PEACE LINGUISTICS: IMPERATIVES FOR ESCAPING FRICTION AND PEACEBUILDING IN SOCIAL INTERACTION.

Ahumaraeze Chinwe Innocentia
Directorate of General Studies
Federal University of Technology Owerri
iahumaraeze@yahoo.com

Abstract

Peace seems to have become humanity's most sought after desire and value in our dispensation given its elusive nature. Friction, conflict and chaos have continued to have their toll on humanity. This trend has been fueled by the acts of individuals, even the verbal/ language acts, which have increasingly become violent. In social interactions today, language is often marked with disharmony and communicative violence evident in the use of aggressive, offensive and dehumanizing constructions that have the potentiality to harm and, by extension, escalate friction and conflict. It is in line with the foregoing that this paper examined peace linguistics' imperative for escaping friction and building peace. Peace linguistics advocates for the prevention of communicative aggression, creation of harmony and promotion of peace using language principles and applications. The study adopted the cooperative principles of Grice (1957) and Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness as working frameworks. The researcher also hinged the study on corpus linguistic approach as data were sourced from social media interactions and used to investigate how language can deconstruct and how it can construct and foster peace. The paper identified that since communication and language [its vehicle] are what human life revolves around, language could, thus, be used to champion peace building when it is used constructively and made to possess human dignifying attributes. The paper posited that the tenets of peace linguistics which include effective use of language, harmonious exchange, humanized constructions and communicative peace should be adopted in social interactions. Recommendations were made on the need to escape friction, prevent conflict and strengthen peace through humanizing language performances.

Keywords: communicative violence, friction, peace, communicative peace, peace linguistics, peacebuilding.

Introduction

Linguistics, the scientific study of language, is a field that is ever current given its focus on man's means of interaction and social involvement. Linguists have continued to explore its branches of psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, historical and computational linguistics as they affect man's cognitive tendencies, man's language use and its intersection with society, man's application of language to real life situations, man's application of computer science to linguistic studies and man's documentation of

language change over time. Whitla (2010) opines that linguistics studies many aspects of language like the sound systems, conversational interactions, uses men put language to in social situations, relationship of language to the functions of the brain, how languages develop and change and how machines can store and produce language. Language, which occupies the center space in linguistic studies as man's tool for interaction and for carrying out social actions, has also received no less attention. For Gomes De Matos (2005, p. 2), language is "the complex cognitive or mental system of symbols shared by all humans everywhere and used for communicating intra and interpersonally through spoken, written or sign languages". This definition highlights the following indices of language: it is a system of shared symbols, it is cognitive, it is a communication tool and it has channels of use.

Deducible from the foregoing is the communicative import of language. Language functions in communication as a tool for information dissemination and for the building of interpersonal relationships (LeBlanc, 2011). Language use is one area that has witnessed increasing waves of researches in recent times as it crisscrosses the subfield of applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and pragmatics. Applied linguistics according to Gomes de Matos (2016, p. 161) is "an interdisciplinary field that addresses an increasing variety of language-based context, language policy… and language use". Sociolinguistics studies the relationship between language and society with focus on how language is used by individual speakers and groups of speakers in social interaction (Wardhaugh, 2016, p. 10) while pragmatics "studies the factors that govern our choice of language in social interaction and the effects our choices have on others" with particular focus on humans as language users and their language production in context (Crystal 1999). The researcher deems it necessary to state that this research has beamed its searchlight on language use and its dualistic tendencies of constructivism and destructivism.

It is pertinent to point out that knowledge of language does not end at knowing the abstract formal system that characterizes a language. One should also be aware of the sociolinguistic and pragmatic indices that characterize language use. A language user who knows his onions should get familiarized with the relationship between language and society and how to communicate in appropriate contexts and situations. This brings us to the competences one needs to imbibe to be able to function well in language acts. Linguistic competence propounded by Noam Chomsky accounts for the correctness and grammaticality of language as a rule governed phenomenon. From the Chomskian notion of competence, other forms of competencies have evolved to account for the complexities in language use. The communicative competence moves beyond Chomskian correctness and grammaticality to look at appropriateness in language use. For Canale and Swain (1980, p. 165) cited in LeBlanc (2011, p. 25), communicative competence entails that following the rules of the language, users communicate according to social expectations in situational contexts given that language cannot be divorced from its social realities and responsibilities. This involves choosing the right words to convey appropriate meaning. Canale and Swain (1980) also identified the sociolinguistic competence which accounts for the appropriateness of utterances in relation to the socio- cultural context and, the strategic competence which imbues a language user with the ability to consciously plan language use.

The survey of these competences is important to the thought process development of this paper because they will account for proficiency in language use as Andrew (2001, p. 30) has noted that language proficiency includes sociolinguistic, strategic and communicative competencies. One who has acquired these competencies plans one's language use harmoniously while lack of acquisition of these competences leads to

improper language use, language devoid of harmony and capable of sparking off friction and conflict.

As has been hinted earlier, communicative competence focuses on appropriateness in language use which includes choosing right words to reflect socio-cultural linings, recognizing the purpose of communication, recognizing participants and the meaning they have brought into the communication process and striving for a cooperative exchange. Failure to put such things into consideration results in a failed and unharmonized exchange. This must have informed Gomes de Matos' (2001) definition of communication as an act of sharing which is capable of bringing about harmony or disharmony. In a bid to ensure that language is devoid of disharmony, Gomes de Matos has propounded the notions of peace linguistics which he projects as an advocacy for peaceful language use and communicative peace which he sees as an offshoot of communicative competence which is an advocacy for communication to be made more peaceful (Gomes de Matos, 2008, p. 341).

Statement of the Problem

In this twenty-first century, there are increasing and cyclic waves of friction, bitterness and conflict globally and these have invaded our language acts. The human emotion of compassion seems to have lost in the lopsided competition with the negative emotional outflows like conflict. Schilling (2011, p. 14) must have had this in mind when he asserts that "conflict and misunderstanding hold sway in many human encounters as socio economic pressures build up tension in social setting". Today, there are clashes of interest and rancor globally and these have infiltrated into our language use. This is because language cannot be divorced from the society where it engages to influence social structures which also influence its (language) structure (Wardhough, 2006, p. 10). This sociolinguistic perspective holds validity in our time because, as the world is increasingly heating up, linguistic productions are becoming less compassionate and more violent. This brings us to the problem this study has set out to investigate, the use of language to cause friction and perpetuate violence. Linguistic violence occurs when language is used in dehumanizing forms. Gomes de Matos (2001) has noted that language use can either bring harmony or disharmony depending on the level of responsibility a language user exhibits in communication. To this author, one can communicate responsibly to create harmony (friendly and respectful communication) or irresponsibly to create disharmony by the use of offensive, impolite, aggressive and insensitive language. Once the later happens, friction ensues because of its potentiality to spark friction, create distance and defensiveness and usher in an era of conflict. Thus, the problem of language violence and its aftermaths are what this paper studies with a view to proffering solutions. It is pertinent to point out that this research not only seeks to establish the link between linguistic violence and impoliteness and their role in causing friction and thereby leading to lack of cooperation in communicative exchange. It also captures the role of peace linguistics in calming every storm. Thus, its contribution to existing knowledge is that impoliteness and linguistic violence breed disharmony which stalls cooperative exchange while peace linguistics balances the equilibrium.

Purpose of Study

This study is aimed at investigating linguistic violence as causation to friction in social structures and interactions. Schilling (2011, p. 202) has noted that violence consists not only of actions, structures or systems that cause physical or environmental damage but also

of attitudes and words that cause psychological and social damage. Freidrich (2012, pp. 17-18) has opined that language can be employed as an instrument of harm. He goes further to say that the scale needs to be tipped in the opposite direction by the reinforcement of the humanizing uses of language that espouse respect for human dignity which in turn helps us develop a non-killing mentality. Freidirich's postulation brings us to another factor that the study aims to advance, the non-killing and non-violent properties of language in order to cushion the effects of linguistic violence. Having known the effect linguistic violence can have on the psych of individuals, the study projects non-violent communication as an alternative. Non-killing linguistics, just like peace linguistics, focuses on language use for peace making while non-violent communication highlights the language of compassion. Gomes de Matos (2014c) and Resenberg (2003, p. 8) who are proponents of these concepts are much aware that language principles and applications can also be used to quell the evil effects of linguistic violence. For Gomes de Matos, non-killing linguistics, henceforth NKL, is the employment of linguistic principles by language users to prevent acts of communicative violence and killing. Rosenberg, on his own, projects non-violent communication, henceforth NVC, as an approach that encourages exchanges that focus on shared human values needed to increase goodwill and to resolve differences peacefully. Thus, this study aims not only to investigate the effects of linguistic violence but to also highlight the importance of peace linguistics and its offshoots of non-killing linguistics and non-violent communication as parameters for escaping friction and for peace building.

Research Questions

The following question were formulated to guide the society

1. Does violence emanate from language use?
2. What are the manifestations of linguistic violence?
3. Can language principles and applications be used in fostering peace?
4. In what ways can language be used for peace building?

Significance of Study

This study is significant in more than one ways. In the main, it will reveal the dualistic applications of language use: for violence and for peace. By juxtaposing the effects and gains of these dual applications of language, it will make language users become more aware of their linguistic choices and their applications in social communicative interactions.

Conceptual Review

This section is a copious survey of the concepts that populate this research. As the study investigates peace linguistics' imperative for escaping friction and for peace building in social interaction, peace linguistics, its parent concepts like language and communication and its offshoots of communicative competence, communicative peace, non-killing linguistics and non-violent communication need to be explicated, drawing signposts of their potentiality in escaping friction and in peace building.

Language and communication are concepts that enjoy a relationship of connectivity and are man's tools for social actions, engagements and exchange. Language drives communication which in turn enriches it. The two concepts have also received variants of

definitions that have revealed their nature and function. Language is a rule governed symbolic system that enables users to generate meaning and also to define reality (Trembolen, 1995 in Dada, 2010). Merriam - Webster Online Dictionary defines communication as "an act of transferring … a process by which information is exchanged between individuals through a common system of symbols, signs or behaviour". This definition highlights the functions of language in communication. Thus, language functions as a tool for information exchange and the coordination of the realities of life through processes and space provided by communication. In language use in communication, interactants pass across messages which are expected to be understood, acted upon, and feedback sent to complete the cycle. Communication becomes effective when this cycle is completed. There is a breakdown if the process remains incomplete or when linguistic choices mar the flow of the message or the rapport that exists between the interactants.

The foregoing highlights the view of language as dual-edged, which use either creates rapport or destroys shared values depending on the choice of linguistic items. Language is a social interactive tool and should have norms of use. First and foremost, a language user must acquire competences in the use of language. These competencies, ranging from sociolinguistic, communicative to strategic, provide the mental and psychological apparatus for proper and appropriate language use. Gay (1988) thinks on the board in his assertion that language, as an institution, can do violence that is psychological and that linguistic violence occurs when we are both psychologically and socially hurt by words. In order to escape friction and make our language use violent-free, the notions of peace linguistics and communicative peace are advocated.

Peace linguistics, henceforth PL, is an interdisciplinary approach to language study that advocates for peaceful language use. Having witnessed the increasing waves of linguistic violence, Gomes de Matos propounded the notion of peace linguistics and has remained an advocate of this, churning out countless publications on the concept. According to him, aspects of language and peace can be woven into an applicable form in human communicative interaction (Gomes De Matos, 2005). Definitively Crystal (1999, pp. 254-255) asserts, "peace linguistics is a climate of opinion which emerged during the 1990 in which linguistic principles, methods, findings and applications were seen as a means of promoting peace and human rights at a global level … to foster language attitudes which respect the dignity of individual speakers and speech communities". For Curtis (2018a, p .12) "peace linguistic is concerned with the applications of the insights gained from the [scientific] study of language to practical problems such as how to help bring about world peace". Gomes de Matos (2018, 2014a) lending voice in furtherance of this discourse asserts that PL attempts to create conditions for language users to communicate peacefully as peace is a new awareness in language education.

This brings us to the notion of peace in language studies. Linguists like Gomes De Matos, Richard and Rogers (2011) and Freidrich (2007) have proposed the integration of peace into language education. LeBlanc (2011) submits that the peace linguistic approach finds itself in peace studies which is the United Nation's response field to the pressing need for peace after World War II. Richard and Rogers see PL's emergence as a response to the need assessment by linguists to address conflict and violence through language while Friedrich points out that peace education focuses on conflict resolution and peace cultivation using language.

PL is, thus, an emergent approach to conflict resolution, born out of the need to curb linguistic violence which seems now to exist on a large scale. Its basic message is using language not only as an ordinary tool for exchange but as a tool for communicating

peacefully. It maintains that certain types of language spark off violence by creating hurt (hurtful/ harmful language) and Gomes De Matos (2006, p. 160) has isolated "verbs of violent communicative act' that abuse, humiliate, oppress, disrespect and stigmatize as demeaning words that show how language can spark off a state of violence. Gomes de Matos (2000, p. 341) maintains that "human beings' right to peaceful and just life should be matched by a corresponding human responsibility to communicate peacefully". This assertion seems to be in tandem with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's (1996) report's adoption of a universal Linguistic Human Rights which demands that linguistic communities worldwide be rallied around the belief that "language as an essential vehicle for identity and cultural expansion is inseparable from the peace and intercultural understanding".

The foregoing typifies that responsible language use can create pathways for acceptance, understanding and escaping friction in social communicative interactions. Also deducible is the underlying peace potential of language. Thus, Gomes de Matos (2002) has given the injunction that language users be educated "not only to talk about peace in their communication acts but to communicate in peaceful ways" and that communicative peace should be seen as a "deeper dimension to communicative competence". PL is, thus, an advocacy that language be used to "promote peace" by incorporating the values of "human rights, justice and peace into one's array of core values" (Friedrich, 2007, p. 50). Gomes de Matos (2006) has proposed the notion of applied peace linguistics as an offshoot of applied linguistics. Since Applied Linguistics investigates and proffers solution to language-based problems, Applied Peace Linguistics emerged with the aim of providing conditions for teaching language users to use language peacefully so as to escape friction. Applied Peace Linguistics, henceforth APL, focuses on how language can be applied in the pursuance of peace. APL is charged with a dualistic function. On one hand, it helps users to identity states of harmony, agreement, communicative dignity and communicative peace. Again, it functions to isolate states of disagreement and disharmony that culminate in communicative conflict, discord and contentions. Thus, APL charged with twofold responsibility probes these questions:

- What is a lack of harmony marked by communicative hostility?

- What vocabulary and phraseology does a person rely on when arguing, quarreling or bickering?

- What communicative exchanges involve disagreement and conflict?

- How do language users apologize the cause of humiliation?

- How do language users monitor, reward, rephrase communicative insensitivity or contemptuous rudeness?

- How do we make regretful acknowledgment of a communicative offense?

- How do we blame someone/persons when we consider them responsible for a misdeed or failure: do we treat them with communicative dignity? (Gomes de Matos, 2014)

These questions and the answers they generate basically summarize peace linguistic application. Deducible from them are the notions of communicative hostility or aggression, communicative insensitivity, communicative offense, communicative dignity and communicative harmony. In the application of language, a user needs to know the

import of his language use (vocabularies and phraseologies) on the receiver. One can be communicatively hostile, aggressive and insensitive with his choice of words and this leads to communicative disharmony. One's language use can also dignify others thereby bringing about communicative harmony. The foregoing is a pointer that language can be used to escape friction and avoid conflict when users know and apply certain principles and practices which Gomes de Matos (2012, p. 3) has termed "Principles and Practices of Conflict Resolution" which are approaches proposed to highlight the communicative life-improving force of peaceful language use embedded in these two concepts: communicative peace and communicative dignity.

PL has great imperative for escaping friction and for peace building because of its mantra of communicative peace, non-violent communication and non-killing linguistics. Friction and conflict in a communicative interaction come as an aftermath of irresponsible and incompetent use of language. Gay (1999) has isolated friction and conflict-causing linguistic choices to include hurtful language (racist comment), conscious, hurtful form of violence (aggressive) and harmful language (oppressive). Gomes de Matos (2006) cited earlier has identified verbs of violent communicative act as friction-causing and conflict escalating and Canale and Swain (1980, p.30) have stated that in a bid to resolve emergent problems occurring from linguist violence, language users should be made aware of the difference between violent and peaceful language so as to make informed choices.

It is imperative to point out that in language use, peace is established when an exchange comes from the point of valuing the other as a human that has rights, feelings and needs. In the secular world today, there seems to be a dearth of peace, thus, it has come to occupy a focal position in the list of individual and national aspirations. Peace has continued to receive unabated attention because of its dynamics of ousting conflict and violence. Peace literally means the absence of all forms of violence. Schilling (2011, p. 20) states that peace is a process, a struggle to transform violence as it "describes the unfolding of conflict in a constructive way". Schilling goes further to say that peace does not mean the total absence of conflict and exists where people interact non- violently and manage their conflict positively, paying attention to the needs of others. She noted that peace could be negative (absence of war, direct violence and conflict at all levels of human engaging activities) or positive (absence of indirect and structural violence) which makes for bridge building between conflicting parties which, in turn, translates to building a culture of peace.

Building bridges to curb violence among/ between conflicting parties is known as peace building which is a process of intervening in conflicts and maintaining peace. Schilling (2011, p. 29) sees the term as including processes like peacemaking (interactions designed to end hostilities using non-violent dialogue to reach peace agreements) and peace-keeping (monitoring and enforcing agreement). Peacebuilding, no doubt, is a process that is interventive for it seeks ways to move beyond conflict to induce a culture of peace.

How then can peace linguistics help in escaping friction and peacebuilding? Linguists Gomes de Matos and Friedrich and psychologist Rosenberg seem to have handed down non-negotiable ways in their communicative peace, non-killing linguistics and non-violent communication chants. In 1984, Marshal Rosenberg, a psychologist propounded the notion of non-violent communication where he proposed that a language of compassion be used in all communicative interactions. NVC focuses on ways of interaction that do not impede the communication flow required for information exchange and the peaceful resolving of differences (Schilling 2011, p. 202). Rosenberg (2003, p. 18)

notes that NVC focuses on shared human values and needs and encourages language that increases goodwill against those that contribute to resentment or lowered self worth. Analyzing with the giraffe against the Jackal, Rosenberg used body parts to symbolize NVC thus:

Heart – emotion and empathy; focusing on needs and feeling

Height – ability to look into the distance -- keen and sensitive awareness of future possibilities.

Long neck – symbol of vulnerability as well as affection-attracting. Rosenberg (2005) (2006) has noted the role of empathy in NVC while noting how participants in an exchange can communicate:

- Use a list of feelings – affectionate, cheerful, and loving.
- Do not use authoritative words.
- Listen empathetically by focusing on speakers feeling and needs.

Gomes de Matos' writings all have bearing to the imperatives of peace linguistics in escaping friction and conflict and in peacebuilding. First, he coined the concept of communicative peace (1991b) that preaches that communication be done in constructive and in human-dignifying ways. Gomes de Matos (2006) projects the use of humanizing language that is friendly, responsible, sensitive and compassionate rather than using dehumanizing language. Gomes de Matos (2005) has, in furtherance of the foregoing, listed the functions and principles of a peaceful language user which are imperatives in peace building in these injunctions:

Dignify your Dialogue by
- addressing others with respectful language and optimistic vocabulary, by disagreeing through empathetic language,
- using positivizers (adjectives and verbs that enhance positive values on people),
- convincing others cooperatively,

Honour Humanism and foster Humanization by
- avoiding verbal harm and humiliation,
- applying justice and peace in communication acts,
- rephrasing potentially dehumanizing language.

Act as a Peace Patriot by
- promoting a passion for peace especially in aggressive contexts,
- being a peaceful bridge person between persons and groups
- letting your communication contribute to a culture of peace.

These can only be achieved if the tenets of Gomes de Matos and Friedrich's (2012) non-killing linguistics and Gomes de Matos, communicative peace are imbibed. NKL emerged as an offshoot of PL which aim is to apply the principles of linguistics in helping users prevent acts of communicative violence and killing (Gomes de Matos, 2014c) and to communicate life improving forces necessary for peace building (Gomes de Matos, 2012). Knowing full well peace linguistics' imperatives for escaping friction and for peace building, Gomes de Matos postulated in his numerous writings the following:

- Language should perform peace building, supporting and sustaining functions.
- Users of language should interact constructively in character elevating ways.
- Languages should be learned and used for human life- improving purposes.
- Language users should nurture communicative compassion.
- Users of language should prevent acts of communicative aggression.
- Interactants should communicate cooperatively and peacefully.

The foregoing has made certain establishments. Language use can lead to friction and conflict when it is not humanized. Language can also be employed constructively when it is imbued with humanizing tendencies. It is the constructive use of language that ousts friction and makes for peaceful and harmonious co-existence of individuals.

Theoretical Framework

This study adopted Culpeper's (1996) Impoliteness Model and Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principles as working frameworks. These approaches were chosen given their capacity to highlight areas of friction and conflict in communication.

Culpeper's Model of Impoliteness

Impoliteness is a linguistic theory that hinges on face-damaging linguistic and non-linguistic acts. Impoliteness is juxtaposed against Brown and Levinson's (1978) politeness theory that sees politeness as face-saving linguistic acts. Impoliteness, just like politeness, has been given various definitional conceptualizations but this researcher focuses on Culpeper's view that sees it as all communicative behaviours intended to cause the "face loss" of the hearer. It includes all face threatening acts directed at the hearer which in turn affects the speaker through response. Impoliteness is an act that is face-aggravating or face-damaging in a particular context. Context here is important because what is face-damaging in one context could not be in another. There are many models of impoliteness since it was first introduced in language studies in 1977. Linguistics like Hickey (1791), Culpeper (1996) and Bousfield (2006) have continued to research and further its use. Culpeper has continued to churn out works on impoliteness (1996, 208, 2011). Culpeper's model of impoliteness manifests in communicative interactional settings where speakers, through their language, act intentionally to damage the face of the hearer. Culpeper states that impoliteness and its sister, rudeness, are inappropriate in interactional exchanges, thus, they are negatively marked concepts. Culpeper (2008) stresses that all behaviours, linguistic or non-linguistic, that are intentionally used by a speaker in a communicative interaction to damage the face wants of other participants are said to be impolite. To him impoliteness is intentional while rudeness is unintentional.

Culpeper (2011) sees impoliteness as a multidisciplinary concept which has bearing with almost all humanistic disciplines – sociology, psychology, media and conflict studies. Culpeper (2006, 2008) postulated two categorical divisions of impoliteness -- inherent impoliteness and mock impoliteness or banter. Inherent impoliteness, according to Culpeper, are those acts that are innately face-threatening regardless of context, while those that are superficial and not intended to insult are called mock impoliteness (Culpeper 1996). Again, Culpeper has outlined five impoliteness strategies which include:

- **Bald on record** – where acts are clear and direct where face is relevant.

- **Positive impoliteness** – use of strategies designed to damage addressee's positive face wants.

- **Negative impoliteness -** strategies used to damage addressee's negative face wants.

- **Sarcasm or mock impoliteness** – use of politeness strategies that are insincere.

- **Withheld politeness** -- absence of politeness work where it would be expected- showing concern to someone in need (Culpeper, 1996, pp. 8-9).

Culpeper (2011) has also isolated types of withheld politeness to include:

- **Affective impoliteness** -- when a speaker makes obvious his anger towards the hearer in a discursive interaction which in turn creates a negative atmosphere.

- **Coercive impoliteness –** manifests when speaker demonstrates power over hearer through use of command and imperatives.

- **Entertaining impoliteness** – manifests in speaker making jest of hearer to gain amusement. Culpeper, looking at the concepts of positive and negative impoliteness, has put forth their strategies of output and manifestation.

His positive impoliteness output strategies include:

- Snub, ignore and fail to acknowledge the other's presence,
- Exclude the other from activity,
- Disassociate from the other – deny common ground,
- Be disinterested, unconcerned and unsympathetic,
- Use inappropriate identity makers,
- Use secretive and obscure language – jargon,
- Seek disagreement – select a sensitive topic to make the other feel uncomfortable,
- Use taboo words – swear abuse,
- Use profane language ,
- Call the other names,
- Use derogatory nominations.

Also, his negative impoliteness output strategies include:

- Frighten the other – instill fear that a detrimental action will occur,
- Scorn, ridicule – emphasize your relative power, belittle the other,
- Invade the others space literally – come closer than necessary by asking intimate questions,
- Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect,
- Personalize using I and you,
- Put the other indebtedness (vulnerability) on record.

Impoliteness and power have been seen to have a relationship of interconnectivity as relative power is seen to manifest in impolite acts. Power is welded by those who are highly placed in different fields over others to influence and limit them. Culpeper (1996, p. 354) links power with impoliteness when he asserts that, impoliteness is more likely to manifest when the speaker is more powerful than the hearer. As power relations are determined by access to valued resources (status, wealth, jobs), a speaker who is highly placed tends to exhibit impolite acts more freely because he is capable of limiting the less powerful participants' ability to retaliate.

Bousfield (2008, p. 150) reechoes Culpeper's position that a person who manifests impoliteness creates and reactivates some aspects of his relative power. The researcher has chosen this model because, in discursive acts involving quarrels and showing difference in power relations, impoliteness can occur although Culpeper did not make the former explicit, a perceived seeming shortcoming of this theory.

Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principles

This is another theory the study hinges on. CP is a communication principle that describes the level of achievement of conversational interactions. In communication, speakers (S) and hearers (H) engage in exchanges that are expected to be cooperative, where hearers are expected to associate speakers with such intentions by cooperating in the exchange in order to arrive at mutual understanding. Grice's postulations about cooperation in interaction are subsumed in these four maxims.

QUANTITY
- Make contributions as informative as is required for the current purpose of exchange.
- Do not make it more informative than is required.
- Provide only necessary information.

QUALITY
- Do not say what you believe to be false.
- Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

RELATION
- Be relevant.
- Maintain the focus of the conversation -- do not veer off from the main topic.

MANNER
- Be brief and orderly.
- Avoid obscurity of expression.
- Avoid ambiguity.

Grice has noted that these maxims are not always adhered to in a discursive exchange. They could be violated, flouted, infringed on or opted out of. Our focus here is on flouting, which occurs when participants deliberately cease to apply the maxims because they want their listeners to infer the hidden meaning behind their utterance; the meaning they implicate by their utterance. This theory was chosen to draw out evidences of uncooperativeness in interaction that are friction-causing.

Methodology

The study is corpus linguistic based and followed the descriptive analytical model. The data analyzed in this research were gotten from the whatsApp page of a network business group. The data were analyzed qualitatively using the peace linguistic tenets, Grice's Cooperative Principles and Culpeper's impoliteness model.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Background: this data was gotten from a group whatsApp page where a woman asked for monetary assistance during this Covid-19 lockdown. It is pertinent to point out that the researcher used the raw data as it is, hence, the non-adherence to grammar rules in the constructions. However, translations were provided for some of the social media coinages and contractions.

Discussions and Analysis

The research has isolated linguistic choices that are impolite and face-damaging.

Use of Bald on Record Impoliteness

These are statements that are insultive and directly attack the face of speaker.

a. The truth remains that you can take a dog to the river but you cannot force it to drink.

b. This ur [your] mindset that's y [why] u [you] find urself [yourself] in this kind of situation begging to eat.

Qualitative Analysis

These statements by speaker B to speaker A are insults and direct attacks on her person and are, thus, face-damaging.

Positive Impoliteness: These are strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants where positive face is the desire to be appreciated in social interaction. Output strategies for positive impoliteness include:

Ignore the Other

A. I will join but I [I] hv [have] to eat before investing.

B. You should have put down that little you have before lock down by now, every ten days u [you] will be sure of something no matter how small.

Qualitative Analysis

In these conversations, B ignored the issue raised by speaker A and chose to tell her how beneficial joining the business is.

Disassociate from the Other

A. Please member's [members] of this group, I need help financially. Me and my kids need to put food on our table. please somebody help.

B. You have chosen just to remain an observer since you were added holding tight to the seed you were supposed to sow [money you were supposed to have invested] and expect yield or rather you used your seed for your priority.

Qualitative Analysis

These strings show that the interactants do not have a common ground to agree. These strings also flout the maxim of relation because what B said is not related to the idea A expressed.

Exclude the Other from Activity: Not found within the corpus

Be disinterested, unconcerned and unsympathetic

A.   I will join but i [I] hv [have] to eat first before investing

B.   You have to change your mindset eating first before investing. I sorry for thee [I pity you].

Qualitative Analysis. In this exchange, B was unconcerned and unsympathetic towards A.

Use of inappropriate identity markers. Not found in the corpus.

Use of obscure, secretive language. Not found.

Seek Disagreement:

C: u [you] shouldn't talk to anyone like that. are u [you] trying to mock her? all fingers re [are] not equal .we should be careful of what we write n [and] post. if u [you] can't help, kindly shut ur [your] mouth and dont add to her problems . even d [the] so called rich ones/investors like u [you] re [are] crying harder behind d screen

E: My brother these words are not welcomed either. If you need to correct someone not with abusive words. Pls [please] try and render apology to him you might do it here or in his private chat. One lov [love]

C: apology on what pls [please]?

Qualitative Analysis. In these strings, C disagrees with E that he has used words that should warrant an apology.

Use of taboo words. Not found.

Call the other name.

C.   even d [the] so called rich ones/investors like u [you] re [are] crying harder behind d screen.

B.   The truth remains that you can force a dog to the river but you can not force it to drink.

Negative Impoliteness:

These are strategies designed to damage the negative face wants of individuals in a discursive interaction. They include:

Frighten

D. Don't forget that table turns around [Do not forget that conditions change over time].

Qualitative analysis. Here, D tries to warn people about their attitude by telling them that tables can turn and they find themselves at the receiving end.

Condensed Scorn or Ridicule.

A.   The truth remains that you can force a dog to the river but you can not force it to drink.

B.   This your mindset that's y [why] u [you] find urself [yourself] in this kind of situation begging to eat [begging for alms].

Qualitative Analysis. These statements by B clearly ridicule speaker A.

Invade the other's space. Not found

Explicitly associate the order with a negative aspect.

A.   I will join but i [I] hv [have] to eat first before investing

B.   This your mindset that's y [why] u [you] find urself [yourself] in this kind of situation begging to eat [begging for food].

C: u [you] shouldn't talk to anyone like that. are u [you] trying to mock her? all fingers re [are] not equal .we should be careful of what we write n [and] post. if u [you] can't help, kindly shut ur [your] mouth and dont add to her problems . even d [the] so called rich ones/investors like u [you] re [are] crying harder behind d [the] screen

E: My brother these words are not welcomed either. If you need to correct someone not with abusive words. Pls [please] try and render apology to him you might do it here or in his private chat. One love.

Qualitative Analysis. B and E associate A and C respectfully with the negative aspects of begging and abusing.

Put the Other's Indebtedness on Record.

A: I will join but i [I] hv [have] to eat first before investing

B.   This ur [your] mindset that's y [why] u [you] find urself [yourself] in this kind of situation begging to eat. U [you] have to change ur [your] mindset.... eating eating first before investment. I sorry for thee [I pity you]

Qualitative Analysis. Speaker B magnifies A's vulnerability by his statement.

Sarcasm or Mock Politeness - Use of politeness strategies that are insincere.

F: The truth is that there is no amount of money one can keep for feeding without any source of adfition [addition] to it that will ever be enough. However, I believe that most of us must have learnt one thing or the other at this period. No one is to be blamed every situation has a message it passes across. It is well with all of us.

B.   I sorry for thee [I pity you]

Qualitative Analysis. These statements, though seemingly polite, are sarcastic and mock speaker A.

Use of Taboo Words – swearing and using of abusive words

> C.   if u [you] can't help, kindly shut ur [your] mouth and dont add to her problems.

Withhold Politeness: Absence of politeness work where it would be expected.

> **a.   Affective impoliteness**

> B: What we do here is to teach and encourage everyone to engage into [in] a business that will put food on your table without stress and that we have been doing here excellently well. The truth remains that you can force a dog to the river but you can not force it to drink. You have chosen to just remain an observer here ever since you were added holding tight to the seed you were supposed to sow [the money you were supposed to have invested] and expect yield or rather you used your seed for your priority.

Qualitative Analysis. This first turn of speaker B in response to speaker A's opening turn is devoid of any trace of politeness. Speaker A must have swallowed her pride to come up with that plea and in our culture, such a person in need should at least be comforted even when the help sought for is not granted.

> **b.   Coercive impoliteness.**

C.   If u [you] can't help kindly shut ur [your] mouth and don't add to her problems.

Qualitative Analysis. Speaker C uses an imperative to cower Speaker B thereby making him to understand that the power he thinks he has to talk to Speaker A anyhow he pleases can also be wielded by another person over him.

Cooperative Principles

The researcher found out that there was no mutual cooperation in this data. Interactants never understood one another hence, there was no successful exchange. Some of the cooperative principles were flouted.

Flouting of the Relevance Maxim.

> A: Pls [please] member's [members] of this group i need help financially. Me and my kids need to put food on our table.pls [please] somebody help

> B: What we do here is to teach and encourage everyone to engage into [in] a business that will put food on your table without stress and that we have been doing here excellently we.

Here, A was talking about financial help and hunger, but B chose to focus on business investment. By so doing, his unwillingness to help is implicated.

Flouting of the Manner Maxim.

> A: I will join but i [I] hv to eat first before investing

> **B**.   This ur [your] mindset that's y [why] u [you] find urself [yourself] in this kind of situation begging to eat.U [you] have to change ur [your] mindset.... eating eating first before investment. I sorry for thee [I pity you].

Here, B needed to say that he cannot help but he obscured his lack of sympathy and rather talked ill or questioned the mindset of speaker A.

Findings

The analysis revealed that there was lack of cooperation in the discursive interaction which resulted as a result of the flouting of the manner and relevance maxims of Grice's cooperative principles. It is pertinent to note that the impolite choices were made because the interactants are not exposed to the tenets of peace linguistics which preaches the use of humanizing language as against demeaning language.

Thus, Gomes de Matos' (2014) human improving relevance of PL seen below was lost to them. CCC – communicate cooperatively and cordially. (constructively– *emphasis mine*).

MMM – Make your messages models of communication.

PPP – plan your prose/ poetic posters peacefully.

RRR – refrain from replying rudely.

AAA – Apologize right after addressing a person aggressively.

It was also revealed that the interactants lack communicative competence and, by extension, communicative peace which makes for appropriacy in language use with special focus on situational context. This lack of knowledge is evident in their use of friction-causing, human demeaning expressions isolated below.

Speaker B. This ur mindset that's y u find urself in this kind of situation begging to eat. The truth remains that you can take a dog to the river but you cannot force it to drink.

Speaker C. If you can't help kindly shut up your mouth and don't add to her problems. even d so called rich ones/investors like u re crying harder behind d screen

C: apology on what pls?

C: There is no need for apology really. Ma'am [Madam] don't worry.

The study revealed that one of the interactants, Speaker E, seems to have been exposed to the tenets of peace linguistics, and, having known the effects of dehumanizing language use, he tried so much to influence others by telling them to adopt humanizing language and apologize in the invent of the use of demeaning language. This is evident in these extracts.

E: My brother these words are not welcomed either. If you need to correct someone not with abusive words. Pls try and render apology to him you might do it here or in his private chat.

E: read ds [these] pls [please] ....and tell me if ds [these] complimentary or mockery/insultive?

E: Your choice of words are not right.1. "Shut your mouth up"2. Even the so called rich/investors like you. If I may ask do you know this person in question? Even if you do those words are insultive.

Had speaker E's injunctions which resonant the human improving relevance of PL been adhered to by the interactants, the volume of friction in that exchanged would have been toned down and there would have been cooperation which would have ushered in a peaceful exchange.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The thrust of this paper has been on peace linguistics and its imperatives for escaping friction and for peacebuilding in social interactions. Globally, friction and conflict have witnessed waves of increase due to issues like socio-economic pressure, religious intolerance and political bias. Thus, the need to temper down the heat from these foreseen cyclic, friction-causing and conflict escalating situations through language use from the peace linguistics perspective becomes imperative. The society revolves around and functions on the dialogic use of language and thus its continued peaceful existence depends hugely on language use patterned not in the notion of destructivism but on that of constructivism (Ahumaraeze and Nwachukwu, 2016, p. 82). Through data analysis, the patterns of destructive, demeaning and dehumanizing exchanges that are friction- causing and uncooperative were revealed to make peace linguistics a must for all as, its application by people of different creed and clime has the potentiality of reducing friction and ensuring peaceful and harmonious living. It is on this premise that the following recommendations were made:

- Communicative peace, a deeper dimension of communicative competence, should be introduced in the language classroom from the high schools as a compulsory course so that students will be taught while in school to be peaceful language users.

- Language users should learn the act of non-violent communication through non-killing linguistics so as to avoid acts of linguistic violence that are friction-causing. They should, rather, lift up souls with their life – improving language (LLL).

- Interactants should avoid acts of communicative aggression by humbling their hubris and exhibiting shared humanity in human communication (HHH).

Interactants should engage in peacebuilding and, by extension, become peacemakers by using peaceful phraseologies.

References

Ahumaraeze, C.I. & Nwachukwu, U. A. (2016). Language use: Implication for peace and global reconciliation. *In Review of arts and social sciences. Quarterly journal of inter-university friendship association with contributions from science and technology*. pp 76-83.

Andrew S. (2009). *Teacher Language awareness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.

Canale & Swain (1980). Theoretical bases approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*.1 (1) 1-14.

Crystal, D. (1999). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, J. (2006). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of pragmatics.* 25. 349-367

_____(2008). Reflections on impoliteness, relational work and power. In D. Bousfield & M. Locher (Eds). *Impoliteness in language* (pp.17-44). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

_____(2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curtis, A. (2018a). Introducing and defining peace linguistics. *The word*. 27(3). 11-13.

Friedrich, P. (2007a). *Language negotiation and peace. The use of English in conflict resolution*. London: Continuum.

Dada, S. A. (2010). Language use and communication artifacts in GSM Adverts in Nigeria. Retrieved from www.linguisticonline.com on May 20, 2020.

Friedrich, P. (2012). (Ed). *Nonkilling Linguistic: Practical applications:* Honolulu: Centre for Global Nonkilling.

Gay W, (1998). Exposing and overcoming linguistic alienation and linguistic violence. Retrieved on May 10, 2020 from http://www.philosophy.uncc.edu/pubexposeoverconnlvla.htm

Gomes de Matos, F. (2000). Harmonizing and humanising political discourse. The contributions of peace linguistics. In *Peace and conflict resolution: A journal of peace psychology* 6 (4) 339-344.

_____ (2002a). Teaching peace promoting vocabulary: A new frontier. *Glosas Didactices*. 8 (spring).

_____ (2005). Using peaceful language: From Principle to Practice. *Peace, Literature and Acts.* Vol 11.

_____ (2008). A plea for the humanizing use of language. *Humanizing Language teaching*. 10 (3).

_____ (2012). LIF- PLUS: The life-improving force of peaceful language. In P.T. Coleman & M. Deutsch (Eds). *Psychological components of sustainable peace* (pp.121-127) New York: Springer.

_____(2014). Peace linguistics for language teachers. Delta. Documentacao de estudos em linguistic teorica e aplicada. 30(2). 412-424

_____(2014c). Language, peace and conflict resolution. In M. Deutsch, P.T. Coleman & E. C. Marcus (Eds). *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice*. (3rd edition) (pp.158 – 175). San Fransisco: Jossy-Bass.

_____(2016). Pedagogy of positiveness: Applied English for diplomatic purposes. In P. Friedrich (Ed). *English for diplomatic purposes* (pp.173-190). Bristol: Multilingual Matters

Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds). *Studies in syntax and semantics 111: Speech arts*. New York: Academic Press.

LeBlanc, J. (2011). How ESOL Teachers become aware of communicative peace. MA TESOL Collection. SIT Digital Collection. Retrieved on May, 20, 2020 from http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/IPP_collection/506.

Merriam Webster online dictionary.

Nurdquist, R. (2019). Definition and examples of linguistics. www.thoughtsco.com. Accessed on 1st June, 2020.

Rosenberg, M. B. (2003). *Non-violent communication: A language of life*. 2nd edition. USA

_____ (2005). *Non violent-communication: A language of peace*. 2nd edition. Encinita. CA: PudlleDancer Press.

Schilling, K. (2011). *Peace and conflict resolutions: A resource book*. C. Kayser & F. Djatteng (Eds). Berlin: CPS/ Bx dw Batoussum.

UNESCO (1996). Universal declaration on linguistic rights. http://www.unesco.org/cpp/declaration/linguistic-pdf. Accessed on 10th may, 2020.

Whitla, W. (2010). *The English handbook*: London: Willy-Blackwell.