Interactive nature of „communication" and its linguopragmatics to consider in management practice

Nana Gabadadze

School "Mermisi", Kutaisi, 4600, Georgia
Email: gabadadze@gmail.com
DOI: 10.56580/GEOMEDI0009

Abstract

As our research showed, responsives' classification has to be based on their categorical features. Answer is a verbal response on causator induced by question. In case of similar interpretation of responses, we will have an opportunity to distinguish direct and indirect meanings of speech act. The given approach makes it possible to single out "the answer" from other types of "response reaction" that may be expressed by different kinesics means and even by more complicated communicative action – i.e. a deed. We have to remind that forms of "response reaction" are not always caused by question that is another factor related to the specificity of responses. Ontological features of the latter are a speech form of reaction that differs it from semiotic equivalents (nod of the head, gesture, communicative silence etc.). It should be noted that taxonomisation of semiotic equivalents of responses is of great importance for foreigners in language learning process. Unfortunately, within the limits of the present study we have no possibility to discuss in more detail the given problem, since it creates a risk of deviation from the basic subject. While representing the part of dialogue integrity, responses, as it was mentioned before, are closely connected to interrogative part. The specificity of linkage revelation in dialogue text has its peculiarities and depends on number of factors: on balance of relationship containing subjective and objective factors and determining communication strategy of respondents, as well as on semantic and formal sides of causation (on interrogative sentence).

Keywords

Communication, linguopragmatics, managment practice.

Main Text

As it was mentioned, "relationship balance" that contains communicants' social and psychological coordination aspects, is one of the most important factors of dialogue interaction. Despite the fact that interrogative part plays a role of causing factor in the dialogue interaction type interesting for us, the addressee in many cases acts as completely independent person, who

initiates or don't initiate contact with the addressant depending on his/her wish.

There can be many situations, when the addressee may withdraw from giving the answer, and motivation is necessary not in every instance. We think that motivation in similar situations can be assessed as a special form of response reaction. Based on the character of the latter, the following situations can be singled out: 1) complete disregard or ungrounded refusal to cooperate; 2) motivated refusal.

Repeated question, change in topic can be considered as peculiar tactical motives of cooperation. Cases, when the addressee meaningly falsifies information, derides the addressant, recourses to irony etc. may be considered as cooperative according to form, but non-cooperative in fact.

The cases of complete integration are primarily related to such occurrences, when the addressant and the addressee either don't know each other, or are in strained relations. Addressee may be irritated due to addressant incorrectness (indiscretion) of familiarity (not ceremoniousness). Disregard may be associated with unwillingness to release information etc. Ungrounded refusal to give an answer in most cases can be assessed as violation of politeness code. On the other hand, ungrounded refusal can be considered in most cases as a peculiar form of protest and can express disrespect, aggrievance. In some cases, such disregard can be related to state of mind of the addressee.

Intermediate place between "answers" and "non-answers" is taken by cases of motivated refusal to answer. Different cases of following types are possible here: "it is a secret", "you don't need to know", "you will learn, when getting older", "unfortunately, I can't say", "sorry, but I'm in a hurry", "I don't want to deal with you", "I have no right" and so on.

From the viewpoint of per locution efficiency, the response to question may rest on different strategies of response reaction: compassion, absence of compassion, disregard. We dealt with the latter category above, but it may have other nuances of meaning within new paradigm. We mean such forms of disregard as "indifference". The latter is a peculiar response to question, which expresses addressee's viewpoint regarding causation and opposes positively- (compassion) or negatively-colored (absence of compassion) reactions. In other words, such indifference can be called "cooperative disregard".

As is known, the concept of "indifference" ranks among "semantic primitives" consisting the vocabulary of "mental language". As S.A. Golubtsov notices: "Indifference is capable to play the role of operator of both axiological appraisal logics and feeling logics" …

In regard to our material this means that such response may belong to both erotetive act and addressant.

E. Topuria shows that indifference indices create several groups in Georgian language:

a) functional class of indifference towards selection of modal alternative;

b) the group with absence of emotional response on object in the subject;

c) thematic group of "weak indifference". Author considered here a "grey stripe", i.e. events belonging to mediocrity. Indices with neutral modality are used in self-evaluation function.

We touched on "indifference" problem in regard to the problem of interaction balance and

opposed it to such categories, as "compassion" and "absence of compassion".

We considered the category of "indifference" as zero category of interaction, against the background of which the positive ("compassion") and negative ("absence of compassion") attitudes are manifested.

Sympathetic attitude toward addressant is revealed in the fact that addressee gets in touch with him/her. "Voluntariness" of such contact can be inhomogeneous. Besides true desire of addressant to give an answer on question, there are cases, when he/she does it under the influence of different factors: influenced by etiquette standards, social status, fear etc. Respectively, the veracity of response reaction during such "voluntary cooperation" is not always absolute and is a reason of misinformation in some cases.

Under reaction correct on its form, quite negative attitude towards addressant may hide. In other words, responses may have indirect speech meanings, too, that can be confirmed by specific examples (see third chapter).

We considered the cooperative back round of interaction (communication), which includes four tactics of response reaction: 1) compassion; 2) absence of compassion; 3) disregard; 4) indifference.

When formulating the question addressant foresees expected reactions of addressees and uses different communication strategies according to forecast: stimulates answer in compliance with etiquette standards, recourses to appeal towards emotional and intellectual factors, tries to have an impact on addressant using "strong position" etc. As we noticed, the interaction balance includes three tactics of response reaction based on: 1) addressant's personality; 2) form of address and 3) information itself.

All three factors can lay the foundation for responsive definition, though according to classic ideas, the answer is the third option. Attitude towards addressant's personality determines selection of cooperative register of interaction, while the form of address to a significant extent influences addressee's desire to get or not to get in touch and contains reaction on the tactics, by means of which the addressant is going to reach a desirable response reaction.

Attitude towards question content is implemented within the reaction on four-element model of question. Analysis of the specific material enabled us to reveal different meanings of responsives.

Responsive-informatives represent information around question raised, and are implemented via structures specific for responsives: according to yes/no form, i.e. incomplete sentence, that we consider as normative option of responsives, i.e. as sentences containing mirror-like response on the structure "to whom".

Among reactions on indirect pragmatic meanings of questions the most typical are reactions on indirect requests, advices, commands etc. Interesting that the response reaction tactics has specific nature in similar cases and differs from the tactics of "responsive-informatives". If the reaction on typical "classic" types of questions has a fixed linguistic standard, then causators expressed in interrogative form, have their specificity.

Through analysis of possible answers on pragmatic options of questions given in the above-

mentioned E. Topuria's work we came to conclusion that the addressee associates answer's nature not with linguistic form, but with pragmatics of interrogative part. For instance, respondents have unequivocal reaction on the command: "Can you answer me?". They react on it as on the command. The respective reaction is induced by the threat given in interrogative form: "Can you wait for me?", or warning "Do you know, what I'd like to say?" [1-6].

Conclusions

Interrogative construction "Can you please keep quiet?" also keeps the meaning of request.

We will not stop on other examples (they will be given in the next chapter), and just note that the response reaction on indirect interrogative speech acts is associated with targeted interpretation implemented by the addressant and, as a rule, it represents a reaction on corresponding intention. We are planning to check all-purposeness of this provision on comparison (translation) material, but prior to moving to the mentioned task, let us to briefly summarize the results of present chapter.

1) Communication theory development and its impact on dialogue study sphere made it possible to use the achievements of speech act theory in order to take a new look on the essence of question-answer-type communication;

2) Interrogative part of dialogue causes the response reaction that necessitated the consideration of its pragmatic peculiarities. While determining the specificity of interrogative (erotetive) speech acts, we differentiated direct and indirect meanings of interrogative construction and revealed their main pragmatic meanings;

3) Attempt to determine the specificity of responsive speech acts in speech act system lead us to conclusion that based on their pragmatic meanings, it is possible that the meaning of "verbal-communicative reactions" will intersect verdictives, exersitives, commissives, behabitives and even expositives (among which we have to rank "answers", as well, in J. Austin's opinion) that complicates the final solution of issue and necessitated distinction between direct and indirect meanings of responsives.

4) Logicians, who elaborated original classification of "responses", came nearest to the interpretation of "verbal-communicative reactions". Unfortunately, this classification based on veracity scale is unusable for classification of those nuances of human relations that are reflected in real communication.

5) Analysis of specific material enabled us to single out constructive elements of responsives:

a) responsives represent verbal response on causing stimulus;

b) answers represent not a passive response on causing source (beginning), but include respondent's (the person, to whom the question is raised) attitude towards information itself and addressant, that is reflected in addressee's possibility to come or not to come into communication and select subjectively correct register of interaction;

c) answers have specific linguistic structures: yes/no constructions, i.e. "incomplete sentences" that represent such normative units in response function, which don't need any filling etc. This

fact provides a basis for us to confirm that "responsives" have whole package of specific characters that makes it possible to classify their special diversity as that of speech acts. They have specific illocutive target (verbal response on causing linguistic stimulus), as well as intentional freedom associated (but not determinated) with causing part, and specific plane of expression, which includes typical responsive structures.

d) the role of provoking part of dialogue unity of question and answer may be played by erotetives, which have different pragmatic meanings that gives rise to non-uniform answers on interrogative constructions monotypic from structural viewpoint.

The asymmetry of interrogative form and not-interrogative meaning quite frequently causes non-uniformity of information perception, especially if it refers to not-native speakers.

e) the specificity of response reactions is determined by interaction (communication) balance that includes subjective and objective factors defining respondent's communication strategy. Interaction balance is reflected on cooperative background, which includes three tactics of response reaction: 1) compassion; 2) absence of compassion; 3) disregard (indifference).

Response reaction tactics are determined by the addressee's attitude towards:

a) addressant personality (along with his/her social-psychological parameters);
b) form of address (compliance/non-compliance with etiquette standards accepted in his/her culture);
c) information itself.

Depending on causing information aspect of response reaction verbal-communicative reaction may be perceived or not perceived as direct answers on question. Despite this, response reaction tactics is interesting by itself, since it represents one of the most important forms of communication interaction, knowledge of which plays enormous role in intercultural communication process in general, and in translation activity, in particular;

d) the analysis of specific material shows that cohesion category in the dialogue complex of question and answer may manifest itself in linkage of information transmitted by addressee with question content itself, and the form of address and addressant's personality.

Comparative (contrastive) analysis (one of varieties of which is represented by translation) will give us an opportunity to discover the peculiarity of linguistic strategy of answer and will assist us to distinct all-purpose and national specific characteristics of the phenomenon interesting for us. Let us try to verify our observation on specific empirical material.

References

1. Макаров М.Л. Интерпретативный анализ дискурса в малой группе. Тверь, 1998.
2. Kaplan B. Selected Works 1993.
3. Розеншток-Хюсси О. Речь и действительность. – М., 1994.
4. Рождественский Ю.В. Теория риторики. – М., 1999.
5. Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека. – М., 1998.
6. Столнейкер Р. Прагматика. НЗЛ. Вып. 16. М., 1985.