

## SECTION I. RISKS OF TRANSFORMING REALITY IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERN DISCOURSE

UDC 811.161.1'27+316.64

DOI: 10.18413/2313-8912-2015-1-4-4-7

**Morel Morel D. A.,  
Spivak L. N.,  
Shatilina S.I.**

**STEREOTYPICAL RISKS AND THREATS IN THE YOUTH'S OPINION  
(DIACHRONIC COMPARATIVE ASPECT)**

1) PhD in Philology, associate professor. Department of foreign languages and professional communication Belgorod National Research University. 85, Pobeda St., Belgorod, 308015, Russia

*E-mail: morel@bsu.edu.ru*

2) director. Zhigailovo secondary school, 19, Bazarskaya St., Zhigailovo village, Korochansky district, Belgorod region, 309234, Russia. *E-mail: gigschool08@yandex.ru*

3) teacher. Sokolovska secondary school, 3, Zelenaya St., Sokolovka village, Korochansky district, Belgorod region, 309237, Russia. *E-mail: sokol02ol@yandex.ru*

**Abstract.** The paper reveals the structure of associative fields of words-stimuli "danger", "risk", "threat", fixed in 1988-90 (the materials of "Russian Association Dictionary") and in 2015 (the results of authors' associative experiment). The obtained results demonstrate the structural stability of these fields diachronically on the one hand and explicit redistribution of "association vectors" within them on the other one. By the end of the historical period under study, the corresponding fragment of the associative network gets saturated with new nodes and demonstrates considerable increase in density and relevance of internal relations. The degree of anxiety (and emotionality in general) in stereotypical perception of danger, risk and threat by modern youth is reduced, such phenomena begin to be perceived somewhat abstractly, and from distance.

**Key words:** associative experiment; stereotypical association; associative network; danger; risk; threat.

**Морель Морель Д.А.,  
Спивак Л.Н.,  
Шатилина С.И.**

**СТЕРЕОТИПНЫЕ РИСКИ И УГРОЗЫ В ГЛАЗАХ МОЛОДЕЖИ  
(ДИАХРОННО-СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АСПЕКТ)**

### Introduction

Since the associative memory model has been proposed (see [6]), reference to the materials dealing with associative experiments has gained a particular relevance for the studies with a cognitive focus and been keeping it to this day. At the same time, «at present, an interest in the study of the dynamics of linguistic consciousness based on the material of the comparative analysis of associative fields being different by fixation time has increased» [1, p. 15].

Such contrastive analyses that we have conducted, based on the materials from «The Russian Association Dictionary» and the results of the author's associative experiment, show high efficiency of such approach in studying the dynamics of the concepts at the turn of the epochs. The data for «The Russian Association Dictionary» were compiled in

the course of a mass experiment of the 1988-90s, and all the respondents (students aged 17-25 years) were born and formed as personalities in the USSR [2]. The author's experiment of a similar age group was conducted after 2013, therefore, its representatives grew after the disintegration of the USSR under the conditions of the other socio-political situation. Such ideological gap could not help affecting the peculiarities of the content and structure of associative fields, which allowed to reveal some interesting tendencies (see the example: [10; 12]), including those relating to the dynamics of stereotypical notions of security [9].

### The Objective of the Paper

The present study attempts to trace the peculiarities of stereotypical perception of security threats by the youth of the Soviet and modern periods

of the history, and to identify the main tendencies in its dynamics in the mentioned historical period in terms of the material of the associations by the stimulus words «danger», «risk», «threat».

### The Materials and Methods

To detect the state of the associative fields at the initial stage of the considered historical period (1988-90s – hereinafter, T<sub>0</sub>), we referred to the data from «The Russian Association Dictionary» [5]. The authors' experiment was conducted on the basis of the analogous procedure (the subjects were asked to fill in the questionnaire containing 100 stimulus words within 10 minutes [2]; see also: [7, p. 156-157]) in 2015 (hereinafter, T<sub>1</sub>) and involved 100 respondents. The collected associative material was semantically clustered (see: [4, p. 76; 8, p. 19-22]). On its basis the fragment of the associative network was modeled (see the example: [7, P. 154-155]).

### The results and Discussion

The analysis of direct and inverse associations allowed to build two models describing the state of the associative network «around» the node «danger» as of T<sub>0</sub> and T<sub>1</sub>.

As of T<sub>0</sub>, «danger» is a central but not system-forming node of the considered fragment of the associative network. As of T<sub>1</sub>, the density of connections of this node increases significantly, and it closely approaches in the semantic space (see: [12, 4, P. 79-88]) with the node «risk» (cross-association are the most frequent).

There is an interesting tendency in the dynamics of top reactions to the stimuli «danger» and «risk». If the T<sub>0</sub>-respondents *accept* the risk (and even approve it implicitly), the T<sub>1</sub>-respondents justify it only. The T<sub>0</sub>-respondents tend to have a positive vision of the development of a threatening situation on the whole: the danger is *past* for them (whereas the answers of the T<sub>1</sub>-respondents are indicative of the frequency of a corresponding reaction to fall to a minimum).

The nodes «explosion» and «terrorist attack» as of T<sub>1</sub> form a binary cluster (an internal coherence of which is enhanced by increasing the relevance of the associative bond with a bomb, which completely correlates with objectively observable criminogenic and socio-psychological tendencies in the Russian society [3, p. 3-4]). At the same time, in the semantic space they significantly converge with the fragment of the network (explosion was not considered by the T<sub>0</sub>-respondents as danger, despite its sustained associating with the use of nuclear weapons).

The node «death» is also close to the considered fragment of the associative network in the semantic space, at the same time, one clearly traces amplification in the perception of death as a

frightening factor. One observes also intensification of the systemic importance of «fear» as a peripheral (relative to «threat») node. Note that the convergence of the fragment with the nodes corresponding to the «existential» concept («fear», «death») at the final stage [10] is mainly due to the formation of the binary cluster «explosion ↔ terrorist attack».

The performed semantic analysis of all associations by the stimulus word «**danger**» allowed to reveal 14 clusters:

*danger*... 1) sudden, 2) greater, 3) has a potential character, 4) for life, health, 5) is supposed to have protection against it, 6) is supposed to have warning about it, 7) is its initiator, 8) everywhere, 9) near, 10) has different localization in space and situation, 11) is past, 12) is coming, 13) is a fear (or absence of it), 14) is a different sensation, psychophysiological state, manifestation of it.

The replies of the T<sub>0</sub>-respondents do not contain the representatives of cluster № 14, and of the T<sub>1</sub>-respondents – №№ 1 and 13.

The linguistic consciousness of the T<sub>0</sub>-respondents «danger» was mainly perceived through the prism of the movement, as being close, significant, supposing to have some symbols that warn about it. For the T<sub>1</sub>-respondents, «danger» is largely reduced to its causers, it is stereotypically perceived as a *risk*, *threat*, *fear*, however, presupposes the existence of *protection* against it.

The attribute of *potentiality* of danger moves up from the irrelevant one for the linguistic consciousness of the T<sub>0</sub>-respondent to the number of nuclear ones for their contemporary peers. Moreover, the attribute of *illusiveness* and of far-fetched nature of danger is actualized.

Note here that the observed tendency of the rapid growth of relevance of the attributes of *causal initiator* of danger (including weapons), and *protection* against it (mainly by means of *artefacts*) is largely correlated with the dynamics of similar attributes of «security» [9].

The clusters formed by verbal (that represent highly-relevant attributes of *motion* of danger for the T<sub>0</sub>-respondents in the situational space) and adjectival (that represent the evaluative qualitative character of danger) reactions are almost completely de-actualized. The latter indicates an explicit decrease in brightness, intensity of perception of danger in the T<sub>1</sub>-respondents compared to their Soviet counterparts.

At the same time, in the replies of the T<sub>1</sub>-respondents, one observes an intensification of awareness of the danger as the cause of emotional

states including the fear (it is interesting that the T<sub>0</sub>-respondents could *not be afraid of it*).

One notes the total decline of relevance of the clusters of localization of danger. A highly relevant attribute of *imminence* of danger as of T<sub>0</sub> is almost de-actualized, which is indicative of a manifest weakening of suspense in T<sub>1</sub>-respondents, and this tendency cannot be compensated by the gain of the cluster «danger is everywhere». The latter, coupled with some reduction in the frequency of a particular space and situational binding of danger, suggests that the perception of danger as of T<sub>1</sub> is de-concretized, becomes more abstract, fuzzy.

As of both T<sub>0</sub> and T<sub>1</sub> in the structure of associative field of the stimulus word «**risk**», 9 clusters have been revealed:

*risk*... 1) is approved, 2) has been justified (or not) 3) is estimated by the degree (great or not), 4) is the danger 5) is a pastime associated with excitement (extreme sports, races, games), 6) is a success, chance (or failure), 7) is the fear (or courage), 8) for life, health, 9) is associated with behaviour and decision-making.

The T<sub>0</sub>-respondents stereotypically interpret risk as «a noble cause», besides, they tend to assess it (mainly as great) and correlate it with danger. For T<sub>1</sub>-respondents, «risk» comes mainly to the danger (for life, in particular) on the one hand and to the idea of excitement, good luck - on the other. In addition, from their point of view the risk is justified (but that is about it).

As of T<sub>1</sub>, the risk almost completely ceases to be perceived as a «noble cause» (moreover, from the responses, the predicates of a positive evaluation completely disappear), however, the attribute of its *propriety* somewhat increases its relevance, shifting towards nuclear (at the same time, *the degree of reasonableness of risk* also increases, as assessment of it as unjustified being frequent enough for the T<sub>0</sub>-respondents is de-actualized).

They begin to identify risk with danger and gambling pastime; relevant clusters demonstrate relatively high growth rates.

The intensification of the theme of passion in the perception of risk can be traced in the increase of relevance of its connection with the condition of success, good luck (the topicality of the saying «fortune favours the bold» has continued for modern respondents). The probability of failure for both groups of respondents is approximately equal and not great.

It is interesting that the decrease of the relevance of the cluster «fear (or courage)» is due to the full de-actualization of the second component. But the decrease

of the relevance of risk assessment in *size* is mainly owing to the representatives of its low indicators.

The analysis of the associative material concerning the stimulus word «**threat**» has revealed 14 clusters:

*threat*... 1) is a danger, 2) is a war, enemy, weapon, 3) is a crime, unlawful behaviour, 4) is a fear, 5) is other psycho-physiological states, 6) is a storm 7) is severe trials of life, 8) to life, health, 9) is an assault, 10) personal or collective, 11) great, 12) is localized in space 13) implies protection from it 14) can be avoided.

Clusters №№ 7 and 14 are not represented in the responses of the T<sub>0</sub>-respondents.

From the point of view of the T<sub>0</sub>-respondents, the stereotypical «threat» has *an object* (life, world, society, in the main), criminogenic or militaristic nature, comes to danger, causes fear. Stereotypical conception of the T<sub>1</sub>-respondents of the threat is somewhat simplified: it has its own object (life in the main) and comes to the danger (the other clusters demonstrate low relevance).

«Threat» begins to acquire not so much social as vital («life-threatening») character. This is indicative of the growth of the relevance of the attribute, on the one hand, on the other – the fall in the relevance of the attributes of the criminogenic nature of the threat and its focus on the *social* world.

The understanding of the threat as *misfortune* is actualized as of T<sub>1</sub>.

In the responses of the T<sub>1</sub>-respondents, the attribute of the *intensification* of threat is practically de-actualized. Besides it, the correlation of threat with fear in their responses is virtually de-actualized (and with the other psycho-psychological states – is weakened).

The specificity of the responses of the T<sub>1</sub>-respondents is actualization of understanding of that the threat can be *avoided of*, and one can be *protected*.

### Conclusion

The present study has shown that by the substantial similarity of stereotypical notions of the Soviet and contemporary youth of the security threats (which is evidence of the stability of the relevant concepts) they demonstrate explicit distinctions that are indicative of structural and informative and functional changes in the picture of the world occurred for the historical period under review.

A number of tendencies in the dynamics of the studied conceptions has been revealed.

For example, in the case of «danger» it is shown that as of T<sub>1</sub> it acquires a potential character, comes to its causer, moves away from the personal space of

respondents, ceases to be perceived through the metaphor of motion.

In terms of stereotypical perception of «risk» two opposite tendencies are formed: on the one hand, «risk is not good» (risk is a danger, a threat to health, it ceases to be approved), on the other - «risk is not bad» (the risk is a lucky chance, excitement, extreme, it is justified).

«Threat» (as well as «danger») is de-concretized, de-personalized, takes more abstract, generalized character, considerably loses on emotionality of perception.

It should be noted that the tendency to virtually complete elimination of the verbal reactions in the responses of contemporary respondents was noted earlier in the analysis of other associative fields (mainly the names of the concepts forming the «security perimeter» [11]).

If the fragment of an associative network with a focus on the node «danger» as of  $T_0$  demonstrates a low degree of systemic coherence, then in  $T_1$ , it is characterized by a higher density and integration: in the same area of semantic space there are more nodes, relations between them are becoming more numerous and stable, the number of highly relevant cross-associations grow. Instead of loosely coupled network ( $T_0$ ) as of  $T_1$  it is observed interaction (including mediated through the node «fear») of the two triads, «risk ↔ danger ↔ threat» and «explosion ↔ terrorist attack → death».

In addition, as it follows from the analysis of this fragment of the associative network, the perception of danger by the  $T_0$ -respondents differed to somewhat lesser extent of anxiety in comparison with their modern counterparts.

#### References:

1. Alimushkina, O.A. Possibilities of Studying Stereotypes in Associative Fields. *Almanac of Modern Science and Education* 2 (33), Part II (2010): 14-15.
2. Karaulov, Yu. N. Afterword. Russian Association Dictionary as a New Linguistic Source and a Tool of Language Capability Analysis. In *Russian association dictionary*, vol. 2, 750-782. M.: Astrel; AST, 2002.
3. Kravets, I.P. *Organizational and Legal Mechanism of Investigating Terrorist Acts Committed by Means of Explosions*: thesis. M., 2010.
4. Petrenko, V.F. *Fundamentals of Psychosemantics*. St. Petersburg: Peter, 2005.
5. *Russian Association Dictionary*, <http://thesaurus.ru/dict/dict.php> (accessed July 10, 2014).
6. Anderson, J.R., Bower, G.H. *Human Associative Memory: a brief edition*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates, 1980.
7. Kiss, G.R. and others. An Associative thesaurus of English and its Computer Analysis. In *The Computer and Literary Studies*, 153-165. Edinburgh: University Press, 1973.
8. Lukavsky, J. *Physiological Correlates and Semantic Distances in Word Association Test*: Dissertation. Prague, 2008.
9. Morel Morel, D.A. Comparing the Same Stimulus Associative Fields Fixed in Different Historical Periods (technique application case study). *New Paradigms and New Solutions in Modern Linguistics* 5 (2014): 43-48.
10. Morel Morel, D.A. Existential Concepts in the Russian Naïve Picture of the World: Dynamics Revealed Through Diachronic Comparative Study of Associative Fields. In *Papers of the 8th International Scientific Conference "Applied Sciences in Europe: Tendencies of Contemporary Development"*, 52-56. Stuttgart: ORT Publishing, 2014.
11. Morel Morel, D.A. Medium-term Dynamics of the Naïve Picture of the World through the Prism of Associative Experiment. In *Applied and Fundamental Studies: Proceedings of the 5th International Academic Conference*, 233-237. St. Louis, MO: Science and Innovation Center, 2014.
12. Ploux, S., Victorri, B. Construction d'espaces sémantiques à l'aide de dictionnaires de synonymes. *Traitement Automatique des Langues* 39, no 1 (1998): 161-182.