

CONFLICT COMMUNICATION: LINGVOECOLOGICAL ASPECT

Darya L. Abusyarova, Kazan Federal University
Svetlana S. Takhtarova, Kazan Federal University

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the analysis of speech conflicts in lingvoecological perspective, the description of causes of conflicts outbreak in different discursive practices, the study of style of communicative behavior variants depending on cooperative or conflict potential of communication. The conflict is determined from the position of linguistic conflict management as a confrontation of two or more interactants, determined by psychic, social, ethic factors and realized in different discursive practices. The reasons for outbreak of conflict in communication can be divergence of communicative goals of interlocutors, reluctance of one or both communicative partners to take into account the interests of an interlocutor in the process of communication, egocentric verbalization of their intentions. The ways to solve the conflict may be constructive oriented to the maintenance of communicative image and interests of both communicators and destructive oriented to further escalation of the conflict. In communicative conscious homoloquens the speech conflict exists as a frame structure. The conflict behavior reveals the originality of a communicative personality, peculiarities of the communicative style. Conflict communications are getting involved in the focus of research interest of linguistic ecology that studies the interaction between language, man as a linguistic personality and environment. Based on the fact that for preserving language, ecosystem observation of communicative norms is of special value, the principal parameters of ecological interaction, oriented to cooperative unison, communicative contact may comprise benevolence, desire of communicative partners to avoid negative personality assessments of the interlocutor, creation and maintenance of general positive well-wishing tonality of communication.

Key words: *conflict, communication, lingvoecology, discourse, speech strategy, mitigation.*

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of conflict has always occupied a special place in subject sphere of different scientific areas - sociology, psychology, pedagogy, law and linguistics. Currently, axiomatic is the fact that a conflict may arise only in the process of communication. Opposite positions or mental act not being expressed verbally or non-verbally cannot be an indicator of the outbreaked conflict, and there is no conflict if only one participant acts. Proneness to conflict in anthropocentric terms is manifested, first of all, in interaction of the subjects of speech production - the author who seeks to unrestricted self-expression, and the addressee who expects a speech production which would be interesting for him in communication (first of all, easy to understand) and comfortable in moral and psychological aspect (Golev N.D., <http://lingvo.asu.ru/golev/articles/z09.html>, accessed April 2016). Active development of the research concerning the study of personal communicative behavior in the conflict situation has naturally led to the formation of an independent scientific paradigm – linguistic conflictology that considers a conflict as confrontation of two or more communicators involved in a single

communicative event that is determined by various factors: psychic, social and ethic, etc., and realized in different discursive practices (Tretyakova V.S., p.301, Gruber H., 1996, p.354). One of the most important tasks of linguistic conflictology is the formation of a negative denotative space of speech communication and factors determining conception, development and solution of the conflict communication. Such problem solving is impossible without defining the nature of a conflict, reasons for its emerging, conflict types, as well as revelation of means and ways used by communicators for ensuring or breaking harmonious communication. The present paper suggests considering these questions from the positions of linguistic conflictology and lingvoecology.

DISCUSSION

Conflict potential of language, depending first of all on the differences in –“pragmatics of the speaker” and “pragmatics of the listener” underlies the emergence of spontaneous and amotivational proneness to conflict, which should be differentiated from the intentional, planned conflicts, in the course of which one of the sides consciously performs the speech acts to the detriment of the other. Such speech acts of the speaker define the speech behavior of the addressee, who, realizing, that the indicated speech actions are directed against his interests, undertakes back such speech actions, expressing his attitude to the subject of the speech or the interlocutor. According to K.F. Sedov, conflict communication is usually based on the desire of one (or both) participants of communication to ease psychological tension for account of the interlocutor. Such relaxation (letting off steam) is preceded by sense of frustration – psychological discomfort, owing to impossibility of achieving a goal (Sedov K. F., 2002).

Thus, the reason for outbreak of a conflict lies in the differences of communicative goals of interlocutors, in reluctance of one or both communicative partners to take into account the interests of the interlocutor in the process of communication, egocentric verbalization of their intentions. The ways to solve the conflict situation may be constructive oriented to such settlement to conflict when communicative image and interests of both interlocutors will be maintained and taken into account, and destructive oriented to the further conflict escalation. In accordance with macrostrategy of communicative behavior in a situation of conflict each of the interactors chooses certain communicative tactics, for example:

- То, что вы делаете, противоречит всем законам: и божеским, и человеческим. Я не сторонница крайних мер, вы знаете, и если вы дадите мне слово, что остановитесь, я никому ничего не расскажу.

- Да что вы можете рассказать, Нат Пинкертон в юбке! Чем вы мне угрожаете? Думаете, я вас боюсь? [Malinina].

Here are differences in value dominants of the interlocutors, in understanding the acceptable and the non-acceptable in their actions leads to emergence of a conflict in which one of the communicators resorts to the tactics of threat, the other – to offense. Both tactics in this case are destructive, which causes further conflict escalation.

It should be noted that intentional proneness to conflict of discursive behavior of one of the communicators may be explicit and implicit, indirect.

The papers on the analysis of conflict communications point out that a speech conflict exists in consciousness of a native speaker as a certain frame structure that includes obligatory components: the participants of a conflict; communicants' conflicting (views, interests,

standpoints, opinions, evaluations, value systems, goals and so on); cause-reason; harm; time and space protensity. However, as V. S. Tretyakova notes fairly, despite the fixedness and predictability of the development of communicative event given by frame scenario of the conflict, certain speech acts of the speaker are not standard, stereotyped. The conflict behavior is particularly evident in originality of the language person. As is generally known, the social and individual traits of personality form a definite steady style of communicative behavior in situations of conflict, which is characteristic of a type of personality. The formed steady individual style, largely determined by innate personality characteristics and realized by the used verbal and non-verbal means of communication, indicates the level of communicative competence of a speaking subject.

Of special interest for the analysis of style of verbal behavior in interpersonal relations is the work by a German psychologist Karen Horney, which is based on the following thesis: people resort to different defensive strategies in the community in order to achieve a sense of security and reduce anxiety. Each strategy is accompanied by a certain basic orientation in relations with other people: striving toward people, or the compliant type; desire to remove oneself from contact with other people, or solitary type; aggressive intention, or ill-disposed type (Khorni K., 1997, p.240). All strategies of verbal behavior of the speaker are accompanied by specific tactics of interaction with a partner and form specific features of communication style, giving it a personality-valuable sense.

According to I. N. Borisova, the type of communication coordination conditioned by two main factors - the type of interaction of illocutionary intentions of the communicants in the process of communication and the nature of modal responses within the framework of interaction, including tone of communication, evaluation type, etc., determines the modus of integrative text dialogue, namely, its interpersonal communicative modality. The author offers the following types of communication coordination: consensual feature (consent, harmony, illocutionary and modal coordination), conformity (illocutionary consistency in modal-tonal neutrality and disinterest and passivity of one of the partners), polemical (illocutionary consistency and preservation of a neutral modality with difference of opinion) and proneness to conflict (dissonance, inconsistency that can result in the collision of illocutionary intentions and modal responses) (Borisova I.N., 2009, p.320).

Thus, the development of communicative scenarios (even within a given genre) is varied: from a harmonious, cooperative to disharmonious, conflict. The choice of a scenario variant depends on a personal type of the individual participants in the conflict, their communicative experience, communicative competence, communication attitude, communication preferences. Speech behavior in the conflict discourse is characterized by a variety of forms due to the specifics of the rules and regulations of discursive activity of communicants, but the basis of this diversity are, in most cases, two main types of strategies governing speech behavior of communicants - cooperative and confrontational. Confrontational strategies traditionally include invective strategy, the strategy of aggression, violence, discredit, subordination, coercion, exposure and others. To realize them one uses confrontational tactics of threat, intimidation, reproach, accusation, mockery, taunt, insults, provocations and others.

Despite the fact that the cooperativity of communication is undeniable communicative value, many researchers point to the growth of aggression, conflicts in human relations which are closely associated with the violation of language, ethic and communication norms in communication. In this context, increasingly more importance is attached to the studies concerning the normative aspects of communicative behavior to which such relatively new

scientific areas as social ecology, paleoecology, linguistic ecology and others can be attributed with good reason.

The linguistic ecology, or ecolinguistics, as one of the most promising research areas of modern linguistics, combining social (correlation of social and linguistic structures in the process of thinking at different stages of ethnogenesis), psychological (problems of speech influence) and philosophical (manifestation of extremely common properties and laws of development of society and cognition in language) directions in linguistics, studies the interaction between language, man as a language personality and the environment (Kislitsyna N.N., accessed April 2016; C, Angela, M, P. Hornberger, 2010, p.370). Special attention in lingvoecological studies is paid to the influence of the environment through man and society on language and the influence of language on the moral and spiritual level of society. Language is regarded as an essential component of a chain of relationship between man, society and nature, and functioning and development of the language is presented as a special ecosystem (Glausiusz J., 1997; Haritos C., 2005; Bastardas-Boada A., 2002, p. 77).

For preserving and effective functioning of the linguistic ecosystem, of particular importance becomes observance not only of language but also of speech, communication norms in communication. Interaction, built in accordance with the standards of communication adopted in the society, is defined as “ecological”, aimed at the cooperative unison of communicative contact.

The examples of “non-ecological” use of language traditionally include inappropriate and incorrect use of foreign words, the use of foreign words with a wrong referent, stylistic violations, bureaucratization of language and speech (expansion of formal style), the influx of loans (primarily Anglicisms), jargonization and vulgarization of verbal communication, legalization of foul language and others. For example, “non-ecological” is the use of substandard, invective vocabulary in public speeches by the authorities of the state.

However, the spectrum of lingvoecological range of problems is, in our opinion, much more extensive and not limited by the above examples of “non-ecological” usage of language units. Based on the fact that the communicative habitat of the speaker is also influenced by the Other, dialogical in its nature, such facts of violations of communicative world homoloquens as offending, abusing, neglecting, using negative evaluations, disrespectful attitude, rudeness, and other conflict forms of verbal behavior, as well as the ways and means to prevent or mitigate should be included in the scope of research interests of this new scientific paradigm, expanding intra-lingual aspect of lingvoecological research.

The main parameters of ecological communication may include goodwill, desire of communication partners to avoid negative evaluations of the interlocutor, creating and maintaining overall positive friendly tone of communication, to ensure which mitigation or the category of communicative easing along with such communicative categories as courtesy, speech etiquette play a special role (Caffi C., 2007, p.342; Fraser B., 1980, p.341; Takhtarova S.,2014, p.208).

RESULTS

Thus, on the basis of the fact that the communicative habitat of the speaker is also influenced by the Other, dialogical in its nature, such facts of violations of communicative world homoloquens as offending, abusing, neglecting, using negative evaluations, disrespectful attitude, rudeness, and other conflict forms of verbal behavior, as well as the ways and means to

prevent or mitigate should be included in the scope of research interests of this new scientific paradigm, expanding intralingual aspect lingvoecological research.

The main parameters of ecological communication may include goodwill, desire of communication partners to avoid negative evaluations towards the interlocutor, creating and maintaining overall positive and friendly tone of communication.

CONCLUSION

Despite the fact that the conflicts in general and communicative conflicts, in particular, accompany our life and are inevitable in the process of communication, the behavior of the speaking party in conflict situations can clearly demonstrate the level of communicative competence of the latter, his capacity for empathy, and formation of his lingvoecological competence and conflictological culture. All this is generally manifested in the choice of cooperative or confrontational strategies and tactics in ecological compatibility vs non-ecological compatibility of communicative behavior of interactants, their abilities or inabilities to minimize the destructive effects of conflicts, to mitigate their negative sides, using a variety of communication tools of constructive conflict resolution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

REFERENCES

- Bastardas-Boada A. (2002). The Ecological perspective: Benefits and risks for Sociolinguistics and Language Policy and Planning. Fill, Alwin, Hermine Penz, & W. Trampe (eds.), *Colourful Green Ideas*. Berna: Peter Lang, - Pp. 77–88.
- Borisova I.N. (2009). *Russian Informal Dialogue: The Structure and Dynamics*. M.: The Publishing House LIBROKOM, 320 pp.
- Caffi C. (2007). *Mitigation* Amsterdam (u.a.), Elsevier, 342 pp.
- Ecology of Language. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* Volume 9. Editors: C, Angela, M, P. Hornberger, Nancy (Eds.). Springer 2010, 370pp.
- Fraser B. (1980). Conversational mitigation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 4, 341-350.
- Glausiusz J. (1997). The ecology of language. (link between rainfall and language diversity). *Discover*, 18.
- Golev N.D. Interaction of the Natural Language and the Language of the Legal Profession as a Basic Problem of Juridical Linguistics. URL: <http://lingvo.asu.ru/golev/articles/z09.html>
- Gruber H. (1996). *Streitgespräche. Zur Pragmatik einer Diskursform*. Opladen: Wetsdeutschen Verlag, 354pp.
- Haritos C. (2005). The language ecology of bilingual memory. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 9.
- Khorni K. (1997). *Our Inner Conflicts. Constructive Theory of Neurosis*. SP. Lan, 240pp.
- Kislitsyna N.N. *Ecolinguistics – New Branch in Linguistics*.
<http://www.crimea.edu/tnu/magazine/culture/culture37/part1/zip/kislitsina.zip>.
- Sedov K. F. (2002). *Language Personality from the Aspect of Psycholinguistic Conflictology*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.dialog-1.ru/materials/archive.asp?id=7379&y=2002&vol=6077>
- Takhtarova S. (2014). Mitigative strategies of self-evaluation in German linguoculture. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 31(2), 208-210.
- Tretyakova V.S. (2003). *Speech Conflict and Harmonization of Communication: Dissertation for Doctor of Philology*. Yekaterinburg, 301pp.