



IGOR KOROLYOV

Kijevo nacionalinis Taraso Ševčenkos universitetas, Ukraina
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

KOOPERACINĖ MAKROSTRATEGIJA KAIP KOMUNIKACINIO ELGESIO DALIS

Cooperative Macrostrategy as Component
of Communicative Behaviour¹

SUMMARY

The article considers cooperative macrostrategy as a cognitive-semiotic category and one of the components of national communicative behaviour. A model of pragmatic registers of cooperative macrostrategy has been described, which ensures successful implementation of the cooperation mode. The particular attention is paid to the cooperative basis of communication, the functioning of which is ensured by the implementation of cooperative macrostrategy. It correlates with the global pragmatic component of the national cooperative communicative behaviour of representatives of a particular language culture. The hypero-hyponymic nature of the relationship between cooperative macrostrategy, microstrategies and tactics, within which the strategic component of communicative behaviour is primarily related to forecasting and planning communication, which is correlated with the main / general intention. The corresponding tactical component represents local intention, which is a tool for implementing micro- and macrostrategies. The research vision of cooperative macrostrategy as a component of national communicative behaviour, which is formed under the influence of a system of values, beliefs, social norms and conventions in the context of certain national traditions, is represented.

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje nagrinėjama kooperacinė makrostrategija kaip kognityvinė-semiotinė kategorija ir viena iš tautinio komunikacinio elgesio sudedamųjų dalių. Pateikiamas kooperacinės makrostrategijos pragmatinių registrų modelis, laiduojantis sėkmingą bendradarbiavimo moduso įgyvendinimą. Itin daug dėmesio skiriama kooperaciniam bendravimo pagrindui, kurio funkcionavimą užtikrina kooperacinės makrostrategijos įgyvendinimas, koreliuojantis su globaliu pragmatiniu tam tikros kalbinės kultūros atstovų nacionalinio komunikacinio elgesio komponentu. Straipsnyje analizuojamas santykis tarp hiperhiponiminio bendradar-

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: kognityvinė semiotika, kooperacinė makrostrategija, komunikacinis elgesys, diskursyvinė praktika.
KEY WORDS: cognitive semiotics, cooperative macrostrategy, communicative behaviour mode, discursive practice.

biavimo makrostrategijos, mikrostrategijų ir taktikų, kai strateginis komunikacinio elgesio komponentas pirmiausia siejamas su komunikacijos numatymu ir planavimu, o tai koreliuoja su pagrindiniu / bendru ketinimu. Atitinkamas taktinis komponentas atspindi vietinį ketinimą, kuris yra mikro ir makro strategijos įgyvendinimo įrankis. Straipsnyje pateikiama kooperacinės makrostrategijos, kaip nacionalinio komunikacinio elgesio komponento, susiformavusio veikiant vertybių, įsitikinimų, socialinių normų ir konvencijų sistamai tam tikrų nacionalinių tradicijų kontekste, tyrimo vizija.

INTRODUCTION

The stratification of human communicative activity into cooperative, intermediate and conflict characterizes human communication in general. Verbal and nonverbal communication is aimed at rapprochement / solidarity or distance / distancing, which can be represented pragmatically in the form of the following two registers: global communication strategies, or macrostrategies, which in turn consist of a set of separate microstrategies (Varzonin 1997: 13). In the context of our research and the specifics of the subject of study related to the cooperative basis of communication, we consider it appropriate to single out the cooperative macrostrategy, which

correlates with the global pragmatic component of the national cooperative communicative behaviour of interactants. It is known that the process of communication can be effective in the case of proper planning of speech and behavioural activities, i.e., with adequate choice of communication strategies and tactics (Arutyunova 1983: 37–56). In the appropriate perspective, the concept of linguopragmatic analysis provides an adequate interpretation of communicative strategies and tactics with the subsequent establishment of their repertoire in the national communicative behaviour of representatives of a particular language culture.

STRATEGIES AND TACTICS IN COMMUNICATION

Traditionally, strategies are seen as the art of management, based on predictions of the purpose of communication, and tactics – as techniques or ways to achieve this goal (Germanova 1993: 27–39). An explanation of the word *strategy* can be found in the explanatory dictionary of V. Dal: “it originates from the Greek στρατηγία – science of war; the doctrine of the best location of all military forces and weapons. Stratagem, military cunning, deception. A strategist and a strati-

late, a warrior, a military leader, a leader, a voivode” (Dal 1989: 166).

The following definitions of strategy are available in the explanatory dictionary of the Ukrainian language:

- 1) the art of preparing and waging war and large-scale military operations [...]; the science of warfare – higher military science [...]; about the system of playing in sports, in which individual moves, combinations, techniques are subject to the general, previously considered plan;

2) figurative the art of social and political leadership of the masses, which should determine the main direction of their actions, deeds [...]; 3) figurative Mode of action, line of conduct of someone (SUM, 9: 751).

The relationship between communicative strategies and tactics is in line with the basic tenets of the theory of speech acts because its object is a specific, single act of speech. According to E. Vereshchagin, V. Kostomarov the concept of speech (speech-behavioural) tactics is the central one. It is defined as a homogeneous in intention and implementation line of behaviour of the communicant, which is one of the components of his / her efforts to achieve strategic perlocutionary effect. Implementing one tactic, the speaker as if step by step performs a series of speech-behavioural acts, the combination of which (provided a successful outcome) determines success (Vereshchagin, Kostomarov 1999: 12). The corresponding speech-behavioural tactics are isolated according to a certain condensed integral meaning-intention, which can be expressed by various (non) verbal means.

E. Klyuyev considers tactics in communication as “a set of practical moves in the real process of speech interaction, i.e., communicative tactics, in contrast to communicative strategy, primarily correlated not with communicative purpose, but with a set of communicative intentions”, which is “a practical means of moving to communicative goals” (Klyuyev 1998: 11). Thus, tactics can be defined as a functional unit of the sequence of speech actions, which contrib-

utes to the solution of a local or global problem under the control of an appropriate strategy (Dijk van 1989, 274).

The strategy involves planning the process of speech interaction depending on the specific conditions of communication and the specifics of the personalities of communicators, as well as the implementation of the conversation plan (Tarasova 1992: 108–110). For successful strategic implementation of speech actions, communicators must have not only basic communication skills, but also presuppositional knowledge to determine the appropriate and adequate to the specific mode of their own communicative behaviour and to predict the communication situation in general. The strategy is governed by two main principles: 1) efficiency in a particular communicative situation; 2) achieving the maximum perlocutionary effect with a minimum of effort.

Synthesizing different views of scholars on understanding the concept of strategy, A. Korolyova notes that linguists are more inclined to interpret communicative strategy as a set of certain speech actions aimed at achieving a communicative goal, but psychologists define speech behaviour strategy as a setting for certain behavioural situations in a particular situation (Korolyova 2008: 50).

It can be distinguished stereotypical, social (inherent in society in general, which are formed based on the experience gained by the speaker) and individual (“invented” by a particular person) among the speech tactics that are used by representatives of a particular language culture (Vereshchagin 1991: 33).

Representation of speech tactics in the national communicative behaviour can take various forms from monotactics, i.e., when to implement the appropriate microstrategy in a particular discursive practice, it is enough to use one tactic, to political tactics, i.e. when each new replica (discursive practice) of communicators corresponds to a separate new tactic – several tactics can be implemented in one discursive practice (replica). Considering the formal side, speech tactics are divided into initial (or starting), medial (or middle, controlling the course of communication) and final (or finite) (Bozhko 2003: 9; Korolyov 2009: 59). Potentially, any of the speech tactics can act as initial, medial, or final, and therefore it has the pragmatic potential of any of the interactant's strategies in the discursive space of the national communicative behaviour.

In some concepts (Klyuyev 2002: 18–19) communicative strategies are correlated with theoretical provisions planned and implemented by the speaker, and tactics – with practical goals of communication. If communicative strategies presuppose a global, general nature of speech interaction, then tactics demonstrate their implementation at each stage of the communication situation. Communicative tactics can be embodied in one or more remarks / statements, which allows the speaker to control their use at certain stages of (non) verbal interaction and adjust their speech actions according to the desired perlocutionary effect. It should be borne in mind that the specificity of communication strategies in general and tactics in particular is the complexity in the use of language and speech tools to achieve the communicative goal.

COOPERATIVE MACROSTRATEGY AS A COGNITIVE-SEMIOTIC CATEGORY

The prediction of cooperative communicative behaviour is based on the epistemological basis of interaction / cooperation, considering both one's own motives, goals and interests, and the interlocutor, as well as the specifics of the whole situation in general. The existence of an invariant model of prototype communicative behaviour involves predicting their speech activity in all similar areas and situations of communication. Considering the specifics of extralinguistic factors of the communicative situation and decoding “the corresponding proposals of existing situational models, the speaker constructs semantic representa-

tions that are reflected in the structure of his speech” (Issers 2002: 169).

From the perspective of national communicative behaviour as a stereotypical form of social interaction, forecasting focuses on the analysis of extralingual factors of communication, determining adequate for a particular linguistic culture semiotic and discursive model aimed at achieving communicative and pragmatic goals in a particular situation, including their most effective means. Therefore, the next step on the way to successful speech interaction is the planning of cooperative behaviour, i.e. the choice of macrostrategy.

A macro-strategy is usually understood as a specific plan, determined by a specific goal and implemented in stages in the form of an algorithm:

the essence of the application of macrostrategy by A is to organize their speech influences on B during communication so that their result is a change in the values of the relevant parameters of B in the right direction for A (Sukhikh, Zelenskaya 1998: 42).

This view of global communication planning is consistent with the cognitive-semiotic view of understanding strategy as a plan of complex speech influence aimed at changing the model of the partner's world, the transformation of his / her conceptual consciousness.

In fact, the cognitive aspect of communication strategies is analysed in detail by T. van Dijk from the standpoint of ways to process complex information in memory, cognitive thought processes. The scholar characterizes the strategy, first of all, as a cognitive plan, which provides for the general organization of a certain sequence of speech actions and the purpose (goals) of communication (Dijk 1988: 153–212). Based on its concept, we assume that the macro-strategy is a category of cognitive level of communication, which controls the choice of the optimal mode of communicative behaviour in the absence of information about the actions of other participants or in the case of local contextual restrictions on personal communication.

O. Issers has a similar view on the understanding of macrostrategy. He highlights the following main components of it: forecasting, planning and

control over the implementation of the communication plan (Issers 2002: 100). In classifying communication strategies, the scholar relies on the "degree of global goals", according to which they can be differentiated into general (basic) and auxiliary (partial). In her opinion, the main strategies are cognitive (semantic), because they are the most significant in terms of priority goals and motives and are usually related to influencing the behaviour of the recipient, his / her worldview, values and more. Auxiliary strategies, respectively, contribute to the solution of specific communicative tasks. Considering such differentiation, all components of the communicative situation (as well as the components of communicative behavior – I. K.) are strategically important: the addresser, the addressee, the communication channel, the communicative context, etc. (Ibid: 106).

However, the attempt to distinguish between auxiliary strategies: pragmatic (communicative-situational), which are responsible for the implementation of strategic tasks; dialogues that control the organization of the dialogue; rhetorical, providing the use of techniques of oratory and rhetorical techniques to effectively influence the recipient. Thus, discussions in scientific circles were caused by combining strategies into certain groups, their inclusion in one or another type:

Building a negative image, in our opinion, is synonymous with discrediting. How to explain the inclusion of the image building strategy in the support strategies? In political and advertising communication this strategy is the main one [...] Why are pragmatic strategies singled out? Any communication strategy can be considered pragmatic (Golodnov 2011, 162).

We agree with the comments, because the differentiation of communication strategies, which is based on specific types of discourses, can be productive. The corresponding view means that the planning of communicative behaviour is the most important stage of speech interaction, during which interactants not only passively perceive information, but actively interpret it, implementing their own strategic line.

It should be noted that for the implementation of a cooperative communicative macrostrategy, a necessary condition is to change the values of relevant parameters, considering the interests of all participants in communication. Cooperative macrostrategy is determined by the appropriate cognitive-semiotic mode, which provides a certain scheme of action in the communication process and determines the choice of speech / language means of expression of content directly related to achieving the goal by all participants in communication.

The cooperative macrostrategy of communicative behaviour is primarily characterized by the orientation in communication to the interlocutor: the desire to direct the situation in a favourable direction, using various regulatory means. Cooperative macrostrategy, as well as confrontational one, is aimed at maximizing the participants' interaction of their own interests, but in a cooperative, "peaceful" way. According to V. Dudchenko's terminology, the corresponding line of conduct, even within conflict communication, is defined as "constructive", because it involves working with the conflict, negotiating, translating, or transforming the conflict into a rational plane,

using methods of conflict management and resolution (Dudchenko 2001). Thus, a cooperative macrostrategy can be implemented by communicators in a constructive conflict situation, or in an unintentional one, when the partners seek to find ways to resolve the conflict that would fully or partially satisfy their interests, which indicates a willingness to compromise.

T. van Dijk pays special attention to dialogue strategies (Dijk 1989), but the stages of dialogue cannot be planned in advance, because it is not known what exactly the partner will say at one stage or another in the development of the conversation in a certain communicative situation. This requires a macrostrategy that can be successfully implemented by successfully combining the choice of the necessary microstrategies that determine the use of a certain set of tactics in the communication process.

For example, the national cooperative communicative behaviour envisages a general cooperative macrostrategy at the forecasting stage, during which the interactant can be kind and polite, careful, and honest, trying to make a positive impression and avoiding any confrontational intentions. Cooperative macrostrategy already at the stages of forecasting and planning will influence the choice of cognitive-semiotic mode (politeness, neutrality, tolerance, and familiarity), which ultimately determines the application of each specific speech tactics, as well as certain linguistic / speech, non-linguistic actions. The optimal implementation of the cooperative macrostrategy necessitates the selection of verbal and nonver-

bal means in each microstrategy and tactics, which can make the maximum contribution to the implementation of certain tasks and solving the over-tasks of communicative interaction.

The process of successful implementation of cooperative macrostrategy, in contrast to the general rules and principles of communication, in certain communication situations can be characterized by flexibility and transformation, because to achieve the main goal and common objectives the speaker must consider textual and contextual (discursive) consequences of each local, specific tactic. The informative and pragmatic components of the national cooperative communicative behaviour in the cognitive-discursive plan at any stage of communication may be incomplete or seem incorrect, which will give a signal (sign) of a lower degree of accuracy and effectiveness of one of the tactics, and then the interactant must respond quickly and involve other tactics to adjust the course of communication, avoiding the transition to another type of communication.

The process of implementing a cooperative macrostrategy can be correlated with the stereotypical scenario development of the communication situation.

Thus, T. van Dijk, commenting on the concept of script, emphasizes its stereotypical nature: “[...] scripts represent the structures of knowledge and have a common, sometimes stereotypical nature” (Dijk van 1989: 49). The ontological essence of cooperative macrostrategy in the context of national cooperative communicative behaviour modelling is stereotyping. Therefore, exposing the view of T. van Dijk on the stereotype of the scenario of speech behaviour, we postulate the existence of a certain pragmatic registers of stereotypical cooperative macrostrategy (see Fig. 1).

Thus, the national cooperative communicative behaviour is carried out by implementing a cooperative macrostrategy through microstrategies that correspond to cognitive-semiotic modes of politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity at the stages of forecasting and planning and involve the use of one or more (repertoire) of communicative tactics aimed at ensuring the successful course of communicative interaction (Korolyov 2018). The combination of these tactics is determined by specific discursive practices, national values of speakers and both linguistic and cultural means of their construction.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Cooperative macrostrategy} \\
 = \\
 \text{(cognitive-semiotic modes)} \\
 \text{(politeness (+) neutrality (+) tolerance (+) familiarity)} \\
 + \\
 \text{cooperative microstrategies} \\
 = \\
 \text{speech tactics (1+ 2 + 3 [...])}
 \end{array}$$

Fig. 1. Pragmatic Registers of Cooperative Macrostrategy

A separate problem here is the criteria for identifying microstrategies that correspond to the modes of politeness, neutrality, tolerance and familiarity, governed exclusively by discursive practices, and allow the implementation of cooperative macrostrategy. For example, in the official business sphere, the mode of familiarity is hardly acceptable, in contrast to the everyday communication of close communicators of one ethnoculture, where this mode can be the key to a cooperative macrostrategy. As for politeness, it has traditionally been differentiated into positive and negative (Gazizov 2011: 13), but today it is increasingly considered in terms of reducing distances with the recipient, or distancing / moving away from him / her.

Among the tactics of positive (true) macrostrategy of cooperation, which mainly correspond to the cognitive-semiotic modes of politeness and neutrality in the national cooperative communicative behaviour, the following can be distinguished: expression of respect (attention, interest, sympathy, care) for the interlocutor; demonstration of unity and solidarity of the addresser and the addressee (proposal of joint actions); desire for mutual understanding and agreement with the addressee, etc.

The actualization of the national-cultural component of these tactics is associated with stereotypes of behaviour specific to a particular linguistic culture, and linguistic means of expression that will be different in different discursive situations or narrower in discursive practices (acquaintance, greetings, wishes, gratitude, praise, invitation, etc.).

Among the tactics of negative macrostrategy of cooperativeness (quasi-cooperativeness), which correspond mainly to the mode of negative politeness, we will name the following: pretending to feel respect for the interlocutor (request, repentance, apology, etc.); playful, insincere demonstration of unity and solidarity of the addresser and the addressee (forced proposal of joint actions); caused by various pragmatic factors, the desire for mutual understanding and agreement with the addressee, etc. (Gazizov 2011: 28).

For example, in an excerpt from Ilya Repin's letter to Leo Tolstoy, which, despite the negative assessment of the addressee's personal traits, retains the character of a friendly message: the addressee is offered even greater opportunities for criticism, which will not further worsen relations between communicators:

Ваши замечания относительно моих "Провод" совершенно верны... Не удастся мне напасть на глубокую идею, которая бы пластично выливалась в образах... Еще раз благодарю Вас за Ваши письма, они меня очень ободряют; пожалуйста, не скупитесь на замечания, я их очень люблю, особенно Ваши драгоценны мне, по своей правде и высокому строю мысли" [И. Репин – Л. Толстому, 19.11.1880] / (lit. "Your remarks about my "Wire" are absolutely correct... I cannot attack a deep idea that would plastically pour out in images... Thank you again for your letters, they greatly encourage me; please, do not skimp on comments, I love them very much, especially yours are precious to me, for their truth and high order of thought" [I. Repin to L. Tolstoy, 11/19/1880]).

The choice of a set of tactics by communicants is determined by their belong-

ing to a certain linguistic culture and it is determined by the traditions of intra-ethnic communication that are passed down from generation to generation. Every culture has its own rules of conversation, which are related to culturally determined means of communication and behaviour. Based on the preliminary results of numerous studies (Korolyov 2018; 2021; Korolyova, Korolyov 2020), we can cite the dominant characteristics of the national characters and mentality of Ukrainians, Russians, Lithuanians and Americans, which manifest themselves differently in the choice of microstrategies in cooperative communication in different discursive situations and nationally-marked tactics for their implementation: Ukrainian: *доброзичливість / привітність – friendliness, лагідність – gentleness, шаноба – respect, щирість – sincerity, гречність – politeness, емоційність – emotionality, екзекутивність – executiveness, etc.*; Russian: *искренность – sincerity, откровенность –*

frankness, душевность – soulfulness / heartfulness, гостеприимность – hospitality, отзывчивость – responsiveness; Lithuanian: tolerancija – tolerance; atsidėjimas – attentiveness; santūra – restraint; амер.: positive thinking, autonomy, privacy, mutual understanding, communication control (Hilbig 2009; Korolyov 2018, 2021; Larina 2009; Lebedko 2002 and oth.).

Cooperative macrostrategy is traditionally aimed at the successful implementation of the mode of communicative cooperation, but sometimes there are cases of complex interaction of strategic plans, characterized by varying degrees of cooperation. If the cognitive-semiotic mode of familiarity is dominant in communication, then the corresponding microstrategy can be interpreted as cooperative provided the informal nature of communication and symmetrical / equal social status of interactants and as non-cooperative in formal communication with asymmetric / different social status of interlocutors.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the analysis of theoretical and methodological material allows to define the cooperative macrostrategy as a cognitive-semiotic category, which is one of the components of national communicative behaviour and a pragmatic register of successful implementation of the mode of cooperation. The structure of the cognitive-semiotic model of cooperative macrostrategy is influenced by systems of values, beliefs, social norms and conventions, which are formed in the context of certain nation-

al traditions. It allows to operate the concept of linguistic and cultural communication strategy (Snitko 1999; Sukhikh, Zelenskaya 1998: 16). Thus, the concepts of communicative strategy and tactics are in hypero-hyponymic relations, within which the strategic component is primarily related to forecasting and planning and it correlates with the main (general) intention, and tactical – with a specific step that implements the strategy and represents local intention.

References

- Hilbig Inga. 2009. Lietuvių ir anglų prašymų strategijos ir mandagumas, *Lietuvių kalba* 3. <<https://doi.org/10.15388/LK.2009.22872>> [accessed on 2021 06 05]
- Korolyov Igor. 2021. Ukrainiečių, rusų, lietuvių ir amerikiečių nacionalinis kooperacinis komunikacinis elgesys: nuo kognicijos į diskursą [National Cooperative Behaviour of Ukrainians, Russians, Lithuanians and Americans: From Cognition to Discourse]. *Logos-Vilnius* 108: 199–206.
- Korolyova Alla, Korolyov Igor. 2020. Standardization of the Formulas of Discursive Practice *Farewell* in the National Cooperative Communicative Behaviour, *Valoda: nozīme un forma* 11. *Grammar and language standardization*: 77–92.
- SUM 1978 – *Словник української мови: в 11 т.* 1978. [Ukrainian Language Dictionary: in 11 vol.]. Ред. колег. І. К. Білодід (голова) та ін. Київ: Наукова думка, 1970–1980. Т.9.
- Vereshchagin 1991 – Верещагин Евгений М. 1991. Коммуникативные тактики как поле взаимодействия языка и культуры [Communicative tactics as a field of interaction between language and culture]. *Русский язык и современность. Проблемы и перспективы развития русистики: доклады*. Ч. 1: 32–43.
- Арутюнова Нина Д. 1983. Стратегия и тактика речевого поведения [Strategy and tactics of speech behavior]. *Прагматические аспекты изучения предложения и текста: статьи*. Киев, 1983: 37–56.
- Божко Галина П. 2003. *Речевые тактики в репертуаре русской языковой личности (на материале коммуникативной ситуации “примирение”)* [Speech tactics in the repertoire of the Russian linguistic personality (based on the material of the communicative situation “reconciliation”]: PhD thesis. Київ.
- Варзониин Юрий Н. 1997. Риторика в эпоху постструктурализма [Rhetoric in the era of post-structuralism]. *Язык и дискурс: Когнитивные и коммуникативные аспекты*. Тверь: Тверской гос. ун-т: 9–16.
- Верещагин Евгений М., Костомаров В. Г. 1999. *В поисках новых путей развития лингвострановедения: концепция рече-поведенческих тактик* [In search of new ways of development of linguistic and regional studies: the concept of speech-behavioral tactics]. Москва: Прогресс
- Газизов Р. А. 2011. Коммуникативная категория вежливости в немецкой лингвокультуре [The communicative category of politeness in German linguoculture]: PhD thesis. Уфа.
- Германова Наталия Н. 1993. Коммуникативная стратегия комплимента и проблемы типологии речевых этикетов [Communication strategy of compliment and problems of typology of speech etiquette]. *Язык и модель мира* 416: 27–39.
- Голоднов Антон В. 2011. Риторический метадискурс: основания прагмалингвистического моделирования и социокультурной реализации (на материале современного немецкого языка) [Rhetorical Metadiscourse: Foundations of Pragmalinguistic Modeling and Sociocultural Realization (based on the material of Modern German)]. Санкт-Петербург: Астерион.
- Даль В. И. 1989. *Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка: в 4 т.* [Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language: in 4 vol.]. Москва: Русский язык. Т. 4.
- Дейк ван Т. А. 1988. Стратегии понимания связанного текста [Strategies for understanding coherent text]. *Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Когнитивные аспекты языка* 23: 153–212.
- Дейк ван Т. А. 1989. *Язык. Познание. Коммуникация* [Language. Cognition. Communication]. Москва: Прогресс.
- Дудченко Вячеслав С. 2001. Трансформация конфликта [Conflict transformation]. *В контексте конфликтологии: диагностика и методология управления конфликтной ситуацией*. Москва: Институт социологии РАН, № 3.
- Иссерс Оксана С. 2002. *Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи* [Communicative strategies and tactics of Russian speech]. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.
- Клюев Евгений В. 1998. *Речевая коммуникация* [Communicative strategies and tactics of Russian speech]. Москва: “ПРИОР”.
- Клюев Евгений В. 2002. *Речевая коммуникация. Успешность речевого общения* [Speech communication. The success of verbal communication]. Москва: РИПОЛ КЛАССИК.
- Корольов Ігор Р. 2018. *Національна кооперативна комунікативна поведінка: від когніції до дискурсу* [National cooperative communicative behaviour: from cognition to discourse]. Київ: ВПЦ “Київський університет”.

- Королюва Алла В. 2008. Стратегії і тактики комунікативної поведінки учасників спілкування в ситуаціях конфлікту [Strategies and tactics of communication behavior of participants in the conflict in situations of conflict]. *Studia Linguistica*, 1: 48–53.
- Ларина Т. В. 2009. Категория вежливости и стиль коммуникации. Сопоставление английских и русских лингвокультурных традиций [Politeness category and communication style. Comparison of English and Russian linguocultural traditions]. Москва: Рукописные памятники Древней Руси.
- Лебедько Мария Г. 2002. Время как когнитивная доминанта культуры. сопоставление американской и русской темпоральных концептосфер [Time as a cognitive dominant of culture. comparison of American and Russian temporal conceptual spheres]. Владивосток: Изд-во Дальневост. ун-та.
- Репин И. 1880. Л. Толстому, 19.11.1880. <http://az.lib.ru/r/repin_i_e/text_1892_pisma.shtml> [accessed on 2021 06 14].
- Снитко Т. Н. 1999. Предельные понятия в Западной и Восточной лингвокультурах [Limiting concepts in Western and Eastern linguocultures]. Пятигорск: ПГЛУ.
- Сухих С. А., Зеленская В. В. 1998. Прагматическое моделирование коммуникативного процесса [Pragmatic modeling of the communication process]. Краснодар: Краснодарск. гос. ун-т.
- Тарасова И. П. 1992. Структура смысла и структура личности коммуниканта [The structure of meaning and the structure of the communicant's personality]. *Вопросы языкознания* 4: 108–110.

Endnotes

- ¹ The article has been prepared within the scope of the scientific project „Ecolinguistic Modes of Discursive Space of Ukraine in the European

Multicultural Continuum“ (registration number 2020.02/0241) with the support of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine.