

Speech of an average citizen of a Russian town

Tatyana Michaylovna Balykhina¹, Marina Sergeevna Netesina^{1,2}

¹Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Miklukho-Maklaya Street, 6, Moscow, 117198, Russia

²Moscow State University of Medicine and Dentistry after A.I. Evdokimov, Delegatskaya Street, 20, Moscow, 127473, Russia

Abstract. Speech of an average citizen of today Moscow is analyzed in the article. New trends in today speech of a city are mentioned: dynamic overcoming of existing traditions, adoption of novelties from spoken discourse. It is necessary to study the complex of motivations that provoke statements (releasing tense, making a person laugh, etc.), compile dictionaries that include "positive" conversational speech (other studies are prevailing new), cataloging of speech material that is yet in the state of "remark" in researches now, turn to study of priorities of Russian people as it is shown in the article.

[Balykhina T.M., Netesina M.S. **Speech of an average citizen of a Russian town.** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(5s):385-392] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 78

Keywords: speech of an average citizen, Moscow, "positive" conversational speech, Russian people

Introduction

Communicative space of a city is multifaceted. Conversational speech is realized as a text-discourse that is called speech "immersed in life" (N.D. Arutiynova), "a particle of constantly moving flow of a men's experience" (B.M. Gasparov), "result of comprehension of text" (V.G. Kostomarov, N.D. Burvikova), "secondary communicative activity" (I.N. Tupitsina).

Variants of city speech are formed by social base. It may be divided into social dialects, jargon, interdialects, coine, slangs [1]; native speakers of 1) elite speech culture, 2) average literary speech culture, 3) literary speech culture, 4) familiar communicative speech system [2]. B.G. Unbegaun defines Russian language as a two-dimensional language and opposes it to one-dimensional languages oriented solely on communicative speech like, for example, modern Ukrainian or Belarus languages [3].

It is accepted that social characteristics may be ordered in the following way by their impact on phonetic phenomena: 1) territorial, 2) age, 3) social strata, 4) education. "It is possible to discuss the language issues ... in terms of vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar being determined historically, dialectically/territorially" [4, p. 42].

Basics of modern approach are laid by B.A. Larin (who separated different language groups in the boundaries of a city, divide speech into bookish style language and low dialects), N.I. Tolstoi (divides speech culture into four types).

Representatives of spoken community may be divided into professional and social layers that traditionally include politic and executive structures, journalists, intellectuals. Youth [5, others] and celebrities [6, others.] are considered to be influential

social strata regarding its effect on speech. Such division is always conditional because representatives of each strata are not uniform they may be grouped by different indicators, partly coincide with each other or have common parts. But representatives of these strata may be united by speech priorities. Choice of language tools depending the aim of communication is the most important indicator of group preferences or rejections [7]. We added two more categories to those mentioned by most researches, i.e. representatives of media, intellectuals and politics. These groups are noticeable in communicative space of Moscow like these three, they represent dominating trends in live spoken process. These groups are average citizens of megalopolis (communicative speech area) and migrants.

Method

Analysis of pronounced speech of representatives of five social and professional groups has been done: media, intellectuals, migrants, politicians, average citizens (total 1507 people). Social and lingual category has its features — lingual, social, communicative and functional [5, p. 10].

The following research methods were applied: survey, information gathering, expert evaluation of material on the base of lingual and cultural complex analysis of oral texts (considering ethnic, gender, social and cultural approaches), comparative analysis; mathematical and statistical processing of all materials.

Planned and realized research is qualitative research from technological point of view. Qualitative analysis does not require solving research tasks directly connected with quantitative description

of data, i.e. study an object in the scope of quality paradigm.

Audio and video stories have been selected with samples of pronounced speed of mentioned groups of megalopolis citizens (total 748 stories, total duration — 138 hours). The only accepted method that takes extremely long time with limited group of researches is overall and repeated listening of text and its auditing by researches involved — philologist with professional “feeling” of language.

On one hand the quality of pronounced speech characterized the quality of its informative and formal aspects. For example such evaluation parameters as *articulation, articulatory clearness, pronunciation, fluency* characterize formal side of speech and *logic, adequacy, accuracy* — its informative side.

At the same time evaluation indicators of pronounced speech may be qualitative and quantitative (“So I think that the movement of sociolinguistics into quantitative work has been paralleled or has helped move many other areas of the field in this direction” [8]). Important stage of qualitative evaluation is separation of pronounced speech indicators. Qualification and membership of auditors are also important. Philologists, phonetics specialists and native speakers with different education may be auditors.

As for quantitative characteristics of indicators they may characterize only presence or total absence of a certain parameter. Speech is *accurate or not, expressive of not*, etc. In accounting for units of language the following variants were used: *no, moderate presence, expressed presence*.

Professional philologists having experience of foreign accent analysis, with tough articulation, analysis of dialect specifics of pronunciation, analysis of media stylistics, analysis of stylistics and poetics of pronounced texts (radio, TV, work of art texts) worked as experts in the research.

The problem of reference point, neutral background is the first problem of speech quality evaluation. Norm in wide linguistic meaning is model, unified, widely accepted in a certain lingual sphere usage of the units of language based on written and accepted rules. Norm is reality, it is cultivated in radio and TV communications and directly connected with language system, for example with sounds characteristics.

Variations and peculiarities are always marked. It manifests itself in the fact that each deviation from norm, widely accepted rules attracts attention of auditor (in our case a person who is professional speaker, who study pronounced speech professionally and who is highly experienced with it). The task of expert auditors is to extract indicators that

characterize speech, to carry out sound analysis and make evaluations. It depends on their experience and skills.

Metaphor is often the base of verbal definitions of speech indicators, many indicators are figurative. At the same time these figures of speech should be transparent, clear.

Defining evaluation criteria we rely on the definition of tolerant speech interference given in [9] (objective position regarding persons with opinions, actions, race, religion, etc. different from those of speaker, knowledge of lingual and cultural and ethnic and cultural specifics of communicating persons, active use of lingual resources in speech interference to gain common understanding, adequate lingual and speech execution of all components of communication that is expresses in communicative strategies and speech behavioral tactics of communicating persons). Mutually oriented speech structure is considered in evaluation of speech regarding both speaker and listener: “The underlying theme is that accounts for what gets done and gets understood in talk-in-interaction must take into account not only its composition, but also its position — not only with respect to the grammar of sentences, but also with respect to the organization of turns at talk, of action sequences encompassing multiple turns at talk, and of occasions of talk, all of which are demonstrably oriented to by speakers in their production of the talk and by recipients in their analyzing of the talk” [10, p. 134].

At the same time we relied on the following fact. According to psychological science expert evaluates features of a person better if he measure characteristics with complex structure not integrally by their complex manifestation but by separate simpler “one-dimensional” scales that may be combined in more complex unity. In this way the following criteria of evaluation of pronounced speech of people of our megalopolis have been formulated.

- Speech technique (*articulative clearness, enunciation*).
- Level of voice mastering, speech mastering (*variety of timbres, harmony, flying character* — capability to sent the voice over a distance and regulate loudness, voice *agility* — capability to change it s height, *intensity* — pronunciation force, tension, *monotony, variety of intonations, expressiveness* — emotional intensity, expressiveness of mimicry, gestures, pose).
- Desire to communicate the ideas properly (*loudness, pronunciation speed, expressiveness* — selection of language means to increase impression from statements and attract interest and attention of a partner, to affect its sense and feelings, *availability* — weighted speech content,

accounting for cultural and educational level of a partner his experience).

- Attention to a partner, addressee of speech (*attention, capability to listen*).
- Expression of the attitude to an interlocutor (*irony, mockery, aggression*).
- Maximal approach to literary speech considering tolerance (*accent, dialect, naturalness* (including naturalness of gestures, intonations, mimicry), *affectation* (including affectation of gestures, intonations, mimicry), *briefness, verbosity, politeness* — keeping to decorum rules in speech considering the environment, sex and age of interlocutor, *self-control* — ability to react calmly on unexpected and tactless questions and statements of interlocutor, *correctness* — compliance to norms, *purity* — absence of filler words, colloquial words, *logic* — logical correlation of statements, *accuracy* — correlation between speech meaning and communicative idea of speaker and reflected reality, appropriateness — correlation between speech specifics and communication tasks).

So, **deepening** path was the following: speech technique — voice mastering — expressiveness — desire to communicate — expression of an attitude to interlocutor — maximal approach to literary speech considering tolerance. Phonetic, lexical, syntactic sides of pronounced speech were analyzed separately.

Main body

Modern megalopolis speech is characterized by the following:

- oral form of communication became as authoritative and important as written that led to functional opposition of literary language with spoken;
- opposition between the system and norm became expressed; sharpened in its perfection language system makes norm to a certain extent useless (codifying activity of authoritative organizations and persons is weakened: theater—actors, TV — newsreaders, reference books that allows variations and accepting tongue and speech variants, - linguist);
- changing material base of literature existence: not only literary and scientific text but also social and political journalism with its modern “familiarities” became model text;
- lofty style is disappearing replaced by average, neutral style; conversational speech takes the place of neural style.

The theory of norm had been developed in Russian science by L.V. Shherba, D.N. Ushakov, S.I.

Ozhegov, M.V. Panov, R.I. Avanesov. Language literary norm is accepted in social and lingual practice of educated people rules of pronunciation, word usage, usage of historically developed grammar, style and other language means. Norm is defined and fixed in dictionaries, text-books, etc. It is stable and has system character because it is directly related with language structure.

General “literary standard”, literary norm general (or thought to be general in a certain part) for both form (literary and spoken) of lingual communication is being created in any developed literary language with its traditions of declamatory speech and numerous examples of reproduction of spoken speech in the works of art. As concerned modern state of Russian language norm, researches mention that the share of spoken communication in oral practice of society is constantly growing. It is caused by growing of the number of different talk-shows, author programs, FM-broadcasting, various interviews, debates, discussions, round tables as well as the necessity of personal socialization.

It is known that norm is at the same time linguistic and social and historical category. Social side of norm is manifested in the system of evaluation (right — wrong, appropriate — inappropriate). These evaluations presuppose aesthetic component (beautifully — ugly).

Undoubtedly “live as life” (N.V. Gogol) language is constantly developing. Usual shift during which significant changes in language are aggregating lasts for 20 — 40 years and more. It is so called moderately dynamic type of language evolution. Most modern literary languages are characterized by the trend to convergence of literary language norms and conversational speech norms although different social conditions may significantly change this process. Usually it has two sides: certain liberation of existing norms under the influence of conversational form of a language and development of relatively normalized literary form in oral communication.

Strength of literary norms existing earlier, censorship of written and public speech withstood all accelerations. Even in stormy period of reformation Peter the Great reproached his ambassador: “*upotrebljaesh' ty zelo mnogo pol'skie i drugie inostrannye slova, za kotorym samogo dela vyrazumet' nevozmozžno*” (*you use too much polish and other foreign words so the essence is incomprehensible*). But frequently a word gained a foothold in language, was fixed in language and later was withdrawn from language for some ethic or political considerations. It is known an interesting story about the word *chrusch* that according to The Dictionary of Russian Language compiled by S.I.

Ozhegov meant a name of some beetles and had the following example of usage: “*Chrusch is a vermin*”. In late 50s — beginning of 60s censorship seemed an obvious political hint in this article and the word itself.

Opposition of Moscow and Petersburg pronunciation specifics may cause changes in Russian pronunciation: *sku[sh]no* (Moscow) — *sku[ch]no* (Petersburg) (it is dull), *shi [shi]* (Moscow) — *shi [sh'ch']* (Petersburg) (cabbage soup). Aesthetic reasons are also important, for example, the role of The Small Academic Theater in preserving the old Moscow pronunciation had been weakened. Printed word affect activation of visual perception of graphic form of a word, graphic pronunciation is increasing: *[cht]oby* (in order to), *tikhii* (from *tich[o]i*) (quiet). Written form of a word may defeat its pronunciation: *bleklyi* (instead of *blyoklii*) (faded), *manevr* (instead of *manyovre*) (manoeuvre). Boundary-spanning of territorial dialects may be observed: [g] fricative has been kept in words *aga* (oh, yes), *gospodi* (for God's sake), *bukhgalter* (accounter).

Foreign words are being phonetically adapted: *p[a]aet* (instead of *p[o]aet* (poet), *r[e]ktor* (instead of *r[ə]ktor*), and dual spelling allows for dual pronunciation: *bordjom* — *bordjomi* (name of Georgian mineral water), *diskussirovat* — *diskutirovat* (to discuss).

Intersystem and external reasons of accent changes are the following.

The law of assimilation is activating in laying stresses: *prOdana* (instead of *prodAna*) (sold, feminine gender) analogous to *prOdano* (sold, neuter gender). In case of dual adoption variations may be observed: *idUstria* (Latin) — *industriA* (Greece) (industry).

Stress position of a word is weakened: *kedrOviy* (instead of *kEdrovi*) (cedar), *vishnYOvi* (instead of *vIshnevi*) (cherry), or reverse trend to rhythmical balance may be observed, stress is being shifted to the center of word: *schastlIvyi* (instead of *schAstlivyi* (happy), *khodzOgovor* (business agreement) from *dogovor* (agreement).

Verbal stress remains relatively stable, nominative stress is an object of discussions: *dogOvory* — *dogovorA* (agreements). Keeping stress place of source word is more typical for foreign words: *bArter* (exchange), *brOker* (broker), *mNedjer* (manager).

The following trends may be observed in grammar:

Increasing of analytical features of Russian language. It shows itself firstly in reduction of cases number, for example, modern genitive case is the former attributive case (*kniga brata* — brother's

book, *prokhlada lesa* — forest's freshness) and quantitative case — (*metr materii* — meter of fabric, *stakan chaya* — a glass of tea). Secondly the class of indeclinable proper names is growing: proper names ending —ino (*Pushkino* — name of a town in Moscow region), complex names with the first indeclinable part (*divan-krovat* - folding divan); abbreviations: *MGU* (MSU), in People's Friendship Russian University.

Class of nouns of common gender is growing, application of masculine gender to female persons is becoming more frequent: *nasha ekskursovod* (our tour guide), *director zanyata* (director is busy), *khoroshaya vrach* (good doctor) or *Ivanova* — *khoroshi vrach* (Ivanova is good doctor). The way of designation of generalization in nouns is changing (forms that designate singleness acquire generalization meaning): *professura* (professors), *starichiyo* (neglectful word for elderly people), *fermerstvo* (farmers), *soldatniya* (neglectful word for soldiers), *ingeneria* (engineers), *Doma aktyorov* (The Houses of Actors); generalization forms sometimes are not expressed grammatically: *chitatel zhdyot novykh knig* (reader is waiting for new books).

There are also shifts in the forms of grammatical gender. Masculine gender is defeating feminine gender in opposition of masculine and feminine genders: *apogei* instead of *apogeya* (apogee), *braslet* (instead of *brasleta*) (bracelet), *shampun* (masculine gender) (shampoo), *gel* (masculine gender) (gel). Semantic foundation appears in form separation: *zhar-zhara* (heat or farvor — only heat), *kariyer* — *kariera* (full gallop, mine, sand pit — carrier), *kegl* — *keglya* (size of type — skittle). Neuter gender eliminates gender variability in indeclining nouns adapted from foreign languages: *penalti* (penalty), *ralli* (rally), *salyami* (salami), *povidlo* (jam).

Forming of plural ending -ost, -est in forms of grammatical number are allowed: *dogovoryonnosti* (agreements), *nedoskazannosti* (elusivenesses). Plural forms of nouns appear: *benziny* (benzines), *nefti* (oils), *gazy* (gases). In verbal forms of nouns plural forms are used but they do not show trend to lexical divergence: *beg-bega* (race — recing), *skhvatka* — *skhvatki* (fight — fights), *gryaz* — *gryazi* (mud — muds).

Changes in case forms have the following trends:

- 1) to indeclinability of names;
- 2) to case keeping;
- 3) to indeclinability of names resulting in variability of case endings;
- 4) easy attitude to traditional literary norm;

5) fixing of professional speech position in general language system.

Variations in use of nominative and genitive cases appear to be the most stable.

In nominative case the following trends may be observed:

1) younger forms ending -a are fixing replacing forms ending -i, -y (*ingeneriy* — *ingenera* (engineers) and also *professora* (professors), *uchitelya* (teachers), *traktora* (tractors), *inspektora* (inspectors)).

2) forms ending -y, -i are being pushed off in literature and other written forms: *dogovory* (agreements), *rektory* (rectors), *direktory* (directors), *vybory* (elections);

3) semantic separation goes on: *lageri* (political groups) — *lagerya* (forced labor camps), *tsvety* (flowers) — *tsveta* (colors), *propuski* (non-attendance) — *propuska* (passes).

In genitive case the following trends may be observed:

1) competition of endings -ov/zero ending is growing;

2) zero ending are being fixed:

in naming of people by nationality: *gruziny* — *mnogo gruzin* (Georgian — many Georgians), *turkmen* (Turkmen), *bashkir* (Bashkirs), *tatar* (Tatars);

names of nationalities ending -tsy are drawn to suffix -ets: *italianets* — *italiantsev* (Italian — Italians);

names ending -ane, -yane are used with zero ending: *anglichane* — *anglichan* (Englishmen);

in names of fruits, vegetables: *mnogo apelsin* (*apelsinov*) (many oranges), *mandarin* (*mandarinov*) (tangerines), *baklazhan* (*baklazhanov*) (aubergines), and only *limonov* (lemons), *anasosov* (pineapples), *bananov* (bananas), *arbuzov* (watermelons);

in names of units: *mnogo kilogramm* (*kilogramm*) (kilograms), *volt* (volts), *rentgen* (roentgen);

in neuter gender nouns ending -ie (*ushelie* (canyon), *zhelanie* (desire)) existing ending is pushed off by ending -ii: *zhelanii*, *ozheralii* (necklaces).

Verbal forms are also changing. Forms with suffix -nu are being pushed off by variants without suffix: *dostignut* — *dostig* (achieve), *ozyabnut* — *ozyab* (to become frozen), *promoknut* — *promok* (to get wet). Form typical for productive class are defeating other forms: *bryzgat* — *bryzgaet* (instead of *bryzzhet*) (splashing), *dvigat* — *dvigaet* (instead of *dvizhet*) (moving).

Variation of letters -o and -a in radicals are observed:

1. form with -a has been fixed in verbs: *osvaivat* (to become familiar), *otstraivat* (to build), *osparivat* (to argue), *usporaivat* (to calm down), *udvaivat* (to double), *zatravigivat* (to touch), *odalzhivat* (to borrow).

2. forms vary in a number of verbs: *poditozhivat* — *poditazhivat* (to sum up), *obuslovlivat* — *obuslavlivat* (to cause), *upolnomochivat* — *upolnamachivat* (to authorize), *udostovat* — *udoataivat* (to award).

3. forms with -o are kept in verbs: *otsrochivat* (to postpone), *oposhlivat* (to make vulgar), *uprochivat* (to strengthen).

Active processes go on in syntax too. Social factors affect activation of conversational syntax constructions. Number of partitioned segmented syntax constructions is growing. *Dry linen, Soft slippers and warm dressing gown. Cheerful music from loudspeaker. It was just what seemed to us.* The role of conjunctive constructions and parceling of statement structure is growing. *In a few minutes he went on — alone. Now I am in a village. Alone. Just night.* It makes the statement logical, increase meaning accents, develops information semantically, creates specific conversational image of a statement.

Binomial constructions are being actively used: *Russia and Belarus. It is uneasy in my soul.*

Predicative complexity of a sentence, usage of contamination that imitate speech process when a thought is being formed on the fly: *Living according to the principle "a man is a friend to a man".*

Constructions "noun + connective word *this is* + subordinate clause": *Love is when people cannot live without each other.* Discordant and uncontrollable wordforms are activating: *How to get Prosect Mira?*

A number of prepositional constructions is growing: *teacher of history* (instead of *history teacher*), as well as prepositions number *in a sphere, in a deal, in a process.*

New trends in syntax

Syntactical compression is observed, i.e. omission of link, construction elements (usually internal) while keeping boundary members: *coffee from Brazil* (instead of *coffee delivered from Brazil*). Syntactical reduction became more frequent i.e. omission of necessary grammar element in a structure: *theme is interesting (why? whom for?)*, *firm guarantees (what? who?)*. Syntactical links are weakening, i.e. case functions in a sentence became weaker that results in changing of places in a sentence: *Winter in Yalta. In Yalta it is winter. Black with streaks of gray birch tree — birch tree is black with streaks of gray.*

The most vivid are the following trends in **vocabulary**. Complete layers of vocabulary that designated the Soviet realm are disappearing: *collective farm, social competition*. Historicisms are coming back to vocabulary and peripheral vocabulary and words are being reviewed from the point of view of style: *business, predprinimatel* (entrepreneur), *torgi* (auction). New phraseology is being developed: *wild market, money-laundering, a person of Caucasian nationality, new Russians*, etc. New political vocabulary is being developed as well: *agrarian socialism, by-soviet group, by-communist ideas, mini-putsch*, etc.

Marker vocabulary of the time is being developed: *krutoi* (tough) (about a rich businessman), *oblom* (offset), *tusovka* (get-together), *razborka* (shootout), *bespredel* (coming beyond the limits) — in criminal jargon — outbreak in forces labor camp. Many words have come from jargons and unlike their literary synonyms stress the level of manifestation of some indicator.

New cliché are created by commercials: *pause for advertizing, sweet two*, etc. Meaning of well-known words is becoming wider: *disco-club, business-club, trade house, Trade palace*. Vocabulary is being deideologized and depolitized: the word *predprinimatel* (entrepreneur) meant earlier *capitalist, moneymaker* (negative connotation), and now it means *owner of a company, firm, person engaged in economy or finance* (neutral or even exultant meaning).

Meaning of words are being reviewed they are became wider or more narrow, somwtimes get metaphoric meaning: *pozvonochnik* (backbone) — a person that was appointed after the phone call of important person; *chelnok* (shuttle) — trader of goods brought by himself, *pod snezhnik* (snowdrop) — private taxi driver, *zakhlopyvanie* (flapping) — flapping too loudly and aggressive to make a person stop talking, etc. Vocabulary that goes back to spiritual traditions are being revived: *miloserdie* (charity) — earlier *pardon, pity*; now — *philanthropy*). Words become neutral from the point of view of style or they are being reviewed stylistically. The words *dostoyanie* (property), *deyaniya* (deed), *evangelie* (the *Gospel* — *political Gospel*), *khram* (temple — *the temple of science*), *derzhava* (power — *underdeveloped power*).

Words in the last fashion are being created by journalists to attract attention of mass reader, spectator: *znakovaya* (merker), *kultovaya* (cult) figure (important person), *priezdy* (arrivals) — instead of numerous arrivals. Some words become euphemisms, their real meaning is being covered, background information about these words are lightening: *competent organs* (instead of ChK (Emergency

Committee, NKVD (People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs), KGB (The Committee of National Security), *physical elimination* (instead of *murder*), *undertake extreme measures* (*commit troops*), *mopping-up settlement*. Vocabulary and speech means became more metaphoric: *corridors of power, reformation ship, totalitarian islands*.

Special words acquire wider meaning: *sclerosis* (medical term) *of shame*, *algebra* (mathematical term) *of ideas*, *virus* (medical term) *of distrust*, *energy of thoughts*, *logic of feelings*, *diplomatic hygiene*.

Words adapted from English push off not only Russian words but words adapted from other languages: *sandwich* (instead of *buterbrod* — Butterbrot (German)), *slogan* (instead of *lozung* — *Losung* (German)), *hit* (instead of *shlyager* — *Schlager* (German)), *display* (instead of *écran* (French)).

Special computer language has been developed comprising slang and technical words: *byte* (information unit), *diskovod* (disk drive), *cursor* (cursor), *mysh* (computer mouse), *Aibolit* (name of a character from popular tale — antivirus program), *kvotit* (quote), *cloki* (clock), etc.

Interaction of different subsystems of language is observed in everyday speech. *Got married with contingent. Limita is living in a house*. Trend to speech coarsening is also being observed as a result of its liberation and as a reaction on negative sides of life: *naekhat* (run over) (to swear at), *kinut* (to throw) (to leave in a trouble), *otstegnut* (unbutton) (to give money).

Still mastering of some national standard — literary norm — is being demanded from its members by today society. Correct speech is one of indicators of general education. It may be proved by the results of monitoring the questions and statements of people addressed to the phone service of Russian language. These results were presented by E.N. Gekkina [5]. Interests of these people were related mainly with accurate (correct, true) usage of a word in written and conversational speech as well as usage of strict normalized grammar variant.

Existence of orthoepic, grammar and word-formative variants of a word was considered mainly as lingual violation. People appealing to the Service were sure that examples are strictly regulated and show certain distrust to answers of operators if they explain permissibility of usage of several variants of words in different functional areas or at the present stage of language development.

Results of our research (survey) [11] prove the value of literary norm for Moscovites. Although 79% of respondents said that their speech is “good” all of them want to improve their speech (only 2% of

respondents answered “not important”). All speech characteristics require improvement according to respondents (89% want to improve *articulation*, 90% want to improve *stress laying*, 65% want to improve *grammar accuracy*, 54% — logic, 68% — correctness, 55% — tolerance, 45% — *sentences construction*). 41% of respondents are interested in improvement of *accuracy*, 34 % — *expressiveness*, 28% — *effectiveness*, 21% — *emotionality*.

The answer of the question what group requires improvement of speech (politics, media, intellectuals, migrants, average citizens of megalopolis) was all of them (87% of respondents). Survey shows that people want politics, journalists and intellectuals speaking more *accurate*, *expressively*, *correct* and *logically*. Such qualities of oral speech as *emotionality*, *richness of expression forms*, *absence of filler words* most of respondents consider not important.

If pronounced speech conforms the norm of oral speech listener does not notice individual characteristics of it and when the norm is being violated attention of a listener is drawn to it. Unity of language norm of speaker and listener creates the best conditions for communication. If one of the people in conversation use his own norms that are not accepted they do not only attract attention of a listener as something unusual and strange but hamper understanding of speech. Violation of norm may be significant or not. Semantics of many language units consist of hints on these or that characteristics of speech sounding. Speech of a person is often a reason to consider him “one of us” or not. At the same time pronounced speech may be characterized in the context of utilitarian indicators such as distinctiveness, dynamic, speed, voice timbre, loudness, specifics of pronunciation and others. Good quality of oral speech depends on dictation, capability of express different meanings, possible in text and may be traced by a number of indicators.

Demand for rich informative expressive spontaneous monologue is growing in society. Still expert analysis of pronounced speech of average citizen uncovers the following quality of speech: irony, mock, using jargon, foreign words, dialect words, there are many filler words in speech, voluntary and emotive tonemes, pauses, hesitations, filler sounds, sounded pauses, sounds are distorted, swallowed, rhythmic of words is distorted. All these facts show low speech culture, lack of understanding of importance of improvement of the quality of oral speech, lack of interest to interlocutor.

In general communicative ignorance is typical for many citizens of megalopolis and it hamper their professional activity and everyday communication.

Conclusion

We would like to warn researches, linguists against traditional in speech study opposition of positive and negative, because system description requires the following:

- ✓ study of motivations complex that cause statements (to release tension, make interlocutor laugh and others);
- ✓ development of dictionaries that contains “positive” conversation speech (other words are dominating in this area now);
- ✓ cataloging of speech material that is yet in the state of “remark” in researches now, turn to study of priorities of Russian people as it is shown in the article;
- ✓ turn to study of priorities of Russian people.

Optimization of views on modern Russian language will promote optimization of views on national mentality. Here lays the deep meaning of tolerant analysis of modern discourse.

Resume

Dynamic process of overcoming of existing traditions is going on in modern Russian language. (There is an idea that the main base of lingual norm now is scientific speech). The following novelties are adopted from conversational discourse:

2. the role of public speech is growing;
3. a number of people whose speech is allowed to broadcast is growing so norm is shaken;
5. impact of professional, conversational speech is growing;
6. foundations of literary norms are distorted;
7. flow of new adopted words perceived from hearing is growing.

Thanks

Research was carried out with Russian Humanitarian Scientific Foundation funding in the scope of scientific and research project “Communicative space of megalopolis: analysis of pronounced speech” No 11-04-00071a.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Balykhina T.M.
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia
Miklukho-Maklaya Street, 6, Moscow, 117198,
Russia

References

1. Educational practice of people communicative speech of a city learning. Program and guidelines for students of faculties of phylology, 1990. Omsk.
2. Sirotinina, O.B., 2001. The main criteria of good speech. *Khoroshaya Rech*, pp: 16-28.
3. Unbegaun, B.O., 1973. The Russian Literary Language: a Comparative View. *The Modern Russian Review*. LXVIII, 4.
4. Komova, T.A. 2010. Introduction to Comparative Studies of Language and Culture: Great Britain — Russia. A Course of Lectures. 3rd revised edition. Moscow: KRASAND, pp: 128.
5. Modern Russian speech: state and functioning, 2004. St.-Peterburg, pp: 368.
6. Shkapenko, T. and F. Khubner, 2003. Russian "get-together" as foreign language. Kaliningrad, pp: 200.
7. Krysin, L.P., 2001. Today Russian intellectual: an attempt of speech portrait. *Russian language in scientific coverage*, 1: 90-106.
8. Gordon M.J., 2006. Interview with William Labov. *Journal of English Linguistics*. 34(4): 332-351.
9. Balykhina, T.M. and M.S. Netesina, 2012. Communicative space of megalopolis: analysis of pronounced speech. Moscow: People's Friendship University of Russia, pp: 340.
10. Schegloff E.A., 2010. Some other 'uh(m)'s. *Discourse Processes*, 47:130—174.
11. Balykhina, T.M. and M.S. Netesina, 2012. How does the modern Russian megapolis speak? Actual problems of communication and culture (issue 14), Center of Information and Educational Technologies of PSLU, pp: 214.

4/24/2014