

DOI: 10.24234/wisdom.v17i1.411

Marina KARNAUKHOVA,
Irina ARYABKINA,
Irina TALINA,
Margarita LUKYANOVA,
Sergey DANILOV,
Oleg KHASYANOV

AXIOLOGICAL COMPONENT IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND ITS ANALYSIS IN THE PROCESS OF TRAINING MASTERS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Abstract

This article analyzes approaches (philosophical, linguistic and historical) to the concept of “value” in the political discourse. When some critical events occur in the country or in the world, there is the transformation of axiological concepts. The article substantiates the point of view that the process of identification with a sociocultural community is clearly seen in modern political leaders.

Based on philosophical and historical analysis, the authors disclose the transformation of the concept of “value”.

In each language, one can trace the component of categorization and assessment of political reality. Modern problems of transforming society and ensuring its sustainable development lead to the evaluation of the value system.

The application of various scientific methods (including theoretical analysis of the provisions of philosophical, historical, pedagogical, sociological, cultural science) made it possible to perform this study.

Keywords: linguistic map of the world, linguistic, political space, concepts, socio-cultural self-identification, value orientations, political values, political ideals.

Introduction

In order to reveal the essence of the transformation of the axiological concept in political discourse, it is necessary to turn to the concept of the “linguistic picture of the world”.

“Linguistic picture of the world” is an integrated set of images of reality that exists in the individual or collective consciousness and is reflected in a communicative activity.

The linguistic picture of the political world is a complex combination of mental units (concepts, frames, domains, gestalts, scenarios, conceptual vectors, fields), which are related to the political sphere of communication and political discourse. Most of these units are fixed in the language with the help of words, compound words, phrase units and impose on a person a certain vision of the world, especially in terms of its categorization and evaluation.

The linguistic picture of the political world exists in mind.

Political consciousness is the subject's perception of that part of reality associated with politics, with the issues of power and subordination, with the state and institutions (Gozman & Shestopal, 1996, pp.113-125).

It is accepted to follow a particular scheme of generating political behaviour in political psychology. One should take into account a number of things: the external environment, which sends incentives to the subject of behaviour. Shestopal E. pays attention to the motives which lead the individual or the group to perform some activity. These motives are values, orientations, attitudes, beliefs and goals of the subject; personal characteristics of the role, style of decision-making, style of interpersonal relations, cognitive style; actual actions and deeds; feedback between behaviour and conditions (Shestopal, 2000, pp. 463-467).

The individual develops certain political attitudes as a result of the influence of the factors as mentioned above. These political attitudes are called political mentality.

The mentality is understood as "a way of perceiving and understanding reality, determined by a set of cognitive stereotypes of consciousness. These cognitive stereotypes are characteristic to a particular person, social or ethnic group of people" (Popova & Stermin, 2003, p. 7).

Consequently, the political mentality is a way of perception and understanding of political reality by an individual, social, ethnic group and the whole people (ethnos). It is important to define the concept of linguistic picture of political reality. This concept embraces such mental fields as a political struggle, subjects of political activity, state authorities etc. Each field contains concepts that refer to this field, for example, political

organizations, political parties, political leaders, voters, citizens represent the mental field "subjects of political activity", concepts elections, demonstrations, meetings refer to "political struggle and its forms", concepts representative, executive, judicial, federal, regional refer to "state authorities" etc.

The expressed meanings in every language form a particular unified system of views. The way of conceptualizing reality peculiar to this language is partly universal, partly nationally specific. The speakers use different languages, and that is why they can see the world a little differently. The picture of the world changes in the course of historical development – influenced by the subject's sphere of activity. That is why it would be wrong to recognize the uniformity of the picture of the world. Therefore, it would be right to speak not about the picture of the world in general, but the pictures of the world as a reflection of the reality of people of different cultures and eras, people of different professional backgrounds.

Theoretical Framework

The concept of a linguistic picture of the world includes two related but different ideas:

- 1) the picture of the world which is offered by the language differs from the "scientific" one (in this sense, the term "naive picture of the world" is also used);
- 2) each language "paints" its picture, depicting reality somewhat differently than other languages do (Apresyan, 1995, p. 38).

The reconstruction of the linguistic picture of the world is the critical problem of linguistic semantics nowadays, which deals with the reconstruction of an integral system of representations reflected in a given language, and explores

individual (linguistic-specific) concepts that are characteristic of a given language. These concepts are so-called “keys” to culture. These key concepts in one culture do not have equivalents in other languages very often, and therefore translators use different ways of translating these realities (transcription and transliteration, creating a new/complex word, contextual translation, similar translation, hyponymic translation).

For example, a *maverick* is a statesman who takes a position different from others; *address* - speech at plenary meetings of the General Assembly, etc. (Amirkhanova & Dudochkina, 2019, pp. 293-295).

Realities, referring to the elements which have no equivalents in the other language, are difficult to translate. They are connected with background knowledge. Realities are words (and phrases) that name objects which are characteristic of the life (everyday life, culture, social and historical development) of people of one country and alien to another country.

These words express national and/or historical colour; they, as a rule, do not have exact equivalents in other languages, and, therefore, they cannot be translated just by applying standard rules. They require a unique approach.

The political space is part of the entire communication space. Communicative space and political space are related as a whole and a part. The political space is characterized by a dynamic structure because it is a material resource for politics. It is the space for the struggle of parties, slogans, theories, and movements to observe the relationships between actors (people, states, classes, systems). Karnaukhova M. V. (2000) notes that “these actors communicate and contradict, parties and interests clash. Sometimes they find the opportunity to cooperate, and they stop risking and struggling. These political processes can

differ in intensity and depth because they depend on many things: the nature of horizontal and vertical ties, relations between the centre and the periphery, relations of subjects, the concentration of economic, military, social, political, ideological forces and factors acting in the sphere of the world (regional and local space, international and national, global, international” (pp. 29-34).

Every society is characterized by dynamism in political life. There are a centre and a periphery in the political organization of any system. The political life of society always unfolds in space and time.

Understanding political discourse presupposes the knowledge of the background, the expectations of the author and the audience, ulterior motives, plot patterns that exist in a particular era. Political discourse is directly related to value orientations in society. Value categories are often viewed as semantic and cognitive constructs (Shapochkin, 2012, p. 59).

While studying the theory of political culture or its features, analyzing the problems of political participation, it is necessary to focus on the specific political values of certain social groups. The problem of reflecting this phenomenon in the complex of its components is also worth mentioning.

A value is considered to be everything that has a certain significance, personal or social meaning. Accordingly, “anti-value” is perceived as undesirable, harmful, against which the political activity subjects are fighting.

This capacity can be an object, process, person, event, all the variety of objects of human activity, social relations and natural phenomena, assessed by an individual or group in terms of its importance for the life of the subject. The methods and criteria based on which the assessment of the relevant phenomena is carried out are

fixed in the public consciousness and culture as “subject values”, expressed in the form of normative ideas and serving as guidelines for the subject’s activity. Since the value is directly related to the purpose and motivation of activity, it is not only a stimulating, “nudging” but also a directing component of it (Lukyanova & Danilov, 2014, pp. 680-687).

Value orientations are an ordered system of values, hierarchized according to the criterion of their significance for the subject. It can be individual or collective. Value orientations can be easily changed because they are influenced by political and socio-economic changes. The world is very dynamic and what was of no value at one time becomes significant, and people have to rethink and reassess values.

Modern problems of transforming society and ensuring its sustainable development lead to the necessity to rethink the value system. The difficulty in defining value orientations lies in the change of cultural paradigms and in the fact that “different peoples use the same names for values, but put up different semantic content in them.

The concept “value” was understood by different researchers in different ways.

The sociological concept of values interpreted the value as a norm, a way of being, which is significant for the subject. M. Weber (1990) applied this concept to explain social action and social knowledge (p. 33).

The famous American psychologist A. Maslow (1997) believed that value is an electoral principle, a selective attitude that is taken from needs (pp. 61-68).

The German philosopher H. Rickert (1998) thought that the problem of value is the problem of “significance” (p. 74).

Another German sociologist, philosopher, social psychologist, psychoanalyst E. Fromm be-

lieved that values contribute to a fuller development of specific human abilities, supporting life (Fromm, 1993, p. 44).

The representative of the American sociological theory, the head of the school of structural functionalism, T. Parsons (1998), believed that “norms and values are the basis of social life” (p. 76).

Much attention was also paid to values in the works of Soviet and Russian scientists. The Soviet and Russian psychologist B. S. Bratus (1988) believes that values are the conscious meanings of life (p. 92). The Soviet and Russian philosopher and culturologist, an expert in the field of philosophy, history of culture, theory of value, theory of aesthetics, expressed his point of view on this problem: “Value is the meaning of a given object for a subject, this is a specific relationship, because it does not connect the object with another object, but it connects the object with the subject... Value arises in the object-subject relation, and it is neither quality of an object, nor an experience of another object (a person)” (Kagan, 1997, p. 29).

Value is a set of social and natural objects (things, phenomena, processes, ideas, knowledge, samples, models, standards, etc.). The value determines the vital activity of a person, the society within the objective laws of development of a person or society.

Value arises from the comparison, which is expressed with the help of thoughts in a particular judgment, ideal images of the world of reality. The value determines the development of a person and a community.

There are numerous scientific theories about understanding value. The objective naturalistic theory considers value as an objective property of the object itself. The objective-transcendental theory asserts that value exists outside the act of

assessment as a transcendental being that dictates a norm of behaviour to a person. The Marxist theory links the concept of value with social being and practical activities of people, explaining the objective, socio-historical nature of values. Subjective psychological theory is based on the assumption that value is not an inherent property of the object. It is the mental attitude of the subject to the object.

All these philosophical ideas about the nature of values influenced the study of values significantly in the context of other sciences.

Thus, in pedagogy, values are considered in a wide variety of contexts (for example, through the prism of family relations (Donina, Salikhova, Aryabkina, Chernova, & Kovardakova, 2019, pp. 58-68); as an important component of a teacher's professional competence (including cultural and aesthetic competence) (Aryabkina, 2015, p. 214), etc.). Some researchers emphasize the importance of art in forming the value bases of cultural and aesthetic perception of the surrounding reality (Aryabkina, Spiridonova, Kapranova, Savaderova, & Mayorova, 2019, pp. 514-520).

The study of values in political science and linguistics is very important for us.

Value representations exist, as a rule, in a verbalized form and are reflected in the language of people. The system of values can vary significantly from culture to culture, and the principle of cultural relativity seems to be quite relevant in this case.

Political values are understood not only as ideals but also as clearly described norms, legalized regulations that must be observed.

Political anthropologists from different countries, in their studies, conclude that the idea of the uniqueness of political forms and traditions of different peoples, which they should preserve

as a particular value, appeared in political science. The world of every person has a bright socio-cultural colouring, and so does the political sphere. Each civilization develops and cultivates certain personal qualities in people, and children learn these cultural values from an early age.

V. I. Karasik divides values into external and internal. External values include material objects of culture which are significant for its representatives. Inner values are a system of beliefs and ideas about good and bad. For cultural linguistics, the values of the second type are of greatest interest due to the diversity of their linguistic implementation and ambiguity of interpretation (Karasik, 2002, p.85). V. I. Karasik proposes the classification according to which values are divided into individual, macro-group, ethnic and universal.

The famous American psychologist M. Rokeach devoted his life to the study of personal and social values. He believed that human values are relatively few, and they are organized into a system. He believed that all people operate with the same set of value concepts, although not to the same extent. M. Rokeach divides values into terminal, that is, those values that are related to the goals of individual existence, and instrumental, which are associated with the ways of achieving goals. In addition, M. Rokeach suggested that all values be organized hierarchically and have different meanings for individuals of different sex, age, wealth, etc. The works of M. Rokeach demonstrate the transition from the perception of values as abstract concepts of morality to their concretization in connection with the daily activities of a person. M. Rokeach (1973) defines values as a deep belief that a particular behaviour or final state is individually or socially conditioned and preferable in comparison with the opposite behaviour or the final state (p. 72).

If a person from any country identifies himself with this particular culture, the values of this culture become his personal. The process of identification means not only the acceptance of these traditions but also the transmission of these sociocultural traditions from one generation to another.

The French philosopher G. Le Bon visited many countries and described his impressions from these travels. He thought that every nation had soul, feelings, thoughts, beliefs and everything expressed in art (Le Bon, 1995, p. 14).

Traditionally, faith is very important in Russian culture. The individual was also important but less than faith. People lived and died with this faith. A person is ready to believe in an idea and serve it. Folk proverbs and sayings reflect the archetypal traits of the Russian character: “Open the soul” (the archetype of honesty, sincerity, frankness). Radicalism is also one of the most ancient archetypes of the Russian national character. Russian character can manifest a desire to take everything to extremes. Russian people can demonstrate a rigid line of behaviour, and then suddenly they change their minds “with all the breadth of their souls”. Another folk proverb says: “Russians harness for a long time, but they go fast”. It means that Russian people are characterized by a certain slowness from the very beginning, and then they can suddenly fulfil all plans, catch up and even overtake.

Western civilization considers a person, his mind to be the greatest value. Suppose something is created by a person, then it deserves evaluation. This civilization never supported anything collective. Another concept is worth mentioning. That is material progress. Every individual is responsible for the welfare of society. People are born to work in Western civilization. The prosperity of one person can lead to prosperity in

the whole country. Thus material progress is encouraged and respected by this society. Material values are preferable in the West. Private property is sacred there.

G. Lessing (2017) wrote that a German was “born to act” (p. 41). The Germans themselves admit their obsession with work, which is unknown neither to the British, with their conservatism, nor the French, with their love of life, nor the Italians, with their playfulness. The Germans are capable of working with an iron determination without weakness and fatigue. The Germans themselves note that their culture is a culture of perseverance, where the technique easily degenerates into schematism. A sense of duty is decisive for the German mentality. Even among Europeans, Germans stand out for their selfishness and individualism (Lessing, 2017 p. 41).

The main value of the “Confucian” East is clan solidarity. This solidarity gives rise to patriotism, love for the homeland, a desire to work in its name. There is a sacralization of political power in the East. Religion is closely connected with the state in many Eastern countries. The state is separated from society and does not depend on it. Moreover, the state in the East has always been given a sacred character. The power-property dominates, and politics and morality are often not separated from each other (Vasilenko, 2011, pp. 257-267).

American sociologist N. Smelser (1994) notes that American culture asserts such values as self-confidence, self-control and aggressiveness (p. 56). Americans believe sincerely that the United States is a chosen nation, blessed by the Providence to save the world, which is in sin.

Today, the messianic style in US foreign policy is manifested especially strongly, which is associated with the claims to the role of global leadership. The cult of leadership is a characteris-

tic feature of Americans. N. D. Totmyanin, who researched the problems of political socialization in the West, cited the data of opinion polls. When US citizens were asked to determine which of the political values – freedom or equality – was more important, 72% of them opted for freedom, and only 25% chose equality. The Americans have a very developed cult of success and competition (Totmyanin, 1995, pp. 29-41).

Identification methods largely depend on the historical era, political system and political ideology. During the period of Antiquity, the politician identified himself with the community of free citizens since civil society and the state were not yet separated. In the epoch of the Middle Ages, divine providence was recognized as the source of political power, and the monarchs identified themselves not with their subjects but with the institution of the state. This found expression in the famous phrase of Louis XIV: “The state is I!” (Vasilenko, 2011, pp. 257-267).

The identification of national interests with state interests reached its ultimate level in the totalitarian states of the XX century. A politician cares “about the welfare of the people” in such a society. He emphasizes the right of the ruling party (or the leader of the people) to a priori knowledge of “great truth”.

Liberal democracy requires that politicians identify with their constituents. As noted by G.G. Diligensky (1994), in these conditions, it becomes possible “for identification on the basis of empathy. There is a leader’s orientation to meet the needs of the people led by him, to include their will and aspirations in the process of making political decisions” (p. 210). At the same time, a politician retains his identity with the institution of power (the state) in a democratic society. The demonstration and assertion of “great power” and the power of the state are often the

main goals of modern democratic leaders.

Sociocultural self-identification of a politician takes place within the framework of duality in a democratic society: a politician feels himself to be both a representative of the government (state) and a representative of the will of the majority of voters. These two often divergent identities overlap with his personal motives and political goals (Diligensky, 1994, p. 210).

The history of each civilization presents us many examples when, in an unusually short time, under the influence of circumstances, the political convictions of people underwent sharp changes. In the era of significant religious and political crises, ideals and values can be easily changed.

American political scientists G. Almond and S. Verba, in their work “Civic Culture. Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Countries”, emphasize that there is a nationwide consensus on basic values in the West, which gives political culture a profound homogeneity (Almond & Verba, 1963, pp. 323-374). Within the framework of such culture, there is no single universally significant picture of the world: each person builds a hierarchy of values around his specific “I” here since it is individuality that is primary and valuable in itself. The values are considered to be true if they can be affirmed in the course of rational argumentation. Thus, values turn into a derivative of his interests. Values are fixed in various forms if they are based on moral activity, moral behaviour, attitudes, consciousness or forms. They are illustrated by the content of the beautiful, perfect, ideal if it somehow relates to the aesthetic side of social consciousness and activity. They can be the canons of certain religions, and they can be related to the confessional life of a person or society.

Value orientations are a stable expression of

moral consciousness. The change in the content of value orientations that determine the general direction of human activity and his interactions with the world and with people is due to socio-economic and political changes which take place in the world, in the country, and it becomes the starting point for rethinking and reassessing the main values.

A person “lives” in a socio-cultural space, which is the unity of the experience of activity and the experience of his relationship to the world, to people and to himself. It is necessary both for the reproduction, broadcasting of this experience and for the development of their ability for moral creativity, for the crystallization of moral values.

Political science, like any fundamental scientific field, proceeds from well-defined and strict laws and principles and any human activity, including political. It is based and guided by values. Values establish the conditions for the development of society, which give stability to it.

The value interpretation of the world, representing perspective assessments, enables people to navigate the world. The world of politics is formed through assessment and measurement. Any political analysis is based on certain value prerequisites that cannot be chosen arbitrarily but are always correlated with social ideals and are significant for society. When value assumptions are selected and clearly defined, they, combined with factual analysis, make possible conclusions that, in turn, can form the basis of any rational policy. Despite the recognition of the special meaning-forming and guiding role of values in real politics, the concept of political values is one of the most contradictory and insufficiently defined in political science.

It is well known that the development of any science, including political science, is carried

out on the basis of conceptual tools. Concepts are the essence of knowledge. These logical constructions contribute to obtaining clear ideas about the studied phenomena. Through visual perception, we cannot decide whether we should analyze values in terms of the ideal or the real, subjective or objective, as a relation or as a quality.

Reflection on political phenomena opens up certain promising opportunities for productive analysis of the problem as a whole, and it also defines the contours of new problem areas. This is one of the main channels for the development and enrichment of scientific knowledge.

When analyzing the concept of “political value”, values are the most important. The nature and essence of the phenomenon of value cannot be revealed only from the standpoint of politics or economics, law or morality, in the context of which values manifest and function. Values do not determine the essence of a particular sphere of human activity – political, economic, legal and any other.

It is necessary to use the potential of modern axiology, psychology, sociology, anthropology, i.e. those scientific disciplines that develop value problems in order to make a comprehensive development of the problem of political values. It should be recognized that building an interdisciplinary approach to values is the only sensible strategy because this approach can provide us with the necessary data and will give us the opportunity to analyze the value concept better.

The main purpose of the interdisciplinary approach is to develop a common understanding. Constructive axiology often comes instead of the classical philosophical theory of values nowadays. Constructive axiology is based on such postulates as historicism and the understanding of the need for constant renewal of values in the

process of development of society, as well as the variation in the context of various cultural environments.

The founder of Rome Club, A. Peccei (1988), who largely determined the direction and priorities of the research, spoke about the prospects of “establishing harmony between outdated value systems and continuously changing reality” (p. 23).

Political phenomena are complex in nature, and they manifest themselves in a variety of ways in various cultural and historical contexts. The definition of political concepts is characterized by complexity, multidimensionality, and it has different values. Conceptual disputes aimed at finding the primacy of a particular definition are normative (evaluative) in nature since the expression of a certain value is an integral part of the concept itself.

Conceptual debates are also a form of political activity. They clash not only with the theoretical preferences of analysts but also with the political perspectives which they support. Political values are represented in social ideals, which are the creation of public consciousness. These values concerning different spheres of political life are generalized, and an ideal mental model is presented. This ideal mental model becomes the norm, which is hard to perform. This is a goal for achieving, and it needs planning, direction, methods, etc.

Political ideals exist in the public consciousness in a particular society because they reflect the political experience of this society, and the realization of these ideas can change peoples' lives. There is a great difference between the real political values of a society and ideals. Political ideals are expressed in ideological theories, and they can be the driving force to unite the country, open new perspectives to ac-

tivity and consolidation, they can show the direction of development.

Some ideals are really valuable. Each nation should have a goal, which can activate energy, power and desire. When the country faces some difficult situation, these ideals encourage to work even more, and they became vital.

In order to achieve some ideals a society needs norms, that is, methods and means. Political values are hard to achieve; they are like a dream or a model. Though they are difficult or impossible to get, they are desirable by everybody. For example, political ideals for human rights, personal freedom, civil society and many other political ideals are fixed in many documents, manifests (norms) nowadays. Many documents will appear later, and they will influence the behaviour, attitude of citizens in many societies.

Methodology of the Implemented Research

The study was based on methods of theoretical analysis of the provisions of philosophical, historical, pedagogical, sociological, cultural studies. The retro-specific analysis of Soviet, Russian and foreign experience in the use of the axiological concept in political discourse, theoretical methods (comparison, analogy, analysis, synthesis, abstraction, concretization, classification), traditional pedagogical methods (observation, questionnaire), methods of programmed training (presentation of information, execution of programmed tasks, monitoring and correction) have been used for the research. The statistical method was applied for quantitative analysis.

Results

Every person identifies himself with a par-

ticular socio-cultural community (social group, culture, state), and this process of identification takes place in the psyche of any person.

This process is especially evident among political leaders and politicians because they represent party, class, culture, state. At the same time, the emphasized identification of a politician with his country, nation, culture is not only a psychological but also a professional characteristic.

The political behaviour of each politician, to one degree or another, is a reaction to events taking place in society and in the world. Each politician chooses his position, focusing on the historically established political organizations, parties and institutions.

The text of a political speech, as a rule, is dedicated or contains a reference to an event that forms the relevance of a political statement. In addition, politicians turn to the most significant value concepts since this tactic allows them to achieve the greatest persuasiveness of the speech and ensures the implementation of the main pragma-communicative goal of the speaker.

Thus, the analysis of speeches of political leaders made in difficult, critical periods helps to determine and trace the relationship and interdependence of such categories as value and event, determine which value concepts are the most important to people during a crisis, or, conversely, economic well-being, as well as to identify what value concepts seem to be the most powerful and influential in terms of impact on the audience.

For our analysis, we took the speeches of three leaders of the countries: V. V. Putin (Russia), D. Trump (USA) and Xi Jinping (China). The undergraduate students who study in the speciality "Political Science" in Ulyanovsk State University were asked to answer the following

questions: to what period the speeches of V. V. Putin (Russia), D. Trump (USA) and Xi Jinping (China) belong, what helped you to determine the right time of the creation of these speeches, what is the object (or objects) of these speeches and what value concepts were used in them. All speeches were taken from the plenary meeting of the Jubilee, 75th session of the United Nations General Assembly, held on September 22, 2020.

The speeches of Xi Jinping (China) and D. Trump (USA) were presented to the undergraduates in Russian translation. The task of the analysis was not only to identify value concepts but also to place these concepts according to classification.

These speeches were dedicated to the 75th anniversary of the United Nations and the global coronavirus pandemic. Our goal was to prove that the global coronavirus pandemic is represented in the discourse as the event that forms the value-event picture in the world. The most important for this study was to show the tactics of building value hierarchies.

At the first stage, the undergraduates identified the main value concepts in the speeches of the leaders of three countries.

At the second stage, the undergraduates calculated the concepts, especially those which they met more than one time. It was important to determine the high frequency of words denoting the corresponding values in the given speeches.

At the third stage, it was necessary to arrange the concepts in accordance with the proposed classifications of values: 1) The highest values are humanity, man; 2) The second group is represented by material values. We can refer to tools, labour, natural resources and, of course, the products or tools which are important for mankind for its reproduction; 3) The main values of social life are in the third group. The common

values are state, class, nation, family. These values can change from country to country, and for example, “family” can be the main value in one country but can be of no value in another; 4) This group is represented by the main concepts of cultural and spiritual values. The common values are moral, philosophical concepts, scientific knowledge; 5) This group represents political values. We usually refer to human rights, democracy, freedom, the rights of the nation, etc., to this group.

From the point of view of the importance of objects for society and a person, it was necessary to determine: 1) absolute values – objects or properties that everywhere and always preserve the value of unconditional value for people: life, health, knowledge; 2) relative values – objects and their properties, the value of which changes for any reason (historical, class, etc.) (Chudinov, 2009, pp. 36-37).

In the context of belonging to a certain time period, all the speeches of the leaders were certainly related to the events of 2020, since the main problems discussed at the plenary session were the 75th anniversary of the United Nations and the global coronavirus pandemic. All the undergraduates could define the time correct.

As for the object of assessment, here, the objects were different. Within the framework of V. V. Putin’s speech, the objects of speech were: the UN Security Council, the UN, the UN Charter, the League of Nations, the World Health Organization and the global coronavirus pandemic. The undergraduates could estimate these objects through the author’s special attitude.

The objects of D. Trump’s speech were: the USA, the World Health Organization, China, the UN, and the global coronavirus pandemic. The objects of Xi Jinping’s speech were: UN, the USA, China and the global coronavirus pandem-

ic.

The central place of V. V. Putin’s speech was dedicated to the 75th anniversary of the United Nations Organization (15 concepts) and to the struggle with the coronavirus pandemic. The undergraduates identified the main concepts, which concerned the coronavirus pandemic: “epidemic” – 1, “pandemic” – 5, “virus” – 5, “vaccine” – 4, “the World Health Organization” – 3, “health” and “healthcare” – 2, “personal protective equipment” – 1, “quarantine” – 1. Thus, 22 concepts are associated with the greatest problem of humanity, that is, with the coronavirus pandemic. The undergraduates found 11 concepts connected with “international law” and “world order” in the speech of Russian President V. V. Putin. The concepts “integration growth”, “integration associations”, “innovations”, “new technologies” were used 10 times.

In D. Trump’s speech, the undergraduates revealed a high frequency of the usage of such concepts: “we” – 29, “the USA” – 11, “I” – 10. Eight concepts are associated with the greatest problem of humanity, that is, with the coronavirus pandemic: “virus” – 4, “pandemic” – 1, “vaccine” – 2, “the World Health Organization” – 1. The undergraduates identified 9 concepts of “China” in D. Trump’s speech. A particular feature of D. Trump’s speech was the frequency of the usage of concepts related to “human rights” – 11 concepts. Environmental problems were also voiced by D. Trump. The number of concepts is 5. The United Nations was mentioned 4 times in D. Trump’s speech.

Xi Jinping’s speech also touched upon the most important problem of the whole world – the struggle with the coronavirus pandemic. The undergraduates recorded the following concepts: “epidemic” – 11, “pandemic” – 7, “virus” – 6, “the World Health Organization” – 1, “vaccine”

– 1, “healthcare” – 1. Thus, there were used 27 concepts, and this indicated the leader’s great concern about the pandemic. Xi Jinping noted the great role of the United Nations – 11 concepts, and he also used the concepts of “global challenges”, “economic globalization”, “global governance” 14 times. Environmental problems turned out to be the least used concepts – 2. The Chinese leader mentioned his country 7 times, and the USA was mentioned only twice.

As a result of the analysis, the following conclusion can be drawn: the coronavirus pandemic is now central to the policies of three states. It was proved that the global coronavirus pandemic is represented in the discourse as an event that forms the value-event picture in the world. The undergraduates placed the concepts related to the global coronavirus pandemic to the highest values because the lives of people all over the world depend on the effective struggle with this illness. It was also proved that the process of identification with a sociocultural community could be clearly seen in modern political leaders because the high frequency of words denoting the corresponding values showed that. All leaders noted the special role of the UN. As for other problems, here, each state has its own problems and tasks that require attention and solution.

Conclusion

The linguistic picture of the political world is a complex combination of mental units (concepts, frames, domains, gestalts, scenarios, conceptual vectors, fields). It is expressed in words, compounds, and phrase units. The political space is part of the entire communication space. The political space is characterized by a dynamic structure because it is a material resource for politics.

The concept “value” was understood by different researchers in different ways. It should be recognized that building an interdisciplinary approach to values is the only sensible strategy.

Value representations exist, as a rule, in a verbalized form and are reflected in the language of people. The system of values can vary significantly from culture to culture, and the principle of cultural relativity seems to be quite relevant in this case.

Value orientations can be easily changed because they are influenced by political and socio-economic changes. The world is very dynamic and what was of no value at one time becomes significant, and people have to rethink and reassess values.

Every person identifies himself with a particular socio-cultural community (social group, culture, state), and this process of identification takes place in the psyche of any person.

This process is especially evident among political leaders and politicians because they represent party, class, culture, state.

The speeches of the leaders at the plenary meeting of the jubilee 75th session of the United Nations General Assembly held on September 22, 2020, were chosen as the material for studying the value aspect of political discourse. These speeches were dedicated to the 75th anniversary of the United Nations and the global coronavirus epidemic. In the course of the research, special attention was paid to considering the linguistic representation of the value category. It was concluded that the category of value exists in the consciousness of the individuals. It was proved that the global coronavirus pandemic is represented in the discourse as an event that forms the value-event picture in the world. The undergraduates placed the concepts related to the global coronavirus pandemic to the highest values. Thus

the transformation of the value concepts takes place when there are socio-economic and political changes in the world, in the country, and it becomes a starting point for rethinking and reassessing values.

The philosophical and historical analysis of values shows that there are many theories and approaches to this problem.

The prognostic potential of the study is in contributing to solving an important scientific problem of defining value in political discourse. It opens a direction to scientific researches in this subject.

References

- Almond, G., & Verba S. (1963). *The Civic Culture. Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Countries*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Amirkhanova, A. D., & Dudochkina, O. G. (2019). *Sposoby perenosa realii s angliiskogo yazyka na russkii v politicheskom diskurse* (Methods of Transferring Realities from English to Russian in Political Discourse). *Young Scientist*, 52(290), 293-295.
- Apresyan, Yu. D. (1995). *Obraz cheloveka po dannym yazyka: popytka sistemnogo opisaniya* (The Image of a Person According to Language Data: An Attempt at a Systematic Description, in Russian). *Questions of Linguistics*, 1, 37-67.
- Aryabkina, I. V. (2015). Pedagogical Model of Primary School Teacher Cultural and Aesthetic Competence Formation Using Personality Oriented Approach. In *Worldwide Trends in the Development of Education and Academic Research, Sofia, Bulgaria, 15-18 June. Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 214, 10-17.
- Aryabkina, I., Spiridonova, A., Kapranova, O., Savaderova, A., & Mayorova, N. (2019). Development of Personal Cultural and Aesthetic Perception by Means of Performing Art. *Amazonia Investiga*, 8(19), 514-520.
- Bratus, B. S. (1988). *Smyslovaya sfera lichnosti* (Semantic Sphere of Personality, in Russian). In *Personality Psychology in the Works of Domestic Psychologists*. Moscow: Mysl'.
- Chudinov, A. P. (2009). *Sovremennaya politicheskaya kommunikaciya* (Modern Political Communication, in Russian). Ekaterinburg: Ural State Pedagogical University.
- Diligensky, G. G. (1994). *Social'no-politicheskaya psihologiya* (Socio-Political Psychology, in Russian). Moscow: Thought.
- Donina, O., Salikhova, A., Aryabkina, I., Chernova, Y., & Kovardakova, M. (2019). Value-Semantic Filling of the Family Concept and Value Orientations of Russian Modern Young People Family Life. *Amazonia Investiga*, 8(22), 58-68.
- Fromm, E. (1993). *Psikhoanaliz i etika* (Psychoanalysis and Ethics, in Russian). Moscow: Republic.
- Gozman, L. Ya., & Shestopal E. B. (1996). *Politicheskaya psihologiya* (Political Psychology, in Russian). Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix.
- Kagan, M. S. (1997). *Filosofskaya teoriya cennosti* (Philosophical Theory of Value, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Too TK "Petropolis".
- Karasik, V. I. (2002). *Kul'turnye dominanty v*

- yazyke. *Yazykovoi krug: lichnost', koncepty, diskurs* (Cultural Dominants in Language. Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse, in Russian). Volgograd: Change.
- Karnaukhova, M. V. (2000). *Tekstovyi portret politika kak komponent politicheskogo diskursa* (Text Portrait of a Politician as a Component of Political Discourse, in Russian). (PhD dissertation, Ulyanovsk State University).
- Le Bon, G. (1995). *Psikhologiya narodov i mass* (Psychology of Peoples and Masses, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Layout.
- Lessing, G. (2017). *Laokoon: ocherk o granitsakh zhivopisi i poezii* (Laocoon: An Essay upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry, in Russian). Moscow: Imaginative literature.
- Lukyanova, M. I., & Danilov, S. V. (2014). *Aksiologicheskaya model' sovremennogo obrazovaniya* (Axiological Model of Modern Education, in Russian). *Modern Problems of Science and Education*, 6, 680-687.
- Maslow, A. (2008). *Motivatsiya i lichnost'* (Motivation and Personality, in Russian). Saint Petersburg: Peter.
- Parsons, T. (1998). *Sistema sovremennykh obshchestv* (The System of Modern Societies, in Russian). Moscow: Aspect-Press.
- Peccei, A. (1988). *Chelovecheskie kachestva* (Human Qualities, in Russian). Moscow: Progress.
- Popova, Z. D., & Sternin, I. A. (2003). *Yazyk i nacional'naya kartina mira* (Language and National Picture of the World, in Russian). Voronezh-Moscow: Origins.
- Rickert, H. (1998). *Filosofiya zhizni* (Philosophy of Life, in Russian). Kiev: Nika-Center.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press.
- Shapochkin, D. V. (2012). *Politicheskii diskurs: kognitivnyi aspekt* (Political Discourse: Cognitive Aspect, in Russian). Tyumen: Publishing house of Tyumen University.
- Shestopal, E. B. (2000). *Psihologicheskii profil' rossiiskoi politiki v 1990-e gody: teoreticheskie i prikladnye problemy politicheskoi psihologii* (The Psychological Profile of Russian Politics in the 1990s: Theoretical and Applied Problems of Political Psychology, in Russian). Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Smelser, N. (1994). *Sociologiya* (Sociology, in Russian). Moscow: Phoenix.
- Totmyanin, N. D. (1995). *Osnovnye aspekty politicheskoi kul'tury i socializatsii amerikancev* (The Main Aspects of Political Culture and Socialization of Americans, in Russian). *USA: Economics, Politics, Ideology*, 1, 29-41.
- Vasilenko, I. A. (2011). *Politicheskije peregovory: uchebnyk* (Political Negotiations: Textbook, in Russian). Moscow: INFRA-M.
- Weber, M. (1990). *Osnovnye sociologicheskie koncepcii* (Basic Sociological Concepts, in Russian). Moscow: Progress.