

IT IS NOT ACCEPTED AS A MARKER FOR BEHAVIOR ASSESSING IN CONTEMPORARY RUSSIAN CONSCIOUSNESS

¹JULIA V. KAPRALOVA, ²LYUDMILA B. SAVENKOVA,
³TATYANA S. SHAKHMATOVA, ⁴LADA A. MOSKALEVA

^{a,c,d} Kazan Federal University, 18 Kremlyovskaya street, Kazan 420008, Russia

^bSouth Federal University, Bolshaya Sadovaya Str., Rostov-on-Don, 344006, Russia

e-mail: ^a fina.pallada@mail.ru, ^b info@ores.su, ^c global@ores.su, ^d russia@prescopus.com

Abstract: The article conceptualizes the application of a negative impersonal construction *не принято* ("it is not accepted") as a marker of a textual semantics, which is connected with the conveyance of the idea about a negative evaluation of an action/condition/behavior as the one that doesn't correspond to a certain socially important norm. The topicality of addressing to the problem in question is conditioned by the need in the specification of the factors that influence the self-control of the Russian society and the consideration of particular actions as the ones that are disapproved in the society in whole or in some of its segments. In the course of the research, the methods of parametric classification, lexical-semantic and contextual analysis were used, as well as the methods of quantitative data processing, the materials for which were represented by 465 fragments of literary, journalistic and colloquial texts, which were published in 2001–2016 and which were extracted by means of continuous sampling from the Main corpus of the "Russian National Corpus" (NRC). The objective of the research is to answer the following questions: which matters and why are conceptualized in the modern Russian society as not acceptable ones, can it be said that inappropriateness is acknowledged by the whole society or the contextual environment of the word combination "it is not accepted" defines particular social unions, for which it is possible to form the lists of parameters of criterion behavior or deviations from it; whether there are textual markers of preserving or changing of behavioral norms of native speakers of the modern Russian language. In terms of behavioral self-restrictions, Russians are mostly focused on the details of their private lives. Self-restrictions of the all-Russia scale refer to less than 30% of all the cases. The main factors of self-restrictions in particular segments of the society are labor activity and the life of a family. Globalization processes allow Russian speakers to conceive themselves as a part of the humanity and reflect regarding the lack of the identity in the spheres of self-control in people from various countries. For Russians, the moral aspect plays a crucial role in posing restrictions. That is, a modern Russian cares about other people's opinions and pays a special attention to the peculiarities of the communications behavior. The idea of constant nature of such types of self-restrictions prevails in the society. The recognition of their transformation in retrospective is associated with appealing to the facts of the recent (Soviet) past.

Keywords: it is not accepted, behavior, society, social group, linguistic culture, Russian-speakers, modern Russian speech.

1 Introduction

Modern linguistic studies are aimed at solving general humanitarian tasks. One of such tasks is the conceptualization of the processes of self-identification of the society that exists within the borders of unified linguistic culture. The research is based on the following postulates: the language system is adaptive (Arnold, 1991, 7); native speakers face constant, although gradual, changes in it; those linguistic items that are recorded in dictionaries and adopted by grammarians are not necessarily realized intactly in the speech production (Fleischer, 1978); the general nature of the humankind conditions the existence of a range of unified values, which, however, do not necessarily have the same positions in hierarchical axiological systems of various nations, and more often, they do not represent an exhaustive list of various ethnic-lingual societies (Wierzbicka, 1992; Privalova, 2006).

Agreeing with the point of N.V. Ufimtseva stating that "...the duty of every ethnic group is self-cognition" (Ufimtseva, 1998), we will note that first, self-cognition is a basis for a certain self-control, a reason for looking at oneself from the outside and seeing one's merits and demerits; second, it is the possibility of detecting both constant and variable social and cultural characteristics of a collective subject; third, it can be a mediator that regulates the contacts with the other world (it allows to define the points of convergence and divergence of one's ethnical culture with other ones within the unified civilization) (Yapparova, 2017; Mobbalegh Naseri et al, 2018). For a specialist who acts as a mediator in intercultural communication (a translator or a teacher of foreign language), the results of such self-cognition include a direct practical usefulness, being in demand in lingual-semiotic, lingual-stylistic and lingual-didactic

objectives (Akhmetzyanova & Gilazetdinova, 2018; Antonova et al, 2016; Villalobos Antúnez & Ganga, 2016).

The majority of the works dedicated to the issues of Russian linguistic culture refers to its constant characteristics and precedence. Linguistic manifestations of modern Russians' self-identification receive less attention. This research fills in this lexical gap at the account of paying attention to the contexts that include a negative word combination it is not accepted. We are aimed at answering the following four questions: 1) which social associations (with the consideration of qualitative and quantitative parameters) accept these or those self-restrictions in behaviors or other socially important actions; 2) what is the nature of such actions and what do they relate to; 3) what are the reasons for posing self-restrictions on the selection of behavior patterns or performing actions; 4) which of these restrictions are recognized as a feature of a certain epoch, and which of them represent the means of preserving historical values.

2 Methodology

In order to understand the attitudes of a certain society or some of its segments towards the object of a social interest, it is reasonable to detect the mentions of this object and the nature of its evaluation in the utterances of the members of such a society. In order to provide the relevance of the utterances' sampling, the Main corpus of the "Russian National Corpus" (hereinafter referred to as NRC) was selected as a source of the materials, and the formal condition for selecting the contexts was the presence of impersonal negative construction it is not accepted (meaning "it is not approved by the society or a part of the latter and is not an acceptable standard of conduct or a regular situational reaction") in them. The focus on the views of modern bearers of Russian linguistic culture led to a tensed limitation of a speech material by the opuses of the 21st century. Four hundred and sixty-five examples of the usage of the mentioned construction have been found in 37821 texts.

The main data processing method was the one that we conventionally called the method of parametrical classification. Essentially, it is about a parallel reliance on a range of logically significant parameters that are required for meeting the objectives of the research. Progressively as the context was being detected, it was classified according to four reasons: 1) for whom it is not accepted; 2) what is not accepted; 3) why is it not accepted; and 4) in which time limits it is not accepted. For each reason, the specific implementations were formulated (for whom – for the members of one family, for friends, for the people united by some occupation etc.; what – to discuss a certain topic, to express one's opinion, to perform a specific action etc.; why – because it is shameful, improper, irrational etc.; when – then, usually, now etc.), which conditioned a detailed characteristics of an estimated object. The statements of specific implementations were formulated inductively based on the material itself. The information was extracted from the utterances by means of contextual and lexical-semantic analysis. In case there was not enough context from NRC to make a qualification regarding the meaning, the reconstruction of a contextual semantics was performed based on the full web version of a certain opus. At the next stage of materials' analysis with the consideration of the mentioned parameters and their implementations, it was possible to examine every aspect of the studied phenomenon with the application of quantitative methods of data processing.

3 Results

The distribution of the sample material can be illustrated by several categories of the examples:

3.1 For whom "it is not accepted"?

1. In Russia (on in the state that is considered to be a preceding one – in the Soviet Union or in Kiev Rus) without specifying ethnical characteristics of the subjects of the behavior (or specifying them as Russians) – 315 examples.
2. In Russia (on in the state that is considered to be a preceding one – in the Soviet Union or in Kiev Rus) with the mentioning of ethnical or geographical (that implies an ethnical one) belonging of the subjects of the behavior (the Ossetians, the Chechens, the Caucasians, Highlanders, West-Ural-Volga peoples) – 13 examples.
3. For anyone (i.e., in various ethnic and cultural societies, including Russians, it is considered unaccepted) – 13 examples.
4. In the international communication practice (i.e., in the dialogues that are conducted at the country level, including Russia) – 3 examples.
5. For the representatives of any foreign linguistic culture or a number of cultures – 95 examples.
6. For the members of any confessional association that is not recognized by the Russians as a commonly accepted one (Wahhabis, Isma'ilites, Jews) – 4 examples
7. For fictional characters (in imaginary worlds) – 4 examples.

3.2 What "is not accepted"?

1. To exercise certain behavior patterns or to behave in a specific manner – 187 examples.
2. To perform certain actions (which cannot be classified as behaviors) – 87 examples.
3. To draw somebody's attention to the facts, circumstances etc., to display something, to ask a question about something that can cause discomfort to other person/persons – 83 examples.
4. While communicating, to touch upon the delicate topics or to mention something that was agreed not to be mentioned – 32 examples.
5. To express an opinion or position in certain circumstances (for example, in the presence of an authority figure) – 27 examples.
6. To allow oneself showing a demonstrative emotional reaction (a verbal one, a psychophysiological one or a motorial one) – 20 examples.
7. To evaluate an object in a certain way – 13 examples.
8. Not to perform a certain expected action – 6 examples.
9. To be perceived by other people as a person who doesn't have a good command of a language – 4 examples.
10. To think over the topic, which, according to the opinions of other persons respected by the subject, should be disregarded – 1 example.

3.3 Why "it is not accepted"?

1. A society or its part considers it something reprehensible, undeserving, unprofessional etc. – 101 examples.
2. It is irrational – 46 examples.
3. It is tactless – 39 examples.
4. It affects the interests of other people – 33 examples.
5. It is considered something that is not worthy of people's attention in their everyday lives – 32 examples.
6. It is prohibited according to established and publically stated rules – 30 examples.
7. It affects a person's reputation – 28 examples.
8. It is not considered as a value in a society or a social group – 25 examples.
9. It is shameful – 21 examples.
10. It is considered unessential for knowing or using an object – 18 examples.
11. It is dangerous for one's life or affects one's health and well-being – 17 examples.
12. It doesn't meet the requirements of etiquette – 17 examples.
13. It belongs to the sphere of superstitions – 2 examples.
14. It is not feasible or not possible for a person because of the biological reasons – 2 examples.

3.4 When "it is not accepted"?

1. Usually – 314 examples.
2. Previously, mentioned before – 79 examples.
3. Now, at the moment – 63 examples.
4. Before (as contrasted to the present time) – 8 examples.

4 Discussion

The analysis of the contexts that include the construction it is not accepted in each of the aspects stated above allows defining the following tendencies.

1. The most evident opposition is represented by two groups of subjects: 1) Russians and 2) non-Russians who live outside the territory of Russia. The quantitative domination of the context related to the first group can be explained by the importance for the ethnical and cultural community to cognize the behavior of its members in details and in various aspects. However, the very fact that more than 20% of all the examples relate to the attempt to see what exactly is not accepted in other nations or countries demonstrates people's willingness to understand their "planet neighbors". Various types of references to foreign cultures are possible, like, it is not accepted in Japan; the Japanese do not accept that; in Europe and in France, in particular, ... is not accepted; in the Western world it is not accepted etc. It appears that the mentioning of the place name instead of the ethnonym reflects the gradual substitution of ethnic and cultural world perception with the civilizational one (to know more about the specifics of ethnicity in the conditions of globalization refer to (Zakirova, 2016): the behavers are perceived as citizens of a specific state rather than the members of ethnical and lingual community; on the other hand, a tendency to metonymization can be observed (abroad, any Russian speaker is identified as Russian, and in Russia any person who comes from China is identified as Chinese).

Overall 28% of the examined contexts reflect the Russian speakers' thoughts about behavioral self-restrictions extended to Russian (or some of the precedent ones) society as a whole. This is often marked by such lexemes as Russia, Russian, Russian-speaker, Rus, we, our. However, while reflecting about the recent (Soviet) past, they do not extensively use the construction it is not accepted in the context of the place names like the USSR, the Soviet Union or the definition of the world soviet, but only use the link-verb in the past tense (it **was** not accepted), in particular cases adding some lexical temporal markers (then, in those years, in my day).

In general, the self-restrictions that are posed on the behavioral peculiarities in social unions of various types, starting from minimal informal groups that are created on the base of interpersonal interaction (relations between a man and a woman, between friends or mates, between remote friends), continuing with such formalized small social group as a family, specific social and professional unifications (various work places like firms, organizations, educational institutions etc.) and finishing with various social strata that are characterized qualitatively rather than quantitatively (people of the same occupation or profession, similar hobbies, same ideology, one level occupied in the state hierarchy, unified age or gender attributes) etc. Often, there can be found references to self-restrictions in the behavior of certain people within one type of professional activity (it is not accepted in the scientific community, ... among the artists, ... in the army, ... in business etc. – overall, 71 contexts was found). Thirty contexts relate to this, pointing at the limitations that are accepted in a certain work environment. The next highest unification, in which the peculiar number of behavioral limitations is developed, is a family (33 contexts), e.g.: in this house, it was not accepted to...; in this family, it was not accepted to...; etc. Let us emphasize: if in the historical and cultural tradition or in the process of the family ties' evaluation, the attention was paid to the relations between the spouses in the first instance (Saiwuleshi et al, 2017), in the examined material the roles of both adults and children appear to be equally important.

2. The parameter “what” of the construction “not accepted” shows that self-restrictions posed by the Russian-speaking bearers of the modern linguistic culture onto their own behavior to a great extent refer to the behavioral style (e.g., it is not accepted that a young family lives at the account of their parents; it is not acceptable to interfere with the sphere of other people’s interests etc.); or the performance of certain actions (e.g., to call an ambulance because one feels a headache or not to go to work because of that; it is not acceptable for a man to kiss a lady’s hand in an official setting; it is not acceptable that a guest teaches a wife how to deal with her husband etc.). However, in this group, even a selection of certain speech tactics or reference may be considered as an action (to apologize, to accept an apology, to be rude, to intrigue etc.) Besides, more than 160 examples (points 3-9 in Table 2) are associated with the speech; at this, it is often mentioned that it is not accepted to touch upon the topics that can cause a negative reaction in an interlocutor or a third party.

3. Among the reasons of non-admission of these or those actions or behavioral styles, the moral ones prevail over the pragmatic ones; other people’s opinion and the unwillingness to be perceived by other people as an immoral, unprofessional etc. person, appear to be very important. See the examples: In the department, it is not accepted that the workers boast about their achievements or dramatize about the situation; ... it is not accepted that you are interested in whether you are leaving a joint or personal property to somebody while you are drawing up the will.

4. About 68% of the examples represent the self-restriction as a constant one; lexical temporal markers are absent or demonstrate the constant nature of the self-restriction: Up to now, it was not accepted that powerful persons expressed such kind of thoughts in such an eventful context etc. Predominant is the tendency of subjects of the statements to perceive themselves as the members of lingual and cultural society that preserves its traditions. The other tendency is the willingness of the subjects of the statements to operate only verified data while observing the changes in their self-restrictions, emphasizing their belonging to the present (at the account of application of such words as now, at the moment, today, these days, yet, already, lately) or pointing at the personal experience of the subject of the reflection or people who relate to the nearest precedent generations: ... he has never brought her presents like this. He hardly even brought her anything – it was not accepted.

5 Summary

The method of parametrical classification of a specific speech material, which is not limited either topically or personally, but which represents the reflection of the large amount of the Russian-speaking part of the Russian society, presented in the expressions of the first fifteen years of the 21st century and marked by means of a negative construction it is not accepted (which earlier had not been an independent object of a linguistic-cultural or linguistic-cognitive study), may serve as an instrument of reconstruction of particular fragments of contextual exemplification of modern Russian speakers’ consciousness.

6 Conclusions

The conducted study marks out the perspectives of the cognition of the peculiarities of behavioral self-regulation by the society or some parts of it by means of contextual analysis of the key semantical grammar structure. The specific materials and results of the works may be used both for the aims of teaching the course “Linguistic and cultural studies” as a part of foreigners’ learning Russian and for the aims of practical acculturation of the students, the effectiveness of which to a great extent depends on the level of awareness of Russian language learners about the habits, psychology, cultural and social attitudes of the bearers of this language.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

Literature:

- Villalobos Antúnez J.V., Ganga F. (2016). Derechos sociales fundamentales: Consideraciones iusfilosóficas de sus dilemas. Aproximación utópica desde la Bioética Global, Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana, 21(75), pp. 93-111.
- Fleischer W. (1978). Konnotation und Ideologiegebundenheit in ihrem Verhältnis zu Sprachsystem und Text. Wiss. Ztschr. Der K.-M. Univ. Jg. 27. –H. 5. Leipzig, pp. 543–553.
- Wierzbicka A. (1992). Semantics, Culture and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations. New York: Oxford University Press, p. 496.
- Privalova I.V. (2006). Linguistic cognition: ethnic-cultural markedness (semi-theoretical research): Abstract of a thesis... DLitt. – Moscow, p. 50.
- Ufimseva N.V. (1998). Ethical character, self-perception and linguistic consciousness of Russians // Linguistic consciousness: formation and functioning. – M.: The Institute of Linguistic Studies of RAS, P. 135–170.
- Yapparova, V.N. (2017). Linguistic features of Russian diplomatic discourse References // 4th International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences and Arts SGEM, Vol 2, pp.791–796.
- Akhmetzyanova L.M., Gilazetdinova G.Kh. (2018). Lexico-semantic and linguo-stylistical analysis of A. Vvedensky's and D. Kharms' art texts, XLinguae. 11(2), pp. 455–470.
- Antonova N.V., Vassilieva V.N., Kononenko M.V. (2016). The problem of quality of education in foreign language teaching // Journal of Language and Literature. 7(2), Pp. 159–162.
- Mobbalegh Naseri M.R., Milani A., Aghae M. (2018). Comparative analysis of crimes against domestic and foreign security in the military penal code and other criminal laws, Astra Salvensis, Supplement No. 1, pp. 85-95.
- Zakirova A.Zh. (2016). The phenomenon of ethnicity in conditions of globalization: the thesis of Candidate of Philosophical Sciences. Nizhniy Novgorod, p. 189.
- Saiwuleshi XXX., Bochina T.G., Abakumova O.B. (2017). Russian proverbs about spouses and marital relationships, Ad Alta: Journal of interdisciplinary research. 7(2), pp. 22–24.