

How to Cite:

Britsyn, V., Sukalenko, T., Ladyniak, N., Kaleniuk, S., & Zhelyazkova, V. (2021). Modern tendencies of development of norms of Ukrainian language. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 102-113. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS4.1653>

Modern Tendencies of Development of Norms of Ukrainian Language

Victor Britsyn

National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine

Tetiana Sukalenko

University of the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine, Ukraine

Nataliia Ladyniak

Kamianets-Podilskyi Ivan Ohienko National University, Ukraine

Svitlana Kaleniuk

V. O. Sukhomlynskyi Mykolaiv National University, Ukraine

Viktoriya Zhelyazkova

V. O. Sukhomlynskyi Mykolaiv National University, Ukraine

Abstract--The article contains an overview of new trends in Ukrainian literary and colloquial language development in historical retrospect and dynamics. In particular, changes in the lexical structure of language, new phenomena in word formation, morphology and syntax, innovative shifts in styles, etc., in the context of communicative strategies and tactics, rhetorical, stylistic, and linguistic norms and techniques adopted in various spheres of communication are considered. The article is aimed at forming ideas and gaining knowledge in the field of the theory of the modern Ukrainian language in those sections that are distinguished by the greatest significance of the theoretical approach (grammar, syntax), as well as skills and abilities in those parts that require an applied application (culture of oral and written communication, stylistics, rhetoric, genre studies, the principles of spelling). With the dominant idea of the pluralism of norms and an orientation towards their non-rigid codification, there is also an idea of the loosening of the norms of the literary language, of the grave and even dangerous condition experienced by the modern Ukrainian literary language.

Keywords--cognitive activity, language change, language norms, lexicography.

Introduction

The language is constantly changing. The variability of language ensures its compliance with the changing needs of human communicative and cognitive activity. There is no doubt that native speakers themselves carry out all language changes; at the same time, these changes do not depend on the will of the people but are objective in nature. Most writing innovations start with modifications. In the language, their new variants appear at each historical spotlight, along with the traditional elements (Sydorenko & Matsko, 2020).

Progress ordinarily begins with an exclusive discovery, which then enhances a regional or stylistic contrast. Over time, this option may supersede the basic one, and thus specific change will become a common fact. Not all modifications become a common fact, which means that it belongs to the language, but only those that meet the needs of society. Linguistic modifications do not happen unconsciously since they perpetually have a basis. Differentiate between obvious and subjective grounds for language development (Selivanova, 2011). Apparent motivations include impulses originating from the outer environment. Internal notions include developing trends that are embedded in the morphology itself. External circumstances of style changes are due to multiple social determinants. The most influential of these is the development of spiritual and material culture, science, productive powers, technology, etc (McLaughlin et al., 2007; Lachman et al., 2010).

The development and improvement of the academic standard have been an urgent problem for more than two centuries. In lexicography, codifiers have gone from trying to cover all the vocabulary of the Ukrainian language and introduce the maximum number of words into dictionaries, quite uncritically referring to sources, to the idea of compiling a normative dictionary with mandatory documentation of registered lexical items (Yaroshevich, 2010). The evolution of language and the desire to bring the normative vocabulary and spelling standard closer to today's linguistic realities and needs of the speaker, on the one hand, and to revive in them what was artificially removed in Soviet times, on the other hand, stimulate further activities of linguists-planners (Fishman, 1973; Van Parijs, 2006).

The literary norm is increasingly assessed by writers or cultural figures and by ordinary speakers today. It is impossible not to take it into account due to the lack of scientific substantiation (Demetriadis et al., 2008; Nettle, 1999). For any social norm, including language, to be established, it is necessary to have lawfulness, permission, and prescription. It determines that the rule-making manner is both a commitment and a surrender of the license to train. For many reasons, Ukrainians are increasingly questioning the legitimacy of real norms and institutions that assume the power function of normalization. This also applies to the sphere of language. This is due to the lack of relevant knowledge and low national consciousness, and more globally – a general tendency for postmodern societies to reduce to zero the theory of deviation, which automatically leads to the desire to legitimize the individual norm (Antonioni et al., 2013; Pulvermüller & Shtyrov, 2006). In this context, the study of modern tendencies of the

development of standards of the Ukrainian language seems to be a very urgent task.

Materials and Method

The object of this study is the living speech of the turn of the century, reflected in the language of fiction, periodicals, media, etc. The subject of the research is the processes of interaction between living speech and book styles of the Ukrainian literary language as the primary condition for the development and functioning of the Ukrainian literary language (Hatami-Marbini et al., 2017; Cheng et al., 2020). The purpose and objectives of the study are to analyze the emerging trends in the change in the system of norms of the modern Ukrainian literary language caused by the influence of living speech on the styles of the Ukrainian literary language.

Following the tasks and characteristics of the research subject, the methods of theoretical knowledge were used:

- Analysis and synthesis of empirical material;
- Construction of analogies;
- Logical methods for establishing cause-and-effect relationships.

The complexity of applying the indicated methods is designed to provide a multidimensional linguistic analysis of the interaction of live speech of native speakers and the norms of the Ukrainian literary language. The methodological basis of the research is characterized as follows:

- The philosophical doctrine of the relationship between language and thinking;
- The principle of a systematic approach to the knowledge of linguistic phenomena in their speech implementation;
- Teaching about the laws of language development.

Results and Discussion

Since language is not static in nature, dynamics is an integral feature of it at any time of its existence, that is, also in synchrony. Thus, each language in any synchronous cross-section is a unity of stable and variable. Each state of language is its dynamic equilibrium. The fundamental external cause of language changes is languages contact. This is one of the most potent stimuli for language change, implying the usage of glossary and phraseology (Abutalebi et al., 2013; Sinclair-de Zwart, 1973). So, in modern decades in the Ukrainian language, many foreign words are used, largely from English (for example, file, display, interface, marketing, management, etc.) Therefore, acquiring phraseological units both in their initial form and in the frame of an outline is a reasonably common phenom: to be or not to be, o mores, o tempora, Drang nach Osten, tabula rasa.

The concept of “norm” is one of the fundamentals in linguistics. However, the phenomena associated with it are very diverse and can be characterized from different positions. In particular, changes in word-formation should be noted – for example, a common phenomenon is borrowing suffixes and prefixes. In the

Ukrainian, there are borrowed prefixes a-, anti-, inter- anti-people, anti-art, interpolate), suffixes -up-, -ism-, замінити на -ism-, -ant-, -azh-, -am-, -ar- and many others. The Ukrainian suffix shchin(a) is borrowed in Russian: Pskovshchina (Pskov region), Smolenshchina (Smolensk region).

On the whole, we share the point of view of S.I. Vinogradov, according to which the communicative norm is a broader orthological formation than the stylistic norm (Vinogradov, 1983). However, the thesis that there are inclusion relations between the communicative standard and the norms of other types seems controversial. If it seems reasonable for native speakers to abandon linguistic correctness itself, they can sacrifice the formational norm to achieve the necessary communicative effect. This means that formational and communicative models are not in privative but equipollent opposition. The concept of a norm, which has long been known from linguistic and normalizing practice, only in 20th-century linguistics received a theoretical foundation. It began to be studied in various aspects of general linguistics, the culture of speech, in the theory and history of literary languages, in the idea of communication. The main features of the norm of the literary language are relative stability, general use, and obligation. The sources of the linguistic norm are the oral speech of literary educated and authoritative people in society, the works of classic writers (Diessel, 2007; Mercer, 2011; Romero, 2001).

The written form of language manifestation actualizes the metalinguistic opposition “spontaneous norm - canonical rule,” the members of which are opposed according to the following parameters: genesis, the form of representation in the minds of communicants, structure, form of existence in speech activity, degree of metalinguistic (Fitch, 2010). Fitch also notes that the concept of an ideal norm arose in the course of everyday and scientific comprehension of the dialectical conjugation of stable and changing, invariant and variable in a functioning orthological system, reflecting fluctuations in the ideas of native speakers about the teleology of normalizing processes in the range of “absolute unification - flexible stability” (Fitch, 2010). V.V. Vinogradov emphasizes: “The concept of the norm is central in the definition of the national literary language (both in written and spoken form)” (Vinogradov, 1978). The language norm is developed in verbal communication, fixed as an *usus*, and codified. Deviations from the norms are recognized and evaluated in grammars, dictionaries, other codification works, and the general public consciousness.

As a result of tradition and codification, the literary norm is a set of rather strict prescriptions and prohibitions that contribute to the unity and stability of the literary language (Selihei, 2007). The norm is conservative and aims to preserve the linguistic means and the rules for their use accumulated in a given society by previous generations. However, the conservatism of the norm does not mean its complete immobility in time. It is another matter that the pace of normative changes is slower than the development of a given national language as a whole. The more developed the literary form of the language, the better it serves the communicative needs of society, and the less it changes from generation to generation of people who use this language (Tarnopolsky, 2000; Rietveld & van Hout, 2017).

To date, a broader view of the problem of language standardization has appeared in linguistics (Horodenska, 2013). The study of the norm is an intralingual aspect of ecolinguistics. The basis of ecological thinking is an understanding of systemic relationships: a system is understood as a whole consisting of several parts, a set of elements in certain relationships with each other (Stibbe, 2015). The subject of ecolinguistics is the interaction between language, a person as a linguistic person, and his environment. At the same time, language is considered an integral component of the chain of relationships between man, society, and nature (Klochko, 2017). The functioning and development are presented as an ecosystem, and the world around us is a language concept (Fill & Penz, 2017).

Perceiving the norms of the language, their formation, change, and development as systemic interconnections, we believe that the existence and functioning of the norm should be considered not only as of the influence of language on the world but also as the influence of the surrounding noospheric space on the language. It is especially evident in the phenomenon of online communication and content creation (Besters-Dilger, 2007). Some researchers, defining the linguistic norm, emphasize its regulating function and significance as a system for ordering the use of various means of language. Eco-linguistics raises the topic of preserving a codified language in a globalized world where change is taking place much faster than before.

Language evolution, accelerated by active social processes, sometimes is not immediately reflected in the reference literature. In this regard, researchers propose a division of the norm into two types: real, linguistic, which is formed as a result of the influence of various social factors arising from the peculiarities of the functioning of a particular language in a specific speech collective for a certain period, and codified, which is the result of the choice of a particular person and group of one or another language means (Fitch, 2010). Comprehension of the variation and change of linguistic norms through the prism of the oppositions “normative-systemic,” “normative-conventional”, “formal-substantial”, “socially limited-socially unlimited”, “locally marked-locally unmarked”, “one's own-someone else's”, “spontaneous-prepared”, “standard-expressive”, “conventional – unconventional”, “expressive-appellative”, “internal-external” allows correlating traditional orthological plots with the attitudinal and cognitive principles of modern linguistics, which, as E.S. Kubryakova notes, is characterized by expansionism, anthropocentrism, functionalism, and explanatory style (Kubryakova, 1994).

Norms of literary language were formed with an orientation to the linguistic tradition, i.e., linguistic models of a specific area. For example, the basis for the modern Ukrainian literary language was the Middle Dnieper dialect of the south-eastern dialect. For a long time, it and partly other dialects actively nourished the literary language, becoming the basis for the formation of its norms. Today, the urbanization of life leads to the direct influence of dialect speech on the literary language being significantly weakened, and its role is gradually taken over by the media (Ricento, 2013). But the argument of distribution in a specific dialect remains essential for determining the properties of a feature of the language system.

Today, the role of the national criterion in the processes of standardization of the Ukrainian language is significantly growing (Seargeant, 2011; Buyse & Verlinde, 2013). A detailed analysis of this trend requires a separate scientific investigation. However, it should be noted that this helps to preserve the identity of the language system and can also harm it. Excessive fascination with the idea of "cleansing" can lead to a complete public rejection of purposeful change and damage the language system itself. R. Yakovets rightly says about this: specific Ukrainian language elements sudden removal or replacement of undesirable, from the codifier's point of view, language structures (in our opinion, the other side of violence) will lead to the loss of systemic connections of units, which will negatively affect the language mechanism, "contribute to its disease" (Yakovets, 2007).

Most scholars acknowledge the existence of external and internal causes of language development. In addition, in linguistics, there has been a debate more than once, which internal or external reasons are decisive in language development. As noted by N.B. Mechkovska, "[...] it would be a hopeless prank to decide what changes the language more - internal or external forces. In the history of language, there are no laboratory "pure" shifts caused by a single cause, then external, then internal. It would also be reckless to link internal factors to changes in language structure and external ones to events outside of language (i.e., changes in the relationship between language and society) precisely because different motives are interrelated in real life, and act simultaneously" (Mechkovska, 1998). The indisputable truth of the opinion expressed here is confirmed by the fact that the division of the causes of linguistic changes into external and internal is conditional because language, society, and cognitive activity of people are interrelated, and A. Sommerfelt was right when he argued that all changes ultimately have social character (Sommerfelt, 2017).

Today, in the era of globalization, new words come into our language every day, borrowed mainly from the English language (Bagan, 2020; Korobova, 2019; Mysecko, 2000; Sergienko, 2018). Not all of them are actively used, but a foreign word often supplants its Ukrainian counterpart. Of course, borrowing occurs most often in narrow linguistic circles (for example, to denote technical discoveries or scientific publications, where one cannot do without a borrowed term, and there is no Ukrainian analogue for it) (Masenko, 2000). In a dynamic world, changing the language and mastering borrowings by it is inevitable. It should be admitted: borrowing in a language is necessary, but it is important to use this source of vocabulary replenishment in moderation. Now there is a tendency among young people to form words based on borrowed ones. In particular, the words *zafrendyty* (to add to friends on a social network), *lajknuty* (to mark someone's post on a social network as liked), *repostnuty* (to add someone's post to own page on a social network) are well known. All these words are elements of the jargon of active users of social networks; they are necessary since they briefly and succinctly define a new concept. These processes are a vivid confirmation of the development of the language, its living functioning and constant enrichment (Golombek & Doran, 2014; Hiorth, 1954).

The 12th and 13th centuries period was marked by rapid phonetic changes in the Ukrainian language, which was prompted by the reduced separation of the

ancient Russian phonetic-phonological system from the modern Ukrainian one. Later, no significant changes took place in the Ukrainian phonetic-phonological system. Although there are more intense and less intense periods in language development, language never changes dramatically. Otherwise, different generations of people would not understand each other. The slowness and non-simultaneity of changes in various subsystems ensure the reliable functioning of language as a means of communication (Vysotki et al., 2021; Menaka & Sankar, 2019). The pace of language change also depends on the social conditions of language functioning, language contacts, written tradition, and so on.

The Ukrainian literary language has recently undergone such significant changes that we already speak of different functional statuses. It has sharply democratized, restored its lexical and phraseological structure, internationalized, and dynamized. Instead of a normative standard focused mainly on classical and "socialist-realist" fiction or standard newspaper "clerk", the language of "vocal" mass media, the element of live broadcasting, which is no longer controlled by censorship of the institute of state editors, is now coming to the fore (Besters-Dilger, 2007). Communication technologies represent drivers in language development; they are helping to spread new language models. The principle of operation of new mass media increases the pace and density of communication. It thus accelerates smoothing out the variability and awareness of the linguistic phenomenon as a marker of social status.

The grammatical categories and meanings of words in the literary language are subject to historical changes, which lead to shifts in norms, their instability, the emergence of various accentological, grammatical, semantic variants. Therefore, the norm may be mandatory, i.e., the only one, or recommended, variable, and the variants of the standard can be both equal and depend on the sphere of use of the word (form) or the stage of development of the language system (Fill & Penz, 2017). In this context, it should be noted that today, a significant liberalization of norms in the Ukrainian language is observed (Babakov, 2015). "The formation of the linguistic norm was difficult, especially the formation of terminological vocabulary from various sciences and industries. In the standardization of terminological and nomenclature vocabulary, translated special dictionaries played a certain role, not devoid of diversity and purist tendencies. He distinguished himself by the lexicographical level "Practical Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary" (1926), compiled by Kharkiv philologists M. Johansen, M. Nakonechny, K. Nimchinov, and B. Tkachenko. Translated dictionaries... contributed to the codification of lexical norms of the Ukrainian literary language" (Yermolenko, 2000).

The modern Ukrainian literary language is characterized by increased attention to folk sources, where one can find natural substitutes for uncritically taken or artificially imposed borrowings from foreign languages. The Ukrainian language is currently going through a stage of intensive stylistic development:

- The confessional style is being revived;
- Modern political discourse is being formed on new principles;
- Military terminology is being formed.

In some styles, particularly art and journalism, partly in science, the processes of expanding vocabulary and phraseology, strengthening dialectal influences, and returning word-forming types and grammatical forms seized in the previous period were intensified. Some spelling, terminological and lexicographical problems await resolution. In language policy, speech culture must move away from the wrong path of artificial convergence of Ukrainian with Russian and focus on natural, due to historical tradition, ways of development, returned to the Ukrainian language natural sound, expression, sentence structure, and phrase (Kim, 2014; Russell, 1970).

In turn, the intensive development of language inevitably raises the issue of language norms as a social agreement on its generally accepted model, which is binding on all native speakers and users. It is such a social contract that ensures the unity of the national language and the ability to perform the functions of the language of the state. Ukrainian society today is witnessing an ever-deeper social differentiation of the Ukrainian language, and hence differentiation of norms (Fill & Penz, 2017). As E. Kravchenko notes, “the peculiarity of the model of development of the Ukrainian literary language and the development of its norms are determined by the fact that the vertical development of the language was not connected with the state and power for many decades vertical. This has led to unbalanced and interrupted development and functioning of individual subsystems (professional broadcasting, urban broadcasting, jargon, etc.). In addition, these subsystems, which must correlate with the power vertical, developed in different linguistic spaces: Russian, Polish, German” (Kravchenko, 2009).

Conclusion

The norm fulfills the function of unification and strengthening of literary language structure throughout the whole path of its development, preserving, however, stability and tradition as the main features. However, the beginning of the 21st century is a time of inevitable actualization and broad public discussion of the place and role of the Ukrainian language in society and the normative principles. Even in the period of globalization of culture to denote new realities, new words appear, or borrowed names are adapted to the literary norm, and so on (Radchuk, 2002). All this indicates the dynamic nature of the norm, which involves the traditional reproduction of linguistic units, defined by language practice as exemplary, and the fixation of language phenomena constantly generated in the process of living communication. On the other hand, the author's innovations - occasionalism, most noticeable in fiction, which is a constant source of replenishment and development of the Ukrainian literary language, are gradually adapting to the linguistic and literary norm but do not take root in the system of literary language.

Linguistic standards, in particular, lexical as the most sensitive to social changes, cannot but respond to the dynamics of social life. The task of linguists is to find out which social processes are most reflected in the current stage of life of Ukrainian society in its language, influenced the lexical, word-forming, grammatical, stylistic, orthographic norms (Len & Hoang, 2019; Suryasa et al., 2019). The breadth, specificity, and stability of such changes serve as guidelines

for codifying the new corpus of the Ukrainian literary language. There are several areas of study of the norm in linguistics, but each of these areas considers only one aspect of this problem. We believe that there is a need to combine these areas of research (Lindemann, 2013; Issa et al., 2021). A new direction in linguistics should be built based on an integrated approach to studying the norm: from the history of its formation, change (evolution) to the study of the current state. These ideas resonate with noospheric thinking in the science of language.

References

- Abutalebi, J., Della Rosa, P. A., Ding, G., Weekes, B., Costa, A., & Green, D. W. (2013). Language proficiency modulates the engagement of cognitive control areas in multilinguals. *Cortex*, 49(3), 905-911. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.08.018>
- Antoniou, M., Gunasekera, G. M., & Wong, P. C. (2013). Foreign language training as cognitive therapy for age-related cognitive decline: a hypothesis for future research. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 37(10), 2689-2698. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.09.004>
- Babakov, O. (Ed.). (2015). *New tendencies in the development of the Ukrainian language*. Melitopol.
- Bagan, M. P. (2020). Anglization of modern Ukrainian-language communicative space: causes, main manifestations and consequences.
- Besters-Dilger, J. (2007). The Ukrainian language in education and mass media. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 29(1/4), 257-293.
- Buyse, K., & Verlinde, S. (2013). Possible effects of free on line data driven lexicographic instruments on foreign language learning: The case of Linguee and the interactive language toolbox. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 95, 507-512. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.675>
- Cheng, H., Hu, C., & Li, B. G. (2020). Lexicographic biases in international trade. *Journal of International Economics*, 126, 103346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2020.103346>
- Demetriadis, S. N., Papadopoulos, P. M., Stamelos, I. G., & Fischer, F. (2008). The effect of scaffolding students' context-generating cognitive activity in technology-enhanced case-based learning. *Computers & Education*, 51(2), 939-954. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2007.09.012>
- Diessel, H. (2007). Frequency effects in language acquisition, language use, and diachronic change. *New ideas in psychology*, 25(2), 108-127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2007.02.002>
- Fill, A. F., & Penz, H. (Eds.). (2017). *The Routledge handbook of ecolinguistics*. Routledge.
- Fishman, J. A. (1973). Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization and planning. *Language in Society*, 2(1), 23-43.
- Fitch, W. T. (2010). *The evolution of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Golombek, P., & Doran, M. (2014). Unifying cognition, emotion, and activity in language teacher professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 39, 102-111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.01.002>
- Hatami-Marbini, A., Ebrahimnejad, A., & Lozano, S. (2017). Fuzzy efficiency measures in data envelopment analysis using lexicographic multiobjective

- approach. *Computers & industrial engineering*, 105, 362-376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2017.01.009>
- Hiorth, F. (1954). Arrangement of meanings in lexicography: Purpose, disposition and general remarks. *Lingua*, 4, 413-424. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(54\)90075-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(54)90075-3)
- Horodenska, K. (2013). Novi yavysycha ta protsesy v ukrainskomu slovotvorenni: dynamika chy destruktsiia slovotvirnykh norm? [New phenomena and processes in Ukrainian derivation: dynamics or destruction of derivational rules?]. *Ukrainska mova*, 2, 3-12.
- Issa, S. H. M., Bajiri, M. E., Alyamani, K. A. Z., & Abhishek B. P. (2021). Lexical semantic activation in bilinguals: evidence through blocked naming task. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S1), 860-866. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS1.1470>
- Kim, H. Y. (2014). Learner investment, identity, and resistance to second language pragmatic norms. *System*, 45, 92-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.05.002>
- Klochko, S.O. (2017). The progress of ecolinguistics in Ukraine: An Analytical Review. *The System and Structure of the Eastern Slavic Languages*, 12, 3-18.
- Korobova, I.O. (2019). Lexicosemantic development of the newest English loanwords in the modern Ukrainian language. *Visnyk of Kyiv National Linguistic University. Series Philology*, 22(1), 109-122.
- Kravchenko, E. (2009). Modern literary norm as a reflection of a new paradigm of society. *Linguistic Studies*, 19, 236-241.
- Kubryakova, E. S. (1994). Paradigms of scientific knowledge in linguistics and its current status. Publishing House of Russian Academy of Sciences, Series Literature and Language, 53(2), 3-15.
- Lachman, M. E., Agrigoroaei, S., Murphy, C., & Tun, P. A. (2010). Frequent cognitive activity compensates for education differences in episodic memory. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 18(1), 4-10. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JGP.0b013e3181ab8b62>
- Len, W., & Hoang, R. (2019). Problem towards local language translation in artificial neural networks. *Applied Translation*, 13(2), 8-15. Retrieved from <https://appliedtranslation.nyc/index.php/journal/article/view/522>
- Lindemann, D. (2013). Bilingual lexicography and corpus methods. the example of german-basque as language pair. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 95, 249-257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.645>
- Masenko, L. (2000). Modern problems of spelling, terminological and lexicographic standardization of the Ukrainian language. *Language and Society: The Postcolonial Dimension*. Kyiv.
- McLaughlin, K. A., Borkovec, T. D., & Sibrava, N. J. (2007). The effects of worry and rumination on affect states and cognitive activity. *Behavior Therapy*, 38(1), 23-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2006.03.003>
- Mechkovskaya, N. B. (1998). Language and religion. *Lectures on philology and history of religions*. Moscow: Torgovij dom Grand.
- Menaka, G., & Sankar, G. (2019). The language learning assessment using technology for the second language learners. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 5(4), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v5n4.674>

- Mercer, S. (2011). Language learner self-concept: Complexity, continuity and change. *System*, 39(3), 335-346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.006>
- Mysecko, O.Ye. (2000). Historical and logical aspect of penetration of English borrowing into modern Ukrainian. *Visnyk of Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University*, 5, 58-62.
- Nettle, D. (1999). Using social impact theory to simulate language change. *Lingua*, 108(2-3), 95-117. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841\(98\)00046-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(98)00046-1)
- Pulvermüller, F., & Shtyrov, Y. (2006). Language outside the focus of attention: the mismatch negativity as a tool for studying higher cognitive processes. *Progress in neurobiology*, 79(1), 49-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pneurobio.2006.04.004>
- Radchuk, V. D. (2002). Language in Ukraine: Condition, Functions, Perspectives.
- Ricento, T. (2013). Language policy, ideology, and attitudes in English-dominant countries. In *The Oxford handbook of sociolinguistics*.
- Rietveld, T., & van Hout, R. (2017). The paired t test and beyond: Recommendations for testing the central tendencies of two paired samples in research on speech, language and hearing pathology. *Journal of communication disorders*, 69, 44-57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2017.07.002>
- Romero, C. (2001). Extended lexicographic goal programming: a unifying approach. *Omega*, 29(1), 63-71. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0483\(00\)00026-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0483(00)00026-8)
- Russell, W. A. (1970). The complete German language norms for responses to 100 words from the Kent-Rosanoff word association test. In *Norms of word association* (pp. 53-94). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-563050-4.50006-6>
- Seargeant, P. (2011). Lexicography as a Philosophy of Language. *Language Sciences*, 33(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2010.06.002>
- Selihei, P. (2007). Native Words vs. Loan Words in Terminology: Harmony or Conflict? *Visnyk of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine*, 9, 20-28.
- Selivanova, O. (2011). The problem of forms of language mixing in sociolinguistics. *Language and society*, 2, 3-10.
- Sergienko, M. (2018). The Influence of the English Slang on the Modern Ukrainian Language. *Path of Science*, 4(12), 4006-4010.
- Sinclair-de Zwart, H. (1973). Language acquisition and cognitive development. In *Cognitive development and acquisition of language* (pp. 9-25). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-505850-6.50007-4>
- Sommerfelt, A. (2017). *Diachronic and synchronic aspects of language: selected articles* (Vol. 7). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- Stibbe, A. (2015). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by*. Routledge.
- Suryasa, I.W., Sudipa, I.N., Puspani, I.A.M., Netra, I.M. (2019). Translation procedure of happy emotion of english into indonesian in kṛṣṇa text. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(4), 738-746
- Sydorenko, O., & Matsko, L. (2020). The Ukrainian language: origin, development and present-day situation. *europa ethnica-Zeitschrift für Minderheitenfragen*, 77(3+ 4), 159-164.

- Tarnopolsky, O. (2000). Writing English as a foreign language: A report from Ukraine. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 209-226. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(00\)00026-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00026-6)
- Van Parijs, P. (2006). Linguistic Diversity. What is it? And does it matter. *Proceedings Challenges of Multilingual Cities, Brussels*, 9-10.
- Vinogradov, S.I. (1983). On the social aspect of the lexical norm (Public assessment of abbreviations and abbreviations in the 20s - early 30s). Literary norm in vocabulary and phraseology. Moscow: Nauka.
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1978). Istorija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka [History of the Russian literary language]. *Izbrannye trudy [Selected works]. Moscow, Nauka Publ.*
- Vysotki, V. M., Patalashko, E. V., Stepanenko, V. E., Makarova, T. V., & Balabanova, I. A. (2021). Language as a communication resource and its place in the representation of world practices: philosophical and linguistic approach. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 574-584. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS3.1621>
- Yakovets, R. (2007). Features of Ukrainian linguopurism (syntactic aspect). *Linguistic Studies: Collection of Scientific Works*, 15, 86-90.
- Yaroshevich, I. (2010). Formation and codification of Ukrainian morphological terminology. *Ukrainian language*, 3, 44-54.
- Yermolenko, S. Ya. (2000). Codification of the norm. In: V.M. Rusanovsky, & O.O. Taranenکو (Eds.). *Ukrainian language. Encyclopedia*. Kyiv: Bazhana.