

## THE BASIC COMPONENTS OF COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGY

Humanitarian institute NAU, e-mail filosof@nau.edu.ua

*The article represents the basic components of communicative strategy regarded as cognitive process planned by the sender to achieve the communicative purpose.*

### Introduction

Appealing of the philosophical idea of the second half of the XX<sup>th</sup> century to communicative-language rationality testified interest to language not as a neutral means of idea expression but productive medium determining ontology of life and consciousnesses. A great deal of scientists drew their attention to the construction of communicative process. The conclusion that communicative interaction is not chaotic, but ordered and guided phenomenon was reflected in numerous researches (T. Van Dijk, Ellingsworth, Clevenger, Neuliep, Mattson, Zhang, Suhih S., Demjankov V.).

All the results reflecting purpose-oriented nature of communication could be classified on the basis of three main approaches. According to the first approach (Babajtsev A., Blakar R., Brown P., Gojzman O., Nadeina T., Zalevskaja A., Krasnyh V., Leontev A., Suhih S., Levinson S., Levy D.) the strategic character of communication is realized by participants of the communicative process. Representatives of the second approach (Gumperz J., Tannen D., Kellermann K.) share the opposite point of view estimating that the strategic character of communication is not realized by participants of the communicative process. For instance, Kellermann K. stays that strategic character of communication does not mean sensibleness of made speech actions [23; 288]. According to the third approach communication can have either strategic or non-strategic character. A representative of this approach - O. Issers writes that despite the fact of mainly strategic orientation, in some cases communication may have non-strategic character [8; 103].

### Analysis researches and publications

Numerous scientific researches devoted to possibility of planning of communicative process caused introduction and wide usage of the term *communicative strategy*. The term *strategy* was actively borrowed by linguists from other scientific areas: «Strategy - [...] covers questions of theory and practice of preparation of the country and armed forces for war, its planning and conducting, investigates war laws, elaborates ways and forms of preparation and conducting of strategic operations, determines the purposes and tasks of fronts, fleet and armies, distributes forces on battlefields...» [15; 1290]. «Strategy, in mathematics, a specifically determined plan, covering all possible contingencies that a player might make in advance for a complete play of a game» [26; 603]. «Strategy (in game theory), is a possible way of player's actions in the frameworks of the rules of the game» [2; 547]. The common point of strategies of different kinds is recognition of that fact, that they

represent some kind of hypotheses concerning the future situation: «Strategy carries out intellectual support of transition from present to future» [11; 67].

Strategic processes, despite the sphere they are carried out in, are opposite to algorithmic processes. In the strategic process there is neither guaranteed success nor uniform representation of interactions of different kinds [6; 164]. Consequently verification of results of strategic approach should be connected with the sphere of precedents or experiments.

The term *communicative strategy* is defined by researchers in different ways. J. Gumperz connects the concept of strategy with speaker's interpretation in the concrete communicative situation: the character of such interpretation determines the intuitive choice of lexical, grammar, discourse and other verbal and nonverbal means of represented messages [21; 35-36].

D. Tannen shares this point of view and states that the communicative strategy has the property of automaticity and is not realized by communicators, but foresees an opportunity of further decoding by producers [25; 47].

D. Levi has another point of view and confirms that *strategy* may be defined as cognitive process of speaker's correlation of the communicative purpose with definite language means of expression [24; 197].

I. Fernando emphasizes the cognitive nature of strategy and defines it as «...a way of achievement of victory or advantage in the competition, intellectual duel, etc., representing some complex cognitive model (gestalt) of summing-up of the previous experience and including personal, local and other measurements, specifically arranged in consciousness and memory» [22; 110-111].

T. van Dijk characterizes communicative strategy as «the property of cognitive plans» [5; 272]. The cognitive plans represent «the general organization of some sequence of actions and include the purpose or purposes of interaction» [5; 274]. He estimates that general strategy of the discourse is the macro-strategy defined as «the characteristics of the cognitive plan of communication which supervises the optimum solution of tasks by the system in flexible and locally operated way under conditions of lack of information about corresponding (subsequent) actions of other participants of the communicative process or local contextual restrictions on own (subsequent) actions » [5; 274].

O. Issers definition is «...strategy represents the cognitive plan of communication which determines the optimum solution of speaker's communicative tasks under conditions of lack of information connected with partner's actions» [8; 100].

T. Vinokur interprets the communicative strategy as "...realization of speaker's idea and intention represented in the text [3; 84].

T. Yanko represents the language approach to the definition of communicative strategy. It's founded on the theory of actual division and communicative structure of the sentence: «The communicative strategy of the speaker consists of the choice of communicative intentions, distribution of increments of information on communicative components and the choice of the succession of communicative components in the sentence» [19; 38]

#### **Task of the article**

The represented conclusion of strategic planning of communication causes necessity of research of its structural unit - communicative strategy.

#### **Basic part**

The cognitive theory influenced development of linguistics convincingly proved that studying of language forms is incomplete without appealing to cognitive categories which are practically inseparable from language (T. Van Dijk, R. Lakoff). Therefore following T. Van Dijk, O. Issers, M. Makarov, A. Romanov, I. Fernando, D. Levi we deal with the communicative strategy as the cognitive process of speaker's correlation of the communicative purpose with the set of theoretical courses directed on its achievement.

The classification of communicative strategies can have different basis. The detailed classification is represented in the monograph written by O. Issers. The communicative strategies are classified according to:

- 1) presence/ absence of the intense for cooperation: - cooperative, - non-cooperative;
- 2) the degree of intense of the intention: - general, - local;
- 3) the character of functioning in the communicative process: - main, - additional (pragmatic, dialogue, rhetorical). [8; 104-106]

Irrespective the type of communicative strategy its components are:

- 1) communicative purpose (strategic result the communicative act is directed to);
- 2) communicative intention (representation of the way of uniting of the theoretical courses directed on achievement of the communicative purpose);
- 3) communicative prospect (an opportunity to cause desirable consequences of the communicative act in reality) [9; 18-19].

Strategies are aimed to realization of the final aim of communication. As strategies are focused on future and connected with forecasting of the situation, their sources should be searched in motives which determine human activity. Motives are not always realized by people; moreover, the motivation of actions represented by a person often does not coincide with the true motives of his behavior. Comparing with motives comprehension of needs is easier. Speaker's strategies are often guided by certain system of precious, beliefs, social norms and conventions representing collectively person's disposition.

The means of achievement of the communicative purpose is the communicative tactic. Communicative

tactics have smaller scale in the communicative process than communicative strategies. They don't correspond with the communicative purpose but with the set of separate communicative intentions.

To show the interrelation of elements of communicative strategy and communicative tactic E. Klyuyev represents the following explanation: «...using the communicative competence the speaker puts forward the communicative purpose (determining or not determining the communicative prospect as an opportunity to cause desirable consequences in reality) and, following certain communicative intentions, develops the communicative strategy which either will be transformed into the communicative tactic (or fail, or be transformed unsuccessfully) as a set of communicative intentions (tasks), enriching the communicative experience of the speaker» [9; 20].

The results of semantic and pragmatic analysis of speech interactions could be useful if one tries to define communicative purposes reflecting motives of human behavior. Firstly, it is the desire to realize an intention, secondly, necessity to adapt to the situation (Cody, Dillard; Segrin, Harden, Rearrdon). Except these purposes it's possible to point to paramount (the purposes of influence) and minor (derivative of various motives of human activity) ones (Wilensky, Clark, Deila, Schank, Abelson, Smith). If paramount purposes initiate the communicative process, minor purposes serve as borders which determine the type of speech behavior.

J. Dillard elaborated the typology of minor purposes classifying them as:

1. The purposes connected with self-expression, moral standards and self-evaluation of the speaker.
2. The purposes connected with effective interaction of participants of the communicative process. They include acceptability, relevance and connectivity of messages, social approval of the addressee, retaining of partner's image.
3. The purposes reflecting speaker's aspiration to store and increase values significant for him.
4. The purposes determined by speaker's desire to have control over the situation, avoid negative emotions [20].

As verbal ability is based on the ability of perception of objects and conditions of the world, the problem of comprehension of speech and language cannot be dealt with beyond the problem of word's comprehension. Comprehension assumes perception – perceptive and conceptual allocation of the object by gifting of certain sense or concept as mental representation to it. From this point of view, perceived objects are signs, and sense given to them – is either true or false information about them. The process of construction of senses («conceptual pictures») of these signs-objects is characterized by construction of new senses, or concepts on the basis of those which are existent. Only those objects which are capable of being "caught" by means of senses of the conceptual system reflecting the cognitive experience of their carrier are perceived.

The structure of the communicative act is set by frames (sets of steady representations about a subject or a group of subjects) and scripts (sets of steady

representations about process as a set of events reproduced on a regular basis). Hence, before the communicative act is initiated the communicants have different kinds of information: «1) the information of forthcoming speech event; 2) the information of cognitive presuppositions; 3) the information of the situation or the context» [8; 94]. Therefore the forecast of communication is formed on the basis of representations about it, communicative interaction and the situation in whole. These representations cause a strategic choice of significant units of different levels and ways of their organization, namely designing of the coherent text, optimum solution of communicative tasks.

To realize the chosen strategy effectively the addressant needs to distribute communicative roles among the addressees with the help of spatial location; glide of the conversation; gestures; the manner of speech and speech contents. To show the participants of the communicative process who is the addressee different ways could be used. Among them the following ones are accentuated:

- the principle of involving;
- the principle of equal chances;
- the principle of individual identification;
- the individually approached addressees;
- the circuitous requests;
- performatives.

N. Formanovskaja allocates the following types of the addressees:

- real and hypothetic;
- foreseeable generalized;
- mass, public, concretized;
- personal, individual, concrete;
- indirect (deutero) [17; 37].

In each case a communicant has his background assumption, intention and tactics of response in speech interactions. The addressant sends his message with certain communicative purpose. Alongside with addressant's intention addressee's attitudes are important too. Therefore the communicative act is the result of collision and interaction of intentions of two or more participants of communication.

The process of communication is regulated by a set of rules and laws carrying out of which guarantees the successful embodiment of communicative strategy of interlocutors. It is possible to allocate three approaches to this problem: representatives of the first approach (H. Grice, T. Van Dijk) consider that communicants should follow the Cooperative Principle including some maxims; representatives of the second approach (R. Lakoff, J. Leech) assumes that the Principle of Politeness is the basis of successful communications; representatives of the third approach (L. Apostel, B. Moen, R. Fisher and U. Juri) are inclined to consider the communication from the point of view of its efficiency to achieve the planned purpose.

The Cooperative Principle requires communicants' involving into the conversation with the necessary contribution at each concrete stage of the conversation. The Cooperative Principle consists of maxims which can be assorted into four categories:

- 1) Maxim of Quality: Truth
  - Don't say what you believe to be false.

- Don't say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

- 2) Maxim of Quantity: Information

- Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange.
- Don't make your contribution more informative that is required.

- 3) Maxim of Relation: Relevance

- Be relevant.

- 4) Maxim of Manner: Clarity

- Avoid obscurity of expression.
- Avoid ambiguity.
- Be brief.
- Be orderly [4; 45-47].

Despite the Cooperative Principle represented by four maximum, H.P. Grice allocates maxim of politeness, aesthetic maxim, etc. to be the background of the rules of social interaction.

T. Van Dijk supports H.P. Grice's basic idea. In any communication some degree of deviation from main principles of pragmatism leading to occurrence in speech intentionally caused or inadvertent not literal senses of the statement is possible. T. Van Dijk's estimates that H. Grice managed to show convincingly that deviations are frequently strategically motivated to allow "communicant-infringer" to be within the framework of the common behavioral assumption, determined by the Cooperative Principle. The metaphor could be seen as a typical example. When it is used deviation from rules of "clarity" is obvious, but the addressee has an opportunity to take from the text figurative metaphorical sense transferred to him. It allows considering the metaphor as a universal ontological retranslator, a general characteristic of all languages, styles, chronological communicative formats [1; 11]. Thus, the Cooperative Principle does not exclude motivated usage of not literal senses in speech interaction.

R. Lakoff has specified problematical character of application of the Cooperative Principle to the analysis of discourse, as H.P. Grice's maxims are applied to various types of discourse in a different degree. For instance, the persuasive discourse is build on the basis of deviation from the Cooperative Principle but the communicants are aware of not observing of the Principle.

If the Cooperative Principle basically appeals to the construction of the text, the Politeness Principle deals with metatextual area. Following the Politeness Principle creates the environment of positive interaction, provides the favorable background for realization of communicative strategy.

The author of the Politeness Principle, G. Leech, formulates communicative maxims in the concepts of ethical standards of behavior:

1. The tact maxim states: "Minimize the expression of beliefs which imply cost to other; maximize the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to other."

2. Generosity maxim states: "Minimize the expression of benefit to self; maximize the expression of cost to self." Unlike the tact maxim, the maxim of generosity focuses on the speaker, and says that others should be put first instead of the self.

3. The Approbation maxim states: "Minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other; maximize the expression of beliefs which express approval of other."

4. The Modesty maxim states: "Minimize the expression of praise of self; maximize the expression of dispraise of self".

5. The Agreement maxim runs as follows: 'Minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other; maximize the expression of agreement between self and other.'

6. The sympathy maxim states: 'minimize antipathy between self and other; maximize sympathy between self and other.' This includes a small group of speech acts such as congratulation, commiseration, and expressing condolences. [17; 53]

R. Lakoff supplements these principles with general initial principles of rationality and blessing:

- don't be persuasive;
- listen to the interlocutor;
- be friendly.

In addition to the mentioned above maxims there are some other maxims connected with physiological theories: self-defenses maxim, hearings maxim etc. (Demjankov; Berkeley-Alain; Carnegie). Thus, taking into account postulates and maxims of communication it is possible to reveal the basic conditions which help to achieve communicative purposes:

1. One-orientated intentions of both communicants.
2. Neutral or regardful attitude of the addressant toward the addressee.
3. An optimum dosage of illocutionary force of the statement.
4. Awareness of expediency and relevance of communication by the addressee and his readiness for an execute action.

5. The choice of language means of expression which suit the parameters of the definite communicative situation: the place and time; the addressant with his set communicative obligations; the addressee possessing or allocated to possess certain presupposition properties; purpose-oriented character of the message.

In real communication these communicative postulates are often ignored, the result is communicative failures which are embodied in full or partial misunderstanding of the message by the partner of the communications and undesirable emotional effect. Complexity of research of communicative failures could be explained with the fact that the reason of the phenomenon is caused not by a single factor but by a complex unit of them.

The classification of reasons caused communicative failures was elaborated by O. Ermakova and E. Zemskaja and is considered to be widely used. They estimate that communicative failures are provoked by:

- the device of language;
- distinctions of communicants;
- pragmatic factors;
- metacommunicative reactions of the addressee [7; 33].

N. Formanovskaja allocates three bases for classification of communicative failures:

- sociocultural (distinctions in world view of communicants);

- psychosocial (different mental models of fragments of reality, discrepancy of estimations of fragments and phenomena of reality, infringement of speech behavior, infringement of communicate channel, wrong perusal of speech intention etc.);

- linguistic (misunderstanding of meaning of grammatical means, inaccurate reference applying, polysemy, homonymy etc.) [17; 170-174]

The final success or failure of the communicative act is determined by the combination of various strategies and tactics of communicants. Possession of communicative strategies and tactics is included into the pragmatic competence of a communicant: the more he is competent of language and speech in application of postulates and rules of dialogue, the more flexible strategies and tactics are used to achieve the communicative purposes.

The communicative competence includes different abilities:

1) to forecast social and psychological factors of the communicative situation the communicants are going to be involved in;

2) to plan the process of communication basing on the peculiarity of the communicate situation;

3) to carry out psychosocial management of processes of communication in the definite situation [14].

## Conclusion

Both planning of the process of communication depending on definite conditions of its course and personalities of communicants and realization of this plan assume the presence of communicative strategy. Communicative strategy is directed at realization of the communicative purpose that foresees analysis of presuppositions and frames of the addressant, and also hypothetical presuppositions and frames of the addressee with their further coordination, and in the case of impossibility of such coordination - refusal from the communicative act or its transformation into another communicative act.

Strategic planning is determined by a purpose of the addressant and communicate context motivating a choice of tactics as practical means of achievement of the corresponding communicative purpose. Absence or lack of the contextual information leads to non-predicted perlocutionary effects representing communicative failures. Possession of strategies and tactics is determined by the communicative competence of the addressant allowing embodying certain communicative prospect.

## Bibliography

1. Арутюнова Н. Метафора и дискурс //Теория метафоры. – М., 1990. – С. 11.
2. Большая Советская Энциклопедия /Гл. ред. А.М. Прохоров. – Т. 24. – Книга I. – 3-е изд. – М.: Издательство «Советская Энциклопедия», 1976.
3. Винокур Т.Г. Говорящий и слушающий. Варианты речевого поведения. – М.: Наука, 1993. – 172 с.
4. Грайс Г.П. Логика и речевое общение /Пер. с англ. В.В. Туровского //Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 16. Лингвистическая прагматика. – М.: Прогресс, 1985. – С. 217-237.
5. Дейк ван Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – 310 с.

6. *Дейк ван Т.А., Кинч В.* Стратегии понимания связного текста //Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. XXIII. Когнитивные аспекты языка: Пер. с англ. /Сост., ред., вступ. ст. В.В. Петрова и В.И. Герасимова. – М.: Прогресс, 1988. – С. 153-173.
7. *Ермакова О.Н., Земская Е.А.* К построению типологии коммуникативных неудач (на материале естественного русского диалога) //Русский язык в его функционировании. Коммуникативно-прагматический аспект. – М.: Наука, 1993. – С. 30-64.
8. *Иссерс О.С.* Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи. Изд. 3-е. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2002. – 284 с.
9. *Клюев Е.В.* Речевая коммуникация: Учебное пособие для университетов и институтов. – М.: РИПОЛ КЛАССИК, 2002. – 320 с.
10. *Макаров М.Л.* Основы теории дискурса. – М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2003. – 278 с.
11. *Почепцов Г.Г.* Стратегия. – М.: Рефл-бук, К.: Ваклер. – 2005. – 384 с.
12. Понимание речи и философия языка. //Новое в зарубежной лингвистике: Вып. 17. Теория речевых актов. Сборник. Пер. с англ. /Сост. и вступ. ст.
13. *Романов А.А.* Системный анализ регулятивных средств диалогического общения. – М.: Наука, 1988. – 154 с.
14. *Руденский Е.В.* Социальная психология: Курс лекций. – М.: ИНФА-М; Новосибирск: ИГАЭиУ, 1997. – 224 с.
15. Советский энциклопедический словарь. /Гл. ред. Прохоров А.М. – 4-е изд. – М.: Советская энциклопедия. – 1632 с., ил.
16. *Сухих С.А.* Речевые интеракции и стратегии //Языковое общение и его единицы. – Калинин: Калининский государственный университет, 1986. – С. 71-77.
17. *Формановская Н.И.* Речевое общение: коммуникативно-прагматический подход. – М.: Русский язык, 2002.
18. *Франк Д.* Семь грехов прагматики: тезисы о теории речевых актов, анализе речевого общения, лингвистике и риторике //Новое в зарубежной лингвистике: Вып. 19. Теория речевых актов. Сборник. Пер. с англ. /Сост. и вступ. ст. И.М. Кобозевой и В.З. Демьянкова. Общ. Ред. Б.Ю. Городецкого. – М.: Прогресс. 1986. – 424 с.
19. *Янко Т.Е.* Коммуникативные стратегии русской речи. – М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2001. – С. 38-45.
20. *Dillard J.P., Segrin Ch. & Harden J.M.* Primary and Secondary Goals in the Production of Interpersonal Influence Messages //Communication Monographs. – v. 56, March 1989, 19-38.
21. *Gumperz J.J.* Discourse Strategies. – Cambridge: CUP, 1982. – 402 p.
22. *Fernando C.* Idioms and Idiomaticity. – Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. – 265 p.
23. *Kellermann K.* Communication: Inherently Strategic and Primarily Automatic //Communication Monographs. – 1992. – V. 59. – P. 288-300.
24. *Levy D.* Communicative Goals and Strategies: Between Discourse and Syntax// Syntax and Semantics. – V. 12. – 1979. – P. 183-210.
25. *Tannen D.* Gender and Discourse. – N.Y., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994. – 203 p.
26. The New Encyclopedia Britannica. – In 30 Volumes. – Volume IX. – N.Y.: Micropedia, 1978.

М.А. Абисова

**ОСНОВНІ СКЛАДОВІ КОМУНІКАТИВНОЇ СТРАТЕГІЇ**

У статті розглядаються основні складові комунікативної стратегії як когнітивного процесу, спланованого адресантом для досягнення комунікативної мети.

М.А. Абысова

**ОСНОВНЫЕ СОСТАВЛЯЮЩИЕ КОММУНИКАТИВНОЙ СТРАТЕГИИ**

В статье рассматриваются основные составляющие коммуникативной стратегии как когнитивного процесса, спланированного адресантом для достижения коммуникативной цели.