

Linguistic and pragmatic aspects of communication in the modern media world



Liudmyla Mialkovska^a   | Vita Sternichuk^a  | Anzhelika Yanovets^a  | Alla Hubina^a  |
Natalia Kyseliuk^a  | Iryna Zabiaka^a  | Yuliya Kriukova^b 

^aForeign and Ukrainian Philology Department, Faculty of Digital Educational and Social Technologies, Lutsk National Technical University, Lutsk, Ukraine.
^bDepartment of Foreign Languages for Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, Lutsk, Ukraine.

Abstract Taking into account the purposeful activity of modern man, his acquisition of enormous masses of information during a short period, the communication aspect of communication in the business sphere has gradually turned from a means of enjoyment, length, and unhurried language interaction into a means of accurate, short and simultaneous full communication of a problem, initiative, proposal. Communication pragmatics came to the aid of such language transformations. The article proves that pragmalinguistics studies speech communication as a manifestation of speech activity – purposeful influence on each other (persuasion, persuasion, request for information, etc.) using language. To achieve their communicative goals, depending on the context and situation, their communicative roles, the speaker and the addressee use certain speech acts (written as sentences) corresponding to these goals – stating facts, encouraging action, etc. It is scientifically determined that the emergence of ecolinguistics is due to the need to solve the problems of interaction between language, man and nature. It is indicated that it covers extremely diverse research that reflects the importance of environmental issues in society. The attention given to issues of environmental protection at all levels of society, and as a result, the relevance of environmental issues, as well as the peculiarities of communication in the field of environmental protection, allow us to distinguish a separate type of discourse - ecological, which is characterized by the constant addition of the ecological glossary, the emergence of special axiological units, the presence of separate status models - role configuration, which determine the use of certain communicative strategies in specific communicative situations. It was highlighted in practice that the main discourse-creating concepts in environmental discourse are environment, pollution, energy, and climate change, which constitute the semantic base of communication in the field of environmental protection.

Keywords: ecological communication, nonecological communication, ecological vocabulary, ecological discourse, media communications, linguistic analysis

1. Introduction

The identification of ecological vocabulary is based on the scientific concept of ecology and the sociocultural linguistic concept of M. Novikova (ECOLOGY). The special concept of "ecology" refers to the complex science of survival in the environment (M. Musienko, V. Serebryakov, O. Bryon, etc.). This concept is related to, in fact, the ecological terminology system, which, first, serves a highly specialized field of ecological knowledge and forms the basic corpus of ecological linguistics. However, taking into account the current societal trend of overcoming the technocratic paradigm of thinking inherent in the 20th century and to form a global ecological consciousness, a new ecological conceptsphere is being launched. It reproduces not only biological and technogenic but also anthropogenic (philosophical, religious, cultural, social) parameters of human relations with the environment. Ecological terminology together with all lexical units that directly or indirectly reveal the content of the conceptual, value and/or figurative components of the language concept ECOLOGY form a wider corpus of ecological vocabulary.

2. Literature review

With respect to the development of cognitive linguistics and pragmatic approaches to the development of linguistics, language has been the subject of research by Chenki A. (1997), Fauconnier G. (1994), Jackendoff R. (1988), Johnson-Laird Ph. (1980), Lakoff G. (1987), Langacker R. (1987), Popova N. (2013) and others. The features and problems of ecolinguistics are considered and studied by scientists such as Kyseliuk N. (2023), Mialkovska L. (2022; 2023), Zhvania L. (2023), Rozhylo M. (2023), Yablonsky M. (2023), Hrysiuk V. (2023), Solohub L. (2022), Pochapska O. (2022).



3. Methods

The methods that were used. The research methodology in this article includes the combined use of onomasiological and semasiological approaches and methods of linguistic and sociolinguistic analysis; lexicographic, component, cognitive, discursive, descriptive, contextual-interpretive, and stylistic analysis; and the method of correlating social phenomena with innovative linguistic phenomena.

4. Results

Research results. Since the time of V. von Humboldt and O. Potebny, language has been interpreted as a phenomenon that has a culturally active, social-psychological basis. I. Shevchenko is convinced that "its communicative and cognitive components cannot avoid social marking" (2005, p. 17). Language is a means of organizing, processing and transmitting information. "It is studied not autonomously, but from the point of view of how it reflects a person's vision of the world and ways of conceptualizing the world, general principles of categorization and the mechanism of information processing, as well as from the standpoint of how the human cognitive experience and the influence of the environment are represented in language" (Boldyrev, 2000, pp. 5-6). A. Chenki, in turn, added that "because language is an integral part of knowledge (cognition), it reflects the interaction of psychological, communicative, functional and cultural factors" (1997, p. 340).

The authors of the philosophical grammar A. Arno and K. Lanelo, who developed the philosophical idea of R. Descartes, considered "the ability to speak as an innate human ability, which is realized with the help of an initial impulse—an idea. They denied other mental operations. The following schools and directions that arose in linguistics studied language unilaterally, and the central place was given to the selective approach. Proponents of this direction held the opinion that there is a clear line between linguistic knowledge (knowledge of linguistic meanings, forms, and categories) and nonlinguistic knowledge (encyclopedic knowledge about the world). The meaning of words does not depend on the awareness of the state of affairs in the real or imaginary world of the person speaking. Everything that was directly related to the description of linguistic units and categories – the influence of the human factor (mental state, social and cultural aspects, communication conditions, etc.) – was considered, according to N. Boldyrev's observations, "insignificant for linguistic research" (Boldyrev, 2000, pp. 12, 56). Structuralists did not deny the fact, supported by cognitivism, that meaning is contextually determined and cannot exist by itself. However, unlike the latter, as Y. Baylo claims, "structuralists understood by such a context only the intralinguistic context, that is, syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between language signs within the language system" (2011, p. 5).

According to R. Jackendoff, "Despite the large number of different research approaches, there is one basic reference in cognitive linguistics, which is that meaning in language is the subject of conceptualization" (1988, p. 156), "information a structure that is encoded by the mind" (1988, p. 81). Meaning is a cognitive structure, and the context that determines linguistic meaning is external to the language system and embodies other cognitive structures. The study of language forms is consciously incomplete without reference to cognitive categories since thinking categories are practically impossible to separate from linguistic categories. Another characteristic feature of cognitive linguistics is the approach to categorization. Within the framework of the classical approach, which is the basis of traditional linguistics, the following can be distinguished:

1. categories with clear boundaries;
2. all members of the category are endowed with certain mandatory and essential features;
3. the features of the category are binary opposed;
4. All members of the category have the same status; that is, they are equal in importance.

At the same time, another approach to the nature of categorization, which was proposed by L. Wittgenstein, was developed in cognitive linguistics. Based on his well-known analysis of the meaning of the word "game", L. Wittgenstein concludes that there is a "family resemblance" (family resemblance) between the members of the category, thus characterizing both the similarity and the difference between them. Later, research by E. Roche proved that the category has a center and a periphery. This gave grounds for asserting the existence of prototypes around which other, less prototypical members of the semantic category are formed. With the help of various experiments, E. Roche proved that the degree of membership in a category is a psychologically determined concept; that is, it does not depend on language but reflects certain psychological aspects of a person's perception of the world. Having defined itself as an independent direction in linguistics, cognitive linguistics also does not deny anything that was achieved earlier in linguistics; rather, it integrates all acquired knowledge and generalizes it on a new, higher, explanatory level. At the same time, N. Boldyrev claims that "the cognitive level of analysis creates an opportunity to go beyond linguistic knowledge itself and analyze the ratio of linguistic meaning and conceptual content conveyed by a single word" (2000, p. 13). Cognitive linguistics is based on the conditioning of language by extralinguistic reality and on the close relationship between language units and the referents they name. According to linguists L. Mialkowska, A. Yanovets, L. Solohub, O. Pochapska, and H. Reshetnik, "application of cognitive linguistics capabilities in the process of learning a foreign (English) language turned out to be a systematic synthetic process, where the system of meanings, knowledge of communicative scripts of communication, cultural component, and the ability to express correctly, determine the features of meanings, genre and style are important" (2022, p. 489).

The founders of cognitive linguistics, J. Lakoff and R. Langacker, started the implementation of the latest ideas of linguistic thought within the framework of generative semantics. From their considerations regarding the main postulates of semantics, which were based on the theory of N. Chomsky and their gradual development over time, a direction of linguistics arose, which American and Western European linguists call cognitive semantics. The approaches of J. Lakoff and R. Langacker were embodied in two works that appeared in 1987. One of them, "Women, Fire and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind" (1987) develops fundamental concepts of cognitive linguistics such as conceptual experientialism, the theory of prototypes and its influence on language formation, idealized cognitive models, and the influence of culture on semantic configuration. It is here that one can find the foundations of cognitive linguistic and cultural studies, which in Eastern European science have developed into a separate branch of cognitive linguistics (A. Vezhbytska, S. Vorkachev, V. Karasyk, V. Kononenko, V. Maslova, A. Prykhodko, G. Slyshkin, etc.). R. Langacker's two-volume work "Foundations of Cognitive Grammar" (1987) gives rise to cognitive grammar, which is also studied from the point of view of the semantic approach.

Due to the independent development of linguistics in the post-Soviet areas, many approaches to the study of the interaction of language and thinking appear in domestic linguistics. However, the most common of them, according to Z. Popova, is the so-called semantic-cognitive approach (a term coined by Z. Popova and Y. Sternin), the very name of which is determined by "the direction of research on the study of the relationship between the semantics of linguistic signs and its development with the conceptual sphere of the people, which is modified due to the cognitive processes of consciousness" (Popova, 2013, p. 198). Z. Popova proved that "the semantic-cognitive approach to the study of the interaction of language and thinking is developed in the works of American (F. Johnson-Laird, D. Rumelhart, J. Fauconnier, C. Fillmore), English (L. Talmy), German (F. Ungerer, G. Schmid), Spanish (K. Vasquez, I. Inchaurrealde, H. Cuenca, R. Mendoza, H. Sifuentes, M. H. Hilferty) and other scientists devoted to the so-called cognitive semantics" (Popova, 2013, pp. 198-199). The results of their research make it possible to formulate the following postulates of a cognitive semantics/semantic-cognitive approach (Table 1).

Table 1 Postulates of the semantic-cognitive approach.

Postulate	Content of the postulate
Language is a variable entity in which individual mathematical formulas are combined (generativist style)	It is an unstable system that evolves unevenly and does not have defined limits between linguistic units, that is, there is only a prototypicality of categories, but the absolute similarity of the same elements of a specific category is absent. Thus, all language units and forms are studied from the most regular to the less regular and nonstandard (so-called exceptions)
Semantic, grammatical, and pragmatic elements of linguistic units form a coherent entity	Due to their indivisibility, there are idealized cognitive models (according to the terminology of R. Langacker "cognitive domains" (1987), J. Fauconnier "mental space" (1994), L. Talmy "schemes" (2000), R. Schenk and R. Abelson's "scenarios" (1977), F. Johnson-Laird's "mental models" (1980)) that shape human thinking, since it is impossible to separate linguistic, encyclopedic, and cultural components consciousness
Metaphor and metonymy (in contrast to their classical definition in rhetoric) become the main means of communication between the reality of the surrounding world and language	Language is a formation based on imagery and creativity of thinking
The priority for the functioning and development of language is its pragmatic use in everyday communication	Communicative necessity, views of participants in the communicative process, individual worldview, biological limitations that characterize a person as a biological species, etc., are the drivers and limitations that direct the development of the linguistic picture of the world: necessity precedes use, functioning is more important than form, and meaning is more important for grammatical abstraction

Source: Compiled by the author according to (Popova, 2013, p. 199-200).

To learn language in the real world, it was necessary to use the acquired theoretical knowledge and developments in practice. A pragmatic approach helped scientists, linguists and linguists in this regard. In this case, pragmatics studies the mediating function of signs and their implementation in real situations of communication in society. Pragmalinguistics investigates the active aspect of communication (both oral and written) based on a special system of rules, postulates, and strategies. The development of modern linguistics proves that an in-depth study of language as the most important means of communication is impossible without addressing the communicative and pragmatic aspects of its functioning.

There was increased interest in linguistics in communicative pragmatics at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries. This led to the focus of researchers' attention on the dynamic study of the use of linguistic and paralinguistic means that realize the individual-personal, intentional (needs, motives and goals) and situational aspects of the message. Studying the specifics of communicative behavior in various social spheres is becoming one of the dominant directions of research in humanitarian disciplines such as sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, linguistics, linguistic conceptology, and discursive linguistics. Within the framework of the revolutionary turn of attention of humanities disciplines to the person and the development of anthropocentric approaches to the study of language and speech, research in which the human factor occupies a dominant



position has undergone rapid development: the problems of identifying patterns of linguosemiotic assimilation of *Homo sapiens* in the surrounding material world and information space, strategic building communication for the realization of human needs, and structuring an environment beneficial for communicators.

The era of rapid development of communication technologies forced people to radically change their communicative behavior: if, in the era preceding the hyperinformation boom, the achievement of pragmatic communication goals was mainly verbal, then our time requires an intensive introduction of a visual component into communication. The world has become brighter, more illustrative, and more demonstrative; on its terrain, there is a real threat of getting lost and not getting what is desired for a certain personality. Pragmalinguistics studies speech communication as a manifestation of speech activity—a purposeful influence on each other (persuasion, persuasion, request for information, etc.) using language. To achieve their communicative goals, depending on the context and situation, their communicative roles, the speaker and the addressee use certain speech acts (formed as sentences) corresponding to these goals—starting facts, prompting action, etc. O. Selivanova defines pragmalinguistics as "a branch of linguistics that investigates the use and functioning of language signs in the process of communication about the interactivity of its subjects (speaker and addressee), their characteristics, and the communication situation itself" (2006, p. 287). In modern pragmalinguistics, attention to linguistic means is combined with their projection of personal factors of communication and components of the communicative situation.

Semiotic orientation of pragmatics in the second half of the 20th century. was supplemented by the communicative orientation of the theory of speech acts, which developed within the framework of linguistic philosophy under the influence of neopositivism. Although some researchers note the inadequacy of the theory of speech acts as a basic conceptual apparatus for building a pragmatic concept of verbal communication, in general, this theory has accumulated significant scientific potential and prepared the ground for the development of pragmalinguistics (Akimova et al., 2022). With this in mind, linguists distinguish three directions in pragmalinguistics: the first is focused on the systematization of pragmatically charged language units of different levels, the study of their interaction with semantics and syntax; the second is to research the interactivity of communicators in the processes of language communication; the third is on the modeling of cognitive structures that ensure the interactivity of discourses, in particular, frame interaction, strategic programmes, etc.

The 20th century gave birth to many new sciences, their avant-garde combination and the results of their combination. Along with the development of pragmatics in linguistics, ecolinguistics is developing. The American linguist Einar Hauge is considered to be the founder of the concept of language ecology. In 1970, he explained in his report that language ecology can be defined as the science of the relationship between language and its environment, where the environment is the society that uses language as one of its codes. Language exists only in the minds of speakers and functions only in other speakers and their social and natural environment. The ecology of language is partly physiological (interaction with other languages in the mind of the speaker) and partly social (interaction with the society in which language is used as a means of communication). The ecology of language depends on the people who learn it, use it, and transmit it to other people. Ecolinguistics is commonly called one of the modern scientific directions in the field of linguistics and is formed at the junction of social (the relationship between social and linguistic structures in the process of thinking on different stages of ethnogenesis), psychological (problems of language influence) and philosophical (manifestation of extremely general properties and patterns of development and cognition in language) directions.

Recently, special importance has been given to linguistic research; scientific investigations devoted to the discovery of laws, rules and principles that are common to both ecology and language; and the study of the role of language in solving urgent environmental problems. The problem of interaction between society and nature goes far beyond scientific discussions. This is due to the real threat of a global planetary ecological disaster. After all, the evolution of man leads to drastic changes in his relations with the surrounding world. She no longer adapts to this world but tries to adapt it to her needs. As a result, human influence on nature is becoming increasingly tangible. Environmental issues are gaining increasing importance for modern society and are becoming a significant factor in the everyday life of mankind. A safe environment becomes one of the main values. All these factors testify to the formation of the ecological sphere of human activity.

In this respect, ecolinguistics is interpreted as a section of linguistics on the border of socio and psycholinguistics and linguistic philosophy aimed at considering language as a component of the system of mutual existence of man, society and nature (Selivanova, 2010, p. 147).

Two directions in ecolinguistics:

- ecology of language, which metaphorically transfers ecological concepts to language (according to E. Haugen);
- linguistic ecology (according to M. Holliday), in which languages are considered from the point of view of ecology and the role of language in describing the problems of the surrounding world is studied.

The first direction of ecolinguistics can be demonstrated by the scientific works of N. Kiselyuk and A. Yanovets, who provide an example of ecological/nonecological linguistic units. Scientists offer a simple example of cases of use of the lexical unit *Damn*, "taken from the Cambridge Dictionary:

- It's broken! *Damn!* (an expression of anger);
- *Damn*, that tastes good. (used for emphasis) (Cambridge Dictionary).

As the above examples show, in the first case, the lexical unit *Damn* expresses anger and irritation and has a negative meaning, while in the second example, this lexeme is used together with the positively evaluated word *good* to enhance positive emotions (satisfaction, delight)" (Kyseliuk and Yanovets, 2023, p. 25). That is, the authors analyze normative and nonnormative vocabulary that is established in society from a pragmatic point of view, and through context, discursive verbal means form an ecological or nonecological communicative reaction of the interlocutor and the reader. This is a fairly new symbiosis of communicative links of language and ecology with the addition of psychoanalysis, where there is a concept of toxic relationships that have the right to exist and further develop.

We adhere to the second direction of the interaction of ecolinguistics, that is, we support Alvin Fill's classification, in which "linguistic ecology studies the relationship between language and ecological issues" (Huzenko, 2012). At the time of environmental disasters on the planet, the problems of the interaction of language and the surrounding world attracted the increased attention of both domestic and foreign researchers. To expand the sphere of influence of ecolinguistics, which, in our opinion, should convey to the masses the rules of behavior in the environment and the means and methods of its protection from anthropogenic influence, it is advisable to use the mass media method of presenting information, thereby covering a very large number of audiences. According to researchers of environmental communication, the subject of this study is questions based on the well-known Lasswell formula "who? reports what? what channel whom? effect? ", in particular:

- Who are the subjects of environmental communication, and who participates in discussions?
 - why are some people listened to and heard, while others are disregarded? ;
 - What ecological and nature protection problems and their aspects are being discussed, and why are they discussed?
 - What will be the consequences if a specific environmental problem is not resolved?
 - Where and when does communication take place on pressing environmental issues, and in what forms, contexts, and discourses?
 - How do contexts and discourses affect the possibilities of solving problematic issues? are there any restrictions?
- (Meisner, 2020)
- what language tools are used? Why are certain words, metaphors, images, frames, music, art, stories, etc., used, and how do they affect those who hear and see these messages?
 - How exactly should you communicate about environmental topics? (Sandmen, 1972, 41-47).

Since the 1970s, P. Sandman has gone increasingly deeper, developing a model of ecological mass communication based on a combination of educational and advertising platforms. P. Sandman suggested that to interest the audience, communication should start with why it is necessary to receive environmental information (real motivation). Interest naturally causes a need, for example, for additional, clarifying, etc., information, which leads to its search, influencing the environmental behavior of the individual. The received information can provoke cognitive dissonance, which can be eliminated, for example, by searching for new information. On the other hand, information received during formal, informal or informal education or from any available source can change first the social guidelines of an individual and then his behavior (1972, p. 41-47).

One of the main features of environmental discourse is the mass nature of communication: in many cases, the addresser does not address the addressee directly, and therefore, the communication is somewhat unidirectional. The author, creating a message intended for a mass addressee, takes into account the idealized idea of a communication partner, who is a carrier of only general memory devoid of personal and individual experience. The message intended for such an addressee is abstract, devoid of individual character and includes only the unabbreviated minimum. This makes it necessary to focus on concepts that are understandable and acceptable to everyone who can participate in the communication process when creating texts for a mass audience. Such concepts are deep cognitive and value categories. Authors of environmental texts created for mass communication, in most cases, rely on core value concepts with which human life is connected, such as health, life, and well-being. Emotional argumentation can also have an effective influence on the mass addressee. In the environmental discourse, emotions are appealed to, mentioning global environmental disasters or talking about cataclysms that await humanity in the future (Rozmaritsa, 2000, p. 56).

From a cognitive point of view, the ecological discourse is based on the concepts of ENVIRONMENT, POLLUTION, ENERGY, and CLIMATE CHANGE, which were selected by analyzing language material using logical-conceptual criteria. It was established that the topic of communication in the environmental sphere is reduced to these concepts—the activation of these units in the discourse allows the speaker to orientate what is being said about environmental issues. This provides grounds for classifying the concepts of ENVIRONMENT, POLLUTION, ENERGY, and CLIMATE CHANGE as discourse-creating, that is, those that make up the semantic base of this type of discourse (Rozmaritsa, 2002, pp. 440-441).

The definition and analysis of the abovementioned units precisely as concepts are determined by the branching and complexity of the system of lexemes that verbalize these formations. In contrast to lexical-semantic fields, which consist only of homogeneous units, ENVIRONMENT, POLLUTION, ENERGY, and CLIMATE CHANGE, as objects of linguistic representation of extralinguistic reality, combine units of different levels—morpheme, lexical, and syntactic—and include means of expressing various linguistic categories, particularly the categories of negativity and modality. The approach popular in modern cognitive linguistics, which consists of considering language units from the point of view of frame semantics, also turned out to be

inadequate in this study since the construction of frame schemes, mostly purely based on dictionary definitions, makes the analysis too formalized. At the same time, the linguistic subtleties of the study of the ways of verbalizing extralinguistic reality, in particular, the peculiarities of the processes of conceptualization and symbolization of concepts, remain neglected.

The concepts ENVIRONMENT, POLLUTION, ENERGY, and CLIMATE CHANGE cannot be classified as terms since communication in environmental discourse is mostly designed for a mass addressee, and mass communication does not involve the use of a large number of specialized language units. For this reason, the ecological term system as such was not the object of research in this work. In addition, one of the criteria for assigning lexical units to the category of terms is their stylistic neutrality and lack of expression. Three of the five concepts described in the study (POLLUTION, CLIMATE CHANGE) express a negative assessment and therefore have a connotative meaning concept that is also characterized by an enormous expressive potential (Rozmaritsa, 2002, p. 442).

The concept of the ENVIRONMENT is key to environmental discourse. The growing attention of native speakers to environmental problems contributed to the formation of a large number of word combinations with the noun environment and the adjective environment derived from it, where they perform an attributive function, combined with nouns that have a negative meaning: environmental degradation, environmental damage, environmental disadvantages, environmental consequences, environmental catastrophes, environmental hazards, and environmental health threats. This can be explained by the fact that the state of the environment is deteriorating, and conversations about the environment are mostly held in a negative context. The formation of the sociopolitical environmental movement also contributed to the emergence of stable phrases, which included the lexeme environment and the environment. This group of lexical units includes phrases that include nouns that characterize a person by their activities (environmental activists, environmental professionals) or denote a human collective (environmental organizations, environmental NGOs, environmental pressure groups, or environmental lobby groups) (Shytyk et al., 2022).

The concept of ENVIRONMENT has a large semantic volume; it denotes not only the connection of man with nature but also his environment, i.e., it characterizes the set of various factors that influence human life. This is why phrases involving the token environment and environment can be conceptually related to several spheres of human activity at the same time: environmental agreements, environmental policies, the Environment Ministry (ecology and politics), environmental taxes, environmental permits (ecology and economy), environmental law, environmental rights, environmental offences, and environmental proceedings (ecology and law).

Another discourse-creating concept for environmental discourse is ENERGY because the issues of safe energy use and overcoming the energy crisis are very important for environmentalists. New elements of the vocabulary of language often arise due to a change in society's attitude toward some aspects of life. In particular, accidents at nuclear power plants on Three Mile Island (USA) and Chernobyl (Ukraine) changed the attitude toward the issue of nuclear energy from positive-neutral to sceptical-negative in English-speaking society, which caused changes in the internal and external valence of the word nuclear itself. This affected the formation of new phrases (nuclear safety, nuclear terrorism), the meaning of which includes the components "safety"/"danger", and derived words that testify to the polarization of public opinion regarding the issue of the use of nuclear energy: pro-nuclear, anti-nuclear, nonnuclear, and nuclear-free. The solution to the energy crisis is considered possible through the use of renewables and alternative energy sources. Lexemes denoting the following types of energy carriers have greatly enriched the modern English language: wind-powered, solar-powered, biobased, straw-fueled, propane-powered, hydrogen-fueled, and fuel-cell-powered. In addition, new phrases with the meaning "that contributes to energy saving" have appeared and can be considered universal predicates in the ecological discourse: energy-efficient and fuel-efficient (Rozmaritsa, 2002, pp. 443-445).

Equally important for environmental discourse is the concept of POLLUTION, which is traditionally reflected in the phrases air pollution, water pollution, and soil pollution. However, the growing attention of society to the problems of environmental pollution has led to a broader understanding of this concept and the selection of new types of this phenomenon and therefore new ways of verbalizing the concept: noise pollution, light pollution, and gene pollution. The concept of POLLUTION is also verbalized with the help of lexemes denoting polluting substances (pollutants), the characteristic feature of which is the use of abbreviations. This contributes to the transition of environmental knowledge from the scientific to the mass level since it is easier for ordinary citizens to remember the short names: PPCPs, PVC, and CFCs. Another reason for the emergence of new concepts is the creation of means that do not pose a threat to the environment. A common feature in the linguistic form of these concepts is the presence of lexical means of expressing the category of negativity: low-sulfur, unleaded, non-GM, mercury-free, and zero-emission (Shytyk et al., 2020).

During the last decade, the problem of global climate change has gained considerable importance in English-speaking societies. In the linguistic picture of the world, this process was affected by the emergence of the CLIMATE CHANGE concept. The increase in the number of natural disasters associated with climate change has led to the establishment of negative associations with the lexeme climate among English speakers. From now on, its meaning includes danger and hostility. This is evidenced by word combinations and compound words (climate-related disasters, weather-triggered disasters, drought-ravaged, heat-related disorders), as well as the combinatorics of the words climate change and global warming, which are

combined with the verbs *combat* and *curb*, which have a common sema "to deal with something unpleasant" (Rozmaritsa 2004, pp. 10-12).

The problem of global climate change is related not only to ecological problems but also to other spheres of society. The complexity of the concept of climate change contributes to the constant expansion of its semantic field, as a result of which language units appear in it, the conceptual and terminological attachment of which to a certain layer of the vocabulary is quite conditional. Thus, in particular, phrases appeared, one of which is semantically related to the concept of CLIMATE CHANGE, and the second is borrowed from the fields of politics (climate policy, climate change meetings, climate talks, climate treaty, anti-global warming plan) or economics (emissions credits, carbon market, emission trading) (Rozmaritsa, 2002, p. 446).

Communication in the field of environmental protection is characterized by the use of specific value concepts and the activation of special evaluation structures, which can be explained by a special type of mentality reflected in the environmental discourse. The traditional system of values is anthropocentric; it is based on a two-valued orientation, which involves the recognition by society of only opposing value concepts, as a result of which life appears as a system of opposites and extremes, which are mutually exclusive ("either-or" system). According to this view, human life is perceived as a "zero-balance game", where the victory of one is simultaneously the defeat of another, where benefit can be gained by harming another. The relationship between man and nature can be characterized in the same way. However, for an environmentally conscious person, the value of objects and phenomena is not measured only by their ability to serve human needs and interests. The efforts of ecologists are aimed, first, at changing public consciousness, rejecting one-dimensional thinking and establishing new values and evaluation criteria that are measured not only by their usefulness for a person or a certain group of people but also by "zero-balance games", which reflect the so-called "situation with both winners" ("win-win" situation). Therefore, in the ecological discourse of the status of values, concepts that combine beneficial and ethical evaluations are acquired—that is, they are simultaneously "favorable" both for nature and for those who enjoy its benefits. The role of positive axiological units in ecological discourse is determined by the prefixes *bio*, *eco*-, and adjectives *green*, *renewable*, *recyclable*, *organic*, and *sustainable*. Negative evaluation is expressed by the units *-scare*, *corporate*, *Mc-* (food scare, corporate greed, McLibel). At the same time, the last two lexemes acquire a purely negative evaluation in the environmental discourse since ecologists largely place responsibility for the destruction of the environment on large corporations, and the McDonald company is one of the most prominent representatives of the world's business giants (Rozmaritsa, 2001, p. 200).

The survey showed "that primary directions of using modern digital tools as means of teaching the mass media language are the formation of a cultural and cognitive context for understanding the functioning of the state language in the mass media and establishing a propaedeutic platform for studying other disciplines" (Mialkowska et al., 2023). The sources of information obtained from the cycle of ecolinguistics in terms of pragmatic perception with the help of mass media include many long-existing and new information platforms. Among them, the following are the most visited:

- The publication "Ecological communication pedagogy and practice" (Milstein et al., 2017). This edition introduces the new concept of the "knowledge negotiator" as a way of reconceptualizing the role of students in the learning process to help students explore the role of environmental communicators in public discourse, through which students see the complexity of environmental issues and learn different perspectives on it, which contributes to public debate about environmental problems (Milstein et al., 2017, 12). Importantly, a variety of environmental communication teaching practices are presented here, ranging from networked digital spaces to art-based practices (e.g., teaching students through community projects, using storytelling as a means of "personal and community transformation", etc.) (Milstein et al., 2017, p. 159);

- The educational platform Prometheus, on which all registered users can receive free informal training in such courses as "Journalistic investigations, advocacy and anticorruption in the field of ecology", "Ecopractices for agriculture and communities", "How to proceed: Business about sustainable development", "How to proceed: To civil servants about sustainable development", and "Household waste - act now!" etc. (Prometheus);

- The International Environmental Communication Association—the association was created in 2011 but has gone from the first conferences on communication and the environment, which were held once every two years (since 1991), to the creation of a platform for communication on environmental issues—a professional magazine, "Environmental Communication" (The International Environmental Communication Association);

- The International Communication Association is an academic association for scholars engaged in the study, teaching and application of all aspects of mediated communication at the international level; promotes research in this field; and operates the Divisions: Environmental Communication, which is a vehicle for promoting the greening of the ICA in the areas of scholarship and education to help communication scholars improve the environmental performance of their universities, media industries, and environmental organizations; the unit supports members of the association integrating the principles of sustainable development into teaching (International Communication Association);

- The Ecodia Center for Environmental Initiatives is a public organization that unites experts and activists around the idea of preserving the environment through influencing decision-making, primarily in the fight for energy efficiency, renewable energy, combating climate change, clean air for all, and the development of sustainable transport and Agriculture of Ukraine (Ecoaction);

- The Green Web Foundation has two offices, Berlin (Germany) and Wageningen (Netherlands), that moderate the electronic directories of green hosting companies. To register in this directory, the company must prove that the website is a real green provider and an actual green user. This can be done by providing evidence of either the use of green energy or strict carbon accounting. Having such an electronic directory makes it easier to find nongovernmental environmental companies, organizations, environmental information, etc. (Green Web Foundation);
- The Journal of Environmental Education, which publishes pedagogical research in the field of environmental and sustainable education, formal and informal, from early childhood to higher and professional education (The Journal of Environmental Education);
- Environmental Communication, which provides a forum for interdisciplinary research and analysis of the many intersections between communication, mass media, society, and environmental issues (The Journal of Environmental Education).

5. Discussions

Environmental issues are gaining increasing importance for modern society and are becoming a significant factor in the everyday life of mankind. A safe environment is becoming one of the main values that candidates for high positions appeal to during election campaigns. In the power structures of almost every country, commissions or departments are dealing with environmental issues. The subject of advertisements of commercial companies is also gradually shifting to the sphere of environmental protection issues. The word "ecology" is now associated not only with science but also with a sociopolitical movement that advocates the development of humanity in harmony with the environment. All these factors testify to the formation of the ecological sphere of human activity and the study of the peculiarities of communication, which can contribute to the development of the general theory of discourse and the theory of communication.

Language, being a multifunctional phenomenon, serves all spheres of social existence and acts as the semantic foundation of social consciousness. In the process of the evolution of the environmental movement in the field of environmental communication, a special ideology was formed, new concepts, terminology, and texts emerged, and certain communicative strategies were developed that required linguistic research. At the same time, the definition of discourse by modern linguists as a "special mental world" or "conceptosphere in dynamics" requires researchers not only to limit themselves to the analysis of communicative strategies that are characteristic of one or another type of discourse but also to search for concepts that constitute its semantic basis to study the peculiarities of verbalization of these concepts in language.

The problems of linguistic and pragmatic aspects of communication in the modern media world are actively studied by a number of modern scientists. In particular, some scientists analyze the phenomenon of communicative linguistics (Mialkovska et al., 2022) based on the concept of the conscious attitude of native speakers toward their communicative activity and the ability to analyze the causes of conflicts or failures in communication, which they see as effective tools for ensuring the harmonization of interpersonal relations. Some scientists (Rozmaritsa et al., 2023) have focused on the development of the main principles of linguistic pragmatics based on a dynamic approach to language, positioning the idea of activity as a methodological basis.

Linguistic pragmatics in a wide range of issues related to the dynamics of discursive analysis and the theory of discourse in general, communicative syntax, the theory of functional styles, psycholinguistics and other directions are studied by a number of modern scientists (Shytyk & Akimova, 2020; Boldyrev, 2000), whose work convincingly testifies to the absence of clear contours in the phenomenon of linguistic pragmatics, although its problem field covers a complex of interdisciplinary issues related to all factors of communication processes.

At the same time, many modern scientists (Talmy, 2000) are convinced that despite the identification of linguistic pragmatics in some studies with all components of the communication process, the phenomenon of communication cannot be reduced only to pragmatics since its participants use the means of the language code with their semantic and syntactic features. In view of this, the identification of linguistic pragmatics as a field of research, within which the functioning of language signs in speech is studied, is more general semiotic than purely linguistic.

The majority of scientists have a common vision regarding the functionality of linguistic and pragmatic aspects of communication in the modern media world, which includes the study of general patterns of human communication using natural language, the analysis of the spectrum of organizational means within the process of communicative interaction, the study of various situational components of communication and the factoricity of the corresponding influence. Despite a significant range of scientific developments on the studied issues, most issues of pragmalinguistic concepts of communication interaction in the modern media world require wider practical research.

6. Conclusions

Therefore, our choice of ecolinguistics based on pragmatic foundations makes it possible to form the ecological culture of the information consumer through linguistic means. At the same time, these linguistic means form a stable linguistic system, and connections, concepts, cores, and other semantic groups inherent only to this system begin to form. Therefore, the

formation of the ecolinguistic direction is currently an important direction that can unify many environmental terms and definitions for their greater recognition in different languages of the world and foster understanding and response to environmental problems, transmission of information through mass channels and solving or raising the problem for discussion. Conducting research in the indicated directions is promising both for solving linguistic problems and for environmental problems because solving global environmental problems requires knowledge from various disciplines, including linguistics.

Ethical considerations

Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding

This research did not receive any financial support.

References

- Akimova, N., Akimova, A., Akimova, A. (2022). The study of the genesis of internet texts understanding in adolescence depending on the level of mental and speech development. *Psycholinguistics*, 31(1), 6-24. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2022-31-1-6-24>
- Baylo, Y. (2011). Cognitive direction as a new approach to language learning. *Bulletin of the Chernivtsi National University*, 3 5-8.
- Boldyrev, N. N. (2000). Cognitive semantics: a course of lectures on philology. Ternopil.
- Center for Environmental Initiatives Ekodia. <https://ecoaction.org.ua/>
- Chenki, A. (1997). Semantics in cognitive linguistics. Fundamental directions of modern American linguistics. Kibrika, A. A., Kobozeva, I. M., Sekerina, I. A. (Ed.). Kyiv, 340 p.
- Discourse as a cognitive-communicative phenomenon (2005). General ed. I. S. Shevchenko, Constanta. Kharkiv.
- Environmental Communication. <https://www.tandfonline.com/journals/renc2>
- Fauconnier, G. (1994). *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 190 p.
- Green Web Foundation. <https://www.thegreenwebfoundation.org/>
- Huzenko, T. A. (2012). Strengthening the role of social networks in ecological communication. *Scientific Notes*. Ukrainian Academy of Printing. 3, 15-23. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nz_2012_3_5
- International Communication Association. <https://www.icahdq.org/group/envirocomm>
- Jackendoff, R. (1988). *Conceptual Semantics. Meaning and Mental Representations*. U. Eco, M. Santambrogio (ed.), PTVioli. Bloomington.
- Johnson-Laird, Ph. N. (1980). Mental models in cognitive science. *Cognitive science*, 4, 71-115.
- Kyseljuk N., Yanovets, A. (2023). Analysis of communication through the prism of emotional ecolinguistics (on the basis of contemporary english discourse). Current issues of humanitarian sciences: interuniversity collection of scientific works of young scientists of Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University. Drohobych: Helvetika Publishing House, 60(5), 23-28.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 614 p.
- Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical prerequisites*, 1. Redwood: Stanford University Press, 540 p.
- Meisner, M. (2020). Environmental communication: what it is and why it matters. <https://www.theieca.org/resources/environmental-communication-what-it-and-why-it-matters>
- Mialkowska, L., Yanovets, A., Solohub, L., Pochapska, O., Reshetnik, H. (2022). Cognitive and Pragmatic Aspects of Media Text in the Digital Context. *International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*, 22(1), 485-490. <https://doi.org/10.22937/IJCSNS.2022.22.1.63>
- Mialkowska, L., Zhvania, L., Rozhylo, M., Yablonsky, M., Hrysiuk, V. (2023). Digital Tools in Teaching the Mass Media Language. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(4), 43-48. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n4p43>
- Milstein, T., Pileggi, M., Morgan, E. (Eds.). (2017). *Environmental Communication Pedagogy and Practice* (1st ed.). Routledge, 298 p.
- Popov, O. O., Kyrlyenko, Y. O., Kameneva, I. P., Iatsyshyn, A. V., Iatsyshyn, A. V., Kovach, V. O., Kiv, A. E. (2022). The use of specialized software for liquid radioactive material spills simulation to teach students and postgraduate students. Paper presented at the CEUR Workshop Proceedings, 3085, 306-322.
- Popova, N. M. (2013). Modeling of the national conceptosphere: semantic analysis and cognitive interpretation. *Problems of word, sentence and text semantics*, 31, 198-206.
- Prometheus. <https://prometheus.org.ua/>
- Rozmaritsa, I. (2000). Linguistic aspects of environmental issues. Materials of the conference Linguistics and verbal communication in the 21st century: trends and perspectives, Logos, Kyiv, May 16-17, 55-57.
- Rozmaritsa, I. O. (2001). Axiologically labeled units in ecological discourse. Linguistic and conceptual pictures of the world: Collection. of science works, Logos, Kyiv, 199-202.
- Rozmaritsa, I. O. (2002). Verbal representation of the climate change concept in the English-speaking picture of the world. Linguistic and conceptual pictures of the world: Collection. of science Pract., Logos, Kyiv, 440-447.
- Rozmaritsa, I. O. (2004). Linguistic features of communication in the field of ecology autoref. Thesis candidate philol. Sciences: spec. 10.02.04 Germanic Languages, Kyiv, 15 p.
- Sandmen, P. (1972). Who Should Police Environmental Advertising? *Columbia Journalism Review*, January/February, 41-47.

- Schank, R. C., Abelson R. P. (1977). *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Hillsdale: N. J., 248 p.
- Selivanova, O. O. (2006). *Modern linguistics: a terminological encyclopedia*. Dozvillia-K, Poltava, 716 p.
- Selivanova, O. O. (2010). *Linguistic encyclopedia*, Dovkillya-K, Poltava, 844 p.
- Shytyk, L., & Akimova, A. (2020). Ways of transferring the internal speech of characters: Psycholinguistic projection. *Psycholinguistics*, 27(2), 361-384. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2020-27-2-361-384>
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge: A Bradford Book. The MIT Press, 1 (Concept Structuring Systems), 565 p.
- The International Environmental Communication Association. <https://theieca.org/>
- The Journal of Environmental Education. <https://www.tandfonline.com/journals/vjee2>