Structural and orientation metaphors in the simulation of social conflict discourse
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Abstract—Linguists paid close attention to the study of the problem of communicative success in the second half of the twentieth century. Paraverbal phenomena and language, as means, serve communication in all manifestations, both in coordinated communication and during conflict dialogues. Preparations for the study have also led to problems such as: understanding of common programmes and ways of human behavior; Theoretical and practical descriptions of different fragments and parameters of specific behaviors, identification of verbal and non-verbal correlates transmitted in the process of communication of values; semantic analysis of non-verbal signs in their comparison with natural-language signs, in particular the identification of clear and the detection of hidden meanings of units of different natures that replace or accompany language signs in the act of communication; sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic developments aimed at recognizing the various keys of people’s psychological states and emotions, the human relationship to other people and to the world around them; non-verbal communication - within these problems, non-verbal communication was seen as a complex whole consisting of interconnected elements and parts, that is, as a system.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Researchers of successful verbal communication come to the attention of such phenomena as communicative failure, communicative interference, communicative failure, communicative failure, linguistic conflict.

Linguistics strives to develop techniques and describe the features of the predominantly phenomenon of communicative success, and no one systematically considers its downside, namely, the coordinated interaction. Speech conflicts are only gradually entering the field of linguistic research, where new concepts have begun to emerge related to the unusual aspects of language use in classical linguistics. These are concepts such as the inventive functioning of the language and its manifestations - resentment, insult, threat, as well as the concepts of linguistic manipulation, speech aggression and linguistic ecology, which leads to the emergence of a relatively new branch linguistic knowledge - psycholinguistic conflictology, presented so far in single works. The basis of the birth of psycholinguistic conflictology was social psycholinguistics, the central area of observation of which is the sphere of everyday interpersonal communication of linguistic personalities. Attempts are being made to grammatically and syntax analysis of the written conflict text in order to identify linguistic components. Speech conflicts as a way of studying intercultural contradictions become the object of analysis of intercultural psycholinguistics.

As a subject of linguistic research, conflict discourse is an area almost unexplored: the question of the functional role of speech conflict works of interlocutors within the dynamic model of dialogue communication remains open; conflict discursive practices in the course of the implementation of the speech actions of the subjects of regulatory activity as a set of functional-pragmatic units - regulators designed to solve specific communicative tasks in conflict speech interaction, which can be implemented in discursive formations, built in accordance with functional semantic representation of conflict discourse.

As a conflict discourse is such a speech interaction of interlocutors, the illocutive dominant of which is characterized by the presence of a clash of
communicative goals, the representation of which contains implicit or explicit invectives, resulting in the general conceweht that the participants of the discourse experience negative emotions due to verbal influence on each other [1]. Communication within the framework of conflict discourse is the interaction of partners, which is carried out by replica steps built from the signs of natural language. Attention of the listener, to express the opinion of the speaker about the subject of the conversation, to address the listener with a proposal, a request, to express various emotional states while defending their interests [2]. The expression of directed emotions has a pragmatic character: to force the recipient to do something, to influence him in the right speaking way, to fulfill the request, to deprive confidence, to cause doubt, to activate aggression inhibitors and Targeted amplification of language expression is designed for a certain verbal response. The interaction of the communicating parties in conflict discourse is possible if the partners can influence each other, and this influence is ordered into a single process, the rules of which can be regulated.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The object of our study is the speech behavior of opponents of conflict discourse in typical models of conflict discourse [3]. As a rule, we see this in the protest behavior of modern youth. Subject studies advocate semantic and pragmatic aspects of the speech behavior of opponents in conflict discourse.

The study is based on the material of Russian verbal (oral and written) texts of conflict discourse, although the analytical review and analysis of ideas, many conclusions and results put forward and obtained in the dissertation, are also based on data (the total volume is 4,800 dialogues, including 2,457 in Russian and 2,343 in English). Data from the speech conflict behavior of English-speaking subjects are used to map individual phenomena or decipher some details of the model of conflict discourse, which in many of its manifestations has a universal character. The diverse nature of the sources of research is explained by the versatility and popularity of the object of research in human society.

Due to various circumstances, the resolution of most of the tasks set in the article required discussion of new theoretical problems, filling existing conceptual and terminological gaps, using original practices and consideration of methodological grounds for analysis with their subsequent empirical review. This allows us to consider the transformation of the traditional youth behavior matrix in the context of protest behavior [4].

We consider the aspects of the variability of metaphorical modeling of social conflict in the media discourse, due to ideological, ethno-cultural and thematic differences of discourse: we study the direction of metaphorical modeling and the implementation of the interpretative potential of conceptual metaphors of structural type. Discursive variations of structural metaphors are identified and studied through comparative analysis of 1) one thematic subdiscourse in media publications with different socio-political attitudes; 2) one thematic subdiscourse, implemented in different ethno-cultural context of the media discourse; 3) two thematic subdiscourses of the Russian-language media discourse.

This article provides an analysis of precisely those aspects of conflict discourse that allow to test new approaches to the study of elements of communication space. The paper adopted an approach of analyzing a variety of non/verbal units, which involved the study of semantic, pragmatic and syntax ratios and the characteristics of their joint functioning in conflict discourse.

III. RESULTS

The ideological space of media discourse is a complex system of views, attitudes and values shared by the addressee and the recipient, through which information is transmitted and interpreted. The ideological background of media discourse, on the one hand, determines the choice of conceptual metaphors by which representative events are modeled, on the other hand, sets the framework for the realization and interpretation of metaphorical meanings. Ideological attitudes are particularly important in media discourse, predetermining the formation and interpretation of representative images.

The most productive (5% or more of the total number of orientational metaphors) models of conceptual metaphors of spatial orientation were: a LOT – LONG, a LITTLE SHORT (35.9 %); MORE UPSTAIRS, LESS DOWNSTAIRS (25.9 %), GOOD INSIDE, BAD OUTSIDE (12.8 %); EU – CLOSED SPACE (7.3 %); GOOD/ACTIVE mode – VERTICAL BAD HORIZONTAL (5.5 %); BETTER at the top, WORSE at the BOTTOM/DEEP (5 %). Least represented were the models SIGNIFICANT AT the CENTER, is INSIGNIFICANT – ON the EDGES (2.3 %) and MORE WIDER, LESS – is (was 1.5 %).

The binary principle of the device of metaphorical models of spatial orientation allows "placing" meaningful components of the conflict on a conventional scale between its "poles", which contributes to the visualization of events and their better understanding. "Built" orientation metaphors scales and schemes allow you to visualize how the current "location" of the phenomenon, and the dynamics of its development. This way of thinking is convenient for the interpretation of a conflict situation, the conditions in which the development of social conflict, especially its economic component, which was revealed in our study.

Hallstrom, 2003: movie “Chocolat”. Presup positionbase: opponents - O1: Vianne, mother; O2: Anouk, daughter -teen; O1’gt;O2; very early morning; bedroom.

O1: Time to go.(1) (mother touched the shoulder of her daughter)

O2: I'm not going.(1a) (the girl doesn't open her
Within the framework of the metaphorical model the actions of the PARTIES to the CONFLICT IS an ATTEMPT to ENTER the BUILDING and the AREA of CONFLICT IS the HOUSE/STRUCTURE to represent various aspects of the Ukrainian conflict involves slots “device building” and “building construction”: the importance of action to resolve the conflict compared with such parts of the building construction, such as “door hinge”, “bearing design”, “entrance”, “corridor”, thus there is actualization of their functional aspect. For example, the impact of decisions and measures is associated with the possibility of access to the building, while the lack of development prospects is represented by comparison with locked doors.

Characteristics of speech behavior of the opponent of conflict discourse, his communicative goals and elements of psychological discomfort are the the state of social tension in the country.

The communicative register cannot be considered relevant to the conflict formula “I declare/challenge you because You do not...”. Any locomotive (forming) potential can actualize the structure of the replica step closing the formula. The content plan of the conflict discourse is determined by a variety of reasons that form the linguistic picture of the world of non-conflict personality. The expression plan contains not only separate markers, but also discursive complexes characterized by units of different language levels.

The basis for the implementation of conflict discourse, involving the creation/ destruction, use/neglect, as well as the improvement of regulatory rules and implementing their norms, standards and skills in the form of a set of discursive practices, is the linguistic paradigm. This is a theoretical model that explains the practical technology of verbal conflict communication, i.e. a set of specific techniques and the algorithm of their action in conflict discourse. Such methodological base allows revealing regularities of occurrence of markers of conflict interaction [5].

A significant portion of orientational metaphors (15.8 per cent) aimed at modeling the parties to the conflict and their actions. And most of them (82.9 %) represent the relationship between Greece and the EU countries, modeling the external conflict between Greece and the big three countries. The actions of Greece in the conflict with the leading countries of the EU presented the same type of nominations in the framework of the European UNION — a CLOSED SPACE: “afraid of leaving the Euro”; “intentions to leave the Euro zone”; “Greece will leave the EU” etc. Giving such a social institution as the European Union, territorial delineation, orientation metaphor represents a political initiative (exit from the European Union) as a physical movement in space. If representation of the parties to the conflict widely used models of GOOD/ACTIVE mode – VERTICAL BAD HORIZONTAL and BETTER – at the top, WORSE at the BOTTOM/DEEP field-the source of which is the conceptual category of verticality, important for most crops.

In the framework of the metaphorical model the actions of the PARTIES to the CONFLICT IS an ATTEMPT to ENTER the BUILDING and the AREA of CONFLICT IS the HOUSE/STRUCTURE to represent various aspects of the Ukrainian conflict involves slots “device building” and “building construction”: the importance of action to resolve the conflict compared with such parts of the building construction, such as “door hinge”, “bearing design”, “entrance”, “corridor”, thus there is actualization of their functional aspect. For example, the impact of decisions and measures is associated with the possibility of access to the building, while the lack of development prospects is represented by comparison with locked doors.

Characteristics of speech behavior of the opponent of conflict discourse, his communicative goals and elements of psychological discomfort are the
distinctive features of the model of conflict discourse as a system of organized sequence of interactive manifestations that are necessary for the personality of the speaker in order to make a communicative contribution to the development/extension of the conflict.

IV. DISCUSSION

As for orientation metaphors, they are based on the physical experience of the spatial orientation of a person in the world around him. Yu. M. Lotman, notes the extremely important place of the category of space in the processes of forming a picture of the world, directly linking the knowledge of the surrounding world with the creation of its spatial model [6]. Spatial modeling can be applied to spheres that initially do not have a spatial appearance, including social phenomena. Metaphor is the main mechanism of spatial modeling realization in the language. Spatial images are a manifestation of the General pattern of semantic analogical likening the sphere of abstract phenomena physically and sensually perceived [7].

Most of the knowledge about the categories of space is acquired by man in the process of cognition of the physical structure of the external world at the earliest stages of its development, which explains the conventional nature of most orientation metaphors. "Space is one of the first realities of existence, which is perceived and differentiated by man" [8].

Being the most ingrained cognitive models, orientation metaphors are so familiar that their mechanisms are practically not realized and "do not require additional mental effort neither in generation nor in perception" [9]. A distinctive feature of the orientation metaphors are the underlying opposition (top-bottom; far-close; wide-narrow; inside-outside; center-border, etc.) [10, 11], acting as a kind of "poles" in metaphorical models, which determines their bipolar structure: MORE – at the TOP, LESS – at the BOTTOM; GOOD – INSIDE, BAD – OUTSIDE, etc. Thus, the inferential mechanisms of orientation metaphors are relatively simple and are based on the transfer of the experience of spatial orientation of a person in the world around him to abstract concepts, including the phenomena of social life. Orientation metaphors define a simplified schematization (categorization) of the interpreted phenomena by their placement on a conventional scale between the "poles" of the opposition, which allows us to give them "spatial specificity" [6] and visually structure these phenomena in their interaction. Metaphorical consequences of orientational metaphors are determined by cultural stereotypes of objects placement in space, which are often universal in different cultures, because they are caused by the coinciding physical (sensorimotor) experience of human interaction with the surrounding world.

V. CONCLUSION

The nature of the interpretation of social conflict based on the cognitive potential of metaphor is determined by the type of conceptual metaphor and discursive factors [12]. Differences in the cognitive nature of structural and orientation metaphors determine their focus on the representation of certain structural components of the conflict, its stages and aspects. Like Russian-language media with different socio-political attitudes, English-language publications are characterized by different levels of metaphorical texts. It was found that the texts of Euronews and BBC have a higher level of metaphoricity than the texts of "guardian" (cf.: "Guardian" – 0.9 % VS Euronews – 4.7 %, BBC – 4.4 %). We attribute these differences to the more powerful ideological orientations of the Euronews and BBC publications, due to the need to broadcast EU and UK public policy.

The results of the study showed that media images of representative social conflicts formed under the influence of discursive factors always retain a set of invariant features, but the nature of the interpretation of individual components of the conflict in different discourse conditions can differ dramatically, which leads to the formation of opposite images of the same component of the conflict.
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