

The role and place of language in social conflict

Aleksandra Vorozhbitova
Doctor of Philology, Doctor of
Pedagogy, Professor, Professor of
the Department of Roman-German
and Russian Philology
Sochi State University
Sochi, Russia
alvorozhbitova@mail.ru

Maria Streltsova
Post-Graduate Student
Tyumen State University
Tyumen, Russia

Fatima Urakova
Doctor of pedagogical Sciences,
docent, head of chair of Russian
language and methods of teaching
Adyghe state University
Maikop, Russia

Zauregul Nessipbayeva
Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,
Senior Lecturer
Al-Farabi Kazakh National
University
Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract—Conflict discourse is a poorly understood area. The basic function of the language is interactivity, regulation and coordination. Therefore, any speech activity is rhetorical in nature. Linguistic rhetoric is at the junction of theoretical linguistics and practical rhetoric. This young science is engaged in the study of texts that are clearly focused on direct, effective and operational impact. Unfortunately, until now, these disciplines existed quite separately, which was manifested, for example, in different approaches to the analysis of speech means, as well as in the branching system of typology of texts. The authors consider the social conflict through the prism of the linguistic paradigm.

Our research is conducted in the light of the solution of a common linguistic problem – the distinction between the contexts of conflict discourse and the cases of their pragmatic use. The pragmatic characteristic of language units embodies their functional specificity, which determines the content of conflict discourse, intentions and receptive abilities of opponents of conflict discourse in conflict discourse. Verbal behavior in conflict discourse is characterized by variety of forms, linguistic manifestation of role performances, the specifics of the rules and regulations interactive activities of interlocutors, which relies on mismatched communication.

Keywords—*Linguistic rhetoric, social conflict, functional specificity, conflict studies, work with the population, management, conflict studies, work with the population, management*

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of Dialogic space is one of the modern problems of communicative and cognitive areas of linguistics, the achievements of which allow revealing in more detail the features of the relationship between language and the person thinking and speaking within the framework of human speech behavior. Accordingly, in linguistics, the volume of anthropocentric direction is increasing, making it possible to note the growing level of verbal aggression of modern man [1]. Language and non-verbal

phenomena as tools that support communication in all its various manifestations – as in consistent communication and in conflict dialogues. "Every remark, however short and abrupt, has a specific completeness, expressing a certain position of the speaker, which can be answered, in respect of which it is possible to take a reciprocal position" [2].

Speech conflicts only gradually enter the sphere of linguistic research, where new concepts associated with unusual for classical linguistics aspects of the use of language began to appear. These are such concepts as the invective functioning of language and its manifestations - resentment, insult, threat, as well as the concepts of language manipulation, speech aggression and linguistic ecology, which causes the emergence of a relatively new branch of linguistic knowledge - psycholinguistic conflictology, presented so far in individual works [3]. The basis of the origin of psycholinguistic conflictology was social psycholinguistics, the Central area of observation of which is the sphere of everyday interpersonal communication of linguistic personalities.

Communication within the framework of conflict discourse is the interaction of partners, which is carried out with the help of replica steps, built from the signs of natural language. Replica steps are used to establish contact and maintain the attention of the listener, to Express the opinion of the speaker about the subject of the conversation, to appeal to the listener with a proposal, a request, to Express various emotional States in defending their interests. The expression of directed emotions has a pragmatic character: to force the addressee to do something, to influence him in the right direction, to fulfill the request, to deprive him of confidence, to cause doubt, to activate the inhibitors of aggression, etc. the Purposeful strengthening of the statement by means of linguistic expression is designed for a certain speech-behavioral reaction of the addressee. The interaction of the communicating parties in the conflict discourse is possible if the partners can influence each other, and this influence is

ordered in a single process, the rules of which can be regulated.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

For realization of the purpose and tasks of our analysis as the minimum speech unit speech confrontations, i.e. conflict discourse is considered.

Conflict discourse was studied using General scientific hypothetical-deductive and descriptive-analytical methods; as well as methods - functional analysis, semantic and pragmatic interpretation. In addition, socio-contextual methods were used, indicating the role manifestations of the participants of the conflict discourse.

Anthropocentric approach provided the possibility of using the achievements of the Sciences of boundary linguistics for a comprehensive assessment of the linguistic personality in the framework of human speech behavior. Communicative and pragmatic approach helped to identify the linguistic causes and effects of the varieties of conflicting discourses, to consider the conflict discourse in the framework distinguish between different contexts of conflict discourse and their pragmatic use. Conflict discursive practices are investigated in the course of implementation by the subjects of speech actions of regulatory activity as a set of functional and pragmatic units – regulators, designed to solve specific communicative problems in conflict speech interaction, which is implemented in discursive formations, built in accordance with the functional and semantic representation of the conflict.

III. DISCUSSION

The linguistic interpretation of rhetoric as a science, aims to combine the efforts of philological Sciences, seen in the works of Russian linguists, such as, V. N.Radchenko, O. I. Marchenko, O. P. Brynskikh, Y. V. Rozhdestvensky, aV. I., A. A. Vorozhbitova, O. B. Sirotnina, A. K. Mikhalskaya etc.

We relied on the ideas and principles set forth in the works of V. Humboldt (communicative-active paradigm dating back to the works of V. Humboldt); G.P. Melnikov, E.G. Pyrikov (the methodological need to highlight the external and internal determinative features), E.V. Sidorov (the interactive-coordinating nature of the language; comprehension of the text as an interconnected model of communicators); V.A. Kurdyumov (consideration of language as a non-discrete process of endless structural transformations).

A dynamic model of coordinated communication [4] is taken as the basis for the description of verbal conflict situations of various orders and levels, which is built on the basis of collective, game (to streamline specific steps) promotion of partners to resolve the claims (stated at the beginning of the dialogue by each participant) of claims (claim for leadership, claim for initiative, claim for the scope of the code of trust, etc.) and goals.

The pragmatic characteristic of verbal communication associated with the effectiveness of the

implementation of language signs in terms of the impact of speech interaction on the behavior of communicants in specific situations of various nature is the subject of study by a number of domestic and foreign scientists [5-10]. Researchers of successful verbal communication get into the attention of such phenomena as communicative failure, communicative hindrance, communicative failure, communicative failure, language conflict.

The systematization of the works of Valton, Rammel, Pruit and Rubin gives a fairly complete picture of the possible options for the representation of the model of human interaction, which represent a kind of scenarios of the implementation of the model in reality, based on the assessment of attitudes, objectives, taking into account the selected tactics and strategies, which is necessary in the analysis of the nature of the collision of participants in the conflict discourse.

Discourse is represented by a set of replica steps, a pair of which is a speech act. The realization of the speech act has been the subject of study of George Austin, who presented to linguistics the fact of implementation of speech act, its structure, and character, criteria of functioning of lexicological-semantic and grammatical features. These lexical-semantic and grammatical features had a plan of expression predicate units, namely the units of the performative nature of the plan. As for the categorization of the dominant predicates of conflict interaction, it should be noted that this moment in its various aspects has become the subject of study for many researchers. A. A. Zalevskaya [11] studied the semantic aspect of categorization of dominant predicates of conflict interaction, that is, the plan of verbal expression of the collision. N. CH. Zaichenko [12] analyzed the conflict from the point of view of its functioning, as well as considered the pragmatic aspect of interaction, designated as conflict interaction. B.Yu.Gorodetsky [13] considered this type of interaction to identify, both grammatical and semantic of features and characteristics through the analysis replica steps and perlocutionary acts.

IV. RESULTS

Conflict communication is systemically organized: successive interactive manifestations of the speaker and listener in the form of a set of discursive practices are based on certain rules. The basis of these rules is the sum of linguistic, encyclopedic and illocutive knowledge (the latter occupy a Central position in the system of conflict discourse and are in a certain relationship with other types of knowledge).

The communicative register cannot be considered relevant to the conflict formula "I declare/challenge you because You do not...". Any locomotive (forming) potential can actualize the structure of the replica step closing the formula. The content plan of the conflict discourse is determined by a variety of reasons that form the linguistic picture of the world of non-conflict personality. The expression plan contains not only separate markers, but also discursive complexes characterized by units of different language levels.

Ethno-cultural speech space, acting as a form of existence of national culture in human consciousness, is a regulator that determines the perception of reality, part of which is human communication. Of course, this type of discourse as a social conflict can arise between opponents of conflict discourse within any linguistic culture. The situation of opposition between "friend and foe" reinforces social conflict discourse. This aspect can be clearly seen in relation to migrants in the receiving countries, in relation to representatives of other faiths and social strata [14-16].

As an object for analysis, we take the social network Odnoklassniki, which clearly reflects conflict-oriented discursive strategies in the Russian-Ukrainian ethnic conflict. So, for example, in this widespread network of the post-Soviet space there are 812 groups "anti-Maidan", and groups where also discuss events of the Ukrainian Maidan, there are 172. As a result of injection of anti-Ukrainian moods the conflict among users of a network entered a destructive phase. Ukraine, in turn, opened five social networks, which are the ethno-information platform that promotes the modern Ukrainian political course [17]. The Ukrainian authorities began to actively promote the idea of distance not only at the political but also at the domestic level, especially in those Russian regions in which Ukrainians occupy leading positions [15]. Active anti-Russian discursive strategies have led to the fact that out of five Ukrainian social networks only two remain on the market [18].

We believe that the interethnic conflict discourse is the speech interaction of communicants-representatives of different ethnic groups, as a result of which participants get into an uncomfortable state due to the verbal impact on each other, due to the fact that the illocutive dominant of speech interaction is characterized by the presence of a collision of verbally expressed goals. Hence, such a pronounced expression, the injection of negative estimations. Like, "Bloody election. Where will they lead Ukraine?" (video from 28.10.2014), "Dill congratulate you on the seventieth anniversary of the liberation from the Nazis, I do not want to, because it was a big mistake. You should have been killed with the Germans. You are the shame of planet Earth" (a message on the forum "Maidan") [19], etc. Similarly is a discourse and from the Ukrainian side: "stretchy insanity of revanchist Hitlerian starter of name Putin" [20]. It should be noted that such an expressive negative connotation will not serve to search for a common platform and reduce confrontation on both the Ukrainian and Russian sides.

Interaction of communicating parties in the dialogue of conflict color is possible if: a) dialogue partners can influence each other; b) this influence is ordered in a single process, the rules of which can be regulated.

The result of such counteraction will be the achievement or failure of the communicative goal; at least one of the participants will experience negative emotions; at least one of the participants in the conflict discourse will enrich his semiotic thesaurus, first of all,

with the idea of the framework of "power", which is manifested in the conflict discourse characteristics of the role of the recipient owning the initiative. As a result, there is an increase in the distance between the individual and the national [21], which leads to interethnic mismatch within the linguistic personality [22]. We believe that within the framework of the interethnic conflict discourse between these two terms "power" and "initiative" it is possible to put an equal sign, then "power" should be considered as a combatant element of pragmatic relations in the interethnic conflict discourse.

V. CONCLUSION

Interaction of participants of the social conflict as members of society proceeds with violation of the accepted universal norms of behavior, stereotypes of speech behavior which often have ritual character. They represent the knowledge of the opponents of the conflict discourse about the fragment of reality, correlated with the thematic content of the model act of interaction", implemented against the background of social norms and rules equally relevant to partners.

In identifying the institutional sphere of the manifestation of CD has been allocated a communicative pair, the communication which should be carried out according to the norms and standards of communication within one of the following five basic social institutions: the Institute of marriage and family (husband-wife, father-son/daughter, mother-daughter/son); Institute of the state (officer-soldier, superior-subordinate); economic institutions (the seller-the buyer, the taxi driver-passenger, passenger-passenger, Manager, client); Institute of education (teacher-student, teacher-student); Institute of religion (preacher/parishioner); specific institutions of the total [23] - characterized by: limited social contacts with the rest of society; tightly controlled routine (hospital, prison, military camp, monastery), which also emits vapours (gang leader – of the six, mafia - mafia, Dean - novice). At the heart of the allocation of these types of institutions are the needs of mankind in the reproduction of the genus, security and social order, in the production and production of livelihoods, in the transfer of knowledge, socialization of the younger generation, training, in solving spiritual problems and finding the meaning of life.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. A. Vorozhbitova, G. M. Konovalova, T. N. Ogneva, and N. Y. Chekulaeva, "Continuous linguistic rhetorical education as a means of optimizing language policy in Russian multinational regions", in *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 2017, No 6 (2), pp. 328–340.
- [2] M. M. Bakhtin, "The Problem of speech genres, in Bakhtin M. M. SOBR. Op. Moscow: Russian dictionaries, 1996, Vol. 5: Works 1940-1960 years, pp. 159-206. Comments - pp. 535-555.
- [3] N. V. Muravyeva, "The language of conflict", in *Aspects of language conflict*. Moscow, 2002, pp. 34-43.
- [4] O. N. Morozova, *Discourse of consent in a dialogue space*. Moscow: Aquarium, 2005, 220 p.
- [5] N. D. Arutyunova, *Language and the world of man*. Moscow: Languages of Russian culture, 1999, 895 p.
- [6] N. F. Alefirenko, *Modern problems of language science:*

- Textbook. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka, 2005, 231 p.
- [7] I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt, "Social interactions in an ethological, cross-cultural perspective", in F. Poyatos, CA.: Sage, 2001, pp. 48-61.
- [8] G. V. Kusov, "Diagnosis of the concept of "insult" in linguistic expertise", in Theses of the XXXI scientific conference of students and young scientists of universities of the southern Federal district. Krasnodar: Kuban state University of physical culture, sports, technology, 2004, 227 p.
- [9] E. V. Paducheva, Semantic researches. Moscow, 1996, 125 p.
- [10] R. Gale, "Do performative utterances have any constative function", in *The Journal of Philosophy*, 1976, Vol. 67, No 12, pp. 117-121.
- [11] A. A. Zalevskaya, *Word. Text: a psycholinguistic study*. Moscow: 2005, 288 p.
- [12] N. U. Zaichenko, "Structural and content characteristics and psychological features of the conflict", in *World of psychology*. Moscow, 1998, Vol. 4, 215 p.
- [13] B. Yu. Gorodetsky, I. M. Kobozeva, and I. G. Saburova, "To the typology of communicative failures", in *Dialog Interaction and knowledge representation*. Novosibirsk: Computer center of THE USSR Academy of Sciences, 1985, pp. 64-78.
- [14] I. M. Gabdrifkov, I. S. Karabulatova, L. G. Khusnutdinova, Kh. S. Vildanov, "Ethnoconfessional Factor in Social Adaptation of Migrant Workers in the Muslim Regions of Russia", in *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science*, 2015, Vol 6, No 3, Suppl. 4, May 2015, pp. 213-223.
- [15] I. S. Karabulatova, and Z. V. Polivara, "Intraethnic installation of Ukrainian Labour migrants in the preservation of linguistic and cultural identity", in *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science*, 2015, Vol. 6, No 3, Suppl. 2, May 2015, pp. 142-148.
- [16] S. V. Ryazantsev, E. E. Pismennaya, I. S. Karabulatova, and Ch. Y. Akramov, "Transformation of sexual and matrimonial behavior of Tajik labor migrants in Russia", in *Asian Social Science*, 2014, Vol. 10, No 20, pp. 174-183.
- [17] T. Vorona, Five Ukrainian social networks created in two weeks, 04.04.2014. Available at: <http://ain.ua/2014/04/04/518701>.
- [18] T. Vorona, Of the five new Ukrainian social networks survived two and a half, 11.07.2014. Available at: <http://ain.ua/2014/07/11/532263>.
- [19] Network Odnoklassniki, antimaidan. Available at: <http://www.odnoklassniki.ru/anti.maydan.ukr>.
- [20] Network Odnoklassniki. Available at: <http://www.odnoklassniki.ru/mi100/topic/62969920594067>.
- [21] G. M. Niyazova, "Ethnocide and ethnic identity in the ethnolinguistic informational space of the modern polyethnic region", in *Proceedings of higher educational institutions. Sociology. Economy. Policy*. Tyumen, 2007, No 3, pp. 72-74.
- [22] A. A. Vorozhbitova, O. I. Marchenko, A. V. Timofeyev, and G. I. Issina, "Planetary Linguistic Personality" Category and Bi/Polylinguistic Modeling of the Pedagogical Process of Higher School Professional Training: Sochi Linguistic and Rhetorical School", in *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 2018, No 7 (4), pp. 882-892.
- [23] E. Goffman, *Breaking Frame. Frame Analysis. An Essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1981, 377 p.