

Identifying Russian Customary Orthoepic Norms in Process of Students' Enculturation

Liudmila Glebenko

European and Oriental Languages Department,
Sholom-Aleichem Priamursky State University, PGUSA
Birobidzhan, the Russian Federation
mila_yug@mail.ru

Irina Grebennikova

European and Oriental Languages Department,
Sholom-Aleichem Priamursky State University, PGUSA
Birobidzhan, the Russian Federation
ira_greb@mail.ru

Abstract—When considering a person's position in culture and his / her familiarization with cultural values, the process of enculturation is of particular importance. The idea of enculturation as a process of involving the individual in the social sphere of culture is considered in relation to the University students. The formation of cultural identity includes the development of the values of native culture, its norms and traditions. Enculturation of an individual is connected with the problems of preservation of cultural traditions, cultural adaptation, cultural and spiritual integration into society. The main instrument of the process of enculturation is the mother tongue. Language is not only a means of communication, but is also a means of understanding values. Language is a means of learning and preserving cultural experience. This is a dynamic, constantly evolving system, which has its own rules and regulations. The purpose of this article is to identify the degree the students retain orthoepic norms in the process of enculturation.

Keywords—culture; orthoepic norms; codification; customary usage; variability

I. INTRODUCTION

The modern world faces a challenge of creating new conditions for the coexistence of different peoples and cultures. In the foreground, is the ability of people to interact with each other, showing respect and expressing tolerance for cultural and individual peculiarities.

Culture is the basis on which social relationships are built and where the relationships between an individual and the society are developed. Culture forms values and a way of thinking and determines norms of behavior. Culture performs various functions: educational, integrative, regulating, axiological, but its main function is an adaptive one, which is a specific means of human adaptation. Culture plays an important role in forming perception, determining mentality and ethnic identity, moral and spiritual values, making people socially active and purposeful. It regulates relations with representatives of other cultures.

There are many definitions of the term "culture". In the traditional sense, culture is a set of material and spiritual values. However, the understanding of the phenomenon of culture should not be limited to this. Culture also covers the issues of value perceptions and value orientations.

Value orientations can be likened to complex belief systems, specifically about what is desirable and important in life and what is not. These represent main intelligences, ways of perceiving the world and decision-making frameworks, which guide a person's thinking, emotions and behavior in different contexts. Although unconsciously chosen, a value orientation acts as an organizing principle according to which a person adapts to the world.

Due to psychological and environmental factors, value orientations may gradually change and develop during a person's lifetime. Thus, culture is a unique social organism with its own laws, which is regulated by specifics of prevailing value orientations.

At the early stage of interpreting the term "culture" scientists used the ethno-national approach, which is based on studying different factors coexisting together, including climate, religion, morals and customs typical of a community.

Culture defines ways of thinking and our learned behavior, because it covers all aspects of social life, any kind of human activity. Culture performs important adaptive functions, fulfils social self-organization of the society. It is the basis on which social relationships are built, the relationship of an individual with the society, determining the model of behavior, national character of the society and people's perception.

In the process of exchange between a person and his native culture, an individual learns the accepted cultural and social norms, values and behavior. In other words, he goes through enculturation. Enculturation is the process by which people learn the dynamics of their surrounding culture and acquire values and norms appropriate or necessary in that culture and worldviews.

Enculturation includes the formation of fundamental skills that determine the types of communication and interaction with other people, terminal values, resulting in a behavioral similarity of a person with other members of this group, which will fundamentally distinguish him from representatives of other cultures. Culture is a product of people's common life of the same community. We can distinguish two levels of community of people: nation and ethnicity.

The most important factors in the formation of the nation are the common territory, together with natural conditions,

language, culture, a certain religion, mentality and common identity.

Every nation has its own values, its own social norms, which determine the way a human exists in the society. National culture is the personal way a community develops. Its mentality can be seen in the social, cultural and spiritual spheres.

University plays one of the main roles in human enculturation because it transmits the basic values of the society and instills culture in students. Subject-subject relations at University are characterized by the penetration of a set of relations of the society in the internal structure of an individual with the appropriate transformations.

The main instrument of the process of enculturation is the mother tongue. Language is not only a means of communication, but is also a means of understanding values. Language is a means of learning and preserving cultural experience. This is a dynamic, constantly evolving system, which has its own rules and regulations.

In this regard, it is interesting to analyze the orthoepic side of students' speech in the process of enculturation to their native culture at the University.

II. OBJECTIVES

The object of the study is the pronunciation standard of the current Russian language (at the segment level).

The subject of the research is the customary orthoepic norms, apart from the accent, of the modern speech of students of Sholom-Aleichem Priamursky State University in Birobidzhan.

The purpose of the study is to systematize and deepen the current knowledge relating to the anthropocentric interpretation of linguistic facts and linguistic categories (including norms and customary usage) and determine the condition of orthoepic norms (segment level) in Birobidzhan, based on the opposition of linguocentric and anthropocentric approaches existing in science.

III. METHODS

For the current stage of study, variance is characterized by reliance on statistical (quantitative) methods, since their data are considered to be an important source for interpreting the changing norms.

The study is applied in general scientific and linguistic methods of research. In theoretical terms of research: a fundamental review on philology by Russian scientists, descriptive and comparative methods. In empirical terms, the following directed methods are expedient: lexicographic review, comparative analytical method, continuous sampling method, questionnaire, empirical data collection method - survey, test. At the final stage, these are methods of quantitative and qualitative processing of findings: a statistical, qualitative, correlation analysis, meaningful interpretation of linguistic material, a generalization of the described facts according to their unifying characteristics.

Purposive and conscious anthropocentric approach to the linguistic description of the pronunciation norms, the systemic human mental activity allows us to offer a new interpretation in the study of customary orthoepic norms, to add some science points that are only promising and require their detailed development, namely, anthropocentric categories of customary orthoepic norms.

Emphasizing and reviewing of new cognitive, communicative aspects of the orthoepy norms study allows us to structure the problem area of customary usage as a language phenomenon. Speaking of an object of profound research interest in such areas of linguistic science that are closely connected with a person, for example, culture of speech, the usual orthoepy norm confirms and submits its status as an anthropocentric category.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Nowadays, the Russian language is influenced by various factors: the press, television, radio, the Internet as well as foreign languages. These processes can be both positive and negative. These factors influence greatly the swinging of the codified norms. The reason is not only the lack of literacy, but also increasing language dynamism. A logical disagreement between the language use and possibilities of the language has increased. However, regulatory requirements should not be conservative. The current recognition of new options that replace the previous ones is the most complicated task in accepting them. The variation of orthoepic norms in many cases occurs not only because of orthoepic incompetence or subjective opinion. Many errors are nonrandom and are predetermined by similar or other systemic phenomena of a living literary language. These are the reasons why we need to refer to the norms of the correct Russian speech (in particular, pronunciation norms) and their additional study. In this regard, the study is quite important as it identifies the actual state of the orthoepy norm observed in the town of Birobidzhan. The issue of pronunciation standards in modern Russian today remains open.

Orthoepy norms as a part of the sound aspect of the language are constantly changing. They are closely related to the customary usage. Customary usage began to be significant in codifying norms. Orthoepy dictionaries are compiled on the principle of a descriptive approach. The descriptive principle should be studied continuously. In the description of the pronunciation norms, linguists work for a detailed analysis of orthoepy norms and setting up a sequence for their occurrence and firming according to the historical development. Covering the issues associated with the current customary orthoepic norms of citizen in various regions is becoming more necessary for modern science.

These days, it does not seem difficult to search for scholarly works devoted to the description of norms and pronunciation variants in the modern Russian language. Scientists comment on such concepts as *orthoepy*, *norm*, *variant*, *variance*, *variability*, *customary usage*, and *codification of the norms*. However, there are no works regarding the specific features of the orthoepy norms at the segment level, particularly, in the town of Birobidzhan, the

Jewish Autonomous Region. In addition, there are a number of questions related to the actual component of this phenomenon and clarification of the age of speakers of usual speaking norms of the modern Russian language in the selected region. Therefore, these issues require review that is more intensive. Recent observations of changes in the speech of literary language speakers of different age groups make it possible to talk about the relevance of studying the issue from the point of view of the characteristics of a particular area. Thus, it is fair to say that the issue of modern pronunciation standard is still urgent. It consists of describing regional features of usual pronunciation norms in the Russian language. The novelty is determined by patterns in the evolution of orthoepy norms at the segment level in the Jewish Autonomous Region, which were not considered important before.

The relevance of the study of customary orthoepic norms by literary Russian speakers in the region comes in response to the need of the insufficient study of this phenomenon, the observation of the level of orthoepic literacy of the citizens. The need to monitor the development trends of customary pronunciation rules in a specific urban environment and to identify the level of presented categories of modern normative phenomena defined as usual are also of great importance. The relevance of the study, therefore, is to confirm inattentive attitude to the norms of the literary language, which is most clearly manifested in the field of orthoepic norms in recent decades. The relevance is referred to the necessity of identifying evolutionary processes in orthoepy and predicting these phenomena in the nearest future. People are able to articulate sounds from birth, but culture dictates which sounds we choose and how we form a certain language out of them. The power of cultural influence can be seen when we interact with people belonging to our culture, and those ones who are completely strangers to us.

The theoretical significance of the research is to determine the main types of options at the segment level, and to study the prevalence of each of the options and their quantitative ratio in identifying local peculiarities that build up the literary pronunciation variants in the area. We also need to determine the degree of prevalence of these samples, as well as to observe the reasons for an unequal correlation of variants in the speech of town residents (university students).

The applied value is to preserve the norms of the literary language by promoting the value of this phenomenon. It may include the compilation of educational aids and regional training courses on special modules of the Russian orthoepy. It can be used in codification of the orthoepic norms, drawing up normative orthoepic recommendations regarding the state of the modern literary Russian language. It is possible to use the findings of real pronunciation, due to the territorial variation of the Russian language. The outcomes of the study can contribute to enlarging theoretical, as well as scientific and practical grounds for increasing orthoepic literacy. The study will help to identify regional features that form the territorial version of literary pronunciation. It will be followed by the study of linguistic and other reasons that have led to an unequal ratio of options in regional speech. It is possible to change the practice of teaching orthoepy taking into account the experience of linguistic studies aimed at identifying local

varieties of the literary language. It is necessary to bring into focus the need to include special orthoepy marks into dictionaries that reflect local pronunciation features.

Many scientists obtained most of the very valuable scientific outcomes related to language norms studies. A great number of authors dealt and still deal with the issue of modern pronunciation norms and customary usage. The theoretical basis of the study were the Russian phonetic scholars' works dedicated to the development of the literary language, Russian orthoepy, and the orthoepy norms of the Russian language: D.N. Ushakov, J.I.V. Scherba, R.I. Avanesov, A.A. Reformatsky, V.V. Vinogradov, O.S. Ozhegov, G.O. Vinokur, A.M. Peshkovsky, K.S. Gorbachevich, L.P. Krysin, R.F. Kasatkina, L.L. Kasatkin.

According to the primary review of Russian scholars' studies the following aspects of the subject have been covered so far: the orthoepic norm generation as a web of pronunciation rules; pronunciation standards and pronunciation options; specific features of pronunciation literary norms; the literary norms and a variability of linguistic units, sources of deviations from the literary pronunciation norms; normative rate of a literary pronunciation system; types of pronunciation styles.

O.V. Antonova, L.A. Verbitskaya, J.V. Ganiev, T.M. Grigorieva, G.M. Grehneva, N.S. Grishina, E.V. Erofeeva, T.I. Erofeev, T.P. Zhiltsova, V.N. Zamyslova, N.K. Ivanova, L.V. Ignatkina, Z.I. Idrisova, M.L. Kalenchuk, A.N. Kozhin, A.M. Konurbaeva, I.V. Lobanova, S.V. Osovina, N.B. Parikova, E.D. Polivanov, O.V. Pryadilnikova, G.V. Stepanov, F.P. Filin, V.I. Chernyshov, K.I. Churkina, A.D. Schweizer and other linguists worked out the following aspects of the terms of reference:

sociolinguistic dependence of the pronunciation norms in a dialectal environment; local connotation of literary colloquial speech; sociolinguistic study of local peculiarities of Russian literary pronunciation (counter final pretonic vocalism in Krasnoyarsk residents' speech); a territorial variation of the Russian literary pronunciation (as exemplified in Vologda and Perm citizens' speech); variation of the modern orthoepy norm and actual orthoepic recommendations; pronunciation peculiarities of residents' speech in a small town; regional features of the pronunciation system of the modern Russian language in the Republic of Bashkortostan; features of the influence of the dialect language; norms of pronunciation of consonants and their combinations; pronunciation standards of certain grammatical forms; peculiar pronunciation of borrowed words; dynamism and variability of the orthoepic norm; codification of the pronunciation norm during the generation and development of a literary language.

The goal of the psycholinguistic experiment is to identify the types of customary orthoepic norms, the frequency of using acceptable options in the modern literary speech of native speakers (students) in Birobidzhan. In addition, to answer the question of what unstable phenomena are more common, and mark out their criteria. The students of the university, for whom the literary Russian language is native, became the respondents of the experimental part. A characteristic sign to select informants as a distinctive feature

of that group was an age without reference to gender. Recipients are young people aged 18-25. There were 70 informants who took part in the survey. It is supposed to be the first part of the survey (among the students).

The objectives of the experiment are to carry out sociophone studies. The purpose is to determine forms that are more preferable in pronunciation among students of that age according to the native speakers' answers.

In order to get an answer to the question about the prevalence of these phenomena, a survey was carried out. The aim is to monitor the regularity of using pronunciation options by native speakers. From the Pronouncing Dictionary by R.I. Avanesov, 140 units were selected on purpose, including verbs and nouns with variants of pronunciation. The choice of lexical units (words) for the experiment was carried out by continuous sampling from a number of nouns and verbs, including borrowings, most commonly encountered in oral speech, the meaning of which is understandable to all speakers. Selected lexemes and word forms can be divided into the following groups:

- 1) With the mark *correct*
- 2) *Equal options*
- 3) *Permitted including permitted obsolete*
- 4) *Not recommended including outdated, not recommended*
- 5) With the label *wrong*
- 6) *Rude wrong.*

The task is to substantiate all observations on speech, conclusions, recommendations using verified methods, including a sample of informants, thereby achieving objective results.

The students were asked to choose an option or options characteristic of their own speech. The instruction ran: 'You are offered a questionnaire to percept words as stimuli that give variability at the segment level. How do you pronounce the following words? Mark your option / options (in the case of two equivalents) in the appropriate row.' The words were written in alphabetical order.

V. CONCLUSION

The results allow us to conclude that there is some variance with the accepted norms of pronunciation in nearly all categories mentioned above. In some cases, only the "correct" option is preserved, or the use of equal options is observed, i.e. coexisting variants are noted, the "junior" or "senior" norm prevails in speech. However, not recommended or incorrect options occur too.

In this regard, we should talk about the codification of pronunciation and so-called speech reality. Empirical research can cause a base of such variants of pronunciation that reflect a certain speech pattern. The results can be presented after selection, analysis and synthesis in the form of a limited set of examples. Native speakers, as a rule, choose and approve only codified norms convenient for speech communication.

According to the findings, we come to the following conclusions: the pronunciation norm is conservative and dynamic simultaneously. The variation of the pronunciation standard of the Russian language can affect both examples of convergence with the basic reading rules, and those of their dilution. Constant changes of the norm contributes to the fact that the real and codified (within the the descriptive approach) pronunciation norms do not fully correspond at present.

Speech reality is high-priority, and pronunciation codification is based on its assessment and accounting.

When reading a word, native speakers mind graphics, the principle of analogy, and morphemic division. The variability in some cases is predetermined by the peculiarities of grapheme-phoneme relations in the Russian language.

Pronouncing variability at the segment level is noted only among some high-frequency words, while most of these variations refers to non-frequent vocabulary. In an unfamiliar word, native speakers tend to consider the place of the morpheme border, if it is clearly understood.

It should be noted that the norms themselves are not stable phenomenon. Changing the pronunciation norms is a gradual process, subordinated to the internal mechanisms of language development. One should not rush to accept new phonetic variants; it would be more wise to perform the function of normalization, i.e. to maintain the pronunciation tradition that has developed over a long time. The practical significance of studying the orthoepic customary usage at the segment level is undoubted. An overview of the orthoepic norms is a characteristic of the culture of speech. To avoid pronunciation mistakes, one should learn not only a norm, but also know the types of options, as well as conditions why which one or the other can be used. Thus it is recommended to refer to the "Orthoepic Dictionary of the Russian Language". The dictionary demonstrates the regulation of a sustainable option. However, in defending linguistic traditions, the dictionary should not stand for a deterrent in the language development.

In addition, ideas of the concept of speech correctness can also be formed according to other units and / or draw on various kinds of sociocultural knowledge in a native speaker's linguistic consciousness. On the one hand, the choice of one or another method is determined by a combination of linguistic, extralinguistic and psychological factors. On the other hand, it is determined by the linguistic characteristic of the word itself. A native speaker chooses a method according to the strength of grasping the meaning of a word. Pronouncing lexical units, which can be mixed in the production and / or perception of speech due to their formal, semantic or thematic peculiarities, allows us to consider them as a separate anthropocentric unit of the language system. The detailed systemic description of customary pronunciation norms as an anthropocentric category includes identifying their typological diversity, considering customary usage as a field object, defining the status of usual pronunciation norms, specifying a procedure for recognizing various variants, and clarifying the reasons for using in speech.

The optimal technology of describing customary orthoepic norms as anthropocentric units is possible only in anthropocentric orthoepy. The development of the

interpretation of the customary pronunciation rules can be performed in a special dictionary devoted to their system description.

The reliability of the research findings is proved by the outcomes, which are based on the conclusions of an extensive integrated experiment involving the Russian language speakers. 70 informants who speak Russian regulatory pronunciation at the native speaker level read a representative list of words with a variant marked in the dictionary. The experiment involved respondents who did not specially majored in philology.

The research presented in this paper does not cover the all the issues focused. Prospects for further research may be related to a more detailed review of pronunciation norms as a means of the process of enculturation of native speakers in different age groups. We come to the conclusion that the practical significance of phonetic research, is determined by the tasks of codification of norms, which should be based on the real pronunciation of people of different generations.

Acknowledgment

The authors of the paper thank E.B. Trofimova and L.V. Blinov for scientific advice.

References

- [1] V.M. Alpatov, "On the anthropocentric and system-centric approaches to the language", *Issues in Linguistics*, No. 3, p.15, 2009.
- [2] V.M. Alpatov, "Two approaches to learning the language", *History and Modernity*, No.1, pp. 7-21, 2016.
- [3] V.M. Alpatov, "What and how linguistics studies", *Issues in Linguistics*, No. 3, pp. 4-18, 2015.
- [4] "Anthropocentric studies", O.B. Sirotnina, ed. Saratov: Publishing house of Saratov University, 2011, 295 p.
- [5] R.I. Avanesov, "Orthoepic dictionary of the Russian Language", Moscow: Publishing house 'Russian language', 1988, 704 p.
- [6] E.L. Barkhudarova, "Orthoepic variability as a sign of changes in the phonetic system of the Russian language in the late 20th and early 21st centuries", *Bulletin of Moscow State University. Series 9 Philology*, No. 6, pp. 92-102, 2004.
- [7] L.V. Blinov, V.L. Nedorezova, "Intercultural communication in the educational environment of higher institution as the factor of formation of social competence of students", *Pedagogical education and science*, No. 12, pp. 56-60, 2009.
- [8] "Culture and communication: global and local dimensions", under the general editorship by doctor of philosophy Yu.V. Petrov. Tomsk: Publishing house NTL, 2004. 400 P.
- [9] V.Z. Demyankov, "Dominant linguistic theories at the end of the 20th century", *Language and science at the end of the 20th century*. Moscow: Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, 1995. pp. 239-320.
- [10] Yu.V. Dorofeev, "Anthropocentrism in linguistics and the subject of cognitive grammar", *Actual problems of current cognitive linguistics: proceedings of the XV International Linguistic conference 'Language and the World'*. Tavrida National V.I. Vernadsky University. 2008. pp. 15-27.
- [11] I.N. Efimenko, "Dialogue of cultures in the modern world (socio-cultural adaptation of foreigners, linguistic interference, linguistic-cultural aspect)", *Russian-Chinese language communication and problems of communication in modern world: materials of International scientific-practical conference*. Omsk, 18-19 November 2009/ ed. edited by L. B. Nikitin. Omsk: Publishing house Omgpu, 2009. pp. 38-41.
- [12] E.V. Erofeeva, "On the issue of the relationship between the concepts of norm and customary usage", *Problems of Socio- and Psycholinguistics: collection of scientific articles edited by T.I. Erofeeva*. Perm State University, Issue 2, pp. 3-8, 2003.
- [13] M.N. Fedorenko, T.N. Fedorenkova, M.V. Stankina, "Universal psychological mechanisms of interpersonal perception to intercultural integration", *Dialogue of cultures – culture of dialogue: proceedings of the International scientific-practical conference*, 2008. – pp. 225-230.
- [14] F.P. Filin, "Sources and destinies of the Russian literary language", Moscow: URSS, 2010, 325 p.
- [15] O.E. Frolova, "Problems of language norms. The Seventh Shmelev readings", *Popular Science Journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, No 4, pp. 122-125, 2006.
- [16] J.V. Ganiev, "About an adequate description of Russian normative pronunciation", *The Russian Academy of Sciences. Issues in Linguistics*, No.3, pp. 121-128, 2008.
- [17] K.S. Gorbachevich, "Variability of the word and language norm: as exemplified in the modern Russian language", *URSS*, 2009, 237 p.
- [18] Yu.N. Karaulov, "The Russian language and language personality", Moscow: KomBook, 2006, 264 p.
- [19] L.L. Kasatkin, "Orthoepema as a basic unit of orthoepy", *Russian Academy of Sciences. Issues in Linguistics*, No. 2, pp. 31-38, 2011.
- [20] A.M. Konurbaeva, "On the problem of the relationship between the concepts of norm and customary usage in the Russian and Spanish-speaking linguistics", *Bulletin of Pushkin Leningrad State University: 'Philology' series - SPb.*, No. 1, vol. 1, pp. 112-119.
- [21] P.I. Kostomarov, "Anthropocentrism as the most important feature of modern linguistics", *Bulletin of The Kemerovo State University, Series: Philology*, No. 2, pp. 198-203, 2014.
- [22] O.A. Krylova, "Regulatory conservatism versus language fashion", *Bulletin of The Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Linguistics Series*, No. 3, pp. 9-14, 2010.
- [23] L.P. Krysin, "The Russian literary norm and modern speech practice", *The Russian language in scientific approach*, No. 2 (14), pp. 5-17, 2007.
- [24] A.O. Laletina, "Language norm in the era of globalization", *Bulletin of Kazan Federal University. Series: Humanities*, No. 6, vol. 153, pp. 219-226, 2011.
- [25] N.M. Lebedeva, A.N. Tatarko, "Ethnic identity, group status and type of settlement as factors of intergroup intolerance", *Psychological journal*, vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 51-64.
- [26] I.M. Loginova, "Linguo-didactic description of current Russian orthoepy", *Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, a series of Russian and foreign languages and teaching methods*, No. 3, pp. 50-55, 2012.
- [27] Sh.H. Schwartz, W. Bilsky, "Toward A Universal Psychological Structure of Human Values", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 53(3), pp. 550-562, 1987.
- [28] N.S. Valgina, "Active processes in modern Russian", Moscow: Logos, 2003, - 304 p.
- [29] V.N. Zamyslova, "Speech features of residents' speech in a small town", *Thesis research summary majored in philology*. Krasnoyarsk, 2004.