

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ**

Кафедра германської філології

**Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики
на тему: АГРЕСИВНА КОМУНІКАЦІЯ: ПРАГМАТИЧНІ**

ТА ФУНКЦІОНАЛЬНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ

(НА МАТЕРІАЛІ СУЧАСНИХ АНГЛОМОВНИХ СЕРІАЛІВ)

Допущено до захисту

«__» _____ року

студентки групи МЛа 56-23
факультету германської філології і перекладу
освітньо-професійної програми
Сучасні філологічні студії (англійська
мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика та
перекладознавство
за спеціальністю 035 Філологія
Драган Юлії Володимирівни

Науковий керівник:
Волкова Лідія Михайлівна

КИЇВ –2024

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE
KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY**

Chair of Germanic Philology

Master's Qualification Paper

**AGGRESSIVE COMMUNICATION: PRAGMATIC AND FUNCTIONAL
PECULIARTIES
(A STUDY OF MODERN ENGLISH SERIALS)**

Yuliia Drahan
Group MLa 56-23
Department of Germanic
Philology and Translation

Research Adviser
Professor
LIDIYA M. VOLKOVA
(Ph.D. Linguistics)

Kyiv –2024

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER ONE. THE ESSENCE OF AGGRESSIVE COMMUNICATION.7	
1.1 General features of aggressive communication.....	7
1.2 Linguistic pragmatic aspects of emotions.....	13
1.2.1 Communicative paradigms.....	14
1.2.2 The main linguistic theories of communication.....	18
1.3 Communicative situations and how they appear.....	20
1.4 Strategy of dominance in speech aggression.....	24
Conclusion to Chapter One.....	30
CHAPTER TWO. MAIN PRINCIPLES OF FUNCTIONING OF	
AGGRESSIVE COMMUNICATION IN MODERN ENGLISH SERIAS.....	32
2.1 Strategy of dominance. Its function in the structure of a speech act.....	32
2.1.1 The main types of direct speech acts.....	33
2.1.2 The main types of indirect speech acts.....	37
2.2 Aggressive communication in modern English series.....	43
2.3 Gender features of verbal aggression.....	54
2.4 Contextual types of aggressive communication.....	61
Conclusion to Chapter Two.....	69
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	71
RESUME.....	73
REFERENCE LITERATURE.....	75
LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS.....	82

INTRODUCTION

Communication is not just about the transmission of information, but also about the creation and negotiation of meaning between individuals. (Hall, 1980)

The dynamics of aggressive communication are complex, often involving a mix of overt hostility and covert manipulation designed to undermine the target. (Butler, 1997)

As communication remains a fundamental aspect of human life, understanding its various forms – including aggressive communication – becomes crucial for fostering healthier and more productive relationships. Aggressive communication is a widespread and multifaceted phenomenon that significantly impacts interpersonal interactions and broader societal discourse. The issue of aggression, particularly in its sociopolitical dimensions, is a central point of research across several disciplines, including social philosophy, psychology, political science, and sociology. The significance of examining this phenomenon from the perspectives of linguistics and pragmalinguistics has grown, reflecting a shift in linguistic focus. Structural linguistics, once dominant, is now increasingly supplanted by a functional approach, with anthropocentrism emerging as the predominant principle. Contemporary linguists are keen to explore why individuals resort to speech aggression, the objectives they aim to achieve by influencing various aspects of the listener's consciousness, and how recipients of such verbal attacks respond.

Verbal aggressive behaviors disrupt the main principles of cooperative and respectful communication. They often violate Grice's Maxims - particularly those of quality and relation - by introducing falsehoods or irrelevant hostility into the discourse. Additionally, such behaviors can constitute face-threatening acts as outlined in Brown and Levinson's Politeness theory, attacking both the positive face (the desire to be appreciated) and the negative face (the desire for autonomy) of individuals.

Understanding the mechanisms and manifestations of verbal aggression is central in developing strategies for softening and fostering healthier communication environments. This involves not only recognizing and addressing such behaviors when they occur but also cultivating communication skills that emphasize empathy, respect, and constructive dialogue.

In this Paper we investigate the usage, peculiarities and function of aggressive communication in the stream of English language. The main strategies: the strategy of dominance, pragmatic aspects, linguistic theories of communication, gender features of communication, direct and indirect speech acts, are studied to expand and highlight the central features of aggressiveness in the speech flow.

The object of this Qualification Paper is aggressive communication in the English dialogical discourse.

The subject of the Master's Paper is aggressive communication in communication based on the study of Modern English serials.

The main aim of the Master's Paper is to investigate realization and pragmatic peculiarities of aggressive communication in Modern English dialogical discourse.

To achieve the aim, the following **objectives** should be fulfilled:

1. Examination of the basic features of aggressive communication.
2. Identification of linguistic pragmatic aspects of emotions.
3. Identification of the principles that can be used as a basis for the classification approach to direct and indirect aggressive speech acts.
4. Interpretation of natural examples taken from the Modern English serials in order to identify functional peculiarities of speech aggression.
5. Determination of gendered communication.

The methodology of this study incorporates a range of general scientific and specialized linguistic methods. To analyze the literature and the obtained materials, the method of generalization is employed. The descriptive method is utilized to explore the concepts of direct and indirect speech acts within communication, offering a detailed examination of their role in language, as well as their impact and

functional characteristics. Various discourse analysis techniques are applied to examine how communication functions according to the examples from Bridgerton English serial. The intentional method is specifically used to uncover and analyze the speaker's intent within dialogical discourse. Additionally, conversational and contextual methods are employed to investigate the role and function of gendered communication in different dialogical contexts.

Theoretical significance of the Paper is highlighted lies in the fact that its results may contribute to the study of verbal aggression in communication in Modern English dialogical discourse.

Practical value lies in possible application of the results in further researches on the subject. This research may also prove useful for different branches of science, not only linguistics, such as psychology, sociology

The source of the **material** for analysis was Modern English serial "Bridgerton" that now consists of three seasons and presents a wide range of examples of aggressive communication in different communicative situations.

Structurally the Paper consists of Introduction, two chapters, conclusions to each chapter, general conclusions, resume and the list of references.

Chapter One investigates theoretical essence of the study, particularly: general features of aggressive communication, its pragmatic characteristics, main verbal strategies in speech. It is aimed at revealing theoretical points of the work.

Chapter Two is based on studying practical results of theoretical issues described in the previous Chapter. It presents analysis of numerous examples from Bridgerton serial in order to systemize and provide a functional classification. Main types of speech acts that may considered aggressive are described and analysed.

CHAPTER ONE. THE ESSENCE OF AGGRESSIVE COMMUNICATION

1.1. General features of aggressive communication

Modern people cannot live without communication in any area of their life and work, and it does not depend on whether a person likes it or not, whether a person an extrovert or an introvert. Let us try together to find the reasons for such a unique phenomenon as interpersonal skill and answer the question why a person needs communication (Levinson, 1983:7).

The importance of communication in an individual's life cannot be overstated. It plays a crucial role in shaping and developing the human psyche. Through communication, people share information, perceive and understand one another, learn from each other's experiences, and share their own. This ability to communicate distinguishes humans from other biological beings on the planet.

In the process of communication, we share information. The assimilation of new knowledge is the most important aspect in the development of personality. Most of information, knowledge we get directly from people during communication. Of course, we can receive information from books, films, and other sources. But, in most cases, it is more interesting to get information asking a clarifying question and as a result, trying to explain what you understand and do not understand (Cutting, 2002:56).

Aggressive communication refers to a special style of interaction where one individual asserts dominance, control, or criticism over another through language. This form of communication can manifest in various ways, including direct verbal attacks, insinuations, and non-verbal cues. Studying aggressive communication within the field of linguistics is crucial as it helps us understand the underlying mechanisms of conflict and the impact of language on social interactions. The examination of aggressive communication is rooted in several key linguistic theories. One foundational theory is the Speech Act Theory, developed by J.L. Austin and further refined by John Searle. This theory provides a comprehensive

approach to analyzing how language functions are used not just to convey information, but to perform actions.

Austin's fundamental insight was that utterances can perform actions beyond merely stating facts. He categorized speech acts into three main types:

1. **Locutionary acts** - these are the basic acts of producing sounds, words, and sentences that constitute the act of saying something. For instance, the sentence “The door is open” is a locutionary act that involves articulating these words.
2. **Illocutionary acts** - these acts carry a specific function in communication, such as asserting, questioning, commanding, or promising. In saying “The door is open”, the speaker might be informing someone, issuing a reminder, or implying an invitation to come in.
3. **Perlocutionary acts** - these acts refer to the effects or consequences that utterances have on the listener, such as persuading, frightening, or inspiring. For example, saying the same - “The door is open” - might make someone enter the room or close the door. (Austin, 1962)

John Searle expanded on Austin’s work by further categorizing illocutionary acts into five distinct types:

1. **Assertives** - statements that convey information or describe the world, such as assertions, claims, or reports.
2. **Directives** - attempts by the speaker to get the listener to do something, such as requests, commands, or suggestions.
3. **Commissives** - commitments made by the speaker, like promises, vows, or offers.
4. **Expressives** - expressions of the speaker's psychological state, such as apologies, thanks, or congratulations.
5. **Declarations** - utterances that change the reality by the fact of being uttered, such as resignations, declarations of war, or baptisms. (Searle, 1969)

Understanding and applying Speech Act Theory provides valuable insights into the dynamics of aggressive communication. By analyzing the types of speech

acts used and their intended functions, we can better understand the motivations behind aggressive language and its effects on interpersonal interactions.

Another significant theoretical framework for examining aggressive communication is the Cooperative Principle, proposed by H.P. Grice. This principle provides insight into how communication is intended to function in cooperative interactions and how aggressive communication often deviates from these norms.

The Cooperative Principle, introduced by Grice in his paper “Logic and Conversation”, posits that effective communication relies on the cooperation of participants. Grice outlined four conversational maxims that speakers typically adhere to in order to facilitate understanding: quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

1. **Quantity:** this maxim involves providing the right amount of information - neither too much nor too little. According to Grice, speakers should be as informative as necessary, and no more. In aggressive communication, this maxim is often violated when individuals overwhelm their interlocutors with excessive details or, conversely, provide insufficient information to obstruct understanding.
2. **Quality:** the quality maxim emphasizes the importance of truthfulness. Speakers are expected not to say what they believe to be false or for which they lack adequate evidence. Aggressive communication can breach this maxim through the use of false accusations, exaggerations, or deceit intended to harm or manipulate the listener.
3. **Relation:** also known as the relevance maxim, this principle dictates that contributions to a conversation should be relevant to the topic at hand. Aggressive communicators might flout this maxim by bringing up unrelated issues to distract, confuse, or attack the interlocutor.
4. **Manner:** the manner maxim pertains to clarity and the avoidance of ambiguity. Speakers should strive to be clear, orderly, and brief. Aggressive communication often involves deliberate ambiguity, distraction, or convoluted language to intimidate or dominate the conversation. (Grice, 1975)

Grice's Cooperative Principle assumes that most conversational exchanges are fundamentally cooperative, with participants working together to achieve mutual understanding. However, aggressive communication typically involves a departure from these cooperative norms. Instead of facilitating mutual understanding, the aggressor uses language to dominate, control, or harm the other party.

Building on Grice's work, Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson developed Politeness Theory, which examines how individuals mitigate face-threatening acts. Politeness Theory is grounded in the concept of "face", originally introduced by sociologist Erving Goffman. "Face" refers to an individual's self-esteem or emotional needs in social interactions. Brown and Levinson expanded this concept into two main types of face: positive face - the desire to be liked, appreciated, and approved by others. It involves the need for one's self-image to be validated and affirmed in social interactions; and negative face - the desire for autonomy, freedom from imposition, and the right to make one's own decisions. It involves the need to be free from others interference.

According to Politeness Theory, social interactions inherently involve face-threatening acts (FTAs), which can challenge either the positive or negative face of the interlocutors. Brown and Levinson propose that individuals use various politeness strategies to mitigate the potential threat posed by these acts. They identify four main strategies:

1. **Bald on record** - direct and unambiguous communication, often used when the speaker has a close relationship with the listener or when urgency overrides the need for politeness. For example, "Close the door."
2. **Positive politeness** - strategies that seek to minimize the threat to the listener's positive face by showing friendliness, solidarity, or approval. For example, "Could you close the door? It would be great if you could."
3. **Negative politeness** – strategies that aim to minimize the threat to the listener's negative face by showing respect and deference and acknowledging the imposition. For example, "I'm sorry to bother you, but could you please close the door?"

4. **Off-record (indirect)** - indirect communication that allows the speaker to avoid direct imposition, leaving the listener to interpret the meaning. For example, “It’s getting a bit drafty in here.” (Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., 1987)

By understanding how face needs are managed and threatened in social interactions, we can better identify and address the underlying mechanisms of aggressive communication. Promoting the use of politeness strategies can enhance the quality of interactions, reduce conflicts, and build more positive and productive relationships.

Identifying linguistic markers of aggression involves analyzing various components of language. Lexical markers include the use of derogatory terms, insults, and curse words. Syntactic structures, such as imperative sentences and exclamations, often convey aggression by asserting dominance or expressing strong emotions. Pragmatic features, including sarcasm, irony, and rhetorical questions, can also serve as indicators of aggressive intent. The expression and perception of aggressive communication are influenced by sociocultural factors. Different cultures have varying norms regarding acceptable levels of directness and confrontation in communication. Power dynamics also play a crucial role; individuals in positions of authority may use aggressive language to assert control, while subordinates may perceive such language as more threatening. Situational triggers, such as stress or competition, can strengthen aggressive communication.

Aggressive communication has significant effects on interpersonal relationships, organizational environments, and media interactions. In personal relationships, it can lead to conflicts, reduced trust, and emotional harm. Constant exposure to aggressive communication can damage relationships, making it difficult for individuals to communicate effectively and resolve conflicts. In organizational settings, aggressive communication can result in decreased productivity, lower morale, and increased turnover. Employees who experience or witness aggressive communication may feel demoralized, leading to a toxic work environment. The rise of digital communication has also amplified the impact of aggressive language, with online interactions often lacking the mitigating cues present in face-to-face

communication. Addressing aggressive communication involves strategies to reduce verbal hostility and promote positive interactions. Developing empathy and emotional intelligence can help individuals recognize and manage their own aggressive tendencies. Communication training programs can teach conflict resolution skills and techniques for maintaining respectful dialogue.

Aggressive communication is a complex phenomenon that intersects with various linguistic and psychological principles. Understanding its theoretical foundations, emotional drivers, and linguistic markers provides valuable insights into its role in human interaction. Addressing aggressive communication through empathy and strategic interventions can enhance the quality of social and professional relationships. Future research should continue to explore the nuances of aggressive communication in different contexts and cultures.

Addressing aggressive communication involves strategies to reduce verbal hostility and promote positive interactions. Developing empathy and emotional intelligence is crucial. Empathy allows individuals to understand and share the feelings of others, reducing the likelihood of aggressive responses. Emotional intelligence involves recognizing and managing one's own emotions, as well as understanding the emotions of others. Communication training programs can teach conflict resolution skills and techniques for maintaining respectful dialogue. These programs often focus on active listening, assertiveness without aggression, and techniques for de-escalating conflicts.

In summary, aggressive communication is a multifaceted issue that requires a comprehensive understanding of linguistic theories, emotional dynamics, and contextual factors. The foundational work of scholars like J.L. Austin, John Searle, H.P. Grice, Penelope Brown, Stephen C. Levinson, and Paul Ekman provides a robust framework for analyzing and addressing aggressive communication. By integrating insights from these scholars, we can develop more effective strategies for managing and mitigating the negative impacts of aggressive communication in various aspects of life. The complexity of aggressive communication highlights the

need for ongoing research and practical interventions to foster more respectful and productive interactions.

1.2 Linguistic pragmatic aspects of emotions

In the realm of linguistic pragmatics, the study of emotions occupies a crucial space, exploring how emotions are expressed, perceived, and interpreted through language within various communicative contexts. Emotions play a fundamental role in human interaction, influencing not only what is communicated but also how it is communicated and understood. It is important to apprehend the relationship between language and emotions, highlighting the pragmatic mechanisms that facilitate the expression and interpretation of emotional states.

The main tasks of pragmatics are: to provide successfulness conditions for the utterance-act and explain in what respect such an act may be a component in a course of interaction in which it is either accepted or rejected by another speaker. In other words: what has been the abstract structure of the utterance-object must become the abstract structure of the utterance-act. A second task, thus, is to formulate the principles underlying such courses of verbal interaction, which must be satisfied for an utterance act to be successful. Third, since our empirical data are largely available only in the form of utterances, it should be made clear in pragmatics how conditions of success for the utterance as act, as well as principles of communicative interaction, are connected with the structure or interpretation of the discourse. (Dijk, 1976:190)

While discussing pragmatic-communicative aspects of a literary text, we should consider the fact that the aim of a literary text is not only to convey particular information but also to influence the thoughts, feelings and emotions of the addressee. Adequate comprehension of the function of a literary text is impossible without analyzing basic components of pragmatics. These components are: pragmatic purpose and pragmatic potential. Literary discourse reflects not only the outer world, objective reality, but also inner world of the characters, described by

the author, and subjective reality of the author. Literary discourse is characterized by a unique wholeness and expresses ideology and pragmatic purpose of the author.

Pragmatic purpose can be defined as a purposeful concrete intention of the addresser, materialized in the text in order to impress the addressee. Pragmatic purpose of a literary text is closely connected to two components of an act of communication, i.e. to the link between the author and the target reader. It is linked to the text's semantic category, specifically to its two types: conceptual semantic information and implicit semantic information. "All the processes of expression involve intention which is thoroughly contemplated and which mobilizes the necessary means of linguistic expression. Speaker's, orator's and writer's intention is an idea for the receiver. It is a source of idea."

A key aspect of the pragmatics of literary texts is that it tends to uncover the conditions under which the pragmatic effect can be achieved only through pragmatic competence, which depends on the addressee's level of awareness. Pragmatic competence refers to the ability of the addresser to handle the linguistic expression of the world.

1.2.1 Communicative paradigms

Since the 17th century, the examination of cognition has remained philosophy's primary focus. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, philosophical domains like empiric-criticism prioritized investigating theories of knowledge. Experimental psychology, beginning in the late 19th century, turned its attention to cognition, initially exploring sensory processes like sensation and perception. The following approach to the language phenomenon and its components is universal, integrating various anthropocentric approaches that succeeded structuralism and emerged in the 20th century, including functionalism, the communicative approach, the activity approach to language, psycholinguistics, text linguistics, and sociolinguistics: language is a cognitive domain interconnected with others, reflecting the interplay of psychological, cultural, sociological, environmental, and various other factors, thus necessitating interdisciplinary study; the structure of

language relies on “conceptualization”, shaped by an individual’s experiences and interactions with their surroundings and their relationship to the external world; language units undergo categorization, forming networks of “conceptual” dependencies based on prototype principles, with many of these connections being metaphorical and metonymic. The following point is grammar which is driven by semantics, meaning the properties of linguistic forms arise from human semantic and pragmatic needs. The meaning of a language unit is a conceptual structure “conventionally” tied to it, based on figurative associations with physical space. These conceptualizations are highly environment-dependent, meaning universal definitions are impossible as meanings are unique to each language. Meanings are framed within “relevant” knowledge structures (such as “conceptual domains”, “scenes”, “naive models”, and “cognitive models”), distinguishing focus from background knowledge structures. Syntax, morphology, phonology, lexicon, and semantics are interdependent and influenced by extralinguistic behavior and knowledge, lacking “autonomy”.

The fusion of scientific schools and research programs, along with the rise of cognitive linguistics, gave birth to the cognitive-communicative paradigm. This paradigm marks the shift from static to dynamic linguistics, examining language from a functional perspective within speech activity. Text and discourse have become core subjects of linguistic research, analyzed within the context of speech activity.

The cognitive-communicative paradigm is grounded in the concept that language functions as a cognitive process occurring within communicative activity, enabled by specific cognitive structures and mechanisms in the human brain. This paradigm uniquely synthesizes cognitive linguistics (focused on mental processes related to language) with communicative or functional linguistics, incorporating semiotic principles. It entails analyzing pragmatic attitudes of speakers and listeners and the conditions for performing speech acts, alongside examining speech-thinking processes based on the brain’s capabilities. Hence, understanding linguistic phenomena occurs at the intersection of cognition and communication, justified by

the functional nature of language that serves both cognitive and communicative purposes. The informational nature of both cognition and communication underpins their relationship, dealing with knowledge, opinions, assessments, generalizations, beliefs, and other linguistic-psychological aspects.

It is important to note that in modern pragmalinguistic literature along with the notion of “language personality” (refers to the aggregate of an individual’s linguistic traits and competencies that reflect their identity and worldview), there is also a “speech personality”, derived from the Saussurian dichotomy language - speech, and “communicative personality” - a specific participant in the communicative act.

The concept of “speech personality” delves into the intricate interplay between an individual’s language use and their personal, social, and cultural identity. It emphasizes how speech reflects and influences one’s character, cognitive processes, social interactions, and cultural norms. Speech personality is a critical aspect of individual and cultural identity. It reflects how individuals use language to express their personal identity and navigate social roles. Scholars like Claire Kramsch have explored this interplay, emphasizing that language learning and use are intertwined with cultural identity. In “Language and Culture” (1998), Kramsch argues that language is a key vehicle for expressing and negotiating cultural identity.

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis further supports this view by suggesting that language shapes thought and perception. Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf posited that the structure and vocabulary of a language influence how its speakers perceive and categorize the world. Consequently, speech personality reflects the cognitive and cultural frameworks individuals use to interpret their experiences.

Moreover, in the 60-ies of the last century, the opinion was asserted that “the person speaking” is a creature capable of “conducting an incessant dialogue”, beginning with the exchange that underlies all other types of exchange and makes them possible (we mean the exchange of words). If we are entitled to call the person *Homo sapiens*, then, first of all, because he is *Homo loquens*, a speaking man.

It is important to note that the cognitive-communicative paradigm that emerged in the latter half of the 20th century was driven not only by prevailing linguistic and psychological advancements in the sciences but also by social and natural science factors. The consolidation of this paradigm in the humanities is significantly influenced by A. Einstein's theory of relativity and N. Bohr's theory of complementarity, which served as the scientific "alpha" shaping the direction of research throughout the mid-20th and early 21st centuries.

Perceiving the cognitive-communicative paradigm as a complex linguistic unit, we consider it necessary to identify its prolegomena, i.e. universally recognized ideas on the basis of which it was built:

1. Synthetic character of the paradigm.
2. Domination of language in thinking and mastering the world in society.
3. Polyphony in discourse.
4. Ambivalence of verbal structures and stability of speech generation.
5. Interpretation of indirect speech acts, metaphors, underlies the understanding of metamodels in discourse.
6. Meta meaning in discourse.
7. Most of the speech events are repeated, recurrence is the most important prerequisite for mutual understanding of the interlocutors.
8. Reflection is the main tool of the researcher.

The foundation of our study lies in the fifth, sixth, and eighth points, as indirect communication requires the listener to continuously decode the speaker's message. The text serves as a code, a meta-meaning, which must be identified. Meta-meaning encompasses everything not explicitly stated by the speaker (the author) and must be understood by the listener (reader) to grasp the true meaning of the message. These are the implicatures, as defined by P. Grice, which need to be uncovered to decode the message. One way to identify meta-meaning is to interpret indirect speech acts such as hints, irony, hidden mockery, allegory, deliberate misunderstanding, parody, implicit pressure, silence, metaphor, etc. (Grice, 1975)

1.2.2 The main linguistic theories of communication

Communication, a cornerstone of human interaction, is fundamentally driven by the “speaking person”, also referred to as “homo loquens”, a concept introduced by N.D. Arutyunova. The focus on the individual, the self, and the “I” spans multiple disciplines, including philosophy, psychology, sociology, and linguistics. Modern perspectives on the “Ego” view it as a multi-faceted phenomenon, encompassing various aspects such as the phenomenological, biological, material, interactive, linguistic, and ideological selves.

The exploration of communication, specifically speech activity, within the realm of domestic linguistics, led to the development of the theory of speech communication in the 1970s. This new theory broadened the scope beyond individual speech acts, incorporating elements from psychology and information theory to define a more comprehensive concept of the communication act.

In linguistics, one of the known schemes of the speech act was proposed by R.O. Jakobson. The model of the speech act includes six main components: context, sender (addresser), message, recipient (addressee), code, and contact. This model highlights the complexity of communication, emphasizing that a message is not just transmitted but is also encoded and decoded within a specific context and through a shared code (language). The component of contact in Jakobson’s model encompasses both oral and written forms of communication, underlining the various mediums through which communication can occur. (Jakobson, 1960)

The components of communication, or speech activity can be differentiated into three key aspects: language as an object, language as a process, and language as an ability. Lately it was expanded on components by associating them with different manifestations of the “Speaking Man”, a concept that explores the multifaceted nature of human linguistic interaction:

Language as an object: refers to the tangible, structural elements of language, such as grammar, vocabulary, and phonetics. It represents language in its static form, as a set of symbols and rules that can be studied and analyzed. This corresponds to the notion of linguistic person or linguistic personality, an individual

who demonstrates a certain level of knowledge and understanding of a language's formal aspects. This "linguistic person" is characterized by their ability to use language correctly and accurately, reflecting a deep familiarity with its conventional structures and norms.

Language as a process emphasizes the dynamic, ongoing nature of communication. It involves the active use of language in real-time to convey thoughts, emotions, and intentions. This aspect highlights the fluid and contextual nature of communication, where language is continuously adapted and shaped by the speaker's goals and the communicative situation. Krasnykh identifies this component with the communicative personality, the individual who engages in specific communicative acts. This personality type focuses on the pragmatic and contextual use of language, adapting speech to suit different communicative settings and interlocutors.

Language as an ability: refers to the inherent capability of individuals to acquire, comprehend, and utilize language. It encompasses both the cognitive and practical skills needed for effective communication. In Krasnykh's framework, this is associated with the speech personality, an individual who not only knows the language but also strategically uses it to achieve specific communicative goals. This includes choosing appropriate linguistic and extralinguistic tools, such as tone, body language, and contextual cues, to enhance the effectiveness of communication. (Krasnykh, 2003)

In contemporary pragmalinguistics, various interpretations of the term "communicative situation" exist, reflecting diverse perspectives on this linguistic concept. The issue of defining communicative situations has been explored by scholars such as V.G. Admoni, E. Benveniste, V.G. Gak, N.I. Zhinkin, V.A. Zvegintsev, I.A. Sternin, and N.I. Formanovskaya, among others.

Some researchers interpret a communicative situation as an individual speech act or a segment of a larger communication event, such as a single utterance in a dialogue. The communicator, driven by a particular intention, internally formulates the message, which is then articulated through external speech by encoding it into

sounds. The recipient, upon receiving this auditory signal, deciphers and understands the conveyed meaning. This process involves an exchange of cues, establishing a feedback loop where the roles of speaker and listener are continually exchanged, maintaining the fundamental structure of the communicative act: speaker, message, and listener.

Linguists like V. von Humboldt, J.L. Austin, H.P. Grice, and M.A.K. Halliday have pointed out that utterances are inherently linked to specific contexts, asserting that context-free statements do not exist. As a result, every utterance carries not only a referential meaning but also a social contextual meaning that is comprehended within the particular communication situation. (Rezunenکو, 2007)

1.3 Communicative situations and how they appear

The concept of communicative situations is fundamental to understanding human interaction. A communicative situation encompasses not only the verbal exchanges between interlocutors but also the underlying social, psychological, and contextual factors that influence communication. This chapter aims to explore the structure of communicative situations, integrating perspectives from various disciplines and scholars to provide a comprehensive understanding of the components and dynamics involved. By examining key theoretical frameworks and empirical findings, this chapter will elucidate how communicative situations are constructed, maintained, and understood.

A communicative situation can be broadly defined as a context or environment in which communication occurs, involving participants who share information, ideas, or feelings. The structure of these situations includes several core components: the speaker, the listener, the message, the medium, the context, and the feedback mechanism.

Roman Jakobson, a prominent figure in structural linguistics, proposed a model that identifies six elements in any communicative act: context, message, addresser (speaker), addressee (listener), contact (medium), and code (language). Jakobson's model emphasizes the functional diversity of communication,

highlighting that each element serves a specific purpose in facilitating effective exchange (Jakobson, 1960).

The critical components within the structure of a speech act include the illocutionary act, also known as illocutionary force, and the perlocutionary act. According to a dictionary on linguistics and semiotics, “perlocution” refers to the part of the speech act involving the non-verbal consequences of the illocutionary act, such as eliciting surprise, causing offense, etc. “Illocution” pertains to the intentional aspect of an utterance, while an illocutionary act represents a type of speech action executed during the utterance of a speech act, reflecting its communicative intent and purpose. Furthermore, the primary function of a perlocutionary act is to influence the listener’s understanding or behavior, thus generating a new communicative situation.

In his seminal work “How to Do Things with Words”, J.L. Austin introduces the concept of the “performative” utterance, derived from the Latin term “Regego”, meaning “I act.” This type of utterance is distinct from declarative statements, as it serves not merely to describe a state of affairs but to perform an action. Unlike declarative statements, performative utterances are not assessed in terms of truth or falsity but are instead used to execute an action.

Performatives possess several distinguishing characteristics:

1. They function simultaneously as both an action and a statement.
2. They lack the attributes of truth and falsity.
3. They are self-referential, referring to the speaker or addressee.
4. They occur at the moment of speaking.
5. They are characterized by the modality of reality.
6. They conform to socially accepted norms and conventions (etiquette).
7. They exist only at the moment of utterance.
8. They are typically expressed using a verb in the first-person singular, present tense, indicative mood, or by using a first-person pronoun followed by a verb, as in “I promise you that...”. In written language, this can also manifest as a passive verb form in the second or third person, present tense, indicative

mood, such as in “Passengers are asked to cross the railroad tracks only via the pedestrian bridge” (Austin, 2004:26).

We should note at once that context is a critical component in the structure of communicative situations. According to Dell Hymes, a sociolinguist who developed the “SPEAKING” model, context includes settings, participants, ends (goals), acts, key (tone), instrumentalities (forms and styles of speech), norms, and genre. This model underscores that the effectiveness of communication depends heavily on the alignment of these contextual elements (Hymes, 1972).

Further, H.P. Grice introduced the concept of “implicature” in his theory of conversational maxims, which are guidelines that speakers typically follow to ensure effective communication. Grice's maxims - quantity, quality, relation, and manner - highlight the implicit rules governing communicative situations, where context helps infer meaning beyond the literal words spoken (Grice, 1975).

Moreover, the roles of the speaker and listener are dynamic and often interchangeable within a communicative situation. The speaker encodes thoughts into a message using language, while the listener decodes and interprets this message. Consolidating with the point of view of Erving Goffman, we note that these roles can also include a range of participation statuses such as bystanders, overhearers, or eavesdroppers, who, while not directly engaged, still form part of the communicative context (Goffman, 1981).

The structure of communicative situations is also shaped by social variables such as power, status, and cultural norms. Pierre Bourdieu, a sociologist and philosopher, discussed the concept of “linguistic capital”, referring to the social value attributed to different ways of speaking. Bourdieu’s work highlights how power dynamics influence who gets to speak, what is said, and how it is interpreted, thereby shaping the communicative situation. (Bourdieu, 1991)

Robin Lakoff, a linguist, explored how gender affects communication, noting that societal norms often dictate the expected language behaviors of different genders. Lakoff's findings suggest that gendered language use can lead to

miscommunication or unequal participation in communicative situations (Lakoff, 1975).

For our study, it is also important to highlight the process of encoding a message which involves selecting appropriate language and symbols to convey the intended meaning. Claude Shannon and Warren Weaver's communication model, originally developed for information theory, emphasizes the importance of clarity in this process, noting that noise can disrupt the transmission of the message. Their model delineates components such as the information source, transmitter, signal, receiver, and destination, which can be adapted to human communication to understand how messages are sent and received. (Shannon & Weaver, 1949)

Stuart Hall, a cultural theorist, further developed this idea in his encoding/decoding model, which posits that messages are interpreted in multiple ways depending on the listener's cultural background and personal experiences. Hall's model suggests that decoding is not a passive process but an active engagement with the message, influenced by the individual's social context and ideology (Hall, 1980).

The structure of communicative situations is a complex interplay of various elements, including context, participants, message construction, and feedback mechanisms. Each component contributes to the overall effectiveness and interpretation of communication. Theoretical contributions from scholars across multiple disciplines – such as Jakobson, Hymes, Grice, Goffman, Bourdieu, Lakoff, Shannon, Weaver, Hall, Austin, Searle, Bateson, and Tannen - provide a rich framework for analyzing and understanding these situations.

Understanding the intricacies of communicative situations is not merely an academic exercise but has practical implications in fields such as linguistics, sociology, psychology, and communication studies. By integrating these diverse perspectives, this chapter offers a comprehensive overview of how communicative situations are structured, highlighting the importance of context, roles, power dynamics, message construction, and feedback in shaping human interaction.

1.4 Strategy of dominance in speech aggression

Linguists have shown a sustained interest in speech aggression, likely because of its increasing presence in public, political discourse, and the media. This form of aggression is seen as a significant factor that can have negative emotional and psychological effects on the recipient. Additionally, it serves as a communicative strategy during conflict situations.

Currently, a prominent field in the study of verbal aggression is psycholinguistics, which explores how aggression arises during the cognitive process, specifically through the transformation of external reactions to negative stimuli into internal responses, which are expressed through speech. Speech, as a complex neuropsychological activity, is heavily influenced by intellectual processes, making it a key area for understanding the mechanisms behind verbal aggression.

One of the key components in aggression is dominance. Dominance in communication refers to the use of language and other communicative behaviors to assert control or influence over others. Deborah Tannen, a renowned linguist and professor, has extensively explored the concept of dominance in communication. In her research, Tannen examines how conversational styles and gender dynamics influence perceived dominance and power relations in communication, especially within professional settings. Key concepts from Tannen's work are:

1. **Conversational style:** Tannen emphasizes that conversational style - the way individuals speak, including their tone, pace, and choice of words - can significantly affect perceptions of dominance. For instance, some people might speak more assertively, using direct language and firm tone, which can come across as more dominant. Others might use a more cooperative or deferential style, characterized by softer tones and indirect speech, which can be perceived as less dominant.
2. **Gender differences:** One of central themes is the difference in communication styles between men and women. She argues that these differences often lead to misunderstandings and can influence workplace dynamics. For example, men are often socialized to be more competitive

and direct, which can be interpreted as dominant. In contrast, women are often socialized to be more collaborative and supportive, which might be seen as less dominant in traditional hierarchical structures.

3. **Metamessages:** Tannen introduces the concept of “metamessages”, which are the implicit messages conveyed by the way something is said, rather than by the content itself. These metamessages can convey dominance or submission. For example, interrupting someone can send a metamessage of control or dominance, whereas frequent nodding and agreeing can convey support or deference.
4. **Power dynamics in workplace communication:** The main point is to explore how these gendered conversational styles manifest in the workplace. She discusses how men and women might perceive and react to interruptions, the use of humor, the framing of criticism, and the dynamics of speaking in meetings. For example, women are often interrupted more frequently than men in meetings, which can undermine their perceived authority and contributions.
5. **Implications for leadership and management:** Tannen’s work has significant implications for leadership and management practices. Understanding these dynamics can help leaders foster more inclusive and effective communication strategies. By recognizing how conversational styles can affect perceptions of dominance and power, managers can work towards creating environments where all voices are heard and valued, and where different communication styles are respected. (Tannen, 1994)

Deborah Tannen’s exploration of dominance in communication provides valuable insights into how conversational styles shape power dynamics, particularly in gendered contexts. Her work underscores the importance of being aware of these dynamics to avoid misunderstandings and to promote equitable communication practices, both in the workplace and in broader social interactions.

Verbal aggression manifests speech situations characterized by dominance. This form of aggression can occur across various communicative contexts.

In contemporary linguistics, terms such as verbal aggression, hate speech, verbal extremism, and discourse of hatred have gained prominence. The prevalence of verbal aggression is largely attributed to an unfavorable socio-cultural climate present in many modern societies. This environment is marked by increasing antisocial behavior, a general decline in speech etiquette, the rise of invective and vulgar language, the promotion of violence through media outlets, and a significant weakening of the traditional communicative norms that once mitigated such aggressive verbal expressions.

Building on the psychological theory of activity as developed by scholars like J.C. Vygotsky, P.I. Zhinkin, L.V. Zaporozhets, V.P. Zinchenko, and A.A. Leontiev, the act of speech aggression can be understood as the internalization of an action. This internalization refers to the process where externally visible actions are transformed into mental activities within the consciousness. These activities then become abstracted, verbalized, condensed, and crucially, capable of further cognitive development. The core of verbal aggression lies in the unique transformation of external processes, such as responses to negative emotional stimuli, into internal processes linked to speech. Verbal aggression, like other speech acts, is characterized by a duality or ambivalence: it involves reflexive responses shared with animals and higher forms of neuropsychic activity unique to humans.

An alternative approach to studying verbal aggression involves analyzing aggressive speech acts as methods of exerting negative influence on the recipient, in line with the communicative theories of J.L. Austin and J.R. Searle. This perspective categorizes techniques aimed at “affecting the consciousness, behavior, and emotions of the addressees when one party seeks to irritate the other at any cost, to influence them, and to assert dominance”.

While exploring features of dominance in communication it is worth discussing the main strategies of speech aggression (methods used by speakers to achieve these aggressive ends, often by manipulating language to affect the target emotionally, cognitively, or socially).

The first place is taken by direct speech acts which involve clear and unambiguous expressions of aggression, often in the form of commands, criticisms, or insults. These acts are straightforward in their intent to dominate or control. For instance, commands like “Do it now!”, “Stop doing that!” leave little room for negotiation, clearly positioning the speaker in a dominant role. Similarly, direct criticisms or insults, such as “You’re incompetent!”, serve to diminish the target's social standing, thereby asserting the speaker's superiority.

In contrast, indirect speech acts are also present in communication. They are more subtle forms of aggression that rely on implied meanings and require interpretation by the listener. These can include sarcasm, innuendo, or veiled threats. For example, the statement “It would be a shame if something happened to your project” implies a threat without directly stating it, thus allowing the speaker to maintain plausible deniability while still asserting dominance. Indirect speech acts are often more socially acceptable than direct ones, as they can be less confrontational and provide a way to manage face concerns. (Searle, 1969)

Moreover, interruptions and conversational overlaps can be powerful tools for asserting dominance in a dialogue. Zimmerman and West found that men are more likely than women to interrupt in mixed-gender conversations, a pattern that can reflect broader societal power imbalances. Interruptions serve to disrupt the flow of conversation and assert control over the dialogue, positioning the interrupter as more dominant. However, not all interruptions are perceived negatively; cooperative overlaps, where the listener shows active engagement and support, can be a sign of interest and solidarity (Zimmerman and West 1975, P.105).

The use of questions, particularly challenging or rhetorical questions, can serve as a form of speech aggression. These questions can undermine the authority or credibility of the interlocutor, thereby asserting the speaker's dominance. For instance, a question like “Do you really think that’s a good idea?” not only questions the validity of the other’s viewpoint but also implies the speaker’s superiority in judgment. This strategy is often used in debates and arguments to destabilize the opponent’s position.

The oncoming discussion is connected with mock politeness and irony. Mock politeness, or “politeness strategies” used insincerely, can be another form of speech aggression. Brown and Levinson describe how speakers might use exaggerated politeness to mask an insult or criticism, thereby making the aggression more palatable or socially acceptable. For example, saying “Oh, you’re so smart” in a sarcastic tone can be a way to belittle someone’s intelligence while outwardly appearing polite. This tactic allows the speaker to maintain a veneer of civility while still achieving the intended dominance effect (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

The use of speech aggression and dominance strategies can have significant psychological and social implications. According to Leech, repeated exposure to verbal aggression can lead to stress, anxiety, and decreased self-esteem in the target. This is particularly relevant in environments such as workplaces or educational settings, where power dynamics are often at play. Moreover, the use of speech aggression can reinforce existing social hierarchies and power imbalances, contributing to systemic issues such as sexism, racism, and classism. (Leech, 1983)

Further significant component of this discussion is presented with gender and cultural considerations. Gender and cultural contexts greatly influence the perception and impact of speech aggression. As Tannen points out, conversational styles can vary greatly between men and women, with men often socialized to be more assertive and women to be more cooperative. These differences can lead to misunderstandings and reinforce gender stereotypes. (Tannen, 1990) Similarly, cultural norms dictate what is considered aggressive or dominant behavior. For example, what might be seen as assertive in one culture could be perceived as rude or aggressive in another (Hofstede, 1980). Understanding these cultural and gendered nuances is crucial for interpreting speech aggression accurately.

Furthermore, the ethical implications of using dominance strategies in speech aggression cannot be overlooked. While some degree of assertiveness may be necessary in certain contexts, crossing the line into aggression can be harmful and counterproductive. According to Habermas’s theory of communicative action, ethical communication should aim for mutual understanding and respect, rather than

manipulation or compulsion. Therefore, the strategic use of speech aggression raises ethical questions about the balance between asserting oneself and respecting others dignity and autonomy (Habermas, 1984).

The realization of dominance strategies in speech aggression is a complex interplay of direct and indirect communication tactics, cultural norms, and psychological factors. Understanding these strategies requires a multifaceted approach that considers the theoretical frameworks provided by scholars like Tannen, Goffman, and Searle, among others. As this chapter has shown, speech aggression is not merely a linguistic phenomenon but a social one, deeply embedded in the structures of power and hierarchy. Recognizing and critically examining these dynamics is essential for fostering more equitable and respectful communication practices.

Conclusion to Chapter One

Aggressive communication is a multifaceted phenomenon that influences various aspects of interpersonal interactions, organizational environments, and discourse as a speech phenomenon. This Chapter has delved into the essence of aggressive communication, exploring its linguistic underpinnings and the role it plays in shaping human interaction. By examining aggressive communication through the lenses of Speech Act Theory, the Cooperative Principle, and Politeness Theory, this chapter has provided a comprehensive analysis of how aggressive language functions and impacts communication. Additionally, the chapter explored the pragmatic aspects of emotions, emphasizing the importance of understanding the interplay between language and emotions in communicative contexts.

First of all, the importance of understanding different types of speech acts is highlighted in analyzing aggressive communication: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. This understanding can help in identifying the underlying motivations behind aggressive language and its impact on interpersonal relationships.

Moreover, Grice's Cooperative Principle provides a framework for understanding how communication is intended to function in cooperative interactions, and Politeness Theory, as developed by Brown and Levinson, explores how individuals manage face-threatening acts in social interactions.

In this Chapter we identified various linguistic markers of aggression, including lexical choices, syntactic structures, and pragmatic features.

The Chapter also explored pragmatic aspects of emotions, focusing on how emotions are expressed, perceived, and interpreted through language. Emotions play a critical role in shaping the way communication is conducted and understood. The chapter highlighted the importance of pragmatic competence in recognizing and interpreting the emotional content of communication. This competence is essential for understanding the impact of emotions on aggressive communication and for developing strategies to manage emotional triggers in interpersonal interactions.

The Chapter has provided a comprehensive analysis of the theoretical foundations, emotional drivers, and linguistic markers of aggressive communication. By integrating insights from Speech Act Theory, the Cooperative Principle, Politeness Theory, and the pragmatics of emotions, this chapter has contributed to a deeper understanding of how aggressive language functions and impacts human interaction.

The findings underscore the importance of ongoing research and practical interventions to address the challenges posed by aggressive communication. By promoting empathy, emotional intelligence, and politeness strategies, it is possible to mitigate the negative effects of aggressive communication and enhance the quality of interpersonal and organizational interactions. The complexity of aggressive communication highlights the need for continued exploration and innovation in the field, with the goal of fostering more respectful, constructive, and positive communication in all areas of life.

CHAPTER TWO. MAIN PRINCIPLES OF FUNCTIONING OF AGGRESSIVE COMMUNICATION IN MODERN ENGLISH SERIAS

2.1 Strategy of dominance. Its function in the structure of a speech act

The strategy of dominance in speech acts is a crucial area of study within cognitive linguistics and pragmatics. It is particularly relevant in contexts where speakers aim to establish or maintain authority. This research examines the cognitive processes involved in these strategies, focusing on conceptualization, inferencing, and perspective-taking.

First of all, conceptualization is the process by which individuals form mental representations of the world and encode these representations in language. According to Lakoff and Johnson, conceptual metaphors play a significant role in shaping our understanding and expression of abstract concepts, including power and dominance. Dominance strategies often rely on metaphors that frame interactions in terms of hierarchy and control (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980).

The next step is inferencing – the cognitive process of deriving implicit meanings from explicit language. Dominance strategies often involve indirect speech acts where the intended meaning is not directly stated but inferred by the listener. The ability to make inferences is crucial for both the speaker, who must anticipate the listener's inferential processes, and the listener, who must accurately interpret the speaker's intentions.

All in all, perspective-taking is the ability to understand a situation from another person's viewpoint. In the context of dominance in speech acts, effective perspective-taking enables a speaker to anticipate how their utterances will be received and to adjust their language to achieve the desired impact. The concept of Theory of Mind (ToM), as discussed by Baron-Cohen, refers to the ability to attribute mental states to oneself and others. ToM is essential for interpreting and predicting the behavior of others based on their beliefs, desires, and intentions. In dominance strategies, a speaker with a well-developed ToM can craft messages that

manipulate the listener's perception and reactions to maintain or enhance their own authority (Baron-Cohen, 1985).

In our research we highlight Searle's work on speech acts, which distinguishes between direct and indirect speech acts. Direct speech acts, such as commands, are straightforward expressions of dominance. Indirect speech acts, such as suggestions or hints, require the listener to infer the intended meaning, allowing the speaker to exert control subtly (Searle, 1969).

Furthermore, we are going to emphasize the importance of gender which also plays a crucial role in how dominance is enacted and perceived in speech acts.

Tannen's

work on gendered communication styles in "You just don't understand" reveals that men and women often use different strategies to assert dominance, influenced by societal expectations and norms. The real situations must reveal the essence of this topic. (Tannen, 1990)

2.1.1 The main types of direct speech acts

It is important to note that direct speech acts involve utterances where the speaker's intention is explicitly stated and readily understood without the need for inferencing. These acts are integral to effective communication, enabling clear and unambiguous exchanges. The study of direct speech acts is rooted in the broader field of pragmatics, which focuses on language use in context.

Our research goes deeper to John Searle's work expanded on Austin's ideas. Searle focused on the illocutionary act, categorizing speech acts based on their function and the speaker's intention. He identified five primary categories of illocutionary acts that were already mentioned in the first chapter: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, declarations. In this part of the study, we will examine and analyze the real examples (Austin, 1962).

- **Assertives** are direct speech acts where the speaker conveys information, states facts, or describes the world. The primary function of assertives is to represent a state of affairs and commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition.

They are characterized by their truth-conditional nature, meaning their validity depends on their correspondence with reality. They are essential for sharing knowledge and establishing common ground in communication.

Situation 1: Mrs. Bridgerton is getting ready to welcome guests to their family mansion.

- Miss Patridge requires large amounts of sugar for her morning tea, and Lord Abernathy, he will refuse to eat any meat that is not well-cooked, while Lady Abernathy will only consume her meat bloody. And make sure you put an extra blanket on Lord Weston's bed. I hear he feels the cold. (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 4)

Meaning: Mrs. Bridgerton provides the information that is known to everyone just to make sure everything will be perfectly ready for her guests.

Situation 2: Miss Edwina and Lord Bridgerton are on the hunting. The conversation starts between them and young lady is talking about her experience in this unique hobby.

- My father was a secretary for a royal family in India. A family gracious enough to let me hunt with them. Even as a young lady.
- Then it seems you'll manage quite well. (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 4)

Meaning: Miss Sharma is sharing the information about her father and how she learned to hunt. This topic was chosen according to the situation and in order to establish common ground in this small talk.

▪ **Directives** are speech acts in which the speaker attempts to get the listener to perform a specific action. These acts are characterized by their function of influencing the listener's behavior. They can vary in their level of politeness and forcefulness, from polite requests to authoritative commands.

Situation 3: we will analyze the phrases of the queen in the season 2 of Bridgerton serial.

- Now, tell me of your wedding plan. (Episode 4)
- Make them bigger, longer, brighter. Our guests must be captivated. (Episode 5)

- Brimsley, escort the guests to the garden and do not allow anyone to leave. (Episode 6)
- I shall give you three days to consider my proposal and come to your senses. If you do not, then I will deploy my resources to crush you like a serpent. Pride may not be as precious to you as your breath. (Episode 7)

Meaning: when a person wants to force someone to do something the high tone of voice and clarity in the speech are usually present. In many cases it may be a kind of order or just a request to influence the listener behavior.

▪ **Commissives** - the speaker commits to a future course of action. These acts create an obligation for the speaker to follow through on their stated intention. Searle emphasizes that commissives involve a psychological commitment by the speaker, which can range from informal promises to formal contracts. They are crucial in establishing trust and reliability in interpersonal relationships. (Searle, 1979)

Situation 4:

- I will, of course, confirm that you are rather quiet about how when your business is doing.
- I shall meet you in the carriage.
- I will do everything in me power to ensure your happiness.
- I promised I would not consider myself until you and mama were taken care of.
- I give what I have in order to protect you. (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 6)

Meaning: all above phrases were taken from different situations to show the examples of how a speaker may create an obligation for his own future actions. Sometimes, depending on the situation, such phrases may carry subconscious meanings or goals that the speaker sets for himself.

▪ **Expressives** are direct speech acts that convey the speaker's emotional state or attitude. They express how the speaker feels about a particular situation or event. Expressives play a vital role in social interactions, as they help to convey empathy, build rapport, and maintain social harmony. Holmes highlights the importance of

expressives in workplace communication, noting their role in fostering a positive organizational climate. (Holmes, 1995)

Situation 5:

- I beg your pardon, Lady Danbury.
- It's a delightful surprise to see you in attendance.
- It is a delightful ball, your majesty. Very diamody.
- Your presence is noted and your queen appreciative. Allow it to now be my honor to present to you the season's diamond. (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 1)

Meaning: all examples are taken from a highly polite conversations between the characters of the serial. In general, the language of such expressives in Bridgerton serial is sophisticated and well thought. Though in such polite word combinations a hint of selfishness or mockery may be found.

▪ **Declarations** bring about a change in the external world simply by being uttered. These acts have the unique ability to alter the status or condition of the subject to which they refer. Declarations require a specific institutional context and authority to be effective. They often occur in formal settings, such as legal proceedings, religious ceremonies, and organizational contexts.

Situation 6: the annual ball organized by the queen started but she decided to interrupt it because of some bad news.

- I have seen enough! (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 1)/

Situation 7: the scene takes place in the church during the priest monologue.

- We are gathered together here in the sight of God. Please, be seated! (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 6)

Meaning: declarations are not featured to the serial under analysis as they are more common during official procedures, however, the examples above are taken from the formal and rather exceptional situations which are governed by a particular person, and namely the queen and the priest.

2.1.2 The main types of indirect speech acts

It is important to recognize that indirect speech acts involve utterances where the intended meaning is not directly stated but inferred by the listener. These acts are essential in everyday communication, providing nuance, politeness, and subtlety. They can be classified according to several criteria:

- according goal-setting (based on the theory of language functions of R. Jakobson, M. Halliday and V. Vinogradov);
- by the strength of the impact (on the illocutionary force, relying on the theory of speech acts of J. Austin and J.L. Searle);
- by the reaction of the Listener (addressee);
- based on the results of communication.

In our study, we emphasize the criterion of deducibility: whether the hidden aggressive meanings of the speaker are decoded and brought from the deep structure to the surface level. This approach involves a linguist-observer (meta-observer) analyzing the speech patterns and behaviors of communicants to understand and elucidate the methods of hidden processes occurring in the linguistic consciousness of participants who need to interpret meta-meanings in speech production.

In this decoding process, the meta-observer (linguist-researcher) interprets several extralinguistic indicators, such as the communication situation, purpose, speaker's intentions, and listener's reaction. Different indirect speech acts exhibit varying strengths of impact, and we are particularly interested in how speech aggression can manifest in both "soft" and rigid forms. We are going to focus on types of speech aggression that, in certain communicative situations, take on allegorical forms, masking their aggressive nature.

- **Hidden mockery** refers to a form of indirect communication where the speaker conveys disdain, ridicule, or scorn in a subtle manner. This type of communication often masks the mockery with polite or seemingly benign language,

making the underlying aggression less obvious. It can be a powerful tool for expressing negative sentiments while maintaining a facade of civility.

It is a form of verbal pressure. In ordinary communication, it is perceived as an “offensive joke, scorn”.

Situation 8: everyone came for the annual ball hosted by the queen to open the season and to crown a young lady with the title of Queen’s diamond.

- Mr. and Mrs. Finch.
- Lady Featherington. It’s a delightful surprise to see you in attendance. After such a long mourning period. Almost as long as our son has been courting Philippa, if you can imagine.
- Yes, it has been difficult time, indeed. Darkness has been our candle in recent months.
- Mmm, have you come unaccompanied? Or has the new heir finally come to manage this unsettled business of your daughter’s dowry?

Meaning: Mr. and Mrs. Finch remind Lady Featherington about her difficult situation with dowry and the death of her husband in quite unpolite and rude way, emphasizing that it took her as long to come back to the society as their son has been courting Philippa.

Situation 9: a small talk happens between men in the garden.

- Mr. Mondrich, I must ask about this social club of yours. An admirable endeavor, if not rather surprising. What can a boxer know about running a business?
- Ha-ha-ha...
- About as much as a gentleman knows about mining.

Meaning: Lord Featherington puts Mr. Mondrich in awkward situation through a hidden mockery, highlighting his past career in boxing. However, the gentleman finds the way to beat him using the same strategy.

▪ **Irony** is a linguistic and rhetorical device where the intended meaning of words is opposite to their literal meaning. It is a multifaceted tool used to convey humor, criticism, or mockery, often in a subtle manner. In the context of aggressive

communication, irony can serve as a vehicle for indirect aggression, allowing speakers to convey negative sentiments while maintaining a facade of politeness or neutrality. It is “a trail consisting of the use of a word or expression in the sense of the reverse of the literal with the aim of ridicule”. (Rosenthal, 2008:155)

Situation 10: Ms. Sharma, Ms. Edwina and Mr. Bridgerton are talking in the garden when the gentleman plans to go for hunting.

- Kate is being modest.
- Do you not think it true?
- Perhaps, your sister aims straight on the field, but surely, she would have some trouble managing...
- Why would you assume I had any trouble managing at all, my lord?!
- I only mean to say....
- Because I am a woman?
- No! No! I did not say that!
- But you thought it!

Meaning: Irony is aimed at the behavior of Mr. Bridgerton. He feels caught off guard and does not manage to find appropriate words for the answer.

Situation 11: Lord Featherington, Mr. Bridgerton (younger son in the family) and Mr. Mondrich are in the bar.

- Mondrich! Pleasure seeing you here.
- Well, it is his bar.
- Seems the lord is treating it more like his private office for conducting his schemes.
- “Schemes” is a rather unpleasant word, don’t you think?

Meaning: Irony is used by Mr. Mondrich against Lord Featherington and his behavior.

▪ **Metaphor** is a figure of speech where one concept is used to represent another, highlighting similarities between them. In indirect communication, metaphor can be presented as one of the forms of moral verbal influence on the addressee.

Situation 12: Miss Sharma and Lord Bridgerton meet in the garden after the young lady overheard the conversation of the Lord and his friends.

- I was wondering if we'd meet again.
- So you might discern if my wit is acceptable, my manners genteel?
- You were eavesdropping?
- It was hardly an effort, seeing as you were proclaiming your many requirements for a wife loud enough for the entire party to hear.
- You take issue with my requirements?
- I take issue with any man who views women merely as chatters and breeding stock.
- None of that was meant...
- Viscount Bridgerton, yes? When you manage to find this paragon of virtue, whatever makes you think she will accept your suit? Are the young ladies of London truly so easily won by a pleasing smile and absolutely nothing more?
- So, you find my smile pleasing.
- I find your opinion of yourself entirely too high. Your character is a deficient as your horsemanship. I shall bid you good night.

Meaning: Metaphor is hidden in the words of Ms. Sharma and how she expresses her surprise and dissatisfaction of Lord Bridgerton opinion about the young ladies of London. She makes it clear that she despises the man and his views.

▪ **Default** in indirect communication can be represented as one of the forms of moral suppression of the addressee.

It is “the turn of speech, consisting in the fact that the author does not fully express the idea, giving the reader (or listener) to guess what was left unsaid”. (Rosenthal, 2008:572)

Situation 13: Everyone gathers for horse racing but the conflict starts between Ms. Sharma and Lord Bridgerton.

- Genuine in the sense you were sent here to distract me, all so Lord Bridgerton could get closer to my sister. We are leaving!
- I have heard of a sore loser, Miss Sharma, but never a sore winner.

- Do not speak to me or my sister ever again!
- What has happened?!
- It seems a second game was a foot today and Lord Bridgerton made certain I play the fool! Let us go!

Meaning: The speaker lets the interlocutor understand that she does not like how she has been treated. The speakers do not give a lot of details, so others simply do not understand what is happening.

▪ **Deliberate misunderstanding** is a form of verbal protest, expressed in the fact that one of the communicants “does not understand” the meaning of words addressed to him, or the intentionally expressed form of a language game.

Situation 14: Bridgerton family sitting together and talking to each other in their home.

- No one informed me that we have lost three staff in the last month! There are precisely the things I must know about.
- We are not the only ones affected by our ill-reputation of late, Anthony.
- Colin! Would you care to inform me about anything?
- ...
- What about our accounts? You do not seem to take note of them, since I spent the last two days balancing our books, only to discover that you have taken out a rather large sum. Whatever for?
- If you must know, I was exploring an investment with Lord Feathrington.
- This is just what makes the difficulties in this household. No one gives any thought as to how it must be managed!
- He is one and 20, brother.
- Is no one in this family allowed to make their own decisions?
- You! Keep doodling. And do not ask me to speak of your activities. I wouldn't know where to begin.

Meaning: Lord Bridgerton wants to understand what happened with a big amount of money and why no one told him anything. He is shocked and frustrated but others are not taking it seriously.

▪ In terms of indirect communication, **implicit pressure** refers to a subtle form of verbal coercion designed to instill fear in the listener by affecting their behavior, emotions, and perceptions.

Situation 15: Mrs. Featherington thinking about her future with daughters as it depends on Lord Featherington.

- Well, where is he? Why is he taking so long?
- Because he wishes to make us suffer. The new Lord Featherington is off somewhere, delighted in our misfortune, because this man is as cruel as he can be. I heart he cast his only son out the Americas for daring to question his word. I trembled to think where he will send the rest of us if he has a mind.

Meaning: Mrs. Featherington creates a cruel picture of Lord Featherington, however, she knows that her future is connected with him and he is the only person who can save their family. She imposes on her daughters the idea of who this man is.

Given the speaker's intent and situational context, any speech act can manifest as an indirect speech act. Mentioned allegories are seen as fundamental and recurring. We have delineated cognitive operations for explantation, which involve unveiling the meaning within the allegory. These operations include:

a) Decoding the hidden meaning of the utterance, thus fulfilling the main objective of the explantation, which is to clarify and interpret the utterance's meaning;

b) Identifying extralinguistic elements of discourse and their impact on the speech configuration.

Identifying the aggressive potential in indirect speech acts is complex, requiring not only linguistic expertise but also an "extralinguistic instinct" that enables the addressee to discern and surface the speaker's hidden meanings. Consequently, the strategy of domination plays a pivotal role in recognizing and analyzing indirect (implicit) speech acts, which shape the communication context and the addressee's speech behavior.

In this study, the meta-observer conducts explanation, primarily focusing on extralinguistic factors defining the communicative scenario. Considering the verbal influence of the speaker, we discuss the illocutionary intent and the hearer's response as the perlocutionary effect.

2.2 Aggressive communication in Modern English series

Infante and Wigley describe verbal aggressiveness as a communication trait where a person attacks the self-concept of another person instead of, or in addition to, their position on an issue. The direct confrontation and accusations in communication exemplify verbal aggressiveness, as the speakers challenge each other's decisions and character (Infante and Wigley, 1986).

In this part of the work, attention is focused on revealing all peculiarities of aggressive communication in the real process of speech interaction.

Situation 16: Miss Daphne and her brother are discussing awkward situation that just has happened between Miss Sharma and Mr. Bridgerton.

- It is not what you think.
- I am trying very much not to think about it all.
- Daphne....
- You are courting her sister!
- And I have every intention of bringing it to a point.
- Why?!
- Why?! Because I am courting her. Because I have decided!
- And I have decided last year that I would marry the prince until you caught me in the garden with Simon at the Trowbridge Ball under very similar circumstances!
- Similar only in that I am a man and Miss Sharma is a woman.
- And you were alone! Quite close to one another.
- Only there is one significant difference! Nothing, in fact, happened!
(Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 4)

The dialogue under discussion reflects an escalating confrontation that reveals underlying tensions, misunderstandings, and aggressive communication strategies. First of all, direct accusation, which serves as a verbal attack: “*You are courting her sister!*” This statement confronts interlocutor with an assumption, which can be seen as an aggressive move intended to provoke a defensive response. However, the response, “*And I have every intention of bringing it to a point,*” is a defensive justification, indicating that the accused feels compelled to defend their actions. The defensive nature of this statement suggests that the speaker feels attacked and is trying to assert control over the situation. As noted by Gottman in his studies on conflict communication, defensiveness is a common reaction to perceived verbal aggression, “it is often a mechanism to protect oneself from the perceived threat posed by the aggressive interlocutor” (Gottman, 1994).

It is worth mentioning that the use of social norms and gender expectations in communication can be a form of symbolic aggression. According to Lakoff, language often reflects and reinforces societal power structures. By invoking gender roles, the speaker implicitly asserts dominance and attempts to rationalize behavior that might otherwise be seen as questionable (Lakoff, 1975). The statement, “*Similar only in that I am a man and Miss Sharma is a woman,*” invokes traditional gender roles and societal expectations to justify or dismiss behavior. This line subtly emphasizes gender norms to deflect criticism, implying that what might be improper for a woman is not necessarily so for a man.

The next point in our analysis is minimization. It is a tactic described by Infante and Rancer in their work on argumentative and aggressive communication. It involves diminishing the importance of the other’s concerns, which can lead to further frustration and aggression from the other party (Infante and Rancer, 1996). The final line, “*Nothing, in fact, happened!*” serves to minimize the significance of the confrontation. This is a common strategy in aggressive communication, where one party attempts to downplay the issue to avoid accountability or further escalation.

Situation 17: Miss Edwina is frustrated after she understood there are feelings between her sister and the man she wanted to marry.

- What I want is the truth! Oh! Suddenly, your words fail you, sister?
- Edwina! Kate! I am not sure what is going on.
- I shall tell you what is going on, Mama. After a lifetime of filling my head with nonsense, of all this talk of great, gallant notions and looks between lovers...
- Edwina...
- You have feelings for him! All this time you wanted him for yourself.
- No, that is not true!
- Oh, you cannot deny it now, Kate! How could I have been such a fool? You lied to me again and again! You told... You told me. You told me we had put all secrets to rest, but no. The Sheffield inheritance, that was merely the beginning of your deception. I fooled myself into believing you had only the purest of intentions, that your only desire was for me to be happy.
- And you are no one's fool. That is the truth!
- Do you love him?!
- What?! (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 6)

We note that, according to Vangelisti, emotional aggression in communication tends to escalate conflict because it places the interlocutor in a defensive position, making constructive communication difficult. (Vangelisti, 1994) The statement, *“What I want is the truth! Oh! Suddenly, your words fail you, sister?”* shows an emotional outburst combined with an accusatory tone. The speaker's demand for truth and the immediate follow-up with a rhetorical question is designed to corner the other person, creating a confrontational atmosphere.

“You lied to me again and again! You told... You told me. You told me we had put all secrets to rest, but no.” - the theme of betrayal, a potent trigger for aggressive communication is exemplified in this part. Perceived betrayal is a significant catalyst for aggressive communication, as it directly threatens the relational trust between individuals. Research by Metts indicates that betrayal often leads to increased

aggression in communication as the betrayed party seeks to regain control and assert dominance over the narrative (Metts, 1989).

Further tactic used is forcing confrontation, a strategy identified by Cupach and Spitzberg in their research on interpersonal conflict. Forcing a confrontation can be a form of verbal aggression, where one party seeks to elicit a specific response, often with the intention of exposing or humiliating the other. For example: “*Do you love him?!*” is an aggressive move to force the other party into a corner, compelling them to reveal a potentially uncomfortable truth. This demand escalates the emotional intensity and places significant pressure on the other individual (Cupach and Spitzberg, 1994).

Moreover, sarcasm is equally important in this situation. As a form of indirect aggression, it has been explored by Kowalski, who notes that it allows the speaker to express hostility or criticism while maintaining plausible deniability, thus complicating the communication dynamics and often leading to further conflict. (Kowalski, 2000) The rhetorical question “*Oh! Suddenly, your words fail you, sister?*” is a sarcastic remark that serves to undermine and belittle the other person. Sarcasm is a common tool in aggressive communication used to mock or convey contempt.

Situation 18: the conversation during the family dinner turns into an argument.

- I beg your pardon...
- And do not think I took it lightly; being cast out by the only family I had ever known. I was heartbroken, indeed. But in time, I came to see that, in your cruelty, you did us all a great service!
- I hardly think this a proper dinner conversation.
- I quite agree. Please, collect...
- When you cast me out, what you did was set me free! Free to raise my daughters far from your constant judgment and craven demands that they should chase wealth and titles above all else!
- You are a fine one to talk! You speak of scorning riches, and yet you have come crawling back to snatch at our fortune.

- Lady Danbury is right!
- Believe me, I want nothing from you!
- Oh! You may not, but your daughter certainly does! The trust fund we have set up for her. The condition of which clearly states that she must marry a man of good English breeding to inherit!

....

- That is enough!
- I declare!
- I will not... stand for it! You may leave at once!
- You cannot be serious! (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 5)

The dialogue presents a lot of features that were already mentioned, however, built the ground for aggressive communication. For instance, accusatory language is a key line of aggressive communication, where one party places blame on another, often to assert dominance or express hostility. According to Crossley, moral judgments in language are used as a weapon in aggressive communication to undermine the interlocutor's moral standing and justify the speaker's hostility. (Crossley, 1995) The line, "*But in time, I came to see that, in your cruelty, you did us all a great service!*" introduces the conversation with an accusatory tone, disguised as a backhanded compliment. The speaker accuses the other of cruelty, establishing a morally superior position from which to attack. The counterattack, "*You speak of scorning riches, and yet you have come crawling back to snatch at our fortune,*" shifts the focus from the initial accusation to a personal attack on the other's motives. This move escalates the conflict by challenging the speaker's integrity and intentions. Confrontational defense, where the attacked party responds by launching a counterattack, is a common strategy in aggressive communication. According to Baxter, this form of communication is designed to regain control of the narrative and to undermine the credibility of the opponent, often leading to a cycle of escalating aggression. (Baxter, 1984)

Other example, "*When you cast me out, what you did was set me free!*" uses sarcasm to convey bitterness and resentment. Kaufer argues that sarcasm allows

speakers to express contempt in a socially sanctioned manner, often escalating conflict by provoking defensive reactions from the target (Kaufer, 1981).

One of the most important features is discussed by Fairclough: it is about how language is used to assert power, and in aggressive communication, this often takes the form of commands or ultimatums that aim to dominate the interlocutor. Power dynamics are central to aggressive exchanges, where authority and control are contested (Fairclough, 1989). The command, “*You may leave at once!*” is a direct attempt to assert authority and control over the situation. This authoritative dismissal reflects a power struggle, where one interlocutor tries to dominate the interaction by expelling the other. The statement, “*You cannot be serious!*” is a form of dismissal that undermines the other’s authority and ridicules their command. This dismissal further escalates the conflict by refusing to acknowledge the other’s power or right to make decisions.

Situation 19: everyone is on the wedding of Miss Edwina and Mr. Bridgerton. Lady Danbury and Mrs. Bridgerton come across each other.

- It seems the two of us have not spoken since our dinner with the Sheffields. Ha-ha-ha...
- Yes, it seems so. Though why would you? It is not as if you have ever more private information you wish at last to share with me, do you?
- You must know...
- Enjoy the wedding, Lady Danbury! (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 6)

This dialogue is a nuanced example characterized by subtle jabs, sarcasm, and implied criticism. The interaction unfolds as a tense and passive-aggressive exchange, where the underlying conflict is communicated through indirect means rather than overt hostility. The initial statement, “*It seems the two of us have not spoken since our dinner with the Sheffields. Ha-ha-ha...*” is laced with sarcasm. The laughter following the statement suggests an attempt to downplay or mask underlying tension, yet the pointed reference to their lack of communication since a specific event hints at unresolved conflict.

The response, “*Yes, it seems so. Though why would you? It is not as if you have ever more private information you wish at last to share with me, do you?*” contains an implied criticism. The speaker sarcastically questions the other’s willingness to share information, suggesting a history of secrecy or withholding, which is a form of indirect accusation. Implied criticism is a common feature of indirect aggression in communication. According to Tannen, indirectness allows the speaker to criticize or challenge without direct confrontation, which can create tension and escalate conflict in a passive-aggressive manner. Here, the speaker’s rhetorical question serves to undermine the other’s integrity and trustworthiness. (Tannen, 1986)

In the following phrase, “*You must know...*”, the use of innuendo is consequential for us. Innuendo as a form of implicit aggression is explored by Leech, who argues that such language is designed to convey hidden meanings that the speaker wants the listener to grasp without stating them directly. This can be particularly effective in creating a tense atmosphere, as the listener is forced to interpret and react to what is left unsaid (Leech, 1983).

Coming to the next phrase – “*Enjoy the wedding, Lady Danbury!*”, it serves as a means of cutting off the conversation, signaling a refusal to engage further. This is a tactic of withdrawal, which can be seen as a form of passive-aggressive communication where the speaker denies the other person the opportunity to respond or resolve the underlying issue.

Situation 20: the scandal unfolds between Eloise and Penelope after she finds out who Mrs. Whistledown is.

- Where did you get all of this money?
- What are you doing going through my things?!
- Answer... me.
- It’s none of your business.
- It’s none of my business. I see. And what exactly is your business, Pen?

...

- How you were one of the only people who could've known about Miss Thompson's pregnancy!
- Eloise, you could not...
- And then! I thought about how you said people have been talking about me and Theo.

...

- Eloise, I am sorry.... I was trying to protect you.
- Is that what you were doing? By writing about me in your latest sheet?! By telling the entire world about things I trusted you with?
- No, it was the only way to convince the queen it was not you. It was the only way I could save you!
- The only person you were interested in saving was yourself. All so you could keep making money, at a cost to everyone else. At a cost to Miss Thompson. To my brother. To my entire family! To your entire family! I ended my friendship with Theo because of you! One of the only good things in my life, all because of your self-serving manipulation!
- You have no idea how horrible it has felt to keep this from you! From everyone, for so long! Whistledown has been all I have had, and I have given it up! I am done with it! (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 8).

This example shows a high-intensity conflict characterized by direct and indirect aggressive communication tactics, including accusations, defensiveness, and emotional manipulation. The dialogue begins with a direct and accusatory question: *"Where did you get all of this money?"* This immediately sets a confrontational tone, establishing an environment of suspicion and mistrust. The subsequent demand, *"Answer... me,"* reinforces the power dynamic, pressuring the other character to justify their actions.

On the other side, we see the defensive response, *"What are you doing going through my things?!"* and *"It's none of your business,"* illustrates a common tactic in aggressive communication: evasion. Instead of addressing the accusation, the

speaker deflects by questioning the accuser's behavior and asserting their right to privacy.

Let us note that emotional manipulation is a subtle but potent form of aggression that seeks to control the emotional response of the other person. Jones and Paulhus discuss how manipulative communication strategies, such as guilt-tripping, are used to exert power over others by appealing to their emotions, often at the cost of the relationship's integrity. (Jones and Paulhus, 2014) The statement, "*The only person you were interested in saving was yourself,*" is an example of emotional manipulation, where the speaker attempts to induce guilt in the other person by accusing them of selfish motives. This shifts the focus from the speaker's actions to the moral character of the other, intensifying the emotional stakes of the conversation.

Moreover, personalization of conflict and justification build the ground of this example. The first one is a strategy that amplifies the seriousness of the offense and the perceived stakes. Wilkinson argues that this tactic is often used in aggressive communication to heighten the emotional impact and to force the other party to recognize the full extent of their perceived wrongdoing (Wilkinson, 2013). While justification, according to Schlenker, serves to preserve the speaker's self-image and reduce the likelihood of further conflict by portraying their actions as reasonable, despite the harm caused (Schlenker, 1980). For example, the escalation continues with the personalization of the conflict: "*At a cost to Miss Thompson. To my brother. To my entire family! To your entire family!*" This broadens the scope of the argument, implicating the other party in a wider web of harm and betrayal, thus increasing the emotional weight of the accusations.

The escalation continues with the personalization of the conflict: "*At a cost to Miss Thompson. To my brother. To my entire family! To your entire family!*" This broadens the scope of the argument, implicating the other party in a wider web of harm and betrayal, thus increasing the emotional weight of the accusations.

The final statement, "*Whistledown has been all I have had, and I have given it up! I am done with it!*" represents a form of withdrawal and finality, signaling the

interlocutor's decision to end the conflict by removing themselves from the source of tension. This can be seen as a mix of resignation and a desire to regain control by stepping away from the situation entirely.

Situation 21: Miss Sharma and Mr. Bridgerton having a small conversation.

- It is fine, weather we are having, is it not?
- You wish to speak to me of the weather?
- Is there another topic of conversation that'd be more appropriate?
- There is nothing appropriate about what you are doing proceeding with this engagement!
- On the contrary, I believe it is the most proper outcome for all.
- Oh! And what of everything that passed between us at Aubrey Hall?
- Nothing passed between us. I am a gentleman.
- Is that so?! (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 5)

The interaction begins with a seemingly benign statement about the weather, which is met with skepticism and disdain by the woman, immediately setting a confrontational tone. Her response, "*You wish to speak to me of the weather?*" serves as a veiled criticism, suggesting that the man's choice of topic is trivial and perhaps intentionally evasive.

As the conversation progresses, the woman escalates the verbal aggression by directly questioning the appropriateness of the man's actions: "*There is nothing appropriate about what you are doing proceeding with this engagement!*" This statement is an overt attack on the man's moral and ethical decisions, implying that he is acting in a way that is both improper and hurtful. Coming further, the man's response, "*On the contrary, I believe it is the most proper outcome for all,*" is a defensive maneuver. By asserting that his actions are "proper," he attempts to reclaim moral high ground and neutralize her accusation. This response is a form of verbal aggression that, while less direct, seeks to invalidate the woman's concerns by framing his decisions as logical and justified.

Finally, the woman's retort, "Is that so?!" is a rhetorical question that is dripped with sarcasm and disbelief. This brief but potent statement encapsulates her

verbal aggression by questioning the man's integrity and sincerity in a way that is both direct and scornful. The use of sarcasm here is particularly effective in conveying contempt and challenging the man's self-presentation.

Situation 22: Lady Featherington accuses Mr. Featherington of deception and financial manipulation.

- Our financial predicament is entirely your doing, Lady Featherington. If you hadn't forced me into this ill-starred engagement, we'd soon be living comfortably on Miss Cowper's ample dowry.
- Oh, go on! Blame me for taking you at your word when you spoke of your great fortune in rubies! Had you thought to confide your plans, then I would not be considering dismissing the servants that I have just rehired!
- All of that would be solved if you would simply call off the wedding and allow me to set my cap at Miss Cowper again.
- And leave my poor Prudence jilted? When her reputation's already been called into question? No! It is far too late for that, my lord. No! You must continue in this engagement. I will think of something.
- Well, you'd better think fast. (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 5)

The man's opening statement, "*Our financial predicament is entirely your doing, Lady Featherington,*" is a direct accusation that immediately establishes a confrontational tone. By placing the blame squarely on Lady Featherington, he initiates the verbal aggression by attacking her decisions and character. Lady Featherington's response, "*Oh, go on! Blame me for taking you at your word,*" is both defensive and sarcastic. The phrase "*Oh, go on!*" is dismissive and suggests that she is accustomed to such accusations, undermining their impact. Her use of sarcasm serves as a counterattack, subtly mocking the man's reliability and truthfulness. By stating, "*Blame me for taking you at your word,*" she shifts the focus back onto him, implying that the financial situation is partly his fault for not being forthright. This deflection is a common tactic in aggressive communication, where the goal is to avoid responsibility and redirect criticism.

When Lady Featherington mentions considering “*dismissing the servants that I have just rehired,*” she introduces an element of guilt, emphasizing the consequences of the man’s actions on others. The man’s next statement, “*All of that would be solved if you would simply call off the wedding,*” is an assertive demand, placing the burden of resolving the problem entirely on Lady Featherington. The use of the word “simply” downplays the complexity and difficulty of the action he is suggesting, making it seem like a reasonable and easy solution. This diminishes Lady Featherington’s concerns and reinforces the idea that she is responsible for fixing the situation. His insistence on “allowing” him to pursue Miss Cowper again further underscores his aggressive approach, as he is not just asking for a solution but dictating one.

The man’s closing statement, “*Well, you’d better think fast,*” is a final, aggressive push that combines a threat with a demand. The phrase “*you’d better*” implies urgency and pressure, while also placing the onus entirely on Lady Featherington to resolve the predicament.

In conclusion, the analysis of these dialogues underscores the importance of recognizing and understanding the subtleties of aggressive communication. This understanding is vital for navigating interpersonal relationships, whether in personal or professional contexts, and for addressing the underlying conflicts that such communication strategies often conceal. The theoretical frameworks provided by the referenced scholars offer a robust foundation for further research into the cognitive and social functions of aggressive communication in various communicative settings.

2.3 Gender features of verbal aggression

Verbal aggression, a form of communication intended to harm others through language, is a phenomenon influenced by a complex interplay of biological, psychological, and social factors. While both men and women are capable of exhibiting verbal aggression, their tendencies, expressions, and underlying motivations can differ significantly due to these factors.

Aggressiveness refers to the tendency to respond aggressively in frustrating or conflict-laden situations, whereas aggression refers to the actual behavior exhibited in such scenarios. Research indicates that men generally display higher levels of aggressiveness across all age groups compared to women, although some scholars challenge this view. It is suggested that up to the age of six, boys and girls do not differ in aggressiveness, with differences emerging later due to gendered socialization practices.

The differences in verbal aggression between men and women can, in part, be traced back to biological factors, particularly those related to brain structure and hormonal influences. Studies by Baron-Cohen suggest that men and women have different brain wiring, which may contribute to their distinct communication styles and aggression patterns (Baron-Cohen, 2002). Men typically have a higher level of testosterone, a hormone associated with dominance and aggression, which can lead to more overt and direct forms of verbal aggression. (Archer, 2004) Women, on the other hand, generally have higher levels of estrogen and oxytocin, which are linked to nurturing behaviors and empathy, possibly moderating their expression of aggression (Taylor 2000).

From a psychological standpoint, the theory of emotional intelligence also provides insights into gender differences in verbal aggression. Goleman argues that emotional intelligence, which includes the ability to manage one's own emotions and understand others, tends to be higher in women. This heightened emotional intelligence can make women more sensitive to the social and emotional consequences of verbal aggression, leading them to engage in more indirect or subtle forms of aggression, such as passive-aggressive comments or social exclusion (Bjorkqvist, 1994).

In our study we are going to analyze some examples from *Bridgerton* serial, mostly the dialogues between two main characters – Miss Sharma and Mr. Bridgerton. Their scenes in the film are of the greatest value to our research in terms of aggressive communication.

Situation 23: Miss Sharma and Mr. Bridgerton meets in the garden discussing the situation that has happened recently during the horse-riding event.

- How much clearer must I be?!
- I brought a gift for Miss Edwina.
- Take your Trojan Horse elsewhere!
- I assure you; this is a very real horse. I'd not recommend trying to climb inside.
- Truly, this is all a game to you!
- I am not here to play games.
- Then what was Mr. Dorset, if not some deceitful prank?
- The business with Mr. Dorset was not so great a deceit as you imply.
- And now you question my judgment!
- Only because you questioned mine.
- I have never met a man as brazenly presumptuous....
- You do not even know me!
- I know you are polished. I know you are careful. I know you make promises without so much as uttering a word! There is not much more I need to know!
(Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 2).

From the point of gendered communication styles, the woman's communication is layered with emotional undertones and indirect accusations, which is reflective of the "rapport talk" often attributed to female communication styles. Her verbal aggression is not just about the immediate conflict but also about expressing deeper emotions and relational concerns. The man's responses, focused on defending his actions and asserting his position, are more aligned with the "report talk" style, where the emphasis is on maintaining control and conveying information clearly. His verbal aggression is direct and aimed at resolving the immediate power struggle, rather than addressing underlying relational issues.

From the point of science, the man in the dialogue exhibits a more direct and confrontational form of verbal aggression. His responses, such as "*I am not here to play games*" and "*Only because you questioned mine,*" indicate a straightforward

approach to expressing frustration and asserting his position. This aligns with research that suggests men are more likely to engage in direct, overt forms of verbal aggression, often as a means of asserting dominance or control in a conversation.

The woman, on the other hand, uses both direct and indirect forms of verbal aggression. Phrases like *“Take your Trojan Horse elsewhere!”* and *“I have never met a man as brazenly presumptuous”* show direct verbal aggression, where she openly challenges and criticizes the man’s behavior. However, her statements also include elements of indirect aggression, such as insinuating deceit (*“The business with Mr. Dorset was not so great a deceit as you imply”*) and making assumptions about the man’s character without explicit accusations (*“I know you make promises without so much as uttering a word!”*). This reflects the tendency for women to blend direct and indirect verbal aggression, often using insinuation and implication to convey hostility or criticism (Bjorkqvist, 1994).

Moreover, both characters employ sarcasm and irony as tools of verbal aggression. The man’s remark, *“I assure you, this is a very real horse. I’d not recommend trying to climb inside,”* is laced with sarcasm, which serves to mock the woman’s statement and undermine her accusation. Sarcasm, as a form of verbal aggression, is often used to belittle or ridicule the other party without direct confrontation, which aligns with the broader patterns of male verbal aggression, where humor and sarcasm can be employed to diffuse tension while still asserting dominance.

The woman’s response, *“Truly, this is all a game to you!”* also carries an ironic tone, suggesting disbelief and disapproval of the man’s perceived intentions. This use of irony can be seen as a way to indirectly criticize the man’s actions, which is consistent with the tendency of women to express aggression through more nuanced, indirect means.

Situation 24: Miss Sharma and Mr. Bridgerton argue about the lord and Miss Edwina’s wedding.

- My feelings would not allow me to speak.
- So your feelings are too strong for you now?

- Miss Sharma...
- No, no, all you are doing, my lord, is toying with the emotions of an impressionable young lady!
- Miss Edwina seems perfectly capable of forming her own impressions. Perhaps, you took notice...
- So now you claim to know my sister better than me?!
- I know she wishes to be happy.
- This is precisely what I wish for her. I can assure you, happiness is not your strength! Exasperation, perhaps. Fixation, most definitely! The only feeling you are, in fact, capable of engendering, my lord, is that of discontent! (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 3).

The woman in the dialogue employs a form of verbal aggression characterized by emotional manipulation and psychological pressure. Her initial statement, “*So your feelings are too strong for you now?*” is a sarcastic challenge to the man's emotional restraint, subtly mocking his perceived inability to manage his emotions. Further, her accusation, “*all you are doing, my lord, is toying with the emotions of an impressionable young lady!*” is an attempt to guilt the man into acknowledging his perceived wrongdoing, casting him in a negative light.

The man's response, “*Miss Edwina seems perfectly capable of forming her own impressions,*” reflects a more direct approach to verbal aggression, typical of male communication styles. By subtly undermining the woman's authority and implying that her sister is independent and does not need her protection, he asserts dominance in the conversation. This approach aligns with findings that men are more likely to use direct, assertive language to establish control in a conversation. The subsequent exchange, “*So now you claim to know my sister better than me?!*” and “*I know she wishes to be happy,*” demonstrates a power struggle where the man attempts to counter the woman's emotional arguments with a calm, rational assertion of his knowledge and intentions. This reflects the male tendency to engage in verbal aggression through calm yet firm rebuttals, aiming to reframe the argument in a way that diminishes the emotional impact of the woman's words (Eagly & Steffen, 1986).

It is worth mentioning that the man's approach is more direct and fact-oriented, aiming to assert control and refute the woman's emotional accusations. His verbal aggression is less about emotional manipulation and more about defending his position through logical rebuttal. In contrast, the woman's verbal aggression is deeply intertwined with emotional appeals and relational considerations. This interaction highlights how women may express verbal aggression through a combination of direct and indirect strategies, often focusing on the relational implications of the exchange.

Situation 25:

- Obstinate, inflexible, unyielding to good, pain common sense.
- Well, I can certainly understand why that would be so troubling for a man like you. A man used to having his way. A man used to giving orders...
- I do not give orders!
- You give me orders and you expect me to listen! I do not listen....
- Perhaps you should!
- I will never listen to you! Or to anyone I wholeheartedly disagree with! The fact it's taken you this long to come to terms with that, to accept that fact...
- You wish to know why?
- I am uncertain you ever know why...
- I know why.
- Enthrall me with your self-awareness! (Bridgerton, Season 2, Episode 7)

It is important for our analysis that the woman initiates the verbal aggression by using a series of adjectives - "*obstinate, inflexible, unyielding*" - to characterize the man. This is a direct attack on his personality, aiming to undermine his self-perception by labeling him with negative traits. This type of verbal aggression serves as a strategy to dismiss and devalue the man's perspective before he even has a chance to respond. This aligns with the tendency in female communication to focus on relational aggression, where the intent is to damage the interpersonal connection by questioning the other party's character (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995).

Her follow-up statement, “*Well, I can certainly understand why that would be so troubling for a man like you,*” uses sarcasm to belittle the man, implying that his frustration is merely a product of his entitlement. This tactic not only challenges his authority but also attempts to provoke an emotional response, leveraging his presumed expectations against him. Women, as research shows, often employ sarcasm and insinuation as tools of verbal aggression to destabilize the other person's emotional equilibrium (Mills & Mullany, 2011).

To continue, the man's response, “*I do not give orders!*” is a defensive maneuver, aimed at reasserting his authority by denying the woman's accusation. This reflects a common male strategy in verbal aggression, where the focus is on maintaining control and dominance in the conversation. His subsequent statement, “*Perhaps you should!*” further exemplifies this approach, as he directly challenges the woman's refusal to listen to him, implying that her resistance is irrational and that she would benefit from his guidance. This aligns with findings that men often engage in verbal aggression by asserting their authority and attempting to dominate the discourse (Aries, 1996).

The dialogue concludes with the man's attempt to assert his understanding, “*I know why,*” followed by the woman's biting response, “*Enthrall me with your self-awareness!*” This exchange highlights the use of irony and mockery as tools of verbal aggression, particularly by the woman. Her sarcastic invitation for the man to explain himself is not a genuine request for information but rather a method of mocking his self-perception and dismissing his insights. Irony and mockery are common in female verbal aggression, as they allow the aggressor to maintain a veneer of civility while delivering a sharp, emotionally charged blow (Kreuz and Roberts, 1995).

In examining the dynamics of verbal aggression between men and women, this study reveals significant gender differences in both the expression and underlying motivations of such behaviors. Through the analysis of dialogue examples from the *Bridgerton* series, it becomes evident that verbal aggression is

not merely a product of immediate conflict but is deeply influenced by gender-specific communication styles, biological factors, and social conditioning.

Men, as demonstrated by the male characters in the dialogues, tend to engage in direct, overt forms of verbal aggression. This approach is typically characterized by assertive language, straightforward challenges, and an emphasis on maintaining control and dominance within the conversation. These findings align with existing research, which suggests that male verbal aggression often aims to assert authority and resolve power struggles through confrontation. The use of sarcasm and humor by male characters also serves to undermine their opponent's stance while subtly reinforcing their dominance.

Women, on the other hand, display a more complex interplay of direct and indirect aggression. Female characters in the dialogues often employ emotional appeals, insinuations, and relational concerns to navigate conflict, reflecting the relational aggression strategies that women are more likely to use. This includes indirect tactics such as sarcasm, irony, and psychological manipulation, which are designed to provoke emotional responses and challenge the other party's character or intentions without resorting to overt confrontation (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Mills & Mullany, 2011). The tendency for women to blend these strategies highlights their sensitivity to the social and emotional consequences of verbal exchanges, as well as their preference for preserving relational dynamics even in conflict situations.

Overall, this analysis underscores the importance of considering both biological and social factors in understanding gender differences in verbal aggression. While men and women are both capable of aggressive communication, the methods and motivations behind their aggression are often shaped by broader societal expectations and inherent biological predispositions. Future research could benefit from exploring these dynamics in different cultural contexts, as well as examining how changes in social norms might influence the evolving nature of verbal aggression across genders. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of gendered communication styles, particularly in the context of verbal aggression,

and highlights the need for more nuanced approaches to managing and mitigating conflict in mixed-gender interactions.

2.4 Contextual types of aggressive communication

Aggressive communication plays a key role in shaping human relationships, manifesting itself in different contexts, situations and degrees of intensity. From direct verbal confrontations to subtle, indirect insinuations, verbal aggression is a powerful tool that people use to assert dominance, manipulate, or undermine others. Understanding the various forms and functions of aggressive communication is critical to both mitigating its harmful effects and developing healthier patterns of interaction.

This classification explores the diverse contexts in which aggression occurs, the varying intensity of its expression, and the strategies used to exert influence and control. By examining aggressive communication through the lens of nuance, we can gain valuable information about how speech acts function in social, family, and professional settings. This paper will present several variants for the classification of aggressive communication, depending on the social structure in which the conflict occurs and intensity level. It is obvious that these classifications are not perfect and scientifically researched, but they can make a certain contribution to future science.

We will start with the **aggressive communication in the family circle**. The family is often a space where communication patterns are deeply ingrained, making it a common arena for both overt and covert aggression. Emotional intimacy and long-term relationships can amplify conflicts, leading to different forms of aggressive behavior.

- **Parental aggression.** This involves a parent asserting control or authority over children. It may manifest through harsh discipline, critical comments, or constant orders. For example, parents may berate children for their perceived failures, using phrases like “You never do anything right!” or employ subtle criticisms that undermine confidence. Long-term exposure to parental

aggression can impact children's emotional development, fostering insecurity or defiance.

- **Sibling rivalry.** Sibling interactions often involve competition, jealousy, or conflict over resources (attention, praise, possessions). Aggression between siblings can range from teasing to serious verbal fights, where derogatory comments are used to demean one another, often with the goal of establishing dominance or favoritism. Siblings might exchange insults or sarcasm, which can contribute to tension within the family unit.
- **Spousal aggression.** This can involve both overt hostility (yelling, insults) or more covert forms such as sarcasm, withholding affection, or passive-aggressive behaviors. Power struggles are common, with one partner attempting to control decisions, finances, or emotional dynamics. For instance, one partner may make dismissive comments about the other's capabilities or mock them in social situations, undermining their authority.

It is worth mentioning **aggressive communication in the workplace.**

Workplaces are often hierarchical, and aggressive communication frequently arises from power imbalances, competition for promotions, or stress-related conflicts. Professional environments may also encourage indirect forms of aggression, where open hostility is not socially acceptable.

- **Vertical aggression.** This occurs when superiors use their authority to dominate subordinates. Examples include managers issuing threats, using harsh criticism, or giving unrealistic deadlines to employees to assert control. A supervisor might say, "If you don't finish this by the end of the day, don't bother coming back tomorrow," to impose dominance.
- **Horizontal aggression.** Peer-to-peer aggression is typically less about authority and more about competition. Colleagues may undermine each other through gossip, sabotage, or exclusion from important conversations. Aggressive email exchanges, public criticism in meetings, or spreading rumors are common tactics. In this context, a statement like "I don't think

you're quite ready for that project" might be a veiled attempt to discredit a coworker.

- **Covert workplace aggression.** Since direct confrontation is often frowned upon in professional settings, aggression can manifest in more subtle ways. This may involve sarcasm, withholding critical information to make a colleague fail, or providing backhanded compliments. For example, someone might say, "Oh, you actually did a decent job on this - didn't expect that!" to belittle another's accomplishments.

Taking into account the modern life standards we must go deeper into the topic of **aggressive communication in digital spaces**. Online platforms have become breeding grounds for aggressive communication, often exacerbated by anonymity and the lack of face-to-face interaction.

- **Cyberbullying.** This is one of the most pervasive forms of digital aggression, where individuals use social media, messaging apps, or forums to attack, threaten, or harass others. Cyberbullies often hide behind anonymous profiles to issue threats, spread lies, or publicly shame others, causing emotional distress.
- **Trolling.** Trolls provoke emotional responses by posting inflammatory or off-topic messages in online communities. Unlike cyberbullying, trolling is more focused on disruption than personal attacks. Trolls might use sarcasm or overt insults to deride others opinions, often just for the sake of causing chaos or amusement.
- **"Elegant" digital aggression:** Aggression in online communication isn't always overt. Passive-aggressive comments, ignoring messages, or "ghosting" (cutting off communication without explanation) can serve as indirect ways of asserting dominance or showing disapproval. For instance, someone might post a cryptic, judgmental status on social media aimed at a specific person without naming them, which leaves room for plausible deniability.

The intensity of aggressive communication can vary from mild to extreme, depending on the situation and the individuals involved. The task of this Paper is to examine and develop all the aspects of aggressive communication and its main degrees are also important for us.

Mild forms of aggression may be less direct and often involve non-confrontational tactics that can still have a significant emotional impact on the recipient.

- **Passive aggression.** Passive-aggressive communication avoids direct confrontation, instead using indirect resistance or negative behavior. This could include intentionally delaying work, withholding praise, or making veiled complaints. For example, a colleague might say, “I thought you were going to handle that... but it’s fine, I’ll take care of it, as usual,” hinting at frustration without addressing the issue openly.
- **Sarcasm.** Sarcasm allows the speaker to criticize or mock while maintaining a superficial level of politeness. It is often used as a defense mechanism, enabling the speaker to express aggression indirectly. An example would be, “Oh sure, you’re *such* a hard worker,” when criticizing a colleague who appears lazy.
- **Subtle dismissals.** Subtle dismissals occur when a person’s opinions, emotions, or input are ignored or trivialized. In a meeting, someone might say, “Let’s move on, we’ve heard enough from you,” or offer disinterested body language, signaling that the person’s contribution isn’t valued.

Moderate aggression involves more direct challenges or confrontations, but without the intensity of severe hostility.

- **Verbal criticism.** Criticism becomes aggressive when it is used not to offer constructive feedback but to diminish the other person’s competence or worth. For instance, “You never get this right, do you?” is a form of criticism that attacks the recipient’s ability rather than addressing the issue itself.
- **Interruptions.** Constantly interrupting someone’s speech is a way to dominate the conversation and assert control. Interruptions prevent the other

person from fully expressing themselves, implicitly signaling that their thoughts are less important. It's common in aggressive negotiations or heated debates where one party seeks to overpower the other.

- **Indirect blame.** Indirect blame involves hinting at someone's fault without directly accusing them. Phrases like "Well, I'm sure *someone* didn't double-check that report," can make the recipient feel responsible without directly confronting them, creating an environment of guilt and defensiveness.

Severe forms of aggressive communication are designed to cause emotional harm, assert dominance, or control the other person.

- **Verbal abuse.** This includes shouting, name-calling, and personal insults aimed at causing emotional harm. Verbal abuse is intended to break down the target's self-esteem or induce fear. An example might be, "You're worthless and will never amount to anything," which directly attacks the recipient's sense of self-worth.
- **Intimidation.** Intimidating communication often involves threats or coercive language meant to make the recipient comply with the speaker's demands. For example, "If you don't do what I say, I'll make sure you regret it," is a clear attempt to control through fear.
- **Aggressive confrontation.** This refers to outright verbal battles where the goal is to overpower the other person, often accompanied by yelling, interrupting, and dismissing the other person's perspective. In this type of communication, the speaker seeks to dominate the interaction entirely, leaving no room for collaboration or compromise.

Moreover, aggressive communication can be strategic, intended to achieve specific goals such as gaining dominance, controlling a narrative, or managing power dynamics, as was mentioned before in this work. Let us provide our personal classification under the dominance strategy.

- **Control through speech.** Asserting authority by dominating conversations, deciding topics, or interrupting.

- **Imposing ultimatums.** Forcing decisions or outcomes by presenting options in a way that leaves the other person little choice.

Aggression used to manipulate others into a desired response or behavior, typically without them realizing they are being manipulated.

- **Guilt tripping.** Using language that invokes guilt to control the other person's actions.
- **Feigning ignorance.** Pretending not to understand the other person's perspective or downplaying their emotions to avoid accountability.

By organizing aggressive communication into these categories - contextual types, degrees of intensity, and strategic forms - it becomes easier to recognize the various ways aggression can manifest and the impact it has on interpersonal relationships. This classification also highlights the importance of understanding both direct and indirect forms of aggression to mitigate their effects and promote healthier communication practices.

According to Daniel Goleman, the ability to manage emotions (both your own and those of others) is key to reducing the impact of aggressive communication. Emotional intelligence helps regulate aggressive impulses and identify emotional cues that may precede aggressive exchanges. Research has shown that people with higher emotional intelligence tend to resolve social conflicts with greater empathy and less aggression (Goleman, 1995).

Controlling one's own emotions is a skill that can also be acquired over time. Let us mention some common tips on how to reduce the level of aggression in communicative situations.

Emotional intelligence involves recognizing, understanding, and managing one's own emotions, as well as recognizing and influencing other people's emotions. People with high emotional intelligence are more aware of their emotional triggers and can manage their reactions to avoid aggressive communication. One of the tip is to practice self-awareness techniques such as mindfulness or journaling to identify emotional triggers. Work on empathy to better understand the emotions of others, thus reducing the likelihood of responding aggressively.

Developed by psychologist Marshall Rosenberg, the system of nonviolent communication is a system that helps people express their needs and feelings without resorting to aggression. It emphasizes empathy, active listening, and focusing on needs rather than blame. When you encounter aggressive communication, practice “I” statements instead of “you” statements (for example, “It upsets me when deadlines are missed” instead of “You never meet deadlines”). It focuses on personal feelings, not accusations or accusations (Rosenberg, 2003).

Moreover, a major breakthrough in this field is CBT – cognitive behavioral therapy. It helps people identify distorted thinking patterns that lead to aggressive behavior and replace them with more constructive thoughts. People often resort to aggression due to cognitive distortions such as “black and white thinking” or “catastrophism”. Here's a tip: When you feel the urge to respond aggressively, pause and assess whether your thoughts are based on rational evidence. Techniques such as “thought stopping” or “reframing” can help change perspectives. (Beck, 1976)

Additionally, mindfulness techniques such as deep breathing and meditation can reduce stress and emotional reactivity, both of which are key triggers for aggressive communication. Practicing mindfulness can help people stay calm in stressful situations and respond more deliberately rather than impulsively (Kabat-Zinn, 1990).

Taking a “time out” during heated conversations allows people to cool down and regain their composure before continuing. Temporarily withdrawing from the situation can prevent it from escalating into an aggressive exchange. When you feel overwhelmed, agree to take a short break, saying, “I need a few minutes to collect my thoughts,” before returning to the discussion with a calmer mindset (Gotman, 1999).

Learning specific conflict resolution techniques can help prevent aggressive communication from escalating. These techniques include active listening, reframing the problem, and finding win-win solutions instead of zero results. Actively listen during conflicts, repeating what the other has said to ensure

understanding. Avoid interruptions and make sure both parties feel heard (Fisher & Ury, 1981).

In conclusion, controlling and reducing aggressive communication requires a multifaceted approach based on emotional awareness, effective communication techniques, and psychological understanding. By combining these scientifically proven strategies, people can develop healthier communication patterns, reduce conflict, and create more harmonious interactions in personal, family, and professional relationships.

Conclusion to Chapter Two

The study of aggressive communication in Modern English series, as examined in this chapter, underscores the intricate dynamics of dominance and power as manifested through language. The analysis has delved into various speech act strategies, particularly focusing on the cognitive and pragmatic aspects of dominance, as well as the nuanced deployment of indirect speech acts. These strategies not only reveal the underlying mechanisms of aggressive communication but also illustrate the sophisticated ways in which speakers exert influence and control over their interlocutors.

At the heart of this investigation lies the strategy of dominance, a crucial concept in understanding aggressive communication. The cognitive processes involved, including conceptualization, inferencing, and perspective-taking, play a central role in how dominance is expressed and maintained in dialogue. Conceptual metaphors, as highlighted in the works of Lakoff and Johnson, are instrumental in framing interactions within hierarchical structures, thereby reinforcing power dynamics. The chapter illustrates how these metaphors shape our understanding of power and dominance, particularly in the context of popular media such as the “Bridgerton” serial, where hierarchical relationships are a recurring theme.

The examples provided from the “Bridgerton” series offer a rich context for understanding how these speech acts operate in real-world scenarios, however within the fictional limits of a television show. For instance, hidden mockery and

irony are frequently used by characters to undermine or belittle others while maintaining social manners. Metaphors and deliberate misunderstandings, on the other hand, allow characters to subtly challenge or criticize others without overt confrontation.

One of the key insights of this Chapter is awareness of the fact that aggressive communication is often carried out at the subconscious level, where the speaker's intentions are not immediately apparent to the listener. This indirectness can serve to protect the speaker from potential backlash while still achieving the desired outcome of dominance. The conclusion arrived at lies in the fact that understanding these subtle forms of communication requires not only linguistic expertise but also an "extralinguistic instinct" that enables one to detect and interpret the hidden meanings behind the words.

The role of gender in aggressive communication is another important aspect discussed in this Chapter. Our analysis suggests that men and women may employ different strategies to assert dominance, influenced by societal norms and expectations. This adds another layer of complexity to the study of aggressive communication, highlighting the need to consider the broader social and cultural context in which these interactions occur.

In conclusion, this Chapter provides a comprehensive examination of the principles of aggressive communication in Modern English series, with a particular focus on the strategies of dominance and the use of indirect speech acts. The integration of cognitive and pragmatic approaches offers a nuanced understanding of how language functions as a tool for exerting power and control in social interactions. The examples from the "Bridgerton" serial not only illustrate these concepts in action but also underscore the relevance of this study to contemporary media and its portrayal of interpersonal relationships.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

This study offers an attempt of linguistic analysis of aggressive communication, drawing on cognitive, pragmatic, sociocultural, and emotional perspectives to provide a nuanced understanding of how language functions as a tool for exerting power and control in social interactions. The findings underscore the complexity of aggressive communication, highlighting the subtle strategies employed in both direct and indirect speech acts and the significant role of cognitive processes in shaping these interactions.

We delve deeply into the cognitive aspects of aggressive communication, particularly focusing on how dominance is conceptualized and enacted through language. The analysis reveals that aggressive communication is often rooted in complex cognitive processes that involve the interplay between conceptual metaphors, inferencing, and perspective-taking. These processes are essential in shaping how dominance and power are both perceived and communicated.

The study also emphasizes the importance of considering the broader sociocultural context in which aggressive communication occurs, including the influence of cultural norms, gender roles, and media representations. The emotional and psychological dimensions of aggressive communication further underscore the need for holistic approaches to managing and mitigating its effects.

The findings of this study have significant implications for both practice and future research. Understanding the cognitive, pragmatic, and sociocultural dimensions of aggressive communication can inform the development of more effective communication training programs, conflict resolution strategies, and mental health interventions.

Future research should continue to explore the intersectionality of aggressive communication, particularly in relation to gender, culture, and media. Cross-cultural studies can provide valuable insights into how different societies perceive and manage aggressive communication, while gender studies can further explore the ways in which societal expectations influence communication styles. Research on media's role in shaping language use and perceptions of aggression can also

contribute to a broader understanding of the societal impact of aggressive communication.

In conclusion, the objectives of this research have been successfully met, and the tasks outlined have been accomplished. It is hoped that the findings will enhance the broader understanding of this topic and prove beneficial to language learners.

RESUME

Магістерська робота присвячена дослідженню агресивної комунікації в сучасних англомовних серіалах. Дослідження здійснювалась на матеріалі серіалу “Bridgerton”. В роботі досліджуються прагматичні аспекти агресії в англомовному діалогічному дискурсі, аналізуються особливості використання агресивних мовних стратегій і їхній вплив на учасників комунікації. Основна увага зосереджена на вивченні функціональних особливостей агресивної комунікації та її реалізації через прямі й непрямі мовленнєві акти.

Метою роботи є дослідження прагматичних та функціональних особливостей агресивної комунікації в сучасних англомовних серіалах. Для досягнення цієї мети було виконано такі завдання:

- Вивчено загальні особливості агресивної комунікації та її лінгвопрагматичні аспекти;
- Проаналізовано стратегії домінування у мовленнєвій агресії;
- Виявлено відмінності між прямими та непрямими мовленнєвими актами;
- Розглянуто гендерні аспекти вербальної агресії;
- Проаналізовано функціональні особливості агресивної комунікації на прикладі сучасного англійського серіалу “Bridgerton”.

Агресивна комунікація характеризується домінуванням у мовленнєвих актах, що проявляється через прямі та непрямі форми мовленнєвої агресії. Непрямі акти агресії є більш поширеними адже зберігають так звану формальну ввічливість.

У дослідженні також наголошується на гендерних аспектах агресивної комунікації: чоловіки і жінки використовують різні стратегії для вираження агресії, що часто призводить до конфліктів та нерозуміння. Наприклад, чоловіки зазвичай більше схильні до використання прямих агресивних актів, тоді як жінки можуть вдаватися до непрямих форм агресії.

У ході дослідження було проаналізовано приклади агресивної комунікації на основі фрагментів діалогічного дискурсу із серіалу “Bridgerton”. Це дозволило застосувати теоретичні положення дослідження на практичному англomовному матеріалі. Основні види мовленнєвих актів агресії були ретельно розглянуті та проаналізовані в різних контекстах.

У результаті виконаного дослідження було досягнуто основної мети – визначено прагматичні й функціональні особливості агресивної комунікації в сучасному англomовному дискурсі. Ця робота має як теоретичне, так і практичне значення, сприяючи подальшому вивченню агресії у мовленні та її ролі у міжособистісних і соціальних комунікаціях.

Кваліфікаційна робота складається зі вступу та двох розділів. Обсяг роботи складає 82 сторінки. У списку використаної літератури нараховується 93 джерела теоретичного матеріалу.

Ключові слова: агресивне спілкування, англomовний діалогічний дискурс, мовленнєвий акт, стратегія домінування, гендерний аспект агресивної комунікації.

REFERENCE LITERATURE

1. Дзюбишина-Мельник, Н. Я. (2009). Когнітивна семантика: теорія і практичні дослідження (ст. 45-67). ПАРАПАН.
2. Жаботинська, І. В. (2016). Когнітивна лінгвістика: засади і перспективи (ст. 120-135). Видавництво Черкаського національного університету.
3. Коваленко, Ю. М. (2021). Англійська мова в контексті глобалізації (ст. 20-28). Видавництво “Літера”.
4. Ковалів, Ю. І. (2010). Стилїстика англійської мови: теорія і практика (ст. 55-78). Видавничий дім “Києво-Могилянська академія”.
5. Кочерган, М. П. (2010). Загальне мовознавство (ст.60-80). Академія.
6. Мельничук, В. І. (2020). Комунікативні стратегії в англійській мові (ст.32-39). Видавництво “Освіта”.
7. Alberti, R. E., & Emmons, M. L. (2017). *Your perfect right: Assertiveness and equality in your life and relationships*. Impact Publishers.
8. Archer, J. (2004). Sex differences in aggression in real-world settings: A meta-analytic review. *Review of General Psychology*, 8(4), 291-322.
9. Aries, E. (1996). *Men and women in interaction: Reconsidering the differences*. Oxford University Press.
10. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
11. Baron-Cohen, S. (2002). The essential difference: Men, women, and the extreme male brain. *Journal of General Psychology*, 8(4), 289-294.
12. Baron-Cohen, S., Leslie, A. M., & Frith, U. (1985). Does the autistic child have a “theory of mind”? *Cognition*, 21(1), 37-46.
13. Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. Ballantine Books.
14. Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994). Guilt: An interpersonal approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(2), 243-267.
15. Baxter, L. A. (1984). An investigation of compliance-gaining as politeness. *Human Communication Research*, 10(3), 427-456.
16. Beck, A. T. (1976). *Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders*. International Universities Press.

17. Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18(2), 117-127.
18. Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.
19. Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2008). Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral, gender, and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Psychological Science*, 19(3), 268-275.
20. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
21. Buss, D. M. (1995). Evolutionary psychology: A new paradigm for psychological science. *Psychological Inquiry*, 6(1), 1-30.
22. Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. Routledge.
23. Campbell, A. (1999). Staying alive: Evolution, culture, and women's intrasexual aggression. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(2), 203-252.
24. Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge University Press.
25. Coates, J. (1996). *Women talk: Conversation between women friends*. Blackwell.
26. Connell, R. W. (2002). *Gender*. Polity Press.
27. Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66(3), 710-722.
28. Crossley, N. (1995). Body techniques, agency, and intercorporeality: On Goffman's relations in public. *Sociology*, 29(1), 141-158.
29. Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1994). *The dark side of interpersonal communication*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
30. Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
31. Dijk, T. A. van. (1976). *Macro-structures and cognition: Twelfth annual Carnegie symposium in cognition*. Carnegie-Mellon University Pittsburgh.

32. Dodge, K. A., & Crick, N. R. (1990). Social information-processing bases of aggressive behavior in children. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 16(1), 8-22.
33. Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100(3), 309-330.
34. Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 6(3-4), 169-200.
35. Epley, N., Keysar, B., Van Boven, L., & Gilovich, T. (2004). Perspective taking as egocentric anchoring and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(3), 327-339.
36. Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
37. Felson, R. B., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1993). *Aggression and violence: Social interactionist perspectives*. American Psychological Association.
38. Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. Penguin Books.
39. Gibb, J. R. (1961). Defensive communication. *Journal of Communication*, 11(3), 141-148.
40. Gibbs, R. W. (1999). *Intentions in the experience of meaning*. Cambridge University Press.
41. Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Pantheon Books.
42. Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
43. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
44. Gottman, J. M. (1994). *What predicts divorce? The relationship between marital processes and marital outcomes*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
45. Gottman, J. M. (1999). *The seven principles for making marriage work*. Crown Publishing Group.

46. Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1992). Marital processes predictive of later dissolution: Behavior, physiology, and health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(2), 221-233.
47. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
48. Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Reason and the rationalization of society* (Vol. 1). Beacon Press.
49. Haiman, J. (1998). *Talk is cheap: Sarcasm, alienation, and the evolution of language*. Oxford University Press.
50. Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Anchor Books.
51. Hall, S. (1980). Encoding/decoding. In S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, & P. Willis (Eds.), *Culture, media, language: Working papers in cultural studies 1972-79* (pp. 128-138). Hutchinson.
52. Hample, D. (2005). *Arguing: Exchanging reasons face to face*. Routledge.
53. Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage Publications.
54. Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men and politeness*. Longman.
55. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269-293). Penguin Books.
56. Infante, D. A., & Rancer, A. S. (1996). Argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness: A review of recent theory and research. *Communication Yearbook*, 19, 319-351.
57. Infante, D. A., & Wigley, C. J. (1986). Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and measure. *Communication Monographs*, 53(1), 61-69.
58. Jakobson, R. (1960). Linguistics and poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 350-377). MIT Press.
59. Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Introducing the short dark triad (SD3): A brief measure of dark personality traits. *Assessment*, 21(1), 28-41.
60. Jurafsky, D., & Martin, J. H. (2020). *Speech and language processing* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall.

61. Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full catastrophe living: Using the wisdom of your body and mind to face stress, pain, and illness*. Bantam Dell.
62. Kaufer, D. S. (1981). Understanding sarcasm as a speech act. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 5(5), 399-414.
63. Kowalski, R. M. (2000). I was only kidding: Victims' and perpetrators' perceptions of teasing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(2), 231-241.
64. Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford University Press.
65. Krasnykh, V. V. (2003). *Linguistic personality: A theory and methodology*. Gnosis.
66. Kray, L. J., Thompson, L., & Galinsky, A. (2001). Battle of the sexes: Gender stereotype confirmation and reactance in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(6), 942-958.
67. Kreuz, R. J., & Roberts, R. M. (1995). Two cues for verbal irony: Hyperbole and the ironic tone of voice. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 10(1), 21-31.
68. Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. Harper & Row.
69. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
70. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
71. Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
72. Lomia, N. (2014). Theory and practice in language studies. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(5), 865-871.
73. Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford University Press.
74. Metts, S. (1989). An exploratory investigation of relational transgressions. *Communication Studies*, 40(4), 196-205.
75. Mills, S., & Mullany, L. (2011). *Language, gender, and feminism: Theory, methodology, and practice*. Routledge.
76. Miyake, A., Friedman, N. P., Emerson, M. J., Witzki, A. H., Howerter, A., & Wager, T. D. (2000). The unity and diversity of executive functions and their

- contributions to complex “frontal lobe” tasks: A latent variable analysis. *Cognitive Psychology*, 41(1), 49-100.
- 77.Rezunenko, V. V. (2007). Contextual aspects of speech communication. Language Publishers.
- 78.Rosenthal, R. (2008). Conducting judgmental bias studies: Some methodological considerations. In J. A. Dovidio & L. A. Rudman (Eds.), *Judgment and decision making* (p. 155-173, 572). Springer.
- 79.Rosenberg, M. (2003). *Nonviolent communication: A language of life*. PuddleDancer Press.
- 80.Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations*. Brooks/Cole.
- 81.Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- 82.Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- 83.Shannon, C., & Weaver, W. (1949). *The mathematical theory of communication*. University of Illinois Press.
- 84.Sternin, I. A. (2000). *Communicative behavior and communicative situations*. Voronezh State University Press.
- 85.Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- 86.Tannen, D. (1986). *That’s not what I meant!: How conversational style makes or breaks relationships*. William Morrow.
- 87.Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don’t understand: Women and men in conversation*. William Morrow.
- 88.Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and men in the workplace*. Avon Books.
- 89.Taylor, S. E., Klein, L. C., Lewis, B. P., Gruenewald, T. L., Gurung, R. A. R., & Updegraff, J. A. (2000). Biobehavioral responses to stress in females: Tend-and-befriend, not fight-or-flight. *Psychological Review*, 107(3), 411-429.

90. Vangelisti, A. L. (1994). Family secrets: Forms, functions, and correlates. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11(1), 113-135.
91. Vygotsky, L. S. (1934). *Thought and language*. MIT Press.
92. Wilkinson, S. (2013). *Crisis talk: Negotiating emotional trouble in conversation*. Cambridge University Press.
93. Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions, and silences in conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance* (pp. 105-129). Newbury House.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

1. “Bridgerton”, Season 2 by Chris Van Dusen: <https://bridgerton.info/>

