



IGOR KOROLYOV

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

NACIONALINĖS VERTYBINĖS ORIENTACIJOS KAIP KALBINĖS SĄMONĖS FORMANTAI

National Value Orientations as Formants
of Language Consciousness¹

SUMMARY

The article suggests a new approach for the philosophy of language understanding of national value. The approach views national value as formants / components of language consciousness. Value dominants are considered in a cognitive-semiotic perspective from the standpoint of their relationship with the notions of communicative value and linguocultural code. The influence of communicative values on the formation of dominants of national language consciousness with a corresponding sign character and functional potential has been considered separately. Thus, in the methodological framework of cognitive semiotics the idea of the conditionality of the collective / individual language consciousness to the semiotization of national value orientations has been postulated. Such processes determine the value dominants of national communicative behaviour, which forms the discursive space of a particular linguaculture.

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje pateikiamas naujas kalbos filosofijoje požiūris į nacionalines vertybines orientacijas kaip į kalbinės sąmonės formantus / komponentus. Vertybinės dominantės nagrinėjamos pažintiniu-semiotiniu požiūriu, būtent atsižvelgiant į jų santykį su komunikacinės vertės ir kalbinio-kultūrinio kodo sąvokomis. Atskirai nagrinėjama komunikacinių vertybių įtaka formuojantis tautinės kalbos sąmonės dominantėms, turinčioms atitinkamą ženklų pobūdį ir funkcinių potencialą. Kognityvinės semiotikos metodologiniu pagrindu keliami idėja apie kolektyvinės / individualios kalbos sąmonės sąlygiškumą semiotizuojant nacionalines vertybines orientacijas. Šie procesai determinuoja nacionalinio komunikacinio elgesio, kuris formuoja diskursyvią tam tikros kalbinės kultūros erdvę, vertybines dominantes.

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: kognityvinė semiotika, kalbinė sąmonė, nacionalinės vertybinės orientacijos, lingvokultūrinis kodas.
KEY WORDS: cognitive semiotics, language consciousness, national value orientations, linguacultural code.

INTRODUCTION

The values of every community, united by a specific criterion, including national one, are formed as a result of complex semiotic combinations and interaction of traditions and norms, represented by ambivalent relations in the national character and mentality of the ethnic group within a certain discursive space. Defining the essence of the notions of *value orientation / national value, communicative value* (Korolyov 2011, 2013; Larina 2009) with clarification of their semiotic nature and functional potential is relevant in the context of further research attempts to model both the national language / communication consciousness and its product, i. e. speech behaviour.

The system of national values is not formed by chance. On the one hand, it

is the result of cultural development, historical experience of a nation / society, because in culture there is usually an idea of absolute moral principles that are immutable and have intrinsic value, given to us by a higher or some external force. On the other hand, it is the result of the search for a social ideal, because these values arose as a product of biological and cultural evolution and a certain selection in the process of historical development (Burtsev 2007; Kapranov 2017; Leontovich 2005). The corresponding ontological perspective of values correlates with natural and social ecolinguistic modes in the epistemological plan, which allows to qualify the phenomenon of semiotization of national values as formants of language / communicative consciousness.

COMMUNICATIVE VALUES AS REGULATORS OF SPEECH BEHAVIOUR

The notion of the value of freedom has been known since the time of the Enlightenment, which presupposed a person's conscious submission to the laws that he establishes for himself or together with others. Thus, already in the moral ideal of the Enlightenment, value affiliation is interpreted as a social and communicative principle, although the philosophy of values develops later in the XIX century by the followers of I. Kant, who criticized the hedonistic-utilitarian ethics that developed during the Enlightenment (Gaidenko 2003: 495). In the teachings of I. Kant, a new under-

standing of the value of freedom and practical reason as "common goals" that outlined the ideological and theoretical justification of the European political doctrine of liberalism, is formed. It defined the intellectual vector of Western civilization (Kant 1965: 276–277).

In neo-Kantianism, values are interpreted as certain absolute norms that form a general plan of cultural functions, the conditions for the possibility of human existence. Based on the doctrine of personalism of E. Mounier (Mounier 1994: 81) and existential needs as the basis of social character, personality type

and its actions in the psychological anthropology of E. Fromm (Fromm 1995), O. Shipunova emphasizes the key importance of communication in human self-determination:

“Existential need is based on a combination of psychosocial factors (archetypes) and sociocultural values (stereotypes) in a certain norm of communication, sanctified, as a rule, by tradition, i.e. the symbolic language and ritual rooted in the discursive practice of speech communication and social behaviour. The existential norm that an individual forms during his conscious life is based on belonging to a value” (Shipunova 2013: 152).

Among many definitions of the notion of value, one of the most common is proposed by the American social psychologist M. Rokeach: „A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence” (Rokeach 1973: 19). The same scholar has the shortest understanding of the values of the individual as „principles of life” with the following characteristics:

„1) the total number of values that a person possesses is relatively small; 2) all men everywhere possess the same values to different degrees; 3) values are organized into value systems; 4) the antecedents of human values can be traced to culture, society and its institutions, and personality; 5) the consequences of human values will be manifested in virtually all phenomena that social scientists might consider worth investigating and understanding” (Rokeach 1973: 3).

One of the founders of axiology, the philosopher H. Rickert proposed a taxonomy of values, consisting of six types: logical (scientific), aesthetic (works of art), mystical (cult), religious, moral, personal (Rickert 1998: 374–387). Meanwhile, M. Rokeach singled out two classes of values:

- 1) terminal values are the beliefs that an ultimate goal of individual existence from a personal or social point of view is worth to achieve. There are: a) concrete (health, work, friends, personal life) and abstract (cognition, development, freedom, creativity); b) professional self-realization (interesting work, active life, etc.) and personal life (love, friendship, etc.); c) individual (creativity, freedom, self-confidence, etc.) and interpersonal relationships (happy family life, etc.); d) active (freedom, interesting work, etc.) and passive (wisdom of life, beauty of nature and art, etc.).
- 2) instrumental values are the beliefs that a certain way of acting from a personal or social point of view is the best in any situation (Rokeach 1973: 22).

D. Leontiev singles out the following opposition groups among them: a) ethical (honesty, intolerance of shortcomings, etc.) – interpersonal communication (politeness, sensitivity, etc.) – professional self-realization (responsibility, diligence, etc.); b) individualistic (independence, firm will, etc.) – conformist (self-control, diligence, etc.) – altruistic (tolerance, sensitivity, etc.); c) self-affirmation (high demands, courage, independence, etc.) – acceptance of others (breadth of views, tolerance, etc.); d) intellectual (education,

rationalism, etc.) – directly emotional worldview (cheerfulness, honesty, etc.) (Leontiev 1992).

As for the notion of *communicative value* (V. Dementyev, T. Larina, etc.) in its relation to the relevant classes of values in general, it is understood as

“caused by the most important principles of national culture communicative category, which is regularly and naturally manifested in the language and speech system (language assessment systems, aspects of lexical nomination, norms of specific speech genres, etc.), in the text (assessment activity) and in general cognitive relations with the world aspects of the evaluative cultural and language worldview)” (Dementyev 2013: 28).

The interpretation of communicative values proposed by T. Larina as „mental attitudes that act as regulators of generally accepted normative communicative behaviour (verbal and non-verbal), typical for members of a certain ethnocultural society“ (Larina 2009: 150), almost coincides in meaning with the previous notion, which provides background for further understanding of this phenomenon in this perspective.

Any discursive practice in the national communicative behaviour of the interactant is a certain semiotic construct of national language consciousness with a pronounced axiological dominant, which is primarily tested by the principle of belonging to the value and may have different evaluation modality: truth – lie, forbidden – allowed, possible – impossible. Not only cognitive, but also psycho-emotional reactions and non-verbal human behaviour correlate with the content and, therefore, have a value character.

Communicative values, in turn, form the dominants / value orientations of the national language consciousness with the appropriate semiotic character and functional potential, producing and regulating communicative behaviour, which is one of the main languages and cultural codes. Undoubtedly, the existence of universal communicative values in different linguocultures is partly caused by the essence of the human personality, the existence of certain natural, moral, ethical basic constants of language consciousness. Thus, the algorithm of formation of universal behavioural (non)-verbal norms (general cultural, group, situational, personal or individual) is created mainly in the context of identity / similarity of communicative values, which were semiotized in the language consciousness of different linguocultures.

In communicative behaviour words / discursive practices are not just signs denoting objects, phenomena, objects of reality. In interpersonal monocultural and intercultural communication, we create whole systems of ideas, beliefs, myths, typical for a certain community, a certain culture. This is especially evident when translating a variety of discursive practices with non-equivalent vocabulary. Sometimes a foreign communicator needs to explain the specifics of intercultural equivalents before he / she can properly understand and use at least similar words and the notions they denote, such as: Ukrainian: *добродію, наразі, нівроку*; Russian: *изба, лапти, авось, сопряженный*; Lithuanian: *cepelinai / didžkukuliai – zepelins – ‘Lithuanian national dish’, dievodirbys – ‘master of mak-*

ing sacred images, usually wooden'; rūpin-tojēlis - 'sculpture (usually wooden) of Christ the Sorrowful in a sitting position with his hand resting on his knee and supporting his cheek; English: barber - 'steam over water on a frosty day', bouncer - 'a person or a large thing', including those used only in the USA filibuster - 'obstructionist', fraternity - 'student fraternity', etc.

It should be noted here that non-equivalence is more often manifested only within a certain pair of national discursive spaces and languages. In other words, the non-equivalent status of a lexeme when translated into one language will not necessarily be preserved when translated into any other language. Even completely translated lexemes have different cultural and, consequently, communicative value, for example: Ukrainian: хліб (без хліба й любов гине); Russian: хлеб (на соль пьется, на хлеб спунтся); Lithuanian: duona (turėk duonos, turėsi ir prie duonos); English: bread (half a loaf is better than no bread); Ukrainian: гроші (і знов за рибу гроші; з грошима і в грязі чистий); Russian: деньги (где говорят деньги, там молчит совесть); Lithuanian: pinigai (žmogus pinigus renka, velnias pinigine siuva); English: money (bad money drives out good).

In this context, we can also share the experience of a colleague, a teacher of Russian and Ukrainian as foreign lan-

guages. Once she even felt guilty when her student from the USA was offended by incorrectly translating and interpreting the address of his beloved girl. It vividly reflects the cooperative dominant of the national value orientation in the Russian and Ukrainian linguocultures. He almost quarrelled with his chosen one, because she told him: Ukrainian – *Ти найдорожча для мене людина* (You are the most expensive person for me); Russian – *Ты самый дорогой для меня человек* (You are the dearest person to me). Seeing the phrase in the electronic translator: English – *You're the most expensive to me*, the American was offended and asked for an explanation: *Why did she say it to me? I'm not greedy, she is probably greedy? What does she want?* Since he came to clarify the situation of misunderstanding with his teacher of Russian and Ukrainian, and not with a girl who could react differently to his claims, he received a qualified answer and later, rejoicing, decided to introduce her to his parents.

Thus, in almost every linguoculture one can observe the originality and specificity of the systems of communicative norms, which are formed by the difference in the national value orientations of a certain ethnic group. The corresponding differences are caused by the cognitive-semiotic dominants of the national language consciousness.

NATIONAL VALUE ORIENTATIONS AS THE BASIS OF LINGUOCULTURAL CODE

Communicative deviations became the impetus for the actualization in the second half of the XX century of the study of values through the prism of the

notions of „value orientations“ and „personal values“ (V. Bilsky, D. Leontyev, M. Rokeach, S. Schwartz, etc.). They accumulated ideological, political, moral

and ethical components for human assessment of the surrounding reality, as well as the ways to differentiate them according to the degree of significance for each individual. Semiotization of value orientations occurs only through the assimilation of a certain person's social experience. As a result of this process, goals, ideals, interests, beliefs, etc. are formed, and therefore national values are considered as a complex socio-psychological phenomenon that characterizes the orientation of the individual and the content component of his / her activity, determines the general approach to himself / herself, others and the world in general and gives a certain meaning and direction to its behaviour and activities (Values in Human Life).

Thus, differences in the value worldview are manifested in the national value orientations of the linguocultures of the peoples of the world, which determine the peculiarities of life, type of relations, rules of communication of a particular ethnic group, etc. There is no denying the fact that different peoples differ from each other on a daily basis, including in communicative behaviour, which reflects their national values, due to the specifics of their national characters.

A rational explanation of differences in no way exaggerates or diminishes the self-worth of a culture with which other cultures are openly or implicitly compared. One cannot but agree with the thesis of the fundamental equality of "all colours in the field of the world community", which was formulated at one time by V. Karasik (Karasik & oth. 2005: 5). Therefore, one of the most important

tasks of linguoculturology is to establish systemic (causal and other) relationships between the characteristics of a particular linguoculture. These systemic connections create a semiotic code of culture, which is characterized by a certain stability and can be objectively established on the basis of analysis of the meanings of words and expressions, stereotypes and precedent texts.

The ideologue of classical liberalism L. von Mises points out that all people feel the influence of the environment and the circumstances of life in which they are forced to live, but "the environment acts only through the human mind" (Mises von 2001: 191). Thus, according to M. Burtsev, the attitude to human morality depends on the approach to the question of its origin:

"If we consider moral principles as the result of a certain evolutionary process that allowed our previous generations to adapt to the environment, then in today's information society, when the environment is changing rapidly, social norms (as well as values – I. K.) may be subject to greater or lesser transformation, and therefore at present some moral values lose the ability to be adaptive and necessary, causing the problem of rational choice of moral imperatives at the level of both society and the individual" (Burtsev 2007: 226–227).

Distinguishing between the notions of *values* and *value orientations*, researchers state (Leontyev 2003; Sutuzhko 2009) that the former exist in culture and they are components of social life, because certain values in the case of acceptance become personal. The latter constitute an integral formation and determine the

subjective attitude to the world and oneself, to certain values, i. e. to reflect the orientation of the individual to certain goals (Pakhomova 2011: 121).

We will operate with the notion of *national value orientations*, which are semiotized in the language / communicative consciousness, forming its *dominants*. The functional potential of them influences and regulates the national speech behaviour and activities of the language personality (Zdravomyslov & oth. 1967). Semiotization of national value orientations is based on the notion of language and cultural code, which, in turn, is one of the varieties of cultural code as „internally connected system of carriers of cultural and value information and attitudes formed within languages of culture as a result of cultural agreement and represents deep semantic field of culture“ (Ivanova, Chanysheva 2010: 283).

It should be noted that the culture code is reflected in different semiotic systems, and it is characterized by numerous varieties. Thus, O. Leontovich differentiates the internal code (language of thought) and the external / (non)-verbal code (Leontovich 2005: 45). V. Krasnykh, in turn, proposes to distinguish somatic, spatial, temporal, objective, biomorphic, spiritual codes (Krasnykh 2001: 5-6). D. Gudkov and M. Kovshova offer three codes: verbal, real and action (Gudkov 2007: 28). R. Bart describes such cultural codes as socio-historical, chronological, topographic, onomastic, rhetorical, actional, phatic, hermeneutic or enigmatic, metalinguistic, etc. (Bart 2001: 44).

The analysis of problematic issues related to the units of cultural codes al-

lows D. Gudkov to emphasize the semi-otic nature of natural and social objects, objects and phenomena of the environment that perform a symbolic function and explain the additional semantics:

“Names that refer to relevant objects form interconnected secondary semiotic systems, which we define as codes (somatic, zoomorphic, natural-landscape, etc.) of national culture. The units that are part of these codes are endowed with certain cultural meanings, some of which are present in the “bright zone” of consciousness of representatives of a culture, while others are not aware, present implicitly, forming a kind of gap, are structural elements of the latter” (Gudkov 2004: 39).

We emphasize the linguistic and cultural code, which is embedded in the collective / individual language / communicative consciousness, as a result of semiotization of national values. It is responsible for the ecosystem of a certain discursive space, and it serves as one of the constituents of speech behaviour. It is also the appropriate foundation of both natural and social dominants of ecolinguistic modes, within which the norms of expression of communicative needs of interaction participants generally accepted in a certain language and cultural community function (Ivanova 2009: 271). In this context, the notions of constants and national value dominants of the language / communicative consciousness of interactants, which are reflected in their stereotypes and regulate speech behaviour, should be used (Korolyov, Domylivska 2020).

The phenomenon of collective / individual language consciousness, formed, in particular, as a result of semiotization

of national values, is associated with certain natural and social dominants of eco-linguistic modes (Korolyov 2021), discursive space and communicative behaviour (Korolyova, Korolyov 2020) and correlates with ontological-centric and socioanthropocentric interpretation of the values of A. Subetto.

According to the scientist's opinion, value always presupposes / embodies significance for something. Adhering to the ontological-centric principle, he argues that value relations are present wherever there is a structural division of systems and hierarchy. In this case, the value as the identity of the significance of one element for the implementation of the function of the system component of the higher hierarchy, acquires the meaning of the invisible functional mechanism that gives the system integrity (Subetto 2003). In our opinion, the corresponding axiological feature of values determines the processes of semiotization of the environment in general and the environment, which form a collective national language / communicative eco-consciousness.

The existence of universal human values due to the motivational aspect is proved in the works of famous psychologists S. Schwartz and W. Bilski, who developed an original effective method for diagnosing value orientation. He identified ten types: power, hedonism, achievement, care, security, conformism, stimulation, traditionalism, universalism (Schwartz, Bilsky 1990). According to A. Subetto, basic values are the product of long cycles of existence with a slow change of meaning. Other values (instru-

mental or material) have a smaller chronotope scale, are renewed and transformed faster. They are easier to manage (Subetto 2003).

Basic values coexist with cultural axioms of a certain discursive space, as a result of correlation of which constants / dominants of language / communicative consciousness are formed, which produce and regulate (non)-speech behaviour: true within a certain linguoculture (Karasik & oth. 2005: 6). There are cultural axioms that have a socio-biological nature, and therefore understandable to humanity as a whole (care for young children, respect for elders, protection of themselves and their loved ones). There are norms of behaviour that are typical for a certain ethnic group or regional ethnic community (it is no coincidence that they speak of Russian generosity, Caucasian hospitality, French gallantry, German accuracy, English restraint, Ukrainian friendliness and sincerity). Undoubtedly, there are axioms of behaviour that are typical for different groups of people. Finally, there are values that determine the uniqueness of the individual character. If for ethics and psychology universal or individual orientations of behaviour are fundamentally important, then for linguoculturology ethno- and socio-cultural values are decisive.

American anthropologists F. Klakhon and F. Strodbeck have identified five main parameters by which the views of different cultures on the world around them differ and which determine their national value orientation. In their opinion these are: 1) man's attitude to nature (man nature orientation); 2) its attitude

to activity (activity orientation); 3) its relation to time (temporal orientation); 4) the nature of relationships between people (relational orientation); 5) human nature orientation (Kluckhohn, Strodtbeck 1961: 10–11). On the basis of these relations the system of values of the people also develops, its views, concepts, culture are formed.

The situation of misunderstanding in intercultural communication can be explained by the following typical factors: interlocutors have a low level of lan-

guage / communicative competence (they do not understand the meanings of words, phrases and grammatical forms); they do not set up for mutual understanding (they do not listen to each other, look for hidden offensive meanings in everything, they do not speak for a partner, but for someone else they are in a changed state of consciousness); some of them do not take into account the specifics of the situation (for example, they do not see the humour, tragedy or solemnity of the moment).

CONCLUSIONS

Value dominants / national value orientations are regulators and certain semiotic markers in both monocultural and intercultural, interethnic discursive space, because they depend on the success of communicative activities, the implementation of pragmatic resources to achieve the desired perlocutionary effect, which form the basis of modus operability. Communicative values, in turn, influence the formation of the dominants of the national language consciousness with the appropriate sign character and functional potential. Thus, *national value orientations* are semioti-

cized in the language / communicative consciousness, forming its dominants, the functional potential of which influences and regulates the national speech behaviour and activities of the language personality (Zdravomyslov & oth. 1967). It should be noted that the culture code is reflected in different semiotic systems, and it is characterized by numerous varieties. National value orientations form the dominants of language / communicative consciousness on the basis of constant values, create a kind of value archetype of the mentality of a particular people, ethnos, society.

References

- Barthes Roland – Барт Р. 2001. *S/Z* / под ред. Г. К. Косикова. Москва: Эдиториал УРСС.
- Burtsev Mikhail S. – Бурцев М. С. 2007. Моделирование эволюции стратегий кооперации из элементарных действий [Modeling the Evolution of Cooperation Strategies from Elementary Actions]. *Современные проблемы биологической эволюции: материалы конференции. К 100-летию Гос. Дарвиновского музея*. Москва: Изд-во ГДМ: 225–227.
- Demytyev Vadim V. – Дементьев В. В. 2013. *Коммуникативные ценности русской культуры: категория личности в лексике и прагматике* [Communicative Values of Russian Culture: The Category of Personality in Vocabulary and Pragmatics]. Москва: Глобал Ком.
- Fromm Erich – Фромм Э. 1995. *Бегство от свободы* [Escape from Freedom]. Москва: Прогресс.
- Gaidenko Piama P. – Гайденко П. П. 2003. *Научная рациональность и философский разум* [Sci-

- entific Rationality and Philosophical Reason]. Москва: Прогресс-Традиция.
- Gudkov Dmitriy B., – Гудков Д. Б. 2004. Единицы кодов культуры: проблемы семантики [Units of Cultural Codes: Problems of Semantics]. *Язык, сознание, коммуникация* / Отв. ред. В. В. Красных, А. И. Изотов. Москва: МАКС Пресс, Вып. 26: 39–50.
- Gudkov Dmitriy B., Kovshova Mariya L. – Гудков Д. Б., Ковшова М. Л. 2007. *Телесный код русской культуры: материалы к словарю* [The Corporal Code of Russian Culture: Materials for the Dictionary]. Москва: Гнозис.
- Ivanova Svetlana V., – Иванова С. В. 2009. Актуальные проблемы лингвокультурологических исследований [Actual Problems of Linguocultural Research]. *Система языка: синхрония и диахрония: междуязыковский сборник научных статей*. Уфа: РИЦ БашГУ: 267–273.
- Ivanova Svetlana V., Chanyшева Zulfira Z., – Иванова С. В., Чанышева З. З. 2010. *Лингвокультурология: проблемы, поиски, решения* [Cultural Linguistics: Problems, Searches, Solutions]. Уфа: РИЦ БашГУ.
- Kant Immanuel – Кант И. 1965. *Метафизика нравов в двух частях* [Metaphysics of Morals in Two Parts], *Кант И. Сочинения: в 6 т.* / под общ. ред. В. Ф. Асмуса. А. В. Гулыги, Т. И. Ойзермана. Москва, Т. 4. Ч. 1.
- Kapranov Yan V. 2017. Antropogenesis Triad “Brain – Conscience – Language” As Cultural Determiner. *National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald*. Kyiv, Milenium: 62–66.
- Karasik Vladimir I., Prokhvacheva Oksana G., Zubkova Yana V., Grabarova Emiliya V., – Карасик В. И., Прохвачева О. Г., Зубкова Я. В., Грабарова Э. В. 2005. *Иная ментальность* [A Different Mentality]. Москва: Гнозис.
- Kluckhohn Florence R., Strodtbeck Fred L. 1961. *Variations in Value Orientations*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Korolyov Igor R., – Корольов И. Р. 2011. Відображення національно-ціннісних орієнтирів у комунікативній поведінці різномовних інтерактантів [Representation of Nationally-Centered Organizations in Communal Behavior of Social Interactions]. *Studia Linguistica*. Київ: ВПЦ „Київський університет“, Вып. 5. Ч. 2: 286–291.
- Korolyov Igor R., – Корольов И. Р. 2013. Национально-ценностные ориентиры речевого поведения интерактантов в разноязычных кооперативных коммуникативных ситуациях [National value orientations of speech behavior of interactants in multilingual cooperative communicative situations]. *Новые парадигмы и новые решения в современной лингвистике*. Кемерово: ФГБОУ ВПО „Кемеровск. гос. ун-т“, Вып. 2: 111–118.
- Korolyov Igor. 2021. Ecolinguistic Modes: Natural and Social Dominants. *Logos*. Vilnius. № 106. P. 100–108.
- Korolyov, Igor. 2020. Discursive Practices as Sign Constructs of Communicative Consciousness. *Logos* 102: 61–69.
- Korolyov Igor, Domylyvska Ludmyla. 2020. Mentality and National Character as Semiotic Regulators of Communicative Behavior. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research* 9(1): 354–364.
- 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*. Kalnača, Andra, Lokmane, Ilze (eds). Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds: 77–92.
- Krasnykh Viktoriya V., – Красных В. В. 2001. Коды и эталоны культуры (приглашение к разговору) [Codes and Standards of Culture (Invitation to Talk)]. *Язык, сознание, коммуникация*. Вып. 19: С. 5–19.
- Larina Tatiana V., – 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.
- Leontovich Olga A., – Леонтович О. А. 2005. *Русские и американцы: парадоксы межкультурного общения* [Russians and Americans: Paradoxes of Intercultural Communication]. Москва: Гнозис.
- Leontyev Dmitriy A., – Леонтьев Д. А. 1992. *Методика изучения ценностных ориентаций* [Methodology for Studying Value Orientations]. Москва: Смысл, <<https://refdb.ru/look/1403298.html>> [accessed on 2021 02 16].
- Leontyev Dmitriy A., – Леонтьев Д. А. 2003. *Психология смысла. Природа, стремление и динамика смысловой реальности* [The Psychology of Meaning. Nature, Aspiration and Dynamics of Semantic Reality]. Москва: Смысл.

- Mises Ludwig von – Мизес Л. фон. 2001. *Либерализм* [Liberalism]. Москва: ООО “Социум”, ЗАО Изд-во “Экономика”.
- Mounier Emmanuel – Мунье Э. 1994. *Что такое персонализм* [What is Personalism]. Москва: Изд-во гуманитарной лит-ры.
- Pakhomova Ekaterina V. – Пахомова Е. В. 2011. Методика диагностики ценностных ориентаций (МДЦО) [Methodology for the Diagnosis of Value Orientations (MDTsO)]. *Вестник Самарской гуманитарной академии. (Серия „Психология“)*. 2011. №2 (10): 120-134.
- Rickert Heinrich – Риккерт Г. 1998. *Науки о природе и науки о культуре* [Natural Sciences and Cultural Sciences]. Москва: „Республика“.
- Rokeach Milton. 1973. *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press.
- Schwartz S. H., Bilsky W. 1990. Towards a Theory of the Universal Structure and Content of Values: Extention and Cross-Cultural Replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. № 3: 878–891.
- Shipunova Olga D. – Шипунова О. Д. 2013. Нормы коммуникации и принцип отнесения к ценности в интересующей практике [The Norm of Communication and the Principle of Attribution to Value in Intersubjective Practice]. *Философия коммуникации: проблемы и перспективы* / под ред. С. В. Клягина, О. Д. Шипуновой. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во политехн. ун-та: 151–162.
- Subetto Aleksandr I. – Субетто А. И. 2003. *Разум и антиразум (Что день грядущий нам готовит?)* [Reason and anti-reason (What is the coming day for us?)]. Санкт-Петербург – Кострома: Костромск. гос. ун-т. <<http://spkurdyumov.ru/philosophy/razum-i-anti-razum/5/>> [accessed on 2021 02 18].
- Sutuzhko Valeriy V. – Сутужко В. В. 2009. Ценностные ориентации как основа оценивания [Value Orientations as a Basis for Assessment]. *Вестник Тамбовского гос. университета*. № 1: 177–183.
- Values in Human Life: Definition, Features and Their Classification* – Ценности в жизни человека: определение, особенности и их классификация. <<http://psych.info/psihologiya-lichnosti/mirovozzrenie/tsennosti-v-zhizni-cheloveka.html>> [accessed on 2021 02 10].
- Zdravomyslov Andrey G., Rozhin Vasilii P., Yadov Vladimir A. – *Здравомыслов А. Г., Рожин В. П., Ядов В. А. (Eds.) 1967. Человек и его работа (социологическое исследование)* [Man and His Work (Case Study)]. Москва: „Мысль“.

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.