

How to Cite:

Koroliova, V., Hurko, O., Popova, I., Holikova, N., & Maiboroda, N. (2021). Communicative sabotage, suicide and avoidance as evidences of communicative discomfort: Based on modern Ukrainian plays. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 1187-1201.
<https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS4.1757>

Communicative Sabotage, Suicide and Avoidance as Evidences of Communicative Discomfort: Based on Modern Ukrainian Plays

Valeria Koroliova

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Olena Hurko

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Iryna Popova

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Nataliia Holikova

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Nataliia Maiboroda

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

Abstract---Purpose of the study: The purpose of the article is to compare and distinguish between the communication phenomena of sabotage, suicide, and avoidance displayed in the speech of characters of modern Ukrainian plays; to define them as communicative tactics that do not always violate communicative comfort and lead to conflict in communication; to characterize the main communicative goals and maxims affected by these communicative tactics. The key methods of the study, in addition to general scientific ones, were such dedicated linguistic methods as contextual and situational, speech and action analysis of communicative sabotage, suicide, and avoidance, as well as the method of structural and pragmatic analysis to provide characteristics of speech abnormal behavior of characters in modern Ukrainian plays, to identify of the consequences of communicative sabotage, suicide, and avoidance. The tactics violating the rules of the communication code are communicative sabotage, communicative suicide, and communicative avoidance. Communicative sabotage is mainly used by characters in a negative psychoemotional state as a way to express irritation and contempt, which causes changes in the focus of communication and hinders the achievement of the objective, informative and communicative goals of communication.

Linguistics and Culture Review © 2021.

Corresponding author: Hurko, O.; Email: hurko8226@lund-univer.eu

Manuscript submitted: 27 July 2021, Manuscript revised: 18 Oct 2021, Accepted for publication: 09 Nov 2021

Keywords---communication code, communicative situation, communicative tactics, cooperation principle, politeness principle.

Introduction

A conflict is the main genre feature of a play and the driving force behind the drama's evolvement. Despite the combination of baroque, romantic, realistic types of conflict in modern dramatic works, as well as the mundane theme of artistic conflicts devoid of acuity, brightness, and depth, the communication of modern dramatic discourse is usually tense and uncomfortable, which is motivated by generic communicative intentions of the actors, as well as due to social, intellectual, age and gender aspects. The growing level of aggression in modern society also affects the representation of this trend in plays. Taking into account the fact that the communicative environment of the modern plays' characters is limited to everyday communication, and the chronotopic structure – to modern or recent time, it becomes logical to reflect in the dialogues of characters the aggressive speech behavior characteristic of modern people in everyday communication, affecting communicative comfort (Cornelius & Faire, 1992; Ilie, 2021; Suima, 2017).

Pragmatics models the functioning of all communicative acts down to certain principles and postulates that communicators must use to achieve certain results. The main principles shaping successful communication are the well-known principles of cooperation and politeness. The cooperative principle is determined by the partners' interest in the effectiveness of information transfer, which determines the coordination of communicators' speech activity, the avoidance of communicatively incompatible speech acts. This principle suggested by G.P. Grice, postulates: one's communicative contribution at a certain stage of the dialogue should be such as is required by the mutually accepted purpose and direction (Grice, 1985). The cooperative principle has been implemented in the maxims of conversation, which determine the degree of communication cooperation (the maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner). The cooperative principle presupposes observance of the politeness principle suggested by G. Leech and aimed at ensuring the harmonization of information exchange and conflict prevention (Leech, 2016). The politeness principle and the cooperative principle are functionally intersected, while creating a communicative code, as they regulate the social behavior of communicators, including communicative activities.

Among the principles of conflict-free communication I. Sternin singles out the patience principle (the conversation partner is right, even if he/she is not), the principle of favorable self-presentation (try to please the conversation partner), the positive principle (minimize negative information) (Sternin, 2015). Politeness is interpreted as a principle of social interaction, based on respect for the partners, taking into account their interests, and willingness to assist. The perception of politeness as a set of rules and norms is associated primarily with the names of Goffman (1972); Lakoff (1982); Leech (2016). The latter considers politeness as a specific strategy of speech behavior aimed at preventing conflict situations (Leech, 2016).

The politeness principle is implemented in conversation through various maxims, in particular the maxims of tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. Each of the six maxims of the politeness principle consists of two submaxima: a positive maxim, aimed at preserving the "positive face", and a negative one, which meets the needs of the "negative face". The term "face", introduced by E. Goffman, is interpreted as a positive social value, established by each interlocutor in the process of communication with others, and recognized by others (Goffman, 1972). The communicative activity supports or threatens a positive face (the addressee's desire to be accepted and approved as a social personality) and a negative face (the addressee's need to be independent, to have his own space). The "face" theory motivates distinguishing between positive and negative politeness. Adherence to positive politeness is conditioned by the demonstration of the unity of the speaker with the listener and can be found in the expression of interest in the communicative partners, taking into account their desires and interests. Negative politeness considers the feeling of freedom of the other person and is aimed at ensuring that the speaker is not obtrusive and too emotional, does not offend the listener (Goffman, 1972).

At the same time, the generic features of drama, which is characterized by the tension of action, stipulate constant ignoring of the cooperative and politeness principles in the conversation of characters. Observance of positive and negative politeness can often be noticed in characters' conversations only at the level of speech-stimulus and speech response. Long-term use of politeness maxims in dramatic communication contradicts both the generic principles of drama and everyday oral communication in general. In the dramatic dialogues, the rules of communicative code frequently break the methods of communicative sabotage, communicative suicide, and communicative evasiveness which have become the object of our research in the article (Palarivattom & Kochunni, 2015; Masrul, 2018). At the same time it is necessary to put a question: do such violations always cause discomfort in communication? Could it be possible to consider automatically the communication as being uncomfortable if the communicative sabotage, the communicative suicide, or the communicative evasiveness are included in the dialogues? We have attempted to understand exactly this phenomenon in our article.

Literature Review

The optimal communication is determined as a successful one, but the communicative discomfort provoked by the communicative and anomalous phenomena is observed if the deviations from the general line of the development of dialogue or the violations of the dialogical behavioral regulations appear. N. Bolochontseva determines the phenomenon of communicative discomfort as a state of uncomfortable communication that, in case of its prologation, causes a conflict that can turn into a communicative failure – a negative result when the aim of communication is not reached. The situation of communicative discomfort arises when during the communication there are the available lines that complicate the realization of some communicative intentions or expectations of interlocutors (Bolochontseva, 2010). The appearance of communicative discomfort is caused by the breach of positive and negative politeness.

The basic maxims that determine the positive and negative politeness forming the comfort atmosphere of communication are the maxim of tact (it regulates the limits of personal space); the maxim of magnanimity (it protects the interlocutors from prevailing in the process of communication); the maxim of approval (it means a positive assessment of other people); the maxim of modesty (it envisages the non-acceptance of praise on oneself); the maxim of concord (it lies in unoppositeness); the maxim of sympathy (it demonstrates the anxiety about some interests, desires, and necessities of a communicative partner). The violation of the last maxim preventing a conflict during a communication becomes the consequence of the communicative anomalous actions that cause the communicative discomfort (Lindblom, 2001; Shostak & Gillespie, 2014). Foremost, communicative sabotage is brought into correlation with these actions.

T. Nikolaeva, who introduced the term into linguistics, thinks that it is an expression that can help to manipulate the mass consciousness, she distinguishes four possible varieties: imposing one's opinion, refusing to provide an expected answer to a question, wishing for avoiding the theme of communication, wishing for offending an interlocutor (Nikolaeva, 1990). V. Andreyeva compares communicative sabotage with language opposition, communicative failure, manipulation, speech demagoguery, conflict, speech aggression and regards the phenomenon as unifying, but not identical to them (Andreyeva, 2009). O. Dotsenko presents communicative sabotage as a method of informative pressure on an interlocutor, it is a reaction of an addressee to a remark of a sender, in which the previous remark is ignored, and new content is introduced in the answer (Dotsenko, 1997). In this way, the maxims of tact, magnanimity, and sympathy are broken by a speaker. O. Yarenchuk marks that it is important to analyze the communicative sabotage in three aspects "language – perception – thinking" (Yarenchuk, 2013).

To the semantic sabotage A. Fleishman adds derision, the distraction of an interlocutor from the theme of his story, interruption, unexpected pause in communication, violation of accuracy of an interlocutor, objection to the point from the speech of an interlocutor (Fleishman, 1967). Among the basic tactics of sabotage X. Kornelius and Ch. Fair call threat, order, negative criticism, touchy nicknames, concealment of important information, interrogation, praise with an underlying message, display of reasons of behavior, inopportune advice, refusal from a discussion of the problem, rivalry. To our opinion, the term "communicative sabotage" accurately calls the deviant processes in the communication directed at the violation of communicative comfort and rules of communication. In the researches of the scientists–non-slavicists these phenomena are called equivocal communication (Kline et al., 2008; Lamour, 2021), communicative aggression (D'Errico et al., 2017; KAJI et al., 2017), the refusal to communicate (Wright, 2018), the mobbing strategy (Minibas-Poussard, 2018), the verbal violence (Nieto et al., 2018; Rosenthal et al., 2018), and so on.

It should be noted that the researchers do not give the accurate categorical determination of the phenomenon, characterizing the communicative sabotage as the communicative strategy (Suima, 2017), the communicative tactics (Khomenko, 2014), the communicative method (Pavlyk & Vusyk, 2021), the speech genre (Andreyeva, 2009). To our opinion, communicative sabotage is a

transitional tactic between the strategies of manipulation and speech aggression as it can verbalize each of these confrontational strategies. The tactics of communicative sabotage is used for the hidden counteraction in a dialogue, which is why the situations without any contradiction and conflict are not determined as the communicative sabotage, but as the communicative evasiveness that is caused, first of all, by the external factors. Investigating the communicative tactics of evasiveness in the political discourse, O. Ponomarenko determines it as a certain speech act, in which the politicians practically realize the strategic intention to avoid the clear expression of thought with the help of one or several verbal and nonverbal methods (Ponomarenko, 2004). Another display of discomfort communication is the inappropriate beginning of the communicative act, which E. Kluyev has fairly called the communicative suicide, i. e. an appreciable error that at once makes the communication uneffective (Kluyev, 2002).

Materials and Methods

In the process of research the complex methods of scientific analysis have been used, in particular: an interpretive and analytical method, on its basis the theoretical sources with the use of synthesis, analysis, systematization, and so on have been studied; a method of theoretical generalization which has promoted the formulation of conclusions; a contextual and situational method used by speakers for the exposure of discomfort communicative situations and also for the analysis of reasons in the application of tactics of communicative sabotage, suicide, and evasiveness; a method of linguistic, divided into acts analysis of communicative sabotage, suicide, and evasiveness; a method of structural and pragmatic analysis for the descriptions of the linguistic and anomalous behavior of characters in the modern Ukrainian plays as well as for the exposure of consequences in the application of communicative sabotage, suicide, and evasiveness (Cherry, 1988; Ryabova, 2015; Jary, 1998).

Results and Discussion

One of the brightest reasons of communicative discomfort communication is communicative sabotage – the tactics of speech influence on an interlocutor that provides the hidden resistance and is directed at the ignoring of the communicative partner. Communicative sabotage does not arise spontaneously, it is used by an addressee during a psychological attack in the line of an interlocutor. It is exactly in such a psychological and emotional condition that the negative emotions resulting in speech aggression prevail at a communicator. Communicative sabotage does not become a method of self-defense, instead, it becomes a way of expressing indignation, irritation, neglect (Holtgraves & Perdew, 2016; Abdi et al., 2010). Mostly, communicative sabotage is used as a test for a certain problem or an appeal to the action, in this case, a communicative partner does not receive a direct answer that breaks the maxims of consent, magnanimity, tact, and sympathy. We intend to analyze the main methods of expression of the tactics of sabotage used in the dialogues of personages from modern Ukrainian plays.

- The answer to the question is in the form of a question, for example:

Baz (dials a number on the mobile phone). Hello, girl, is that you? How is it going? How is study, how are your telephone psychos?

Mila. Did anything happen to you? Do you have anyone else?

Baz. Why do you think so? I just wanted to call you (N. Liutenko «Panda»), (Liutenko, 2014).

In the given telephone conversation consisting of seven sentences, six are interrogative. That is, at the very beginning of communication, both communicators ignore the partner's questions and ask instead of responding.

- Negative constructions, for example:

Andrii. Bandit! That's who you are.

Ostap. A soldier who shed his blood for Ukraine.

Andriy. You beat the Germans, you were sitting at Hitler's ass, warming yourselves.

Ostap. But you know nothing.

Andriy. I don't know... And I don't want to know (P. Arie «Glory to the Heroes»).

In the above dialogue, Ostap's last utterance contains a call for further explanation and additional information about certain events, which is sabotaged by communicator Andrii who uses the constructions with the negative particle no.

- Negatively colored emotional and evaluative vocabulary, for example:

Vasyl. Yes, I always put «notches» in the diary, and then I take everything into account when donating to church. Hard, how hard the work is. Whoever says anything (squints at Zina).

Zina. You can't hear a more stupid thing. Baptism is virtual. Virtual churches, icons, crosses, life. Maybe a pope is virtual, and alcoholic Kolia sits there and gives his blessings from behind «a nalyvaika» (Lana Ra «Witches' Time»), (Ra, 2012).

Communicator Zina, violating the maxims of sympathy, tact, approval and consent, evaluates the information of communicator Vasyl in a sharply negative way, using invective vocabulary (a stupid thing, an alcoholic, «a nalyvaika»).

- The use of sarcasm, for example:

Frau Krage. My life is already under your complete control. (Unsatisfactorily). We're going to have peppered bacon for dinner today.

Helena. But...

Frau Krage (raised her voice). I said – bacon. Go ahead, cook (she pointed at the kitchen).

Helena. Then I need to go to the city...

Frau Krage. Don't I have any bacon in the fridge?

Helena. You do not have pills for gastritis attacks... Which will definitely occur at around two o'clock in the morning (N. Doliak «Gastarbeiters' Seasons»). (Doliak, 2012)

Communicator Helen is unable to stop communicator Frau Krage from a certain action and resorts to a sabotage tactic, using sarcasm as a means of protest against the communicative partner's intentions, violating the maxims of sympathy and consent. In modern plays, we quite often detect a combination of different linguistic manifestations of communicative sabotage in one dialogue, this causes discomfort in communication and often ends in communicative conflict, for example:

Christina. I'm leaving.

Felix. Will you call?

Christina. Why?

Felix. I don't know.

Christina. Idiot! (Runs out) (V. Kharaman «War»). (Kharaman, 2011).

In the given condensed dialogue, both partners use the sabotage tactic, verbalized in negative constructions (I don't know), feedback questions (Why?), negative evaluation vocabulary (Idiot!). As a result, the dialogue ends abruptly and the goals of communication are not achieved due to the violation of the maxim of sympathy, approval, and tact. The participants of the dialogue, using the tactic of communicative sabotage, do not want to continue the conversation, as they do not consider the topic to be worth discussing, and sometimes express an emotional reaction to their stimulative utterance which initiates the beginning of a conversation. For example:

Vira. And what did you dream of?

Mitia. Of women. I dreamed of different women living in different countries. Some of them were black, others just like you, different, different women with full open lips. I am a traveler on the main road, and they meet me, each meets in their own way, and no one gets angry, says a bad word, seeing me they only open their full wet lips and smile with their eyes like big good and humble animals.

Vira. Well, I don't know what to tell you. I didn't think that's what you dream of, otherwise I wouldn't ask. Why are you telling me this? (M. Nikitiuk «Dachas») (Nikitiuk, 2011).

In some cases, communicative sabotage may indicate reluctance of the one who sabotages to continue the topic of the conversation or communication in general, for example:

Death. And the formula you have is good. But you think wrong. A small error. A small nuance that you've missed.

Peter. Which?

Death. Which- which! I will not say! (O. Taniuk «Avva and Death»), (Taniuk, 2007).

In the above dialogue, the reluctance of one of the communicators to have a conversation in a certain thematic direction is verbalized through a negative sentence I will not say! This method of a speech impact expresses hidden resistance and aims to ignore the content of the statement so as to avoid communication. Note that within the dramatic discourse authors use communicative sabotage as a marker of a character's unprepared speech, spontaneity and emotionality of reactions.

A communicative sabotage tactic is used by communicators to change the direction of communication which is proposed by a communicative partner. As a result, communicative comfort is under strain primarily due to violations of the rules of communication (the principles of cooperation and courtesy). At the same time, communicative sabotage hinders the achievement of the main goals of communication: informative, which consists in conveying information to a partner and obtaining confirmation that it has been received; substantive, which lies in inquiry, getting something, change in an interlocutor's behavior; communicative, which consists in the formation of harmonious relations with an interlocutor. The tactic of communicative sabotage primarily affects the achievement of the objective goal of communication: the requests and appeals of one of the partners are ignored by the other participants of communication (Rohr & Rahman, 2015; Felemban, 2012; Zu, 2021). However, if such communicative actions do not disturb the communicative balance, then communication can be considered comfortable because informative and communicative goals will be achieved in this case. Under such circumstances, communicative situations in which a communicator uses the change of the topic of conversation or the evasion of the question, without disturbing the communicative balance, we do not consider uncomfortable due to the tactic of communicative sabotage. In such dialogues, it is worth talking about the tactic of evasion, the purpose of which is often to maintain conflict-free and comfortable communication (Kovalenko et al., 2021; Fatikhova & Ziatdinova, 2021).

J. P. Forgas & M. Cromer state a speaker's emotional mood influences the phenomenon of evasion, in particular, negative emotions increase the number of evasive phrases in speech. The degree of the conflict of the situation also has a significant impact: the sharper the conflict is the more evasion in the communicators' speech (Forgas & Cromer, 2004). The communicative tactic of evasion is defined as a way to implement verbal and nonverbal means of strategic intention to completely or partially avoid transferring communicatively significant information, to abdicate responsibility for its accuracy, or convey implicitly while trying not to disturb the communicative balance. Within the limits of communicative evasion, the methods of full and partial information blocking can be distinguished. Communicative evasion is realized under the condition of violation of one of the postulates or the general principle of cooperation, as a result of which there is a refusal of cooperation (complete evasion) or blocking of communication (partial evasion). In the first case, it is appropriate to say about the tactics of communicative sabotage, which causes communicative discomfort during communication.

The communicative technique of complete blocking of information provides for a complete refusal to provide it, for example:

Helena. So be it. Imagination, dreams are already something. What have you got? What do you have? I'm asking you.

Oleg. Do not ask me!

Helena. I'm asking.

Oleg. What the hell, who are you and who gave you such a right to ask? (A. Pogrebinska "The Ninth Lunar Day"), (Pogrebinska, 2004)

The communicative technique of partial blocking of information, as opposed to a complete refusal of communication, can be implemented in some ways aimed at avoiding the provision of the necessary information or its distortion, for example

Father (to Valentina and Vladislav). He will not repeat what has been said before to Arnold, because I see from your behavior that you have agreed among yourself.

Valentine. And you won't say anything at all?

Father. In addition, I am glad for you (V. Tarasenko "Buy a moon track"), (Tarasenko, 2011).

Communicant Father, refusing to provide the information needed to communicative partners, at the same time expresses emotional support, trying to avoid communicative discomfort. Violating the maxima of consent, the Father adheres to the maxima of sympathy and tact. We stress examples when communicators use alternately both types of communicative evasiveness, which increases the feeling of discomfort in communication, for example:

Prosecutor. Working methods.

Grace Kelly. I will not answer.

Prosecutor. Do you understand that you are responsible for 263 terrorist acts, the victims of which were 22 ministers, 33 governors-general, governors and vice-governors, 16 mayors, chiefs of police, prosecutors, 7 generals and admirals, 4 attempted assassinations on the president? Working methods!

Grace Kelly. Believe it or not, but like everyone else. Same as in others. We were no different from others. Absolutely nothing (M. "Who Framed Grace Kelly?") (M, 2013).

Violation of the general principle of cooperation and the maxim of sympathy is the most categorical way of evasiveness: evasiveness is realized through a complete refusal to continue communication. This method is unsuccessful for the development of communication since it often leads to misunderstanding and verbal aggression on the part of the listener (Radovanović, 2020). The use of this method of evasion through sabotage tactics indicates the non-cooperative direction of the communicant and uncomfortable communication, for example:

Marco. Galya, I can't even believe that we are on the train. You can imagine that we are now sitting by the oven, where the fire is quietly blazing.

Galina. I can not. By the way, you, Marco, have a ring on your hand.

Marco. As they say, the time has come ...

Galina. You see. And you fantasizing about some oven.

Marco. And what is forbidden in this?

Galya (rises). It's time to sleep. I climbed to my top shelf (E. Mykolaichuk-Nizovets "Kashtan and Lily of the Valley").

The communicant Galina does not want to continue the topic of the conversation because of the courtship of Mark and, having chosen the tactics of sabotage, verbally and non-verbally makes it clear to the communicative partner that the conversation is over. A more effective way to maintain comfortable communication is to violate only a single maxima, provided that the general principle of cooperation and communication rules are observed. J. Yule notes that despite the fact that speakers cannot comply with certain rules, they "demonstrate attempts

to comply with them” (Yule, 1996). In this case, the implementation of evasiveness occurs through the tactics of evasiveness with a constant demonstration of cooperative behavior. The listener is not always aware of this and sometimes is not able to identify the true goals and motives of the speaker.

Matthew. Yeah, I've just had a taste of it! So did you really hang out in the zone? Wow, bro! Then respect for you! I have a couple of clients in Lviv, so they also slurped official porridge! Cool guys, I'm telling you! I learned life from them!

Warm. We will not talk about this now. I might tell you more about this page of my biography later. And meanwhile – here you have just arrived here, in America. How do you feel here?

Matthew. But I've just arrived a couple of hours. But in general this America is wow - clean, everyone has good cars, new ones. Such houses are standing along the road, big, beautiful (A. Irvanets "Once Upon a Time in America").

Communicant Warm uses tactics of communicative evasion, violating the maxima of consent. At the same time, changing the topic of conversation does not cause communicative discomfort, as evidenced by the last remark of Matthew. It should be noted that in the case of implicit transmission of information (hint, irony, etc.), the violation of the communicative code concerns only the literal meaning of the utterance, and not the “deep” meaning of the message, corresponding to the penseses of successful communication. In this case, while verbalizing the tactics of evasiveness through the method of partial blocking of information, the principles of cooperation and politeness are not aroused and comfort in communication is maintained.

Another tactic that can violate the communicative code of communication in the dialogues of modern plays is communicative suicide. According to N. Kovalskaya and G. Dzhunusalieva, communicative suicide is a gross mistake made in communication, which immediately makes further communication ineffective in advance (Dzhunusalieva & Kovalskaya, 2011). Such tactics can render further information exchange ineffective. For example, phrases like «*You won't believe it! It is impossible to believe in it! It looks like a lie*», adopted at the beginning of a statement, provoke doubts among the addressee about the veracity of the information provided by the addresser, and affect the effectiveness of communication:

Eugene. Martha, you won't believe me, it`s happened.

Martha. What`s happened?

Eugene. Remember, last month I went to donate sperm as a donor.

Martha. Well, there is nothing to brag about. What, they didn't accept it, because it's not oily? (V. Pachovsky "Bitches Brew (There will be no peace for you all!))".

In the submitted dialogue, the stimulus replica of the interlocutor Eugene, containing a communicatively incorrect phrase, evokes irony in the reactive replica of the second interlocutor Martha and indicates further rejection of information, which makes communication ineffective. In other examples, the tactics of communicative suicide used in everyday communication, on the contrary, programs the listener to perceive unexpected information and react to it, for example:

Maksim. Kostya, you have to help me to protect my freedom!
Kostya (worried). What have you done?!
Maksim. You will not believe! Fucked a woman!
Kostya (worried). Did she write a rape report ?!
Maxim (laughs). What do you think I'm a sex maniac ?!
Kost realizes that he's on the slippery slope and is keeping silent.
Maksym. Kost, you have to help protect my freedom from this woman!
Kost looks at him questioningly.
Maksym. To cut it short, Ira told me yesterday that she's knocked up! (G. Legka "Who were you in a past life?").

While analyzing the above dialogue, we see that Kostya's response to the tactics of communicative sabotage of Maxim was the most categorical conclusion about the rape committed by the communication partner. That is, the information presented in this way caused a reactive result and the expectation of confirmation of the worst news, which turned out to be untrue. Therefore, the communicative suicide tactics led to erroneous conclusions and the informative speech goal was not achieved.

Another example of communicative suicide may be etiquette cliché such as *"Sorry for taking your time". "It's not very important, but..." "It won't take much time!"* Such phrases set the focus of the listener to the fact that the following information is not necessary, and it can be annoying because it takes time. Note that such cliché may not activate the negative perception of further information only informal communication, provided that the conversation partners have unequal social roles, for example: a manager – a subordinate, socially higher status – socially lower status. For example:

Sergeant (leaves, but immediately returns). I apologize for being a distraction, but I can't leave without offering to restore holy justice.
She. You may offer.
Sergeant. My godchild's father is famous – he's the captain of the traffic police, and I have even held preliminary negotiations. This is the idea: your boyfriend, I'm sorry, your husband shall write a statement that he was made drunk, robbed and lost the car...
She. Stop! This matter is settled, holy justice has been met, and here is for the suggestion- please, take it (gives him a banknote) (Y. Vereshchak "The Beggar Detective"), (Vereshchak, 2014).

In the analyzed dramas, dialogues mainly represent everyday communication, so such a communicative suicide is not always justified by Ukrainian conversational etiquette. Sometimes this tactic is used by the speakers who understand in advance the inefficiency of communication and the impossibility of achieving the informational purpose of communication, for example:

Katia (coming to her senses, grabs the phone). Well, look at us, Karas!
Taras. Like in a movie! If I told the dudes, they would not believe the story.
Katya. And my old ladies would say I'm too cool for school (V. Serdiuk & V. Kozheliianko "Playdough Meta").

Thus, the use of tactics of communicative sabotage, communicative avoidance and communicative suicide by the characters of modern Ukrainian plays does not condition the communication discomfort. The violation of the cooperative and politeness principles with these tactics may not cause an imbalance in communication, provided that all communication partners are set up for cooperative interaction (Rinartha et al., 2018; Benda et al., 2006).

Conclusion

Considering conflict as a driving force in the development of drama, it is natural for the characters of a play to actively use the tactics that violate the rules of the communication code, including communicative sabotage, communicative suicide, and communicative avoidance. Communicative sabotage is mostly used by the characters in a negative psychoemotional state as a means of expressing irritation and contempt. Communicative sabotage causes changes in the focus of communication proposed by the partner and hinders the achievement of substantive, informative, and communicative goals of communication. Provided that communicative comfort is maintained and that informative and communicative goals are achieved, sabotage tactics are replaced by communicative avoidance tactics. The tactics of avoidance represent the method of partial blocking of information, and the tactics of communicative sabotage imply a total refusal to communicate. Communicative suicide is a stimulus that violates communication rules. This tactic mainly causes discomfort during the communication of the characters of modern dramatic works, which results in erroneous conclusions or information imperception by the communication partner, which the suicide tactics were aimed at. The only communicative situation in which communicative suicide causes no discomfort is formal business communication when the phrases verbalizing the suicide tactics are the etiquette clichés.

Thus, we can conclude that the availability of tactics of communicative sabotage, suicide, and avoidance does not make the situation a priori uncomfortable. The availability of/no comfort during a conversation makes it possible to distinguish between the tactics of communicative sabotage and communicative avoidance. The prospects of further studies are, in our opinion, in the studies of gender features of the application of tactics of communicative sabotage, communicative avoidance, and communicative suicide in modern dramatic works.

References

- Abdi, R., Rizi, M. T., & Tavakoli, M. (2010). The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse. *Journal of pragmatics*, 42(6), 1669-1679. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.11.001>
- Andreeva, V. (2009). Strategies and tactics of communicative sabotage: thesis of candidate of philology sciences. Kursk: Kursk State University
- Benda, J., Longtin, A., & Maler, L. (2006). A synchronization-desynchronization code for natural communication signals. *Neuron*, 52(2), 347-358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2006.08.008>
- Bolokhontseva, N. M. (2010). The phenomenon of false communicative comfort and imaginary communicative conflict-free. *Scientific Bulletin of the Voronezh*

- State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering. Series: Modern Linguistic and Methodological-Didactic Research, 14, 163–172.
- Cherry, R. D. (1988). Politeness in written persuasion. *Journal of pragmatics*, 12(1), 63-81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(88\)90020-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(88)90020-3)
- Cornelius, H., & Faire, S. (1992). Everyone Can Win: How to Resolve Conflict. East Roseville. NSW: Simon & Schuster.
- D'Errico, F., Poggi, I., & Corriero, R. (2017). The leader's voice and communicative aggression in social media. In *Verbale Aggression* (pp. 357-376). De Gruyter.
- Doliak, N. (2012). astarbajterky [Migrant workers]. *Kharkiv, Klub simejnoho dozvillia Publ.*
- Dotsenko, E. L. (1997). Psychology of manipulation: phenomena, mechanisms and protection. Moscow: CheRo, Moscow State University.
- Dzhunusalieva, GD, & Kovalskaya, NA (2011). Communicative deviations in the context of the theory of speech communication. *Scientific journal of the National Pedagogical University named after MP Drahomanov. Series 9: Current trends in language development*, (6), 68-71.
- Fatikhova, D. R., & Ziiatdinova, E. M. (2021). Communicative model as an institutionalization factor for a local self-government in the Russian Federation: By the example of local self-government bodies in the Republic of Tatarstan. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 697-703. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS3.1627>
- Flemban, F. H. (2012). Building up learners' communicative competence: The politeness principle. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 70-76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.070>
- Fleishman, A. (1967). How to sabotage a meeting. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, 341-344.
- Forgas, J. P., & Cromer, M. (2004). On being sad and evasive: Affective influences on verbal communication strategies in conflict situations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(4), 511-518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2003.06.005>
- Goffman, E. (1972). On face work: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction'1955. *ders.: Interaction Ritual. Essays on face-to-face behaviour, London.*
- Grice, G. P. (1985). Logic and Speech Communication. New in Foreign Linguistics. Moscow: Progress, 1985. Issue. Xvi. *Linguistic pragmatics*, 217-237.
- Holtgraves, T., & Perdeu, A. (2016). Politeness and the communication of uncertainty. *Cognition*, 154, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2016.05.005>
- Ilie, C. (2021). Evasive answers vs. aggressive questions. *Questioning and Answering Practices across Contexts and Cultures*, 323, 35.
- Jary, M. (1998). Relevance theory and the communication of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(1), 1-19. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(98\)80005-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)80005-2)
- KAJI, I. S., Arefi, M., AQAEI, J. A., ASLI, A. M., & Farhadi, T. (2017). Comparison of cognitive empathy in students with relational and explicit aggression.
- Kharaman, V. (2011). War.
- Khomenko, Y. (2014). Communicative sabotage is one of the reasons for an unsuccessful communal act. *Philological Studios*, 1, 118–122.
- Kline, S. L., Simunich, B., & Weber, H. (2008). Understanding the effects of nonstraightforward communication in organizational discourse: The case of

- equivocal messages and corporate identity. *Communication Research*, 35(6), 770-791.
- Klyuev, E. V. (2002). Verbal communication. *Moscow: RIPOL Classic*.
- Kovalenko, O. V., Yepyk, L. I., Yeromenko, A. Y., Kashynska, O. Y., & Bezruchenkov, Y. V. (2021). Training of the future tourist guides for intercultural communicative interaction within professional activity. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 729-746. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS4.1712>
- Lakoff, G. (1982). *Categories and cognitive models*. Cognitive Science Program, Institute of Cognitive Studies, University of California at Berkeley.
- Lamour, C. (2021). Interviewing a right-wing populist leader during the 2019 EU elections: Conflictual situations and equivocation beyond borders. *Discourse & Communication*, 15(1), 59-73.
- Leech, G. (2016). *Principles of pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Lindblom, K. (2001). Cooperating with Grice: A cross-disciplinary metaperspective on uses of Grice's cooperative principle. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(10), 1601-1623. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(00\)00069-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00069-2)
- Liutenko, N. (2014). Panda. Dnipro, 9-12, 124-139.
- M. (2013). Who framed Grace Kelly?
- Masrul, .-. (2018). Communications interaction of mining company to community in corporate social responsibility program implementation. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 42-54. <https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v6n1.482>
- Minibas-Poussard, J. (2018). Mobbing in higher education: Descriptive and inductive case narrative analyses of mobber behavior, mobbee responses, and witness support. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 18(2).
- Nieto, B., Portela, I., López, E., & Domínguez, V. (2018). Verbal violence in students of compulsory secondary education. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 8(1), 5-14.
- Nikitiuk, M. (2011). Dachas.
- Nikolaeva, T. M. (1990). On the principle of non-cooperation and/or categories of sociolinguistic impact. *Logicheskii analiz yazyka. Protivorechivost'i anomal'nost' teksta*.
- Palarivattom, S., & Kochunni, K. (2015). Real-time, interposable communication for web services. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 2(5), 26-32. Retrieved from <https://sloap.org/journals/index.php/irjmis/article/view/310>
- Pavlyk, N., & Vusyk, H. (2021). Strategies And Tactics Of Communicative Sabotage And Lingual Means Of Their Representation In Political Discourse. *Publishing House "Baltija Publishing"*.
- Pogrebinska, A. (2004). The ninth lunar day.
- Ponomarenko, O. V. (2004). Linguistic pragmatic ways of turning the skill in the bitter Italian political discourse: thesis of candidate of philology sciences. Kyiv: Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.
- Ra, L. (2012). Witches' time.
- Radovanović, A. (2020). Vasion in serbian parliamentary questions evasion in serbian parliamentary questions. *TEME: Jornal for Social Sciences*, 44(2), 637-654.
- Rinartha, K., Suryasa, W., & Kartika, L. G. S. (2018). Comparative Analysis of String Similarity on Dynamic Query Suggestions. In *2018 Electrical Power*,

- Electronics, Communications, Controls and Informatics Seminar (EECCIS)* (pp. 399-404). IEEE.
- Rohr, L., & Rahman, R. A. (2015). Affective responses to emotional words are boosted in communicative situations. *Neuroimage*, *109*, 273-282. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.01.031>
- Rosenthal, L. J., Byerly, A., Taylor, A. D., & Martinovich, Z. (2018). Impact and prevalence of physical and verbal violence toward healthcare workers. *Psychosomatics*, *59*(6), 584-590. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psych.2018.04.007>
- Ryabova, M. (2015). Politeness Strategy in Everyday Communication. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *206*, 90-95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.033>
- Shostak, G. I., & Gillespie, D. (2014). Communicative tactics of creating headlines in British newspapers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *154*, 276-279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.151>
- Sternin, I. A. (2015). Modeli opisaniya kommunikativnogo povedeniya [Models for describing communicative behavior]/Iosif Abramovich Sternin. *Voronezh: "Garant*.
- Suima, IP (2017). Main types of the responsive sentences in the question-answer system. *Bulletin of Dnipropetrovsk University. Series: Linguistics* , (25, issue 23 (1)), 178-185.
- Taniuk, O. (2007). Avva and Death.
- Tarassenko, V. (2011). Buy a moon track.
- Vereshchak, Y. (2014). The beggar detective.
- Wright, S. (2018). When dialogue means refusal. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, *8*(2), 128-132.
- Yarenchuk, E. (2013). The cognitive nature of communicative sabotage. *Language Theory and Intercultural Communication*, *1*(13), 34-42.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zu, Z. (2021). The right contextual information determining the success of communication on translation. *Applied Translation*, *15*(1), 39-43. Retrieved from <https://appliedtranslation.nyc/index.php/journal/article/view/1423>