Technical Terminology] // Cb. statei po yazykoznaniyu / Pod red. M.V. Sergievskogo, D.N. Ushakova, R.O. Shor. Moscow, Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta. (In Russian)

2. Danilenko, V.P. (1971). Leksiko-semanticheskie i grammaticheskie osobennosti slov-terminov [*Lexico-Semantic and Grammatical Features of Word-Terms*] // Issledovanie po russkoi terminologii. 235p. Moscow, Vysshaya Shkola. (In Russian)

3. Golovin, B.N., Kobrin, R.Yu. (1987). Lingvisticheskie osnovy ucheniya o terminakh [*Linguistic Foundations of Terms Study*]. 286 p. Moscow, Vysshaya Shkola. (In Russian)

4. Zherebilo, T.V. (2010). Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov [Dictionary of linguistic terms]. 486 p. Nazran', OOO "Piligrim" (In Russian)

5. Rozental', D.E., Telenkova, M.A. (1976). Slovar'-spravochnik lingvisticheskikh metodov [*Dictionary and Reference Book of Linguistic Terms*]. 2-e izdanie. 643 p. Moscow, Prosveshchenie. (In Russian)

Авторы публикации
Имамутдинова Флюра Ришатовна – *канди-дат филологических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков Уфимского государственного нефтяного технического университета, г. Уфа, Россия.*
E-mail: ufa_kafenglish@mail.ru

Authors of the publication
Imamutdinova Flyura Rishatovna – *Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages,Ufa State Petroleum Technological University, Ufa, Russia.*
E-mail: ufa_kafenglish@mail.ru

FORMATION OF SOCIAL REALITY IN MODERN YOUTH SUBCULTURES

A.K. Mingaliev[1], I.Z. Shakhnina[2], G.F. Gali[2]

arslan.mingaliev@yandex.ru, voda-2005@mail.ru, gulnaragali@mail.ru

[1]*Ethnographic Museum of Kazan (Volga region) Federal University*
[2]*Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia*

Аннотация. Авторы рассматривают в статье процессы, связанные с конструированием социальной реальности в молодежных субкультурных группах. В работе описываются мировоззренческие концепты, особенности внутренней структуры и внешней коммуникации членов молодежных субкультур. Сравнение проводилось в среде наиболее многочисленных субкультур, связанных с национализмом, уличным криминалом, протестной активностью. Теоретической базой исследования является социальный конструкционизм. Материалы статьи могут быть полезны преподавателям социально-гуманитарного профиля, студентам, сотрудникам государственных и административных структур, работающим в области молодежной политики, правоохранительным органам.

Ключевые слова: социальная реальность, социальный конструкционизм, молодежные субкультуры, идентичность.

Abstract. In the article the authors consider the processes associated with the construction of social reality in youth subcultural groups. The paper describes the worldview concepts, features of the internal structure and external communication of members of youth subcultures. The comparison was carried out among the most numerous subcultures associated with nationalism, street crime and protest activity. The theoretical basis of the research is social constructionism. The materials of the article could be useful for teachers of social and humanitarian profile, students, officers of state and administrative structures working in the field of youth policy, law enforcement agencies.

Key words: social reality, social constructionism, youth subcultures, identity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Currently, in modern Russian society, the process of group formation and individual identity, the search for understandable and representative markers of self-identification for a person continues. The most mobile part of society – young people take an active part in this process of setting identity. Modern collectivist attitudes, an increased desire for participation, a sense of unity and cohesion encourage young people to unite in different groups and communities, with different degrees of involvement [4].

Such groups, moving towards "special area of interests" can be transformed into subcultures (subcultural groups) with an inherent set of specific distinctive features [3, p. 25]. Since the subculture unites people not satisfied with existing values transform into some specific community. In other words, existing social appears as a form of perception by subculture members. Society faced with number of fundamental gusts, connected with functioning of such subcultural groups. The core of the first question is how the subculture participants create the social reality, where they are. The second question concerns the affection of this reality on the subculture participants. Then the third question could be understood in terms of identification of subculture creators in within in this reality.

The most suitable theory, which is able to explain the existing position of young generation, is social constructionism. The main issue of social constructionism is the analysis of how the knowledge of a person or group is transformed into a social reality and how they then affect each other. In this work we will consider the nature and specific examples of this phenomenon for subcultural groups. Social reality is formed not only by man as such. It is a product, first of all, of communication between different people who may have nothing in common with each other or, conversely, be members of the same social group. The latter case is simply necessary in the framework of our work.

Social reality is created in the process of communication and interpersonal relationships. In other words, we will not be able to achieve an objective picture of reality, because the reality created in the process of communication, incorporates the sides of different participants in the process.

In addition, an important clarification for further research is that the created reality, in turn, can also affect both the group and its individual representative. Thus, the fundamental mechanism is the production by people of subjectively determined social reality and its mutual impact on the same or new participants in the process.

The most fruitful idea is connected with description of three subcultural groups: "right-wing nationalists", "protestors" and "street crime members". The conventionality and obvious non-academic character of the name is caused, first of all, by the ambiguity of the proposed definitions. Terminological pluralism allows to broad interpreting of these subcultures.

It should be noted that in the context of this work, the "right-wing nationalists" are the persons who share the worldview of racial and ethnic intolerance with representatives of other ethnic groups. Hence the ideas of migrant phobia, xenophobia and anti-Semitism inherent in the "right-wing nationalists" can receive social and political overtones, expressed in criticism of current state power and supporting part of the population.

By "protestors" we mean people who are in opposition to the modern political power and public administration and express their public and civil position through protests or rallies.

Finally, under "street crime members" we understand the subculture of young people who correlate with their moral values, standards of behavior and everyday practices with the traditions of the criminal-prison environment or the actualized adolescent-youth phenomenon of "A.U.E." («арестантский уклад един» or «атмос- фера уличного единства»).

2. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The aim of our work is to analyze the construction of social reality in subcultural youth groups through social constructionism. Based on this goal, we identify the following tasks:

1) To give a detailed definition of the theory of social constructionism and its possible correct application in the study of urban subcultural space;

2) To establish characteristics of the selected subcultural groups on the basis of the materials collected during field work;

3) To consider the revealed features in the environment of "right-wing nationalists", "protestors", "street crime members" through social constructionism;

4) To summarize the results obtained to identify patterns in the process of constructing social reality by representatives of urban youth subcultures.

The object of our research is the modern urban youth subcultures of the "right-wing nationalists", "protestors", "street crime members". The subject is the features of the construction of social reality.

The theoretical basis of the work is social constructionism, the theory of which was developed in the work "Social construction of reality" (1966) by Peter Ludwig Berger (1929-2017) and Thomas Luckmann (1927-2016) [1]. This theory is the Foundation for the study and analysis of perceived social reality.

Continuing the theoretical and methodological theme, we emphasize that in this study we adhere to the constructivist approach in anthropology. The format of the work involves the use of such scientific methods as "included observation", in-

depth interview, comparative, content analysis, as well as general scientific methods of analysis and synthesis.

3. RESULTS

It is necessary to understand that subculture is always a vivid protest against established rules in society, a conflict of interests, where society is initially wrong and unfair. The concept of injustice is relevant for all three social groups studied. Under the term "youth" we understand the participation in these communities of persons in the age range of 16-30 years. Of course, in these groups there may be participants who fall out of the outlined range. However, according to empirical materials, we received the vast majority in this age category. The main criterion for attributing a person to this subculture is his own identification, as well as some "approval" from other participants of the subculture. However, the second point may initially be inappropriate to perception, unless we use the "snowball" method to increase the respondent base.

Social reality is a special intersubjective phenomenon in the life of a person and a group, which can and should by its nature be constructed by people in the processes of social and interpersonal communication. In addition, the constructed social reality will interact with the subject, already influencing him in its turn. This is due to the fact that social reality is by its dual nature both a phenomenon and a process.

As the study showed, the Bergman – Lukman theory is correct and appropriate to use in the framework of an integral field anthropological study. This is due to the sociological and socio-humanitarian basis of the theory and the study of social behavior and perception of reality, which is close to the anthropological (mostly postmodern) paradigm of "looking through the prism of personality". It was important to determine the nature of typing, channels of stereotyping, which allow to exist this subculture to take place and maintain stability.

Great differences are found in the representation of objective reality within a subculture and the way the exogenous environment, which represents the formation of reality within this structure. Thus, there is an ambiguous attitude within the group to some leaders and apologists, a priori recognized by the external environment as indisputable authorities. And it is more concerned the "protestors" component than the "street crime members" or "right-wing nationalists".

The main type of subculture members behavior is the adoption of the established "rules of the game". It is extremely important for subcultures to typify the idea of injustice and inequality. And injustice, as they consider, is a model of political, ethnic, social oppression and discrimination, which was constructed by elites or somebody among authorities. And inequality is typified as having the dual nature of appearance: natural and artificial [2, p. 240].

The dichotomy "we – they" is the main point for all investigated subcultures. In this case "we" (members of subcultures) are initially and a priori right, and "they" (social environment) can transform their images up to the enemy and completely unacceptable. In addition, the use of specialized linguo-symbolic language for the construction of its own coordinate system in social reality. There is also a factor of "transfer" of social

knowledge stock from followers or "experts" to neophytes. Moreover, as it highly should in complex multicomponent society within this subcultural environment, the social stock of knowledge is distributed in portions. And it depends on the members being involved in this sphere of interests.

Control over sustainable adherence to social reality is exercised through the application of sanctions. If for "protestors" social sanctions for deviation from the accepted norms are minimal (absolutely not tangible), then for the other two groups – "right-wing nationalists" and "street crime members" – the consequences of such sanctions can go beyond the usual ostracism up to the use of physical force [5]. And the involvement of the subcultures members in the focus groups is most often associated either with the proximity of ideological attitudes (people's subjective realities) or with the strong influence of the social environment (including virtual space). Hence, participants can already form a social reality acceptable to the subculture. In this case they identify themselves with it, and start looking for specific channels of communication with people having been already involved in this social group. Thus, we can assume that communication in the theory of social constructionism can and should be understood not as direct contact between two (or more) specific subjects, but also as a process of "self-learning" through virtual space. In other words, the theory does not speak only about a certain predisposition. It also does not mention insurance against the introduction of a person to a particular subculture. Since it goes beyond the boundaries of its subject field.

In general, exogenous communication occupies an important place in the processes of producing social reality, however, with its own characteristics. Because of the fact that the "protestors" and the "right-wing nationalists" profess clearly proselytizing goals, it is important for them to spread their typed ideas, ready for consumption by potential participants as widely as possible (perhaps even to the detriment of the depth of immersion). In contrast, the "street crime members" are the most closed subculture, which is less interested in the mass influx of neophytes. And it is caused, first of all, by the specific nature of their appearance.

4. CONCLUSION

All the researched groups are absolutely multi-valued and can be institutionalized in different ways, but in their ideological content, they undoubtedly have a number of similar qualities. The main way of constructing social reality-the direct communication of members of subculture has recently been seriously pushed by the virtual mechanism. This mechanism characterizes, first of all, the "protestors" and "right-wing nationalists". Through Internet the representative of subculture can lot get different forms of information and then spread these ideas in offline, joining the offline community.

In the theory of social constructionism, the thesis about a person is possibility to several realities is important. The subculture takes only part of the time and does not provide the entire moral and psychological component of life. The processes of socialization can take place outside these groups. A person outside can behave in a manner that is not peculiar for this group. But there can be quite a serious ideological

conflict between the social norms adopted to this group. But members and partners can impose certain sanctions against the retreating members.

References

1. Berger, P., Lukman, T. (1995). Social construction of reality. Treatise on the sociology of knowledge. 323 p. Moscow, Medium.

2. Gromov, D.V. (2012). Street actions (youth political activism in Russia). 506 p. Moscow, Institute of Ethnology and anthropology RAS.

3. Gromov, D.V., Martynova, M.Yu. (2009). Youth subcultures of Moscow. Collection of scientific articles. 544 p. Moscow, Institute of Ethnology and anthropology RAS.

4. Hebdige, D. (1979). Subculture: The Meaning of Style. 305 p. London & New York, Routledge.

5. Ivanov, A.V., Kozlov, V.E. (2019). Phenomenon of street-criminal subculture "A. U. E." among youth in the Republic of Tatarstan. // Kazan pedagogical journal. №1. Pp. 205-209.

Авторы публикации

Мингалиев Арслан Хайрутдинович *–*
хранитель музейных предметов Этнографического музея Казанского (Приволжского) федерального университета г. Казань, Россия.
Email: arslan.mingaliev@yandex.ru

Шахнина Ирина Зиновьевна – *кандидат педагогических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков Института международных отношений Казанского (Приволжского) федерального университета, г. Казань, Россия.*
E-mail: voda-2005@mail.ru

Гали Гульнара Фаритовна – *кандидат педагогических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков Института международных отношений Казанского (Приволжского) федерального университета, г. Казань, Россия.*
E-mail: gulnaragali@mail.ru

Authors of the publication

Mingaliev Arslan Khairutdinovich *–*
Curator, Ethnographic Museum, Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia.
Email: arslan.mingaliev@yandex.ru

Shahnina Irina Zinovevna – *Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages, Institute of International Relations, Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia.*
E-mail: voda-2005@mail.ru

Gali Gulnara Faritovna – *Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages, Institute of International Relations, Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia.*
E-mail: gulnaragali@mail.ru