

TACTICS OF NON-COOPERATIVE INTERACTION AND LINGUISTIC MEANS OF THEIR IMPLEMENTATION**Е.В. Пискун**Полесский государственный университет, piskun.e@polessu.by

Abstract. The article examines the main tactics of non-cooperative interaction and the linguistic means of their implementation in modern Internet communication.

Keywords: communication, tactics, linguistics, interaction, culture.

Studying Internet communication in the discursive aspect allows to comprehend the features of the speech behavior of communicants in the recently formed communicative environment, including identifying the specifics of aggressive behavior, which, according to recent observations, is a fairly common phenomenon on the Internet. Thus, Internet language is characterized not only by increased dialogicity (forum, chat, conference), the development of colloquial written speech, the growth of emotionally charged vocabulary, but also by the coarsening of speech, the constant formation of the "image of the enemy". Aggressive speech behavior is characteristic not only of virtual reality, but also of modern reality in general, which is dictated by a decrease in the level of culture, national intolerance, easy accessibility of various media, propaganda of violence, etc. These and many other sociological and psychological factors are an aid to the widespread spread of aggression. However, due to the specific nature of Internet communication, which occurs in special conditions characterized by the fact that communicants do not communicate "in person," but in many cases anonymously, the manifestation of aggression in the virtual space is especially widespread. One of the dominant forms of aggressive, conflictual speech behavior in the media space is discreditation [1].

The works of Russian and foreign linguodidacts emphasize the necessity and importance of developing lexical-pragmatic skills of dialogical communication of communicants (oral discourse) from different countries and cultures: the formation and use of lexical-pragmatic (linguopragmatic) skills directly depends on the understanding of the culture of another country, because for successful communication, it is necessary not only to master a sufficient vocabulary, but also the ability to use them in a given communicative situation [2]. New communication environments (virtual space) and Internet platforms produce new types of texts - Internet texts / digital texts, which determine both the complexity of the lexical plan and linguodidactic nature. In addition, the Internet offers a wide range of texts from ordinary users. This includes blog articles, messages on social networks and much more. Such content provides a lot of valuable information. Every year new lexical units (jargonisms, slang, abbreviations, sociolects) are formed taking into account the current state of social institutions.

The Internet allows us to trace the communicative impact of various linguistic and visual means on the addressee, tracking the reaction to the received message through verbal (communicants' responses) or non-verbal (emoji, trolling, memes, emoticons, etc.). The speech actions of the participants in the discussion may have a linguistic embodiment that contradicts the leading communication strategies and, thus, violates the principles of constructive interaction (cooperation, mutual understanding, respect for the opponent's position).

Such verbal behavior is observed when using such non-cooperative tactics as the tactic of evading an answer, the tactics of confrontation (statement of incompetence, accusation, reproach, ridicule, causticity, insult); tactics of discrediting the opponent (ridicule, insult, mockery, accusation, etc.), the appearance of which, apparently, is due to the real-time mode, which leaves its mark on the methods of expressing meanings.

Tactics of evading an answer

Although an invariable attribute of a dialogue is content richness, nevertheless, it may contain responses that are characterized by low or even almost zero information content, that is, they do not provide the requested information in the required volume (I have no associations on this matter yet).

Such uninformative responses, as a means of implementing the tactic of evading an answer, in fact represent refusals to answer, which can be based on a variety of reasons: a) lack of time (*I can't answer this question right away*); b) the specific nature of the question (*This is a difficult question*); c) no need to answer immediately (*I will answer later*); d) no need to answer yourself (*You should address this question to yourself*), etc.

Tactics of stating the opponent's incompetence

In dialogues between participants, instead of a deep, comprehensive analysis of the interlocutor's position and putting forward arguments "for" or "against", a categorically expressed negative assessment of the professional qualities of his personality is demonstrated (*You are very boldly talking about a system about which you have no idea*) [3, p. 44].

Tactics of Accusation

One of the frequently used tactics is the tactics of accusation, the main goal of which is to achieve a negative reaction from the recipient (It's your fault!).

Tactics of Reproach

Tactics of reproach, which are part of the strategy of evaluative-emotional influence, are used to evoke shame, remorse, etc. in the addressee [4]. This tactic refers to tactics of negative evaluation, reflects a conflict form of speech behavior and is characterized by the expression of disapproval, discontent or reproach regarding any action or statement. By using this tactic, the addresser tries not only to implicitly express a negative assessment of the addressee's behavior, but also to exert an emotional influence on the addressee in order to bring interpersonal relations into a state that would meet his interests (*Even you could do this!*; *“Always, even if I come to ask you about the work. I don't want anything to do with love when I'm at work. Work's work”*) The thesis of this statement is Paul's reproach that his girlfriend (Miriam) constantly bothers him with her kisses, which is confirmed by the argument: *“even if I come to ask you about the work”*. The argument-word “even” represents an argument - proof of the thesis that even when the addresser talks to her about work, she climbs up to him to kiss. Consequently, this argument, introduced by the argument-word “even”, is more convincing and categorical than any of the possible arguments, proves the conclusion about the girl's obsessive behavior).

Tactics of Insult

Tactics of insult are speech acts that contain an indecent form of negative evaluation of a person, humiliating the honor and dignity of this person. As a rule, the intellectual, moral or even physical characteristics of the communicant are subject to evaluation (you are a sick senile; the article is a noob, the author is a noob and has disgraced himself; you blurted out, as usual, without thinking). Often, the insult occurs according to the model of "who are you / what", "what are you doing / how", where the second part of the utterance is always explicated by lexemes that carry negative semantics. At the same time, the choice of linguistic means is not limited to the use of abusive vocabulary. In some cases, the remarks are based on normative vocabulary, but have a negative evaluative coloring. The purpose of using such vocabulary is an attempt to bring out emotions in the interlocutor (*You just do not understand!*; *Sometimes it is better to keep quiet, etc.*) [5, p. 34].

Tactics of ridicule

Ridicule is defined as an offensive joke about someone or something. Like tactics of insult, ridicule is aimed at exalting one's personality by belittling the merits of the opponent, but unlike insult, it is based on a joke, irony, which can be qualified as an intentional phenomenon aimed at humiliating, ridiculing the interlocutor (*Give him an order too!*) [5, p. 35].

Tactics of discrediting the opponent's position

Its fundamental difference from the tactics of criticism is that while the tactics of criticism have a constructive nature, are distinguished by polite linguistic design and contribute to the development of speech interaction, the discrediting tactics are an incorrect form of communicative influence, characterized by an emphasized conflict and often causing an undesirable perlocutionary effect, for example, a direct or indirect refusal to further participate in communication. Discrediting Tactics of discrediting the opponent's position are inextricably linked with the use of stylistically reduced, emotionally charged linguistic means, indicating an extreme degree of non-acceptance of the interlocutor's position.

List of References

1. Nikolaeva A.V. Trolling as a speech strategy in the Internet space. URL: <http://nikolaeva.livejournal.com/554313.html> (date of access: 02/26/2024).
2. Dobrosklonskaya, T.G. Medialinguistics: a systems approach to studying the language of the media / T.G. Dobrosklonskaya. – M.: URSS, 2008. – 264 p.
3. Solovieva, N.V. Tolerance of speech interaction in Internet communication (based on Internet discussions) / N.V. Solovieva. – Bulletin of Perm University. Russian and Foreign Philology, issue 1(17), 2012. – P. 41-45.
4. Davydova, T. A. Speech act of reproach in English: dis. ... Cand. Philological sciences. – Irkutsk: Publishing house of Irkutsk State Linguistic University, 2003. – 161 p.
5. Gritsenko, L. M., Demidova, T. A. Communicative strategy of discrediting in Internet communication (on the example of Internet trolling) / L. M. Gritsenko, T. A. Davydova. – Bulletin of Tomsk State University. Philology. No. 55, 2018. – P. 29-42.