

The Linguistic Representation of Insincerity in Russian and English¹

Ainur N. Shuinshaliyeva², Nailya G. Mingazova², & Mohammed el Miloud Belhamiti³

Abstract

The paper discusses insincerity, as well as the types and methods of its manifestation. Details reflect the characteristics of a lying person and his manner of behavior in an insincere atmosphere. The paper is aimed at explaining the linguistic mechanisms underlying the expression of insincerity, and developing a general theoretical understanding of the role of insincerity in verbal communication. Insincerity is understood as a discursive strategy of a linguistic personality, aimed at the intentional expression of false propositions and their corresponding linguistic design. The research discusses a set of types associated with the separate consideration of falsity as properties of propositions, that is, such knowledge of some possible world, which contradicts the objective picture of the world, and insincerity as a characteristic of the speaking subject related to its communicative intentions and features of the communication situation. The linguistic representation of insincerity is revealed.

Keywords: Sincerity/Insincerity; Linguistics; Discourse; Verbal/Non-Verbal Means of Communication

1. Introduction

Eastern proverb says: “You told me the first time, and I believed. You repeated – and I doubted. You said the third time – and I understood that you were lying”.

Since ancient times, many researchers have paid enough attention to the phenomenon of insincerity and its representation was analyzed from different perspectives. Thus, Panchenko (1999), like other modern researchers, believed that insincerity, as a suggestive influence, could be carried out not only as a verbal act, but also with the help of non-verbal means of communication (Panchenko, 1999).

¹ Please cite this paper as follows:

Shuinshaliyeva, A. N., Mingazova, N. G., & Belhamiti, M. M. (2019). The linguistic representation of insincerity in Russian and English. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(SP), 559-564.

² Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia

³ University of Oran, Oran, Algeria

According to Pinker (2014), insincerity cannot be expressed simultaneously with sincerity, in the sense that if the performative statement is supplemented with an indication of the speaker's insincerity, it will become unwise (Pinker, 2014). Agaeva (2017) also indicates the active role of the speaker in the creation of truth values in the process of communication. In the set of maxims of the Cooperative Principle proposed by the researcher, there is a supermaximum of quality that dictates the speaker to try to make his participation in communication to be true. The importance of the speaker's figure in the creation of the truth is emphasized by two specifying maxims: 1. "Do not say what you think is wrong" 2. "Do not say what you do not have adequate evidence for" (Agaeva, 2017). Kroeber and Kluckhohn (2017) interpret deceitful discourse as an intuitively perceived law of social interaction. In their opinion, in a normal speech situation a person believes that his interlocutor speaks sincerely, unless he has no serious reason to refuse such an assumption (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 2017). Smakhtin, Klimova, Arkhipova, Andrievskii, Shalamova and Sidorova (2018) describe peculiar features of verbalization of emotions in the texts of the English and Russian online mass media covering economic and financial spheres giving statistical data obtained from the comparative analysis of the lexis representing emotions in the English and Russian articles (Smakhtin et al., 2018). As for Paul (2018), the scientist stated that the discourse takes the process of unfolding a sentence or text to the highest motivational level – the level of the structure of language personality (Paul, 2018).

2. Materials and Methods

The content of information and the technique of its transmission to another person are subjected to analysis, during or after communication. Success in identifying the hidden circumstances, methods of disinformation depends largely on the experience and training of the person who is trying to do it. Following Povarnin (1988), we can identify the following most characteristic signs of insincerity, including excitement, manifested in voice and speech when transmitting false information: involuntary change of intonation; change of speech rate; change of voice timbre; the appearance of a tremor in the voice; the appearance of pauses when answering questions that should not have caused difficulties; too fast answers to questions that should make you think; the appearance of expressions in speech atypical for a given person in normal communication or the disappearance of words and phrases typical for him; demonstrative underlining with the help of speech means intonation, pauses, etc., of any fragments of the transmitted information, masking or distorting the true attitude towards it (Povarnin, 1988).

According to the researcher Glagolev (1987), the face is better adapted to lying, since it has a significant capacity. A variety of facial expressions, eye movements, direction of gaze, movement of a person's face during communication, and most importantly, the ambiguity of manifestations of various states of a person

“outside” often lead to incorrect conclusions about the degree of sincerity of a person. Focusing on the face of the interlocutor to indicate lies, the observer’s attention is often drawn to the following parameters: "Running look". This is due to the fact that a person who is not accustomed to lying, hardly “holds the gaze” of the interlocutor and looks away; "Easy smile." The smile accompanying insincerity, allows you to hide the internal tension, however, does not always look natural enough; "Microenergy facial muscles." At the time of a false report, you can see how the shadow “runs over the face”. Video recording allows you to fix with this short-term tension in the facial expression, lasting a fraction of a second. Thus, this involuntary reaction is a very reliable indicator of lies; “Partner’s control at the moment of false statement”. Telling lies, some people for a short time concentrated their attention on the partner’s face, as if trying to assess how successfully they were able to mislead him; “Vegetative reactions”. Redness of the face or its individual parts, trembling of the lips, dilated pupils of the eyes, frequent blinking and other changes characteristic of feelings of shame, fear and other emotions accompanying insincerity on a subconscious level in people who are not used to lying and are uncomfortable (Glagolev, 1987).

Armenina (1975), undertakes the courage to single out a separate series of gestures that, in her opinion, accompany insincerity, doubt and fraud: the “hand to face” gesture was confirmed by an experiment in which it was observed that nurses lying to patients about their health status more often put a hand to their face than sisters who spoke the truth; gesture “covering the mouth” covering the mouth with palm, fingers or fist, as well as coughing with covering the mouth. In cases where such a gesture is associated with appraisal positions, a closed palm rests on the cheek, and the index finger often points upward; gesture “touch to the nose”, light rubbing of the nose or a quick touch on it, which, unlike the actual scratching of the nose, does not look so obvious; the gesture of “rubbing the eye” in case of a big lie, men tend to avert their eyes, and rub them, and women tend to easily touch the eyes and rub the area under the eye. This gesture can be combined with clenched teeth and a fake smile; gesture “collar pulling off”. Armenina A.L., referring to D. Morris's research, connects this gesture with a slight irritation in the sensitive tissues of the face and neck, arising during a false statement due to sweating (Armenina, 1975).

In fact, a lie, as a subjective-volitional truth, entered people's lives as an integral part of it, and in every discourse it is present in all the variety of its functions: regulation, glorification, disinformation, manipulation, (self) protection (salvation), defamation, etc. The one who has lied forever remains a liar in people's emotional memory. Al-foadi, and Mingazova (2018) stated that sound waves, reproduced by speech organs form acoustic vibrations that help a person define the key meaning of word basic elements.

The fact that a lie in the communicative behavior of a linguistic person takes a huge place is confirmed by a huge conceptual field of lies, all of which fragments of lexicalization have names in different parts of the speech of Russian and English.

The linguistic representation of insincerity in Russian covers mostly nouns (36) denoting different shades of the semantics of the “nomovs” of language: *ложь, обман, вранье, неправда, неискренность, уловка, ухищрение, сокрытие правды, затемнение, двуличие, симуляция (эмоций), мистификация, лукавство, ловкачество, лесть, зомбирование, манипуляция, дезинформация, тенденциозность, инсинуация, опорочивание, притворство, полуложь, запоздалая правда, лицемерие, небылица, ахинея, клевета, уклончивость, лжесвидетельство, видимость, двойная игра, увертка, наговор, оговор, фальсификация*. In English, Roger's dictionary lists the following (86) nouns on the subject of deception: *deceit, fraud, duplicity, fraudulence, misrepresentation, bluff, craft, cunning, dishonesty, obliquity, subtlety, subtlety, dupery, guile, humbuggery, hocus-pocus, hanky-panky, illusion, imposition, imposture, legerdemain, pettifoggery, knavery, japery, rascality, roguery, shenanigans, skulduggery, trickery, wiles treachery, sharp practice, chicanery, cunning, artful, astute, crafty, foxy, guileful, sharp, shrewd, subtle, tricky; insidious, crooked, deceitful, deceptive, designing, guileful, intriguing, sly, subtle, treacherous, wile, adroit, dexterous, discerning, keen, sagacious, fraudulent, scheming, acute, alert, apt, long-headed, discriminating, far-seeing, perspicacious, tricky, trickish, dishonest, dishonourable, knavish, treacherous, underhand, unscrupulous, counterfeit, fallacious, false, insincere, two-faced, stealthy, faithless, perfidious, recreant, unreliable, untrustworthy, etc.* In addition, observing, analyzing, summarizing information, making conclusions about a person's honesty, deciding to accept his information as true or false in a given situation, people are based on their own standards of truth and falsehood, sincere and insincere behavior. However, not all characteristics of the behavior of a lying person are equally indicative, and therefore different people with varying degrees of success recognize a lie among the information that the interviewee transmits to them. The following words, phrases, answers, and peculiarities of speech may indicate the insincerity of the interlocutor: persistent conviction in his own sincerity, in which he overly emphasizes his honesty, invariably insisting that he speaks only the truth – in cases where no confidence in his words is expressed. For example: “honestly, I do not know”, “I swear by my health”, “I give a hand to cut off”, “honestly, it was like that”; avoiding the discussion of certain topics, issues (when they affect any unpleasant moments for a person). For example: “I will not discuss it”, “I cannot remember”, “I did not say this (a)”, “I do not see any connection here”; unreasonably dismissive, calling or hostile tone, when you are clearly provoked to rudeness. For example: “I am not obliged to (a) answer your questions,” “I do not know what I am talking about,” “I don't want to talk with you at all”; the desire to cause your sympathy, trust, feeling of pity, if the previous relationship did not lead to such a rapprochement. For example: “I have a family, children”, “I am the same as you”, “I have exactly the same problems”; short denial or indifferent, evasive answers to direct questions; simple repetitive answers or repetition of simple negation; avoiding the use of the words "yes" or "no." For example: “I don't know

anything about it”, “You yourself said it”, “I’m not sure (a)”, “Do you respect me?”, “You are undoubtedly a serious person” (Novoseltseva, 1997).

Such behavior is caused by the fact that during the conversation it becomes harder and harder for a person to lie. If at the same time you find out any circumstances, it is useful to keep in mind that an innocent person: can express suspicion, distrust of you, without rendering any opposition in clarifying the circumstances of the case; often gives comprehensive information with all the details, even not directly related to the case; verbose; constantly tries to interrupt you with his explanations; begins to actively defend himself before being accused or suspected of something. At the same time, the guilty person: avoids detailed explanations; restrains himself when answering questions; has a reaction in clarifying the facts; can refuse explanations for no apparent reason; indicates the accuracy of small parts; expresses a desire to help you in clarifying certain circumstances (Davidson, 1984).

3. Results

Studying the mentioned signs of interlocutor's speech behavior gives the opportunity to develop the observation, allows a person to think of a reasonable style of the behavior. In this case, one of the most important practical recommendations is that in case of disagreement between the words and gestures of the interlocutor, vision more than hearing should be trusted. After all, involuntary gestures, movements, facial expressions, and not spoken phrases will correspond to the truth. It should be taken into consideration that the reliability of the signs that convey the true attitude of the interlocutor decreases in the following order: spatial location, posture, voice signals, facial expressions, and statements directly. In other words, it is much easier to hide the truth or true attitude towards a person through words, facial expressions, voices, and more difficult with the help of other means of communication (gestures, movements, posture).

4. Conclusion

Thus, we concluded that the more a person has the ability to "Machiavellianism", the less likely he is to determine his insincerity by external signs. In such cases, greater emphasis should be placed on the analysis of the content of information and think through the tactics of the questions asked. It is easier to tell a lie when there is an opportunity to prepare for it. External signs of excitement are more noticeable when a lying person has to deal with questions that he could not prepare answers for in advance. The problem of revealing insincerity is extremely difficult because of the multiplicity of factors that are to be analyzed. A person at any age must understand and realize that insincerity is a wrong phenomenon. Insincerity continues to sow the seed of discord in the relationship of many people. False influences people's attitudes and negates everything. Improving manipulative technologies and using them in the practice of everyday communication leads

humanity to undermine its own essence, as part of a rational nature. By virtue of these circumstances, spiritual ecology should take a worthy place in the educational system of the modern man and upbringing the future generation.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Agaveva, A. A. (2017). *Hidden Meanings and Their Linguistic Interpretation*. (Unpublished Dissertation). Saint Petersburg
- Al-foadi, R. A., & Mingazova, N. G. (2018). The three-level phono-grammar order and its derivational connecting link: The elements of language system (on the material of Arabic). *XLinguae*, 4, 59-77.
- Armenina, A. L. (1975). *Spawning Deception*. Moscow: Science.
- Davidson, D. (1984). *Inquiries into truth and interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Glagolev, N. V. (1987). *False information and ways of its expression in the Russian language*. Russian literature in the context of modern integration processes. Volgograd: Volga State University Publishing House.
- Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (2017). *Culture. A lying discourse*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Novoseltseva, O. A. (1997). *Expressions expressing an assessment of the insincerity of someone else's message*. (Unpublished Dissertaion). Moscow: RUDN.
- Panchenko, N. N. (1999). *Means of objectification of the concept "deception"*. (Unpublished Dissertaion). Volgograd.
- Paul, D. (2018). *Lying and truth*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Pinker, S. (2014). *Misleading*. New York.
- Povarnin, S. S. (1988). The role of word formation in linguistic picture of the world. In *Language and the picture of the world* (pp. 298-305). Moscow: Flint: Science.
- Smakhtin, E. S., Klimova, I. I., Arkhipova, V. S., Andrievskii, K. V., Shalamova, O. O., & Sidorova, N. A. (2018). Verbalizing emotions in texts of economic mass media. *XLinguae*, 3, 103-113.