

## COMMUNICATIVE EFFECT ACHIEVED THROUGH SPEECH ACTS OF MANIPULATION

Dr. Grischechko Oksana, Faculty of Linguistics of the South Federal University, Russia, Rostov-on-Don  
E-mail: [os-sfedu@yandex.ru](mailto:os-sfedu@yandex.ru)

UDK: 81'23

**Abstract:** Linguistic manipulation is a relatively new trend studies in the framework of pragmatics and generally defined as any verbal interaction viewed as goal-oriented and goal-preconditioned phenomenon. It is verbal communication described from the perspective of one of the speakers when he sees himself as a subject of manipulation, while his interlocutor plays the role of an object. Speech acts of manipulation expressed through a variety of utterances having a number of specific aims are used to directly or indirectly convey certain meanings. The article suggest a comprehensive analysis of linguistic means used to construct various types of manipulating and motivating speech acts aimed at conveying different tinges of meaning.

**Keywords:** theory of speech acts, speech acts of manipulation, communicative effect, pragmatics, illocutionary aim.

Anthropologic approach towards analysis of language phenomena predetermines research of speaker meaning and a view of human communication focusing upon «intention and deliberation» (Thomas, 1995:15). The center of speech field is a human (subject, speaker) with the whole set of his psychological characteristics, speech competence and background knowledge. Orientation towards subject of speech marked the transition from analysis of «stable» word meaning to examination of variable content of an expression.

The speaker fulfils his speech task hoping to achieve a definite effect that would lead to understanding and corresponding actions on the part of the interlocutor (Vinokur, 1989: 19).

Modern scientists base their research on the theoretical supposition that human speech is in its nature operative.

Operative power of a word was subjected to comprehensive analysis in the framework of many sciences. Today, in the modern scientific field, a new integral science is being formed that can be called

theory of speech manipulation.

Theory of speech manipulation is a science of effective communication. Like any theory, it has its history. In Ancient Greece and Rome rhetoric was teaching public performance, dispute tactics and methods of winning an argument. Ancient rhetoric was based mostly upon logic, rules of logical thinking and persuasion.

In the middle ages rhetoric was practically gone as a science and resurrected in the XX century on a new, psychological basis – the object of interest shifted from logical to psychological, emotional means of persuasion.

The XX century saw the need of introducing integrated approach towards speech manipulation for certain reasons (Korolev, 1992:3-4):

- *social and political reasons:* development of democracy and ideas of personal freedom and human equality preconditioned the need of a science that would show how to convince people with equal or different social status;

- *psychological reasons:* the end of the XIX century is associated with the new outlook on a human being. Earlier a human was considered primitive and lazy, his adequate operation in the society was associated with the use of the carrot and stick approach. However, today development of culture, literature and art coupled with the appearance of scientific psychology, has provided grounds for a different concept of a human. A human has turned out to be a complex, psychologically versatile identity demanding differentiated approach;

- *communicative reasons:* these reasons are connected with the development of human communication itself. Our time is characterized by expansion of communication spheres and of the number of situa-

tions that demand interaction and persuasion. The notion of oral speech itself broadens out, it starts to fulfill more varied functions, plays a more important role in communication process, which explains the need to look for special ways of communicative interaction, pay more attention to colloquial speech;

- *economic reasons*: competition and production slumps generated the demand for advertology, «imposition» of goods, «winning over» customers. Salesmen were the first to realize the critical need of a science of conviction.

The existence of these objective reasons provides grounds for research in the framework of a whole complex of sciences. Operational force of speech is extensively covered in modern linguistic literature and is studied in a number of allied sciences, in particular, in pragmatic linguistics, psychology, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, theory of mass communication, rhetoric.

From the point of view of such upcoming scientific areas as pragmatic linguistics and psycholinguistics, language, being a means of communication, serves not only the purpose of conveying information, but also effects interlocutors thus regulating their social, interpersonal, mental state and behavior.

Linguistic manipulation studied by these disciplines is defined as manipulation of individual and / or collective conscience and behavior realized through various linguistic means, in other words – with the help of utterances in natural language. Sometimes linguistic manipulation is also associated with the use of messages built by means of non-verbal semiotic systems that include paralinguistic means (tempo, timbre, voice volume, logical stress), kinetic means (gestures, mimic, posture), etc. (Zheltuhina, 2004: 12).

For a long time scientists believed that the function of speech consisted in conveying information about the world. Modern research works view the words as means of influencing other people. Ac-

cording to American psycholinguist D. Slobin, «it is rather dangerous to forget that languages can effectively influence people's beliefs and actions» (Slobin, 1976: 115). Thus, sending a message is never the ultimate objective of communication, this transfer is only a means of achieving other aims directed towards control of interlocutor's activity (Tarasov, 1990: 9-10).

Linguistic manipulation in a broad sense is any verbal interaction viewed as goal-oriented and goal-preconditioned phenomenon, it is verbal communication described from the perspective of one of the speakers when he sees himself as a subject of manipulation, while his interlocutor plays the role of an object (Tarasov, 1990: 5). Being a subject of communication means to regulate your interlocutor's activity, as using speech we induce another person to start, change or finish certain activity or create his readiness towards commitment of a particular action when such necessity arises.

What is meant here is inducement towards proximal verbal or non-verbal reactive action coupled with mediated manipulation aimed at formation of certain emotions, valuations, orientations on the part of the listener that would correspond to the intention of the speaker (Sytnik, Krivulya, 1989: 90). Subsequently these orientations are supposed to lead to organization of such behavior of the listener that the speaker counts for (Matveeva, 1981: 6). Manipulating a person, we aspire to engineer his behavior according to our needs, «to find weak spots in his system of activity and affect them» (Leontyev, 1981: 273).

Subject-object interaction can be *direct* (the subject openly asserts his claims and demands to the object of manipulation), and *indirect* (directed not towards the object, but towards his environment (Zheltuhina, 2004: 13). Direct method of linguistic manipulation includes the forms that have a definite meaning in the language system that directly expresses corresponding illocution, i.e. communicative

aim of the speaker. Thus, for instance, forms of the imperative mood are traditionally associated with the meaning of inducement, declarative and interrogative utterances are conventionally connected with illocution forces of the message and information request. Indirect method of expressing communicative intention consists in the usage of linguistic forms to express illocution forces not connected with their direct linguistic meaning. Indirect forms do not express the speaker's intentions in the open.

In order to construct theory of linguistic manipulation, it is critically important to differentiate the notions of manipulative and actualizing influence, on the one part, and productive and non-productive influence, on the other part. Such differentiation of methods of influence in the framework of communication, takes form of hierarchy reflecting different levels of communicative competence in the use of the language: the primary stage of the typology is represented by non-productive manipulation, the top stage is speech actualization.

Many features of communicative utterances are associated with the aims of creation and perception of speech exerting substantial influence on their form. The stated aims as characterized by hierarchical pattern: among them there are main, general aims and particular, dependent aims.

L.A. Kiseleva highlights the following aims of speech interaction:

*Communicative aims* that include:  
1)informative aims; 2) pragmatic aims:  
a)motivational; b) emotional-evaluative;  
c)emotional-regulating; d) aesthetic-regulating; e) contacting.

*Non-communicative aims* (aims of self-expression) that include: 1) the aim of intellectual expression self; 2) the aim of emotional expression of self; 3) the aim of emotional-evaluative expression of self (Kiseleva, 1978: 149).

The speaker's intention or communicative aim engineers a certain type of utterance. This article sees into the utterances

expressing the speaker's wish to impel the interlocutor to do something).

As is known, accommodates direct speech acts of manipulation. They are usually expressed using the following means.

1) Utterances containing lexical verb in the imperative form:

*Stop talking. Tell him to go away* (Ivanova, 1981: 69).

2) Utterances containing link verb «be» in the imperative form and participle I or II.

*Be\_ always searching for new sensations! Be seated!* (Veihman, 2000: 76).

3) Utterances containing the verb «get» in the imperative form and participle I:

*Get together and get talking!* (Haimovich, 1967: 155).

4) Utterances containing the verb «let» and a pronoun in the 1<sup>st</sup> person plural, indicating inducement towards cooperative action:

*Let us come in. Let us break it off here and now.*

The verb «let» can also collocate with a pronoun with the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular or plural and the infinitive:

*Let them come in* (Akimova, 1992:189).

Together with direct speech acts of manipulation, non-direct speech acts of manipulation are also common in the framework of speech interaction. These are utterances non-imperative in the form, but serving always to express the meaning of inducement. This meaning of inducement is associated with these forms in the language system.

Analysis of theoretical literature and factual material allows to allocate the following types of conventional indirect speech acts (hereinafter referred to as CISA) of manipulation:

1) CISA represented by utterances with modal verbs expressing permission, prohibition, must, necessity, advise, order, warning, command, request (the latest is often marked by *please, kindly*):

*'You don't have to, honey. You can*

*sleep on mine'* (Briarpatch, 89).

*'Will you, mademoiselle be precise, please'* (ABC, 72);

2) CISA in the form of the speech act of interrogation and represented by utterances with modal verbs *can/could, will/would*. Such CISA express request, requests with *could* and *would* being more polite than the requests with *can* and *will*:

*'Could you take me to the suite, please?'* (Briarpatch, 134).

*'Would you be so kind to call back?'* (Too True, 76);

3) CISA in the form of the speech act of interrogation-statement and represented by utterances expressing request:

*'You are going to tell me now, right?'* (Too True, 190).

4) CISA in the form of the speech act of interrogation represented by rhetoric question. Such CISA express prohibition:

*How dare you? How dare you to talk to me like that?'* (Too True, 171);

5) CISA in the form of the speech act of request expressed by general question with modal verb *would* and special questions in the negative form with the word «why». These CISA have inducement or inducement-offer as their illocutionary aim:

*'Why not wait till the receipt of the next letter?'* (ABC, 87);

6) CISA in the form of the speech act of interrogation expressed by special question with the word «why» having the meaning of advice and used in order to induce the addressee to perform the correct action:

*'Why go to the library when you can go to the source?'* (Too True, 225).

7) CISA represented by indirect questions beginning with the phrase «I wonder»:

*'I wonder if you would be kind enough to give me a lift'* (Briarpatch, 57);

8) CISA expressed by declarative sentences with conditional clauses indicating positive and negative consequences of action completion (in the latest case a speech act conveys a meaning of warning):

*'If you come near me again, I'll kill you'* (Briarpatch, 126);

9) CISA in the form of the speech act of question represented by utterances beginning with the words *what about/how about* and conveying the meaning of discreet inducement:

*How about we have dinner together to celebrate?'* (Storm, 117);

10) CISA in the form of the speech act of question expressed by interrogative utterances without word order inversion. Such CISA may have illocutionary aim of request:

*'Then you 'll help me?'* (Briarpatch, 109).

11) CISA represented by utterances containing performative verbs, i.e. verbs that do not describe action, but are an action themselves, and this action is carried out through realization of this utterance: *declare, promise, advise* (Austin, 1986: 39):

*'I beg you to be careful. He is a murderer, remember that'* (ABC, 138);

12) CISA of inducement represented by utterances with verbs in the form of the indicative mood conveying the meaning of instruction. Such utterances often include the construction *be going to*:

*'You are going to do what I ask'* (ABC, 41);

13) CISA represented by utterances containing the verbs in the subjunctive mood. Illocutionary aim of such CISA is formal request (sometimes with the tinge of pleading), inducement with promise, advise:

*'If we stayed here long enough I'd show you a lot of interesting things'* (Too True, 292).

This type of CISA can be represented by speech acts expressed by utterances with lexical content conveying the meaning of need, desirability, probability of committing an action:

*'It is important that you should believe me'* (ABC, 39).

In this group also belong subordinate clauses following the main clauses, like *It*



is time..., It is high time.:

'It is high time you answered Yes or No, mademoiselle' (ABC, 157);

14) CISA in the form of speech acts represented by utterances with set expressions *would rather/sooner, had better, suppose/supposing*. Such utterances express advise, inducement for cooperate action, offer:

'Well, said Crome, we 'd better be getting along' (ABC, 61).

'Suppose we stay here' (Briarpatch, 102);

15) CISA in the form of speech acts represented by utterances containing the verb of desire *wish* and, correspondingly, expressing regard. In such sentences verbs in subjunctive mood are used:

'I wish you would leave me here. I'd like to continue alone, then' (Briarpatch, 65);

16) CISA represented by speech acts expressed by nouns (with or without prepositions) or adjectives and conveying instruction:

'No hurry, Miss' (Briarpatch, 123).

'Careful, please!' (Too True, 76);

17) CISA of inducement represented by speech acts expressed by utterances with constructions indicating lack of necessity to commit an action: *It is no use..., It is no good*. Such CISA express prohibition:

'It 's no good going to work now. They are going to catch you and put you back in prison' (Briarpatch, 161);

18) CISA represented by speech acts expressed by utterances with causative meaning, i.e. describe the process of inducement towards committing an action. Such utterances include verbs *make, cause, force, desire*, as well as the *Complex Object* infinitive construction:

'I'll make you go with me' (Storm, 185).

'I want you to stay here' (Storm, 100).

19) CISA represented by speech acts expressed by utterances containing the verbs of wish. Verbs of desire express request, instruction:

'I want to persuade you to accept a fee of five pounds' (ABC, 40).

20) CISA represented by speech acts expressed by utterances with Complex Subject and For-to-infinitive construction with lexical content indicating the need to commit an action:

'You're not supposed to provide an attraction as well' (Storm, 60);

21) CISA represented by speech acts expressed by utterances with the verb *mind* followed by gerund. The form of declarative utterance expresses permission, the form of interrogative utterance expresses request of permission or appeal. This type of CISA can also be expressed by utterances with the collocation *have objections against* followed by gerund:

'Would you mind escorting me to a taxi?' (ABC, 122);

22) CISA represented by speech acts represented by utterances with the linking element *if you don't mind*. Illocutionary aim of such CISA is request for permission:

'But I'll just have this' — *he indicated the cigarette* — 'if you don't mind?' (Storm, 12);

23) CISA represented by speech acts expressed by utterances of ethical nature with the meaning of offer, invitation:

'It'll be nice seeing you again' (Too True, 238).

Non-conventional indirect speech acts of inducement used to reduce categorical nature of inducement. For this type of speech acts ethical forms, social status of interlocutors, their emotional state and external setting of dialogic communication are of great importance (Kudryashov, 2005:71).

Analysis of factual material prompted the following non-conventional indirect speech acts (hereinafter referred to as NCISA) of inducement:

1) NCISA represented by utterances indicating some external conditions explaining the need to commit an action:

'It's hot in here.'

'Just a moment, I'll open the window' (Honour, 57).

'Look, the percolator's bubbling!'

Melanie unplugged the coffee pot.  
(Storm, 114).

In the given examples direct orders to open the window and unplug the coffee pot are substituted by indication of high temperature and boiling water.

2) NCISA inducing the interlocutor to commit verbal action through the speech act of question by interrogating whether the addressee is intending to commit an action:

'Are you trying to say something, Melanie?' she asked softly.

*'If I am, I meant nothing by it. You know, it's true!'* (Storm, 74).

By using interrogative form the speaker encourages his interlocutor to communicate. Such question has motivational function coupled with the function of contact support:

'Are you going to tell me, or are you not?'

*Dominie swallowed hard, and then fumbling in her pocket she brought out the letter and handed it wordlessly to Lucia* (Storm, 177).

Verbal and non-verbal reactions of the listeners indicate their adequate perception of the speaker's wish to induce them to communicate;

3) NCISA inducing the interlocutor to convey certain information by means of certifying question:

'You have news — yes?' demanded Poirot.

*'It's about as bad as it can be. Sir Carmichael Clarke has been found with his head bashed in'* (ABC, 92).

*'Can you remember anything about them?'*

*'Not a damned thing now.'*

'Sure?'

*'Well — let's see — I remember a remarkably fat woman'* (ABC, 117).

Perlocutionary effect of the given NCISA (conveying information) indicated that they have been perceived by listeners as motivating speech acts.

'She was pretty — yes?'

*This question was met this time with a practical response. Maggie slipped off the table, went to her suitcase, snapped it open and extracted something which she handed to Poirot* (ABC, 72).

Context shows that by asking about the appearance of the murdered girl, Poirot achieves realization of his illocutionary aim – to induce his interlocutor to show the picture.

Such questions may be presented as a hint, i.e. thought that might be understood by guessing (Ozhegov, 1984: 328). A hint is programmed by the speaker as an utterance that has and keeps double meaning. Such utterance can be interpreted both directly and indirectly, although the speaker's intent, of course, is for the listener to get the indirect meaning.

'You know your way now, don't you?'

'Yes', I said and went down the big stairway (Storm, 131);

4) NCISA inducing the listener to give information:

'There are trains, are there not?'

*'But how can I get to the station?'*

*'I'll drive you to the station this afternoon'* (Storm, 179).

Indirect speech act of inducement has additional pragmatic meaning of appellation (appellation is expression through which the speaker addressed the listener in order to attract his attention and induce him to commit an action desired by the speaker (Brusenskaya and others, 2005: 76)): he attracts the listener's attention and through that induces him to listen to the speaker;

5) NCISA inducing the interlocutor to commit an action through the speech act of question-request about details of the action planned by the listener. At that as a rule it is a special question that has presupposition (preliminary knowledge enabling adequate perception of the text; background knowledge (Brusenskaya and others, 2005: 159)) that is knowledge of the listener's planned action:

'When will you go?'

*'Don't push me on this. I want to*

*think it out quiet'* (Too True, 125).

6) NCISA aimed as inducing the listener to commit an action through utterances conveying the means of committing an action: \

'Only by speaking the exact truth you can help us to get on his track' (ABC, 78) (= *Speak the exact truth, then you can help us*).

*'Tell him', said Megan.*

The third party of the conversation clearly perceives illocutionary aim of the NCISA as inducement. It explicitly expresses induces by addressing the author of inducement – the second party of the conversation.

'The easiest way to answer the question is to ask her' (= *Let's ask her. It's the easiest way to answer the question*).

*'And suppose she tells us another lie'* (ABC, 133).

The speaker's line indicates that he perceives the original line as inducement towards action that he objects;

7) NCISA in the form of speech acts aimed at talking the listener into committing an action by indication of lack of undesirable consequences of this action (indirectly the meaning of encouragement towards committing an action is expressed):

'You see, mademoiselle, that the information for which I ask you can give freely without wondering whether or not it will hurt anyone' (= *Give me information. It won't hurt anyone*).

*I'm trusting you now, M. Poirot. I'm going to give you the absolute truth'* (ABC, 74).

As judged by his answer, inducement that is part of the speech act is adequately perceived by the listener as such.

## REFERENCES

- Akimova T. (1992). Imperative Mood in the English Language, *Typology of Imperative Constructions*. Saint Petersburg.  
Austin J. How to Do Things With, *New in the Foreign Linguistics*. Vol. XVII: *Theory of Speech Acts*. Moscow.

- Brusenskaya L., Gavrilova G., Malycheva N. (2005). *Dictionary of Linguistic Terms*. Rostov University Press. Rostov-on-Don.  
Haimovich B., Rogovskaya B. (1967). Theoretical Grammar of the English Language. *High School Publishing*. Moscow.  
Ivanova I., Burlakova V., Pocheptsov G. (1981). Theoretical Grammar of the Modern English Language. *High School Publishing*. Moscow.  
Kiseleva L. (1978). Problems of the Theory of Speech Manipulation. *Leningrad University Publishing*. Leningrad.  
Korolev V. (1992). Full Forward Towards Success! The Best of Dale Carnegie. *Rostov University Press*. Rostov-on-Don.  
Kudryashov I. (2005). The Phenomenon of Communicative Freedom in the Oral and Written Discourse. *Rostov University Press*. Rostov-on-Don.  
Leontyev A. (1981). Psychological Peculiarities of the Lecturer. Knowledge Press. Moscow.  
Matveeva G. (1981). Problems of Scientific Text Pragmatics. Leningrad University Press. Leningrad.  
Ozhegov S. (1984). Dictionary of the Russian Language. *High School Publishing*. Moscow.  
Slobin D., Greene G. (1976). Psycholinguistics. Progress Publishing. Moscow.  
Sytnik L., Krivulya V. (1989). On Indirect Pragmatic Influence in Scientific Text, Pragmatics and Typology of Linguistic Communicative Units. *Dnepropetrovsk University Press*. Dnepropetrovsk.  
Tarasov E. (1990). Speech Manipulation: Methodology and Theory, Optimization of Speech Influence. *Moscow University Press*. Moscow.  
Thomas J. (1995). Meaning in Interaction. An Introduction to Pragmatics. *Pearson Education*. London.  
Veihtman E. (2000). New in the English Grammar. *Astrel – Ast Publishing*. Moscow.  
Vinokur T. (1989). On characterizing the speaker. Intention and Reaction, Language and Identity. *Science Publishing*. Moscow.  
Zheltuhina M. (2004). *Specifics of Speech Influencing Means in The Language of the Media*, PhD thesis abstract. Moscow.

## FACTUAL MATERIAL

- ABC — Christie A. (1990). *The ABC Murders*. London.  
Briarpatch — Thomas R. (1985). *Briarpatch*. New York.  
Honour — Archer J. (1986). *A Matter of Honour*. London.  
Too True — Shaw B. (1952). *Too True to Be Good*, Four Plays. London.  
Storm — Mather A. (1979). *Storm in a Rain Barrel*.

New York.