Pragmatic Competence and Conflict Resolution Strategies in Elder-Involved Family Conflicts

Dr. Lucas A. Moreira[ID]
Department of Social Communication, University of São Paulo, Brazil

Rafael Barbosa[ID]
Department of Social Communication, University of São Paulo, Brazil

ABSTRACT

Elder-involved family conflicts present unique communicative and relational challenges that require nuanced strategies for effective resolution. This study examines the role of pragmatic competence—the ability to use language appropriately in social contexts—in shaping conflict resolution practices within multigenerational family settings. Drawing on qualitative interviews and discourse analysis, the research explores how family members navigate politeness, indirectness, face-saving, and empathy when addressing disagreements involving older relatives. The findings reveal that higher levels of pragmatic competence facilitate more constructive dialogue, reduce escalation, and promote mutual understanding. Conversely, pragmatic failures often contribute to misunderstandings, resentment, and relational strain. The study highlights cultural and contextual factors influencing communicative choices and underscores the importance of pragmatic awareness in family mediation and counseling. By elucidating the intersection of language use and conflict resolution, this work contributes to the development of effective interventions that support healthier intergenerational relationships.

KEYWORDS: Pragmatic competence, conflict resolution, elder-involved conflicts, family communication, discourse analysis, intergenerational relationships, politeness strategies, face-saving, mediation, family dynamics.

INTRODUCTION

Intergenerational family conflicts are a pervasive aspect of human social life, often arising from differing values, communication styles, and expectations across age cohorts [8, 15, 21]. These conflicts can range from minor disagreements to significant disputes, impacting family cohesion and individual well-being [5, 12]. The dynamics of such conflicts are particularly complex when involving elders, whose life experiences and communication patterns may diverge significantly from those of younger generations [15, 22]. Understanding how elders navigate these conflicts is crucial for fostering healthier family relationships and promoting effective communication strategies.

Pragmatic awareness, defined as the ability to understand and use language appropriately in various social contexts to achieve communicative goals, plays a pivotal role in conflict management [9, 10, 11]. It involves recognizing implied meanings, managing face (one's public self-image), and adapting communication to suit the listener and situation [3, 7, 10]. In the context of intergenerational family conflicts, elders' pragmatic awareness might influence their choice of conflict strategies, potentially leading to either escalation or resolution [13, 24]. For instance, a high level of pragmatic

awareness could enable elders to employ mitigation strategies, politeness, or indirectness to de-escalate tensions, while a lack thereof might result in perceived impoliteness or misunderstanding [1, 18, 24].

Previous research has extensively explored conflict discourse [6, 16, 19, 25, 27], communication accommodation [2], and pragmatic effects in various settings [10, 13, 28]. However, there is a notable gap in the literature specifically examining the relationship between pragmatic awareness in elders and their selection of conflict strategies within the unique context of intergenerational family conflicts. While studies have touched upon intergenerational relationships [15, 17, 21] and general conflict resolution [5, 8], the nuanced interplay of elders' pragmatic competence and their strategic use of language during family disputes remains underexplored.

This study aims to bridge this gap by investigating how pragmatic awareness among elders influences their choice and application of conflict strategies in intergenerational family conflicts. By focusing on the linguistic and communicative behaviors of elders, this research seeks to provide a deeper understanding of the mechanisms through

which conflicts are managed or exacerbated within family units involving older adults. The findings are expected to offer valuable insights for family counseling, communication training programs, and strategies aimed at improving intergenerational harmony.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative discourse analysis with quantitative assessment of pragmatic awareness and self-reported conflict strategies. This design allowed for a comprehensive understanding of the complex relationship between elders' pragmatic awareness and their conflict resolution behaviors in intergenerational family settings. The qualitative component provided rich, contextualized data on actual communication patterns, while the quantitative data offered measurable insights into pragmatic awareness levels and preferred strategies.

Participants

Participants were recruited through community centers and senior associations in urban areas. The inclusion criteria were: individuals aged 65 years or older, self-reporting involvement in at least one intergenerational family conflict within the past year, and willingness to participate in interviews and complete questionnaires. A total of 50 elders (25 males, 25 females) participated in the study. Participants represented diverse socioeconomic backgrounds and family structures. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and ethical approval was secured from the relevant institutional review board.

Data Collection

Data collection involved three primary instruments:
1. Pragmatic Awareness Test (PAT): A custom-designed questionnaire assessing participants' pragmatic awareness. The PAT included scenarios depicting common intergenerational family interactions, requiring participants to identify appropriate and inappropriate responses, interpret implied meanings, and recognize potential face threats [9, 18]. Responses were scored based on expert consensus.
2. Conflict Strategy Questionnaire (CSQ): A self-report questionnaire adapted from existing conflict resolution scales, asking participants to indicate the frequency with which they use various conflict strategies (e.g., direct confrontation, avoidance, compromise, accommodation, collaboration) in intergenerational family conflicts [8, 24].
3. Semi-structured Interviews and Conflict Narratives: Each participant engaged in a semi-structured interview

where they were asked to describe specific instances of intergenerational family conflicts they had experienced. Participants were encouraged to recount the dialogue as accurately as possible, including their own utterances and those of younger family members. These narratives provided the raw data for discourse analysis, offering insights into actual language use during conflict [5, 6]. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data from the PAT and CSQ were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation analyses, and multiple regression to determine the relationships between pragmatic awareness scores and the reported use of various conflict strategies. Statistical software (e.g., SPSS) was used for this analysis.

Qualitative data from the conflict narratives were subjected to thematic discourse analysis [6, 27]. The analysis focused on identifying specific pragmatic features in elders' conflict talk, such as:

- Facework strategies: How participants managed their own and others' public image [3].
- Impoliteness/Politeness markers: Instances of language use perceived as polite or impolite [1].
- Accommodation strategies: Adjustments in speech patterns to converge or diverge from younger interlocutors [2].
- Mitigation techniques: Linguistic devices used to soften directness or reduce potential offense [24].
- Contextual interpretation: How elders interpreted the communicative context and adapted their language accordingly [4, 23].

The analysis involved iterative coding, categorization of pragmatic features, and identification of patterns linking pragmatic awareness (as indicated by PAT scores) to the linguistic choices observed in the conflict narratives. Triangulation of quantitative and qualitative findings was employed to enhance the validity and reliability of the results.

Ethical Considerations

All procedures were conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines. Participants were fully informed about the study's purpose, their right to withdraw at any time, and confidentiality protocols. Anonymity was maintained through the use of pseudonyms in all data reporting. Data were stored securely and accessible only to the research team.

RESULTS

The analysis revealed significant relationships between elders' pragmatic awareness and their utilization of conflict strategies in intergenerational family conflicts.

Quantitative Findings

The Pragmatic Awareness Test (PAT) scores ranged from moderate to high among the participants, indicating varying levels of pragmatic competence. Correlation analysis showed a significant positive correlation between higher PAT scores and the self-reported use of collaborative and accommodating conflict strategies ($r = .68$, $p < .001$ for collaboration; $r = .55$, $p < .01$ for accommodation). Conversely, there was a significant negative correlation between higher PAT scores and the reported use of aggressive or confrontational strategies ($r = -.42$, $p < .05$) and avoidance ($r = -.30$, $p < .05$).

Regression analysis further indicated that pragmatic awareness was a significant predictor of collaborative conflict strategy use (beta = 0.45, $t = 3.21$, $p < .01$), accounting for approximately 20% of the variance in this strategy. This suggests that elders with greater pragmatic awareness are more likely to engage in constructive, problem-solving approaches during family conflicts.

Qualitative Findings: Pragmatic Strategies in Conflict Narratives

Discourse analysis of the conflict narratives provided rich qualitative evidence supporting the quantitative findings. Several key pragmatic strategies employed by elders with higher pragmatic awareness were identified:

1. Strategic Facework and Politeness: Elders with higher PAT scores frequently demonstrated sophisticated facework, both positive (e.g., expressing appreciation, showing solidarity) and negative (e.g., respecting autonomy, avoiding imposition) [3]. They often used polite forms, indirect requests, and hedging to mitigate potential threats to the face of younger family members, even when expressing disagreement. For example, one elder (high PAT score) recounted, "Instead of just telling my grandson he was wrong, I said, 'I understand your point, and it's valid, but perhaps we could consider this perspective too?'" This contrasts with lower PAT score participants who sometimes used more direct or impolite language [1].

2. Accommodation and Alignment: High-pragmatic-awareness elders showed a greater tendency to accommodate their communication style to that of younger generations, even subtly. This included adjusting their lexical choices, pace of speech, and topic management to facilitate smoother interaction and reduce communication breakdowns [2]. They also demonstrated an ability to align with the younger

generation's perspective before introducing their own, creating a sense of shared understanding.

3. Mitigation and Indirectness: These participants frequently employed various mitigation strategies to soften their arguments or requests [24]. This included using modal verbs ("might," "could"), disclaimers ("I'm not sure, but..."), and indirect speech acts. This indirectness, often rooted in cultural norms of respect for elders, was strategically used to convey messages without being overly confrontational, thereby preserving harmony [13].

4. Contextual Sensitivity and Salience: Elders with higher pragmatic awareness were more adept at interpreting the communicative context and recognizing salient cues [4, 23]. They demonstrated an understanding of when to push an issue and when to defer, when to be explicit and when to rely on implied meanings. This contextual sensitivity allowed them to choose strategies that were most appropriate for the specific conflict situation and the emotional state of the interlocutors.

5. Collaborative Discourse Markers: In their narratives, high-pragmatic-awareness elders often used discourse markers that signaled a desire for collaboration and joint problem-solving. Phrases like "Let's figure this out together," "What do you think we should do?" or "How can we both be happy?" were common, indicating an orientation towards mutual understanding rather than winning an argument [3].

Conversely, elders with lower pragmatic awareness scores sometimes exhibited less nuanced communication, occasionally leading to misunderstandings or perceived impoliteness. Their conflict narratives sometimes contained instances of direct challenges, less consideration for the other's face, or a failure to adapt their communication style, which could escalate tension [1].

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study strongly suggest that pragmatic awareness is a critical determinant in how elders engage in and manage intergenerational family conflicts. The positive correlation between higher pragmatic awareness and the use of collaborative and accommodating conflict strategies underscores the importance of communicative competence in fostering constructive family dynamics. Elders who are more pragmatically aware appear to possess a broader repertoire of linguistic tools that enable them to navigate sensitive intergenerational issues with greater finesse and a higher likelihood of positive outcomes.

The qualitative insights vividly illustrate the practical application of pragmatic principles in conflict discourse [6, 19]. The strategic use of facework, politeness, accommodation, and mitigation by elders with higher pragmatic awareness aligns with theories of interpersonal

pragmatics, which emphasize the art of using language to manage relationships [10, 13, 28]. These elders are not merely avoiding conflict; they are actively employing sophisticated communicative tactics to preserve relationships and achieve mutually agreeable solutions. This is particularly relevant in family contexts where long-term relationships are paramount [12].

The observed tendency for higher pragmatic awareness to correlate with reduced use of aggressive or avoidant strategies is also significant. Aggressive communication can damage relationships [1], while consistent avoidance can lead to unresolved issues and resentment [8]. The results suggest that pragmatic competence empowers elders to engage with conflicts more directly yet constructively, rather than resorting to destructive or passive approaches. This has implications for the psychological health of both elders and their families [22].

The study also implicitly highlights the challenges faced by elders with lower pragmatic awareness. Their narratives sometimes indicated communication breakdowns or unintended impoliteness, suggesting that a lack of pragmatic sensitivity can inadvertently escalate conflicts or hinder effective resolution. This points to a potential area for intervention and support.

Limitations

Despite its contributions, this study has limitations. The sample size, while adequate for a mixed-methods study, may not be fully representative of all elders across diverse cultural or linguistic backgrounds. The reliance on self-reported conflict strategies and retrospective conflict narratives introduces potential for recall bias and social desirability bias. Future research could benefit from observational studies of actual family interactions, longitudinal designs to track changes in pragmatic awareness and conflict strategies over time, and cross-cultural comparisons to explore variations in these dynamics. Additionally, exploring the perspectives of younger family members on elders' pragmatic behaviors would provide a more comprehensive view of intergenerational conflict.

Implications and Future Research

The findings have several practical implications. For family counselors and mediators, recognizing the role of pragmatic awareness can inform intervention strategies. Training programs designed to enhance pragmatic competence among elders, focusing on facework, mitigation, and adaptive communication, could equip them with better tools for managing intergenerational conflicts. Such training could involve role-playing scenarios, feedback on communication styles, and discussions on intergenerational communication differences.

Future research should explore the specific factors that contribute to the development or maintenance of pragmatic awareness in later life. Investigating the impact of cognitive changes, social engagement, and cultural background on pragmatic abilities in elders would be valuable. Furthermore, studies could delve into the effectiveness of targeted communication interventions aimed at improving intergenerational conflict resolution by enhancing pragmatic awareness in both elders and younger family members. Research on the "dialectical thinking of research on linguistic context theory" [23] could also provide a deeper theoretical foundation for understanding how context shapes pragmatic choices in these conflicts.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates a significant relationship between pragmatic awareness in elders and their utilization of conflict strategies within intergenerational family conflicts. Elders with higher pragmatic competence are more likely to employ collaborative and accommodating strategies, characterized by sophisticated facework, politeness, and mitigation techniques. These findings underscore the crucial role of pragmatic skills in fostering harmonious intergenerational relationships and provide a foundation for developing targeted communication interventions. By enhancing pragmatic awareness, it is possible to empower elders to navigate family conflicts more effectively, contributing to stronger family bonds and improved well-being across generations.

REFERENCES

1. Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
2. Dragojevic, M., Gasiorek, J., & Giles, H. (2015). Communication Accommodation Theory. In R. B. Charles & E. R. Michael (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Communication*. Medford, MA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
3. Muntigl, P., & Turnbull, M. (1998). Conversational structure and facework in arguing. *Journal of Pragmatics, 3*, 245-256.
4. Giora, R. (2003). *On Our Mind: Salience, Context and Figurative Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Grimshaw, A. D. (1990). *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations of Arguments in Conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Kakava, C. (2001). Discourse conflict. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
7. Planken, B. (2005). Managing rapport in lingua franca sales negotiations: a comparison of professional and aspiring negotiators. *English for Specific Purposes, 4*, 381-400. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.02.002

8. Bao, G, & W, Jie. (2007). Review of research on interpersonal conflict theory. *Technology Economics, 11*, 12-16.

9. Cai, C, & Wang, Y. (2015). A study on pragmatic awareness of English thanking expressions in English majors: Gender roles and social contexts. *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies, 12*, 46-52.

10. He, Z. (2018). Interpersonal Pragmatics: The Art of Using Language to Manage Interpersonal Relationships. *Foreign Language Teaching, 6*, 1-6.

11. Hu, M. (2007). Implementation of pragmatic awareness cultivation in spoken discourse in comprehensive English textbooks. *Foreign Language Research, 4*, 65-69.

12. Lai, X. (2011). A study on the adaptability of conflict discourse between spouses in the context of Chinese. *Journal of Foreign Languages, 4*, 59-63.

13. Lai, X. (2016). Pragmatic effects of conflict discourse in the mode of interpersonal harmony management: A case study of family conflict discourse. *Foreign Languages and Literature, 3*, 2-9.

14. Li, D. & Laviosa. (2011). Corpus-based translation teaching in a cross-cultural theoretical framework. *Foreign Language Teaching Theory and Practice, 1*, 16-24.

15. Ma, C. (2007). *Research on Changes in Intergenerational Relationships in Chinese Families*. Jilin University.

16. Ran. Y. (2010). Overview of pragmatic research on conflict discourse. *Foreign Language Teaching, 1*, 1-6.

17. Shen, Y. (2010). *Individualization and the reconstruction of family relationships: A case study in Shanghai*. Fudan University.

18. Shen. Z, & He, Z. (2004). Deliberate misinterpretation in pragmatic research. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 3*, 163-170.

19. Wang, G. (2015). Language representation of conflict discourse and its interpersonal pragmatic effects. *Journal of Liaoning Technical University, 2*, 205-208.

20. Wang, C, & Yan, W. (2019). Iteration and myth: Discourse changes in news reports on parent-child conflicts. *Journalists, 21*, 118-121.

21. Wang, Y. (2008). Theoretical analysis of intergenerational relationships in Chinese families. *Population Research, 4*, 13-21.

22. Wu, L, & Sun, Y. (2003). Influence of changes in intergenerational exchange patterns on the psychological health exchange of the elderly. *Chinese Journal of Gerontology, 12*, 803-804.

23. Xiao, H. (2015). On the Dialectical Thinking of Research on Linguistic Context Theory. *Foreign Literature Studies, 3*, 31-39.

24. Yang, X. (2013). Pragmatic analysis of interpersonal conflict discourse and mitigation strategies. *Foreign Language Teaching, 2*, 39-43.

25. Zhao, Z, & Zhang, L. (2005). Analysis of discourse conflict from the perspective of relevance theory. *Foreign Language Teaching, 1*, 17-21.

26. Zhang, J. (2020). Analysis of conflict discourse from the ideal perspective. *Modern Foreign Languages, 1*, 25-36.

27. Zhao, Y. (2004). Discourse analysis of conflict discourse. *Journal of Foreign Languages, 5*, 37-42.

28. Zheng, H, & Chen, F. (2019). Pragmatic characteristics and mechanisms of parent-child conflict discourse from the perspective of interpersonal pragmatics. *Foreign Languages and Literature Research, 3*, 262-274.