

opción

Revista de Antropología, Ciencias de la Comunicación y de la Información, Filosofía,
Linguística y Semiótica, Problemas del Desarrollo, la Ciencia y la Tecnología

Año 36, abril 2020 N°

91

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

ISSN 1012-1587/ ISSNe: 2477-9385

Depósito Legal pp 198402ZU45



Universidad del Zulia
Facultad Experimental de Ciencias
Departamento de Ciencias Humanas
Maracaibo - Venezuela

Linguistic and communicative aspects of argumentation in the business field of communication

Karlygash Shokhayeva¹, Maira Zhunissova¹

¹Abay Kazakh National Pedagogical University, 13, Dostyk ave,
Almaty, 050010, the Republic of Kazakhstan.

shohaeva@mail.ru, zhmaira_71@mail.ru

Gibadat Orynkhanova²

²Kazakh State Women's Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

gibadat_o@mail.ru

Jadira Zhunissova³

³L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 010008,
Satpayev str.2, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan.

jadira-73@mail.ru

Abstract

The article deals with the pragmatic aspects of argumentation in business communication. It is argued that a persuasive speech is a very important competence of specialists in business communication. Only directly negotiating, providing evidences, arguments, counter-arguments, and controversy the negotiators can move quickly to the overall objective of the agreement. Even with a well-developed modern means of communication, the Internet, electronic argumentation support systems, specialists in business communication. In bargaining process negotiator demonstrates himself, his appearance, mind, manners, emotions, ethics, etiquette knowledge, characteristics of voice, gestures, movements, facial expressions, reactions and his language - communication options.

Keywords: Argumentation, Business communication, Logical reasoning, Language of argumentation, Persuasion of opponent.

Aspectos lingüísticos y comunicativos de la argumentación en el ámbito empresarial de la comunicación

Resumen

El artículo aborda los aspectos pragmáticos de la argumentación en la comunicación empresarial. Se argumenta que un discurso persuasivo es una competencia muy importante de los especialistas en comunicación empresarial. Solo negociando directamente, proporcionando evidencias, argumentos, contraargumentos y controversia, los negociadores pueden avanzar rápidamente hacia el objetivo general del acuerdo. Incluso con un medio de comunicación moderno bien desarrollado, Internet, sistemas electrónicos de apoyo a la argumentación, especialistas en comunicación empresarial. En el proceso de negociación, el negociador demuestra su apariencia, mente, modales, emociones, ética, conocimiento de etiqueta, características de voz, gestos, movimientos, expresiones faciales, reacciones y su lenguaje: opciones de comunicación.

Palabras clave: Argumentación, Negocios, Comunicación, razonamiento lógico, Persuasión del oponente.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is already much said about what a specialist in business communication should be like and how she\he should behave. However, the debate on how to become more professional, more effective, more economically valuable is still in progress. Modern communicational behavior and discussion styles have undergone crucial changes due to diverse factors, including economic, political and cultural. Unfortunately, not all changes in communication models accepted have positively affected the overall social interactions. Quite a long observation within educational institutions demonstrates a lack

of pragmatic aspects of arguments while defending their own points of view, which, consequently, leads to serious conflicts. We believe that the major role of today's philologist is to allocate linguistic and communicative aspects of argumentation in the business field of communication. However, the situation reveals the sad truth that the right is the one who cries louder or has more authority. That is why developing the culture of argumentation is seen as the perfect tool for overcoming these educational issues as well. By implementing the concept of argumentation, we will be able to equip future specialists with the necessary techniques of business communication holding. Thus, the article is primarily focused on the basic background of argumentative discourse design, which would be beneficial within the philological and educational process.

Argumentation, as a scientific category, has been in focus of investigation interest since ancient times. Today, a particular attention to the issue is paid especially by philosophic, logic and rhetorical studies. No doubt, each discipline underlines definite peculiar features and identify own approaches to argumentation research. Within the framework of the modern educational paradigm of education, we are to prepare competent specialists who are capable of realizing and solving professional problematic tasks. Concerning specialists of business communication, our main "sword" is a language, how we operate it, and how others assume our intentions.

In this sense, the concept of argumentative discourse culture is seen as the adequate means for educational purposes, and its awareness

might be interpreted as the power to establish rapport with interlocutors and gain a consensus in the process of communication. Some scholars point out that communication is a process through which an addresser intends to modify the cognitive environment of an addressee. In fact, each communicative act presupposes a certain degree of cognitive influence that is why engaging in communication presupposes mastering certain argumentative techniques in order to achieve a certain goal. Communication, then, is not a mere coding-decoding process, but, above all, an inferential process, that is, a reconstruction of the addresser's message, which gives, as a result, the wider coincidence of both cognitive environments.

In the communicative process, culture plays three roles. Modern school is intended to join future generations to the culture of the native country, to cultivate universal human values in them. To develop a tolerant attitude to the culture of the countries of other peoples and ability to participate in cross-cultural dialogue. Firstly, it is from and through the communicators' cultural schemata that the communicative situation is perceived and understood and the communicative act is created. Secondly, it is also from and through the communicators' cultural schemata that the meaning of the addresser's communicative act may be inferred. Finally, the result of the communicative act is a modification of the communicators' cognitive schemata. Thus, culture plays a crucial role in communication and, therefore, may be regarded as the key element for argumentative skills formation. However, displaying a culturally appropriate communicative behavior does not promote effective argumentation on its own.

Cultural-historical activity theory [2, P.56-83] is a theoretical framework, which helps to understand and analyze the relationship between the human minds and activity. It traces its origins to the founders of the cultural-historical school of L. S. Vygotsky and A. N. Leontiev. Especially since the 1990s, this theory has attracted a growing interest among academics worldwide. Core ideas are: humans act collectively, learn by doing, and communicate in and via their actions; humans make, employ, and adapt tools of all kinds to learn and communicate; and community is central to the process of making and interpreting meaning – and thus to all forms of learning, communicating and acting.

It is impossible to approach the concept of personality empirically and to define it by objective definitions of its individual traits. The basic element in defining man's personality is the social relationships into which he enters, in which he is both the subject and the object. The man enters into these social relationships through his activity. Human activity is always material and significant. Humans do not simply behave, nor do they simply perform abstract deeds; any of their actions constitute at the same time interacting with objects outside the self, and it can influence or alter them. There is no human who simply acts; there is the human, and there is that which he or she affects or influences.

This does not mean that speech cannot be an independent activity. Man has to have a specific motive (or system of motives) which can be satisfied by speech itself when the aim of the speech is

not to obtain something but to construct the utterance as such (or a whole text-a system of utterances). Speech is identical to any other psychological activity. It has a definite aim and is impelled by a motive, or more often by a system of motives, which can be external or internal (LEONTIEV, 1981, p.18). He believes that a language is a medium of a human's dialogue with the world and with a human, the world image that is being formed in a human's mind is by the language and the speech activity of the human.

One of the ways of speech influence, according to A.A.LEONTIEV, is the influence through persuasion, the success of which is connected with modeling by the subject of communication of the sense field of the recipient. Functions of language originally began to systematize in compliance with the structure of the communicative (speech) act. The psychological aspects of speech activity related to argumentation in business communication can further be summed up under two headings, and this is something to be taken into account. On the one hand, the communicants should know how to convert this activity into a speech act and make it a part of his non-verbal activities. In order to achieve this, they must form the metalanguage of business communication automatically, without any participation of the conscious mind, or at least with its minimum participation; they must think about what to say, rather than how to say it. Metalanguage becomes the property of each certain individual, a means of communication, and is equal means of thinking and means of understanding of reality. {3, P.26-27}.

2. FINDING AND METHODOLOGY

The advantage of an argumentation model is that it acknowledges the role of social interaction in the construction of the argument. Only in very formal settings, such as courtroom proceedings or political debates are arguments presented outside of a conversational context. Most often, arguments arise from disagreements people have with one another. Arguments are likely to be initially incomplete and to grow as the speaker addresses the challenges presented by a conversational partner. GRIGORIEVA (2007) supported this claim by showing that arguments may be logically sound even if they are incomplete by the standards of formal logic; that is, an argument may be valid even though its underlying premises remain implicit (KOŽENIAUSKIENĖ, 2009).

Furthermore, individuals may not elaborate arguments unless they recognize the need to clarify them or convince their audience. Grice's maxim of quantity holds that a speaker will provide only as much information as necessary for an audience to construct meaning. Thus, discourse is integral to the construction of an argument. If this is the case, then the best way to examine the development of argumentative competence is to examine the process by which individuals construct arguments in the context of discourse (WALTON, 2013).

If we regard argumentative discourse as an activity in the process of development, two forms of development can be identified.

One is enhanced skill in directing the course of critical dialogue to meet the activity's objectives. The other is an enhanced understanding of the goals of argumentative discourse. These two forms of development, we predict, reinforce one another. In other words, progress in strategic performance is propelled in part by a better understanding of the goals of discourse. At the same time, the exercise of these strategies in discourse activity promotes a more refined understanding of the goals of the activity. More generally, as has been proposed in other areas of strategic cognitive development by (WESTON, 2009; FOOT, 2001), meta-level understanding both directs and is informed by strategic performance.

3. RESULT

To understand the conditions under which argumentative dialogue promotes reasoning it is critical to consider people's goals while arguing. In argumentative dialogue, one can distinguish two overlapping but distinct kinds of activity: dispute and deliberation. Both kinds of discourse involve two or more speakers who contrast alternative viewpoints by evaluating claims and the evidence used to support them. However, dispute and deliberation can be distinguished by their goals (KALBIROVA, KARABAYEVA, UMIRBEKOVA, SHOKAEVA, BEKOVA & ANARBEBK, 2016). In a dispute, the goal is to defend a viewpoint and undermine alternatives, whereas in deliberation the goal is to arrive at a viewpoint by comparing and evaluating alternatives. These diverging goals, in turn, create important

differences in the social dynamic between conversational partners. In a dispute, participants compete with the goal of persuading others to adopt their opinion. In deliberation, participants collaborate with the goal of working towards a consensus view.

These discourse activities, dispute, and deliberation, in turn, may influence the ways in which individuals process opposing viewpoints. As HOUTLOSSER (2001) points out, the process of negotiating viewpoints can prompt an array of responses from an individual. When speakers confront opposing claims and evidence in argumentative dialogue, they have at least four basic responses at their disposal:

To dismiss counter-arguments and maintain their position; to agree with counterarguments locally, but deflect their impact by turning to other claims in support of their position; to integrate counterarguments by qualifying or adjusting their position; to accept counterarguments and abandon their position (ZAREFSKY, 2006).

When consensus is the goal of dialogue, individuals allow themselves the full range of these responses. In contrast, when persuasion is the goal of dialogue, individuals must dismiss or deflect counterarguments in order to convince others to adopt their conclusions. Thus, persuasive goals in discourse may limit the value of argumentative dialogue for reasoning by constraining the options that individuals believe they have for responding to alternative viewpoints. As a result, the constraints of discourse goals while arguing may lead individuals to superficially process opposing side claims and evidence.

To prevent the dismiss of the argumentation process, each communicative act should be organized properly.

The nature of an argument is essentially two-fold: there is an underlying statement of purpose or claim, the very point that is presented and exposed for acceptance. In addition, the supporting evidence that will be used as grounds or reasons to support the validity of the claim. A third and necessary ingredient to a compelling argument is the linkage between the claim and the supporting evidence, the component that ensures that the evidence is in fact directly related to the validity of the claim. This is referred to as the warrant, and for an understanding of this component, we need to credit the work of (SAEZ, 2002).

The strategy essentially questions the relation of each piece of evidence as it relates to the overall credibility of the claim. In looking at the structure of arguments, it is important to account for the connections between the reasons offered for the support and the nature of the claim itself. If the connection is not there, the claim can lose its value. This model of argument construction is the most appropriate for educational purposes. Thus, structuring each communicative intention in accordance with the principles of this model, an addresser (a future specialist in business communication) is believed to gain the most effective result. However, any discourse, and argumentation, in particular, is presented by the cohesive and coherent text. There are various tools for creating formal and semantic connections between utterances within the discourse. Typically, they are differentiated

between four large groups: grammatical (syntactical): word order, tense forms unity, aspects of verbs, conjunctions, parenthesis; semantic: repetition; logical: cause-effect relations, conditions, clauses; pragmatic: communicative act inference via presuppositions.

Some linguistic theories have attempted to separate the mental knowledge of language from language use. In CHOMSKY's (1991) terms, this is the distinction between competence and performance (use). CHOMSKY (1991) privileges competence over performance as the subject matter of linguistics. In rejecting the distinction between competence and performance, cognitive linguists argue that knowledge of the language is derived from patterns of language use, and further, that knowledge of the language is knowledge of how language is used.

In the words of psychologist and cognitive linguist, MICHAEL, MALINDA, JOSEP, TANYA & HENRIKE (2005) language structure emerges from language use. This is known as the usage-based thesis. It follows from the assumption that language structure cannot be studied without taking into account the nature of language use. This perspective is what characterizes argumentative discourse as a functional rather than a formal approach to language. Perhaps the most important concept of the usage-based approach is utterance. An utterance is a particular, actual occurrence of the product of human behavior in communicative interaction, as it is pronounced, grammatically structured, and semantically and pragmatically interpreted in its context (EEMEREN & GROOTENDORST, 2004).

An utterance is a linguistic act in which one person expresses towards another, within a single intonation contour, a relatively coherent communicative intention in a communicative context. A language user is a member of a particular linguistic community who attempts to achieve a particular interactional goal or set of goals using particular linguistic and non-linguistic strategies. Interactional goals include attempts to elicit information or action on the part of the hearer, to provide information, to establish interpersonal rapport.

The linguistic strategies employed to achieve these goals might include the use of speech acts (requesting, informing, promising, thanking and so on). Non-linguistic strategies include facial expressions, gestures, the orientation of the speaker, in terms of interpersonal space and so on. However, the utterance is not a discrete or precisely identifiable unit. This is because utterances involve grammatical forms (word order), semantic structures (patterns of the meaning), speech sounds, patterns of intonation, slight pauses, and accelerations and decelerations.

In this respect, utterances differ from the related notion of a sentence. A sentence, as defined by linguistics, is an abstract entity. Utterances typically occur spontaneously, and often do not conform to the grammaticality requirements of a well-formed sentence. For example, in terms of structure, an utterance may consist of a single word, a phrase, an incomplete sentence or a sentence that contains errors of pronunciation or grammar because the speaker is tired, distracted or excited. As this discussion indicates, while a sentence can

be precisely and narrowly defined, an utterance cannot. While sentences represent the structure associated with an utterance, utterances represent specific and unique instances of language use in business communication. Typically, cognitive linguists place little emphasis on the sentence as a theoretical entity. In contrast, the notion of a usage event or utterance is central to the cognitive perspective.

After outlining the main components of a usage-based view of the language system, in business communication, we focus on two areas of cognitive linguistics that attempt to integrate the usage-based thesis with theoretical models of various linguistic phenomena. The first phenomenon is focused on knowledge of the language. In this context, the term grammar is used in its broadest sense to refer to the system of linguistic knowledge in the mind of the speaker. In this sense, grammar refers not just to grammatical phenomena like syntax, but also to meaning. The cognitive model of grammar encompasses the units of language, which constitute the language; and the processes that relate and integrate the various constructions in a language system. The specific theory is called Cognitive Grammar, developed by (LANGACKER, 2008).

The second phenomenon we consider is language change. Here, we examine William Croft's Utterance Selection Theory of language change. This theory views language use as the interface that mediates between the conventions of a language and mechanisms that result in deviation from convention resulting in language change.

Moreover, in accordance with the aspect of the discourse, it is necessary to highlight the functions of the language and communicative acts lied under the position presentation. In almost all the situations in which we find ourselves, language allows quick and effective expression, and provides a well-developed means of encoding and transmitting complex and subtle ideas. In fact, these notions of encoding and transmitting turn out to be important, as they relate to two key functions associated with language, the symbolic function, and the interactive function. One crucial function of language is to express thoughts and ideas. That is, language encodes and externalizes our thoughts. The way language does this is by using symbols. Symbols are bits of language. These might be meaningful subparts of words, whole words, or strings of words. These symbols consist of forms, which may be spoken, written or signed, and meanings with which the forms are conventionally paired. Meaning is the semantic content associated with the symbol. The meaning associated with a linguistic symbol is linked to a particular mental representation termed a concept. Concepts, in turn, derive from percepts.

4. CONCLUSION

Thus, the article is primarily focused on the basic background of argumentative discourse design, which would be beneficial within the educational and philological process. Argumentation, as a scientific category, has been in focus of investigation interest since ancient

times. Today, particular attention to the issue is paid especially by philosophic, logic and rhetorical studies. Each discipline underlines definite peculiar features and identifies own approaches to argumentation research. In this sense, the concept of argumentative skills is seen as the adequate means for educational purposes, and its awareness might be interpreted as the power to establish rapport with interlocutors and gain a consensus in the process of business communication.

If we regard argumentative discourse as an activity in the process of development, two forms of development can be identified. One is enhanced skill in directing the course of critical dialogue to meet the activity's objectives. The other is an enhanced understanding of the goals of argumentative discourse. To understand the conditions under which argumentative dialogue promotes reasoning it was important to consider people's goals while arguing. In argumentative dialogue, one can distinguish two overlapping but distinct kinds of activity: dispute and deliberation. Moreover, in accordance with the aspect of the discourse, it was necessary to highlight the functions of the language and communicative acts lied under the position of business communication.

The need to use only reasonable, fair arguments determines that using at least one unreasonable, unconvincing argument there is a danger that the other person, the opponent, in general, will doubt on justice of reasoning. If the opponent, the inter-viewer asks: what else can you prove it? - it means that the arguments and their presentation

form are not sufficient to convince the opponent. But not always possible to behave on the contrary: more of arguments, the better it is. Endlessly increasing the number of arguments begins to provide arguments of minor importance, and perhaps even contrary to one another. Thus, the adequacy of arguments must be understood not in terms of quantity but by their meaning and convincing. Rhetorical argumentation in business communication – it is an attempt of certain statements or evidence to convince someone to change the opponent's position or belief and acceptance position of other's side of negotiations.

It is in the appropriate form presented claims which are directed to the interviewer's mind and emotions that he could evaluate adopt or reject them. This is achieved without violence - only by persuasion. The rhetorical reasoning is characterized by the following aspects: examining the linkages between the thesis and its underlying claims of justice, and not the grounds on which the thesis is formulated and presented. Argumentation is a targeted activity: attempts of logical, ethos and pathos factors to strengthen or weaken the beliefs of the interviewer, the opponent. It is a social activity, as it is directed to another person (or other people).

It focuses on the dialogue and activates the other side of the argumentation to react to the statements. It is considered the other side of the negotiations is rational, able intelligently to evaluate arguments, to accept them or deny and reject. Ethics of argumentation and persuasion in business communication is related to the rules which are

equally recognized by both the speaker and the audience. Rhetorical ethics is concerned with morality, ethics, etiquette, law, as well as compliance with the technical rules of the language. In the argumentation process necessarily more or less may be infringed on certain rules and regulations. In view of the outcome of cases, norms and rules can be further expanded and narrowed, or if the language of the argumentation, his proof, arguments are ethically unacceptable.

REFERENCES

- CHOMSKY, N. 1991. **Kasher, Asa (ed.). Linguistics and Cognitive Science: Problems and Mysteries.** Oxford: Blackwell. p. 50. UK.
- EEMEREN, F., & GROOTENDORST, R. 2004. **A systematic Theory of Argumentation the Pragma-Dialectical Approach.** A Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics. UK.
- EVANS, V. 2007. **A Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics.** A Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics: 5-14. UK.
- FOOT, K. 2001. "Cultural-Historical Activity Theory as Practical Theory: Illuminating the Development of a Conflict Monitoring Network". **Communication Theory.** Vol. 11, N^o 1: 56–83. UK.
- GRIGORIEVA, V. 2007. **Discourse as an element of the communicative process: Pragma linguistic and Cognitive aspects.** Tambov: TSTU. Russia.
- HOUTLOSSER, P. 2001. **Points of view. In Eemeren F. (Eds.), crucial concepts of in argumentation theory.** Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press: 34-61. Netherlands.
- KALBIROVA, T., KARABAYEVA, A., UMIRBEKOVA, A., SHOKAEVA, K., BEKOVA, D., & ANARBEB, L. 2016. "Development of cross-cultural competence as a factor of cultural-linguistic personality formation". **ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science.** Vol. 03, N^o 35: 149-153. Russia.

- KOŽENIAUSKIENĖ, R. 2009. **Basics of Legal Rhetoric.** Monograph. Vilnius: Registru centras. UK.
- LANGACKER, R. 2008. **Cognitive grammar: a basic introduction.** Oxford University Press. UK.
- LEONTIEV, A. 2005. **Psychology of speech communication: Dissertation.** M., 1975; Reedition. Russia.
- MICHAEL, T., MALINDA, C., JOSEP, C., TANYA, B., & HENRIKE, M. 2005. "Understanding and sharing intentions: The origins of cultural cognition". **Behavioral and brain sciences.** Vol. 28, N° 5. UK.
- SAEZ, F. 2002. "Towards interculturality through language teaching: argumentative discourse". **Cause.** Vol. 25: 103-120. Netherlands.
- WALTON, D. 2013. **Methods of Argumentation.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. UK.
- WESTON, A. 2009. **A Rulebook for Arguments.** Hackett Publishing Company, Inc. UK.
- ZAREFSKY, D. 2006. "Strategic maneuvering through persuasive definitions: Implications for dialectic and rhetoric". **Argumentation.** Vol. 20: 399-416. UK.



**UNIVERSIDAD
DEL ZULIA**

opción

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Año 36, N° 91 (2020)

Esta revista fue editada en formato digital por el personal de la Oficina de Publicaciones Científicas de la Facultad Experimental de Ciencias, Universidad del Zulia.
Maracaibo - Venezuela

www.luz.edu.ve

www.serbi.luz.edu.ve

produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve