

## LINGUISTIC IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONALITY

DARYA YADRYSHCHANSKAYA, HELEN GLAZKO

Polotsk State University, Belarus

*Linguistic personality is a personality expressed in language (texts) and via language, a personality reconstructed in the general terms on the basis of linguistic means.*

Physiologists, psychologists, philosophers and linguists have been studying human personality for centuries. Hundreds of books and articles devoted to human thoughts, feelings and speech acts, have been published in the last two or three decades [1, p.37].

Linguistic personality is the concept that goes through all language aspects and breaks the boundaries between the disciplines that study human personality. Obviously, it is impossible to study personality apart from his/her language.

Linguistic personality is not a novel object of study in linguistics. Some new research into this problem has been done recently. Linguistic personality has been considered 'from the bird's eye view' and the researcher is only able to see and note the most common features that describe a person as a species, as a talking being, as a homo loquens [2, p.3-4].

Any speaker is a linguistic personality, a person who exists in a language space, in communication, behavioural stereotypes, recorded in language, in its linguistic units and texts meanings. The study of the linguistic personality in native linguistics is undoubtedly related to Yu.N. Karaulov. He defines the term 'linguistic personality' as a set of person's abilities and characteristics that determine their speech (texts) production [3, p.7].

The value plan of a communicative personality is demonstrated in conduct standards fixed in a language.

Conduct standards generalize and regulate a variety of communication situations, that is why they are of especial importance. They are recorded in word meanings and phraseological units. These standards are not homogeneous. Their linguistic research is of particular interest in both theoretical and practical aspects. Practical interest helps to understand foreign culture values through language and teach the adequate communicative behaviour in a foreign society.

The theoretical basis given in the work by Yu.N.Karaulov, has become the foundation of the present analysis of the communicative behaviour of two native speakers, allowing to compare their linguistic personalities.

Communicative spheres are subject situations in which national specific features of communicative behaviour are manifested. Communicative spheres differ from standard communicative situations by being more extensive and less structured, less rigid with regard to rules and norms of communicative behaviour acting within their framework. The latter are more diverse than in the framework of standard communicative situations; there are fewer mandatory speech formulas and more variability.

The description of communicative behaviour within the framework of communicative spheres presupposes greater freedom of presentation and less predetermined description by ready-made speech models than description of communicative behaviour of people in standard communicative situations.

The two people whose linguistic personalities were under analysis were both university-educated men in their late twenties, of Caucasian racial type, from the USA. All these factors should be taken into account while analyzing their communicative behaviour.

**Communication with friends.** Communication with friends in the USA is mediated by the concept of privacy which is important for their mentality. It means independence, inviolability of the inner world of a person, a certain distance from others as a desirable state of a person.

From the point of view of Americans communication with friends should be easy and pleasant for both sides. In spite of a certain degree of proximity it should not violate the limits of what is permitted and should not be felt as a burden [4, p.113-114].

**Communication with close friends.** Americans perceive themselves as sovereign people responsible for their actions. They treat others in the same way. The concept of "friendship" in the American culture has a slightly different connotation than the Russian one. Speaking about friendship, Americans mostly have in mind friendly relations. American communication with friends is rather superficial and formal in nature. It is reduced mainly to spending their free time with friends. When an American meets someone who likes the same things as they do, he or she attempts to make friends. Researchers say that American friendship is friendship by personal choice, not by tradition or by the past [4, p.115-116].

**Communication with foreigners.** Americans communicate with foreigners benevolently but indulgently. The USA is a country of immigrants, and Americans do not have hyper-hospitality towards foreigners like Russian people have.

The usual topics of conversation with a foreigner are family, food, leisure activities, sports and politics. The aim of these discussions is an attempt to compare how the Americans and people in other countries live. Americans often discuss the government policy; ask about the economy and prices, they are interested in the causes of events in Chechnya, the affairs of the Russian mafia, and the scale of local crime. Americans often have a very low level of awareness of life in other countries. That is why questions like these should not come as a surprise: "Is it true that you have frost all year round?" [4, p.118-120].

**Communication in a cafe or restaurant.** Restaurants and cafés are very popular places for Americans to meet in. Americans basically like to eat "out" and often go to restaurants and cafes.

Restaurants (cafés) in the USA is both an official and an informal place for communication. People celebrate official and family events there. Business meetings, completion of negotiations and deals take place there.

The one who invites usually is the one who pays the bill, although sometimes a person who is older can insist on paying; or a man who is sharing a meal with a woman. If the inviter does not pay, they should at least express a willingness to do that.

To insist on paying for a meal is a ritual, but a dispute on this topic ends quickly if someone makes it clear that he / she intends to pay for food [4, p.146-147].

American Non-Verbal Communicative Behaviour.

**Distance of communication.** Modern sociological data of communicative behavior distinguishes four basic types of distance:

1. intimate distance (15 – 45 cm) – distance of communication between close relatives and friends;
2. personal distance (45 cm – 1.2 m) – distance of communication at parties, when communicating with good acquaintances;
3. social distance (1.2 m – 3.6m) – communication with strangers and unfamiliar people;
4. public distance (more than 3.6 m) – when speaking in front of an audience [5].

In most cases Americans prefer a fairly large distance of communication — too short a distance for Americans is associated with encroachment on personal space, aggression or even sexual harassment.

"A comfortable communication zone" for an American can be considered a distance of at least half a metre. "Comfort zone" should be observed between two seated interlocutors, i.e. should be the necessary space between them, for example, in the case of a dispute not to hurt one another or to bend slightly to the interlocutor in case of some personal problem discussion [4, c.181-182].

**Physical contact when communicating.** Americans do not belong to contact cultures. They are hardly inclined to the physical contact while communicating. This contact is extremely rare: the rule "Keep your hands to yourself". It is only possible for men to pat each other on the shoulder while greeting.

Although Americans need a relatively large "comfort zone" when talking, they sometimes resort to the help of touches while communicating. They can put their hand on the shoulder of an interlocutor to express an affectionate attitude towards him or her, or even hug them as a sign of sympathy, pat on the back to comfort and pat the child on the head to express their love, often hug each other firmly at the greeting and farewell. They will readily take the interlocutor by the hand and help cross the street [4, c.185-186].

**Smile in communication.** The main mimic of Americans is the smile. The smile in the USA is an indispensable part of conversation. Americans, meeting a stranger's look in transport, in the street or in other places, usually smile or say something. They also smile looking at children or animals.

Americans mostly smile showing their teeth. The American smile is like a grin for a Russian, that is a demonstration of teeth by animals, and it is estimated as wary, often — disapproving, sometimes considered artificial, demonstrative, and insincere.

The main functions of the American smile are:

- demonstration of good will towards the interlocutor;
- demonstration of courtesy in communication: it is customary to smile at people you have business with — buyers, sellers, customs officers, etc., in this respect, the smile in America is the basis of customer service;
- demonstration of personal prosperity ("I'm ok"); even if things do not go very well, Americans keep smiling, in order not to look like "losers"; a smile is the typically American demonstration of perseverance, vitality;
- demonstration of gratitude — the smile can serve as a substitute for verbal means of expressing gratitude. It must also be emphasized that loud laughter in the USA is a sign of a particular attitude towards the interlocutor [4, p.189-190].

---

**Linguistics, literature, philology**

**Eye Contact.** Americans do not look straight at strangers (this violates privacy), but if an American accidentally makes eye contact with a stranger, they will most probably smile back in order to establish contact.

**Silence.** In American communication you can remain silent for some time. This will not cause others to get talking, will not attract attention at all. Americans do not have the concept of "awkward silence." The conversation does not have to go on non-stop while having meals.

Having analyzed two native speakers, it is possible to make some conclusions. With the linguistic personality № 1, communication of the researcher was informal, easy and friendly. We went to three different cafes. Every time we paid bills separately. The first time we agreed to have a cup of tea. While talking we ordered more. The second cup was paid for by the American, since we initially had agreed on only one. The first time we discussed different issues, namely the politics of the two countries, the peculiarities of languages (especially slang), traditions and festivals, the leisure time of young people, etc. The second time and subsequent meetings we touched upon more personal topics, such as family, relationships, spending free time. That was the sign that we were establishing a friendly relationship. The informal language of personality №1 was different from what he used while reading lectures, or conducting a lesson. In unofficial situations he often used slang and joked a lot. His clothes were of casual style (jeans, sweaters), while in the university he wore formal clothes (a suit, or trousers and a shirt). In eye contact he showed that he was listening attentively to the interlocutor and showed respect. Almost all the time he smiled and sometimes laughed out loud. The distance was always about 1-1.5 m. since the meetings took place in a cafe and normally we were sitting opposite each other.

Communication with the linguistic personality №2 was rather formal and tense. Topics for conversation directly depended on the questions put to him. He did not ask anything and was not interested in anything. Communication was based on the "question-and-answer" structure. The impression was that these were business meetings, not friendly ones. The meetings were also in a cafe, but in this case the native speaker never offered to pay. He kept himself restrained, at a distance, smiled politely and almost never laughed, but still maintained eye contact.

Summing up, it can be stated that the linguistic identification of personality is a very interesting aspect of study. By means of verbal and non-verbal behaviour in the communicative spheres one can draw conclusions about a person and their relation to the interlocutor. Two linguistic personalities have been analysed, who coming from the same region showed themselves completely differently. Undoubtedly, both of them observed some simple rules such as distance, eye contact, polite smile and lack of physical contact. Nevertheless the range of language peculiarities has defined specific features in formal and informal communication.

## REFERENCES

1. Апресян, Ю.Д. Образ человека по данным языка: попытка системного описания / Ю.Д. Апресян. – 1995. – 65 с.
2. Караулов, Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность / Ю.Н. Караулов. – Изд. 7-е. — М. : Изд-во ЛКИ, 2010. – 264 с.
3. Карасик, В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс / В.И. Карасик. – Волгоград : Перемена, 2002. – 331 с.
4. Американское коммуникативное поведение / под ред. И.А. Стернина и М.А. Стерниной. – Воронеж : ВГУ-МИОН, 2001. – 224 с.
5. Мир психологии [Электронный ресурс] / Полезная информация по психологии. Дистанция общения. — Режим доступа: <http://www.psyworld.info/distanciya-obshheniya>. — Дата доступа: 27.02.2018.