

INTERACTION SPECIFICITY IN AIR NAVIGATION COMMUNICATION

National Aviation University

E-mail: c-alfatango@mail.ru

Abstract. *The article is about a problem of air navigation communication and the positive influence of interpersonal communication for air navigation specialists. The ability of organizing a dialogue with subject – subject relationship substantially increase professional interaction efficiency. As scientific surveys show a dialogue is not just the form of communication, but an organizing phenomenon that directly influences the quality of air navigation communication, but there is still a gap in the aviation English teaching technics, mainly due to lack of psycho – pedagogical knowledge concerning human factor peculiarities within dialogical relationship framework. The article highlights the possible ways of the problem solution.*

Keywords: air navigation communication, efficient air – to – ground communication, influence, interaction, interpersonal dialogueintersubject approach, psycho-physiological characteristics.

Introduction

Dialogue represents a special format of air – to–ground communication being a single and indispensable attribute of air navigation specialists interaction. We suggest that efficient pilot – Air Traffic Controller (ATC) communication is possible on the condition a special pedagogical approach is used comprising psycho – physiological features of the interlocutors within the professional dialogue framework. Unique background of professional situations generates unfavorable conditions for negative human factor consequents, mainly linguistic factor aspect of the latter.

Comprehension of the intersubject nature of air navigation specialists communication is vital for present day philosophy of a dialogue represented by M. Bakhtin, G. Djakonov, R. Karneev, A. Kharash.

M. Bakhtin suggests existential – ontological dialogue concept thus stating primary role of dialogical relationships for the external personal expression of an individual. We follow his views upon the role of a dialogue during interpersonal communication [1].

M. Bakhtin claims that each “I” who performs an act or deed holds a unique place within the architectonic whole of Being. Because I hold such a unique place, and because my uniqueness is both given and yet to be achieved, I must actualize my uniqueness

M. Bakhtin carried out scientific analysis of the following dialogue relationships and forms: dialogue through language (the simplest external composition form [1], verbal dialogue (internal dialogue form under study), dialogue and reflection, dialogue and

interpersonal communication (where integral views of integral personalities are considered [2].

M. Bakhtin distinguishes dialogue from monologue, and he sometimes associates rhetoric with monologue, but he also encourages the rhetorical tradition rethinking that would admit dialogue, polyphony, heteroglossia, and carnival: a dialogized or dialogical rhetoric.

M. Bakhtin explains dialogue as a subset of human discourse, distinct from monologue and including several specificity features of dialogue, among them stylization, parody, and hidden polemic. The scholar distinguishes monologue from dialogue as single-voiced and double-voiced discourse. Monologic, single-voiced discourse is discourse that recognizes only its elf and its object, discourse that doesnot recognize other equal self in communication. Subject – object discourse is directed toward the object of communication and constitutes the ultimate semantic authority within the limits of a given context. Dialogic, double-voiced discourse is a discourse that contains a deliberate attention to the words of the other.

Intersubject communication nature

G. Djakonov focuses upon the personal integrity (mainly intrapsychic, interpersonal and transpersonal domain) [1].

Skills and knowledge are, according to Buber, acquired through dialogue. In Cohen`s words, “The heart of education is discourse: the dialogue of query and reply in which both sides ask and both sides answer; the dialogue of the joint study by teacher and pupil of man, nature, art, and society; the

dialogue of true friendship, in which the intervals of silence are no less dialogic than spoken discourse”.

Buber states in dialogue, communication is “central” and thus language becomes a powerful means during the meaning-making processes.

Exploring oneself and perceiving the “other” in its singularity are a two-fold task for every person, asserts Buber. Educators must responsibly help learners develop this ability since this leads a person to ‘know’ one’s fellow human being both physically and spiritually.

Buber places much weight on the responsibility of individuals who have to maintain “conscious effort to create the quality of their social space”, that is to have an appropriate attitude to being and relationships so that the “I-Thou” could be formed and transformed.

The “I-Thou” dialogic has much to do with Buber’s community philosophy. As Murphy (1988) points out: “Just as the intimacy of interpersonal relation is rooted in the essential mutuality and reciprocation of the “I-Thou,” so the true spirit of community life is traced in his work to the dynamic plurality of the I-We”. The plurality of this reciprocation, based on the genuine address of the “I” and the genuine response evoked in the Thou, reflects the quality of the community spirit [3].

According to Buber, Education as pure dialogue requires learners to stay open to the reality of the unconditioned and intemporal the unknown and undisclosed [4].

R. Karneev focuses upon a special role of personal individual factors affecting the efficiency of dialogical communication. The scholar worked out a conceptual paradigm of pedagogical communication. The given paradigm is based on the understanding of a special role of a dialogue and intersubject approach during communication.

R. Karneev also states professional activity is often multitasking that calls for a professional capability to maintain an efficient dialogue. The scholar suggests considering individual psychological features in future professionals teaching. We on our part highly appreciate mentioned - above ideas as far as psycho – physiological characteristics determine the dynamo of reactions and responses during communication, combining efficiency of communication and multy – tasking, unbiased information perception thus affecting communication safety of air navigation specialists.

So the need for new pedagogical approach is conspicuous and we suggest it is to be based on the intersubject approach during air navigation specialists teaching.

We also consider air navigation specialists communication should represent the dialogue of the highest rate that conforms with unique professional features. The analysis of scientific works devoted to the dialogue role in professional communication make us bring forward the conclusion as for the concept of a dialogue of the highest rate, mainly the possibility of the maintenance of the latter on the condition of interpersonal communication, where two personalities, not persons are involved [5].

Research literature analysis

Interpersonal communication and interaction phenomena were studied by the following scientists: C. Rodgers, C. Jurard, A. Bodaljov, B.N. Kasarinova, S. Bratchenko, G. Kovalyov, B. Lomov [1; 6-11].

C. Rodgers developed theoretical formulations and hypotheses as to the basis of effectiveness in relationships. According to the scholar, individuals sharply different in personality, orientation and procedure can all be effective in a helping relationship, can each be successful in facilitating constructive change or development on the condition they bring to the helping relationship certain attitudinal ingredients.

The first of them is congruence. By this Rodgers mean that the feelings the interlocutor is experiencing are available to him, available to his awareness,

That he is able to live these feelings, bethem in the relationship, and able to communicate them if appropriate. Empathy is another ingredient that may exert the affect on communication substantially increasing its performance.

Being the second essential condition in the relationship when he is experiencing an accurate empathic understanding of his communication partner, and is able to communicate some of the significant fragments of that understanding thus providing essential growth-promoting of relationship [6].

Thus, humanistic psychology representatives (K. Rodgers, C. Jurard) looked into interpersonal communication from position of personal approach representing such main attributes of a personality as sociality, subjectness, morality, transcendicity and uniqueness [6; 11].

There exist different approaches to interpersonal communication issues study which are brought to a generalized scheme and that is their main drawback according to S. Bratchenko.

Interpersonal communication (professionally – oriented for our research) may be actualized through interaction, influence, manipulation; it can develop according to the logics of the course of actions or against it, propagate humanistic solutions or demonstrate egotism. S. Bratchenko also thinks interpersonal communication is classified according to the aims and structurely –functional contents [7].

Another Bratchenko idea resonate with the ideas of our research concerning personal structure component. The scholar claims that merely personal component development gives an impetus to communicative competence enhancement and revival; she also describes interpersonal dialogue as the highest level of communication and the primary goal of communicative training. The scholar also notifies behavioral component affecting personal interaction. Behavioral component consists of the elements of “communicative behavior” during interpersonal interaction and a set of behavioral patterns for different situations, including mime, gestures. S. Bratchenko asserts that behavioral component directly depends on personal component. The scholar’s idea as for the secondary role of the technical side of communication also correlates with the ideas of our research.

We should also add that the emotional component represents a close relation to relationships and communication during interaction and is determined by personal component.

We also think that the cognitive component plays a substantial role in interpersonal professional communication. The cognitive component represents an integrity of perception and comprehension processes; apart with perception characteristics, the given component also reflects unbiased other people assessment, reflection capabilities, moral principles adherence; personal factor also exert an affect on cognitive processes. So, personal component is an indispensable attribute of interpersonal communication, where intentional moral side of communicative competence predominates over operational one [7].

Interpersonal communication based on dialogical relationships operates the concepts like interpersonal (the highest communication level), dialogicity (personality features), dialogism (communication process characteristics), dialogist (an individ that

realizes the importance of dialogue maintenance), dialogue communication (communication consists of dialogue elements).

Dialogic relationships according to M. Bakhtin represents an interaction between equal partners, despite monologue, that neglects equal partnership. So, communication from dialogical perspective is orientated towards equality of interlocutors, otherwise there arouse a threat for airnautical communication deformation. M. Bakhtin also underlines conscious subjectivity and consequently specificity of mutual understanding.

A scientist introduces a special concept known as dialogization of languages, that poses an attraction for our research in terms of radiotelephony phraseology and Aviation English correlation.

Such a dialogization of languages creates a complex unity of the interlocutors, for meaning in a language resides neither in my intention nor in what I speak or write but at a point between two interlocutors intentions.

This dialogization of languages, dialogized heteroglossia, occurs constantly through a process of hybridization, both intentional and unintentional. Hybridization “is a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor”. Hybridization is also unintentional and as such is the primary means of change in a language, “a mixing of various languages co-existing within the boundaries of a single dialect, a single national language, a single branch, a single group of different branches or different groups of such branches” [12].

Bakhtin’s dialogue concept is a part of our research intersubject approach theoretical background comprising human factor psychology aspect.

Pedagogists and scientists differently applied Bakhtin’s dialogue concept provisions. O. Kharash developed the theory of the intersubject (dialogical) approach. The scholar suggests the following concepts with the aim of the intersubject approach application: personal involvement, textual reincarnation, message and etc. O. Kharash also highlights communication partners dynamism and brings forward such concepts as authoritative affect (a single communicator domination) and a dialogical affect (each communicator stands for his own position).

The scholar also introduces three types of messages: dialogical, authoritative and conformistic; he suggests the interactive group as an optimal pedagogical means for real dialogue relationships development [13].

According to B. Lomov. Subject – subject relationships represents a basis for interaction mechanism [8].

N. Kazarinova introduced research communication – interaction phenomena scheme.

The scholar carried out a scientific analysis of interpersonal interaction phenomena, asserting a discrete act of communication is separated with difficulty from prior and subsequent events, that is why communication is a process of relationship formation during the process of interaction (dialogue relationship in our context).

N. Kazarinova represented three models of interpersonal communication, with a focus on communication, affect and interaction as a communicative relationship concept [9].

G. Kovalyov claimed the major peculiarities of dialogue communication and relationship are represented by equal partnership when interacting. The scholar also ranges emotional and personal openness of the interlocutors, psychological empathy, avoiding labels as the normative principles of dialogue organization [10].

Focusing on the relations of communication and activity in multitasking process we claim communication formed during the process of multitasking substantially influences the performance.

B. Lomov, on his part, defined interaction as an organizing component of multitasking [8].

A. Zhuravlyov accentuates the fact that the interaction merely forms the structure of multitasking at each stage being reflected upon every component (aim, motives, means of realization) [14].

G. Kovalyov introduced his fundamental – paradigm concept representing psychological specificity of affect and interaction.

The scholar asserts the interlocutors subjective characteristics are altered during interaction (the needs, capabilities, relationship, behavior).

G. Kovalyov also determines three paradigms of psychological influence strategies. The first paradigm refer to human psyche as a passive object of external influence; another subject paradigm focuses on the personal activity and an optional external influences psyche reflection, where a

subject exerts an efficient influence on psychological information [10].

Subject – subject (dialogue) paradigm represents a special value for our research introducing psyche as an open continuously interacting system with its own means of control. We should mention here, the first two mentioned – above paradigms appeal to monological outlook, intersubject paradigm, on contrary, deals with dialogue perspective.

That is why the psychology of communication influence phenomenon can be both objective and subjective and intersubjective one we refer to interaction phenomenon. So, the main difference between influence and interaction phenomenae reflects different perception perspectives: monologue and dialogue.

We suggest communicative interaction of air navigation specialist calls for special dialogical readiness formation that wouldn't be bounded with a communicative dialogue and better resonates with metacommunication (human factor consideration).

A. Kharash believes communicative influence process presupposes personal outlooks and interlocutor senses being dialogical by its nature that is determined by the intersubject nature of a personality. So, the scholar sticks to the point that any communicative impulse, despite monological or dialogical elements predominance is a reflection of a personal natural dialogical tendency and appeals to subject – subject innate organization [13].

According to G. Dyakonov there exist a special form of the intersubject – dialogical methodology type that correlates with such forms and methods of teaching that are centered around multiple co-existences of communicators.

Subject – subject, dialogical forms and teaching methods are realized through personal communication actualization, equal partnership interaction and innate consciousness dialogicity of communicators.

The scholar also states a dialogical (intersubject) approach to the system of active teaching – communication methods is based on understanding of dialogue final importance.

Putting into force the issue of education optimization through subject - subject interaction would exert a deep influence on psychic and personal development dimensions of communicators.

G. Dyakonov asserts that psycho - personal dialogue dimensions determine educational strategy and future professional communication of those who study [1].

Conclusions

The dialogical (intersubject) approach to air navigation specialists communicative base formation means learning language being involved in educational situations (professionally – oriented for our research) that call for its adequate use. There is an alternative for organizing a communicative situation for professionally - oriented interpersonal dialogue development from perspective of integral personality concept.

The integral personality concept in our research is associated with the specificity of air navigation communication, that features intersubject dialogical communication format.

The ATC job environment is unique in the way that a controller experiences a continuous 8 h state of alert and professional interaction with multiple aircraft crews, where interlocutors (controller - pilot) are out of visual contact, that, in case of unexpected turn of events will definitely aggravate mutual understanding.

The fact that a controller establishes communication with a number of aircraft simultaneously is also aggravated with multi-language dialogue interaction. Suchlike interaction is utterly dependent on communication plasticity, a tempo adequate enough for different language transition capability and also the ability to assess linguistic and communicative characteristics of a partner (speech clarity, tempo and accent).

A controller with a number of communicative problems (inability of discerning emotional state of a partner, reserve, autism, elevation, egotism or negative prejudices towards other people) will obviously pose a potential hazard that may result in safety disruption.

Therefore, ultimately optimal problem solution is possible on condition that interpersonal dialogue interaction is represented in future air navigation professionals educational environment.

References

1. Дьяконов, Г.В. Экзистенциально-онтологическая концепция диалога // Психология общения: социокультурный анализ: материалы Международной конференции (Ростов-на-Дону, 30 октября – 1 ноября 2003 г.) / под ред. А.А. Бодалева, П.Н. Ермакова, В.А. Лабунской. – Ростов-на-Дону: Изд-во Ростовского университета, 2003. – С. 114–116.
2. Бахтин, М.М. Эстетика словесного творчества. – Москва: Искусство, 1979. – 424 с.
3. Bakhtin, M.M. 1979. Verbal Ethics. Moscow. Arts. 424 p.] (in Russian).
4. Murphy, D. 1988. Martine Buber's philosophy of education. – Dublin. Irish Academic Press. 240 p.
5. Parmler, M.; Barnett, G. 2005. Progress in communication sciences. Vol. 13. Buber M. State University of New-York. 216 p.
6. Карнеев, Р.К.; Карнеева, О.А. Изучение особенностей личности учащихся // Библиотечка журнала «Вестник образования». – 2002. – № 3. – С. 30–52.
7. Karneev, R.K.; Karneeva, O.A. 2002. Personality specificity research (Psychology methodology). – Magazine references “Vestnik Obrazovaniya”. N 3: 30–52.] (in Russian).
8. Rojers, C.; Rogers, Carl. 1959. A Theory of Therapy, Personality and Interpersonal Relationships as Developed in the Client-centered Framework. In (ed.) S. Koch, Psychology. A Study of a Science. Vol. 3: Formulations of the Person and the Social Context. New York. McGraw Hill. 320 p.
9. Братченко, С.Л. Формирование диалогической готовности студентов в процессе учебного взаимодействия: диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата психологических наук. – Ленинград, 1987. – 180 с.
10. Bratchenko, S.L. 1987. Students dialogue readiness formation during workshop interaction. – Dissertation on the receipt of scientific degree of candidate of psychological sciences. Leningrad. 180 p.] (in Russian).
11. Ломов, Б.Ф. Психические процессы и общение // Методологические проблемы социальной психологии. – Москва: Наука, 1975. – С. 106–123.
12. Lotov, B.F. 1975. Communication and psychic processes. – Social psychology methodology issues. Moscow. Nauka: 106–123.] (in Russian).

9. Куницына, В.Н.; Казаринова, Н.В.; Погольша В.М. Теория межличностного общения как междисциплинарное знание // Межличностное общение: учеб. для вузов. – СПб.: Питер, 2001. – С. 12–29.

[Kunisina, V.N.; Kasarinova, N.V.; Pogolsha, V.M. 2001. Interpersonal communication theory as interdisciplinary knowledge. – Interpersonal communication. – SPb. Peter: 12–29.] (in Russian).

10. Ковалев, Г.А. Три парадигмы в психологии – три стратегии психологического воздействия // Вопросы психологии. – 1987. – № 2. – С. 41–49.

[Kovalyov, G.A. 1987. Three paradigms in psychology-three strategies of psychological affect. – Psychology issues. N 2: 41–49.] (in Russian).

11. Джурард С. Я и ТЫ // Открывая человеку себя. – Принстон, 1968. – 245 с.

[Jurard, C. 1968. I and Thou. – Disclosing man to himself. – Princeton. 245 p.].

12. Bakhtin, M. 1981. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. Bakhtin Glossary. Editors: Holquist, M&C Emerson.

13. Хараш, А.У. Личность, сознание и общение: К обоснованию интересубъективного подхода в исследовании коммуникативных воздействий // Хрестоматия по педагогической психологии. – Москва: Международная педагогическая академия, 1995. – С. 216–227.

[Kharash, A.U. 1995. Personality, consciousness and communication: intersubject approach and communicative influence. – Psychological communication problems. Moscow. International pedagogic academy: 216–227.] (in Russian).

14. Журавлев А.Л. Совместная деятельность как объект социально-психологического исследования // Совместная деятельность: Методология, теория, практика. – Москва: Наука, 1988. – С. 19–36.

[Zhuravlyov, A.L. 1988. Mutual cooperation as an object of socio – pedagogical research. – Mutual cooperation. Methodology, theory, practice. Moscow. Nauka: 19–36.] (in Russian).

Received 8 December 2011.