Skrynnik Yu. S., PhD (Philology)
V. Karazin KhNU, Kharkiv
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7592-4011

TOLERANCE IN ECOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

The focus of this study lies in researching a human speech behavior, which displays tolerant or intolerant type of a discursive personality. The results of such interpretation of the ecolinguistic approach find their expression and place in the system of ideas about the world and, as a result, shape the habits of human interaction.

The research material consists of dialogic fragments from film scripts, which illustrate the differences in verbal and non-verbal behaviour of a tolerant or intolerant discursive personality in institutional and everyday discourse types. The analysis of the differences in the speech repertoire of a tolerant / intolerant discursive personality is based on the principles of ecolinguistics, discourse theory and linguopragmatics. The methodological basis allowed to investigate the ecological rules of human interaction which contribute to tolerant behavior.

Keywords: ecolinguistics, intolerant discursive personality, non-verbal component of communication, speech repertoire, tolerant discursive personality, verbal component of communication.

Introduction. Language captures the result of human cognition of the world and encodes its cognitive activity by its own means, determining the development and evolution of the human view of the world. The view of the world is a dynamic cognitive structure, its author's global idea of the world, obtained as a result of generalization of the sensory experience of cognition [3]. Linguistic units contain a reflection of the surrounding reality and present a verbalization of a separate element of the world mosaic [2, p. 53].

The basis of the view of the world are the phenomena of the surrounding reality, which are decoded, generalized and embodied in the images and representations of both individuals

and groups of people [4, p. 48]. Accordingly, the system of images and representations in the linguistic view of the world forms a universal subject code, which is common to present and future generations. The linguistic view of the world reflects the connection between language, being and human consciousness, and is rendered as an interpretation of the past, present and future of humanity.

Accordingly, the ecolinguistic approach to the analysis of natural languages is optimal in this regard due to its holistic, interdisciplinary and powerful explanatory potential [9, p. 130]. The extended ecology hypothesis [22] suggests that ecolinguistics is expanding by integrating value and meaning into ecological structures. As a result, it is claimed that human ecology has acquired a deep and irreversible saturation of meaning. The term "saturated with meaning" [22, p. 17] means that our ecological existence in a certain socio-ecological environment is associated with semiotic processes.

The **relevance** of the research is based on the study of the speech repertoire of the individual in the ecolinguistic perspective with a focus on tolerance.

The **object** of the study is the verbal and non-verbal components of communication, which a tolerant / intolerant discursive personality operates with. The **subject** concerns identifying pragmatic features and functions of verbal and non-verbal components of the interaction process, used by tolerant / intolerant discursive personalities. Research methods are based on speech analysis and traditional critical studies of discourse in the ecolinguistic dimension (Steffensen, S. V., Stibbe, A.). The **objective** of this study is to analyze the differences in the speech repertoire of tolerant and intolerant discursive personalities in institutional and everyday discourse types, taking into account the ecolinguistic perspective.

Findings and Their Discussion. From the point of view of ecolinguistics, discourse is treated as a means of forming social relations and at the same time is their product [14, p. 126–127]. In practical terms, an integral feature of discourse is the

combination of functions of utterances, which stimulates the development of the society. It is important for the development of communicative competence, in particular, the relevance of utterances in a particular social context.

The need for environmental control, which is increasingly discussed in recent years [13; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19; 20; 23], is applied not only to the nature and environment, but also to the prediction and planning of the language policy in order to regulate the communicative interaction in a proper way, and create harmonious relations between communicators.

In the first place, under such conditions, stands the compliance with moral and ethical standards [7, p. 81]. Basing on the ecological communicative strategy, which leads to the preservation of physical and emotional health, it can be confirmed that ecological communication is characterized as communication that does not have a detrimental effect on human health and psycho-emotional state. Accordingly, the space of ecological communication consists of verbal or nonverbal means, strategies and tactics of communicative behavior, which do not contradict harmonious communicative-pragmatic and ethical-speech norms, do not reduce the comfort of speech communication and positively affect human emotional health [13].

Ideally, the communication process should meet the moral and ethical norms of society, and communicators should ideally represent a potentially cooperative-conformist type of a discursive personality, focused on adhering to the ecological strategy of communication [11].

It is impossible to understand the language itself without extending its boundaries not turning to its creator [10, p. 51] – a discursive peronality. A discursive personality [21] can be defined as a person who operates in a continuous communicative space and is able to use and interpret different semiotic codes along with the language code, depending on the type of discursive relations in which it is included in certain periods of communication.

Communication requires the individual to follow the norms and rules in everyday and business spheres of life that have developed in

the society. The ability of an individual to follow these rules and regulations is determined by his/her level of tolerance. In the eighteenth century, the concept of tolerance, as noted by historians and philosophers, was considered a human virtue. Tolerance meant respect for differences among people, the ability to live without disturbing others, the ability to have rights and freedoms without violating the rights and freedoms of others [1, p. 80].

The sociological meaning of tolerance is interpreted as "lifestyle tolerance, tolerance for behavior, customs, feelings, thoughts, ideas, and beliefs [6]". Tolerance in domestic and official business communication means the implementation of social roles, which does not contradict the expectations of the society and presupposes compliance with the moral precepts and norms that have developed in the society for the implementation of a certain social role. Therefore, discursive individuals may be classified into tolerant and intolerant. Discursive behavior of a tolerant and an intolerant personality differs in institutional and everyday discourses.

Tolerant individuals are more careful in their judgments about other people than intolerant ones [8, p. 158]. Tolerant individuals pay more attention to their speech repertoire, while intolerant individuals often do not distinguish between everyday and business communication, which is manifested both on the verbal and non-verbal levels of communication.

Tolerant discursive personality in institutional discourse. Discursive behavior of the tolerant/intolerant personality can vary in the institutional or everyday discourse types. Within the frames of the institutional discourse communicators are endowed with the professional status which influences the communicative flow and choice of the discursive behavior. The stereotypical communicative configuration within the institutional discourse is presented by the "dominant – subordinate type". Thus, the stereotypical sample in this case can be presented by the dialogue between a boss and a subordinate. The influence of the discursive personality's type on the course of communication can be easily observed in the following situation:

(1)[A manicured hand lands on Jordan's shoulder.]
MARK HANNA: <u>Jordan Belfort.</u>
JORDAN BELFORT: Yes, <u>sir.</u>
MARK HANNA: Mark Hanna.
JORDAN BELFORT: <u>A pleasure to meet you.</u>
MARK HANNA: <u>And you as well.</u> I see you've already met the village asshole [28].

In the above-mentioned fragment the full form of the address *(Jordan Belfort)* is used by the boss addressing his subordinate. The non-verbal component of patting the subordinate's shoulder *(A manicured hand lands on Jordan's shoulder)* contributes to a friendly atmosphere and to forming an ecological communicative flow. The subordinate, in his turn, demonstrates the tolerant type of the discursive personality by using an agreement with the polite address appealing to the higher status of the communicative partner *(Yes, sir)*. Such phrases as *"A pleasure to meet you"* and *"And you as well"*, performing a phatic speech function, also contribute to the ecological implementation of the tolerant discursive personality type.

The so-called "levelling" of the status-role relations contributes to tolerance provided that the communicators do not transcend the limits of behavioral norms and appropriateness. Common sense-construction (observing rules of politeness and preserving the status-role relations) is the necessary condition for achieving mutual understanding and the success of the intersubjective communication in general [5, p. 40]:

(2) TRUDY (SERVANT): <u>Oh, Miss Rose [running to her].</u>
ROSE DEWITT BUKATER: [crying] We had a little accident.
TRUDY (SERVANT): <u>That's all right.</u>
ROSE DEWITT BUKATER: <u>I'm sorry, Trudy</u>. <u>Let me help you</u> [kneeling to take broken dishes away].
TRUDY (SERVANT): <u>It's all right, miss [taking her hand]. It's all right, miss</u> [24].

The servant uses a polite address *(Oh, Miss Rose)* when addressing the representative of the high society. This is quite natural and appropriate for preserving the ecologically tolerant

communication. The servant's tolerance, sincerity and the desire to help is demonstrated verbally through comforting *(It's all right, miss*) and non-verbally through kinesic *(taking her hand)* and proxemic *(running to her)* components. The use of such non-verbal components breaks the expectations formed in the society about servants but it directs the interaction into a cooperative flow, thus, contributing to the ecological mode of communication. Miss Rose, in her turn, apologizes addressing the servant by her first name *(I'm sorry, Trudy)* and offers her help *(Let me help you)*. On the non-verbal communicative level Miss Rose displays her tolerant attitude through proxemics (*kneeling to take broken dishes away*) in this way expunging the status borders between the servant and herself. Miss Rose's free demonstration of emotions *(crying)* causes the servant's sympathy and readiness to help and, as a consequence, makes them closer on the emotional level. The discursive behavior of the above-mentioned personalities contradicts the general norms of behavior in institutional discourse within the frames of the institutional discourse but still remains a sample of a tolerant behavior.

Violation of the status-role expectations generally composed in the society does not always break the ecological flow of the communication or discredit a discursive personality's tolerance. On the contrary, this violation promotes a successful intersubjective communication where all the participants are satisfied with their tolerant attitude.

Intolerant discursive personality in institutional discourse. However, violations of the norms and rules of a humiliating character demonstrating doubts about the opponent's status do not lead to an ecological communicative flow of the interaction and characterize a personality as an intolerant one. This case is demonstrated in the dialogue between a university chancellor Henry Wright and Professor Richard Brown:

(3) *HENRY WRIGHT: Tell me, Richard, do you like fish?*

RICHARD BROWN: No. I mean to eat sometimes, but outside of that, no. No, I don't.

HENRY WRIGHT: I believe men could learn a lot from fish.

RICHARD BROWN: _That's the most asinine thing I've ever heard. Why don't we just cut to the chase?_

HENRY WRIGHT: All right. We need to talk about certain allegations that have come to my attention, some of which are serious.

RICHARD BROWN: [scoffing] _Don't even start._

HENRY WRIGHT: _Excuse me?_

RICHARD BROWN: _I know you heard what I said. You're simply saying that for effect. You want me to repeat myself, I won't._

HENRY WRIGHT: _I am chancellor of this university._

RICHARD BROWN: _I couldn't give a fucking rat's balls who the fuck you are. I have tenure_, and furthermore, _you're in no position of power when it comes to the two of us_ [27].

Richard Brown undermines his opponent's status, thus, expressing intolerance towards him verbally with discrediting the appropriateness of his idea _(That's the most asinine thing I've ever heard)_. He tries to cut short their conversation _(Why don't we just cut to the chase?)_; criticizes the necessity of their talk with a sarcastic order _(Don't even start)_. He clearly demonstrates his unwillingness to obey _(I know you heard what I said)_; he doubts the sincerity of the opponent's intentions _(You're simply saying that for effect)_ and insists on not repeating his utterances _(You want me to repeat myself, I won't)_. He suppresses the opponent's status by using obscene language _(I couldn't give a fucking rat's balls who the fuck you are; you're in no position of power when it comes to the two of us)_, and raises his own status _(I have tenure)_. Scoffing contributes to the undermining of the opponent's status on the non-verbal level.

Henry Wright, in his turn, tries to hold on his own without using intolerant methods pretending not to hear the opponent _(Excuse me?)_ and reminding about his status _(I am chancellor of this university)_.

Such methods of violating the norms of tolerance lead to a conflict flow of communication and ruin ecological communica-

tive principles which lead neither to the speakers' mutual under-standing nor the successful achieving of communicative goals.

Tolerant discursive personality in everyday discourse. The everyday discourse type is characterized by a free choice of verbal and non-verbal communicative components compared to the institutional discourse. Such freedom of choice expands the borders of ecological communication. In everyday communication speakers pay more attention to one another's emotions and feelings. If speakers belong to the nuclear discursive environment [21] they are likely to demonstrate their feelings more freely and do not feel offended if their inner world is intruded. Thus, tolerance in the everyday type of discourse is measured by the level of openness demonstrated to the communicative partner. The dialogue between father Nate Pullman and son Auggie Pullman confirms this hypothesis:

(4) NATE PULLMAN: I mean, when you started you were still wearing the astronaut helmet in public.

AUGGIE PULLMAN: I love that helmet. I wish I knew where it was. NATE PULLMAN: It's in my office. AUGGIE PULLMAN: What? Dad! That was a gift. You had no right to hide it! NATE PULLMAN: Auggie, Auggie, please, don't be mad. You gotta understand, you were wearing it all the time. I never got to see you anymore. I missed your face. I know you don't always like it, but I love it. It's my son's face. I wanna see it. Do you forgive me? AUGGIE PULLMAN: No. [Silence] Yes. [smiling] Does Mom know? NATE PULLMAN: [whispers] No. God, no, she'd kill me. But I can maybe find it, if you need it back. AUGGIE PULLMAN: That's okay [hugging] [25].

Father worries about his son's feelings and tries to calm him down politely *(Auggie, Auggie, please, don't be mad);* tries to make him understand the whole situation by the detailed explanation *(You gotta understand, you were wearing it all the time. I never got to see you anymore)* appealing to his son's feelings *(I missed your face; I love it. It's my son's face. I wanna see it);* asks (*Do you forgive me?*) being afraid of hurting his

son's feelings. The son shows his tender attitude to his father mostly with the help of non-verbal components *(hugging and smiling)*. Auggie tries to defuse the tension with a hoax *(Do you forgive me? – No. [silence] Yes. [smiling])* which is quite typical for everyday communication.

The speakers use the sub-language [21] which creates the effect that only these speakers are involved in the secret (*Does Mom know? – No. God, no, she'd kill me*) corroborating it with whisper. Creating the sub-language often leads to the speakers' convergence and therefore to the cooperative communicative flow. In the everyday type of discourse the use of the communicative strategies which lead to the speakers' convergence and openness characterizes the speaker as a tolerant one.

Intolerant discursive personality in everyday discourse. Intrusion in the opponent's world is regarded as intolerance in the everyday type of discourse. It prevents the speakers from convergence and might lead to a conflict. Mother Georgia Miller wakes up her daughter Ginny Miller in the middle of the night:

(5) *GEORGIA MILLER: Ginny! Ginny, wake up!*
GINNY MILLER: What, Mom?
GEORGIA MILLER: Is there a hair?
GINNY MILLER: What time is it?
GEORGIA MILLER: I can sorta feel it if I do this, but I can't see it.
GINNY MILLER: It's 5:00 a.m., Mom.
GEORGIA MILLER: Come on.
GINNY MILLER: Get the tweezers away from my eye, you psycho!
GEORGIA MILLER: Ginny, I'm serious! Is there a hair?
GINNY MILLER: Ugh! Jesus, hang on!
GEORGIA MILLER: Come on. Hurry! [26].

Verbally the intrusion in the opponent's world begins with the exclamation *(Ginny! Ginny, wake up!)* which is emphasized by the non-verbal prosodic component – a raised intonation. The addresser *(Mother)* asks her daughter for making an offer which is inappropriate in the middle of the night *(Is there a hair?; I can sorta feel it if I do this, but I can't see it*). The addressee tries to

avoid the offer by changing the subject of the conversation *(What time is it?)*. She doesn't get the answer, and she answers her own question herself *(It's 5:00 a. m., Mom)*. Mother finds the explanation and gives the reason for her spontaneous actions *(I can sorta feel it if I do this, but I can't see it)* pointing out the importance of her daughter's help. The usage of imperatives *(Come on; Get the tweezers away from my eye; hang on!; Come on. Hurry!)*, intolerant direct addresses with the negative evaluation of the opponent *(you psycho)*, interjections used to show the general dissatisfaction with the situation *(Ugh! Jesus)* promote their conversation into an intolerant mode.

Conclusions. The surrounding reality makes people act in different situations in various ways. Thus, the discursive behavior can change from a tolerant mode to an intolerant one depending on the surrounding external factors such as a type of discourse – institutional / everyday, or an opponent's type of behavior; and the internal factors such as a general psycho-emotional type of a personality. The ecolinguistic approach integrates value and meaning into institutional or everyday communication as it regulates interaction and harmonious relations. A discursive personality as a creator can choose a mode of behavior – tolerant or intolerant.

In the institutional discourse observing the norms of behavior and contributing to saving the status-role relations between the speakers is considered as tolerance towards the participants of the communication. The tolerant discursive behavior presupposes the interaction in which the addresses are satisfied with the tolerant attitude towards them. On the verbal level of communication tolerant behavior is characterized by the usage of polite direct addresses, comforting words, offers to help, demonstrating interest towards the opponent, mutual gratitude. On the non-verbal level it is shown through kinesic components such as patting on the shoulder, shaking hands, smiling, and proxemic components such as shortening the distance between the participants of communication; prosodic components in these cases include comforting intonation.

In the everyday type of discourse tolerance is expressed through a caring attitude to the opponent's inner world and emotional state. The level of openness between the participants can scale the intrusion in the opponent's privacy. On the verbal level tolerance in everyday discourse is characterized by polite direct addresses, joking, making hoaxes, expressing worry and sympathy for the opponent, trying to be understood appropriately, appealing to the opponent's feelings. On the non-verbal level tolerance is showed through kinesics, like hugging, patting on the shoulder, shaking hands, a sincere smile; proxemics, like shortening the distance between the participants of communication; prosodics, through calm intonation, whisper for creating the sub-language as a means of convergence and trust.

Flexibility and the ability to adapt to different living conditions encourages humanity to seek for new means of interaction with each other and with the environment. An ingenious mind uses new tools that are more appropriate in such situations. Implementation of the ecological strategy of communication, when an ecologically friendly style of human behavior should become an internal imperative, is possible under the condition of observation of the norms in use of verbal and nonverbal components of communication.

The prospects for further research lies in the study of the speech repertoire of a tolerant discursive personality taking into account gender and cultural factors.

REFERENCES

1. *Валеев А. М., Фомин, А. М.* История и сущность понятия толерантности. *Международный научный журнал «Символ науки».* 2016. № 2. С. 80–83.

2. *Жайворонок В. В.* Проблема концептуальної картини світу та мовного її відображення. *Культура народов Причерноморья.* 2002. № 32. С. 51–53.

3. Как нарисовать портрет птицы: методология когнитивно-коммуникативного анализа языка : коллективная монография / Е. В. Бондаренко, А. П. Мартынюк, И. Е. Фролова, И. С. Шевченко. Харьков : ХНУ имени В. Н. Каразина, 2017. 246 с.

4. *Клочко С. О.* Мовна особистість Нельсона Мандели у площині еколінгвістики та психолінгвістики. *Закарпатські філологічні студії*. 2018. С. 44–51.

5. *Матюхіна Ю. В.* Фатичний метадискурс: головні характеристики. *Тези доповідей XX ювілейної наукової конференції з міжнародною участю «Homo Universitatis. Каразінські читання: Людина. Мова. Комунікація»* (Харків, 5 лютого 2021 року). Харків, 2021. С. 39–40.

6. *Михайлова О. А., Павлова Н. С.* Словарь терминов по дисциплине «Лингвокультурологические проблемы толерантности». Екатеринбург, 2008. 18 с. URL: http://elar.urfu.ru/bitstream/10995 /30862/1/978-5-7996-1406-5.pdf. 7.

7. *Морозова І. І.* Стереотипізація персонажного мовлення. *Вісник ХНУ імені В. Н. Каразіна. Іноземна філологія*. 2018. Вип. 87. С. 77–84.

8. *Олпорт Г.* Толерантная личность. *Век толерантности: научно-публицистический вестник*. 2003. Вип. 6. С. 155–159.

9. *Пасинок В. Г. Морозова О. І., Самохіна В. О.* Еколінгвістичний підхід до аналізу іноземних мов та педагогічного процесу їх навчання в українських вишах. *Якісна мовна освіта у сучасному глобалізованому світі: тенденції, виклики, перспективи*. Матеріали I Всеукраїнської науково-практичної конференції (м. Суми, 23–24 листопада 2017 р.). Суми: СумДУ. 2017. С. 128–132.

10. *Пасинок В. Г., Самохіна В. О.* Особистість та її «мікрокосм». *Тези доповідей XX ювілейної наукової конференції з міжнародною участю «Homo Universitatis. Каразінські читання: Людина. Мова. Комунікація»* (Харків, 5 лютого 2021 року) Харків, 2021. С. 51–54.

11. *Седов К. Ф.* Дискурс и личность: эволюция коммуникативной компетенции. М., 2004. 320 с.

12. *Скриннік Ю. С.* Еколінгвістичні виміри зміни соціальних ролей мовців у англомовному побутовому дискурсі. *Одеський лінгвістичний вісник : науково-практичний журнал*. Одеса : Одеський національний університет «Одеська юридична академія», 2017. Вип. 9. Т. 1. С. 236–239.

13. *Солощук Л. В.* Невербальні компоненти комунікації в еколінгвістичному аспекті. *Мовні та концептуальні картини світу*. 2016. Вип. 55. С. 328–335.

14. *Шевченко И. С.* Соотношение информативной и фатической функций как проблема эколингвистики. *Когниция, коммуникация, дискурс*. 2015. № 10. С. 114–132.

15. *Cowley, S. J.* (2014). Bio-ecology and language: a necessary unity. *Language Sciences,* 41, 60–70.

16. *Doring, M. & Zunino, F.* (2014). Nature Cultures in old and new worlds. Steps towards an ecolinguistic perspective on framing a 'new' continent. *Language Sciences,* 41, 34–40.

17. *Fill, A.* (1995). From the ecology of language to ecolinguistics: stages in the evolution of a science. *Grazer Linguist,* 10, 63–71.

18. *Li J., Steffensen S. V., Huang G.* Rethinking ecolinguistics from a distributed language perspective. *Language Sciences*. Elsevier, 2020. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339924759_Rethinking_ecolingui stics_from_a_distributed_ language_perspective.

19. *Morozova O. I.* Review of "Ecolinguistics: communication process at the seam of life" *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна*. Серія : Іноземна філологія. Методика викладання іноземних мов. 2016. Вип. 84. С. 202–203. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN /VKhIPG_2016_84_29.

20. *Soloshchuk L. V., Skrynnik Yu. S.* Functional and pragmatic features of neologisms in the ecological discourse. *Сучасна германістика: мова і світ людини:* тези доповідей IX міжнародного заочного наукового форуму (м. Харків, 21 жовтня 2020 р.) Харків : Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна, 2020. С. 109–110.

21. *Soloshchuk L. V.* The process of diversification of the non-verbal communicative components in the modern English discourse. *Cognition, Communication, Discourse*, 21. 2020. С. 50–60.

22. *Steffensen S. V.* Beyond mind: an extended ecology of languaging. *Distributed Language*. Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 2011. P. 185–210.

23. *Stibbe A.* Ecolinguistics. Language, Ecology and the Stories We Live By. Routledge, 2020. 260 p.

SOURCES

24. *Cameron J.* Titanic. URL: https://www.scriptslug.com/script/titanic-1997.

25. *Chbosky R.* Wonder URL: https://www.scripts.com/script/wonder_ 23635.

26. *Fisher D. J.* Ginny & Georgia, Season 1 Episode 2, URL: https: // subslikescript.com/series/Ginny__Georgia-10813940/season-1/episode-2 -Its_A_Face_Not_A_Mask.

27. *Roberts W.* The Professor URL: https://transcripts.thedealr.net/script.php /the-professor-2018-So4w.

28. *Winter T.* The wolf of wall street URL: https://imsdb.com/scripts /Wolf-of-Wall-Street,-The.html.

Скриннік Ю. С., канд. філол. наук
ХНУ імені В. Н. Каразіна, м. Харків
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7592-4011

ТОЛЕРАНТНІСТЬ В ЕКОЛІНГВІСТИЧНІЙ ПЕРСПЕКТИВІ

У центрі уваги цього дослідження мовленнєва поведінка людини, що демонструє толерантний або інтолерантний тип дискурсивної особистості. Результати такого тлумачення еколінгвістичного підходу знаходять своє вираження і місце в системі уявлень про світ і, як наслідок, формують звички людської взаємодії.

Матеріалом дослідження є діалогічні фрагменти скриптів кінофільмів, які ілюструють відмінності у вербальній та невербальній поведінці толерантної чи інтолерантної дискурсивної особистості в інституціональному та побутовому типах дискурсу. Аналіз відмінностей у мовленнєвому репертуарі толерантної/інтолерантної дискурсивної особистості ґрунтується на принципах еколінгвістики, теорії дискурсу та лінгвопрагматики. Методологічна основа дозволила дослідити екологічні правила взаємодії людей, які сприяють толерантній поведінці.

Ключові слова: вербальний компонент комунікації, інтолерантна дискурсивна особистість, мовленнєвий репертуар, невербальний компонент комунікації, толерантна дискурсивна особистість, еколінгвістика.

REFERENCES

1. *Valeev, A. M.* & *Fomin, E. M.* (2016). Istorija i sushhnost poniatiya tolerantnosti [History and Essense of the Notion of Tolerance]. *Mezhdunarodnij nauchnyi zhurnal "Simvol nauki"* – International Scientific Journal "The Symbol of Science", 2, 80–83 [in Russian].

2. *Zhaivoronok, V. V.* (2002). Problema konceptualnoi kartyny svitu ta movnoho yii vidobrazhennia [Problem of a conceptual world view and its lingual reflection]. *Kultura narodov Prychernomoria – Culture of the People of the Black Sea,* 32, 51–53 [in Ukrainian].

3. *Bondarenko, E. V., Martynjuk, A. P., Frolova, I. Ye.* & Shevchenko, I. S. (2017). *Kak narisovat portret ptitsi: metodologiia kognitivno-kommunikativnogo analiza yazyka [How to draw a portrait of a bird].* Kharkiv : KhNU imeni V. N. Karazina [in Ukrainian].

4. *Klochko, S. O.* (2018). Movna osobystist Nelsona Mandely u ploshchyni ekolingvistyky ta psykholingvistyky [Language personality of Nelson Mandela through the lens of ecolinguistics and psycholinguitics]. *Zakarpatski filolohichni studiyi – Transcarpathian philological studies*, 44–51 [in Ukrainian].

5. *Matiuhina, Yu. V.* (2021). Fatychnyi metadyskurs: holovni harakterystky [Phatic metadiscourse: main characteristics]. Proceedings from *XX yuvileinoi naukovoi konferentsii z mizhnarodnoiu uchastiu "Homo Universitatis Karazinski chytannja: Liudyna. Mova. Komunikaciia" – XX jubilee scientific conference with international participation "Homo Universitatis Karazin readings: Human. Language. Communication".* (pp. 39–40). Kharkiv [in Ukrainian].

6. *Mikhailova, O. A.* & *Pavlova, N. S.* (2008). Slovar terminov po distsipline "Lingvokulturologicheskie problemy tolerantnosti" [Dictionary of terms on the subject "Linguo-cultural problems of tolerance']. Ekaterinburg. Retrieved from http://elar.urfu.ru/bitstream/10995/30862/1/978-5-7996 -1406-5.pdf [in Russian].

7. *Morozova, I. I.* (2018). Stereotypizatsiia personazhnoho movlennia [Stereotyping of personal languaging] *Visnyk KhNU imeni V. N. Karazina. Inozemna filologiia – Messanger of V. Karazin KhNU. Foreign Philology*, 87, 77–84 [in Ukrainian].

8. *Olport, G.* (2003). Tolerantnaya lichnost [Tolerant Personality]. *Vek tolerantnosti: nauchno-publicisticheskii vestnik – Century of Tolerance: scientific-publicistic messanger,* 6: 155–159 [in Russian].

9. *Pasynok, V. G., Morozova, O. I.* & *Samokhina, V. O.* (2017). Eko-linhvistychnyj pidhid do analizu inozemnykh mov ta pedahohichnoho protsesu yih navchannia v ukrayins'kyh vyshah [Ecolinguistic approach to analysis of foreign languages and pedagogical process of their studying in Ukrainian high schools]. *Yakisna movna osvita u suchasnomu hlobalizovanomu sviti: tendentsii, vyklyky, perspektyvy – Quality language education in modern globalized world:* Proceedings of the Ukrainian scientific-practical conference, (128–132). Sumy: SumSU [in Ukrainian].

10. *Pasynok, V. G.* & *Samokhina, V. O.* (2021). Osobystist ta yii «mikro-kosm» [Personality and his «microcosm»]. Proceedings from *XX yuvileinoi naukovoi konferentsii z mizhnarodnoyu uchastiu "Homo Universitatis Karazins'ki chytannja: Liudyna. Mova. Komunikatsiia" – XX jubilee scientific conference with international participation "Homo Universitatis Karazin readings: Human. Language. Communication".* (pp. 51–54). Kharkiv [in Ukrainian].

11. *Sedov, K. F.* (2004). Diskurs i lichnost: evoliutsiia kommunikativnoi kompetentsii [Discourse and personality: evolution of communicative competence]. Moscow [in Ukrainian].

12. *Skrynnik, Yu. S.* (2017). Ekolingvistychni vymiry zminy sotsialnykh rolei movtsiv u anhlomovnomu pobutovomu dyskursi [Ecolinguistic dimension of the change of speakers' social roles in English everyday discourse]. *Odeskyj lingvistychnyi visnyk: naukovo-praktychnyi zhurnal – Odessa Linguistic Messanger: Scientific Practical Journal,* 9, (Vol. 1), (pp. 236–239). Odessa : ONU [in Ukrainian].

13. *Soloshchuk, L. V.* (2016). Neverbalni komponenty komunikatsii v ekolinhvistychnomu aspekti [Non-verbal components of communication in ecolinguistic aspect]. *Movni ta kontseptualni kartyny svitu – Linguistic and Conceptual Views of the World,* 328–335 [in Ukrainian].

14. *Shevchenko, I. S.* (2015). Sootnoshenie informativnoi i faticheskoi funktsii kak problema ekolingvistiki [Correlation between informative and phatic function as a problem of ecolinguistics]. *Kohnitsiia, kommunikatsiia, diskurs – Cognition, Communication, Discourse,* 10, 114–132.

15. *Cowley, S. J.* (2014). Bio-ecology and language: a necessary unity. *Language Sciences,* 41, 60–70.

16. *Doring, M.* & *Zunino, F.* (2014). Nature Cultures in old and new worlds. Steps towards an ecolinguistic perspective on framing a 'new' continent. *Language Sciences,* 41, 34–40.

17. *Fill, A.* (1995). From the ecology of language to ecolinguistics: stages in the evolution of a science. *Grazer Linguist,* 10, 63–71.

18. *Li, J.* & *Steffensen S. V.* & *Huang G.* (2020). Rethinking ecolinguistics from a distributed language perspective. Language Sciences. Esevier. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339924759_Rethinking _ecolinguistics_from_a_distributed_language_perspective.

19. *Morozova, O. I.* (2016) Review of "Ecolinguistics: communication process at the seam of life". *Visnyk Kharkivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni V. N. Karazina. Seriia : Inozemna filolohiia. Metodyka vykladannia inozemnyh mov – Messanger of V. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series : Foreign Phillology. Methods of Teaching of Foreign Languages*, 84, 202–203. Retrieved from: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/VKhIPG _2016_84_29.

20. *Soloshchuk, L. V.* & *Skrynnik, Yu. S.* (2020). Functional and pragmatic features of neologisms in the ecological discourse. Proceedings from: *IX Mizhnarodnyi zaochnyi naukovyi forum "Suchasna hermanistyka: mova i svit liudyny" – The Ninth International Online Scientific Forum "Modern Germanistics: Language and World of a Person".* (109–110). Kharkiv: KhNU [in Ukrainian].

21. *Soloshchuk, L. V.* (2020). The process of diversification of the non-verbal communicative components in the modern English discourse. *Cognition, Communication, Discourse,* 21, 50–60.

22. *Steffensen, S. V.* (2011). Beyond mind: an extended ecology of languaging *Distributed Language*,185–210.

23. *Stibbe, A.* (2020). Ecolinguistics. Language, Ecology and the Stories We Live By. Routledge.

SOURCES

24. *Cameron J.* Titanic. URL: https://www.scriptslug.com/script/titanic-1997.

25. *Chbosky R.* Wonder URL: https://www.scripts.com/script/wonder_23635.

26. *Fisher D. J.* Ginny & Georgia, Season 1 Episode 2, URL: https: //subslikescript.com/series/Ginny__Georgia-10813940/season-1/episode-2 -Its_A_Face_Not_A_Mask.

27. *Roberts W.* The Professor URL: https://transcripts.thedealr.net /script.php/the-professor-2018-So4w.

28. *Winter T.* The wolf of wall street URL: https://imsdb.com/scripts /Wolf-of-Wall-Street,-The.html.