

ровской Германии, теперь вызывали искреннее восхищение и уважение: “This man is your friend. He fights for freedom” («Этот человек – твой друг. Он сражается за свободу» (на плакате изображен советский солдат), “Russia’s front is our front. Admiration is not enough Britain must send more tanks, planes and guns” («Русский фронт – это наш фронт. Восхищения недостаточно, Британия должна послать больше танков, самолетов и орудий»).

Итак, мы объединили совокупность британских военных лозунгов в сверхтекст на основании единой ситуации функционирования: определенного промежутка времени (1939–1946 гг.); ограниченной территории (Британская империя). Характерным признаком сверхтекста британских лозунгов Второй мировой войны является его внутренняя жанровая однородность, закрытость, коллективное авторство.

На основании проведенного анализа плакатных лозунгов Великобритании можем отметить, что цель, которую ставило перед собой правительство, а именно убедить население в необходимости сражаться в данной войне, была достигнута. Значит, социально-исторические потребности, продиктованные временем, нашедшие свое отражение в сверхтексте британских плакатных лозунгов Второй мировой войны, воздействовали на сознание и поведение британского народа, что в свою очередь повлияло на британскую ментальность.

Литература

1. Данилевская Н. В. Сверхтекст // Стилистический энциклопедический словарь русского языка / под ред. М. Н. Кожинной. М.: Флинта: Наука, 2003.
2. Купина Н. А. Сверхтекст и его разновидности // Человек – текст – культура / под ред. Н. А. Купиной, Т. В. Матвеевой. Екатеринбург, 2004.
3. Лошаков А. Г. Сверхтекст: семантика, прагматика, типология: автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. Киров, 2008.
4. Меднис Н. Е. Сверхтексты в русской литературе. Новосибирск: Изд-во Новосибир. гос. пед. ун-та, 2003.
5. Топоров В. Н. Миф. Ритуал. Символ. Образ: исследования в области мифопоэтического. Избранное. М.: Прогресс-культура, 1995.

УДК 81

*E. N. Komarov (Volgograd, Russia)
Volgograd State Social-Pedagogical University*

Media Reality vs. Axiological World Picture

В статье сделана попытка проанализировать роль средств массовой информации, обеспечивающих социализацию человека в современном обществе. Они обучают новым со-

циальным ролям и ценностям, способам регуляции поведения и деятельности в различной обстановке. СМИ, создающие информационное пространство, сегодня оказались самым эффективным инструментом формирования ценностных ориентаций общества.

Ключевые слова: СМИ, картина мира, новостная информация, ценности, образы действительности, медийная реальность

The article attempts to analyze the role of mass media that ensure the socialization of a person in modern society. They teach new social roles and values, ways to regulate behavior and activity in different situation. The mass media, which create an information space, today turned out to be the most effective tool of forming the value orientations of society.

Keywords: mass media, picture of the world, news information, values, images of reality, media reality

The existence and evolution of objective reality, which we define as an existential-social reality, as an environment for an individual's implementation of his social practice, obeys objective laws and patterns many of which are partially or completely outside the field of total control and influence by the subjects of values, and, consequently, beyond the possibility of comprehension by society. Uncontrollable events, crises, natural and man-made disasters remain out of the reach of society.

At the same time, we recognize a priori that the state, social institutions, influence groups and media can control and program, to a certain extent, the evolution of a social component of objective reality.

While having an individual complex of ideas about social reality, the individual is constantly looking for an adequate image of this reality through the perception and processing of messages from outside.

There are several sources of messages affecting the formation of individual picture of the world. First, it is the practice of passive personal perception of the events that occurs around the individual. This "observational" perception takes place in circumstances where the individual does not participate directly in the events, but simply attends and witnesses them. For example, the sight of a cleaned street will allow him to draw conclusions about a good job of municipal services, a high cultural level of the population, etc.

Secondly, it is a practice of active personal perception of the events in which the individual participates directly. It is a personal experience acquired in the process of the individual's communication with the elements of social practice surrounding him. Messages may come from various social and public institutions, may be the result of an unexpected and unplanned communication with occasional communicators. Contacting an insurance company, talking with a random fellow traveler on a train give to an individual the opportunity to gain direct personal experience and make judgments related to perceived reality.

Thirdly, it is a practice of regular communication of the individual within a contact group of which he is a member. These contact groups may be numerous: fam-

ily, friends, colleagues, etc. When communicating within such groups, we can observe either a passive perception of the events by the individual (presence), or active (participation) or mixed (passive-active or active-passive).

Finally, the fourth source of messages that form an individual picture of the world is the media. The activity of the media allows them, with a certain periodicity, to send to the recipients images of a sufficiently clear view of reality by means of an unlimited number of media messages. All these images of reality (political, economic, social, recreational, etc.) form the media picture of the world, the media reality.

The individual axiological picture of the world of a member of society may consist of several elements. First, it is a set of values and convictions (moral and supermoral) [2, c. 4], whose sharing is not objectively necessary for the individual, because they constitute the entity of his exceptional individuality, of his identity. It is a purely individual vision and perception of reality that cannot be shared even if there is an apparently complete coincidence of views and convictions expressed from outside. It is a kind of “inner code”, the “I” within society, that is, the “I” as a being within the “I” member of a group and the “I” public.

Secondly, it is a set of values and beliefs that are formed and “nurtured” (apparently or objectively shared) within the group of like-minded individuals.

As a rule, these are contact groups that are not socially active (family, colleagues, friends). The level of sharing values and convictions within these groups is extremely high. The individual desperately needs to be a member of such groups.

Thirdly, this is a set of values and convictions that the individual objectively and subjectively “manifests”, while following and submitting to rules, norms and laws (social, moral, corporate). This third component is the most unstable and mobile. Judgments formulated at first two levels of values and convictions can interfere with them. However, it is possible that the “intervention” of these judgments at a cognitive level cannot always find its verbal expression. This occurs in case where, according to the individual, the probability of non-sharing or even rejection of values “imported” by him into the “common” vision of reality is high. The individual, provided that he is not confrontational and objectively accepts the rules of a common game, actively and often unconsciously participates in the creation and safeguarding of an acceptable and shared image of reality, which, ultimately, is a collective world picture conventionally acceptable and shared by society.

The existence and processes of correlation of the second and third types of values and beliefs with the surrounding social reality are absolutely necessary for the normal “non-conflict” existence of the first, the most important type, which is perceived by the individual as a tangible confirmation of the correctness and steadfastness of his basic individual values, beliefs and behavioral imperatives.

Such a representation should not deceive us, that there are values for the individual (“inner I”), only for “us” (group of like-minded individuals), and for “all of us” (society). Values are integral, sufficiently stable and they objectively claim the

means of expression. Their essence remains the same, but the form, intensity, concentration and degree of expression depend directly on external conditions.

For example, a convinced nationalist deeply hates “visiting foreigners” and he writes about it in his diary. He can openly express and “feed” his rejection of this culture by communicating to a group of like-minded people. However, as a member of society, where the principle of the equality of races and cultures is apparently shared by the majority, legalized by the state and recognized by social institutions, the individual, provided that one is not confrontational and respects laws, can only occasionally express his hostile attitude towards visitors. He externally maintains a common tolerant attitude towards other cultures and thus participates in the safeguard of the generally accepted and conventionally shared image of “objective” reality, collective image of reality.

The collective picture of the world or the collective image of reality is something virtual, conventional, very vague, dynamically mobile and having no clearly defined boundaries. However, this “something” represents the result of a conscious and controllable compromise in the choice of the forms and means of the materialization of axiological preference complexes. Individuals consent to this compromise in their objective aspiration to be communication partners, i.e. members of society.

The collective picture of the world is represented by a set of common, related or identical clusters of individual images of reality. A modern man learns the world occasionally, by trial and error, accumulating chaotic knowledge obtained from personal experience, television and radio broadcasts, newspapers, information acquired by chance or by necessity. The individual mainly draws his ideas and views that allow him to evaluate, classify and systematize impressions of objects and phenomena from the mass media. "The culture of society turns into a collection of different stories, and it is this combination of random elements that creates and defines a “mosaic culture” [1, p. 96].

However, new images and representations often do not lend themselves to classification. They do not fit into either the old categories and ideas, or “have a strange, fluid, incoherent form” [5, p. 99].

Since the models of reality are constantly transmitted through various information channels, the individual has less and less need to create his own picture of the world. He, most often, borrows it from the mass media. “Communication is an intrusion into the recipient's system of consciousness, the construction of a certain model of the world in his cognitive system, which does not necessarily coincide with the speaker's model of the world and the ontologically existing picture of the world” [4, p. 123].

The mass media, which create an information space, turned out to be the most effective tool for forming the value orientations of society. They are a defining element, change the nature of social groups, regulate the interaction of groups or a subject with a new environment for him and create a model of the reality of modern individual.

Returning to the question of the role of media in shaping the axiological picture of the world and society, we have to admit the existence of another parallel reality, defined as media reality.

Media reality is a complex of images of reality constantly produced and disseminated by media for all recipients in the form of media messages that actively influence the formation of the collective consciousness of society. It is a picture of the world composed of messages about the most diverse events that constitute the elements of society's everyday social practice, of its social reality. The picture of the world spread by media is a conceptually infinite message that has no physical boundaries, a sort of metadiscourse generated by objective social reality and addressed to the subjects of this reality [3, p. 65].

Media reality, being a product of social reality, tends at the same time to replace this social reality. Massive pressure from the media, to which individuals are permanently exposed, leads to a gradual replacement of direct communication by the consumption of the transmitted image of reality. In this way, the consumer of media messages moves from social reality that is to say from the practice of communicating with real communicators, in the media reality.

If in the social reality the individual more or less clearly imagines what “the truth” and “the fiction” are, media reality broadcasts at every moment an “alloy” of half-truth and half-fiction inconceivable by its composition. As a result, the individual's world picture becomes fundamentally dynamic, changeable from one situation to another, from one media message to another.

Being formed within the social reality to which they belong, the individual picture of the world, values and behavioral imperatives, under such conditions, are in fact out of its reach, since their shaping is largely managed by the reality of media. It dictates in many ways the rules of life in social reality, manipulating the realities of everyday life, tastes, habits, aesthetic and political preferences, etc. The reality of the media gradually replaces social reality, creating a media habitat for the individual, a sort of quasi-reality.

The media environment in which the individual spends several hours a day whose dimensions begin to approach the social reality and its attractiveness is much higher. One of the main features of this new reality is that the individual does not see what is before of his eyes or outside the window. On the contrary, the individual sees what does not exist nearby.

Thus, we come to the conclusion that in the relatively naturalistic images of reality transmitted by media, the quasi-media reality is being formed. It has a set of parallel values (quasi-real values). They are finally able to influence the set of the individual's values shaped in the conditions of real social practice.

Being polysemic, media texts are capable to have an almost unlimited number of interpretations. At the same time, a very relevant question for the study of the functioning of the media arises: how much media texts correspond to reality, how comprehensively and objectively the media represent reality.

References

1. Злобин Н. С. Становление информационного общества и перспективы личности // Цивилизация. Культура. Личность / отв. ред. В. Ж. Келле. М., 1999. С. 96.
2. Карасик В. И. О категориях лингвокультурологии // Языковая личность: проблемы коммуникативной деятельности: сб. науч. тр. Волгоград: Перемена, 2001. С. 3–16.
3. Комаров Е. Н. К вопросу о современной информационной картине мира // *Lingua-mobilis*. Челябинск, 2010. № 7(26). С. 61–66.
4. Самосудова Г. Г. Художественный текст – субъективный образ объективного мира // Концептуальная картина мира и интерпретативное поле текста с позиций лингвистики, журналистики и коммуникативистики. Барнаул, 2000. С. 123–174.
5. Тоффлер О. Третья волна // США – Экономика, политика, идеология. 1982. № 7. С. 99.

УДК 378.147

*R. B. Mambetova, D. K. Bekpulatova (Nukus, Uzbekistan)
Karakalpak University named after Berdakh*

Speech etiquette as a reflection of the culture of an ethnic group

The article deals with the issues of interlingual communication, the formulas of speech etiquette and their national characteristics.

Keywords: speech etiquette, means of communication, national character, situation, ethnic culture, greetings, farewells

Communication is a multidimensional process of interaction between two or more interlocutors, involving the exchange of information, emotions and feelings, the establishment of tolerant relationships.

Interlingual communication has verbal and non-verbal means of communication.

Speech etiquette as a reflection of the culture of the ethnic group are elements of the code of the Karakalpaks and Russians, as well as a means of interpreting facial expressions, gestures, postures of a person in a particular communication situation.

The language reflects the national character and forms it through the use of certain language units that characterize the speech behaviour of a representative of a particular people, as well as non-verbal signs in the process of communication.

Each ethnolinguistic culture has its own specific features, typical only for her features of verbal and non-verbal behaviour in a certain communicative situation.

Emphasizing the role of speech etiquette in human relationships, N. I. Formanovskaya points out that speech etiquette not only “reflects a special level of information that we exchange in communication”, but also “opens the doors to our human interactions” [3, p. 51].