

The Violation of Cooperation in Communication between German-Speaking Interlocutors

BEGMATOVA RANO FAXRIDDINOVNA
Uzbek State World Languages University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article investigates cases of cooperation violations in communication between German speakers, particularly focusing on situations where one participant uses German as a non-native language. The research addresses the broader question of how cultural differences and social attitudes shape conflict dynamics in cross-cultural interactions. Using communicative and pragmatic analysis, supported by synthesized approaches, the study examines dialogue examples to identify patterns and root causes of miscommunication. The findings reveal that cooperation violations often arise from clashes between differing cultural norms and expectations, which lead to misunderstandings, decreased communication efficiency, and heightened interpersonal tensions. These results emphasize the critical role of intercultural competence in navigating such challenges. By shedding light on the interplay between language use, cultural norms, and social behavior, the study highlights the importance of fostering understanding and adaptability in multilingual and multicultural settings. This research contributes to the broader discourse on improving communication strategies and reducing conflicts in intercultural contexts.

Keywords: Verbal communication, native speakers of German language, ensuring cooperation, disruption of cooperation, unpleasant conversation, misunderstanding.

INTRODUCTION

The effective and purposeful flow of communication, including its constructive or destructive direction, largely depends on the attitude towards cooperation. Situations that disrupt cooperation in the communication process reduce the effectiveness of communication and cause misunderstandings between interlocutors. Cases of disruption of cooperation in speech can be manifested by many different factors [1; 2].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Danish linguist D. Lumsden, analyzing a conversation between a teacher and a student, writes that if the teacher cannot get answers to questions or has difficulty achieving unity, then it is necessary to maintain distance [3]. At the same time, he emphasizes that failure to observe cooperation in communication creates distance and characterizes it as the antonym of cooperation. Cooperativeness and non-cooperativeness, of course, are primarily considered as psychological and social phenomena. But it is necessary to explain their linguistic aspects.

In searching for an answer to the question of what the phenomenon of a breakdown in cooperation is, it was found that the phenomenon of non-cooperation is reduced to a situation opposite to the process of cooperation. Communicators should pay attention to the developed principles of smooth flow of communication, otherwise the principle of cooperation will be violated and the conversation will reach a crisis [4]. In this case, non-cooperation occurs as a result of a breakdown in cooperation, that is, the absence of cooperation.



Figure 1. *Circumstances that hinder cooperation*

Situations such as unpleasant conversations and mutual misunderstandings that disrupt cooperation, as shown in Figure 1, reduce the effectiveness of communication.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. *An unpleasant conversation*

An unpleasant conversation can lead to a breakdown in cooperation, and avoiding this conversation is an attempt to maintain cooperation. In turn, avoiding or leaving topics that lead to such consequences helps maintain cooperation. Also, when mutual misunderstandings arise between interlocutors, their elimination is effective for achieving constructive communication and cooperation.

Example 1.

- Was wissen sie über Usbekistan.
- –Mein Gott, Nicht
- Gehört über Usbekistan?
- Wir haben jetzt unsere wahlen gerade hinter uns ja und machen darum und um unsere gedanken was daraus wird und dabei welche seite seid ihr bei diesem fall ist er?
- Es ist eine persönliche Angelegenheit.
- Kein problem, alles gut, vielen dank. [4].

Communicative analysis

1. **Goal:** The blogger wants to get information about Uzbekistan from German citizens.
2. **Type of communication:** The blogger asks questions and tries to get answers from passengers.

3. **Evaluation:** The passengers say they know almost nothing about Uzbekistan.
4. **Mechanism:** The passengers refuse to cooperate with answers like “Oh my God, it’s a personal matter.”

Pragmatic analysis

1. **Pragmatic goal:** The blogger wanted to get information, but the passengers were not interested.
2. **Cultural context:** Not disclosing personal matters, not answering questions from abroad exists in certain cultures.
3. **Social norms:** I don’t like asking questions to strangers.
4. **Method of breaking cooperation:** The passengers refused to cooperate, giving short and vague answers.
5. **Effectiveness:** The passengers’ refusal to cooperate prevented the blogger from achieving her goal.

Synthesized analysis

1. In this example, the blogger aimed to get information from the passengers, but the passengers broke the cooperation by giving short, vague answers. This was due to the cultural characteristics and social norms of the passengers.
2. In some cultures, it is considered unwelcome to ask questions from strangers and reveal personal issues. It is also noticeable from the passengers' answers that they are busy with the elections in Germany.
3. They chose to avoid discussing the questions by giving short answers such as "Oh my God, this is a personal matter." As a result, the blogger's goal of getting information about Uzbekistan was not achieved.
4. The negative attitude in some cultures towards asking questions from strangers and revealing personal issues led to the breakdown of cooperation. The passengers followed their cultural characteristics and social norms, but this interfered with communication.
5. So, for his social experiment, an Uzbek blogger asks German passengers about Uzbekistan and is interested in how much they know about the country. However, in this dialogue, which is unusual for the cooperation process, the speaker

responds by saying the phrase "Oh, God," and thus we get a short answer: "I don't know anything." When the author of the project asks another question, "Do you know where Uzbekistan is located?", the interlocutor gives the reason that a chancellor will be elected in Germany soon, and we are only thinking about this, and thus wants to end the dialogue. However, when the host's curiosity prevails and asks, "Which party representative will you vote for?", he receives the answer, "This is our personal business." Despite the fact that the author of the project calls on so many interlocutors to cooperate, on the other hand, we see that short and sharp answers are trying to end the dialogue.

2. *Elimination of mutual misunderstandings that hinder cooperation*

Example 2.

Karolina Wroebel, aufgewachsen in Polen, studiert seit sechs Wochen an einer deutschen Universitaet. Sie weiss nicht, welche Leistungen von ihr in Seminaren erwartet werden. Deshalb geht sie zur Allgemeinen Studienberatung in die Sprechstunde. Dort arbeitet Lisa Krueger, die nicht viel aeltr ist als Karolina. Karolina erzaehlt ihr ausfuehrlich von ihren Schwierigkeiten, sich an der Universitaet zurechtzufinden. Nach einer Weile unterbricht Lisa sie und moechte wissen, welche konkrete Frage sie hat. Nachdem Karolina gesagt hat, dass sie nicht weiss, was sie in ihren Seminaren tun muss, um Credit Points zu bekommen, raet Lisa der Studentin, Kontakt mit ihren Dozentinnen und Dozenten aufzunehmen, um ihre Fragen zu klaeren.

Einige Tage spaeter ruft Karolina Lisa an. Sie traut sich nicht, auf die Lehrkraefte zuzugehen und sie direkt anzusprechen. Von Lisa erhofft sie sich Ermutigung und Unterstuetzung, wie sie ihr Anliegen formulieren kann. Waerend sie sagen will, warum es ihr geht, unterbricht Lisa sie. "Wie besprochen kann ihnen da nur ihre Dozentin oder ihr Dozent weiterhelfen. Ich habe das doch erkluert".

Karolina legt erschrocken auf, Lisa schaut kopfschuetteln den Telefonhoerer an. Spaeter beklagt sie sich bei einer Kollegin "Manche die zu mir in die Beratung kommen, hoeren einfach nicht richtig zu, das finde ich frustrierend". Karolina erzeult abends

ihre Mitbewohnerin von ihrem Erlebnis und meint "Dieses Pochen auf dem Regal ist so deutsch. Liebt sie es, Leute zu ärgern". [3]

Communicative analysis

1. **Purpose:** Carolina is asking Lisa for help.
2. **Type of communication:** Carolina is asking Lisa a question and waiting for an answer.
3. **Evaluation:** Lisa is repeating her previous answer and has not fully understood Carolina's question.
4. **Mechanism:** Lisa's misunderstanding of Carolina is hindering cooperation.

Pragmatic analysis

1. **Pragmatic purpose:** Carolina expected more help from Lisa.
2. **Cultural context:** In German culture, following rules is considered important.
3. **Social norms:** Lisa's role is to help students.
4. **Method of breaking cooperation:** Lisa did not answer Carolina's question, she did not understand it correctly.
5. **Effectiveness:** Cooperation was not achieved because Lisa's help was insufficient.

Synthesized analysis

1. In this example, Karolina asked Lisa for help, but Lisa misunderstood her question and was unable to follow the rules and give the correct answer.
2. This behavior of Lisa is related to the strict rule-following nature of German culture. He did not try to understand Karolina's problem in detail.
3. Karolina's goal was to get more explanations and help from Lisa. But because of this misunderstanding, the cooperation did not take place and Karolina did not get the answer she needed.
4. This example also shows that cultural characteristics and social norms can affect cooperation. The lack of mutual understanding and flexibility made communication difficult.
5. In the example, despite the presence of the necessary conditions for cooperation, one party refused to communicate

or misunderstood. Such situations arise under the influence of cultural and social factors and disrupt cooperation. In this example, a dialogue is established that is reflected in the process of intercultural communication between a German, Lisa Kruger, and a Polish, Karolina Wrobel, which takes place in Germany. Caroline, who came to study in Germany, contacts the information center for information about the provisions of the University Act. And Lisa Krueger, an employee of the transport service, listens to him to answer questions.

Thus, in this example, Lisa followed the principle of strict adherence to German culture, and Caroline expected more flexibility and understanding. As a result, misunderstandings arose between the two parties and effective communication was not established. This situation led to a violation of the principle of cooperation and the purpose of communication was not achieved.

CONCLUSIONS

Therefore, when situations arise in Germany that disrupt cooperation, it is mainly due to cultural differences and clashes of social norms.

REFERENCES

1. Knapp K. *Angewandte Linguistik*. – A. Francke Verlag Tübingen und Basel, 2007. – S. 644.
2. Meyer K. *Interkulturelle Pragmatik: Aufforderungen, Entschuldigungen und Beschwerden*. Dissertation. Hamburg, 2007. – S. 309.
3. Lumsden D. *Kinds of Conversational Cooperation* // *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2008. – P. 24
4. Kosova I.O. *Pragmatic categories of cooperation and conflict in speech communication* // *Bulletin of VolSU. Series 2: Linguistics*. 2006. – No. 5. – P. 138-141
5. Nadja Fügert, Ulrike Richter. *Wissenschaftssprache verstehen. Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch*. Klett. Stuttgart. 2023. S. 96.

6. <https://youtu.be/tPgtEi2uu7k?si=iCV2hjBhLCQRgeOL>

BEGMATOVA RANO FAXRIDDINOVNA
PHD, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR,
DEPARTMENT OF THEORETICAL
SUBJECTS OF THE GERMAN LANGUAGE,
UZBEK STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY,
TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN.
E-MAIL: <RANO@RAMBLER.RU>