

A. Muldagaliyeva* , K.A. Aisultanova , Z.K. Madiyeva 

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

*e-mail: aizhan.mg@gmail.com

SOCIOLINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF ADDRESS TERMS BASED ON KAZAKH CONSANGUINE KINSHIP SYSTEM

The Kazakh society, being traditional in nature, strictly regulates the behavior of its members in many spheres of life, including family communication. The usage of kinship address terms to refer to relatives as well as nonrelatives indicates the uniqueness of the Kazakh culture. Kinship address terms are powerful means of creating and maintaining solidarity among not only members of a kin community but the whole society. In the Kazakh language, there is a plethora of address terms young people use to refer to the members of their family and close relatives. The present article is aimed to investigate the address terms that modern younger generations of the Kazakhs use to refer to their parents, siblings, grandparents, uncles, aunts and cousins, and nonkins to determine in what way kinship address terms regulate the communicative behavior of the younger generation and formation of their live values. The analysis of data obtained through on-line survey, observation and face-to-face interviews yielded valuable information on the usage of address terms within a nuclear family and close consanguine relatives. The research revealed a strong family orientation of today's Kazakh young people. A peculiarity of Kazakh address terms is a wide use of «Russianized» and Russian kinship terms by the modern Kazakh youth due to two factors – intercultural communication and the bilingual situation in Kazakhstan. Investigation of Kazakh consanguine kinship terms of address employed by the younger generation theoretical and practical significance. It enabled to demonstrate the links between language use, social relations and cultural values.

Key words: kinship, consanguine, address terms, politeness, communicative behavior, hierarchy, on-line survey, face-to-face interview.

А.А. Мулдағалиева*, К.А. Айсұлтанова, З.К. Мадиева

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

*e-mail: aizhan.mg@gmail.com

Туыстық терминдердің атау функциясында қолданылуының социоллингвистикалық аспектілері

Қазақ қоғамы, табиғаты дәстүрлі бола келе, өмірдің көптеген салаларында, соның ішінде отбасылық қарым-қатынаста өз мүшелерінің мінез-құлқын қатаң реттейді. Туыстық терминдердің ағайын-туысқа, сонымен қатар туыс еместерге де атау ретінде қолданылуы қазақ мәдениетінің ерекшелігін көрсетеді. Қазақ халқының мәдениетінің осы қасиетінің арқасында бүкіл қоғам туыстық қатынастармен байланысқан үлкен бір «отбасына» айналады. Қазақтың жас ұрпағы отбасы мүшелеріне, жақын туыстарына қатысты қолданатын туыстық терминдер қазақ тілінде өте көп. Мақаланың мақсаты – қазақтың қазіргі жас ұрпағы ата-анаға, аға-ініге, әпке-қарындасқа, ата-әжеге, нағашы-жиендерге, және туысқан емес адамдарға айтылатын атаулар – туыстық терминдерді зерттеу, сондай-ақ туыстық-атаулар терминдерінің өскелең ұрпақтың коммуникативті мінез-құлқын реттеп, олардың өмірлік құндылықтарын қалыптастыруға ықпал ететінін анықтау. Сонымен қатар, туыстық-атау шарттарының өскелең ұрпақтың коммуникативті мінез-құлқын реттеп, олардың өмірлік құндылықтарын қалыптастыруға қалайша ықпал ететінін анықтау. Онлайн сауалнама, бақылау және жеке сұхбат барысында алынған мәліметтерді талдау нуклеарлы отбасында және жақын туыстар қауымдастығында туыстық терминдердің қолданылуы туралы құнды мәліметтер берді. Бұл зерттеу қазіргі қазақ жастарының берік отбасылық бағдарда екенін анықтады. Қазақ туыстық атау терминдерінің бір ерекшелігі қазіргі қазақ жастарының айналымда «русификациялық» және орысша туыстық терминдерін кеңінен қолдануы болып табылады, бұл екі факторға – мәдениетаралық қатынас пен Қазақстандағы қос тілділік жағдай себепкер. Өскелең ұрпақ қолданып жүрген атау функциясындағы туыстық терминдерді зерттеудің теориялық және практикалық маңызы бар. Бұл қоғамдық қатынастар мен мәдени құндылықтар және тілді қолдану арасындағы байланысты көрсетуге мүмкіндік берді.

Түйін сөздер: туыстық, қандастық, туыстық атау термині, сыпайылық, коммуникативті мінез-құлық, иерархия, онлайн сауалнама, жеке сұхбат.

А.А. Мулдагалиева*, К.А. Айсултанова, З.К. Мадиева
Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы
*e-mail: aizhan.mg@gmail.com

Социолингвистические аспекты использования терминов кровного родства в функции обращения

Казахское общество, будучи традиционным по своей природе, строго регламентирует поведение своих членов во многих сферах жизни, в том числе? и в семейном общении. Использование терминов кровного родства как обращения к родственникам, так и неродственникам указывает на уникальность казахской культуры. Благодаря данной особенности культуры казахского народа все общество превращается в одну огромную «семью», связанную узами родства. В казахском языке имеется большое количество терминов родства, которые молодое поколение казахов используют в обращении к членам своей семьи и близким родственникам. Целью данной статьи является исследование терминов родства – обращений, которые современное молодое поколение казахов использует для обращения к родителям, братьям, сестрам, бабушкам и дедушкам, дядям, тетям и двоюродным братьям и сестрам, а также неродственникам, а также выяснение, каким образом термины родства – обращения регулируют коммуникативное поведение подрастающего поколения и побуждают формирование их жизненных ценностей. Анализ данных, полученных в ходе онлайн опроса, наблюдения и личных интервью, позволили получить ценную информацию об употреблении терминов родства – обращений в нуклеарной семье и в сообществе близких родственников. Настоящее исследование выявило имеющуюся сильную семейную ориентацию современной казахстанской молодежи. Особенностью казахских адресных терминов является широкое использование современной казахской молодежью «русифицированных» и русских терминов родства в обращении, что обусловлено двумя факторами – межкультурной коммуникацией и двуязычной ситуацией в Казахстане. Исследование терминов родства в функции обращения, используемые подрастающим поколением, имеет теоретическое и практическое значение. Это позволило продемонстрировать связи между использованием языка, социальными отношениями и культурными ценностями.

Ключевые слова: родство, кровное родство, термины родства-обращения, вежливость, коммуникативное поведение, иерархия, онлайн опрос, личное интервью.

Introduction

An interesting way of using language in daily situations is to refer to various kinds of kin. The amount of literature on kinship terminology, describing how people in different parts of the world refer to relatives by blood and marriage is very extensive (Wardhaugh, 2006; Dickey, 1997; Likhachova, 2011; Susanto, 2014; Oscan, 2016; Dykova, 2020; Surono, 2014; Aliyeva et al., 2019). A term of address is a word, phrase, name, or title (or some combination of these) used to address someone in writing or speaking. Address term is an inalienable element of communication between people in various life situations. Wardhaugh rightly noted that studying address terms is crucial in understanding how a given language provides tools as well as choices for its speakers to position themselves in relation to others.

The aim of addressing is to maintain social relationship between addresser and addressee. The

choice of address term largely depends on the addresser and addressee's relationship, the social status, the situation and the communicative intent. Wardhaugh notes that the actual rules of address are as complex as the society itself. People may address another by title (T), first name (FN), last name (LN), nickname, and even by some combination of these forms (Wardhaugh, 2006). The choice of terms depends on a variety of social factors: the particular occasion; the social status or rank; gender; age; family relationship; occupational hierarchy; transactional status (i.e., a service encounter, a doctor-patient or a priest-penitent relationship); race; degree of intimacy. Using the appropriate address term leads to a successful interaction, and, conversely, misuse may cause a misunderstanding that hinders effective communication. There are five functions of address terms – to attract people's attention, show politeness, reflect identity, show power differential, and to show intimacy (Wardhaugh, 2006: 268).

Different countries or cultures have specific complicated address terms since one (sub) culture can offer a selection of address terms for any kind of life situations and environments. The address terms

used in one culture may sound unacceptable in another culture. Yu and Ren explain that every culture or society has its own rules and/or norms governing the choice of address terms that are appropriate and cultural specific for use between the people involved in the verbal interaction. The larger the cultural differences are, the larger the differences in address terms will be. Thus, address terms as an important part of language are influenced by and reflect cultures in which they are used (Hao, 2013). Address terms are used by the speaker to show respect, familiarity or unfamiliarity, intimacy, and social status. These functions are reflected in the mode of addressing and the choice of the term. Using a particular term of address in relation to a particular person may provide important information about the speaker, namely age, level of upbringing and of knowledge of national behavioral norms and cultural values, etc. An appropriate address term also indicates the type of relationship the addresser and addressee maintain in a daily life or desire to establish favorable contact. Knowing and using someone's first name is doubtlessly a sign of considerable intimacy or at least a desire for such intimacy. Using a nickname or pet name shows an even greater intimacy or desire to establish favorable contact with the addressee. The choice of address term often indicates the level of the addresser's politeness. Wardhaugh points out that «when we speak, we must constantly make choices of many different kinds: what we want to say, how we want to say it, and the specific sentence types, words, and sounds that best unite the what with the how. How we say something is at least as important as what we say; in fact, the content and the form are quite inseparable, being two facets of the same object» (Wardhaugh, 2006: 260).

In Western cultures, a common way of addressing people is by first name; in the Kazakh culture, using the first name to address an elderly person is considered offensive, indicating an ill-bred addresser, especially, if they are younger in age. Politeness is a key principle in language use since one is to consider the interlocutor's feelings. The idea of politeness is intertwined with the idea of 'saving face' proposed by Goffman. In social interaction, a person is obliged to protect both own face and the faces of others, which results in living out a kind of a mini-drama, a ritual in which each party is required to recognize the identity of the other (Goffman, 1955)

The present research is aimed to investigate the address terms that modern younger generations of the Kazakhs use to refer to their parents, siblings, grandparents, uncles, aunts and cousins, and non-

kins to determine in what way kinship address terms regulate the communicative behavior of the younger generation and formation of their live values.

Theoretical framework

The interest in studying kinship terms as address terms is substantiated by the fact human language, thinking, culture and communicative behavior is the center of such research. A language study will never be exhaustive without considering the human factor. Modern linguists believe that the concept of close connection of language with the consciousness and thinking of a person, with their culture and spiritual life should always be the starting point of any linguistic research; therefore, the focus of the anthropocentric linguistic approach is language personality (Kubryakova, 1995: 212). Vorkachev defines 'language personality' as a set of behavior features of a person using language as a means of communication. Language personality is understood as a product and subject of history and culture, its creator and creation (Vorkachev, 2003). A language personality exists in the cultural area that is reflected in the language in the form of social consciousness at different levels of communication, in behavior stereotypes and norms and in objects of material culture. Man is a social creature by nature, and Leontiev wrote that «human features in a human are formed by their life under conditions of the society and culture created by a human» (Leontiev, 1976: 112). Language personality represents a certain national culture and is part of a certain linguocultural community with inherent mentality and national stereotypes which the language personality appropriates in the process of socialization (Karasik, 2002).

The idea of culture and language connection is the object of numerous researches. This is how Wardhaugh defines culture in his book *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*: "A society's culture consists of whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its members, and to do so in any role that they accept for any of themselves. That knowledge is socially acquired: the necessary behaviors are learned and do not come from any kind of genetic endowment. Culture, therefore, is 'know-how' that a person must possess to get through the task of daily living" (Wardhaugh, 2006: 221). Thus, 'cultural know-how' should find its reflection in language patterns and in forms of activity and communicative behavior if a person wants to live comfortably in a society. Culture manifests itself in communication behavior of the people following the rules of generally accepted speech

norms in different life situations. Generally accepted speech norms are common to all the representatives of a given national culture regardless of gender, age, social status, profession, etc. These are standard situations as greeting and bidding goodbye, getting acquainted, paying respect and addressing, attracting attention, apologizing, congratulating, expressing gratitude, wishes, sympathy, etc. Culture is a motivating force behind our behaviors, and every culture has a peculiar style of communicative behavior. The development of anthropocentric approach in linguistics contributed to the study of communicative behavior of an individual or a group of individuals in the process of communication.

Kazakh kinship system and kinship terms

Kinship for the Kazakhs has always been and remains the strongest survival strategy. Despite the radical changes in Kazakhstan after the collapse of the Soviet Union, namely the departure from the planned socialist economy and transformation to the market economy which promotes the individualistic ideology, the significance of kinship relationships was not diminished. In market economy, two forces (self-interest and competition) play a crucial role; thus, people had to adjust themselves to the new socio-economic conditions, and most found it impossible to cope with the ruthless demands of competition. The adaptive potential of the nation in these conditions underwent a serious trial – for many Kazakhs who mainly shared collectivistic values, it was a crisis leading to depression and moral disappointment. In this difficult period people had to consider the laws of the society and adopt survival behaviors, such as strengthening kinship and family ties. Relatives provided mutual assistance: rendered moral and material support, helped maintain psychological balance and gain a sense of security and confidence. There is a good Kazakh proverb to confirm this idea: *Aghain tiride, aghain olide*, which means «One is with their relatives both in life and in death».

Kazakh families are large strong networks that cover all the dimensions of human life, and the main driving force behind these networks lies in reciprocity and obligation to help and support one another during hardships. These social norms are confirmed and recreated in civic and family festivals like weddings and at different social gatherings to celebrate Nauruz, childbirth, birthday parties, jubilees and etc. Most Kazakh traditions, customs and rituals are centered on kinship. A frequently asked question is:

Does kinship matter today? The answer is: It does – at least for the Kazakhs. Kinship acts as a powerful mechanism for coordination, cooperation, and peaceful coexistence among the nation. Since kinship is a «hybrid» institution involving nature and culture, it also covers social connections and has a wider role in society. Crossman notes that kinship:

- maintains unity, harmony, and cooperation among relationships;
- sets guidelines for communication and interactions among people;
- defines the rights and obligations of the family and marriage;
- helps people better understand their relationships with each other;
- helps people better relate to each other in society.

Kinship, then, involves the social fabric that ties families and even societies together (Crossman, 2020).

Kinship terms

Words denoting kinship, referred to as kinship terms in the linguistic and anthropological literature, are both an object and a means of expression of a kinship system. The study of kinship system and kinship terms was initiated by Lewis Henry Morgan with the publication of his book *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* in 1871. Morgan accumulated a huge amount of data on kinship terminology to develop his classification of kinship systems. Originally his interest in studying kinship was connected with the kinship traditions of American Indians, namely the Iroquois. He wanted to discover the history and origin of the Indians of North America, believing it possible to reconstruct their history and locate their origin by studying kinship systems. He claimed that if the system of their kinship could be found in India, it meant they brought their system from Asia. Having analyzed a huge amount of data, Morgan made a distinction between classificatory (subsuming a relatively large number of biological kin types) and descriptive (subsuming a relatively small number of types, preferably having unique referents) kinship terms (Morgan, 1997). According to Morgan's classification, Kazakh kinship system belongs to the classificatory type and has three groups of relatives: paternal relatives, maternal relatives and spouse's relatives. Paternal relatives are the people who descend from the same ancestor: great grandfather *Ulken ata*, grandfather *Ata*, grandmother *Azhe*, father *Ake*, mother

Ana, *Sheshe*, son *Ul*, daughter *Kyz*, older brother *Aga*, younger brother *Ini*, older sister *Apa*, younger sister *Sinli* (female speaker), *Karyndas* (male speaker), grandchild *Nemere*, great grandchild *Shobere*, great-great grandchild *Shopshek*, great great-great grandchild *Nemene*. Maternal relatives are denoted by the same terms + *Nagashy*: maternal uncle *Nagashy*, maternal aunt *Nagashy apa*, maternal grandfather *Nagashy ata*, maternal cousins *Nagashy sinli*, *Nagashy karyndas*, etc.

The designation of kinship in the language is not limited only by the kinship terms – the Kazakh language has a large number of lexical units for denoting kinship relations: *baur* (literally, ‘liver’) younger brother, *tate* -older male and female relative depending on the region, Western and Central Kazakhstan respectively, *koke* -older male relative, *bala*- son, *kempyr* (literally, old woman)- wife, *shal* (literally, old man)- father, husband, *bai*- (literally, rich man) husband, *apai* -address term to an older woman, *agai* address term to an older man. This group includes a large number of emotionally colored words derived from kinship terms with the help of adding diminutive suffixes: *tai* – *apatai*, *agatai*, *aketai*, *azhetai*; *eke* – *ageke*, *apeke*; *shym* – *anashym*, *akeshym*, *agashym*, etc. When kinship relations are strong, kinship terms play a crucial role in family and society. Meeting for the first time, two Kazakhs begin their conversation from making inquiries concerning the people they come from. As a rule,

there always may be someone through whom they are connected: belonging to the same tribe, affinal kinship or maternal relatives. Afterwards, they determine the kinship term they should use to address each other and determine the type of behavior in order to maintain polite interrelationship (Egenisova, 2017). *The principle of politeness and saving face starts functioning when in the course of communication, the code of kinship is activated and the barrier of alienation is removed thanks to the application of a kinship term as an address.* This custom could easily be misinterpreted or seem funny to a Westerner.

A specific ancient feature of the Kazakh culture is seeking ways to maintain loyal, non-aggressive, friendly relations with people and states. Throughout their history the Kazakhs strove to preserve the harmony in the society and promote the idea of tolerance and respect among people (Aubakirova et al., 2014). Using kinship terms to address non-kins mirrors the mentality and cultural values of the Kazakh society. There is a close relationship between address terms and culture. A special rule of the Kazakh national communicative behavior says that a junior should address a senior and vice versa using a kinship term as a sign of solidarity and the desire to create a favorable atmosphere for communication. The appropriate choice of the address term sets the tone for interpersonal exchange and serves as a means of achieving the desired outcome and building positive relationship with the addressee. In address-

ing non-relatives, the emphasis is on gender and age since it is an important factor in the choice of terms of address in Kazakh culture (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1 – Terms for male non-kins (father’s/older brother’s friends; acquaintances; neighbors; strangers)

Junior speaker:	Senior speaker:
<i>Ata</i> (grandfather) – much older than the speaker; <i>Aga/Aga+i</i> (older brother/male relative) – relatively older than the speaker; <i>Bratishka/bratan</i> (younger brother, borrowed from Russian) – of the same age/younger than the speaker	<i>Baury+m</i> – male, relatively younger than the speaker; <i>Ini+m/in+shek</i> – male, much younger than the speaker; <i>Bala+m/bala+kai</i> – the addressee is of the age of the speaker’s children
Note: the suffix <i>-i</i> indicates remoteness or lack of kinship ties	Note: <i>-m</i> is a possessive suffix; <i>-shek</i> , <i>-kai</i> are diminutive suffixes

Table 2 – Terms for female non-kins (mother’s/older sister’s friends; acquaintances; neighbors; strangers)

Junior speaker:	Senior speaker:
<i>Azhe+i</i> (grandmother), <i>Apa</i> (older sister/female relative) – much older than the speaker; <i>Apa+i</i> (older sister/female relative) – relatively older than the speaker; <i>Tate</i> (a young female) – of the same age/younger than the speaker	<i>Singil+im</i> (younger sister, younger female relative) – female, younger than the female speaker; <i>Kyz+ym</i> (sister) – female, much younger than the speaker; <i>Karyndas</i> (younger sister, younger female relative) – female, younger than the male speaker;

Note: the suffix *-i* indicates remoteness or lack of kinship ties

Note: the most widely used kinship terms in addressing non-kins are *Apai* and *Agai*.

There is a long-standing tradition in Kazakh schools to address teachers as *Apai*, *Agai*; however, some opinions state that addressing school and university teachers by kinship terms is hardly acceptable and should be abolished.

Research methods and materials

The research material was the address terms that the younger generation of the kin community uses to refer to the older generation relatives, namely, grandmother, grandfather, parents, paternal and maternal uncles and aunts, as well as representatives of the same generation – siblings and cousins. Qualitative methods of data collection (interviewing, observation, and document analysis) were used. The data was collected through on-line survey conducted among Kazakh young people aged 17-18 (students of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University). The on-line survey format offers a number of advantages such as objectivity and anonymity of the research data; this is achieved by eliminating any influence that may be present in live surveys which makes the participants more comfortable in providing open and honest feedback. The researchers also employed observation and face-to-face interviewing methods. The observation method was used for increasing the validity of the study since observations help the researcher get a better understanding of the context and phenomenon under study, provide a deeper cultural insight, an opportunity to define new and outdated elements and to explain the underlying reasons for the changes taking place. The face-to-face interview gives a valuable opportunity to directly observe the respondent, to take in social cues that would otherwise be missed in an on-line survey. The data were regarded through the descriptive analysis technique. The following research procedures were adopted: documenting the survey data, analyzing the address terms and reasons for their usage, and making the conclusion of the data analysis.

Results and discussion

The objective of the survey was to find out what address terms the representatives of modern young generation in Kazakhstan use to refer to their consanguine relatives – parents, siblings, grandparents, uncles and aunts, nephews and nieces, cousins. The

choice of respondents was substantiated by the fact that this age is of crucial importance in the life of the young, since people who mostly surround them (their immediate and remote family members) help them gain self-esteem, acquire the sense of belonging and security and develop problem-solving and social skills and life values. In other words, this is the period when young people are integrated in a big kinship community. The on-line survey questions were as follows:

1) How do you address your paternal/maternal grandparents, your parents, paternal/maternal uncles and aunts?

2) How do you address your older/younger male/female siblings?

3) How do you address your older/younger male/female cousins?

The results were as follows:

1) The words *ata*, *atashka* and *apa*, *azhe*, *azheshka* are used to address grandfather and grandmother, respectively;

2) The words *papa*, *ake*, *koke* and *mama*, *anashym*, *apa* are used to address father and mother, respectively;

3) Addressing siblings, the following words are used: personal names (PN), *aga*, *koke*, *tate* (older brother); PN, *bratishka*, pet names, e.g. *Beka*, *Timoshka*, *Baha*, (younger brother); PN, *apa*, *apke*, *apshe*, *tate*, *apatai*, *apalya*, pet names, e.g. *Molya*, *Aika*, *Zhuzya* (older sister); PN, *sestrenka*, pet names, e.g. *Akonya*, *Altusha*, *Monya* (younger sister);

4) Addressing uncles and aunts, the following words are used: *ata*, *papa*, *koke*, *tate*, *aga*, PN+*aga*, *dyadya*+PN (paternal uncle); PN, PN+*apa*, PN+*tate*, *tetya*+PN, *apkeshka*, *apshe*, *tateshka*, *kok*, *azhe* (paternal aunt); *Nagashy*, PN+Nagashy; *ata*, *koke*, *tate*, *kokeshka*, PN+*aga*, *dyadya*+PN (maternal uncle); PN, PN+*apa*, PN+*tate*, *Nagashy*+*apa*, *tate*, *apashka*, *tateshka*, *tetya*+PN, *apshe* (maternal aunt);

5) Addressing cousins, the following words are used: PN; *sestrenka*, pet names, e.g. *Goka*, *Svetulya*, *Aika* (female cousin of the same age); PN, PN+*apa*, *tate*, *tateshka* (older female cousin); PN, pet names (younger female cousin); PN, pet names (male cousin of the same age); PN, PN+*aga*, *koke* (older male cousin); PN, pet names (younger male cousin).

Face-to-face interview. For qualitative research, an on-line survey was complemented by observation facts and interviews. The advantage of a face-to-face interview is the possibility to directly observe the respondent, to take in social cues that would otherwise be missed in an on-line survey.

Face-to-face interviews are most effective for qualitative research since they help explain, better understand, and explore subjects' opinions, behavior and experiences. The interview aimed to find out the variations of address terms within a nuclear family. The respondents were offered two questions: 'How do you address your grandparents, parents and siblings?' and 'Do you ever use variations of your address term in relation to your family members?' The authors were mostly interested in the answers to the second question. Seven respondents answered in the affirmative; some examples of answers are: 'When I somehow misbehave, I tell my mother 'Mamulya, I apologise' (Aigerim); 'When I come home very late after meeting my friends, I address my mother 'Mamusik' because she gets angry' (Alma); 'When I'm very busy, I ask my younger sister, who is twelve, to clean the room, and I address her with affectionate intonation and use the pet name *Bagolya*. Her name is Bakhtigul' (Marat).

Discussion

Family is an important and integral part in every person's life. Every culture and absolutely every nation has centuries-old family traditions. For the Kazakhs, as well for all other nations, family remains the leading social institution in the formation and development of life-meaning values and personality attitudes, and in the upbringing and socialization of the younger generation. For the Kazakhs, family is a sacred unity where life is born. The Kazakh language offers a plethora of address terms that young people use to refer to the members of their family and close relatives. Within a kin community, kinship relations are built on a special hierarchy: junior and senior. Notably, there is one and the same set of kinship addresses which young people use within their nuclear family and close consanguine relatives, no difference is made between maternal and paternal relatives except the term *Nagashy* (mother's brother).

The choice of address terms predominantly depends on the age difference between the addresser and addressee. For example, the terms *ata/azhe/apa* are used to address one's grandparents as well as father's and mother's older brothers and sisters. The address terms *Papa/Mama* are the most frequent (85% of respondents) to refer to parents. 15% of respondents use the terms *Ake/Koke* and *Anashym* to refer to their father and mother, respectively. The most ubiquitous Kazakh terms used to address relatives of different categories are *Apa* (older sister, older female relative) and *Aga* (older brother, older

male relative); these are employed to refer to the older sister/brother, to paternal and maternal aunts and uncles and cousins older than the addresser. They have a variety of emotionally colored synonyms formed by adding the diminutive suffixes to express affection and love towards the relative: *apalya, apeke, apatai, apshe, apkeshka, apashka, apulya/ageke, agatai, agasy, agashka*. Of special interest are the words *koke* and *tate* which are not referred by the authors of the present research as of kinship terms proper since they cannot be used in other sciences, e.g. anthropology, genetics, etc. In everyday speech these lexical units are widely used in relation to any older relative. Their derivatives with the diminutive suffixes also produce the effect of endearment: *tateshka, kokeshka*. Personal names are predominantly employed to address siblings, cousins, younger paternal/maternal siblings, depending on the age difference. Personal names are never used to address an older relative since it is utterly disrespectful. The right address formula is PN+ kinship term. Younger relatives (brothers, sisters, cousins, nephews and nieces) are addressed by their personal names or pet names, e.g. *Gauka* (Gauhar), *Aika* (Aigerim), *Olzhik* (Olzhas), *Asilok* (Asel), etc. The multiplicity of pet names young people create to address their sisters, brothers, cousins, nephews and nieces give clues about the relationships in a family. They are used to convey closeness and intimacy among members of the kin community. The data obtained through face-to-face interviews showed how address terms are used in different life contexts for different purposes, especially for the purpose of expressing the addresser's emotions. Emotional messages are conveyed through specific uses of address terms by the addresser. One specific peculiarity of Kazakh kinship address terms is that modern young people widely use the 'Russianized' terms *atashka, apashka, tateshka, agashka, bratishka*, etc.

Kazakhstan is a multinational state – its population includes numerous ethnic groups with their cultural, linguistic and historical specificity. Today, two diverse languages function in the country: Kazakh and Russian. According to the language policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Kazakh language has the status of the state language and the Russian language functions as an interethnic language, therefore retaining the entire scope of functions. Moreover, in Kazakhstan the infringement of the rights of citizens on the basis of language is not allowed. In educational institutions, Russian is a compulsory subject included in the study programs (Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan Concerning languages in

the Republic of Kazakhstan, No.151-1 of 11 July, 1997).

When languages coexist, mutual influence is inevitable. The two factors, intercultural communication and bilingualism, largely determined the peculiarity of the Russian language functioning in Kazakhstan. During the last decades, the Russian language was enriched by words and word combinations borrowed from the Kazakh language which denote realia, phenomena and concepts common for all Kazakhstan citizens: *beshbarmak* (the national dish), *aitys* (the national song competition), *dombra* (the national musical instrument), *malakhai* (the national headwear), etc. These borrowings were dubbed ‘interculturemas (Badagulova, 2010). In the Russian language, interculturemas emerge due to the following reasons: 1. functioning of the language in a territory as a regional language; 2. active application of the language in different spheres of communication; 3. bilingual people (Badagulova, 2010). Interestingly, the terms *atashka*, *apashka*, *kokeshka*, *tateshka*, *apaika* came back from Russian to the Kazakh language ‘enriched’ with the Russian suffixes -eshk-, -ashk-, -ka- and are widely used by the younger generation of Kazakhs as an endearment term expressing an affectionate attitude towards their beloved relatives. For instance: ‘*Аташ-ка мен Апашка көзінің ағы мен қарасындай болған жалғыз немересін ес білгеннен бауырына басып, төбесіне күн түсірмей, жүзіне жел тигізбей өсіріп, мәпелеп бақты*’ – ‘*From the very tender age, like the pupil of their eyes Atashka and Apashka raised their only grandson protecting him from the scorching rays of the sun and gusts of cold wind*’ or ‘*Апашка мен Аташка демі ыстық, буы бұрқыраған хатты қайта-қайта оқумен болды*’ – ‘*Again and again Apashka and Atashka read the letter which they have just received*’.

It should be argued that the language system develops according to its own laws which we have little influence on; the language itself decides what is needed, and what is not. Some Russian terms of kinship have also entered the Kazakh language, e.g. *brat*, *bratishka*, *bratan* (literally, *brother*,), very often used by young men to refer to their male peers or younger boys as a sign of respect and affection. Interestingly, some words (*agashka*, *apaska*, *tateshka*) have developed new meanings, predominantly negative, in their semantic structure and came to denote influential people, bosses, who use their high position for personal pleasure and enrichment. This is explained by the fact that vocabulary is the most mobile part of language, closely connected with the

life of society, and therefore constantly changing: some words fade into oblivion, new lexical units or new meanings appear, and words expressing new concepts are borrowed from other languages.

Conclusion

The present research of Kazakh consanguine kinship terms of address revealed the links between language use, social relations and cultural values. The analysis of data obtained yielded valuable information on the usage of address terms within a nuclear family and close consanguine relatives. The Kazakh society, being traditional in nature, strictly regulates the behavior of its members in many spheres of life, including family communication. There are special rules of common behavior connected with various life situations, emerged as a result of long-term development of national culture: establishing contact, attracting attention, individualizing a communicant, and creating a favorable atmosphere of communication. The usage of kinship address terms to refer to relatives as well as non-relatives indicates the uniqueness of the Kazakh culture. The whole society can be related by a kinship address; kinship address terms are powerful means of creating and sustaining solidarity among not only members of a kin community but the whole society. Namely, this tradition of extending kinship throughout the whole nation is transmitted from ancestors to the contemporary generation since it plays a significant role in strengthening unity and peaceful coexistence of people. As an important part in speech, address terms open communicative acts and set the tone for further communication. The very use of a kinship term to address a person is a means of showing respect and politeness which is “the form of behavior aimed at the establishment and maintenance of comity, i.e, the ability of participants to engage in interaction in a comfortable and harmonious atmosphere” (Leech, 1983). The present research also revealed a strong family orientation of modern young Kazakhs. The multiplicity of kinship endearment address terms and pet names (*apashka*, *atashka*, *tateshka*, *papulya*, *mamulya*, etc.) used by young people to refer to their relatives give evidence that family is the priority among their life values. In the ranking of values, the Kazakh youth (80.5% of those aged 14-18) considers family as an absolute value (Biyekenova et.al., 2016).

The present research is part of a big research topic on Kazakh kinship address terms. Further re-

search on this topic is to be «Kazakh affinal kinship address terms' which, in the authors' opinion, can provide a complete picture of the address system in the Kazakh language.

References

- Aubakirova S., Ismagambetova Z., Gabitov T., Akhmetova G. (2014). Tolerance as a phenomenon of Kazakh culture. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, pp. 2226-5139.
- Badagulova G.M. (2010) Kommunikativnaya model v usloviyakh mezhkulturnogo obshcheniya i bilingvizma (na materiale russkogo yazyka Kazakhstana) [Communicative model in the conditions of intercultural communication and bilingualism (on the material of the Russian language of Kazakhstan)]. *ACTA LINGUISTICA*, no 1, pp. 116 – 126. (In Russian)
- Biyekenova N.Zh., Abdiraimova G.S., Kenzhakimova G.A., Shaukenova Z.K., Senuk Z.V. (2016) Value system of students of the republic of Kazakhstan as a special social and cultural group. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*, no 11(9), pp. 2481-2494. (In Russian)
- Crossman A. (2020). Kinship: Definition in the Study of Sociology. <https://www.thoughtco.com/kinship-3026370>.
- Dickey E. (1997). Forms of address and terms of reference. *Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 33, pp. 255-274.
- Dienar D.N. (2006). Patterns and variation of address terms in colloquial Indonesian. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, no 29(2), pp. 1-16.
- Dykova V.G. (2020). Sopotavitelnoye issledovaniye angliyskikh i russkikh appelyativov i ikh perevodcheskikh korrelyatsiy [Comparative study of English and Russian appellatives and their translation correlations]. <https://www.dissercat.com/content/sopotavitelnoe-issledovanie-angliyskikh-i-russkikh-apellyativov-i-ikh-perevodcheskikh-korre> (In Russian)
- Egenisova A.K., Erubaeva A.R. (2015) Psihologicheskie osobennosti nacional'nogo mentaliteta kazakhskogo Naroda [Psychological features of the national mentality of the Kazakh people]. *International Journal of Experimental Education*, no 4-2, pp. 371-376. (In Russian)
- Goffman E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry*, no 2, 213p.
- Hao Y., Ren Ch. (2013) A comparative study of social address terms in Chinese and English. *Higher Education and Social Science*, no 5(3), pp. 35-40.
- Hua Zh. (2010). Language socialization and interculturality: address terms in intergenerational talk in Chinese diasporic families. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, no 10(3), pp. 189-205.
- Karasik, V. I. (2002). Yazykovoi krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs [Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse]. Volgograd: Peremena, 477p. (In Russian)
- Kubryakova E.S. (1995) Evolyutsiya lingvisticheskikh idey vo vtoroy polovine XX veka (opyt paradigmalnogo analiza) [Evolution of linguistic ideas in the second half of the XX century (experience of paradigmatic analysis)]. *Language and science of the late XX century*, pp. 144-238. (In Russian)
- Leech, G. (1983) Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman.
- Leontiev A.A. (1976). Psychology of communication. Tartu: University of Tartu, 220p.
- Likhacheva A. (2011). Lexika rodstva v russkoi kommunikativnoi culture [Vocabulary of kinship in Russian communicative culture]. *Sociolinguistics*, no 19, pp. 106 – 112. (In Russian)
- Morgan L.H. (1997). Systems of consanguinity and affinity of human family. University of Nebraska Press, 590p.
- Vorkachev S.G. (2003) The concept as an «umbrella term», Language, consciousness, communication, pp. 5–12.
- Wardhaugh R. (2006) *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. MA: Blackwell, 418p.

Литература

- Aubakirova S., Ismagambetova Z., Gabitov T., Akhmetova G. Tolerance as a phenomenon of Kazakh culture // *International Journal of Asian Social Science*. – 2014. – P. 2226-5139.
- Бадагулова Г.М. Коммуникативная модель в условиях межкультурного общения и билингвизма (на материале русского языка Казахстана) // *Acta linguistica*. – 2010. – №1. – С. 116 – 126.
- Biyekenova N.Zh., Abdiraimova G.S., Kenzhakimova G.A., Shaukenova Z.K., Senuk Z.V. Value system of students of the republic of Kazakhstan as a special social and cultural group // *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*. – 2016. – № 11(9). – С. 2481-2494.
- Воркачев С. Г. Концепт как «зонтиковый термин» // *Язык, сознание, коммуникация*. – 2003. – С. 5–12.
- Dickey E. Forms of address and terms of reference // *Journal of Linguistics*. – 1997. – Vol. 33. – P. 255-274.
- Dienar D.N. Patterns and variation of address terms in colloquial Indonesian // *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*. – 2016. – № 29(2). – P. 1-16.
- Дыкова В.Г. Сопоставительное исследование английских и русских апеллятивов и их переводческих корреляций, 2020. <https://www.dissercat.com/content/sopotavitelnoe-issledovanie-angliyskikh-i-russkikh-apellyativov-i-ikh-perevodcheskikh-korre>
- Егенисова А.К., Ерубаева А.Р. Психологические особенности национального менталитета казахского народа // *Международный журнал экспериментального образования*. – 2015. – № 4-2. – С. 371-376.
- Goffman E. On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction // *Psychiatry*. – 1955. – № 2. – 213p.
- Карасик В. И. *Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс*. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. – 477 с.
- Кубрякова Е.С. *Эволюция лингвистических идей во второй половине XX в. (опыт парадигмального анализа)* // *Язык и наука конца XX в.* – 1995. – С.144-238.

- Crossman A. Kinship: Definition in the Study of Sociology, 2020. <https://www.thoughtco.com/kinship-3026370>.
- Leech G. Principles of Pragmatics. – London: Longman, 1993.
- Leontiev A.A. Psychology of communication. – Tartu: University of Tartu, 1976. – 220 p.
- Лихачева А. Лексика родства в русской коммуникативной культуре // *Sociolinguistics*. – 2011. – №19. – С. 106 -112.
- Morgan L.H. Systems of consanguinity and affinity of human family. – University of Nebraska Press, 1997. – 590p.
- Hao Y., Ren Ch. A comparative study of social address terms in Chinese and English // *Higher Education and Social Science*. – 2013. – № 5(3). – P. 35-40.
- Hua Zh. Language socialization and interculturality: address terms in intergenerational talk in Chinese diasporic families // *Language and Intercultural Communication*. – 2010. – № 10(3). – P.189-205.
- Wardhaugh R. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. – MA: Blackwell, 2006. – 418p.