

<https://doi.org/10.34142/23129387.2019.60.07>

UDC 159.9.072.432

ORCID 0000-0001-5036-0790

PSYCHOSEMANTICS OF THE IMAGE OF A MEGAPOLIS CITY

Konstantin Kudryavtsev,

H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University,
graduate student

E-mail: konstantin1stkh@gmail.com

The article reveals the problematics of psychosemantics of the megapolis city image on an example of Kharkiv. Based on the analysis of the semantic space of the descriptors of Kharkiv city image, semantic universals, semantic additions, semantic background and noise in its structure were determined separately for indigenous and non-indigenous citizens. The results of the study show a positive image of Kharkiv in the perception of its citizens. It was determined that the semantic structure of the image of Kharkiv has specificity depending on the experience of living in the city. It is shown that the semantic universals of Kharkiv image in the perception of native citizens are characterized by descriptors «beautiful», «crowded», «active», «interesting» and «big». It was revealed that the experience of living in the city is a significant factor in the formation of its positive image: the native Kharkiv citizens perceive the city as more «beautiful», «safe» and less «alarming» and «evil». It is shown that the image of the city of Kharkiv corresponds to the images of other big cities by the presence of «capital-marked» descriptors in its semantic core, but it has a number of advantages over them – it is considered as more «safe» and «clean».

Keywords: *the image of the city-megalopolis, semantic universals of the image of the city, architectural semantic differential, psychosemantic research, psychology of urbanism.*

Психосемантика образу міста-мегаполісу

Костянтин О. Кудрявцев,

*Харківський національний педагогічний університет імені
Г.С. Сковороди, Україна*

Мета статті. У статті розкрито проблематику психосемантики образу міста-мегаполісу на прикладі міста Харкова.

Методи дослідження. З метою вивчення семантичного простору міста мегаполісу застосовувався архітектурний семантичний диференціал. Вибірку досліджуваних склали 178 осіб – мешканців Харкова та гостей міста.

Результати дослідження. За результатами теоретичного аналізу проблематики психологічної урбаністики визначено, що позитивний образ міста є фактором позитивного емоційного стану його городян.

Досліджено образ міста шляхом застосування архітектурного семантичного диференціалу. Критерієм формування образу міста визначено досвід проживання у ньому, що виступило підґрунтям для дослідження семантичної структури образу міста Харкова у корінних і некорінних городян. На основі аналізу семантичного простору дескрипторів образу міста Харкова визначено семантичні універсалії, семантичні доповнення, семантичний фон та шум у його структурі окремо для корінних та некорінних харків'ян. Результати проведеного дослідження говорять про загалом позитивний образ міста Харкова у сприйнятті його городян. Визначено, що семантична структура образу міста Харкова у сприйнятті харків'ян має специфіку в залежності від досвіду проживання у місті. Показано, що семантичні універсалії образу міста Харкова у сприйнятті корінних харків'ян характеризуються дескрипторами «красивий», «людний», «активний», «цікавий» і «великий», а гостей міста та городян, що приїхали до нього на постійне проживання – «людний», «активний», «енергійний», «великий», «той, що розвивається», «цікавий», «успішний». Підкреслено, що ядерні значення образу міста характеризують Харків як місто-мегаполіс і за формальними «великий», «людний», «активний», «енергійний»), і за змістовними («цікавий», «той, що розвивається», «успішний») ознаками.

Висновки. Емпірично доведено, що досвід проживання у місті є значущим фактором формування його позитивного образу: корінні харків'яни сприймають місто як більш «красиве», «безпечне», менш «тривожне» та «зле», тобто як «своє». Образ міста Харкова співвідноситься з образами інших міст-мегаполісів наявністю в ядрі дескрипторів, що відповідають ознакам «столичності», проте має низку переваг над ними – є більш «безпечним» та «чистим».

Ключові слова: образ міста-мегаполісу, семантичні універсалії образу міста, архітектурний семантичний диференціал, психосемантичне дослідження, психологічна урбаністика.

Introduction. Studying of an image of the city in consciousness of its citizens is extremely important, as the urban environment has

an everyday impact on the identity of its inhabitants. According to K. Lynch, need of citizens for adaptation to the urban environment is satisfied through formation of an image of the city. The positive image of the city is important for maintenance of a harmonious emotional condition of a person as well as aesthetic qualities of an urban environment influence a person's behavior (Lynch, 1982).

The image of the city is a comprehensive set of all ideas about the city which are formed in group consciousness of the population are created by the whole set of spatial environment components, past and present experience related to life in a given city, a derivative of the social structure of society, of the social groups that inhabit it (Pidodnya, 2010).

Architectural objects contain a complex of imaginative associations, by means of the special communicative informational-symbolic potential, which is different at every stage of the development of society, represent one of the most important components of the human environment, influencing people, defining rules of behavior, norms, expectations, forming social groups (Kashkabash, 2014).

U. Eco (2006) described the possibilities of the communicative function of urban space through the combination of motives and stimulation. Stimulus is a complex of sensations that cause a certain reaction. When forming a specific image of urban space, it is based on a certain stimulus that provokes citizens to the appropriate models of thinking and behavior.

The image of the city is formed and perceived by the subjects as a result of a number of significant factors: emotional experience of the architectural environment, historical events, geographical features, social facts. However, meanings expressed in spatial-temporal structures may not be realized when perceived, what does not exclude its influence on the psyche and behavior of both individual and group as a whole (Kashkabash, 2014).

In our previous study (Kudryavtsev, Fomenko, 2018) the factors of the architectural psychosemantic differential, which are peculiar for the assessment of the image of Kharkiv and allow to assess its key architectural objects (urban loci), were determined. However, a

psychosemantic study of the image of Kharkiv in its holistic perception by the citizens was not carried out, what determined the **purpose** of this study - identifying the semantic structure of the image of Kharkiv in the perception of Kharkiv citizens depending on their experience of living in the city.

Research methods. The sample consisted of: 1) Kharkiv citizens, a total of 178 people which were born in this city (143 people) or came to it for permanent residence in early childhood (35 people) and 2) guests of the city in the amount of 138 who regularly visit Kharkiv (students of the correspondence department in the amount of 112 people) and Kharkiv residents living in the city less than 15 years - 27 people, aged 35 to 63 years, who came to Kharkiv to study or work. The criterion for the formation of two independent samples was the experience of living in the city - the first sample was nominally called "native Kharkiv citizens", the second one was "guests of the city". All the subjects who compiled the sample are men (43%) and women (57%) aged 18 to 67 years old.

To study the image of Kharkiv the full version of the architectural semantic differential was used to assess the image of the city proposed by T. Kashkabash (2014).

The organization of the study provided, first of all, the detection of the semantic structure of the image of Kharkiv in the perception of the Kharkiv citizens, depending on their experience, living in the city. For this purpose, the semantic universals of the image of Kharkiv were examined. As A. Mazurkevich notes, semantic universal is determined by the principle of significance (dispersion of indicators on descriptor scales, included in semantic universals, have statistically significant differences from those that are not before it), as well as coherence (descriptor scales have to form a certain semantic unity, integrity, detected using exploratory factor analysis). At the same time, the central level or the universal core of the description of the stimulus (semantic universals) form meaningful and related scales descriptors. The level of semantic additions is significant and unrelated scales, the level of semantic background is minor and related scales, and the level of semantic noise is insignificant and unrelated scales (Mazurkevich 2013: 120-122).

Research results and discussions. The work carried out allowed to explore the semantic space of Kharkiv and to identify the

four-level structure of its image as part of the central level - the universal core of the description of the stimulus, the level of semantic additions, the level of semantic background, the level of semantic noise (in Tables 1 and 2 there are poles of the scale, which tends to the middle group assessment, its absolute value for respondents born in Kharkiv and those who came to it).

Table 1 shows the psycho-semantic structure of the image of the city in perception of native Kharkiv residents.

Table 1

The image structure of the city among native Kharkiv residents

Semantic universals	Semantic additions	Semantic background	Semantic noise
beautiful 2,11 crowded 1,88 active 1,66 interesting 1,73 big 1,69	developing 1,76 successful 1,71	rhythmic 1,39 fast 1,12 exciting 0,42 solid 1,35 clean 1,2 well-kept 1,47 loud 0,62 calm 0,22 bright 1,36 new 0,26 cozy 1,52 warm 1,2 full 1,58 kind 1,29 constant 1,03 attractive 1,61 wide 1,47 soft 0,36 massive 1,28 rich 1,04 invigorating 1,1 safe 0,28 friendly 1,49	vivid 1,28 energetic 1,6 strong 1,4

As a result of experimental data processing by the architectural semantic differential applied to Kharkiv residents born in the city, semantic universals were revealed: the 90% criterion of the frequency of choice - the range of the scale of averages on all scales -

3.98; 10% left range of retreat from -2.1 to -1.70, 10% right range of retreat from 1.48 to 1.88 (Serkin, 2008: 261). According to the criterion of significance, 7 descriptors have fallen into the semantic universal of the assessment of the image of Kharkiv. As a result of factor analysis, it was found that by the criterion of connectedness of these seven descriptors, five have significant loadings - "beautiful" (-0.808), "crowded" (-0.767), "active" (-0.661), "interesting" (-0.605), "large" (0.694).

The semantic additions in the semantic structure of the image of Kharkiv by its native residents have identified descriptors that significantly differ from the average group assessments on the scales: "developing" and "successful". The level of semantic background was 23 related descriptors "rhythmic" (-0.551), "fast" (-0.529), "exciting" (-0.841), "strong" (-0.501), "clean" (-0.836), "well-kept" (-0.721), "loud" (0.679), "calm" (-0.776), "bright" (-0.502), "new" (-0.744), "cozy" (-0.679), "warm" (-0.691), "full" (-0.617), "good" (-0.573), "constant" (-0.664), "attractive" (-0.574), "wide" (-0.568), "soft" (-0.704), "massive" (-0.728), "rich" (-0.551), "invigorating" (-0.717), "safe" (-0.834), "friendly" (-0.574). Semantic noise includes all other descriptors - "vivid", "energetic" and "strong."

So, a key characteristic in the image of Kharkiv among its native residents is aesthetic appeal, that is, the beauty of the city. Almost all residents of the city which were born in it give the highest rating to the city at the "beautiful" descriptor — the "beautiful" descriptor is a core characteristic of the image of Kharkiv by its native residents. Also in the core characteristics of the image of the city included descriptors, the content of which in general corresponds to the characteristics of the metropolis - large, crowded, active and interesting. These characteristics are included in the semantics of the modern metropolis city - large in size, full of people, active and interesting. The content of the semantic addition in the appearance of Kharkiv, provided by its native residents, continues the theme of the "metropolitan city". Kharkiv in the perception of Kharkiv citizens is not only a "crowded, active, interesting and beautiful big city", but also "developing" and "successful". Of course, success and sustainable development are attributes of the modern metropolis. All

other descriptors, except for “vivid”, “energetic” and “strong”, became a part of the semantic background in the image of Kharkiv by native Kharkiv citizens. So, only three of the thirty-three descriptors for describing the city are not relevant to the image of Kharkiv by native Kharkiv citizens.

Table 2 shows the psycho-semantic structure of the image of the city in the perception of non-native Kharkiv citizens and city guests.

Table 2

The image structure of the city among non-native Kharkiv citizens and city guests

Semantic universals	Semantic additions	Semantic background	Semantic noise
crowded 1,9 active 1,61 energetic 1,57 big 1,61 developing 1,97 interesting 1,93 successful 1,62	beautiful 1,97 full 1,65	fast 1,45 exciting 0,71 solid 0,8 clean 1,17 well-kept 1,39 bright 1,1 new 0,41 cozy 1,26 warm 0,87 vivid 1,33 kind 0,9 constant 1,06 attractive 1,46 tough 0,04 strong 1,54 rich 0,99 invigorating 1,41 safe 0,28 friendly 1,39	rhythmic 1,43 exciting 0,17 wide 1,38 loud 1,07

According to the semantic universals data obtained from a sample of guests of the city, such descriptors as “crowded”, “active”, “energetic”, “big”, “developing”, “interesting”, “successful” belong to the semantic universal of the image of Kharkiv. Unlike native Kharkiv citizens, the “beautiful” descriptor in the image of the city of

Kharkiv did not take place as core among the guests of the city. Such data testify in favor of considering the experience of living in the city as a factor of its high aesthetic assessment by citizens. For those Kharkiv citizens which were born and raised in the city, Kharkiv is “definitely” beautiful, and the beauty of the city is its leading feature. However, for guests of the city and those of Kharkiv citizens which spent their childhood in other cities and settlements, in general they consider Kharkiv beautiful, the “beautiful” descriptor loses its central meaning in the city’s appearance.

Semantic additions in the city’s image in Kharkiv for a sample of guests and non-native Kharkiv citizens made up descriptors "beautiful" and "overpopulated". The semantic background in the form of Kharkov in the persons in this sample are: “fast”, “exciting”, “strong”, “clean”, “well-kept”, “loud”, “bright”, “new”, “cozy”, “warm”, “bright”, “good”, “constant”, “attractive”, “hard”, “strong”, “rich”, “invigorating”, “safe” and “friendly”. The level of semantic background consists of 19 related descriptors: “fast” (-0.708), “exciting” (-0.645), “strong” (-0.623), “clean” (-0.892), “well-kept” (-0.844), “bright”(-0.528), "new "(-0.827), “cozy” (-0.702), "warm"(-0.765), "vivid"(-0.758), "good "(-0.624), "permanent "(-0.716), "attractive" (-0.606), "hard" (0.712), "strong" (-0.601), "rich" (-0.826), "invigorating " (-0.686), "safe "(0.775),“ friendly ”(0.520). Semantic noise is presented by “rhythmic”, “anxious”, “wide”, “loud” descriptors.

So, semantic universals describing the image of Kharkiv among non-native Kharkiv citizens are large in volume, since they have seven descriptors (compared to five among indigenous Kharkiv citizens). It means that to the content of the image of Kharkiv as a non-native city, its residents invest more values. If native residents focus on the beauty of the city (the “beautiful” is the core descriptor first in rank, average 2.11), then the “city” character is noted in the city’s image (1 rank, average 1.90). However, in general, the image of Kharkiv among native and non-native residents on the content of semantic universals resembles. The guests of the city, non-native people, as well as those which were born in Kharkiv, fill the image of the city with such core characteristics as “active”, “large”,

“interesting”. However, some descriptors of the core of the image of the city among the guests of the city are different from the core descriptors of the native Kharkiv citizens. For example, the “energetic” descriptor, which entered the native Kharkiv residents into the space of semantic noise, turned out to be insignificant but is core among the guests of the city.

The “developing” and “successful” descriptors enter the spaces of the semantic additions among the native Kharkiv citizens, and as semantic universals. The nuclear “native” descriptor among native Kharkiv citizens loses the leading value among the guests of the city, entering the space of semantic additions.

So, the structure of the image of Kharkiv among non-native Kharkiv citizens is even more than among native Kharkov citizens, consists of descriptors which indicate the presence of signs of a megapolis city. In the perception of the guests of the city, Kharkiv is not only a large, active, interesting and crowded city, but also energetic, successful and developing.

So, if we look at the image of the city in the continuum of “metropolitan - provincial”, then the image of Kharkiv in the minds of its native residents and guests, tend to the pole of “capital” and has all the attributes of a metropolitan city - large size, crowdedness and overpopulation, energy, activity, success, developing resource and interest for citizens.

The comparison of the features of the perception of Kharkiv by native and non-native Kharkiv citizens showed significant differences in the image of the city by such descriptors as “fast”, “exciting”, “strong”, “loud”, “good”, and in the advantages of one of the poles of the descriptor dichotomy “calm-alarming”, “soft - hard”, “dangerous - safe” (Table 3). So, Kharkiv citizens which were born and spent their whole lives in their hometown, more than those people who regularly visit the city or recently live in it, tend to evaluate the image of the city as less fast, loud and exciting, more beautiful and solid, quiet and calm, warm and kind, soft, relaxing and safe.

Table 3

Average values of Kharkiv image descriptors among citizens with different experience of living in the city

Semantic differential descriptors scales	Research sample		t
	«Native citizens», n=138	«Non-native and city guests», n=178	
Monotonous - rhythmic	1,39±1,35	1,43±1,24	-0,28
Fast - slow	-1,12±1,46	-1,45±1,21	2,12*
Exciting - calm	-0,42±1,31	-0,71±1,10	2,13*
Strong - fragile	-1,35±1,27	-0,80±1,22	-3,90***
Beautiful - ugly	-2,11±1,19	-1,97±1,05	-1,10
Clean - dirty	-1,20±1,40	-1,17±1,32	-0,18
Well-kept - unkept	-1,47±1,15	-1,39±1,19	-0,61
Quiet - loud	0,62±1,39	1,07±1,34	-2,93**
Uncrowded - crowded	1,88±1,01	1,90±1,19	-0,18
Active - passive	-1,66±1,32	-1,61±1,26	-0,37
Calm - anxious	-0,22±1,41	0,17±1,28	-2,53*
Bright - dark	-1,36±1,22	-1,10±1,27	-1,83
Small - big	1,69±1,39	1,61±1,39	0,49
Old - new	0,26±1,59	0,41±1,34	-0,88
Cozy - uncomfortable	-1,52±1,30	-1,26±1,14	-1,83
Warm - cold	-1,20±1,19	-0,87±1,17	-2,48*
Vivid - dim	-1,28±1,34	-1,33±1,12	0,37
Crowded - empty	-1,58±1,06	-1,65±0,96	0,59
Kind - angry	-1,29±1,20	-0,90±1,12	-2,98**
Energetic - sluggish	-1,64±1,18	-1,57±1,16	-0,57
Constant - intermittent	-1,03±1,25	-1,06±1,12	0,18
Attractive - repulsive	-1,61±1,07	-1,46±1,09	-1,17
Developing - regressing	-1,76±1,20	-1,97±0,85	1,71
Wide - narrow	-1,47±1,15	-1,38±1,16	-0,73
Soft - hard	-0,36±1,27	0,04±0,99	-3,08**
Strong - weak	-1,43±1,24	-1,54±1,07	0,82
Miniature - massive	1,28±1,39	1,19±1,48	0,57
Rich - poor	-1,04±1,30	-0,99±1,23	-0,41
Interesting - boring	-1,73±1,20	-1,93±0,91	1,61
Invigorating - relaxing	-1,10±1,29	-1,41±1,15	2,19*
Dangerous - safe	0,28±2,27	-0,28±1,21	3,95***
Friendly - hostile	-1,49±0,98	-1,39±0,95	-0,94
Successful - outsider	-1,71±0,96	-1,62±0,84	-0,82

The tempo-rhythm of the city is perceived by native Kharkiv residents as more harmonious and calm, what may be due to their greater adaptation to the living conditions in the city, the habit to the noise level and movement speed in the city. In addition, native Kharkiv citizens rate the city as a whole more well, noting the greater benevolence of its inhabitants, which in general can be explained by the effects of projection and generalization according to the scheme: "I am good; I am a Kharkiv citizen; all Kharkiv citizens are good. " The habit to the city, the way of life that has taken shape in this city, and the greater experience of living in it (from birth until now) determine the formation of a safer image of the city among native Kharkiv residents.

City guests and people with less experience of living in Kharkiv perceive it as invigorating, faster, loud, disturbing, hard, cold, dangerous, less beautiful and kind. The image of Kharkov among the guests and non-native people is saturated with more sthenic emotions - excitement and anxiety. So, in general, the image of Kharkiv among the guests of the city and the people which came to it was less positive than among the native Kharkiv citizens.

As D. Sazonov (2009) noted in his study, the representations of the urban environment among the inhabitants of the city are associated with the residence time and experience of interaction with the urban environment. The analysis of the study conducted by this author suggests that the image of the city among guests and those citizens which recently arrived in the city is due to the difficulties of orientation in the environment, the gradual formation of awareness of various elements of the city, hierarchy, the structured image of the urban environment in perception, shift of the pragmatic needs related to the primary adaptation in the environment, orientation in the city, employment, safety of living, on the need for active participation in the cultural-historical life of the city and leisure activities, quiet and comfortable living in the city. These data correlate with our results: the image of Kharkiv in the perception of guests and non-native Kharkiv residents is semantically filled with descriptors indicating the need for security and defense, employment and material well-being, entertainment and leisure.

In addition, in our opinion, differences in the perception of Kharkiv by native and non-native Kharkiv citizens is determined not only to their different status (living history and experience in the city), but, above all, the peculiarities of their urban identity. In the dichotomy “local - stranger” image of Kharkov, the native Kharkiv citizens and guests of the city take opposite positions: the native Kharkiv people assess Kharkiv as more “beautiful” and “safe”, because it is “their own”, and non-native residents - as more “interesting”, “strong”, “dangerous”, “cold”, because it is “unfamiliar” for them.

For the purpose to confirm the opinion about the severity of the signs of megapolis in the image of Kharkiv, we carried out a comparative analysis of the image of Kharkiv with images of other million-plus cities. Unfortunately, in the Ukrainian psycho-semantic and psycholinguistic studies there is a lack of research devoted to the image of the big cities (Kyiv, Odessa, Donetsk, Dnepr), therefore a comparative analysis was introduced in relation to metropolitan Moscow, as well as Novosibirsk and Yekaterinburg (third and fourth Russian cities on population size, which more or less correspond to the population and size of Kharkiv).

Comparing the image of Kharkiv with the image of the capital city - using the image of Moscow, obtained in the research of N. Dolgova (2016), - should pay attention to some of the absolute advantages that are endowed with the image of Kharkov by its citizens, primarily on its safety.

The semantic content of the image of Kharkov differs from the image of Novosibirsk, shown in the study of A. Shmelina and A. Tsygankov (2016), described by city residents through core descriptors “dirty”, “rhythmic”, “dynamic”, “young”, “wide”, “developing”, “strong”. The images of Kharkiv and Novosibirsk as two large cities (regional centers, centers of science, culture, industry, etc.) are comparable in only one parameter - the “developing” semantic universals.

Comparing the image of Kharkiv with the image of Yekaterinburg, shown in the study of L. Storostova and D. Rudenkin (2017), we can make conclusions about the common and different in

semantic structures of the images of these two large cities. So, like Kharkiv residents, residents of Yekaterinburg assess their hometown through descriptors “noisy” (semantically close to “loud” in the image of Kharkiv), “well-known” and “rich” (generally, corresponds to the descriptors “successful”, “developing” in the core and space of the semantic additions, also to the descriptor “rich” of the semantic background of the image of Kharkiv), “overcrowded” (descriptors “crowded” and “full” in the image of Kharkiv), as well as “beautiful” (the corresponding descriptor is included in the core image of Kharkiv among its native residents). Just like Kharkiv, Yekaterinburg is perceived by its residents as a metropolitan rather than provincial one. However, analyzing the conclusions of a study conducted by L. Storstova and D. Rudenkin (2017), it can be noted that the image of Kharkiv is less "problematic": Kharkiv residents in general, more positively assess the image of their city, but Ekaterinburg people point to the negative features of the city. Representing Yekaterinburg as a symbolic, status and beautiful city, residents point out many problems, describing it as “uncomfortable”, “overcrowded”, “dirty” and “expensive”.

Conclusions. The results of the conducted study give the grounds to claim that the image of Kharkiv in the perception of its residents is generally positive. The semantic structure of the image of Kharkiv in the perception of Kharkiv residents has a specificity, depending on the experience of living in the city. The semantic universals of the image of Kharkiv in the perception of native Kharkiv residents are characterized by descriptors “beautiful”, “crowded”, “active”, “interesting” and “big”, and the guests of the city and citizens which came to it for permanent residence - “crowded”, “active”, “energetic”, “large”, “developing”, “interesting”, “successful”. The core meaning of the image of the city characterizes Kharkiv as a megapolis city also according to formal “big”, “crowded”, “active”, “energetic”), and according to substantial (“interesting”, “developing”, “successful”) features. Experience in the city is a significant factor in the formation of its positive image: native Kharkiv residents perceive the city as more “beautiful”, “safe”, less “alarming” and “bad”, that is, as “their own”.

The image of Kharkiv corresponds with the images of other metropolitan cities with the presence in the core of descriptors which correspond to the signs of "capital", but has a number of advantages over them - is more "safe" and "clean".

The prospects for further research on the image of Kharkiv are associated with its correlation with the psycho-semantics of the images of large cities of Ukraine, detection of the specifics of the formation of the image of the urban environment among examinees depending on type of urban identity.

References

Eko U. (2006). Otsutstvuyushchaya struktura. Vvedeniye v semiologiyu [Missing structure. Introduction to semiology]. SPb.: Simpozium [in Russian].

Kashkabash T.V. (2014). Gorodskoye vizual'noye kommunikativnoye prostranstvo kak faktor sotsial'noy integratsii (na primere g. Moskvyy) [Urban visual communicative space as a factor of social integration (on the example of Moscow)]. Candidate's thesis. M [in Russian].

Kudryavtsev K., Fomenko K. (2018). Psykholohiya obrazu mista: mozhlyvosti zastosuvannya arkhitekturnoho psykholemantychnoho dyferentsialu [Psychology of the image of the city: the possibilities of applying the architectural psychosemantic differential] Visnyk KHNPU imeni H.S. Skovorody. Psykholohiya. [H.S. Skovoroda KnNPU Herald. Psechology]. 59. P. 49-63. [in Ukrainian].

Linch K. (1982). Obraz goroda [City Image]. M. : Stroyizdat, 1982 [in Russian].

Mazurkevich, A.V. (2013). Protsesual'naya konkretizatsiya i matematicheskoye obosnovaniye metoda semanticheskikh universal'iy [Process specification and mathematical substantiation of the method of semantic universals]. *Vestnik KRAUNTS. Seriya «Gumanitarnyye nauki» - Bulletin KRAUNZ. Series "Humanities"*, 1(21), 112–123 [in Russian].

Pidodnya YU.A. (2010). Obraz goroda v ramkakh sotsial'noy psikhologii [The image of the city in the framework of social psychology]. *Mezhdunarodnyy zhurnal prikladnykh i sotsial'nykh issledovaniy - International Journal of Applied and Social Research*, №1, 86-87 [in Russian].

Sazonov D.N. (2009). Sotsial'no-psikhologicheskiye osobennosti reprezentatsii gorodskoy prostranstvenno-predmetnoy sredy u zhiteley

goroda [Socio-psychological characteristics of the representation of the urban spatial-objective environment among residents.]. Candidate's thesis. Belgorod. [in Russian].

Shmelina O.S., Tsygankova O.Ye. (2016). Obrazy «goroda-mechty» i real'nogo goroda v predstavlenii zhiteley krupnogo i malogo gorodov [The images of the "city of dreams" and the real city in the view of residents of large and small cities.]. *Sotsial'no-psikhologicheskiye issledovaniya goroda - Social and psychological studies of the city*. M.: Izd-vo «Institut psikhologii RAN». 2016. 27-48 [in Russian].

Starostova L.E., D.V. Rudenkin (2017). Mul'timodal'naya territorial'naya identichost': gorod-dlya-sebya i gorod-dlya-drugogo (po rezul'tatam oprosa zhiteley Yekaterinburga) [Multimodal territorial identity: a city-for-itself and a city-for-another (according to a survey of residents of Yekaterinburg).]. *Izvestiya Ural'skogo federal'nogo universiteta - News of the Ural Federal University*, 23, 2 (162). S. 175-187 [in Russian].

Original manuscript received March, 4, 2019

Revised manuscript accepted March, 20, 2019