Iryna MELNYK
Kamianets-Podilskyi Ivan Ohiienko National University,
Kamianets-Podilskyi, Ukraine
E-mail: melnykirina28@gmail.com

Tetyana PETROVA
Kamianets-Podilskyi National Ivan Ohiienko University,
Kamianets-Podilskyi, Ukraine
E-mail: tetyana.petrova@hotmail.com

Alla KHOPTIAR
Kamianets-Podilskyi Ivan Ohiienko National University,
Kamianets-Podilskyi, Ukraine
E-mail: khoptyar@kpnu.edu.ua

PROVOCATION AS A TOOL OF LANGUAGE INFLUENCE

Abstract

The article aims to study provocation as a particular type of interpersonal communication and a provocateur's action who intends to obtain (provoke) necessary verbal reaction from the recipient by employing language influence. The provocateur is considered an active speaker whose main task is to plan the communicative process, choose appropriate strategies and tactics, and verbal and nonverbal markers of their realisation to implement effective communication. Provocation can be realised in terms of both communicative conflict and cooperation. Conflict situations involve communicative disharmony, pressure on the recipient, provocateur's dominance, violating cooperative principles and maxims of communication and politeness principles, and non-cooperative strategies. In contrast, cooperative situations can be regarded as those where communicative balance is maintained, cooperative and politeness principles are followed, and cooperative strategies are applied. Provocation can be effective in both cooperative and non-cooperative implementation

Keywords: provocation, language influence, provocateur, recipient, communicative situation, conflict, cooperation, strategies, tactics.

Introduction

A feature of modern linguistics is the transition from studying language as a closed semiotic system to studying language as a mental communicative process. The change of the scientific paradigm has led to the need to study the laws of human communication, as well as issues concerning language philosophy, the peculiarities of language use in various communicative situations, pragmatic aspects, styles of interaction, etc. Obviously, communication is an integral part of social life. Communication is a special type of human activity and cognitive, and labour activities carried out according to specific laws, established forms, and models. The connections between thinking and speaking are embodied primarily in the generation and perception of speech processes, which, in turn, occur according to specific mental and communicative laws and rules. Communication is a complex system in wherein a person behaves and communicates differently in different situations and under certain circumstances, which is characterised by a multi-

faceted communicative process and, thus, determines various types of communication. When speaking, an interlocutor can convey certain information, persuade somebody, express positive or negative feelings, stimulate others to do something, influence their emotional state, etc.

Interpersonal communication is a motivational process caused by interlocutors' needs, interests, intentions, and goals. During communicative interaction, the speaker tries to influence the listener to achieve the desired result. Result-based communication is always associated with language influence, which is considered in terms of its purposefulness, motivation, and planned effectiveness.

The problem of the language influence on a person to obtain information is related to the phenomenon of provocation. Initially, provocation is regarded as an act or a statement that incites a particular reaction and response, instilling feelings of anger or irritation. Therefore, provocation has two significant features: it is a premeditated, deliberate, and conscious action, and it brings some negative aftereffects to the provoked one, indicating the provocation's manipulative nature. In linguistics, provocation, which is the *object* of the study, is considered a type of intercourse intended for receiving the needed information, i.e., the communicative act of the speaker aimed at provoking the verbal response of the listener in order to gain some information (Semeniuk & Parashchuk, 2009, p. 43). In other words, we can relate it to inquiry or pumping. The provoking person is called a provocateur; the one who is provoked is called a recipient. In this paper, provocation is studied as a special type of interpersonal communication, the purpose of which is to achieve the desired verbal reaction by the provocateur. The *subject* of the study is language influence and strategic planning as provocateur's tools to achieve the communicative goal, i.e., get the necessary information from the recipient. In order to make the communicative interaction successful, the provocateur tries to influence the recipient and change his/her intentions or behaviour in the planned direction. Provocative com-

munication aims to obtain the desired information, so successful strategic planning of speech activity, i.e., appropriate choice of communicative strategies and tactics, taking into account the recipient factor and the type of communicative situation, provides effective communication. The study's relevance is determined by the increased attention of modern linguistics to language influence and the effectiveness of communication, as well as the fact that a comprehensive study of provocation as a tool of speech influence has not been conducted.

Language Influence and Strategic Planning

The influence of language has been attracting scientific interest since ancient times when rhetoric studied the methods of practical eloquence and the technique of arguing. In antiquity, rhetoric was the art of oral public speaking, which explored the patterns of generation, transmission, and perception of language. The basis of such influence was the rules of logical reasoning and belief. In the Middle Ages, rhetoric practically disappeared as science and was revived in the twentieth century on a new psychological basis as a "science of effective communication" (Sternin, 2001, p. 55). Now researchers are primarily interested in psychological and emotional methods of persuasion as well as means of conveying them in language, which, in fact, is connected with globalisation, expanding spheres of human communication, growing interest in studying the communicative process, analysing the behaviour of communicators in different types of discourse, finding ways to improve the effectiveness of communication, etc. Modern linguistics has many approaches to studying language influence, which often complement each other (R. Blakar (1987), O. Gavrilova (2015), O. Denysiuk (2003), E. Dotsenko (1997), V. Karasik (2004), D. Carnegie (1936), V. Kozlova (2014), V. Krasnykh (2001), O. Leontiev (2003), V. Maltseva (2007), A. Negryshev (2009), J. Sternin (2001), R. Chaldini (2010), V. Sheinov (2003), E. Sho-

strom (1992) etc).

It is scientifically substantiated that communicators try to achieve non-communicative goals in any act of interaction. R. Blakar (1987) argued that it is impossible to speak "neutrally" because even informal conversation involves the "use of power", i.e. the impact on the perception and structuring of the world by another person (p. 89). J. Sternin (2001) defines language influence as "the influence of a person on another person or a group of people with verbal and non-verbal means that accompany language to achieve the goal of the speaker" (p. 51). According to the linguist (Sternin, 2001), language influence can be implemented by:

1. argumentation, i.e. giving proofs that confirm the correctness of a statement. Argumentation is a logical way of language influence;
2. persuasion (by convincing, the speaker gives the interlocutor confidence that the truth is proven; persuasion uses both logic and emotional pressure);
3. suasion (mainly emotional motivation of the listener to abandon his views and accept the views of the speaker; suasion is always very emotional, intense, person-oriented, usually based on repetition of a request or an offer);
4. pleading (highly emotional request);
5. suggestion (based on intense psychological and emotional pressure as well as the authority of the speaker);
6. order (motivating a person to perform a specific communicative action without any explanation due to dependence on official or social status);
7. request (encouraging the listener to do something in the interests of the speaker, guided by a good attitude towards him/her);
8. coercion (based on forcing a person to do something against will, usually in the form of extreme pressure or threats). The effectiveness of language influence depends on the speaker's ability to choose suitable means of influence and the ability to successfully combine them depending on the type of interlocutor and the communicative situation.

Obviously, provocation is used to influence people because a person (who may or may not be aware of this) is "made", sometimes against will and desire, to report certain information. Provocation is a refined force because a person usually does not assume that he/she will be provoked to an action that is not in his/her favour. However, the provocation does not always have a negative concept.

To some extent, the effectiveness of communication depends on the communicative position of the provocateur, i.e. the degree of influence and the speaker's authority concerning the recipient (Sternin, 2001, p. 52). The communicative position of the provocateur can alter in different communication situations and within the same communicative situation. A credible provocateur can achieve the goal much faster since a recipient will fully trust him/her, which can motivate the recipient to say more than planned. A positive emotional background is of particular importance for the results of provocative communication. An essential concept for any type of communication, especially for the cooperative implementation of provocation, is communicative comfort, which involves a sense of security, trust between communicators, positive cooperation, and the desire to continue the conversation.

It is essential to mention that provocation is highly related to manipulation, a type of language influence which is carried out by using specific language resources in order to covertly influence the cognitive activity and behaviour of the recipient in the interests of the manipulator (Skovorodnikov & Kopnina, 2012, p. 36). Manipulative influence focuses on two characteristic features. First of all, the latent nature of the manipulator's influence on the recipient, "it is the hidden nature (i.e. hidden fact of influence and its purpose) that makes manipulation powerful" (Bityanova, 2001, p. 75). Another essential characteristic is the use of deceptive techniques and methods of influence, various types of distortion of reality (Dobrovich, 2000; Dotsenko, 1997), which motivate the recipient to such actions and messages that harm his/her communicative inter-

ests, which he/she would not have done if he/she had not been misled. Deception is a critical element in the case of manipulation. In this regard, manipulation is considered a unilateral influence of the subject of manipulation on its object, the desire of the manipulator to obtain a unilateral benefit, a "unilateral advantage" (Tarasova, 1993). Manipulation is an unequal interaction in which the manipulator is more active. He/she ignores the recipient's intentions and tries to impose specific ideas, verbal actions, and forms of behaviour that do not coincide with his/her existing desires and intentions. We correlate provocation with manipulation because, with the help of language, the provocateur tries to consciously influence the recipient in order to stimulate him/her to provide information, perform certain communicative actions, and change his/her behaviour, i.e. to act in the interests of the provocateur, unconsciously and contrary to the recipient's own intentions. Provocation acquires all the signs mentioned above of manipulative influence: it has a hidden nature, is sometimes realised with the help of tricks and deception, the provocateur considers the interlocutor as an object of achieving a communicative goal, ignores his/her intentions and views, tries to control the behaviour, thoughts and emotions of the recipient. Manipulation and provocation are also united by the fact that as a result of interpersonal interaction, only the subject of communication, i.e. the manipulator or provocateur, benefits; the object of manipulation (the recipient) retains the illusion of independence in decision-making and actions. The difference between provocation and manipulation is that the manipulator exerts his language influence implicitly. At the same time, the provocateur can carry it out both implicitly and explicitly and using different methods, both cooperative and non-cooperative depending on the strategic plan pursued by the provocateur.

Language influence, nonetheless, is a bilateral process because, in the process of communication, both the provocateur and the recipient can interact with each other, regulate the course of communication, and change each other's views.

Provocation, along with manipulation, at first glance, can be attributed to a unilateral process because language influence is associated primarily with the speaker's intentions. As a performer of the influence, the provocateur regulates the communicative activity of the interlocutor and tries to influence the recipient so that he/she provides him with the desired information, i.e. to give a particular verbal reaction. With the help of language, the provocateur influences decision-making and the world perception of the partner. Thus, the study of provocation as a category of language influence is usually carried out from the position of one of the communicators - the performer of the influence, i.e. provocateur.

In contrast, the object of influence (the recipient) is only the communicative partner who participates in the interaction. However, while conversing, the position of the participants can be corrected; the recipient, therefore, also takes on an active role and, together with the provocateur, acts as a vocal performer of communication. The recipient can recognise the provocation and may not let the provocateur implement the influence; in this case, the provocation can end up with a breakdown and a failure. Moreover, the recipient is capable of causing unplanned action in response and provoking the provocateur, thus changing roles with him/her.

Communication is an orderly phenomenon based on planning communicative actions and choosing the optimal way to achieve the goal. Like any type of communication, Provocative communication has some particular purpose since communication is a purposeful and intentional activity. Hardly can we find a speaker who remains indifferent to the result of his/her communicative acts. Plans and intentions are mental actions that we develop rationally to fulfil our desires or beliefs. The planning process is critical to our functioning as rational individuals and social beings because it projects our attitudes and beliefs into time and social space, allowing them to affect our actions beyond the present, enabling us to coordinate our actions with others (Bratman, 1987). The communicative intention is a

preverbal aim of the provocateur that determines the communicative strategy (Selivanova, 2006, p. 184). The effectiveness of provocative communication is interpreted through such terms as accomplishing a goal and realising an intention. When reporting something, the provocateur, first of all, thinks about the effectiveness of the message. However, at the same time, he/she considers different approaches, which correspond to a specific communicative situation to a greater or lesser extent. This makes it possible to consider language communication in terms of general strategy (in terms of purpose) and specific tactics (in terms of achievement). For the provocation to be adequate, it must be well planned. In order to realise the communicative goal and intention, the provocateur should formulate a communicative strategy and realise it by employing communicative tactics, in connection with which the speaker chooses the means of communication (verbal and non-verbal) that best meet the existing goal (Makarov, 2003, p. 193). As intentions are fulfilled, the provocateur proceeds gradually towards the eventual fulfilment of his/her aim.

Initially, strategy and tactics concerned military matters. So, strategy is the art or science of the planning and conduct of a war, while tactics are the art and science of the detailed direction and control of movement or manoeuvre of forces in the battle to achieve an aim or task. "Strategy" is a term in such widespread use that, in many cases, it has come to mean little more than "deciding," "planning ahead," or merely "doing something". Properly understood. However, strategy is a collection of ideas, preferences and methods explaining an activity and giving it purpose by connecting it to the desired effect or a stated goal.

The terms "strategy" and "tactics" are also used in linguistics. According to O. Issers (2008), language communication is a strategic process, the basis for choosing optimal language resources. The strategy of language behaviour covers the entire sphere of communication construction when the goal is to achieve specific results (p. 10). A communicative strategy is a high-level plan to achieve one or more communicative goals. Strategy becomes ever necessary when it is known or suspected that there are insufficient resources to achieve these goals. The strategy defines how the speaker will achieve the objectives that he/she has identified, whereas the communicative tactics involve the complex steps for realising this plan. According to T. A. van Dijk (1989), there are several ways to achieve a goal, and strategies are regarded as "the choice" which allows a speaker to achieve this goal (p. 272). If the strategy is considered global, then tactics is local. Thus, the communicative strategy combines the planning process of communication, which is necessary for achieving the perlocutionary effect, i.e. the realisation of the provocateur's communicative aim. So, the provocateur tries to arrange his/her message or dialogue with the recipient to reach the necessary result. Therefore, influence is fundamental in the pursuit of strategic goals.

For the provocateur, strategic and tactical planning is an utterly conscious task. The more precise strategy the provocateur chooses, the more successful and effective the influence and the result of the provocative communication appear. Appropriate strategy leads to the provocateur's realisation of communicative aim. Any strategy is connected with planning the communicative process and considering the personal features of the interlocutor, i.e. his/her psychological "diagnosis" and specific circumstances and conditions of the communicative situation.

Thus, provocation is a tool of language influence that involves a specific sequence of communicative actions organised under the predicted result of communication that affects the recipient. The provocateur sets a specific goal, tries to analyse the situation comprehensively, plans the interaction, predicts possible results and controls the communication process.

Cooperative and Non-Cooperative Provocation

Effective communicators have little trouble

building trust and establishing rapport with their communicative partners. Every individual communicative situation appears differently productive for each participant, and it is not equally profitable for all of them. Depending on the intentions and communicative aims that the interlocutors pursue, linguists distinguish between illocutionary and interactive communication efficiency (Yashenkova, 2010, p. 134). Illocutionary effectiveness involves the agreement between illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect (Austin, 1975; Searle, 1969), but the communication efficiency and the result can be reached either in a cooperative or non-cooperative way. Interactive effectiveness implies cooperation, mutual understanding, and communicative harmony as the indicators of successful interaction. In the situations of provocative communication, the provocateur fails to cooperate as he/she disregards the recipient's intentions, purposes and interests. Moreover, in most cases, the provocateur violates the cooperative principles and Grice's maxims (Grice, 1975) (i.e. the maxims of quality, quantity, relation and manner), which, in fact, enable effective communication. Nevertheless, this does not prevent him from achieving the perlocutionary effect and realising the communicative aim.

So, provocation can be considered from two points of view. On the one hand, it can be characterised as an action related to conflict and aimed at intentional provocation, incitement, confrontation, attack, deception, aggression, etc. This type of provocation is a non-cooperative way of verbal influence on the communication partner, which causes him/her harm and negative consequences. On the other hand, provocation can be considered stimulation and motivation for communicative actions. Then, it is deprived of harmful components and catalyses the development of cooperative communication. Achieving the communicative goal determines the orientation of provocative communication on conflict or cooperation. According to N. Formanovskaia (2002), "in cooperative communication, the communicators' assessments, attitudes, and in-

tentions are not contradictory, so the texts are built in the tone of agreement. In conflict communication, assessments of the situation, positions, intentions are in contradiction, so the texts are built in the tone of disagreement, conflict" (p. 18). A. Ishmuratov distinguishes between three types of communication: cooperation, rivalry and conflict/confrontation. He presents confrontation as an "ill" type of communication, and cooperation and rivalry - as a "healthy" communication (Ishmuratov, 1996, p. 180).

Within provocation situations, there is a need to establish cooperative interpersonal interaction to achieve a communicative goal. The optimal way of communication is called effective, harmonious, cooperative, and aimed at reaching consensus. Cooperative communication is associated with following certain rules of communication, which are based on the Principle of Cooperation introduced by linguist Paul Grice (1975) in his pragmatic theory, i.e. "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (p. 45) and the corresponding maxims of communication, called the Gricean maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner, as well as the Principle of Politeness, comprising Tact Maxim, Generosity Maxim, Approbation Maxim, Modesty Maxim, Agreement Maxim and Sympathy Maxim, claimed by Geoffrey Leech (1983). Adherence to the Principles of Politeness and Cooperation creates an atmosphere of positive interpersonal interaction and provides a charitable background for implementing communicative strategies and tactics.

The principles of Cooperation and Politeness are certainly not the only guarantee of cooperative communication. The concept of cooperation is often associated with the concept of efficiency (Shiriaiev, 1996; Sternin, 2001), which means "the optimal way to achieve the target communicative goals" (Shiriaiev, 1996, p. 14). Thus, communication can be considered cooperative if its purpose corresponds to its result.

An equally important characteristic of coop

erative communication is the balance of relations between interlocutors. In order to achieve the communicative goal, it is necessary to have contact with the recipient, a favourable microclimate, because the atmosphere of mutual understanding has a positive effect on the course of communication. The provocateur needs to demonstrate the special, trusting status of interpersonal relationships, not forgetting about his/her communicative intentions and interests. In the framework of cooperative, communicative interaction, the primary intention of the provocateur is to achieve a communicative goal through cooperation, taking into account the interests of the interlocutor. Thus, in such situations, the provocateur realises their own intentions and maintains a normal interpersonal relationship with his/her communicative partner. We consider the emotional state and mood of the participants of the communicative process to be of primary and decisive importance for cooperative, communicative situations of provocation concerning other components of effective communication. Since language is a reflection of a person's inner state at a particular moment, the emotional state determines what and how the communicator will converse and perceive. In this regard, it can be argued that the emotional state is an essential factor influencing the success or failure of communication in general (Bartashova & Polyakova, 2009, p. 12). If the provocateur creates a positive emotional environment for the recipient, then, accordingly, the recipient will have more accessible and faster contact and interact with the provocateur.

The ability to successfully build a communicative process while maintaining harmonious interaction is integral to the provocateur's communicative competence. The cooperative, communicative situation within provocation is characterised by symmetrical relations between communicators, partnership, the balance of communicative statuses, efficiency and best value of communication, politeness on the part of the provocateur, and application of cooperative communication strategies. The provocateur treats the recipient as an equal participant in communication, which should be considered. Such relations, although equal, are cautious, based on the agreement of interests and intentions, because the provocateur first seeks to realise his/her communicative plan and this type of communicative behaviour helps on the whole. Cooperation entails achieving agreement and balance, resulting in increased efficiency and, consequently, the success of provocative communication. All of this affects the final result of communicative interaction and contributes to the successful achievement of the provocateur's communicative goal.

The following example illustrates the implementation of provocation in a cooperative, communicative situation:

[In the canteen] SHELDON: It's good, isn't it? See, this is fortuitous, finding you here. We need to talk, and you've been avoiding. Avoidance isn't good for anyone, Violet. VIOLET: I'm not avoiding you, Sheldon. I've been very busy, and I have a patient waiting. (Violet is starting to leave, but she notices Cooper). Hey, Cooper, you going back up? COOPER: Oh, good, you guys are talking. At least someone's talking. SHELDON: In fact we're not talking. VIOLET: We're talking, Sheldon. I love talking to you. I love spending time with you. I'm just... SHELDON: Busy. I know. COOPER (noticing kids playing): Cute kids. Over there, Sheldon. (Cooper winks at Violet) SHELDON: Ah. COOPER: Don't you think? SHELDON: I guess. In small doses. I'm not really a kid person. They don't seem to like me. COOPER: So you don't have kids of your own? SHELDON: No. God, no. Thankfully. COOPER: You must see them in your practice. I bet you're great with them. SHELDON: You know what I find? I'm okay with kids. In short bursts. Beyond that... Well, it's not a problem, is it? (Violet smiles) (Rhimes, 2008, Season 2, Episode 14).

The above-given conversation involves two speakers, Sheldon and Violet, who are a couple. Having learned the day before that she is pregnant, Violet reacts ambiguously to this, and she does not know how her boyfriend Sheldon will

perceive such news, so she simply avoids him. Cooper joins the conversation and, in fact, acts as a provocateur in this conversation. He is a close friend of the girl and knows she is pregnant. The provocateur (Cooper) chooses a hint strategy to carry out the provocation, i.e. to tactfully discover Sheldon's attitude towards children because Sheldon does not suppose that his girlfriend is pregnant. This communicative strategy clearly corresponds to the current situation, as some children were playing nearby. The provocateur took advantage of the situational context and proved an observant and intelligent communicator. The chosen hint strategy is implemented in the following speech tactics:

- attracting attention tactics (emphasis). The provocateur tries to draw the recipient's attention to the children playing nearby (*Cute kids. Over there, Sheldon*). This tactic turned out to be the key in this communicative situation. The provocateur achieves the communicative goal because the recipient immediately provides information about his attitude to children. Later in the conversation, the provocateur develops the given topic;

- interrogative tactics. With this, the provocateur tries to learn more (*So you don't have kids of your own?*). The provocation is realised in a cooperative way with a statement (*Cute kids. Over there, Sheldon*), which implicitly encourages the recipient to respond verbally (*I guess. In small doses. I'm not really a kid person. They don't seem to like me. I'm okay with kids. In short bursts*). Due to the neutral statement, the provocateur received the necessary information, adhering to polite communication.

In this case, the hint remained unrecognised to the recipient because he merely answered the question without presuming the hidden intention of the provocateur. Only the provocateur himself (Cooper) and the third participant in the dialogue (Violet) interpreted the hint of the provocateur, which is evident from non-verbal indicators, and this is what, in fact, the provocateur tried to

achieve. Non-verbal means are necessary for the implementation of the communicative strategy of the hint and play a supporting role. Nonverbal means of provocation expression are fulfilled in a kinesthetic way, including a meaningful look, eye contact and wink. A mark of a successful provocation is Violet's non-verbal smile, which is a gesture of approval because the communicative goal was achieved, i.e. the recipient provided the necessary information.

Since the provocation is carried out cooperatively, and the provocateur follows the principles of Politeness and Cooperation and adheres to communicative balance, the recipient smoothly comes into contact and provides the information the provocateur expects from him. This played a crucial role because, in this informal conversation, the recipient feels safe and willing to provide information without thinking about how to answer questions in order not to say too much or somehow hurt himself.

The provocateur demonstrates a cooperative type of communicative personality, as he treats the recipient positively and shows interest, friendliness, and a partnership communication style. Since the interlocutors are friends, the discourse occurs in conditions of social equality. Moreover, the provocateur appears to be a flexible communicator, as he managed to focus on a communicative situation and use the conditions and circumstances to his advantage. The recipient, in turn, also appears as a harmonious linguistic personality. Without communicative dominance on the part of the provocateur, the recipient does not feel the need to hide information; however, he is provoked without realising it due to insufficient ability to analyse the interlocutor's verbal behaviour. Thus, the provocateur's strategic plan proved to be successful and effective.

So, the hinting strategy, the purpose of which is to obtain the necessary information from the recipient, is implemented with a positive attitude and cooperative influence. The provocateur adheres to the communicative rules and tolerantly stimulates the speech activity of the recipient,

who, without feeling any inconvenience, willingly provides information and gets provoked.

However, the effectiveness of provocation can be achieved through communicative cooperation and contradictions, as uncooperative communicative behaviour of the provocateur or recipient may lead to communicative conflict. A. Zdravomyslov (1996) defines conflict as a vital element of human interaction in society. "This is a form of relations between potential or actual subjects of social interaction, whose motivation is based on conflicts in values, interests and needs" (Zdravomyslov, 1996, p. 96). This interpretation classifies conflict as an integral part of human existence. L. Chaika (2009) claims that the nature of verbal conflict is determined by non-verbal phenomena – information, situation, and activities of communicators (p. 133), so in conflict situations of provocative communication, there are not only differences in the communicative intentions of the provocateur and the recipient, but also inequality of communicative roles and social statuses. Conflict is also defined as "a normal manifestation of social ties and relationships between people, a way of interaction in the clash of incompatible views, positions and interests, confrontation of interconnected two or more parties who care about their own interests" (Vorozheikin, 2004, p. 36). Thus, the main feature of the conflict is the presence of opposing views, ideas, motives and interests.

The driving force of provocation is the motive and purpose according to which the provocateur plans his communicative actions in the way to achieve success and efficiency of speech activity, and depending on the intentions, the provocateur chooses an effective way. The provocateur's goal is to develop communication in the desired direction, so conflict situations of provocative speech are based on the principle of non-cooperation, there is a violation of the communication balance, disregard for the principles of Cooperation and Politeness, as well as application of confrontational communication strategies, negative attitude between communicators, differences in communicative competence, the experience of

interpersonal communication, etc. In such cases, provocative speech acquires special features: it is based on insidiousness, the desire to outwit the partner, personally control the situation, influence the emotions and verbal response of the recipient, etc.

The following example illustrates the implementation of provocation in a non-cooperative communicative situation:

MRS. FELDER: Marla came up to us in the lobby. She said, "I hope you experience the great joy I have," and then she left. It was bizarre. MR. FELDER: You work with the police, right? I mean, didn't they tell you this already? KAL: Yeah, but I wanted to hear this from you two. Mrs. Felder, do you have any idea why she would approach you like that? MRS. FELDER: No. KAL: Not true. MR. FELDER: We're gonna be late for the airport. KAL: Here. (Kal grabs the package, which Mrs Felder is holding). MRS. FELDER: (pulling the package back) No, I'll hold that. KAL: No, I'll get it. I'll get it. You know, you're never gonna get that through customs. MRS. FELDER: Why not? KAL: Because I'm gonna call them. I'm gonna tell them you got a suspicious package. That's the kind of pain in the ass I can be if I don't get the truth. MR. FELDER: Look, it was just a hunch. There's a fertility treatment centre here that matches egg donors with couples. We're from Canada, and it's illegal to purchase eggs there. MRS. FELDER: The donors stay anonymous, but they can choose to whom they want to donate. These are our frozen embryos. KAL: So you thought that Marla Seeger was your egg donor. MR. FELDER: Yeah, for a moment. But then we realised that it couldn't be her. She was nothing like the person the broker described to us (Baum, 2009, Season 2, Episode 3).

The above-given example illustrates a blackmail conversation between Kel (provocateur) and the Felders (recipients). Kel investigates the case of the American tourist Marla, who disappeared in Mexico. In order to find out information about her, the provocateur turned to Mr and Mrs Felder, whom Marla met on the eve of

her alleged disappearance. At the beginning of the conversation, one of the recipients tries to avoid contact and does not want to share information because he has his own reasons to do so. The couple came to Mexico to find a donor for fertilisation, and did not want to disclose this information, so they used a strategy of sabotage, which meets their pragmatic goal and is implemented in the following tactics:

- tactics of evading the answer (*You work with the police, right? I mean, didn't they tell you this already?* The recipient refers to other sources of information (the police) to avoid having to provide information);
- distancing tactics *(We're gonna be late for the airport)* to distance from the conversation.

Realising that the recipient is hiding specific facts, the provocateur, as a shrewd communicator applies a threat strategy, which is gradually embodied in the tactics of warning *(You know, you're never gonna get that through customs, I'm gonna tell them you got a suspicious package. That's the kind of pain in the ass I can be if I don't get the truth)*, which stimulates the verbal reaction of the recipient. The intentions of the provocateur, realised in the strategy of threat, do not coincide with the recipient's intentions, which is a sign of conflict in interpersonal interaction.

The strategy chosen by the provocateur is combined with proxemic nonverbal means to achieve effective language influence. The course of communication largely depends on the unique space between the interlocutors. The provocateur deliberately violates the distance and tries to take away the personal thing of the recipient (container with embryos), which is essential to him. The effective combination of verbal and nonverbal means plays a vital role in the interaction and has a positive effect on its outcome, as the recipient provides the desired information, which further helps in the search for the missing woman: *There's a fertility treatment centre here that matches egg donors with couples. We're from Canada, and it's illegal to buy eggs there. The*

donors stay anonymous, but they can choose to whom they want to donate. These are our frozen embryos.

During the communication, the provocateur ignores the principles of Politeness and Cooperation, which is inherent in a non-cooperative threat strategy. However, these deviations from the communicative rules do not prevent but, on the contrary, help the provocateur to achieve the desired communicative result – to get the necessary information. The provocateur acts as a conflict communicative personality because he does not consider his interlocutors' intentions. He is leading in the interaction process by employing language and non-language codes. The provocateur demonstrates an unfriendly attitude and a desire to subdue the interlocutor, putting the recipient in a hopeless situation. Regarding social roles, the provocateur occupies a higher position because the social role and status of the interrogator impact the development of the communicative situation, which gives certain advantages over the interlocutor. In particular, the provocateur has preliminary information about the conversation between the missing woman and has the opportunity to plan his speech activities, so the threat strategy he chose is one of his intentions, which proved to be effective.

The recipient also behaves as a conflict communicator, does not want to provide information, but cannot resist the provocateur and, due to a lack of communicative competence and the circumstances, gets provoked in the result. The strategic plan of the provocateur turned out to be more thoughtful, more robust, and more effective, as it ensured the optimal realisation of the communicative intentions of the provocateur.

Therefore, the conflict strategy is designed to implement the strategic intention, despite the violation of communicative balance and principles of communication. The higher social status of the provocateur provides the necessary level of influence to achieve the perlocutionary effect. Such verbal behaviour contradicts the cooperative interpersonal interaction, but the confrontational

actions and techniques of the provocateur do not prevent him from achieving the communicative goal.

Conclusion

Provocation as a specific type of communication is designed to obtain relevant information, i.e. when the provocateur converses not to convey specific information but rather to obtain it from the recipient. The basis of provocation is manipulative influence. In the communication process, the provocateur tries to influence the recipient, his/her opinion, and verbal behaviour to achieve the desired verbal reaction and information, though the real goal of the provocateur remains hidden from the recipient. The communicative interaction can be effective in case of precise planning of verbal actions by the provocateur, i.e., appropriate choice of strategies and tactics of communication as the optimum realisation of the provocateur's intentions in achieving a specific communicative aim. In addition, the successful course of provocative communication depends upon verbal and nonverbal means of effective implementation of the strategies and tactics, types of communicative personalities of both the provocateur and the recipient, their communication style and individual verbal traits and behaviour, prediction of the conflict causes and communicative failures, which can be an obstacle to the harmonisation of interaction.

Pursuing the communicative aim, the provocateur, as a skilful manipulator, can apply both cooperative and conflict strategies. When reporting something, the provocateur first thinks about the effectiveness of his message and, at the same time, takes into account different approaches that more or less correspond to the specific situation of communication. In some circumstances, the provocateur may realise his communicative intentions and plans, maintaining communicative balance. In other situations, the provocateur achieves them by violating the rules of interpersonal communication. Although, it is essential to mention that provocation can be effective in both contexts.

Conflict situations of provocative communication imply the use of appropriate confrontational speech strategies, disharmony of communication, lack of communicative balance, violation of the principles of Cooperation and Politeness, open domination over the communicative partner, and hostile manner of communication, which causes caution and apprehension on the part of the recipient. Nevertheless, the conflict can be regarded as rational and purposeful action since, due to the ability to consider and assess the situation, a provocateur plans his/her actions, conducts self-control, and monitors the verbal behaviour of the recipient. Therefore, conflict becomes a means of achieving the provocateur's goal.

In cooperative situations, the provocateur, as a rule, achieves a communicative goal while maintaining a balance of interpersonal relationships. Effective provocation is provided by the following factors: friendly interpersonal relations, following the principles of Politeness and Cooperation, partnership style of communication, favourable microclimate, the atmosphere of mutual understanding, and the optimal choice of cooperative strategies and tactics. However, it should be noted that cooperation on the part of the provocateur is at some point feigned, as his/her communicative intentions are a priority, and cooperative style contributes to the effectiveness of their implementation and the achievement of the communicative aim.

References

Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bartashova, O., & Polyakova, S. (2009). *Soblyudeniye i narusheniye printsipov rechevogo obshcheniya v situatsii delovoy kommunikatsii* (Compliance and violation of speech communication principles in situations of business communication, in Russian). Saint-Petersburg:

SPbSUE Publication.

Baum, S. (Director). (2009). *Lie to me.* [Film]. Retrieved from http://lie-to-me.hypno-web.net/quartier/taches-projets/script-vo-203.176.312/

Bityanova, M. (2001). *Sotsialnaya psikhologiya: nauka, praktika i obraz mysley* (Social psychology: Science, practice and way of thinking, in Russian). Moscow: Eksmo-Press.

Blakar, R. (1987). *Yazyk kak instrument sotsialnoy vlasti* (Language as an instrument of social power, in Russian). In V. V. Petrov (Ed.), *Yazyk i modelirovaniye sotsialnogo vzaimodeystviya (Language and Modelling of Social Interaction, in Russian)* (pp. 88-125). Moscow: Progress.

Bratman, M. (1987). *Intention, plans, and practical reason.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carnegie, D. (1936). *How to win friends and influence people.* U.S.: Simon & Schuster.

Chaika, L. (2009). *Verbalnyy konflikt: metodolohichni ta terminolohichni pytannya doslidzhennya* (Verbal conflict: Methodological and terminological research issues, in Ukrainian). *Visnyk Zhytomyrskoho derzhavnoho universytetu imeni I. Franka (Bulletin of Zhytomyr I. Franko. State University, in Ukrainian), 45,* 133-137.

Chaldini, R. (2010). *Psikhologiya vliyaniya* (Psychology of influence, in Russian). Moscow: Eksmo.

Denysiuk, Ye. (2003). *Manipulyativnoye rechevoye vozdeystviye: kommunikativno-pragmaticheskiy aspect* (Manipulative speech influence: Communicative and pragmatic aspect, in Russian) (PhD Dissertation, Ural State University named after A.M. Gorky, Russia, Yekaterinburg). Retrieved from http://psycholinguistik.narod.ru/olderfiles/5/DENISUK.pdf

Dijk van, T. A. (1989). *Yazyk. Poznaniye. Kommunikatsiya* (Language. Cognition. Communication, in Russian). (V. I. Gerasimov, Ed.). Moscow: Progress.

Dobrovich, A. (2000). *Anatomiya dialoga* (Anatomy of a dialogue, in Russian). In A. V. Morozov (Ed.), *Psikhologiya vliyaniya (The Psychology of Influence, in Russian)* (pp. 138-183). Saint-Petersburg: Peter.

Dotsenko, E. (1997). *Psikhologiya manipulyatsii: fenomeny, mekhanizmy i zashchita* (Psychology of manipulation: Phenomena, mechanisms and protection, in Russian). Moscow: MSU Publication.

Formanovskaia, N. (2002). *Rechevoye obshcheniye: kommunikativno-pragmaticheskiy podkhod* (Verbal communication: A communicative-pragmatic approach, in Russian). Moscow: Russian language.

Gavrilova, Ye. (2015). *Struktura rechevogo vozdeystviya* (Structure of language influence, in Russian). *Vestnik Novgorodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni Yaroslava Mudrogo (Bulletin of the Yaroslav the Wise Novgorod State University, in Russian), 87,* 145-148.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. *Syntax and Semantics, 3,* 41-58.

Ishmuratov, A. (1996). *Konflikt i zhoda. Osnovy kognityvnoyi teoriyi konfliktiv* (Conflict and consent. Fundamentals of cognitive conflict theory, in Ukrainian). Kyiv: Naukova dymka.

Issers, O. (2008). *Kommunikativnye strategii i taktiki russkoy rechi* (Communication strategies and tactics of Russian speech, in Russian). Moscow: LKI Publication.

Karasik, V. (2004). *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs* (Language circle: Personality, concepts, discourse, in Russian). Moscow: Gnosis.

Kozlova, V. (2014). *Movlennyevyi vplyv v anhlomovnomu parentalnomu dyskursi* (Speech influence in English parental discourse, in Ukrainian). *Naukovi*

zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu "Ostrozka akademiya" (Scientific Notes of the National University "Ostroh Academy"), 48, 198-200.

Krasnykh, V. (2001). *Osnovy psikholingvistiki i teorii kommunikatsii* (Fundamentals of psycholinguistics and communication theory, in Russian). Moscow: Gnosis.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* New York: Longman Linguistic Library.

Leontiev, A. (2003). *Osnovy psikholingvistiki* (Fundamentals of psycholinguistics, in Russian). Moscow: Smysl.

Makarov, M. (2003). *Osnovy teorii diskursa* (Foundations of discourse theory, in Russian). Moscow: Gnozys.

Maltseva, V. (2007). *Obshcheniye kak vozdeystviye i dialog* (Communication as influence and dialogue, in Russian). *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta (Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University, in Russian), 15*(93), 80-88.

Negryshev, A. (2009). *Aspekty rechevogo vozdeystviya v novostyakh SMI* (Aspects of speech impact in media news, in Russian). Vladimir: VSHU.

Rhimes, S. (Director). (2008). *Private Practice.* [Film]. Retrieved from http://www.addic7ed.com/serie/Private_Practice/2-/14/Second_Chances

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selivanova, O. (2006). *Suchasna lingvistyka* (Modern linguistics, in Ukrainian). Poltava: Dovkillia-K.

Semeniuk, O. & Parashchuk, V. (2009). *Osnovy teoriyi movnoyi komunikatsiyi* (Fundamentals of the theory of language com-

munication, in Ukrainian). Kyiv: In Yure.

Sheinov, V. (2003). *Psikhologiya vlasti* (Psychology of power, in Russian). Moscow: Os.

Shiriaiev, Ye. (1996). *Kultura russkoy rechi i effektivnost obshcheniya* (The culture of Russian speech and the effectiveness of communication, in Russian). Moscow: Nauka.

Shostrom, E. (1992). *Anti-Karnegi ili chelovek-manipulyator* (Anti-Carnegie or man-manipulator, in Russian). Minsk: Polifakt.

Skovorodnikov, A., & Kopnina, G. (2012). *Sposoby manipulyativnogo rechevogo vozdeystviya v rossiyskoy presse* (Methods of manipulative speech influence in the Russian press, in Russian). *Politicheskaya lingvistika (Political Linguistics, in Russian), 3*(41), 36-42.

Sternin, I. (2001). *Vvedeniye v rechevoye vozdeystviye* (Introduction to language influence, in Russian). Voronezh: Kvarta.

Tarasova, I. (1993). *Struktura lichnosti kommunikanta i rechevoye vozdeystviye* (The structure of the communicant's personality and speech impact, in Russian). *Voprosy yazykoznaniya (Issues of Linguistics), 5*, 70-81.

Vorozheikin, I. (2004). *Konfliktologiya* (Conflictology, in Russian). Moscow: Infra-M.

Yashenkova, O. (2010). *Osnovy teorii movnoi komunikatsii* (Fundamentals of the theory of modern communication, in Ukrainian). Kyiv: Academiya.

Zdravomyslov, A. (1996). *Sotsiologiya konflikta* (Sociology of conflict, in Russian). Moscow: Aspect-Press.