

**SCTCMG 2022**  
**International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of**  
**Modern Globalism»**

**MEANS OF REPRESENTING TOLERANCE/INTOLERANCE IN**  
**ENGLISH**

Asiyat Bagautdinovna Abdulkadyrova (a)\*, Khaibat Magomedtagirovna Kadachieva (b)  
\*Corresponding author

(a) Dagestan State University, bld. 204a, app. 6, Magomed Gadzhieva str., Mahachkala, Dagestan, Russia,  
saidulik1@rambler.ru

(b) Dagestan State University, bld. 66, app. 16, Gagarina str., Mahachkala, Dagestan, Russia, haibat@mail.ru,

**Abstract**

The communicative category of tolerance is an opposition of the subcategories of tolerance/intolerance. Depending on the function performed, they are represented by the corresponding prescripts. The analysis of prescripts conducted on the material of the English language revealed that the prescripts conflictuality, categoricity and impositivity are implied for a rigid rejection of conflict, and the prescripts anti-conflictuality, non-categoricity and non-impositivity are implied for its unobtrusive resolution. The language implements these prescriptions with the help of markers – multilevel means, presented in different content scope and differing in their degree of formation. The most numerous is the group of conflictuality markers, which is represented through semantic classes describing the emotional sphere of a person and people's attitudes in conflict situations. The dominant pragmatic type is represented by the statements-menasives. Anti-conflictuality, as an unmarked member of the opposition, may not have speech markers indicating tension in the relationship. Within the categoricity/non-categoricity prescriptions, the verbal means of communication are skewed towards non-categorical, due to manifestations of the British national character, a desire to be discreet, courteous and moderate. The dominant pragmatic type for expressing categoricity is the directive. The non-categoricity is also related to the prescriptiveness of non-impositivity, which is characteristic of English language behaviour. It demonstrates the unacceptability of direct influence on the interlocutor and contributes to maintaining a communicative distance. Polite influence on the interlocutor is realised through the use of markers – requestives.

2357-1330 © 2022 Published by European Publisher.

*Keywords:* Communicative category, intolerance, marker, prescription, tolerance

## **1. Introduction**

The relevance of the problem of tolerance stems from the current state of society, filled with speech aggression and communicative conflicts. Tolerance as an imperative of interaction between peoples and cultures relies on the existence of cultural, ethnic, racial, and social differences, which are also reflected in language. Each language has certain ways and means of representing the category of tolerance/intolerance, which we demonstrate in this article on the material of modern British short stories.

## **2. Problem Statement**

Although tolerance is a complex concept to study, due to the ambiguity and diversity of approaches and interpretations, it is undeniable that tolerance is shaped by intercultural communication and transmitted through language.

Within the established concept of linguistic tolerance, scholars have distinguished communicative categories with different contents depending on language and culture. English has markers that contribute to the actualization of the communicative category of tolerance/intolerance.

## **3. Research Questions**

This study has the following main objectives:

- i. Examine the communicative category represented by the opposition of tolerance/intolerance in English;
- ii. Identify the prescriptions that form the category of tolerance/intolerance;
- iii. Classify and systematize the ways of realizing prescriptions that actualize the category of tolerance/intolerance in English.

## **4. Purpose of the Study**

The aim of the study is to investigate markers as means of realizing prescriptions that actualize the category of tolerance/intolerance in contemporary English-language prose.

## **5. Research Methods**

In addition to general scientific methods of research (description, observation, generalisation, systematisation) the work also uses special scientific methods: interpretation of dictionary definitions, contextual and pragmatic interpretation.

## **6. Findings**

At present, the importance of studying the problem of tolerance is quite acute as there are so many events in the modern world involving people's intolerance of all things alien. Migration, local conflicts, religious extremism, and the disadvantaging of people from different social classes and groups are the result of an accumulated hatred of everything alien, of people who are not who society wants them to be.

The current problems of humanity indicate that it is difficult for people to accept the changes taking place in society, and tolerance is a kind of compromise for overcoming conflicts. However, tolerance is a relatively new and understudied phenomenon, the relevance of studying it is undeniable. The undeveloped criteria for its identification predetermine the ambiguity and diversity of existing definitions. The multidimensional nature of the phenomenon of tolerance allows it to be considered in many fields of knowledge: political and social sciences, pedagogy (Didenko, 2018)

At the social level, tolerance appears as a system of relations between the state and its citizens in the areas of culture, morality and education, regulating and ensuring order and freedom (Molodykh-Nagaeva, 2017).

The problem of tolerance touches on many anthropological and philosophical issues related to the interaction of cultures, communication and understanding between people, possibilities of knowing and comprehending the truth and, in general, knowing the essence of human beings and their identity (Melnikova, 2003). In the sociological literature, tolerance is most often discussed as a phenomenon of intercultural communication and as one of the most important spiritual values.

In cultural studies, tolerance is a form of contemporary compromise between competing cultures and a willingness to accept other traits and views. While being a universal value, the category of tolerance has varying significance for different social communities (Mikhaylova, 2016).

Interest in the problem of tolerance within linguistics emerged only towards the end of the 20th century, which seems to be linked to the shift towards an anthropocentric paradigm. Linguistics does not study tolerance in isolation, but as a psycholinguistic, linguocultural, sociolinguistic and communicative category. The latter, as defined by Sternin (2004), is a high-level abstraction concept, defining one or another aspect of the people's communicative behaviour and structured in the form of prescripts and attitudes. Prescription is defined as a general, maximally generalised prescription, conditioned by the essence of a concept (category), which determines the nature of communicative behaviour (Sternin, 2004).

Interest into tolerance emerged as a reaction to the widely studied discourse of hostility and speech aggression in the literature. The study of this discourse aimed to identify the explicit and implicit means of expressing intolerance as a component of the category of tolerance, which is formed to different degrees in different peoples (Sternin, 2005).

The interpretation of tolerance as a linguistic and cultural phenomenon is only possible through the opposition of tolerance/intolerance (Ruzhentseva, 2020). Moreover, intolerant comments can account for up to a third of all statements (Tarmaeva & Narchuk, 2020). We will look at what markers are used to realise the category of tolerance in English.

According to Sternin's (2004) theory presented above, tolerance is represented by a system of oppositional prescriptions against the background of a tolerant/intolerant attitude. The main prescripts of this communicative category can be as follows: **tolerance** – *anti-conflictuality, non-categoricity, non-impositivity*; for **intolerance** – *conflictuality, categoricity, impositivity*.

In identifying prescriptions, we relied on markers, units of different linguistic levels, which actualize the tolerance/intolerance relationship. The most numerous group of intolerance markers represents *conflictuality*, which is realised through semantic classes describing the emotional sphere of a

person and people's attitudes towards each other that manifest themselves in connection with conflict situations and emotions:

emotive vocabulary denoting the negative emotions *hate, fear, disgust, anger, fury, contempt* and others, as well as semantically related adjectives and verbs:

*Parvez knew he was getting drunk, but he couldn't stop himself. Ali had a terrible look, full of **disgust** and censure. It was as if he **hated** his father* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 102).

*My father, not self-possessed any more, but sweating, **fierce**, his face screwed into a mask I don't recognize* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 54).

*I just couldn't see what was meant to matter about it all. It was all so **bloody** ordinary* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 66).

Symptomatic vocabulary that does not name but describes manifestations of negative emotions: *tear, pain, wound, bruise, blood drops, headache, clench, cry, noise, mess, concern, fever, attack, eccentricity, frown, predicament, sulk, fanatic* etc.;

*Brows pulled into a **frown** by the belt, jaw clenching, neck held taut against the **pain*** (Hewitt, 2005, p. 157).

Vocabulary describes aggressive actions that manifest themselves in hostility, actions against others, and contradiction to the existing foundations of society. Aggressive behaviour results from emotions such as anger, frustration, depression, stress, anxiety, etc. Aggression causes both physical and mental harm. In most cases, aggression is conveyed by nouns that express the desire to humiliate and subjugate the subject: *persecution, attack, indignity, scream, oppression, disruption* etc.

*My people have taken enough. If the **persecution** doesn't stop, there will be jihad. I, and millions of others, will gladly give our lives for the cause* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 103).

It is logical that verbs of appropriate semantics will predominate in this group: *to oppress, to torture, to spit, to clench, to press, to quell, to scrape, to throw out, to rip, to burn off, to kick over, to drag up, hit, to strick, to dislodge, to usher out, to infect, to rout, to consume* ect.

*Parvez **kicked** him over. Then he **dragged** the boy **up** by his shirt and **hit** him* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 107).

At the pragmatic level, conflictuality markers are menasives – statements that contain a menace in them:

*If the persecution **doesn't stop, there will be jihad**. I, and millions of others, will gladly give our lives for the cause* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 103).

*'But what **I object to**' he said, 'is being told by my own son that I am going to Hell!'* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 104).

When identifying prescriptions of tolerance, markers of *anti-conflictuality* come to the fore. This aims to mitigate and prevent disputes and conflicts and, when they arise, to resolve them through discussion or compromise.

*Anti-conflictuality* translates through positive emotions, expressing the subject's tactfulness and desire to avoid conflict: positive emotions arise as a result of tactful, tolerant attitudes aimed at avoiding, suspending, preventing conflict: *love, devotion, sensation, enjoyment, happiness, relief, pity*, as well as adjectives and verbs indicating positive emotions aimed at preventing conflict.

*'Pity you didn't come to the right decision'* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 34).

*With Joseph it was simple: love arrived with him* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 151).

*'Oh, it wasn't too bad. I am just glad it was over in time for Christmas'* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 34).

*Enjoy yourself without hurting others* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 105).

Actions, aimed at eliminating conflict, are represented through different parts of speech: nouns *belief, morality, smile, measure, respect, conscience, reconciliation, faith, support* etc., adjectives *good, decent, good-looking, neat, polite, kind* etc., but predominantly verbs: *to make the best, to hearten, to please, to maintain, to thank, to report, to control, to make joke, to care, to pray, to rescue, to put arms around, to rub, to compliment, to pray, to touch, to make sure, to confess, to agree, to mend, to improve, to bond* etc. (p. 105)

*You must tell him what your philosophy of life is. Then he will understand that there are other beliefs* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 105).

A distinctive feature of this group is the presence of evaluative vocabulary: *good, decent, good-looking, neat, polite, kind* ect.

*'I will continue – in you'. At this the boy appeared a little distressed. 'And your grandchildren' Parvez added for good measure* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 105).

As a rule, problems and difficulties are resolved during the conflict. Tolerant attitudes rarely contribute to the elimination of conflict. Rather, they mitigate the intensity of the impact of the conflict.

Tolerance markers can be not only lexical means indicating different degrees of conflictuality/non-conflictuality, but also the pragmatic orientation of the statement as a whole.

Anti-conflictuality, as an unmarked member of the opposition, may not have speech markers indicating tension in the relationship. However, this type is easily reconstructed based on the above models.

The next prescription that contributes to the expression of intolerance is **categoricity**. Categoricity means not accepting other people's points of view, not being streamlined and inflexible in expressing one's own judgement. In speech communication, categoricity is often the cause of conflict. In relationships, categoricity manifests itself when the subject refuses to hear and accept that which does not correspond to his or her own ideas. Categoricity in statements shows that the subject considers his/her own position to be the most accurate and correct and thereby disregards the opinion of others. This behaviour leads to misunderstandings, arguments and conflicts.

We identified the following examples from the British stories we analysed, in which categoricity is manifested through the author's use of lexemes that act as markers of intolerance. A semantic analysis of the lexemes that make up this group reveals their proximity. As in the conflict examples, this group can include different parts of speech: nouns: *vigil, proof, nothing, self-interrogation, certitude, denial, confidence* etc.; adjectives: *conclusive, severe, forbidden, constant, determined, mad, unreachable, insistent, cogent* etc.; adverbs: *scrupulously, instantly, immediately, never, doubtless, stoically, exactly, bitterly* etc.; verbs: *to stop, to inspect, to witness, to demand, to order, to yearn, to refuse, to claim, to give*

*up, to bear, to stand for, to dominate, to resist, to hold, to stay put, to confront, to keep minds on eye, to achieve, to wangle, to persist* ect.

'*You don't play your guitar anymore*' elicited the mysterious but **conclusive** reply, '*There are more important things to be done*' (Hewitt, 2005, p. 96).

'**Never**,' Parvez replied (Hewitt, 2005, p. 107).

'*Tell me what is happening!*' he **demanded**. Then he returned to his father. '*Now let me out*'. (Hewitt, 2005, p. 98).

At the functional and pragmatic level, directives can be the markers used to implement the prescription of categoricity. However, the fact that categoricity is associated with the performance of certain actions makes it quite natural that this type of pragmatic construction should be used, since directives consist of a direct urge for action by the addressee. The directives are mainly the following models of imperative constructions:

*Do/ don't do smth;*

*Have done with smth;*

*Stop smth to do;*

*You must do smth*

*Don't let someone do smth* etc. (Derenich, 2003, p. 48).

*Art make sense: people **don't*** (Hewitt, 2005, p. 67).

*Bastard, thought Ted. I **ought to** ask for my thruppence back* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 165).

*You **should have told** the conductor* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 169).

An analysis of the category of tolerance from the perspective of its pragmatic realization revealed a predominance of directive constructions, as compared to menasives and requisitives:

'*Well, give up then!*' (Hewitt, 2005, p. 87).

'*Pray*', urged Ali. '*Pray beside me*' (Hewitt, 2005, p. 103).

'*Stop werreting (a favourite local word)*', Ivy. Anyway, Ivy persisted (Hewitt, 2005, p. 39).

The opposite of categoricity is **non-categoricity**. An analysis of contemporary British stories showed that non-categoricity is evident through the following markers: adjectives *possible, silent, compliant, still, impassive, insignificant, monotonous* etc.; verbs *to nod, to sway, to shrug, to endure, to attempt, to slow (down)* ect. They share a common semantic meaning of non-categoricity, implying not to be conflictive and not to express an intense evaluation of one's interlocutor.

*In a **low monotonous** voice the boy explained that Parvez had not, in fact, lived a good life* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 102).

*He **attempted** to make conversation about Ali's beliefs* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 105).

*She said it very **gently*** (Hewitt, 2005, p. 66).

*Surely it wasn't a crime to have a drink when he wanted one? «But it is forbidden, » the boy said. Parvez **shrugged**. «I know» (Hewitt, 2005, p. 101).*

It is not customary among the British to be categorical, as they perceive this as rudeness and bad manners. The characteristic feature of the English to be uncategorical in their judgments is because of a manifestation of the British national character – modesty, courtesy and moderation (Gushchina, 2011). This is perceived as a norm of behaviour. And the norm, as we know, does not get a strong expression in language.

The prescriptivity of impositivity/non-impositivity is even less explored in the current linguistic literature. The term "impositivity" is relatively new to linguistics. Impositivity means imposing one's position and prompting certain actions. However, the difference between categoricity and impositivity is that the speech markers of categoricity strongly force the subject to take certain actions, often using crude language, while the markers of impositivity push and encourage action in a more delicate form. Also, categoricity always commits to physical action, whereas impositivity is restricted at the verbal level. Signs of impositivity can include influencing the subject with negative and positive politeness, but without violating communicative norms.

In the analysed British stories we identified the following markers of impossibility: nouns *philosophy (of life), curiosity, scrutiny, expression, pressure* etc.; adverbs *continually, curiously, audibly* ect.

*You must tell him what your **philosophy of life** is (Hewitt, 2005, p. 105).*

*Has felt her customers observing her ever since Kim was ill, has grown accustomed to the **scrutiny** (Hewitt, 2005, p. 160).*

Verbs that contain in their semantics an indication of impositivity are most often verbs of intellectual evaluation and verbal influence: *to grovel, to boast, to insist, to prepare, to be aware of, to blame, to condemn, to castigate, to accuse, to suspect, to object, to convince, to urge, to influence, to cultivate, to advise, to affect, to remind, to worry, to chant* ect.

*Parvez had to **insist** that no appointment could be more important than that of a son with his father (Hewitt, 2005, p. 100).*

*I was about to **castigate** the boy for being insolent, but I managed to control myself (Hewitt, 2005, p. 107).*

As opposed to being impositive, being non-impositive means not interfering in other people's affairs, not imposing your point of view on others and minimising your influence on your interlocutor.

In our analysis of contemporary British short stories, we identified the following vocabulary indicative of non-impositivity: adjectives *imminent, silent, tacit, staid* etc.; adverbs *inadvertently, occasionally, handedly* etc.; verbs *to let smb do smth, to persuade, to retreat, to intrigue* ect.

*His friends, who had been so inquisitive before, now became oddly **silent** (Hewitt, 2005, p. 100).*

*By now, Bettina had **inadvertently** laid her hand on Parvez's shoulder (Hewitt, 2005, p. 107).*

*Parvez was **persuaded** that she was right, even though... (Hewitt, 2005, p. 104).*

Non-impositivity is characteristic of English behaviour because on a communicative level it is a reflection of people's cultural values and independence. To describe this distancing, English has a special

word – privacy. The English tend to be evasive and secretive. They may not agree with their interlocutor's standpoint, but they will behave courteously without giving even the appearance of disagreement (Gushchina, 2011).

The markers of a tolerant, non-impositional attitude are requestives, i.e. petition sentences which convey a polite address to the subject:

*'Please, can't we stop?'* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 106).

*'Now let me out'* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 107).

*'Oh, Ivy, will you stop mithering, for Heaven's sake?'* (Hewitt, 2005, p. 39).

The expression of a polite request can also be verbalized in the language by means of sentences with the interrogative formant will (would).

## 7. Conclusion

The study of the category of tolerance in English revealed the existence of an opposition of the subcategories "tolerance/intolerance". Tolerance as a communicative category has its own constitutive attributes represented by the prescripts conflictuality – anti-conflictuality, categoricity – non-categoricity, impositivity – non-impositivity. The analysis of these prescriptive data revealed that tolerance markers can act as "units of measurement".

The most numerous is the group of conflict markers, which is represented through semantic classes describing the emotional sphere of a person and the attitudes of people towards each other that manifest themselves in conflict situations. At the pragmatic level, conflict is realised by means of menasive statements. Anti-conflictuality is represented by the vocabulary denoting positive emotions, but as an unlabelled member of the opposition, it may not have markers indicating relationship tensions.

The categoricity/non-categoricity dichotomy is represented by various lexical units with the semantics of directivity, obligatoriness and their antonymous counterparts. The British perceive categorical behaviour as rudeness and bad manners. The characteristic of the British to be uncategorical in judgement, reserved, courteous and moderate, is indicative of the British national character. This explains the smaller number of markers compared to the conflictuality – anti-conflictuality prescription.

The markers of the prescriptivity of impositivity – non-impositivity are the vocabulary that shows a delicate influence on the interlocutor. The study found that English language behaviour tends towards non-impositivity, as it shows to a greater extent the lack of pressure on the interlocutor and contributes to maintaining communicative distance. The polite influence on the interlocutor is realised through the use of requestives.

## Acknowledgments

The reported study was funded by RFBR, project number 20-312-90038 "The concept sphere of spiritual values in British and Russian linguistic cultures".



## References

- Derenich, E. G. (2003). *Imperative sentences in cognitive grammar: on the material of English and American prose* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Vladivostok.
- Didenko, V. V. (2018). The TOLERANCE/ TOLERANZ frame in migration media discourse (in Russian and German print media). *Issues in Cognitive Linguistics*, 2, 59–66.
- Gushchina, G. I. (2011). The actualization of the category of categoricity/non-categoricity of an statement in the linguistic picture of the world. *Contemporary Philology. Proceedings of the 1st International Scientific Conference* (pp. 154–157). Ufa. <https://moluch.ru/conf/phil/archive/23/325/>
- Hewitt, K. (2005). *A New Book of Contemporary British Stories*. Oxford. CBS.
- Melnikova, L. V. (2003). *Tolerance as a saving approach in contemporary culture*: [Ph dissertation]. Tyumen.
- Mikhaylova, O. A. (2016). The axiological ambivalence of tolerance. *Issues of history, philology and culture*, 3, 28–36. <https://doi.org/10.18503/1992-0431-2016-3-53-28-36>
- Molodykh-Nagaeva, E. (2017). Tolerance and its limits. *The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences. International Conference on Research Paradigms Transformation in Social Sciences* (pp. 945–953). <http://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2018.02.111>
- Ruzhentseva, N. B. (2020). Intolerance in the mirror of the media: Linguistic and textual representations. *Cognitive language research*, 2(41), 727–731.
- Sternin, I. A. (2004). Problems of shaping the category of tolerance in Russian communicative consciousness. In N. A. Kupina, & O. A. Mikhailova (Eds), *Cultural practices of tolerance in speech communication*. Collective monograph (pp. 130–149). UrSU Press.
- Sternin, I. A. (2005). Tolerance and communication. In N. A. Kupina, & M. B. Khomyakov (Eds.), *Philosophical and linguocultural problems of tolerance*. Collective monograph (pp. 324–337). OLMA-PRESS.
- Tarmaeva, V. I., & Narchuk, V. S. (2020). Tolerance/intolerance on social media pages dedicated to mixed martial arts. *The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences. 10th International Conference “Word, Utterance, Text: Cognitive, Pragmatic and Cultural Aspects”*. Grozny, Russia (pp. 1391–1400). <http://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2020.08.161>