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INTRODUCTION

The investigation of adolescents’ interactions and relationships in contemporary situation compared to that decades ago comes across two fundamental difficulties. Firstly, the lack of reliable data which show the situation of interaction hidden from an adult’s perspective decades ago. Secondly, there is inadequacy of research methods in the investigation of the intimate inner content of interaction and sensation. Deontological issues should also be mentioned: if it is permissible to invade into one’s privacy exploring it as something objective and existing apart from the very situation of interaction.

Furthermore, it is important to understand the sensitivity of the fundamental theories describing adolescence for the reality of contemporary teens’ life, the adoption of these theories in the new reality characterized by many taboos removed, by the emergence of possibilities of interaction in social networks, the growing relativity in ideological and moral sphere.

Two interrelated objectives of the present research to be reported are the following: 1) to develop an instrument that would be sensitive to intimate aspects of adolescents’ relationship and interaction; 2) to reveal a new present-day characteristics of adolescent peer interaction.

Theoretical background

Different characteristics of adolescence were depicted by researchers since Stanley Hall first called this period *Sturm und Drang* (Storm and Stress). In Russian (Soviet) psychology the main attention was paid to the activity theory and intimate-personal relationship was proclaimed to be the “leading activity” of adolescence. The list of “key words” describing adolescence is very long: *emerging maturity* by D. Elkonin and T. Dragunova (1967), *changes of the type of reflection* by J. Piaget (1999), *the change in the relationship between the real and the possible* by M. Klee (1991), and *the project activity* by K. Polivanova (1996) among others.

The assumption that identity formation is the key developmental task of adolescence belongs to E. Erikson. Identity is defined as an internal “continuity of self-experience of the individual” [Erikson, 1968], “lasting
internal equality with itself” [Ibid.], the most important characteristic of personal integrity, as the integration of experiences of one’s identity with certain social groups. Identity formation is characterized as “changes in identity that can be characterized as progressive developmental shifts” came from Waterman. Dispute on whether identity formation is better characterized by change or by stability was presented in papers by A. Van Hoof and A. Waterman (1999).

Conceptualization of Erikson’s identity theory was used by J. Marcia (1966) in the identity status paradigm. The main attention in his paradigm is on two digressions central for Erikson work including: exploration of developmental alternatives in various identity-defining domains or “crisis” in Erikson’s work and choice of alternatives and participation in relevant activities towards the implementation of these choices. The four identity statuses are defined by the Marcia: foreclosure, identity diffusion, moratorium, and identity achievement. It had been stressed that the achievement of mature identity is based upon the process of meaningful identity exploration. Exploration takes place in three spheres: interaction with parents, with peers and with future professional choices (and thus associated with educational institutions).

Peer interaction is considered to be one of the major trends in adolescents’ development. The notion had been developed inside the theory of identity in two aspects: as a domain ensuring the development of identity (as an adolescence developmental task, developmental psychology) and as that ensuring identification with others (social psychology).

Inside developmental psychology the main question that should be discussed is that of the mechanisms of development. How does it happen that a child self turns into a mature one? The general answer is as follows: the mechanism is described as that of a trial. Teens explore new types of behavior and then get an answer from people surrounding them. They are sensitive to the answer they get. As it was shown in my previous papers [Поливанова, 1996; Поливанова и др., 2013] the trial of new behavior can be described through the notion of authorship: teens put forward words or deeds (as “authors”) and search for “readers” — those who can return them another version or another understanding.
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Thus, the main research question is whether we can describe the present-day teens' interaction as such an exchange, what sort of problems are being discussed, and what the essence of the interaction is. If anything has changed during the last 40–50 years when the main theoretical frames had been elaborated.

Methodological background

To answer the research questions one should compare the characteristics of teens' interaction now and before. However, we immediately come against an insurmountable difficulty. Firstly, a comparison of contemporary realities and those taking place a few decades ago inevitably encounters distortion: adult carriers of knowledge about childhood can describe it from today's adult perspective. Secondly, a comparison on the basis of empirical techniques of repetition of the onetime research reveals a significant change in the requirements for reliability, the volume and composition of the sample, etc. Thus, the methodology (see below) may be subject to reasonable, in our opinion, criticism.

The development of research instruments in psychology and social sciences is always (except for projective methods) constructed (logically) as follows:

- a normative image of the phenomenon under study is constructed;
- it is operationalized and further becomes an operational representation of the phenomenon under study;
- criteria are being elaborated;
- conformity of the logically elaborated and empirically obtained data is estimated.

In other words, psychological reality is laid down before an experiment, and this is extremely important in the context of our research. Then, one analyzes the way of positing norms, theoretical or empirical, but the logic remains unchanged.

And further: the simpler the model of the phenomenon under study (its normative image) is, the more accurate data can be obtained and described. However, the possibilities of interpretation are thus reduced. Thus, psychology and the science of education always set their own,
adult, look at the reality. Then the adult’s vision becomes the basis of interpretation. That means, a researcher’s (adult) model creates some universal vision and further defines to what extent a child matches this model. But the questions posed can simply be out of the child’s picture of the world; it gives socially desirable answers or comes-off.

Nevertheless, there is another way of “asking”. Along with the development of psychoanalysis and other psychological practices, projective methods appear. Projective research methods allow to reconstruct and to make explicit important psychological variables by non-verbal means. Using this means of research could be quite heuristic because of a lower level of control and criticism to the answers that respondents give. The peculiarity of the projective method is that it creates an experimental situation, involving many interpretations. These interpretations may be unexpected for both, the researcher and the respondent, and this is extremely important in the study of personality, cultural features, and other value-laden variables. Thus, projective techniques help researchers to solve the problem of bias.

In the study of adolescents there is another problem — the censoring of answers to sensitive questions, despite the fact that such censorship may not be aware of them. Once the study touches a really important topic for a respondent, there is a great danger that he/she would avoid providing answers.

These features of the research methods and adolescents force us to look for creative ways of study. For example, it is possible to study the interaction of student with classic and contemporary cultural products (novels, films) by creative projective methods [Поливанова и др., 2013]. A wide spread of visual tools offers technical facilities that make it possible to avoid or minimize verbal forms of experimenting.

Photo and video tools have long been used by researchers (psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, historians) to document particular behavioral patterns. Previously photo and video means were used mainly for observation and fixation the data. For example in education video registration has become a powerful tool for analyzing the effectiveness of teachers, identifying the most successful ways of learning and the evaluation of teachers [Goldman et al., 2014; Jacobs et al., 2007; Jacobs
Instrument “Remake”

et al., 1999]. The literature discusses the methodological and ethical principles of analysis of video recordings [Arafeh, McLaughlin, 2002; Erickson, 2006].

Currently, photo and video equipment has become widely available: each student can take and retouch photos, shoot and edit short films. Therefore, photos and videos have become the means for conducting creative projective techniques in the study.

The market and media research responded to the emergence of new research opportunities quite quickly. Trying to identify the underlying patterns of behavior, values and drivers, researchers ask participants to make photo collages, keep video diaries, record small video films, etc. Such creative methods allow researchers to analyze collaborative and individual production and to interpret the data obtained by non-verbal means [Buckingham, 2009; Gauntlett, 2007].

In this project, video techniques were used for the study of modern teenagers. It was very important to minimize the influence of researchers and to try to identify the most important issues, conflicts, interests and values that really excite teenagers.

INSTRUMENT “REMAKE”

The projective models thus used in the present research related to the age norm, began to be applied in the broader context of research (e.g., “drawing of a human being”, “school readiness test”). Thus the development of these features make the objective to seek innovative ways of research, in particular, to study the interaction of children with modern/classical cultural products, and thereby indirectly attempt to recreate (in this case, it is appropriate to say, reconstruct) the psychological characteristics we are interested in [Поливанова и др., 2013].

It was assumed that the classical projective techniques offer interesting possibilities but still require substantial transformation. We put forward a new principle of experiment. Our hypothesis is that a long-term production of the artistic product (artistic modeling) can become a “mirror” of the sphere of inner experiences of adolescents. Artistic ob-
ject modeling can be a text, based on real events and experiences related to the actual interactions (communication) of the students.

Because there is no reliable data regarding the interaction of adolescents from the past, we cannot compare it to today’s teens relationships. So we have chosen a movie that demonstrates adolescent interactions 45 years ago.

The selection criteria for the movie for remake were:
1. The movie presents teenagers and their problems.
2. The movie includes three main types of relations: peer; teen and family; student and teacher.
3. The main conflict in the story should not necessarily have moral stresses, ethical aspect or concern national conflicts.
4. The movie belongs to the Soviet period of 1960s — 1980s (in order to see the differences between Russian adolescents nowadays and those 50 years ago).


The film “Tomorrow, April 3rd” has been chosen as the base for a remake. The principal reason for the choice was the following: it laid down different small episodes/scenes possible for remaking. Such a diversity is seldom today, it is almost always the case that one film presents one story. The second reason is connected with our principal decision to avoid strict moral or ethical dilemmas or political issues that were rather common in Soviet filmography. The movie was shot during the period of “Ottepel” (“Thaw”), so it focuses on daily events and routines.

Movie introduction

Name: Tomorrow, April 3rd
Director: Igor Maslennikov
Written by: Vladimir Valutskiy
Instrument “Remake”

**Genre:** film adaptation, comedy, adventure, family movie

**Year of production:** 1969

**Running time:** 70 minutes

**Brief content**

April 1st is the International Day of fun, the Fool’s Day, literally meaning the Day of Laughter. In Russia this day is usually celebrated with friends and colleagues, they make jokes, cheats and have fun. The film shows the story of one school class. On April 1st, students make a lot of jokes that turn to be offensive and cause some conflicts. Later the students decide and swear that on the next day all of them would tell only the truth. At first glance, it seems to be a good decision. In fact, it turns out that the truth could offend and injure a person.

The film’s title is associated with these events and poses a question if on the next day April 3rd, one could lie back. This question torments heroes of the film and remains unanswered.

Along with this main plot the film presents many small-scale episodes mostly concerning everyday usual life of teenagers and their communication and interaction. The scenario is based upon several novelettes by Ilia Zverev, published in his book “The Second of April”. All the novelettes unite around events that take place in one school group. Thus, the film presents several stories depicted in detail or briefly.

**Main characters**

**Yura Fonarev** — arrogant, circumspect. Opinion leader. “Star” of this class (the popular teen).

**Masha Gavricova** — accurate, responsible, excellent student, “Star” of this class (the popular teen).

**Tutkin** — a closed, creative, talented and little naive painter.

**Kolyan** — aggressive, athletic, booby.

**Form-master, Ariadna** — a young class teacher of the sixth “B” grade.

**Literature teacher, Ludmila Petrovna** — an experienced teacher with a conservative approach to education.

**Parents** — Masha’s mother, Masha’s father.
THE COURSE OF THE EXPERIMENT

The experiment was organized as a part of the program of a Summer school for teenagers and high school students. Summer School is an annual interdisciplinary event which has been held since 2004 in the format of an educational camp for Russian students. Students from almost all Russian regions come to the school for 2–4 weeks to study what they are interested in. Normally, they attend lectures in the morning and fulfill group projects in the afternoon. One of the groups, “a psychology workshop”, was offered a task: to remake an old Russian movie. It was openly told that the main goal was to reveal the differences between the former and today’s teenagers.

There were 14 students aged from 13 to 18. The whole process lasted for three weeks in July-August 2014.

The teens watched the movie several times, discussed it, tried to choose episodes that could better reflect the differences. Three iterations of the story were written.

The first one turned to be very decent, it can be defined as a decorous one. All the events of the original version were preserved only some exterior details changed — cloths, phones, some vocabulary. This version was rejected. No filming was done.

The second version was the opposite. Homosexual relations were discussed, all the main characters were in love with each other. Very soon, the attempt was also abandoned. Also no filming was done.

The third version (see below) was elaborated, accepted and filmed. Due to time shortage the montage went on later on-line when the students already returned home. Comparison of the scenes of the original film version and the remake version represented at the Table 1.
The course of the experiment

**Table 1. Comparison of the scenes of the original film version and the remake version**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The original version of the episode (in order of appearance)</th>
<th>The teens’ version of the episode. Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The form-master (Ariadna) realizes that her students enter a transitional period; She discusses romantic relations of her students with her boyfriend, also a teacher</td>
<td>This scene was discussed, but was not selected for the new film. Discussion went on as follows: “Now the teachers do not delve so in their students, have you ever seen a teacher who would have dreamed of his disciples, and that he would have paid attention to those who in love with someone of the students” — “Nothing of the sort, there are different teachers. Some are very attentive to the students”. The dispute came to a standstill, the scene was rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lesson of literature at the Hermitage. An introduction of the main characters — the students-teenagers and an elderly teacher of literature. A boring discussion of a classical painting</td>
<td>The scene was not considered as being of interest for the film. There was a sluggish replica on the theme: “And we do not have lessons at museums”, but on the whole the scene was ignored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Two groups of students meet in the city center. Students greet each other, wave their hands to each other, “Hey, where have you been?” — “In the museum! And you?” — “Going to the ballet theatre!”</td>
<td>The group discussed if it was possible today that two groups of students would greet each other and if they would notice each other in a city center. They came to the conclusion that such a community: “We, the students” — did not exist any longer, no one would have greeted each other happily. Agreed that nowadays the students were more closed in themselves, in pairs and in groups, the scene was rejected (In the course of discussion it was noticed that former students seemed (or were shown) more energetic and engaged, more naive and pretentious)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Orlov (nickname Tyutkin) is introduced. A talented starry-eyed boy. He draws a sketch of two groups of students meeting; his classmates notices it, cheers him up, one of the classmates Kolyan asks him to draw his portrait. Tyutkin draws but the portrait turns to be a caricature.</td>
<td>This scene was defined as “containing conflict”, was the first one selected for the remake. The following questions were noticed and discussed: 1) Would a rowdy notice and being hurt by a caricature or would he ignore it? 2) Would the classmates intercede for Tuytkin? 3) What would Tuytkin of 2014 look like? 4) How would this scene look like (using digital technology d). After some arguments, teens accepted that “contemporary Kolyan” would have beenflamed out if</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The course of the experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The original version of the episode (in order of appearance)</th>
<th>The teens' version of the episode. Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caricature. It is funny but quite recognizable. All the students laugh. Kolyan flames out, flies on Tyutkin, Tuytkin tries to escape. Classmates intercede for Tuytkin</td>
<td>someone mocked him (drawing — mockery, though involuntary) 1) the classmates still would protect Tuytkin (there were some disagreements); 2) Tuytkin would not have been drawn (using paper and pencil) but would be filmed with an iPhone and posted to Instagram. The scene takes place in a summer camp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to the discussion of episode 4:
Discussing this episode the students began to use swearing words and it went on in further discussions. The discussion of this conflict in this episode turned to be a trigger for swearing. The topic of bullying and trolling first appeared and never passed away. Emergence of digital technology was discussed and turned to be a sort of contemporary youth life label. E.g. paper and pencil drawing would not have provoked any reaction but a photo shoot would. Reaction to a caricature or a photo shoot would take place in a social network not in real interaction.

5 Ryashentsev and other classmates escort Tuytkin home, they read some poetry to cheer him up and called him “a great artist”. Tuytkin promises to himself to give up drawing

Some discussions about friendship and its manifestations took place: “And of course, there would be no poetry, and generally speaking it was too pathetic”. However, the episode itself was found to be insignificant. The episode was discussed, but was not selected

6 Tuytkin unexpectedly meets Masha and Yura together. In spite of his own decision not to draw he does make a picture of their date. Occasionally this drawing falls into the hands of the classmates, it causes discussion and gossips. The date is taken as an inappropriate relationship. Masha is dismayed

This episode had two different versions. In the first version of the script, some minor changes were introduced — clothes, gadgets, language. In the final version, the episode changed considerably. Tiytkin borrows Yura’s iPhone and comes across Masha’s a nude selfie. The gadget falls into the hands of other teens. Bullying, gossips; Masha is dismayed, she slaps Yury, and defiantly goes away embracing another guy (Ryashentsev)

Notes to the episode 6:
1) Again, there is the topic of bullying — and it really becomes the central one in a teenage film.
2) The topic of body appears. It should be stressed that sexual relations are taken as something normal. The conflict is related to the fact of the violation of intimacy, of trust.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The original version of the episode (in order of appearance)</th>
<th>The teens’ version of the episode. Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teachers discuss teens’ relations and conflicts</td>
<td>The episode was ignored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Masha feels offended by Yury, feels abandoned, Ryashentsev offers her to escort home. They slowly walk and talk, Ryashentsev is happy because he is in love with Masha</td>
<td>The episode was actively discussed. The debate centered around relations with those who are ready to become a boy(girl)-friend. Those who are in the “friend-zone”, and act as “substitutes”. Finally, the episode looked as follows: Masha goes crying to the river, there appears Ryashentsev, calms her down, and they go together, pointedly hugging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Scenes from the first of April jokes</td>
<td>The episodes were ignored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Deciding to tell the truth (after the 1st of April), the students rather abused each other, claiming to reveal personal secrets under the pretext of “pure truth”. One of the girls asks Ryashentsev whether he loves Masha</td>
<td>The episode was barely noticed. Careful attitude to each other was mentioned. Note: This is surprising as the original episode contained a hint of bullying that turned to be a leitmotif in teenage version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The students decide to tell the truth (after the 1st of April). Mom asks Masha to tell her cousin on the phone that she was not home. Masha calls her mother refusing to lie. Home conflict, angry mother, Masha persists. The parents conclude: “But our Masha has already grown up!”</td>
<td>The episode was barely noticed. There was a slug-gish attempt to discuss teens’ relations with parents, but with no result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A boring literature lesson with an elderly teacher. She notices the absence of interest and asks: “Maybe you don’t care, do you?” The students agree. The teacher is offended</td>
<td>The episode was ignored</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

After long and hot discussions the following story was written.

The events take place in a summer camp for teens. Tyutkin snapshots Kolyan slovenly eating his lunch. The picture turns to be very funny, everyone sees it because Tutkin uploads it to Instagram. Kolyan is furious and tries to attack Tutkin. A fight starts, some students try to protect Tutkin. The fight is shown as very aggressive.

Tutkin borrows Yura’s phone and finds Masha’s (nude) selfie there. He is shocked and interested, others notice his interest and snatch the phone, see the selfie, discuss it, point to Masha. Yura receives a slap in the face from Masha, and she runs away. Masha goes crying to the river, there appears Ryashentsev, calms her down, and they go together, pointedly hugging.

Yura is upset and does not know what to do, he discusses the events with Kolyan. He advises to behave as a-man to forget a slap and try to apologize. Yura does so and is forgiven. Happy end.

DISCUSSION

In the course of the study we managed to identify new aspects of communication between teenagers in comparison with the previous decades. The data have been obtained through application of an original method. Therefore, we will further discuss the two components of the study separately: the design of the instrument and the data obtained, which was able to identify.

It is assumed that the distinguishing feature of our approach is a complete abandonment of the discussion and description of moral conflicts contained in the original material. During the instrument’s piloting (and this is the essence of our approach), the subject of the text analysis were not teenagers’ moral decisions, though very private, domestic the movie’s heroes make, but precisely the material on which the events unfold. We were interested in the routine of daily life of students: what they talked about, what that they cared about, and, most importantly
Discussion

how the problems were recognized and recreated in the modern situation.

Discussion of the method

The criterion for the possibility of using this method (its validity) is the fact that we have confirmed the known data and got new. Universally recognized data such as: sensitivity to situations as regards relationships between adolescents; new data: the content of modern life communication, the selection of key topics that are important for teens.

It is considered the method presented as a model of a research instrument, not as a proper one. We believe that we have managed to minimize the censorship, and most importantly, create an experimental situation provoking emotional experience of what is happening. We consider the emotional distress is an indicator that the data obtained on the real content (material) but not an artifact.

As in all attempts to use participant observation method, we obtain an array of information that has a serious limitation — the focussed sight of the observer conducting research (see [Miller, 2012]).

In our case, this limitation has been due to the three main properties:

— the choice of the material — the film “Tomorrow, April 3rd”;
— subject for fixation — scenarios and actual final teen movie;
— features of the site, where the instrument has been piloted.

Note, that these restrictions have acted in different ways. On the one hand, the choice of the film allowed to obtain information about the respondents’ preferences: adolescents ignored the topic of relationships between students and teacher, they noticed the topic of parent-child relationship, but finally refused to continue it. Teenagers focused on peer relationships; the key topics for them were: betrayal, love, sex, expressed in the theme of materiality and its representation. The research was conducted on the basis of a Summer School, ensuring a relatively free format of communication between adults and teenagers, addressing each other by first names (unlike the situation of the school hierarchy). On the other hand, the prescribed format of the final product — the script and
the film, outlining the plot of the original version had limits regarding the freedom of expression and shapes of self-expression.

What is the extent to which the described model can be repeated with similar results? In other words, can we assume that the technique will “work” in similar circumstances to obtain similar results? Can the instrument be considered as reliable? There may be two responses. Firstly, it is possible to question the applicability of this criterion to qualitative research. Secondly, we cannot assume that the data obtained are universal. Other communication content can possibly be detected in similar conditions and with the same material. It can be assumed that a series of similar cases will reveal a relatively stable list of key topics.

**Discussion of the results**

It is supposed that, because of the unique conditions of the experiment we were able to identify really “hot” topics of the modern teenagers’ emotional experiences. In this regard, there are two diagnosticity points: choice of the topic (Scene Unit) from the original and the final version (remake).

Select a scene. Three types of episodes presented in the original movie version including three types of situations: adolescent peer relationships; teen and family relationships; student and teacher interactions — differently reflected in the final text (remake). Accordingly, selection/ignoring turns are one of the important parts of the process. According to Lotman, a secondary modeling system becomes meaningful not only the individual elements (e.g., words used in the message), but the position of the element in the structure, and even the absence (blank) of the element. The meaning of the message is decoded and through extra-textual relations — the context, additional meanings, omissions.

Episodes associated with the lesson have been ignored generally in spite of the fact that the content of these episodes was interesting, ambiguous and could suggest some ways for reconstructing. They have never been discussed by adolescent as potentially suitable for the script.

The respondents discussed the episode of Masha’s conflict with her parents, but then it was rejected as not worthy of attention (it was judged as uninteresting).
Discussion

Students discussed the episodes containing different situations of communication between teenagers themselves. As it was already indicated, they selected a fairly complex episode with unintentional publication of an intimate selfie, quarrel, and reconciliation.

How can we discuss the obtained results? It seems to us it was possible to fix two facts — a vivid interest in issues related to the relationship such as love/sex and betrayal, and ignoring themes shows relationships with adults. It is quite an expected result.

However, there are two more lines that, in fact, are of high importance for us: the instrument has made it possible to reveal a keen interest in the topic of corporeality (the scene with body contact, slap, rehearsed 18 times, and the parties to the rehearsals were almost all the students involved in the production of the remake). And the second, the theme of the boundary between belonging to me and to others, private and public. The conflict takes place not in connection with the discovery of close relationship between the movie’s hero and heroine (which was considered quite normal and not worthy of shooting in the discussion in the group) but in connection with the publication of these relations. Paradoxically, a long and detailed discussion of the episode has revealed an intrigue as perceived by the responders: it is not the fact that intimate relationships became known, but that the character could not hold a personal space that has been entrusted to him. There was a trespass of a boundary between private and public, and that has caused the conflict.

It should be added that the whole situation is initially developed against the background of another situation of a boundary trespassing: photos of greedily chewing Kolya were published. Here, there is also a paradox: everyone can see how Kolya is eating, but that fixation (literally, as opposed to cartoon) causes laughter, and then becomes a cause of conflict between a photographer and Kolyan. Here, again it is important to refer to the Lotman’s reasoning: everyday events prove to be invisible until pinned in an art product, but once depicted turn into something different — an event.

Both situations, which became the basis of the final, written by teenagers, script reveal the theme of personal boundaries and their violation
and further conflict. This result is in good agreement with recently published research concerning the essence of teenagers’ interest in the books about Harry Potter [Сазонова, 2014]. In this study, it was found that the substance of interest is the possibility of action on the boundary of the semantic fields. The interest lies in the detection of limitations and thus possibilities to act (we understand action as crossing boundaries of semantic fields). Selected and rewritten episodes center around the admissibility/inadmissibility, around boundaries of “mine” and “foreign”. We assign the profound interest in the body and corporeality to the same line. The body is perceived as mine, not only as physical but firstly as having a boundary.

Just a boundary, if it is laid out explicitly (as in the books about Harry Potter), is being tested and experienced. And this experiment and trial (in our case on the material permissibility-forbiddenness) apparently remains a universal characteristic of adolescence. But the material is significantly expanded, acquiring previously taboo signs.

CONCLUSION

The instrument presented has made it possible to detect the content and the material of relationship of hodiernal teenagers. This result we consider to be a principal one. However, in our opinion, it should be considered not only as testifying to the new realities of the discussion among teenagers, but, more importantly, as an evidence of intensive emotional tension of the situations of communication. Unfortunately, Russian classical psychological theories, in fact, ignored this aspect. Seriously discussing intimate-personal communication, these theories never considered emotional life as the main line of this age period.

The detection of the themes of physicality in adolescence is not surprising. However, more interesting is that the very fact of sexual experience did not provoke intense interest. The conflict that constitutes the final scenario is not sex itself. It can be considered as the material of the conflict, not its essence. The essence, in our opinion, is the very fact of boundary violation — breach of trust, bullying, trolling and physical aggression.
Thus, we come to the discrepancy in a teen’s and adult’s view: when we manage to detect and hear the teen’s voice we find out that the emotional tension centers around the uncertainty of border no matter physical or psychological. Sexuality and intimacy are possible material as well as see here that in itself acute, according to an adult, the fact that intimacy is not. Sharp, in the eyes of a teenager, but not adults, it makes the situation detection, disclosure, albeit unwittingly and unintentionally. That is why the theme of intimacy we are considering here is not the content, but only as a material of real emotional experiences of adolescents.

Let us ask ourselves to what extent could similar experiences be caused by a different situation, related to the violation of the border, but not in connection with the theme of corporeality? We can only guess. But if we turn to the second scenario (only discussed but not finished), we, again, find out intimate relationships hotly debated. It means that sex is an important material of new experiences. Thus, this study allows us to put forward a reasonable hypothesis about the material and content of the experiences of adolescents. These experiences tend to be the subject of intimacy, but not in relation to itself, and in conjunction with other subjects in the first place — the boundaries of privacy, publicity, or in other words, the self-determination of “I” as that protecting and marking the boundaries.
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