошибок. |
| 4 | Текст аннотации эффективно отражает содержание источника. **Имеются незначительные недочеты в отборе информации (лишняя информация или недостаток информации**).  | Текст аннотации оформлен в 1 абзац, структурно завершен, информация изложена логично. **Объем незначительно превышает 200 слов, либо составляет менее 150** Присутствует необходимое и достаточное кол-во ключевых слов. | В тексте аннотации, **в основном,** продемонстрированы умения пользоваться основными стратегиями и приемами академического письма (summarizing, paraphrasing). Информация представлена в сжатой форме. Имеются **единичные случаи прямого заимствования** из текста источника. | В тексте аннотации продемонстрировано эффективное использование профессиональной и академической лексики. **Имеются незначительные ошибки в их использовании.** Текст, в целом, соответствует академическому стилю. | В целом, продемонстрировано достаточное владение лексикой. Правильное пунктуационное и орфографическое оформление.**Имеются 1-2 негрубые грамматические ошибки.** |
| 3 | Текст аннотации частично отражает содержание источника. **Имеются значительные недочеты в отборе информации (лишняя информация или недостаток информации).** | Текст аннотации оформлен **более чем в 1 абзац** (за исключением особых требований в рамках дисциплины) **,** **Имеются ошибки в логике и структуре.** **Объем существенно превышает 200 слов, либо составляет менее 150.** **Присутствует недостаточное или излишнее кол-во ключевых слов.** | В тексте аннотации **недостаточно** продемонстрированы умения пользоваться основными стратегиями и приемами академического письма (summarizing, paraphrasing). **Информация представлена не в сжатой форме.****Часть выражений и конструкций напрямую заимствована из текста источника.** | В тексте аннотации, в целом, продемонстрировано **упрощенное использование профессиональной и академической лексики, имеются многочисленные (более 3) ошибки в их использовании.** | Продемонстрировано ограниченное владение лексикой. Имеются орфографические и пунктуационные ошибки.**Текст аннотации содержит более 3 грубых грамматических ошибок.** |
| 2 | Текст аннотации **неадекватно** отражает содержание статьи. **Имеются значительные недочеты в отборе информации (лишняя информация или недостаток информации).** | Текст аннотации оформлен **более чем в 1 абзац** (за исключением особых требований в рамках дисциплины) **,** **Имеются ошибки в логике и структуре.** **Объем превышает 200 слов, либо составляет менее 150.** **Отсутствуют ключевые слова.** | В тексте аннотации **не продемонстрированы умения пользоваться основными стратегиями и приемами академического письма (summarizing, paraphrasing). Текст представлен не в сжатой форме.****Имеются многочисленные прямые заимствования из текста источника.** | В тексте аннотации **чрезвычайно ограничено использование профессиональной и академической лексики, имеются многочисленные (более 5) ошибки в их использовании.**  | Продемонстрированы **значительные лексические затруднения**. Имеются **многочисленные (более 5) орфографические и пунктуационные ошибки.****Текст аннотации содержит более 5 грубых грамматических ошибок.** |
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**Introduction**

The triple bottom line, in industry and government, recognizes the need to balance economy, environment and equity to ensure sustainable development (Kucukvar & Tatari, 2013; Portney, 2013; Campbell, 1996). For local governments, especially those facing fiscal stress, economic development is often the primary goal, with environment and equity taking second stage. Bringing the three pillars into balance is a key challenge of sustainability. However, within economic development policy itself we are seeing a shift as concern for sustainable development seeks to enhance attention to environmental and social issues as part of a community’s economic development strategy (Portney, 2013). Economic developers recognize the growth potential in green jobs and the need to manage natural resources for long term sustainable development (Harper-Anderson, 2012; Osgood, et al., 2012; Roberts & Cohen, 2002). Inequality is innovative policy groups to argue that “equity is the superior growth model” (Policy Link, 2014).

As the triple bottom line ethos becomes integrated in local economic development policy, we are seeing a shift from primary reliance on business attraction and incentives to outside firms, to a broader set of community economic development policies focused on strengthening local and smaller firms, and addressing environmental challenges and social issues (Zheng and Warner,; Grodach 2011; Reese 2012). This article explores the factors that drive local governments to pursue these broader community economic development strategies, using the latest available national survey data from the International City/County Management Association (2014) on local government economic development policy actions.

In economic development, business incentives are the most common and traditional strategy utilized by local governments (Osgood, Opp, & Bernotsky, 2012; Reese, 2014a; Reese, 2014b). Research generally finds a link between business incentives and economic development(Bartik & Erickcek, 2014; Lowe, 2012; Lynch 2004; Bartik, 1991). However, business incentives are often products of intergovernmental competition (Zheng & Warner, 2010; Bartik, 2005), which can create a negative-sum game and harm long term sustainable development (Partridge, 2011). Community economic development strategies focus on a broader range of issues – from small business development (McFarland & McConnell, 2012), to workforce supports and quality of life (Warner & Zheng, 2013; Florida, 2004), to environmental and social

In recent years, local governments have increased the use of broader community economic development strategies while still relying on traditional business incentive strategies (Bennett & Giloth, 2008; Reese,1998; Zheng & Warner, 2010**).** This policy shift implies that local governments have broadened their focus to include supporting local firms and pursuing more inclusive community economic development, instead of just focusing on attracting firms or external investments. The ICMA economic development surveys show that from 1994 to 2004, local governments increased the use of community economic development strategies, which focus on local firms and community development (Zheng & Warner, 2010). While the percentage of local governments using at least one business incentive decreased from 88% in 1994 to 68% in 2004, in 2009 the use of business incentives jumped to 90 percent of municipalities in the wake of the Great Recession (Warner & Zheng, 2013). The 2014 ICMA survey data indicate that 98% of local governments use at least one business incentive and 98% use at least one community economic development strategy, but they differ in the level of strategies used.

In this article, we explore the 2014 ICMA survey of local government economic development policy to see if we can differentiate the drivers of business incentives from the drivers of community economic development strategies. We are especially interested in determing what role triple bottom line motivations play in determining the mix of economic development strategies a community employs. Using a national survey, we are able to assess if broader community economic development strategies are possible for a wide range of communities.

**Literature Review**

Environmental protection, social equity and economic development compose three pillars of the triple bottom line (TBL) for sustainable development. The TBL approach is widely used to assess performance of sustainability in the private sector regarding aspects of supply chains (Ahi & Searcy, 2015), and various industries (Kucukvar & Tatari, 2013; Tyrrell, Paris, & Biaett, 2012; Milne, 2012; Taylor & Fletcher, 2006). By contrast, for local governments seeking to enhance their triple bottom line, the challenge is to build their tax base and promote job creation, while also ensuring environmental protection and social equity (Osuji, 2011). Campbell (1996) recognized that sustainability is only achieved through repeated efforts to solve the tensions between each of sustainability’s three dimensions. Recent research seems to indicate that local governments may navigate the tension between environment and economy, but the social equity dimension often gets left out (Homsy & Warner, 2015). Local governments facing greater fiscal and economic challenges are less likely to pursue broader economic development strategies, which may promote sustainability (Betz, Partridge, Kraybill, & Lobao, 2012; Lubell, Feiock, & Handy, 2009). Kettl (2002) argues that the traditional silos that define many government practices tend to inhibit the broader thinking required by communities seeking to promote sustainability.

Local governments facing the challenge of sustainable economic development, not only concentrate on increasing tax base and job creation, but also comprehensively consider environmental protection and social equity (Blakely & Leigh, 2010; Nowak, 1997). In a study of Dallas-Fort Worth, Grodach (2011) found that conventional economic development aims to attract external firms and increase median income, but often pays little attention to environmental protection or social equity. In comparison, community economic development concentrates on diversifying the economy (e.g. business cluster, technology zones), narrowing gaps of skills and social services among regions (e.g. management training, affordable housing), and developing environmental friendly and green industries (e.g. energy efficiency program, green building incentives) (Grodach, 2011).

Local governments use business incentives as the primary strategy to stimulate the local economy (Osgood. et al., 2012; Reese, 2014 a; Reese, 2014 b; Kim, 2009). These traditional economic development strategies focus on increasing the tax base and employment (Bartik, 1991; Bartik, 2005; Grodach, 2011). Since the Great Recession, local governments have increased the use of traditional business attraction to offset losses (Warner and Zheng, 2013; Osgood et. al., 2012). Business incentives, including tax abatements, infrastructure improvement and local enterprise development zones, are designed to attract large outside firms (Lynch, 2004; Peter & Fisher, 2004), but are typically not targeted to small businesses and local firms (Grodach, 2011). Business incentives often are driven by competition among municipalities (Bartik, 2005; Grodach, 2011), and may undermine the local economy by spending public money on attracting external firms which may not be suitable for local conditions (Partridge, 2011). Lobao, Adua, and Hooks (2014) found that business attraction is higher in counties with a proportionally larger manufacturing workforce.

Community economic development strategies promote the linkage between firms and local community development (Bradshaw & Blakely, 1999; Clavel et al., 1997). These strategies include small business development, business expansion and retention, and community activities, such as market assistance and management training for small businesses, business clusters and industrial districts which expand local firms’ development, and investments in high quality of life for workers. Community economic development strategies pay attention to environmental protection and social equity (Osgood et al., 2012, Saha and Paterson, 2008), and comprehensively develop the triple bottom line. Community economic development strategies can be driven by green economic development goals of local governments, and these strategies simultaneously make progress on economy and social well-being (Harper-Anderson, 2012). Such strategies often address both environmental sustainability (e.g. energy efficiency program, green building incentives) and social issues (e.g. promote age-friendly businesses). Osgood et al. (2012) reviewed local economic development policies in the last decade and found that community economic development strategies concentrate on environmental sustainability and human investment. Portney (2013) analyzed twenty-four cities in the U.S., and found that energy efficiency programs and green building incentives in community development strategies contribute to environmental protection. Saha and Paterson (2008) surveyed more than 200 large cities in the U.S., and found that affordable housing was one of the most common economic development activities adopted to support social equity.

Community economic development strategies have been found to involve a broader array of participants and community cooperation (Brodhag & Taliere, 2006, Flint, 2010), while the primary participants in business incentives are more narrowly limited to firms and local economic development offices (Grodach, 2011). At the municipal level, when governments have economic development plans developed through a public process, a broader array of policies are adopted (Stokan, 2013) including those focused more on local businesses (McFarland & McConnell, 2012). Local comprehensive plans combined with community development policies can promote smart growth of small communities (Edwards & Haines, 2007). Community development strategies, such as zoning ordinances (Jepson & Haines, 2014), and affordable housing (Talen, 2010) are enhanced by sustainable development goals.

Local governments are being challenged to increase the accountability of economic development policies (LeRoy, 2005). Local goverments have increased performance measurement to assess the effectiveness of business incentives (Zheng and Warner, 2010), but in a study of tax incentives in Kansas, Matkin (2010) found that although procedural requirements of tax abatements increase accountability, measurements did not improve the impacts of tax abatements on economic growth. Accountability measures for community economic development policies are harder to design, as the objectives behind these strategies extend beyond direct measures of jobs, income or tax base. Bartik (2011) reviews the evidence and concludes that investment in both business incentives and community economic development have positive impacts on long term economic growth, but investments in human capital are especially important.

Community economic development strategies and traditional business incentives are not substitutes, but are used simultaneously by local governments (Bradshaw & Blakely, 1999; Blakely & Leigh, 2010). For example, business incentives are often combined with local business expansion and retention strategies to enhance economic development (Blakely & Leigh, 2010; Koven & Lyons, 2010). Lowe (2012) found when business incentives are combined with job training they can have a more sustainable economic development impact.

In this study, we are interested in the drivers that differentiate communities which rely more on business incentives from those which use a higher level of community development strategies. We give specific attention to the level of business incentives and of community economic development strategies used, and the relation between economic development strategies and environment and equity goals. While most localities use at least one business incentive and at least one community economic development strategy, we find that places vary in the levels of strategies used. Some rely more heavily on business incentives, while others rely more heavily on community economic development strategies. Our analysis explores what factors drive the use of different economic development approaches, and if the drivers for community economic development strategies differ from those for business incentives. We classify economic development according to the triple bottom line: economic development, environmental sustainability, and social equity, and assess if local governments’ use of economic development strategies varies in response to different goals.

**Data**

Study data were obtained from a local economic development survey we conducted with the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) in 2014. Surveys were sent to municipal officers in municipalities and counties across the U.S. 5,237 local governments were surveyed, and 1,201 responded for a 23% response rate. After dropping respondents who failed to answer all questions, the final sample included 1,151 respondents of which 230 are principal cities, 706 are suburban municipalities and 215 are rural places. Respondents were from four regions: South (380), Northeast (149), North central (350), and West (272). We used the Twosample Kologorov-Smirov test to measure the equality of the population distribution between the universe and the sample data. The results show the sample captures slightly more larger communities than found in the universe, because places with population below 10,000 had a lower response rate.

The survey contained over 100 questions about local governments’ economic development strategies, planning, goals, motivations and barriers. The survey also measured accountability, participants in the economic development process and funding sources. Responses regarding the level of use of business incentives and community economic development tools, as well as motivations and economic development barriers were on a 4- degree scale (none, low, medium, high). Questions regarding existence of an economic development plan, development goals, presence of a college or junior college in the jurisdiction, and use of accountability measures were dichotomous.

According to the 2014 ICMA survey, almost all local governments use at least one business incentive and at least one community economic development policy. We measured the level of business incentives (BI) and the level of community economic development (CED) strategies by aggregating the level of use (no use=0, low=1, medium=2 and high=3) for each strategy employed by local government.

Business incentives included 15 items and Table 1 shows the percentage of municipalities using each policy, and the level of use of each policy. Business incentives are used to attract external firms and reduce the cost of relocation, so we included elements related to business attraction and cost reduction in this category. The alpha coefficient is 0.79, which suggests that items have relatively high internal consistency. Both business attraction and community level infrastructure investments are the most common business incentives used by US local governments with over 85% reporting using these strategies, most at the medium and high levels. Strategies focused on cost reductions to the firms such as grants (70%) and tax abatement (60%) were also common, but mostly at low and medium levels of use.

Note: Numbers represent percent governments which used this policy. Alpha coefficient is 0.79. Source: ICMA economic development survey 2014, N=1151 local governments. Community economic development strategies are used to help small business and existing local firms, and address planning, training, technology development, environmental protection, and community development concerns. The ICMA surveys measure a broad array of community economic development strategies and our index of community economic development strategies includes eight small business strategies, eight business expansion and retention strategies, three technology and environment policies, eight community development strategies, and six planning and training strategies. The alpha coefficient is 0.91, which implies that items are highly related to each other. Surveys of local businesses (85%), investments in high quality of life (89%), public private partnerships (86%) and zoning/permit assistance (87%) where the most commonly used strategies. Other strategies focused on social inequity by improving quality of human capital (job training for low skilled workers, 71%; training support, 53%), increasing social welfare (affordable workforce housing, 67%; business assistance, 68%; promote age-friendly businesses, 49%), and stimulating factor mobility (promote commuting, 55%). Small business development centers and strategies that encourage businesses to work together such as business clusters, business improvement districts, and main street programs are often adopted to decrease barriers faced by small firms, and facilitate interactions between firms and local governments (Reese & Ye, 2015; Morse and Ha, 1997).

**Model**

We test two dependent variables: the level of business incentives (BI) and the level of community economic development (CED) strategies on or independent variables as shown in the following model: *Level of BI (or CED) = f {triple bottom line motivations, planning,* *barriers, participants, funding, accountability, economic conditions}.* Our independent variables measure triple bottom line motivations as well as planning, participants in the economic development policy process, funding, level of accountability and economic development barriers. Data for all these variables come from the 2014 ICMA national survey. We used American Community Survey (2009-2013) and 2010 Census of Population data to control for socio-economic conditions (income, percent manufacturing employment, poverty rate, percent white population, diploma higher than high school, and population).

Triple Bottom Line Motivations

The survey asked respondents to indicate which goals drive their local economic development policy, and what motivates their economic development priorities. Five goals were listed: jobs, tax base, quality of life, environmental sustainability and social equity. Almost all respondents listed economic development goals as priorities: jobs (89%), tax base (91%) and quality of life (84%), so these could not be used to differentiate our sample. But less than half (45%) of responding communities listed environmental sustainability as a goal, and only a quarter (26%) listed social equity. We are interested primarily in testing if those governments that give attention to environment and equity – elements of the triple bottom line – have broader economic development policies.

In addition to goals, a question on motivations for community economic development priorities included ten elements, shown in Table 4. Each element was measured at four levels (no motivation=0, minimal motivation=1, moderate motivation=2, and significant motivation=3). We used factor analysis and found that goals and motivations differentiate into two factors: environmental and social equity motivations, and willingness to change. Environmental and social equity motivations include environmental sustainability and social equity goals as well as motivations regarding ‘growth in aging population’, ‘income inequality’, and ‘concern about environmental sustainability’. Our second factor, willingness to change, includes motivations

that include a change in the economy, in leadership or in economic development strategy. We hypothesize that communities which rank higher on these two factors will exhibit higher use of community economic development strategies, and lower use of business incentives.

The survey asked if the community has a written economic development plan (yes=1, otherwise=0). Overall, 50% of respondents reported their communities had an economic plan. When local governments have a written development plan, they are more likely to diversify development strategies (Stokan, 2013; Osgood et. al, 2012), so community development strategies are more likely to be considered. Having an economic plan also increases attention to small business endogenous growth (McFarland & McConnell, 2012), which is promoted by community development strategies. Therefore, we hypothesize that local governments with an economic development plan will use higher levels of community economic development strategies.

Barriers

Respondents were asked to indicate which development barriers they faced and their importance. Economic development barriers included 21 elements (Table 5), and the measurement of importance consisted of 4 degrees (0=none, 1=low, 2=medium and 3=high). More than half of respondents identified every element as a barrier to economic development. Primary barriers were on the supply-side of economic development: cost of land (90%), lack of capital/funding (90%), and lack of buildings (89%), followed by taxes (86%) and skilled labor (84%). Eighty-three percent of local governments reported that environmental regulation was an economic development barrier, which implies environmental protection could impede economic growth. Factor analysis showed barriers were relatively independent, so we created an additive index of the number of barriers reported by the local government. We hypothesize that communities with higher level of barriers would have a higher level of community economic development strategies, because those strategies focus on a broader range of economic development issues.

The survey measured the participation of 16 possible parties in the economic development policy process; and the average number participants reported was five. The most common participant was the city (86%), followed by the chamber of commerce (57%). Other potential participants are county (55%), economic development corporation (40%), regional organizations (38%), state government (37%), public/private partnership (33%), private business/industry (32%), citizen advisory board/commission (26%), college/university (25%), utility (21%), private/community economic development foundation (9%), planning consortia (8%), ad hoc citizen group (8%), federal government (6%), and non-profit organization serving the poor (5%). Participatory and multi-stakeholder involvement helps to balance economic, environment and social objectives (Brodhag & Taliere, 2006). Compared to business incentives, community economic development strategies consider more aspects of sustainable economic development. Therefore, we expect that when a higher number of participants engage in economic development, local governments will use higher levels of community economic development strategies, and lower levels of business incentives.

Funding Sources

There are many sources of funding for local economic development policies. Our survey measured the use of nine potential sources of funding. The average number of funding sources used is three. The most common source of funding is local funds (86%). State grants-in-aid (42%), tax increment financing districts (41%), hotel/motel taxes (39%), and sales tax (32%) are the next most common funding sources. Other funding sources include private funding (30%), federal grants-in-aid (28%), general obligation or revenue bonds (22%), and special assessment districts (21%). Our funding variable is a count of the sources employed by each local government. Since many of these sources were developed to fund business incentives, we expect communities using more funding sources will use more business incentives.

Accountability

Accountability of economic development policies is a concern for local government. The ICMA survey measured accountability with thirteen items, which we include as an additive index in our model. The average number of accountability measurements employed is six. The most commonly reported element was a performance agreement as a condition for providing business incentives (79%). Sixty–nine percent of local governments required a cost/benefit analysis before offering business incentives. Effectiveness of business incentives was measured by 72% of local governments. For local governments which measure the effectiveness of business incentives, the most widely used measurements were the number of jobs created by new business (64%), increase in the tax base (60%), and amount of money invested in construction materials and labor (52%). These measures primarily focus on the economic dimension of the triple bottom line. Other performance measurements were cost/benefit analysis (40%), new dollars invested in land (40%), numbers of new businesses relocating or expanding in jurisdiction (35%), and company revenue/sales (25%). Fifty-five percent of local governments reported that they have a claw back agreement in which companies are liable for paying back the value of incentives when they relocate or shut down. Only 17% of local governments require a percentage of new employees to be hired from within the community. Only 34% of respondents reported budget allocation was associated with economic development priorities specified in the plan. Our independent variable for accountability is the number of measures used. Because the primary accountability measurements are related to business incentives, we expect a higher level of accountability measurement will be related to a higher level of business incentives used.

Socio-economic conditions

We control for socioeconomic conditions in the community. These variables include education (whether there is a college or junior college in the jurisdiction, percentage of population which has a degree higher than high school), demographics (population size, percentage white), and socioeconomic factors (income, poverty rate), and economic structure (manufacturing employment rate) (Table 3). We expect that places that have a higher dependence on manufacturing employment and a lower per capita income will use more business incentives. We want to differentiate whether levels of community economic development strategies are related to education or economic conditions in the community. We also control for metro status1 and geographic division, and set suburb and South as references respectively. Urban governments have more economic, social and environmental capital to achieve sustainable economic development (Nowak, 1997); thus, we hypothesize that metro core communities will engage in a higher level of community economic development, compared to rural communities and suburbs. Compared to other regions, the ICMA data show that local governments in the South are less motivated by environmental sustainability and social equity concerns. We hypothesize that other regions will use a lower level of business incentives and a higher level of community development strategies compared to the South.

**Model Results**

We ran two ordinary least squares regressions to understand the differences in factors which explain the level of use of business incentives and of community economic development strategies. Regression results are shown in Table 6. To assess level of response across variables on a standard scale, we describe results using the standardized beta for continuous variables. For categorical variables, we report the model coefficient. We find that municipalities, which pay attention to environmental sustainability and social equity, use higher levels of community economic development tools. If a community is one standard deviation higher on this factor its level of community economic development strategies will be 3.27 higher. A one standard deviation increase in the willingness to change factor, is related to a 0.66 increase in the level of community development strategies. By contrast, the level of business incentives is negatively related to environmental sustainability and social equity motivations. Communities that rank one standard deviation higher on the environmental and social equity factor have 0.48 lower level of business incentives. The willingness to change factor has no effect on business incentives. Thus, our primary hypothesis regarding the link between triple bottom line motivations and higher use of broader economic development strategies is confirmed.

Communities which have a written economic development plan use a higher level of community development strategies as expected. Having a written economic development plan is associated with a 1.93 higher level of community development strategies. By contrast, the relationship between planning and business incentive use is not significant. The positive role of planning on level of community development strategies confirms our expectations. We also find support for our hypothesis regarding participants in the development process. If a community has one standard deviation more number of participants, then its level

of community economic development strategies will be 1.07 higher but its business incentive strategies will be 0.31 lower. Our hypothesis regarding barriers is also supported. Places facing more barriers use more community economic development strategies. A one standard deviation increase in barriers is associated with a 0.79 higher level of community economic development strategies but a 0.30 lower level of business incentives. Broader range of participants and a broader understanding of economic development barriers helps communities see the need for broader economic development strategies, as expected.

Accountability measures are positively associated with higher levels of both business incentives and community economic development strategies with a standard deviation higher level of accountability resulting in a higher level of strategies by about one point in each case. Number of funds shows similar positive results on both types of strategies but the effect is higher on business incentives, 0.96 strategies for a standard deviation higher number of funders, as compared to community economic development where the effect is only 0.76. Pressure to increase accountability in business incentives helps explain the stronger effect.

Regarding our control variables, there is a positive association between use of both community economic development strategies and business incentives as expected. Per capita income is negatively associated with business incentive strategies, but manufacturing employment has a positive relationship. This suggests that communities with higher income and more diversified economies are less likely to use higher levels of business incentives, as expected. Neither of these variables has an effect on level of community economic development strategies.

Municipalities in the South region use more business incentives and fewer community economic development strategies as expected, compared with the Northeast and West.2 Compared to the South, the level of community economic development strategies is 4.38 higher in the Northeast, and the level of business incentives is 2.12 lower. The West is 5.22 higher in average levels of community economic development strategies, and 2.94 lower in level of business incentives, compared to the South. These marginal effects are some of the largest in the model, and reflect the more progressive approach to economic development in the Northeast and the West. However, it is not just regional differences that explain our results.

For example, our models show the level of community economic development strategies is higher in the urban core than in suburbs but there is no difference with rural communities. Level of business incentives does not vary by metro status. Results show no difference in the level of community economic development or business incentive strategies by income, poverty, percent white or educational level. This suggests that both types of strategies can be practiced by a broad array of communities. However, community economic development strategies are higher in communities with a local college, which could be a source of expertise.

**Discussion**

Our models have shown that environmental and social equity motivations and willingness to change are key factors differentiating the level of community economic development strategies from the level of business incentives. Having a written economic development plan and involving a broader range of participants also differentiates communities using more community economic development strategies. The larger number of participants involved in economic development policymaking in these communities may expose officials to a greater range of strategies, increasing both the number of community economic development efforts and their level of use.

Communities facing more barriers use higher levels of community economic development strategies and lower levels of business incentives. This implies that business incentives may be too narrowly focused to address the broader barriers that communities face. Communities with lower income and with higher manufacturing dependence use higher levels of business incentives. When facing greater range of economic and social challenges, communities find they need to move beyond traditional development practices and adopt a higher level of community economic development strategies. These results support our hypothesis that community economic development strategies are more likely to reflect the three elements of the triple bottom line – economy, environment and social equity – and thus lead to sustainable development.

However, our models also show that economic developers do not live in an either/or world. They use both business incentives and community economic development strategies. Because both strategies are used together, we conducted additional tests to confirm our primary findings. Using natural breaks, we split the sample into low and high business incentives (<16, >16) and low and high community economic development strategies (< 33, >33). The majority of the sample, 503 municipalities ranked low on both strategies. We set these low performers as our reference group and ran a multinomial regression to see if higher users of community economic development strategies could be distinguished from higher users of business incentives. They can. Our primary result regarding motivations still differentiates high community economic development users. While high business incentive users also show these motivations, this is only the case when community economic development is also high. While the two strategies are practiced together, it is only when the level of community economic development strategies is high that we see the impact of triple bottom line motivations on. N=1151 US cities and counties.

Our results regarding planning show that high users of business incentives also have written plans. Accountability and funds show the same results as in the overall model. Local governments that rely *primarily* on business incentives pay more attention to performance measures and have a wider array of funding sources. This makes sense, as business incentives are an established tool, with traditional funding sources, and have been the subject of a lot of critique regarding accountability (LeRoy 2005).

We see some interesting differences in our control variables. Places that use both strategies at a high level are more likely to have greater manufacturing dependence, higher poverty, and be in the North Central region and in both the metro core and rural areas. This is the region that has faced the most deindustrialization, but also the region where many of the community economic development strategies, such as business retention and expansion, were first tested (Clavel et al. 1997; Morse and Ha, 1997). Thus these additional subsample models support our hypothesis that communities which use high levels of community economic development strategies pursue more sustainable economic development approaches.

**Conclusion**

In this article, we analyzed the 2014 ICMA survey on local economic development policies to see if we could differentiate motivations leading to higher use of traditional business incentives and higher use of community economic development strategies. While all communities are concerned with job creation, tax base and quality of life, in communities which articulate environment and equity goals, community economic development strategies are more heavily used. These communities also are more likely to engage in a formal economic development planning process with a broader array of participants. This may help them break out of the traditional silos that define many government practices (Kettl 2002) and inhibit the broader thinking required by communities seeking to promote sustainability.

Higher use of business incentives is negatively related to environmental sustainability and social equity motivations, unless business incentives are used in tandem with a high level of community economic development strategies. Communities that use both strategies at a high level, are likely to be under more economic stress – higher poverty, higher manufacturing dependence and in the North Central region, which has faced deindustrialization. But these communities are also more likely to have formal plans and pay higher attention to accountability in their economic development policy.

Economic developers do not live in an either/or world. They recognize that sustainable economic development policy must involve community economic development strategies to address the broad range of barriers that communities face. Business incentives have a role, but must be balanced with broader attention to community economic development strategies to achieve sustainable development (Lowe 2012). And this requires willingness to change, to test new approaches and to give attention to accountability measures. This is part of what distinguishes communities that pursue sustainable economic development policy, regardless of the constraints and challenges they may face.

These results suggest a promising way forward for sustainable development, as use of community economic development strategies is not limited to privileged communities. Our analysis of drivers of community economic development policy shows that balancing across the three dimensions of the triple bottom line is possible for a broad range of communities.

**Пример аннотации**

**Abstract**

What role do local governments play in promoting sustainable economic development? This article uses a 2014 national survey to analyze the relationship between local environment and social equity motivations and the kinds of economic development strategies local governments pursue (business incentives or community economic development policies). Municipalities that pay more attention to environmental sustainability and social equity use higher levels of community economic development tools and lower levels of business incentives. These places are also more likely to have written economic development plans, and involve more participants in the economic development process. By contrast, communities that employ higher levels of business incentives have lower income and are more dependent on manufacturing development. Other capacity measures do not differentiate types of economic development strategies. This suggests sustainable economic development strategies can be pursued by a broader array of communities, especially if they broaden the motivations driving their economic development policy.

*Keywords:* Business incentives, community economic development strategies, sustainable development, planning
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* Critical Thinking Learning Objective (a Scenario) http://intralibrary.rlocetl.ac.uk:8080/intralibrary/open\_virtual\_file\_path/i171n20105t/critical\_thinking.html
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* Purdue University Online Writing Lab http://owl.english.purdue.edu/
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* Qualitative and quantitative research http://intralibrary.rlo-cetl.ac.uk:8080/intralibrary/open\_virtual\_file\_path/i2529n6682t/index.html
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* Punctuation Skills Workshop (Open University) http://compass.port.ac.uk/UoP/items/4a4bb253-6945-afd7-83cd-3ce0c1aa6dad/1/viewcontent
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* Some key Features of Academic Reports (Portsmouth University) http://www.port.ac.uk/departments/studentsupport/ask/resources/handouts/writtenassignments/filetodownload,45398,en.pdf
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* Improve your Grammar (Internet Grammar of English) http://www.ucl.ac.uk/internet-grammar/intro/intro.htm
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* Harvard Style of Referencing http://www.everything2.com/index.pl?node\_id=1206008
* How to Cite References (Bournmouth University) http://www.bournemouth.ac.uk/library/how-to/citing-refs.html
* What is Referencing (University of Nottingham) http://intralibrary.rlocetl.ac.uk:8080/intralibrary/open\_virtual\_file\_path/i1405n11004t/referencing/index.html
* ABC of quotations (Middlesex University) http://studymore.org.uk/copy.htm
* Direct Quotations (Portsmouth University) http://www.port.ac.uk/departments/studentsupport/ask/resources/handouts/referencingandcitation/filetodownload,73257,en.pdf
* Proof reading your Work (Purdue Online) http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/561/01/
* Phrase Bank (University of Manchester) http://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/
* Extending Vocabulary (Portsmouth University) [http://www.port.ac.uk/departments/studentsupport/ask/resources/handouts/writtenassignments/filetodownload,32755,en.pd](http://www.port.ac.uk/departments/studentsupport/ask/resources/handouts/writtenassignments/filetodownload%2C32755%2Cen.pd)
* Academic Word List http://www.englishvocabularyexercises.com/
* British National Corpus http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/
* Corpus of Contemporary American English http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/
* Critical Reading (University Wollongong) http://unilearning.uow.edu.au/reading/readin\_2.html

**10. Материально-техническое обеспечение дисциплины**

Для занятий используются аудитории, оснащенные аудио и видео аппаратурой, компьютером.

1. **Особенности организации обучения для лиц с ограниченными возможностями здоровья**

В случае необходимости, обучающимся из числа лиц с ограниченными возможностями здоровья (по заявлению обучающегося) могут предлагаться следующих варианты восприятия учебной информации с учетом их индивидуальных психофизических особенностей, в том числе с применением электронного обучения и дистанционных технологий:

1) *для лиц с нарушениями зрения:* в печатной форме увеличенным шрифтом; в форме электронного документа; в форме аудиофайла (перевод учебных материалов в аудиоформат); индивидуальные консультации с привлечением тифлосурдопереводчика; индивидуальные задания и консультации.

2) *для лиц с нарушениями слуха*: в печатной форме; в форме электронного документа; видеоматериалы с субтитрами; индивидуальные консультации с привлечением сурдопереводчика; индивидуальные задания и консультации.

3) *для лиц с нарушениями опорно-двигательного аппарата*: в печатной форме; в форме электронного документа; в форме аудиофайла; индивидуальные задания и консультации.