

# INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION: PRAGMALINGUISTIC INTERPRETATION OF STEREOTYPED SPEECH BEHAVIOUR

**Irina A. Zyubina**

*Linguistics and Professional Communication Department  
Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia  
irinazyubina@gmail.com*

**Abstract.** Stereotyped speech behaviour of the group of public prosecutors was examined with the help of Pragmalinguistic comparative analysis, taking into account national-cultural specificity of the addressers (Russian-speaking and English-speaking public prosecutors).

**Keywords:** lingua-cultural community, Pragmalinguistics, implicit speech strategy, addresser, public prosecutor

## **1. Introduction**

At all times, as an important means of expression, human speech possesses a considerable psychodiagnosing potential (Matveeva, G.G., Zyubina, I.A., 2017: 103-111). Human speech can reveal many interesting things about a person. Data obtained through the pragmalinguistic experiment proves this position, coinciding with the characteristics of the public prosecutors, based on the memoirs of their contemporaries and on the results of psycho-diagnostic methods (Zyubina, I., Dzyubenko, A., Matveeva, G., Ratokhina, A., Ostrikoval, G., 2017: 1089-1094).

## **2. Objectives/Purpose of the study**

The purpose of the paper is to make a comparison according to different lingua-cultural communities: the speeches of Russian-speaking and English-speaking public prosecutors in speaking before a trial by jury at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

### 3. Methodology and sub headings

The results of the pragmalinguistic experiment are compiled in Table 1 “Stereotyped speech behaviour of prosecutors’ groups” (Zyubina, I.A., 2011: 126). The data of this table is considered according to the three implicit speech strategies: “Participation/Nonparticipation of members of communication in a speech event,” “Sure/Unsure speech behaviour of an author,” and “The sender’s formation of addressee’s attitude to a speech event by evaluation.”

### 4. Discussion

*The implicit speech strategy “Participation/ Nonparticipation of members of communication in a speech event”*

According to the results of the pragmalinguistic experiment, the average speech-genre index of the plane of personal participation is 17.5%. In the speeches before the Russian jury, the level of this plane is 18.1%, whereas before the British jury it is 13.2%. Russian-speaking addressers actualise the plane of personal participation of the implicit speech strategy “Participation/Nonparticipation of members of communication in a speech event” more often, showing a tendency towards an authoritarian type of verbal behaviour. For the Russian communicative consciousness, it is inherent in a purely peculiar national idea of limited communicative sovereignty of a personality: the Russian consciousness considers acceptable a communicative invasion of privacy. Moreover, it can be almost any person and it can happen in almost any conditions. The Russian existential consciousness sees no obstacles in speaking to anyone. One can make comments to strangers, give them advice, and it is possible to interfere in the conversation of people, to ask one of them a question. One can “hang” one’s own problems on others, request a favour of strangers, can express an opinion about the fact that is being discussed by a number of strangers, can correct them, explain their errors, and it is possible to approach any person closely, to touch an interlocutor, and so on.

**Table 1: Stereotyped speech behaviour of prosecutors' groups**

strategy /	Participation/Nonparticipation of members of communication in a speech event				Sure/Unsure speech behaviour of an author		The sender's formation of addressee's attitude to a speech event by evaluation				MSG						
	the plane of personal participation		the plane of social participation		the plane of objective participation		certain statement		uncertain statement			the plane of positive attitude		the plane of neutral attitude		the plane of negative attitude	
	MSG	%	MSG	%	MSG	%	MSG	%	MSG	%		MSG	%	MSG	%	MSG	%
1. the end of the XIX century / trial by jury / Russia	624	12.4	384	7.6	3,986	80	2,119	42.4	2,875	57.6	547	11	2,298	46	2,149	43	4,994
2. 20s-40s years of the XX century / professional trial / USSR	482	10	652	13.6	3,659	76.4	2,086	43.5	2,707	56.5	684	14.3	1,723	35.9	2,386	49.8	4,793
3. XXI century / professional trial / Russia	1,678	31.2	39	0.7	3,660	68.1	3,017	56.1	2,360	43.9	631	11.8	1,620	30.1	3,126	58.1	5,377
4. XXI century / trial by jury / Russia	529	18.1	195	6.7	2,193	75.2	1,185	40.6	1,732	59.4	291	10	1,532	52.5	1,094	37.5	2,917

strategy /	Participation/Nonparticipation of members of communication in a speech event						Sure/Unsure speech behaviour of an author						The sender's formation of addressee's attitude to a speech event by evaluation						MSG
	the plane of personal participation		the plane of social participation		the plane of objective participation		certain statement		uncertain statement		the plane of positive attitude		the plane of neutral attitude		the plane of negative attitude				
	MSG	%	MSG	%	MSG	%	MSG	%	MSG	%	MSG	%	MSG	%	MSG	%			
5. XXI century / trial by jury / Great Britain	422	13.2	190	5.9	2,584	80.9	751	23.5	2,445	76.5	400	12.5	1,975	61.8	821	25.7	3,196		
the average speech-genre index	3,735	17.5	1,460	6.9	16,082	75.6	9,158	43	12,119	57	2,553	12	9,148	43	9,576	45	21,277		

However, the English speakers as state prosecutors are less focused on personality. For the Western communicative consciousness, the categories of communicative integrity and tolerance are much more expressed, and the categories of politeness and communicative ideal are based on the concept of privacy or “personal integrity”. An English-speaking addresser is characterised by a specific characteristic such as adherence to the “ideology of correctness”.

During the pragmalinguistic experiment we found that the actualisations of the plane of social participation of the implicit speech strategy “Participation/Nonparticipation of members of communication in a speech event” in the speeches of the Russian public prosecutors (6.7%) and in the speeches of the British public prosecutors (5.9%) in general are the same, and do not significantly differ from the average speech-genre index of 6.9%. With all the differences in the levels of socio-economic and cultural development, in special traits of the legal systems and mechanisms for justice in one or another country, the determinants and the nature of a public opinion are much more general than specific. All studies confirm that legal ignorance, incomplete and distorted legal views are considered to be a universal factor, and it also applies to a group of jurors.

Jurors cannot understand all the detailed circumstances of a criminal case, and moreover they do not need to understand the specific rules, the pros and cons, of the law. They are more likely to rely on their own experience. However, a public prosecutor is a professional lawyer, and to bridge the gap between his own professionalism and inexperience in legal cases of the jurors both Russian-speaking and English-speaking public prosecutors will have to become an “insider” for the jurors not to make them dislike and, as a consequence, to reject the position of the public prosecutor. That is why the Russian state prosecutors more often actualise the cooperative type of speech behaviour, unconsciously, and on an existential level they take into account Russian mentality and traditions: a “legal nihilism” established in Russia

long ago, it is a process when people have a distrust for the law, police, the court and Prosecutor's Office.

Actualising the plane of social participation, that is the cooperative type of speech behaviour, a professional public prosecutor can seek support from a friendly trial by jury, that on an unconscious level begin to understand that the public prosecutor is at least close to them in beliefs and life experience, and is the first step in beginning to trust a public prosecutor.

*The implicit speech strategy "Sure/Unsure speech behaviour of an author"*

As it is shown by the material of the study, the average speech-genre index of the plane of certain statement is 43%. The index of certain statement in the speeches before a trial by jury in Russia is a little lower at 40.6%. In our opinion, a Russian-speaking public prosecutor takes a clear stance on a committed crime. One can say that his speech behaviour is definite and relatively confident, especially when compared to the verbal behaviour of an English-speaking public prosecutor.

One can observe the most significant differences compared with the average speech-genre index (43%) in the speech behaviour of the British public prosecutors, which is the lowest among all the studied groups of public prosecutors, their plane of certain statement of an implicit speech strategy "Sure/Unsure speech behaviour of an author" being only 23.5%. High certainty of speech is not a peculiar feature of English-speaking public prosecutors, because it is perceived as disturbing a personal communicative privacy, unacceptable for the British. Extra sureness for the English-speaking communicants can even be associated with such a concept as an "argument," which is mostly negative in its evaluation and can even be regarded as a manifestation of aggression. Therefore, a more certain speech behaviour of the public prosecutors before the English-speaking jurors would not cause the achievement of the goals of persuasion, or as speech experts say, it would be "communicative suicide."

*The implicit speech strategy “The sender’s formation of addressee’s attitude to a speech event by evaluation”*

According to the results of the pragmalinguistic experiment, the average speech-genre index of the sender’s formation of addressee’s positive attitude to a speech event by evaluation is 12%. This figure is almost equal to that of forming a positive attitude to a speech event by the English-speaking public prosecutors which is 12.5%.

Perhaps the more optimistic mood of the English-speaking public prosecutors depends on the socio-economic situation in the UK, which is relatively calm and where life is of high quality. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of Russia. The index of positive evaluation in the speeches of the Russian-speaking public prosecutors is the lowest at 10%. It greatly depends on the socio-political situation. The lower positive intentions of the Russians and the tendency to pessimism are the result of a long difficult situation in the country when the first half of the twentieth century was marked by horrific wars and the second by expectation of war, perhaps even worse for the mental health of the nation. Undoubtedly, all these factors found reflection in the speech behaviour of the Russian-speaking communicants.

Further proof to these words are indicators of the formation of a negative attitude to a speech event by the English-speaking public prosecutors. Despite the fact that the negative evaluation of the Russian-speaking (37.5%) and English-speaking (25.7%) public prosecutors is lower than the average speech-genre index (45%), there is a predominance of accusatory character in a Russian trial by jury.

## **5. Result/Findings**

So stereotyped speech behaviour of the group of public prosecutors was examined with the help of comparative analysis, taking into account national-cultural specificity of the addressers (Russian-speaking and English-speaking public prosecutors). All things considered, we came to the conclusion that: speech behav-

aviour of the English-speaking public prosecutors of the twenty-first century before a trial by the jury differs from the similar group of the Russian-speaking public prosecutors through less actualisation of the plane of social participation in a speech event, in significantly lower indices of categorical speech behaviour and in less formation of addressee's negative attitude to a speech event by evaluation. Therefore, one can conclude that stereotyped speech behaviour differs due to belonging to different linguistic-cultural communities.

### References

Matveeva G.G., Zyubina I.A. 2017. Speech Behavior of Original and Translated Texts' Authors: Pragmalinguistic Aspect. *Science Journal of VolSU. Linguistics*, 16 (3): 103-111.

Zyubina, I.A. 2011. Speech behavior of the state prosecutor in Implicit Pragmalinguistics. LAP LAMBERT, Saarbruecken, 173 pp.

Zyubina, I.A., Dzyubenko, A.I., Matveeva, G.G., Ratokhina, A.S., Ostriкова, G.N. 2017. What is Fedor N. Plevako? (On Speech Behavior in Implicit Pragmalinguistics). *Proceedings of the 4th International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences and Arts SGEM 2017*, 3 (2): 1089-1094.