

Social Action: Unconscious Selection Mechanism

Galina Kolesnikova

Institute of Water Transport Named in Honor of G.Y. Sedov,
Rostov-on-Don, Russia

Abstract: Social action, despite its apparent obviousness, requires in-depth study, because outward simplicity and naturalness of its adoption and subsequent execution is very deceptive. This can be attributed mainly by the existence of two levels of decision: which is realized and which is hidden from the subject in the depths of his subconscious. It follows from this natural solution about the classification based on the criterion of social action. In this situation the character of the social action (exterior, facing outward or internal, facing over) is irrelevant. Subsequent analysis of selected types of social action and their symbolic and archetypal links allowed to identify the matrix of the mechanism for social action selection.

Key words: Social action • Choice • Choice Mechanisms • Consciousness • Unconscious • Perceivable • Non-perceivable

INTRODUCTION

Social action, whether is it external or internal, can be classified on 2 species based on the way of its adoption (perceivable or non-perceivable) by the person: perceivable or non-perceivable social actions. Naturally, the perceivable or non-perceivable actions are based on a decision. Based on this fact, by the thesis of Talcott Parsons, the given position can be determined as follows: social interaction is carried out in most cases through linguistic communication and the language, together with the other symbolic means, is the primary control mechanism, related to the mechanisms of motivation, inherent to individuals [1]. These motivational mechanisms are involved in intentional linguistic expressions, which lead to action through the perception of their value [2].

However, understanding of the “perceivable” mechanisms of social action is ambiguous as it may include: a) the process of understanding of social action in the process of its realization; b) proper awareness of the specificity of adoption of any decision of this social action. Moreover, perceivable social actions in a certain sense can also be reduced to non-perceivable, they may

be appropriately called “those, which individual defines as conscious”, because to assume the awareness does not mean to recognize in reality.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The materials of psychological studies and experiments, conducted in XX-XI centuries, are used in the given research.

The method of qualitative analysis of scientific sources and literature is also used by the author.

RESULTS

We can say about the awareness in the full sense only as the process of understanding of social action in the process of its realization, because the awareness of adoption of any solution will always have a relative degree of certainty which can be defined as “what person thinks or as explains at the conscious level the causes of this social action”.

That is, as soon as we enter into a zone that is usually determined as a conscious, begins interpretation having just a sociocultural nature. This is because basic

need of socially adapted personality is the need “to be recognized as deservedly” and hence any social action the personality explains / interprets / understands through the prism embedded in her mind sociocultural norms, attitudes, values.

Thus, the conscious mechanisms are always socioculturally determined [3]. And it may be the indirect evidence that perceivable decision-making mechanisms for social actions not only have a common base with non-perceivable decision-making mechanisms, in fact - is the same mechanisms. These mechanisms, depending on the social context, answering the question “Why did I choose this action?”, receives an acceptable for the person explanation on a conscious level.

This takes into account the motives, intentions, the ratio of the meaning and importance of action, perception of the immediate environment, membership in any social and professional groups, correlation of this activity with the system of norms and values of the individual. But all these components can be attributed to the landmark field. At the present stage science of development, the questions of social conditioning and character are studying in the epistemological and general methodological terms – first of all in linguistics, theory of prose and poetics, various kinds of arts. In sociology the social sign is seen as a symbol that can be implemented in a word, object or gesture, image and action.

According to Y.S. Stepanov, we can explain the replacement of “sign principle” to “principle of statement” [4], because such a replacement allowed to distinguish between systems in which there are only signs, but there are no statements – for example, in the system in animal communication signals or in the system architectural symbols and in the systems, in which there are the statements. From the perspective of semiotics, sign is perceived as a kind of material-ideal formation able to display information reliably. That is, the sign appears as a generalized concept, for example, “good – evil”, “main - non-principal”, “love – hate”, etc.

Prague Linguistic School, engaged in the development of the theoretical problems of social conditioning sign, regarded it as a social entity, which serves an intermediary between members of the given community and providing an understanding between them only on the basis of the entire system of significances of the given community.

In accordance with understanding of the general theory of signs, Charles Sanders Peirce proposed to classify signs as follows [5]: 1) iconic sign - action is based on an actual likeness of signifier and signified, such

as a picture of the animal and the animal. This type of sign is the simplest, as determined by past experiences and therefore can not convey information by itself; 2) index - action is based on a real adjacency of signifier and signified, for example, smile is an index of joy, smoke - fire index, etc. However, neither the iconic signs or indexes can not say anything; 3) symbol - action is based on the conditional relation of signifier and signified, based on an “agreement”, for example, most of the nations represents a nod as an affirmative answer, but the Bulgarian – as negative. That is, a symbol often denotes the genus of things and not a single thing. In social psychology various suppositive signs (for example - emblems, orders) refers to symbols. Such a suppositive signs provide information about the social status of the individual and / or his membership in a social group. If the sign is presented in the form of word and denotes an object or thing, it starts to function as a social symbol, reflecting the social values ??of the society and ensuring mutual understanding between individuals of the given society in the communicational process.

Thus, in correlation with similar elements, if the sign looks like a socially established (adopted) in this community interpretation, sign updated the content of provided information, helping the realization of basic communication feature – pragmatic.

Symbols have generalized value, they are able to form a judgment and hence may affect thinking and behavior of personality, programming the future as a certain type of behavior. Symbols imprinted in the minds of every person in the form of approved models of the response at all levels of social life (feeling, thought forms, behavioral acts). Formation of these models occurs on the basis of cognitive structures, which are a consequence of the linguistic structure of the language. Linguistic language universals are the primary basis of formation of cognitive structures, influencing on the choice of behavior. Unconscious is in the centre of this process – it is the device of update or representation of the past experiences.

What is the specificity of this unconscious selection mechanism of social action? Carl Gustav Jung singled out a sublevel in unconscious level of individual – archetypal, owned collective unconscious, both oldest and universal [6]. Archetypes, as human experience, manifest themselves in the structure of personality as a kind of “metaphorical structures”. According to M. Evans, these structures are similar to archetypes, because they are not recognized by individuals and provide a form of conscious content. They differ from the archetypes due

to their individuality and permanence: they are acquired in ontogeny. Individual metaphorical structures are formed by the entire culture, prejudging the type of attitude and outlook.

Analyzing the individual metaphorical structures, L.I. Shragina treats them as a universal mechanism of semantic changes. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson define them as a kind of linguistic gestalts, manifested in everyday life in language, thought, action [7]. Directly people's tendency to fetishize dynamic properties and individual qualities is a throwback, supported by any archetype. The programs of Manichean way of thinking are stored in the unconscious and influence on attitude toward loved ones, colleagues, decisions. Thus, exactly archetypal symbols play the main role in the selection of social action, but not conscious and perceivable personal experience [8]: until the consciousness of the person is busy in processing information, symbols act on unconscious levels of personality, consisting of non-perceivable installations, repressed neurotic experiences and, initiating emotional state of mind, predetermine the choice of social action.

We can explain such a powerful influence of symbol by the fact, that it logically deduces any of its physically constituent elements or from whole (if any), element of which it happens to be [9].

Thus, the sign and symbolic content of influencing is determined by using: 1) words; 2) letters; 3) symbols; 4) similar means to obtain information about an object or event. This definition includes the following components: semantics, indicating the meaning of words and symbols; syntax, indicating the relationship between the using symbols; pragmatics, revealing the effectiveness of the chosen syntax and semantics for achieving concrete goals of communication.

Hence, in this context, the essence of symbols lies in their mediating function between the phenomena, their meaning and generated images, ideas, which lie outside of sensory perception and reflection of the given phenomena of reality in their direct impact on the senses. From this it follows that the characters differ in areas of origin. This criterion may be used as a basis of the classification system of symbols. So, we can determine the following classification of symbols according to their origin: linguistic symbols; non-linguistic symbols (color, sound, shape, spatial position); integrative symbols (as a connection of linguistic and non-linguistic elements).

The main linguistic symbol is directly the language. All the other symbols, generated by the language, essentially, belong to the transformational linguistics. Associative links are in the basis of symbols interaction, which can be intercultural, cultural and personal by their nature [10].

Thus, the access code to symbols (linguistic, nonlinguistic, integrative) as a result of which influence on the unconscious of personality occurs the choice of social action, are associative links (intercultural, cultural and personal). The symbols, binder individual consciousness with the archetypal layer, have the greatest power.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above, the selection mechanism of social action can be determined by the following matrix (presented in the Table 1): a) archetype, which is dominant in the given culture (society as a whole); b) myth's idea, which is dominant in the culture, according to its functions and role in the social stratum; c) individual metaphorical structure; d) dominant needs.

Table 1: Matrix of mechanism of social action choice

<i>Dominant archetype in the given culture (society as a whole)</i>	<i>Dominant myth's idea in the culture, according to its functions and role in the social stratum</i>	<i>Individual metaphorical structure</i>	
			<i>Dominant needs</i>
Ruler	Theogonic, tells about the birth of the Gods	Authority	Status, control
Hero	Cosmogonic, describes the creation of the world	Victory	Professionalism, initiative
Sage	Cosmogonic, myths about the world structure	Awareness	Mind, structuring of information, objectivity
Finder	Anthropological, myths about the creation of man	Successful search	Search yourself, discovery of mysteries, individuality
Child	Aetiological, myths about origin of nature	Game	The joy of life, holiday, new opportunities
Lover	Soteriological, myths about man's salvation	Love	Attractiveness, sexuality, sensuality
Good fellow	Eschatological, myths about doomsday	Consolation	Loyalty, ethics, sincerity
Keeper	Presents in all the myths in varying degrees	Preservation	Comfort, relaxation, peace

REFERENCES

1. Parsons, T., 1977. *Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory*. N.Y.: Free Press, pp: 429.
2. Parsons, T., 1968. *The Structure of Social Action*. N.Y.: Free Press, pp: 772.
3. Murphy, J., 2004. *Power of Your Subconscious*. Donetsk: Poligraph Press, pp: 352.
4. Stepanov, Y.S., 2013. *Methods and principles of modern linguistics*. Moscow: Librocom, pp: 312.
5. Peirce, C.S., 2009. What is a sign? *Herald of Tomsk State University. Philosophy. Sociology. Politology*, 3(7): 88-95.
6. Jung, C.G., 1997. *Man and His Symbols*. Moscow: Universitetskaya Kniga, pp.: 438.
7. Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson, 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp: 256.
8. Kolesnikova, G., 2013. The neoclassical psychology and neoclassical reprogramming the unconscious: the ratio and the rationale. *Humanity & Social Sciences Journal*, 8(2): 72-76.
9. Mamardashvili, M.K. and A.M. Ryatigorski, 1997. *Symbol and consciousness. Metaphysical reasoning about consciousness, symbolism and language*. Moscow: Nauka, pp: 567.
10. Smirnov (Abakumov), I.V., 1982. *Physiological fields of biological objects, created by semantic fields*. Moscow: Politizdat, pp: 342.