



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2022.5.13>

UDC 81'27
LBC 81.006.2

Submitted: 21.02.2022
Accepted: 20.06.2022

**DESTRUCTIVE COMMUNICATIVE PERSONALITIES:
A CLASSIFICATION ATTEMPT**

Yana A. Volkova

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Moscow, Russia

Nadezhda N. Panchenko

Volgograd State Social Pedagogical University, Volgograd, Russia

Abstract. Destructiveness is viewed as a fundamental communicative category that determines the strategies and tactics of discourse interaction. Accordingly, destructive communication is understood as a type of communication aimed at deliberately and intentionally causing moral and physical harm to the interlocutor and accompanied with a feeling of satisfaction with the victim's sufferings. The material of the study included 1120 contexts of reflection, selected from Russian literary texts, the National Corpus of the Russian Language, Internet sources and journalistic texts, as well as data from a survey of Russian-speaking respondents. As a result, a classification of destructive communicative personality types is proposed based on the communicative tactics prevailing in their behavior. The authors distinguish three types of destructive communicative personalities: destructive communicative personalities practicing predominantly invective tactics of destructive communication, for example, *ham* (the boor); destructive communicative personalities practicing predominantly manipulative tactics – *shantazhist* (the blackmailer); destructive communicative personalities practicing combined invective-and-manipulative tactics – *revnivets* (the jealous type). These tactics can be implemented in a direct or indirect form. In the analyzed material, there is a prevalence of the communicative personality type who practices predominantly invective tactics of destructive communication. It is also possible to distinguish a potentially destructive personality type whose initial intention is not destructive, but whose communicative behavior can be eventually qualified as destructive from the perspective of the addresser and/or an observer.

Key words: destructiveness, communicative personality, discourse, destructive intention, strategy, tactics.

Citation. Volkova Ya.A., Panchenko N.N. Destructive Communicative Personalities: A Classification Attempt. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], 2022, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 143-154. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2022.5.13>

УДК 81'27
ББК 81.006.2

Дата поступления статьи: 21.02.2022
Дата принятия статьи: 20.06.2022

**ДЕСТРУКТИВНАЯ КОММУНИКАТИВНАЯ ЛИЧНОСТЬ:
ПОПЫТКА КЛАССИФИКАЦИИ**

Яна Александровна Волкова

Российский университет дружбы народов, г. Москва, Россия

Надежда Николаевна Панченко

Волгоградский государственный социально-педагогический университет, г. Волгоград, Россия

Аннотация. В статье деструктивность рассматривается как фундаментальная коммуникативная категория, определяющая стратегии и тактики дискурсивного взаимодействия. Под деструктивным общением понимается вид коммуникации, направленной на причинение собеседнику морального и физического вреда и сопровождающейся чувством удовлетворения от страданий жертвы. В центре внимания авторов статьи – коммуникативные личности, практикующие деструктивное поведение в межличностном общении. Материалом исследования послужили 1 120 контекстов рефлексии, отобранных из русскоязычных художественных текстов, Национального корпуса русского языка, интернет-источников и публицистических текстов, а также данные опроса русскоязычных респондентов. В результате предложена классификация деструктивных коммуникативных типов личности на основании преобладающих в их поведении коммуникативных тактик. Установлено три типа деструктивных коммуникативных личностей: деструктивные коммуникативные личности, практикующие преимущественно инвективные тактики деструктивного общения (например, хам); деструктивные коммуникативные личности, практикующие преимущественно манипулятивные тактики деструктивного общения (шантажист); деструктивные коммуникативные личности, практикующие комбинированные инвективно-манипулятивные тактики деструктивного общения (ревнивец). Указанные тактики могут быть прямыми или косвенными. В анализируемом материале отмечено преобладание коммуникативного типа личности, практикующего преимущественно инвективные тактики деструктивного общения. Выделен тип потенциально деструктивной личности, коммуникативная интенция которой не является деструктивной, но коммуникативное поведение может быть квалифицировано как деструктивное с точки зрения адресата и/или наблюдателя.

Ключевые слова: деструктивность, коммуникативная личность, дискурс, деструктивная интенция, стратегия, тактика.

Цитирование. Волкова Я. А., Панченко Н. Н. Деструктивная коммуникативная личность: попытка классификации // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 2, Языкознание. – 2022. – Т. 21, № 5. – С. 143–154. – (На англ. яз.). – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2022.5.13>

Introduction

The modern linguistic paradigm is anthropocentrically orientated and focussed on the study of a linguistic personality that reveals its individual and typified features in communicative interaction. The focal point of any type of communication is the personality: the addressee's and the addresser's personalities are the two most important elements of communication that link together all the existing characteristics of the communicative process.

The speaker is traditionally seen as a multidimensional and multifaceted “systemic personality” [Krasnykh, 2001; Puzyrev, 2002], embracing a totality of social, professional, gender roles, which, in turn, accumulates societal discursive practices and implements him/herself in a variety of speech events.

This multidimensional nature of a communicative personality is reflected in the multidimensionality of research devoted to it: depending on the communicative competence level, an egalitarian / marginal linguistic personality can

be studied [Sirotinina, 1998]; from the perspective of the communicative tone, one-dimensional and multidimensional, scripted and non-scripted, playful and serious, etiquette and agonal, artistic and non-artistic, argumentative and performative types of discursive subjects are distinguished [Karasik, 2007]; based on verbal behavior characteristics, the speaker is considered from various perspectives – as a truth-seeker or a demagogue, for instance [Panchenko, 2008]; according to the nature of interaction with a communication partner and the ability to cooperate in everyday speech behavior, a conflict, centered, or cooperative types of linguistic personality [Sedov, 2004; 2008], as well as a destructive personality type [Volkova, 2012] can be distinguished.

Categorization of communicative personalities depending on the speaker's basic setting, whether it is aimed at the cooperative communicative interaction or, conversely, against a communicative partner, is, in our opinion, of significant interest, since in modern society there is a visible tendency towards the escalation of aggressiveness, increased conflict

in communication. The relevance of this study is determined by the theoretical significance of the further development of scientific ideas about the destructive communicative personality, on the one hand, and the need to systematize the types of communicative personalities who practice destructive communication and implement specific communicative tactics of destructive interaction.

Material and methods

Linguistic personality has long become a focus of linguistic research. Thus, a number of linguistic personality models have been developed since the end of the 20th century. Among them are the models by Yu.N. Karaulov and G.I. Bogin. It should be noted that the intrinsic feature of all existing linguistic personality models involves functioning of a linguistic personality in communication [Bogin, 1975; Karaulov, 1987]. Therefore, communication studies emphasized the communicative nature of linguistic personality and granted it the name of the “communicative personality.” For example, S.G. Vorkachev specified this concept and provided an in-depth analysis and definition of the term, which features the semantic image of the communicative personality, as well as values and behaviours comprising a so-called ethnosemantic personality [Vorkachev, 2001].

A similar approach can be found in V.I. Karasik [2002], who believes a communicative situation turns a linguistic personality into a communicative one. According to the author, a communicative personality is a person who exists in the language space, i.e. in communication, in behavioral stereotypes reflected in the language, in the meanings of language units and the meanings of texts [Karasik, 2002, p. 8]. A three-level model that includes value, cognitive and behavioral components of a communicative personality reflects the researcher’s idea of the structure of this phenomenon [Karasik, 2002, p. 26]. In this paper, Karasik’s model of a communicative personality will be applied to the study of a typical individual whose communicative intentions are implemented by means of disruptive communicative behavior.

There is little doubt that the multifaceted phenomenon of human personality features a

communicative personality as its integral part. Consequently, it could be assumed that a communicative personality can possibly manifest him/herself through disruptive communicative behavior. The choice of disruptive communicative strategies and tactics relies heavily upon the speaker’s status characteristics, which will be demonstrated further in the paper.

This paper suggests defining a destructive communicative personality through a specific type of communicative behavior, which is referred to as destructive/disruptive behavior. If we stick to Ya. Volkova’s definition of destructive communication as intentionally causing moral and physical harm to the interlocutor and accompanied with a feeling of satisfaction with the victim’s sufferings [Volkova, 2014, p. 50] and take into consideration Karasik’s model of communicative personality, we can distinguish three aspects of the destructive communicative personality: the value, cognitive, and behavioral ones. The value aspect in turn has double nature: on the one hand, it can be represented through a negative assessment of his/her actions by society (the external value component); on the other hand, it is reflected in the violation of the moral and utilitarian norms of society (the internal value component). As for the cognitive aspect, every culture has a certain number of behavioral stereotypes that “instruct” the speakers on how to behave in situations of destructive communication. These stereotypes correlate with corresponding cognitive schemes and frames. The cognitive aspect also includes the concepts of destructive emotions (anger, hatred, fury, disgust, contempt, jealousy, envy, etc.) which, in turn, involve the so-called non-verbal conceptualization of the corresponding emotional states. The behavioral aspect reflects the communicative behavior of an individual when he/she is confronted/involved in destructive communication, i.e. this aspect is closely associated with goals, strategies and tactics employed to manifest and implement destructive communicative intentions.

The material for the research includes a total of 1120 reflection contexts selected from Russian literary texts, the National Corpus of the Russian Language, Internet sources (forums, blogs), and journalistic texts. The research also makes use of the results of the survey conducted among 100 Russian-speaking respondents.

Results and discussion

To categorize destructive communicative personalities, one should bear in mind the general cognitive strategy of destructive communication, since the goal of this type of communication is to destroy the foe emotionally and rise in the estimation of the public as well as in your own eyes. Thus, depending on the predominant type of destructive communicative behavior, we suggest a possible categorization of destructive communicative personalities. Generally, the destructive communicative personality can be categorized into a destructive communicative personality proper and a potentially destructive communicative personality, according to the constant/situational character of the manifestation of destructiveness. Of greatest interest for the research are destructive communicative personalities proper, which vary in terms of tactical preferences: 1) destructive communicative personalities practicing predominantly invective tactics of destructive communication; 2) destructive communicative personalities practicing predominantly manipulative tactics of destructive communication; 3) destructive communicative personalities practicing combined invective-manipulative tactics of destructive communication.

According to our observations, in interpersonal communication, the type of communicative personality that practices predominantly invective tactics of destructive communication prevails in Russian linguaculture. At the same time, destructive communicative personalities can implement these tactics in a direct or indirect form.

The group of communicative personalities who practice predominantly direct tactics of destructive communication (insult, threat, mockery, indignation, malevolence, communicative sadism, rudeness, etc.) includes such communicative types as *ham* (the boor), misanthrope, squabbler/brawler, etc.

Let us analyze the typical communicative behavior of this group using the example of the communicative type “*ham* (boor)”.

Based on the interpretation of *hamstvo* (boorish behavior) offered by S.D. Dovlatov the following constitutive conceptual features of this type can be revealed: 1) a reference to defiantly offensive behavior; 2) an intention to offend, undeservingly insult; 3) a feeling of confidence

that all the offenses will go unpunished; 4) a feeling of pleasure as the interlocutor experiences humiliation and confusion [Dovlatov]. V.G. Romek emphasizes the “slave” position of a boor by adding the criterion of anonymity to the above characteristics of boorishness [Romek, 2004]. The research conducted a survey that included 100 Russian-speaking informants (aged from 18 to 75 years, the men-to-women ratio 24:76). It was revealed that the main features associated with the boor are *grubost'* (rudeness), *nevezhlivost'* (impoliteness), *nevospitannost'* (bad manners), *naglost'* (insolence), *neuvazhenie* (disrespect), *nekorrektnost'* (tactlessness), *neobrazovannost'* (lack of education) (89% of answers), as well as *agressivnost'* (aggressiveness), *neadekvatnost'* (inadequacy) (11%).

According to Ya. Volkova, a typical communicative situation of boorishness can be built according to the following basic patterns: a rude statement → a rational argument → a direct insult; a rude statement → an attempt at justification → a direct insult; a polite request → a rude / insulting statement; a rude statement → indignation → an insulting statement; a rude/offensive statement → a rude/offensive statement in response [Volkova, 2014, p. 224].

We suggest the following prototypical scenario of the boor's communicative behavior. There is some annoying emotional stimulus (an angry neighbor/client, a passenger in transport, etc.), followed by a rude or insulting verbal and/or non-verbal attack on the interlocutor (verbal: rude or obscene vocabulary, *ty*-communication (a disrespectful form of addressing strangers in Russian), or non-verbal: irritated tone of voice, demonstrating some impolite gestures instead of communicating verbally); after that, the speaker makes an attempt to appeal to the boor's logic or use some reasoning, which results in threats, insults, obscenities, and other verbal manifestations of aggression on the part of the boor; the speaker (that is the victim of boorishness) may react in two possible ways: he/she may either proceed with the conflict using boorish (or other aggressive) techniques and, possibly, even overt physical aggression, or ignore the boor and leave the “battlefield”, if no physical aggression is applied. If the speaker chooses to appeal to law and threatens to bring the boor to justice, it usually makes no good since it is virtually impossible to

hold the boor accountable for his/her behavior and punish by legitimate means. The Russian administrative law requires eye-witnesses, audio and video records in order to bring administrative charges against the boor. Some deviations from this prototypical scenario are possible. They include non-standard reactions to boorishness, while the communicative behavior of the boor remains practically unchanged.

Thus, a boor is a typified communicative personality whose main features are overt impudence and aggressive verbal and/or non-verbal behavior accompanied with the conscious/subconscious feeling of impunity of his/her aggressive actions. The boor's communicative behavior emphasizes his/her defiantly offensive attitude towards the opponent. It is also characterized by extreme emotional intemperance, deeply negative value judgments, and a highly conflicting tone of communication. Since the boor's communicative goal is to inflict pain on his/her communicative "partner" and receive some kind of moral satisfaction from this, the boor can be qualified as an exemplary destructive personality who practices direct tactics of destructive communication.

The group of communicative personalities who practice predominantly indirect tactics of destructive communication includes the following communicative personalities whom we can refer to as *klevetnik* (the slanderer) and *donoschik* (the informer). The unifying parameter for these destructive personality types' communicative behavior is the communicative strategy of discrediting or *playing for downgrading one's face* [Issers, 2008, p. 125] implemented by them. Let us characterize the destructiveness of the slanderer's communicative behavior. In terms of the law, slander qualifies as a crime that results in causing mental (moral) harm to a person and implies the liability measures regulated by Article 129 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation. In this paper, we will leave aside the legal aspect of slander and focus our attention on the destructive potential of the slanderer's behavior and characterize the influence that the author of this speech event exerts on the interpersonal interaction partner.

In everyday understanding, slander is a variety of negative manifestation of intentional

verbal aggression against a person (which makes it rather similar to an insult), disgracing a person in another's eyes. Inaccurate information, inconsistent facts, value judgments, and biased opinions form the cognitive basis of slander:

(1) – Это ложь! **Клевета! Гнусная клевета!** – вскричала Амалия Карловна, бегло взглянув на записку (Д.В. Григорович. Недолгое счастье). – It's a lie! **Slander! Vile slander!** Amalia Karlovna shouted, throwing a brief glance at the note¹ (D.V. Grigorovich. Short Happiness);

(2) Вернувшись к мужу, я нашла его в большом раздражении.

– Нет, ты подумай только, – говорил он, в волнении ходя по комнате, – какую низость придумали: ты меня бросила! Какая **подлая клевета!** Какой это враг сочинил?

Мысль, что меня могли **оклеветать**, наиболее поразила мужа в этом инциденте (А.Г. Достоевская. Воспоминания). –

When I returned to my husband, I found him very annoyed.

"No, just think," he said, walking up and down the room in agitation, "What a mean thing they have come up with: you left me! What **vile slander!** What enemy wrote this?"

The thought that I could have been **slandered** struck my husband in this incident most of all (A.G. Dostoevskaya. Memoirs).

In the structure of slander, three main discursive actors can be distinguished: the author (slanderer), the addresser and the referent (the "target" of slander). In interpersonal communication, the latter witnessing slander addressed to him/her or not taking a direct part in communication, can nevertheless become the object of informing and generate a discourse of response by producing either a refutation or justification:

(3) Нелепость это, глупость и **клевета** – все вместе. Я категорически отвергаю подобные измышления (А. Яковлев. Омут памяти). – This is absurdity, stupidity and **slander** – all together. I categorically reject such fabrications (A. Yakovlev. Pensieve of Memory).

The motivational basis for the slanderer's communicative behavior is inherently destructive and involves: 1) envy, revenge, hostility towards the referent; 2) deriving profit, selfish motives:

(4) Создавалось у меня впечатление, что **клеветал** Василий Васильевич на русский народ, чтобы оправдать свое дезертирство и предательство (Е. Зотов, Ф. Шахмагонов. Гость). – I got the impression that Vasily Vasilyevich **slandered** the Russian people in order to justify his desertion and betrayal (E. Zotov, F. Shakhmagonov. Guest);

(5) ... Тех, кто по долгу службы или по призванию писал на меня доносы, **клеветал**, преследовал, чинил всяческие неприятности (А. Зиновьев. Русская судьба, исповедь отщепенца). – ...Those who, on duty or by calling, informed on me, **slandered**, persecuted, and caused all sorts of trouble (A. Zinoviev. Russian Fate, Confession of a Renegade);

(6) Выгораживая себя, изверг **клеветал** на своих простодушных жертв (П. Рашков. Чугунное сердце // Труд-7, 2000.08.15). – Screening himself, the monster **slandered** his innocent victims (P. Rashkov. A Cast Iron Heart // Trud-7, 2000.08.15).

The main communicative intention of slander can be formulated as follows: to spread unreliable information of accusatory character against the referent, ultimately aimed at undermining his/her reputation, humiliating his/her honor and dignity. Since honor and dignity are evaluative categories, and reputation is an evaluative social category that determines the status of a person's decency and virtuousness in society, the communicative behavior of a slanderer is thus aimed at deliberately discrediting, belittling the positive characteristics of a person, at lowering his/her social attractiveness in the view of other people. This intention causes an unambiguously negative assessment of the slanderer's behavior in ordinary consciousness.

As a communicative personality, the slanderer embodies the social "anti-icon". His communicative behavior is characterized by focussing both on the "inner world", or the individual (affects the feelings of the object of slander), and on the "outside world", or the social (reputation, his social face), causing harm from the standpoint of utilitarian, moral norms and social significance. Thus, the destructiveness of his/her communicative behavior in day-to-day communication is defined largely by the moral and psychological (loss of good name) and physical (depression, illness, death) damage inflicted, not by the legal status of slander as a crime:

(7) И неожиданно начал сетовать на семейную жизнь, жаловаться на Оксану, не понимающую его духовных запросов, рассказывал про нее неле-

пые вещи, **вдохновенно клеветал**, не чувствуя стыда (А. Славовский. Сосед // Волга, 2013). – And suddenly he began to complain about family life, complain about Oksana, who did not understand his spiritual needs, told ridiculous things about her, **slandered with inspiration**, without feeling any shame (A. Slapovsky. The Neighbour // Volga, 2013);

(8) После этого Анна никогда больше не видела своей матери за столом, ей подавали обед в ее комнату, ту самую, где однажды утром ее нашли мертвой – она заснула и не проснулась, и это было похоже на то, как если бы день ее спора с отцом о **клевете** на бабушку был последним днем ее жизни, непонятным образом затянувшимся на целый год: она умерла ровно через двенадцать месяцев после этого спора (Г. Газданов. Пробуждение). – After that, Anna never saw her mother again at the table, she was served dinner in her room, the same room where she was found dead one morning – she fell asleep and did not wake up, and it was as if the day of her argument with her father **about slandering** her grandmother had been the last day of her life, inexplicably dragged on for a whole year: she died exactly twelve months after that argument (G. Gazdanov. The Awakening);

(9) Он глубоко вздохнул.

Действительно, я видел, что говорить ему было трудно.

– На ее суд, – продолжал он так же тихо, но уже с другим, ожесточенным выражением, – отдаю я тот поступок, который она совершила, уйдя и не сказав мне ни слова. Поверив **подлой клевете**, которая преследует меня всю жизнь (В. Каверин. Два капитана). –

He took a deep breath.

Indeed, I saw that it was difficult for him to speak.

"To her judgment," he continued in the same quiet voice, but with a different, fierce expression, "I give up the act that she committed when she left without saying a word to me. Believing the **vile slander** that haunts me all my life." (V. Kaverin. The Two Captains).

The slanderer's destructive behavior cannot but affect the psycho-emotional state of the addresser, causing a storm of negative emotions:

(10) Анна помнила только один случай, когда ее мать **совершенно вышла из себя** и кричала высоким голосом, которого Анна не слышала ни до, ни после этого:

– Как вы смеете **клеветать**, Ипполит! Я никогда не допущу этого в моем доме! (Г. Газданов. Пробуждение). –

Anna remembered only one occasion, when her mother **completely lost her temper** and shouted in a high voice, which Anna had not heard before or after:

“How dare you **slander**, Hippolyte! I will never allow this in my house!” (G. Gazdanov. The Awakening);

(11) – ...Но почему вы так говорите, что Алексей имеет к этому отношение? Это **несправедливо! Это самая настоящая клевета**, вот что это такое!

– Ну-ка, убирайся отсюда! – с откровенной злобой прорычал Сукачев, появляясь в дверях. – И не суйся не в свои дела! (Н. Леонов, А. Макеев. Гроссмейстер сыска). –

“But why are you saying that Alexey has something to do with this? **It’s not fair! This is the real slander**, that’s what it is!”

“Come on, get out of here!” Sukachev growled with frank malice, appearing at the door. “And mind your own business!” (N. Leonov, A. Makeev. The Grandmaster of Investigation);

(12) С этого вечера я уже совершенно ее не понимал; **меня бесило** то, что она слишком чутко **внимала Рощинской клевете**; я не мог себе представить, чтобы Ворошнина мне верила меньше, чем оскорбительным сообщениям заурядного Петеньки; я положительно возненавидел ее... (В. Ерофеев. Записки психопата). – From that evening I did not understand her at all; **I was infuriated** that she **listened too keenly to Roshchin’s slander**; I could not imagine that Voroshnina believed me less than the insulting reports of the mediocre Petenka; I definitely hated her... (V. Erofeev. The Notes of a Psychopath).

Slander can be used in institutional interpersonal communication for two main purposes: to influence or confront an opponent. Similar to day-to-day communication, in institutional communication a slanderer’s communicative behavior is aimed at a negative (mental) impact, causing harm to another person/group of persons by means of false information, and can be considered one of indirect destructive tactics.

Let us turn to communicative personalities who practice predominantly manipulative tactics of destructive communication. A prototypical communicative personality here is a blackmailer. Leaving aside the legal bearings of this concept, we will analyse the linguistic image of a so-called emotional blackmailer. This is a communicative personality that practices various manipulative communicative tactics in order to exert influence on a person’s emotional state and achieve the desired goal. Thus, the use of manipulative communicative tactics and covert psychological pressure constitute the basis of this destructive personality type. It should be also born in mind that such communicative

behaviour is often a feature of interaction between close people, who may even be called “nearest and dearest”.

Generally, destructive behavior is revealed through various kinds of threat, the invariant form of which can be formulated as follows: *if you do not behave as I want, you will suffer and regret it*:

(13) Потом он **шантажировал** Вадима, говорил, что опубликует дневник, если Вадим не отдаст деньги... (Э. Володарский. Дневник самоубийцы). – Then he **blackmailed** Vadim, saying that he would publish the diary if Vadim did not give the money back... (E. Volodarsky. A Suicider’s Diary);

(14) Один подонок вообще **шантажировал** ее, даже деньги вымогал, угрожая обо всем рассказать мужу (О. Некрасова. Платит последний). – One bastard **blackmailed** her, even extorted money, threatening to tell her husband about everything (O. Nekrasova. The Last One Pays).

Verbal threat as a form of aggression has two forms. The first one is caused by a stimulus and can be called *reactive*; the second one, correspondingly, is caused by motivation and may be referred to as *proactive*. With regard to blackmail, it is the proactive type that implies the destructiveness of the blackmailer’s behavior. By revealing his/her intention to inflict harm to the addresser at some future time, the blackmailer either modifies the victim’s emotional state or forces him/her to change his/her behavior.

It should also be noted that the blackmailer knows human weaknesses, which makes him/her an excellent therapist. The blackmailer’s main communicative goal is to bring the victim into subjection, to make him/her surrender, and the blackmailer skillfully uses this knowledge of human psychology to achieve it:

(15) Она закатывала дома истерики, **шантажировала разводом**, то и дело уезжала с детьми к маме (К. Немирова. Как во Владивостоке разводят бизнесменов // Комсомольская правда, 2011.04.25). – At home, she threw tantrums, **blackmailed him with a divorce**, and then went away with her children to her mother (K. Nemirova. How Businessmen are Deceived in Vladivostok // Komsomolskaya Pravda, 2011.04.25);

(16) Все то время, пока он разводился, у нас был кошмар. Жена **шантажировала** его дочерью, имуществом и даже любимой собакой. В итоге Гриша отдал ей трехкомнатную квартиру, дачу, купил

супруге новенький «Пежо» и еще денег дал, уж не знаю, сколько именно, но, думаю, немало (Е. Бурцева. Мечтаю быть любимой женой // Комсомольская правда, 2004.12.24). – All the time he was getting divorced, we had a nightmare. His wife **blackmailed** him with his daughter, property and even his beloved dog. As a result, Grisha gave her the three-room apartment, the dacha, bought his wife a brand new Peugeot and paid money, I don't know how much, but I think a lot (E. Burtseva. I Dream of Being a Beloved Wife // Komsomolskaya Pravda, 2004.12.24).

The destructiveness of the blackmailer's behavior becomes apparent due to the reaction of the addresser or third parties, who react rather emotionally when realizing that one of their acquaintances or they themselves have become the object of blackmail:

(17) – Да она же сука... Б...дь поганая... Она меня **шантажировала**... (О. Дивов. Выбраковка). – She's a bitch... Damn fucking bitch... She **blackmailed** me... (O. Divov. Culling);

(18) – Бедная Ирка! – Марина закрыла лицо руками. – Я виновата в ее гибели. Будь они прокляты, эти деньги и этот **мерзкий шантажист**. Своими руками придушила бы его (Л. Дворецкий. Шакалы). – “Poor Ira!” Marina covered her face with her hands. “I am responsible for her death. Damn it, this money and this **vile blackmailer**. I would strangle him with my own hands.” (L. Dvoretzky. The Jackals).

Taking into account that the blackmailer deliberately causes psycho-emotional harm to his/her nearest and dearest by pushing on their pressure points with threats and manipulative tactics, his/her communicative behavior may be unequivocally qualified as destructive.

The research allowed distinguishing destructive personalities that make use of both direct and indirect tactics of destructive communication. These include a mobber, a jealous person, and a communicative sadist. A survey of respondents (100 people, Russian-speakers, aged from 18 to 75, the men-to-women ratio is 24:76) features the following characteristics of a jealous type: a possessor / egoist, distrustful of his/her partner's fidelity, lacking self-confidence and aggressive, a fool. Though some positive features of the jealous communicative type can also be singled out (for example, love for the object of jealousy), all the respondents without exception assessed this communicative personality type negatively.

These data are supported by the results of reflection context analysis (a total of 1120 reflection contexts selected from literary texts, the National Corpus of the Russian Language, Internet sources (forums, blogs), journalistic texts were subjected to analysis). The contextual analysis helped reveal a highly typical nature of a jealous person's behavior that might be identified as either active or passive. The active type is manifested through predominantly overt aggressive actions: typical features of an actively jealous person include throwing tantrums, making scenes, demanding explanations, proofs of fidelity or confessions of infidelity, using threats, moral or physical violence:

(19) К счастью, для меня все это уже пройденный этап. Стекла на работе бил, в проезжающие мимо машины, кирпичи бросал, все подружки – шлюхи, друзья – кобели. В гостях вел себя так, что провалиться на месте. По-трезвому вечные придирки, а выпьет, осмелеет и с кулаками на меня. Все двери, косяки были пробиты дома ² (<http://forum.say7.info/topic66318-50.html>). – Fortunately, I've grown out of that. He used to smash windows at work, throw bricks at passing cars, all my female friends were whores, male friends were playboys. At parties he behaved in such a way that I could sink through the floor. When he was sober, he was always nit-picking, but when he was drunk, he became bolder and flew at me with his fists. All doors, jambs were pierced at home.

A jealous person may hide his/her aggressiveness, which does not imply the absence of destructive emotions. Thus, he/she may go through a period of *covert aggressiveness* that later may turn into *overt aggressiveness*. Covert aggressiveness involves indirect and/or non-verbal manifestations of destructiveness and aggression. The jealous person tends to make use of *the tactics of emotional tension* or *emotional pressure*, which creates conditions unacceptable for constructive communicative interaction:

(20) В последнее время у моего мужа **жуткая ревность** ко мне, ревностью он меня и себя изводит, во время скандалов говорит мне гадости, о которых потом сам жалеет и просит прощения и так постоянно, если выпьет и заведется, то вообще держись, вспомнит все, что было и чего не было. Ревновать меня нет причин, я мама двоих маленьких детей, сижу дома, не работаю, да я гуляю часто с детьми до поздна, хожу в гости и что?! Вот напри-

мер, сегодня, мы задержались в парке, пришли домой начало одиннадцатого, муж недоволен, сказал, сейчас, дети лягут, ты у меня получишь, пока я кормила, мыла и укладывала детей, шепотом говорил гадости. Дети уснули, стал ругать, и требовать объяснений, а что тут объяснишь?! (<https://www.woman.ru/relations/men/thread/4819852/>). – Recently, my husband has had a **terrible jealousy** towards me, he has been tormenting me and himself with jealousy, during scandals he tells me nasty things, which he later regrets and asks for forgiveness, and so constantly, if he has a drink and gets agitated, then you should hold on, he would remember everything that has ever happened or not happened. There is no reason to be jealous of me, I am a mother of two small children, I am the one at home, I don't work, but I often walk with my children until late, I go to visit, so what?! for example, today, we stayed late in the park, we came home after ten in the evening, my husband was dissatisfied, he said, now, the children will go to bed, you will get it from me, while I fed, washed and put the children to bed, he was whispering nasty things. The children fell asleep, and he began to scold, and demand an explanation, but what can you explain?!

Then the jealous person can implement some tactics of overt aggression: he/she tears the partner's clothes, locks him/her at home, does not let him/her meet any people, no matter whether they are friends or strangers, offends and insults the potential rivals and the partner him/herself. The extensive research material shows a number of direct/overt destructive tactics can be implemented, the tactics of reproach, threat, insult, demonstration of resentment, malevolence, and mockery among them. As jealousy gets stronger, the object of jealousy and/or the rival might be subject to physical aggression as well:

(21) Часто **ревнивцы** не просто лишают жизни ближнего, но и **причиняют физические страдания**. Если речь идет о мужчинах, то криминалистике известны случаи, когда мужья и сожители калечили детородные органы женщины и молочные железы. Также систематически происходят преступления, когда женщины, приревновавшие своих мужчин, лишают их полового органа (<https://iz.ru/872251/ivan-petrov/liubov-odna-vinovata-iz-revnosti-sovershaetsia-kazhdoe-vosmoe-ubiistvo>). – Often, **jealous people** not only take the life of their nearest and dearest, but also **cause them physical suffering**. If we talk about men, forensics knows cases when husbands and partners mutilated women's reproductive organs and mammary glands. Crimes also systematically occur

when women who are jealous of their men deprive them of their sexual organ.

Thus, an actively jealous person implements the strategy of humiliating his/her partner in communication through the use of various manipulative tactics (reproach, interruption of contact (silence), emotional pressure, demonstration of resentment) and tactics of verbal and non-verbal aggression (threat, insult, indignation, mockery, malevolence).

To analyze the communicative behavior of a passively jealous person, two literary texts were considered: L.N. Tolstoy's "The Kreutzer Sonata" and C. Millet "Jealousy". The texts belong to different literary epochs and genres. Nevertheless, they allow distinguishing some behavioral features of a passively jealous person. The most noticeable feature can be regarded as the absence of overt aggression in interpersonal interaction: a passively jealous person could be quiet and polite with the object of his/her jealousy. At the same time he/she tries to trap the partner into lying by asking innocent questions (like "Where have you been so long after work?"). At the same time, he/she cherishes treason in his/her imagination. It might happen that deep down the jealous person realizes that there are no grounds for jealousy. Even if this case, the jealous person does want to hurt his/her partner with groundless accusations.

Instead, the jealous person may imagine treason and even elaborate various imaginary treason scenarios: feeling deep down that his/her jealousy has no basis behind it, he/she still does not want to hurt his/her partner's feelings. This fear of breaking the relationship may go even further in case the fact of treason is confirmed. A passively jealous person can keep all his jealousy to him/herself, which may lead to severe somatic disorders and/or overt physical aggression. The overall goal of a jealous person, no matter whether he/she is actively or passively jealous, is to hurt, humiliate, morally or even physically destroy the partner; thus, the communicative behavior of a jealous person features such destructive communicative tactics as communicative sadism, direct insult, emotional pressure, and other direct and indirect techniques of destructive communication. All these taken together allows us to conclude that a jealous person can be unconditionally subsumed under the categories of a destructive communicative personality.

Having thus characterized the destructive communicative personality types proper, we should also distinguish a potentially destructive personality type whose initial intention may not be qualified as destructive. Potentially destructive personality types do not have an intention to offend, insult or discredit a communicative partner, nevertheless, the addresser and/or the independent observer may regard it as destructive.

We believe that a typical representative of potentially destructive personality types is a gossip (spreader of false rumours), since his/her communicative behavior may be aimed at criticizing, defaming, or tarring the reputation of some third party. This destructive kind of gossip has a completely different nature from the so-called “benign” gossip. The gossip intends to hurt the third party though his/her criticism and defamation are not directed specifically at him/her: in fact, it is an indirect condemnation, it is carried out “behind one’s back”.

Recall that gossip is a communicative event, denoting the involvement in the process of gossip exchange among the members of the in-group and the violation of the private space boundaries of the out-group. If the choice of the addresser was incorrect and he/she belongs to the out-group, the gossip’s communicative actions may be misunderstood and spark a negative response:

(22) [Баба с тазом (Мария Андрианова), жен, 40, 1921] А уж с которым из двух она гуляет / не скажу. Не знаю.

[Мать Нади, жен] А не знаете / так и не говорите. И нечего **сплетни** распускать! Татьяна Максимовна! (И. Ольшанский, Н. Руднева, Ю. Райзман. А если это любовь? К/ф). –

[A woman with a bowl (Maria Andrianova), female, 40, 1921] I won’t say which of the two she goes out with. Do not know.

[Nadya’s mother, female] If you don’t know / don’t say anything. And don’t **spread gossip!** Tatyana Maksimovna! (I. Olshansky, N. Rudneva, Y. Raizman. What if it is Love? Film);

(23) – Все это чепуха, **сплетни!** – проговорила она резко. – Дура твоя Файка! Человек, бывает, встречает кого-то на улице случайно... (Д. Рубина. На солнечной стороне улицы). – “All this is nonsense, **gossip!**” She spoke sharply. “Your Faika is a fool! A person happens to meet someone in the street by chance... (D. Rubina. On the Sunny Side of the Street).

The destructive character of gossip is confirmed by an extremely negative emotional reaction (chagrin, irritation, resentment, anger) on the part of the addresser, which brings gossip close to slander:

(24) От сплетни тогда отмахнулась – не в первый и не в последний раз клеветают, но все равно **мерзопакостно** (О. Новикова. Каждый убивал // «Сибирские огни», 2012). – Then she dismissed the gossip: it was not for the first and not for the last time they slandered, but it was still **disgusting** (O. Novikova. Everyone Killed // Siberian Lights, 2012);

(25) Никто нас, вроде бы специально не учил, что **сплетничать некрасиво** (а если бы учил, мы бы, пожалуй, из чувства противоречия стали бы сплетничать), но сплетни вызывают рефлекторное чувство гадливости, хотя и рациональное объяснение можно, наверное, подыскать: сплетничество является проявлением собственного комплекса неполноценности, когда малозначительные или отвратительные явления в жизни других лиц являются возбуждающим фактором (Свобода и ее осложнения // Интернет-альманах «Лебедь», 2003.11.01). – No one seems to have specifically taught us that **gossip is ugly** (and if they had, we would probably gossip on a dare), but gossip evokes a reflective feeling of disgust, although a rational explanation can probably be found: gossip is a manifestation of one’s own inferiority complex, when insignificant or disgusting phenomena in the lives of others are triggering factor (Freedom and its Complications // Internet Almanac “Lebed”, 2003.11.01).

Conclusion

Destructive behavior is aimed at intentionally and deliberately causing moral and/or physical harm to the interlocutor and features a sense of satisfaction derived from the addresser’s suffering; the addressee has the desire to elevate him/herself through humiliating and morally destroying the addresser.

The communicative behavior of a destructive personality is determined by the choice of the basic goal setting, strategy and tactics.

Destructive communicative personality types proper are distinguished by the regular manifestations of destructive behavior that vary depending on tactical preferences. This makes it possible to differentiate a communicative personality who practices predominantly invective tactics of destructive communication (for example, *ham* (the boor)); predominantly

manipulative tactics of destructive communication (*shantazhist* (the blackmailer)); combined invective-manipulative tactics of destructive communication (*revnivets* (the jealous type)).

The greatest destructive potential is revealed in the communicative behavior of individuals who choose invective communication tactics implemented in a direct (the boor) or indirect (the slanderer) form.

Potentially destructive communicative personalities include the gossip, and under certain conditions, the flatterer and the pedant. However, this issue requires additional research. It also looks promising to study communicative types that represent a destructive communicative personality in various types of discourse.

NOTES

¹ Hereinafter translated by Ya. Volkova and N. Panchenko.

² Hereinafter the author's spelling and punctuation are preserved.

REFERENCES

- Bogin G.I., 1975. *Urovni i komponenty rechevoy sposobnosti cheloveka* [Levels and Components of Human Speech Ability]. Kalinin, Izd-vo Kalinin. gos. un-ta. 106 p.
- Dovlatov S.D. *Eto neperevodimoye slovo «khamstvo»* [This is an Untranslatable Word "Rudeness"]. URL: <http://www.sergeidovlatov.com/books/etoneper.html>
- Issers O.S., 2008. *Kommunikativnye strategii i taktiki russkoy rechi* [Communication Strategies and Tactics of Russian Speech]. Moscow, LKI. 288 p.
- Karasik V.I., 2002. *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs* [Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse]. Volgograd, Peremena Publ. 477 p.
- Karasik V.I., 2007. *Yazykovyye klyuchi* [Language Keys]. Volgograd, Paradigma Publ. 520 p.
- Karaulov Yu.N., 1987. *Russkiy yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost* [Russian Language and Language Personality]. Moscow, Nauka Publ. 261 p.
- Krasnykh V.V., 2001. *Osnovy psikholingvistiki i teorii kommunikatsii* [Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics and Communication Theory]. Moscow, Gnozis Publ. 270p.
- Panchenko N.N., 2008. Kommunikativnyy tipazh «demagog» [Communicative Type "Demagogue"]. *Izvestiya Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta* [Bulletin of the Volgograd State Pedagogical University], no. 5 (29), pp. 56-60.
- Puzyrev A.V., 2002. *Opyty tselostno-sistemnykh podkhodov k yazykovoy i neyazykovoy realnosti* [Experiences of Holistic-Systemic Approaches to Linguistic and Non-Linguistic Reality]. Penza, PGPU im. V.G. Belinskogo. 164 p.
- Romek V.G., 2004. Khamstvo nepobedimo? [Is Rudeness Invincible?] *Sotsialnyy psikholog* [Social Psychologist], no. 1 (7). URL: <https://www.romek.ru/ru/hamstvo1>
- Sedov K.F., 2004. *Diskurs i lichnost: evolyutsiya kommunikativnoy kompetentsii* [Discourse and Personality: The Evolution of Communicative Competence]. Moscow, Labirint Publ. 320 p.
- Sedov K.F., 2008. Teoreticheskaya model psikholingvopersonologii [Theoretical Model of Psycholinguopersonology]. *Voprosy psikholingvistiki* [Questions of Psycholinguistics], no. 7, pp. 12-23.
- Sirotnina O.B., 1998. Sotsiolingvisticheskiy faktor v stanovlenii yazykovoy lichnosti [Sociolinguistic Factor in the Formation of a Linguistic Personality]. *Yazykovaya lichnost: sotsiolingvisticheskiye i emotivnyye aspekty* [Language Personality: Sociolinguistic and Emotive Aspects]. Volgograd, Peremena Publ., pp. 3-9.
- Volkova Ya.A., 2012. Destruktivnoye obshcheniye: k opredeleniyu ponyatiya [Destructive Communication: To the Definition of the Concept]. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], no. 2 (16), pp. 205-219.
- Volkova Ya.A., 2014. *Destruktivnoe obshhenie v kognitivno-diskursivnom aspekte* [Destructive Communication in Cognitive and Discourse Aspects]. Volgograd, Peremena Publ. 304 p.
- Vorkachev S.G., 2001. Lingvokulturologiya, yazykovaya lichnost, kontsept: stanovleniye antropotsentricheskoy paradigmy v yazykoznanii [Linguoculturology, Linguistic Personality, Concept: The Formation of an Anthropocentric Paradigm in Linguistics]. *Filologicheskkiye nauki* [Philological Sciences], no. 1, pp. 64-72.

Information About the Authors

Yana A. Volkova, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Department of Foreign Languages in Theory and Practice, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Miklukho-Maklaya St, 7, 117198 Moscow, Russia, yana.a.volkova@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1456-5881>

Nadezhda N. Panchenko, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Head of the Department of Linguistics, Volgograd State Social Pedagogical University, Prosp. Lenina, 27, 400005 Volgograd, Russia, panchnn@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4498-5262>

Информация об авторах

Яна Александровна Волкова, доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры теории и практики иностранных языков, Российский университет дружбы народов, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 7, 117198 г. Москва, Россия, yana.a.volkova@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1456-5881>

Надежда Николаевна Панченко, доктор филологических наук, профессор, заведующая кафедрой языкознания, Волгоградский государственный социально-педагогический университет, просп. Ленина, 27, 400005 г. Волгоград, Россия, panchnn@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4498-5262>