



DOI: 10.54919/physics/55.2024.272de0

The interlocutors' intentions and reactions within the dialogue: implication and verbalization

Irina Suima*

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University
49107, 72 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro, Ukraine

Natalia Diachok

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University
49107, 72 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro, Ukraine

Nataliia Vlasenko

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University
49107, 72 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro, Ukraine

Anastasiia Plakhtii

Prydniprovsk State Academy of Civil Engineering and Architecture
49044, 24a Chernyshevskiy Str., Dnipro, Ukraine

Abstract

Relevance. The responsive sentences of heuristic type make the communication easier for the its participants, but in real life the other types of answers, which are containing new lexical units, are more sufficient, more pragmatically oriented and more important for the process of the communicative interaction.

Purpose. The article deals with a wide range of reply variants within the question–answer system.

Methodology. The study focuses on the interrelation of the intention revealing a communicative task in the different types of sentences with the reaction expressed in the responsive sentence.

Results. Analyzing both structure and semantics of the heuristic responsive sentences and their connections with the utterances of interlocutors' intents in the scope of the English prose fiction, the authors give a meta-description of these answer-forms that correlates their structural, lexical, semantic and functional features defined in the multilingual dimension and realized as the typology criteria with their peculiarities manifesting the systematic characteristics of the English language.

Conclusions. The investigation reveals that in most cases the syntactic construction formed to react verbally to the interrogative sentence as well as to the declarative and imperative ones is not limited only to the response "Yes/No", but extends to a number of words or even phrases uttering the answer.

Keywords: communication; question-answer discourse; intentional sentence; responsive sentence; heuristic responsive; speech act.

Suggested Citation:

Suima I, Diachok N, Vlasenko N, Plakhtii A. The interlocutors' intentions and reactions within the dialogue: implication and verbalization. *Sci Herald Uzhhorod Univ Ser Phys.* 2024;(55):2720-2728. DOI: 10.54919/physics/55.2024.272de0

*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Introduction

Communication as a linguistic phenomenon was dealt with in different aspects in a wide range of scientific researches connected with the structure and semantics of dialogue parts, speech act theory, question-answer unity etc. The meanings expressed by interrogative sentences, communicative bewilderment, unawareness of the questioner, the response of the person who answers the questions, manifestations of speech acts in various aspects require clarification of speech acts, their meaningful features in discussions on the "question-answer" problem. Both in direct and indirect speech acts, various forms of basic and hidden meanings of question sentences are revealed. Thus, the opinion is confirmed that interrogative sentences express not only a request, a demand, but also an inducement – a communicative situation, communicative intention, background knowledge, a press position.

Some information about the ways of expressing the speech act of response is considered. Our classification is based on a functional, or communicative, classification of sentences, the division of utterances depending on the function (goal setting of the utterance) into interrogative, declarative and imperative ones, since, according to linguists, a dialogue is considered successful if there is an utterance (interrogative, declarative or imperative) (and a verbal response / reaction to it [1-4].

It is customary to talk about two sides of communication: 1) intention presupposing plans, ideas, goal or the purpose of the speaker; the act of mental determination of some action or result; and 2) a verbal reaction to the statement, carried out with a special intention. The nature of the intention is most often described in different ways [1; 2]. Constructions containing a verbal reaction to the statement require further research. In this article, the verbal reaction to any kind of expression is called the speech act of the "question-answer" discourse.

Note that scientific research dealt with the interrogative sentences in traditional linguistics is focused on the description of the content [5-7]? Most often, interrogative sentences in which the speaker's desire to find out something or to verify something is expressed by special language means. At the same time, from the view point of linguistic communication – language communication or linguistic theory of communication?, as shown by the studies of many national and foreign linguists, they confirm the fact that a sentence, statement, or other speech constructions are not at all answers to interrogative sentences [8-12]. Modern researchers also speak about this issue [13-21]. At the same time, traditional grammar either takes as a basis the realization of the answer, verbalized by linguistic means in the form of a sentence or statement, or does not touch upon this problem at all.

The aim of the article is: 1) to explain the meanings expressed by interrogative sentences addressed to a specific addressee, the nature of the addressee's perception of the speaker's communicative intention, and on the basis of this form – his/her answer, as well as a direct or indirect answer to the question asked, his/her possible reaction ; 2) to analyze and describe - to define ?"response" sentences as an integral part of the message and to (я бы поставила, так как разбито другими членами предложения) outline their relationship with the intention of the addressee's

statement and the addresser's response. The object of the analysis is the functioning of speech acts in the question-answer discourse.

Communicatively oriented connections of replicas in a question-answer dialogue are considered in their relation to the illocutionary tactics of the participants in communication. According to the linguists, the conversation is considered to be successful in case – of producing both the utterance (interrogative, declarative or imperative) defined as an "intentional sentence" (даем ссылку на присланную вчера статью) and the verbal answer/reaction, generalized as a responsive sentence [1-3]. So, there are two sides of the communication: intention manifesting plans, ideas, purpose or aim of the speaker; the act of determining mentally upon some action or result, and the verbal reaction to the utterance, realized with particular intention.

While analyzing different types and special features of verbal constructions within the dialogue, the following methods are implied: 1) comparative method, which is used for comparing and contrasting of the verbal expressions, containing speakers attention and reaction; 2) descriptive method is used for enumeration of peculiarities of the responsive sentences; 3) lexicographical method is used for definition of such notions, as "responsive", "intention", "communication" etc.

According to the encyclopedic dictionaries and studies, the answer, along with other types of statements (question, command, a spell oath, the statement of addressing to, the order, request), was also identified as a separate unit of speech with peculiar communicative meaning even by ancient philosophers [5-10; 13].

We proceed from the position of T. A. van Dijk that the orientation of a speech act (hereinafter referred to as SA) to another SA (including non-verbal ones) implies their certain dependence on the background of unspoken practices, frames, scenarios and many other communicative situations, which ultimately determines intentional states [22; 23]. Taking into consideration E. Husserl's concept of intention and R. Carnap's dichotomy of intensional/extensional, we agree with the R. I. Pavilionis' scientific position stating that "intentionality as the focus of our mind on objects of the actual or possible worlds and intensionality (intensionality) as the relation of intentional states to a certain conceptual system are natural, universal and essential features of any act of understanding as an act of interpretation" [24; 25].

Statements in English language

The term "responsive utterance" with the meaning similar to the offered definition was used by David Cristal while introducing the types of sentences according to the aim of communication: "situation utterance" (eliciting a response) and 'response-utterances'. Situation utterances are subdivided into 3 groups: 1) utterances that are regularly followed by oral responses only. These are greetings, calls, questions. (Hello, goodbye, see you soon). 2) Utterances eliciting action responding. These are requests or commands (come up to me). 3) utterances regularly eliciting conventional signals of attention to continue discourse. (I've been talking to him. – Yes.) [2]

Leech G., Deucher M., Hoogenraad R. identified the responsive sentences as "They are, we are, I am, he/she is"

etc [26] if they are used as answers to the question. We understand the notion of “responsive sentences” as term with broader meaning, identifying any verbal reaction to any type of utterance.

Representatives of the linguistic schools distinguish between two types of connectedness of a dialogical text:

1) semantic coherence (different types of semantic repetitions, ellipse, substitution, links with the help of syntactic indicators, etc.);

2) communicatively oriented, or pragmatic, coherence, i.e., “the semantic correlation of replicas, moreover, the dialogic reaction violates the dialogue program” [26-30].

The purpose of the interrogative speech act is to fill in the information gap in the speaker's knowledge. In order to encourage the listener to report information, any form of interrogative statement is used, aimed at encouraging the listener to report information. In many languages, there are special forms that express a request for information and are designed according to the syntactic and intonational rules of a given language.

From our point of view, the concept of “response sentences” can be understood and interpreted as a term with a broader meaning, denoting any verbal reaction to any type of utterance. So, for example, this term can be implemented not only in a question-answer dialogue (speech act), but also be used to denote a syntactic unit used as a reaction to any expression. (And where have you been? – Nowhere. Can you help me? I'm on the phone), declarative (There's no way we'll make this plane. It leaves in 45 minutes. Think positive! He thinks I'm guilty. That's not what's important) and imperative (Get upstairs now. Why? Do it! Why me?).

It should be noted that the study of the potential possibilities of speech acts in the form of an interrogative sentence in the context of numerous questions and answers and taking into account interpersonal and social relations of communicants does not lose its relevance in modern linguistics. Evidence of this issue is the fact that recently in the theory of speech acts interrogative sentences often become indirect speech acts. Each interrogative sentence is the sum of three semantic features: a) the speaker's desire to know, b) the nature of the information requested, c) the motivation addressed to the listener, causing him to react verbally. As noted by I.V. Vinantova [31], referring to E.I. Belyaev [32], “according to structural and semantic features, questions in the English language are divided into special (pronominal), connecting (tag-questions), alternative and general (non-pronominal). In addition, to obtain information in modern English, imperative interrogative utterances with speech predicates are used (for example: Tell me, do you never read the “Daily Express”? – A. Huxley) and declarative utterances expressing the speaker's desire to have some information or inform about the presence of an information gap (for example: And I don't know why you've taken against them so much. – J. Fowles). According to the way of expressing the question, interrogative sentences are divided into direct and indirect ones.

According to J. Searle, questions should be classified as directives, “since they are attempts on the part of the speaker to induce an answer, i.e., induce him/her to perform a speech act” [23]. According to C. Kerbrath-

Orechioni, many theorists attribute interrogative SA to a request that can be verbally or non-verbally granted [33].

Content Features of Interrogative Sentences of Speech Acts of the “Question-Answer” Discourse

It should be noted that the content of interrogative sentences depends on a number of factors, among which pragmatic factors play an important role. According to J. Searle, the speech act of a question is carried out under such conditions, leading to their successful understanding and implementation:

- condition of propositional content: proposition or propositional function;
- preparatory conditions:
- the speaker does not know whether the proposition is true, or, in the case of a propositional function, and also does not know the information necessary to construct a true proposition;
- it is not obvious to either the speaker or the addressee that the addressee will provide this information at the moment without being asked to do so;
- sincerity condition: the speaker wants to receive this information;
- the main condition: the question is considered as an attempt to obtain this information from the addressee [23, p. 66]. It follows that the main purpose of the question is to obtain from the addressee unknown information to the speaker. Therefore, the description of the semantics of the question of the speech act of the dialogue discourse in the broadest sense implies the allocation of one or another context (“question-answer”).

First of all, the constructions under analysis can be divided into three main classes: contented responsive – a verbal reaction to the utterance, which satisfies the person who asks something, the answer/reaction, containing the needed information and representing by itself the data necessary for the conversation partner. The communicative units, belonging to this type of responsives, can be characterized with different lexical content and structural peculiar features: What time is it? – Seven o'clock; Had your breakfast? – No etc. uncontented responsive sentences – a verbal reaction, which is unsatisfied for the conversation partner and gives no information he/she asked for. Such type of responsives is usually present when the speaker does not want to give any answer, tries to avoid inconvenient question or even make the asking person answer his/her question by himself/herself: What could you do? – Sometimes one thing, sometimes another!; Are you going in now? – That depends upon whether you have anything to show me; What is your business, sir? – I am a professional! To the speech units, belonging to the uncontented responsives, it is possible to include means of communicative sabotage, attempts to manipulate with the information received from the content of the question or statement itself etc: Have you got a room to let? – Is it for yourself you ask?; What building is that? – That belongs to me friend!

In this regard, some response sentences within the speech act of the “question-answer” discourse (“question-answer system”) are also considered as means of communicative sabotage (nine main figures of communicative sabotage are identified). But it can be

assumed that recipients, as linguistic figures representing forms of communicative sabotage, can be used outside the question-answer speech act.

In the connection with this fact, some responsive sentences within the "question-answer system" are also considered as means of communicative sabotage (nine main figures of the communicative sabotage are identified). But it is possible to suppose, that the responsiveness as linguistic figures representing forms of the communicative sabotage can be used out of the "question-answer system". It is possible to find a correspondent variant for each of these figures out of the "question-answer system" [15]: 1. An indicative of a causal action in the form of a question, when the speaker pretends not to have heard the question / statement or does not understand it: "What will be the payment for such a work? – You will receive your salary in time", "Do you really want to live in such a slum? – What do you mean?" And the same situation can be while providing a reaction to the declarative or imperative utterance: "I think it is time for you to find a job. – You mean, some job in my specialty?", "Let's go somewhere on holidays? – You should not go to the office tomorrow?" etc.; 2. The indicative of the causal action in the form of a question / statement ignored on an emotional level as something inappropriate or incorrect: "What did you do there yesterday? – Just trivial issues", "He thinks that I am guilty – It is not the important thing now!", "The translation of this book is not so good as the original version! – It doesn't matter, you should only know the plot of this book!" etc.; 3. The answer to the question\statement requires additional time to work on and because of this fact it can be postponed: "Will all members of our group be at that conference? – I should call them first!", "Show me, please, your license on these goods production! – I must send an inquiry to the main office!", "I hope you will deliver my parcel as soon as possible! – I should firstly contact our delivering service"; 4. There is an indicative of a causal action that requires an answer to a question / statement, but it is determined by some requirements for the wording of the question / statement or for the speaker: "Can you send this information via e-mail? – Only if you provide us with the internet access!", "You should be at that factory at 3 o'clock! – Pick me up, if you have a car!", "I want you to make several copies of this paper by the afternoon! – If I have time and if you tell me the exact number of the needed copies"; 5. The answering person ask the counter-question or gives counter-statement, which is impossible or very difficult to respond: "Why are you here? – And why are you here?", "What did you do there? – And what did you do there?" 6. The question\statement is readdressed to another person: "Why are you late for work? – Ask the driver of bus I took to get there!", "I heard you company has new taxation policy – I don't know, speak about it with our director", "Give me your time-table for tomorrow! – Ask my secretary to do it!" 7. Questions in the form of a morphological indicative with negation. Refusal to answer a question or statement is motivated by different issues: "Who is the owner of this car? – It is confidential information", "I need to speak with the deputy minister! – Sorry, he doesn't accept visitors now", "Tell me where they keep documents? – It is secret information".

And one more class of the responsive sentences – latent responsiveness – are the most interesting structurally as well as semantically. These communicative units show a verbal reaction, that is not giving an answer to the question directly, but you can analyze the information you are said and understand the data you need: What'll you have? – The same as you!; Do you go to school? – I'm studying with a private tutor.

Responsive sentences are interesting in structural and semantic aspects as well as in functional one. These communicative units can be characterized with a wide range of special features: 1) As it was mentioned above responsiveness express verbal reaction to any communicative unit; 2) Communicative structures under review always have deep semantic implication; 3) The structure of the responsiveness despite the other types of sentences, can vary greatly: the reaction can be presented by one word as well as a long speech or the reaction to the message can repeat the lexical units used in the message itself as well as be expressed in the most unexpected way with the help of different lexemes. This structural peculiarities influence also the functional aspect of the responsive sentences. 4) Different types of the responsive sentences are widely used practically in all spheres of human life and activity; 5) The functional loading of the responsive sentences as a rule depends not only on the initial phrase, which is reacted by means of this sentence, but also on different linguistic and extralinguistic reasons; 6) The communicative units under review can be found in all speech styles; 7) Responsive sentences can be clichéd or fixed structures as well as free, usual communicative units, which are using in everyday life etc.

Role of the sentence types in the language

Responsive sentences are considered in the given article as the verbal reaction to some kind of intention of the speaker and are described within the communicative tasks system. Four-component system of communicative task (declarative, interrogative, imperative and optative sentences), transferring the most typical communicative purposes of the speaker, does not cover completely everything, what is considered to be qualified as intention. In general comprehension of this term, which is implied to a wide range of sciences (psychology, philosophy, logics etc), and with the determinants "communicative" and "language" – in the metalanguage of linguistics, is understood by researchers as the synonym to the notion "aim of communication": "aim (purpose) of communication is the same as the communicative intention, mental prediction of the desired result by the participant of the conversation, the orientation of the consciousness on this result" [26; 34; 35], "communicative intention means a definite aim of the utterance and is a regulative means of speakers' communicative behavior" [36-39]; "communicative intention – is a purpose of the speech act, plans and ideas of the speaker" [40-42]. The correlation between the notions under analysis is ambiguous. Along with the popular within the speech acts theory point of view, according to which terms "communicative aim (task)" and "communicative intention" are identified, exists the other one, separating aims from the intentions of the communication.

However, while speaking about the responsive sentences, the situation is more difficult. In some types of the responsive the ideas and plans of the speaker, or intention can directly correlate with the aim of the communication (for example, motivating and sabotage responsive sentences: “Why are you late for work? – Ask the driver of bus I took to get there!”, “I heard you company has new taxation policy – I don’t know, speak about it with our director”,). In the other sentences, that are also elements of the responsive sentences typology, there is no direct correlation between the responsive and communicative intention of the speaker (for example, emotional reaction on the utterance: We will never get that train! – Be positive!; What a beautiful weather today! – Great!; I finally passed my exam! – My congratulations!). Therefore, in the given article we consider the responsive sentences within the communicative tasks system, because the aim itself of some communicative units under research can be difficult to identify (for example, latent responsive sentences: Do you pay for the bus ticket? – They always check the tickets on the bus).

Within the question–answer system types of replies are traditionally corresponded to the types of questions. The identification of questions typology is dealt with in different linguistic researches [1-3; 5-9]. The classification of answers, which can be connected with the interrogative sentence as well as for example, be means of the communicative sabotage or linguistic manipulation has not its detail description yet. Very often the responsive sentence [43-47] or verbal reaction to the question within the question–answer system somehow contains tautological elements, the case when the answer repeats some lexical units used in the question (I’m willing to work hard! – said the Dick. – And you must not only work hard, but work in the right way) [38]; is formal, when the reply is reduced only to words “Yes/No” or their equivalents (Are these all the clothes you have? – Yes, sir; Have you ever been in any situation? – No, sir) [38] etc. The responsive sentences of such type make the communication easier for the its participants, but in real life the other type of answers, which are containing new lexical units, are more sufficient, more pragmatically oriented and more important for the process of the communication. The responsive sentences of such type can be called heuristic ones. Heuristic responsive sentences are the most interesting class of answers from the structural, lexical, semantic and functional aspects because they are characterized with the usage of the extended lexical filling, comparing to the other classes, they may not include the vocabulary of the interrogative sentence at all while representing by itself the detail to some extend information which had been demanded by the speaker. From the structural point of view the heuristic responsives are diverse and having any kind of structure – from several words to big text message.

Semantically, this type of answers is intended on the presenting of the concrete information the asking person needs. But, as it was mentioned above, it can be done in different ways. It enables us to divide heuristic responsive sentences into three main types:

- the direct answer, needing no additions, more detail descriptions, which satisfies the person who asks:

“Tell me, why does Captain Demerest dislike you so much?” – “I suppose he knows I dislike him” [18];

- the reduced responsive – an answer avoiding some elements of the dialogue, but the speaker, who asks understands the reply correctly and, the same as for the previous class, it needs no additional information or details: What is the matter? – We should go home!;

- the extended responsive – the responsive sentence, containing except the information was asked for some additional data, which, according to the answering persons’ view, will be interesting or useful for the other speaker: “You’d like me to take him home too?” – “He lives at 9002, Hollywood Boulevard. Thank you for your help” [18; 48-50].

The common feature of the three classes of the responsive sentences mentioned above consists in the fact that the answers of all named types are satisfactory ones for the speaker and they present the information he/she needs. But there are also peculiar features of every class, which can be seen while analyzing the structural, lexical and semantic specificity of them.

The direct answer to the question is not restricted to any form or content: “How many complaints have there been?” Mel asked. – “At least 50.”; “Don’t they know there’s a storm and we have a runway out of use?” – “We try to tell them, but they don’t want to listen. I hear they’re holding a meeting tonight to decide what to do next.”; “How did you know about the Snow Committee report?” he asked her – “It was typed in the Trans America Office. I saw it there” [38] etc. As we can see from the examples, the first class of the heuristic responsive sentence – direct answer to the question – in the most cases explains something or presents some information.

The first subtype of the heuristic responsive sentences includes, except the direct answer itself the antecedent responsives, meaning the replies which are correlating with the interrogative pronoun–adverbial component of the question: “Where’s Joe Patroni?” – “Still on the road”; “Why don’t you fly from San Diego?” Tanya asked. – “I’m afraid, my dear, they know me there.”; “What do you do at stops?” – “I pretend to be asleep. Usually they don’t trouble me.”; “How long?” – “Until midnight. Possibly all night” [38] etc. The replies of such type give the concrete answer to the question, but semantically and structurally they are corresponded to the pronoun–adverbial element of the question itself.

In practical communication the heuristic responsive sentences are interrelated within the dialogue with the other types of the replies, which are supplemented each other, because there are some questions demanding the extended answer and there are ones, needing only Yes/No answer:

- “Inez,” he continued. “May I call you Inez?”
- “Yes,” she whispered. “Inez, will you answer my questions?”
- “Yes – if I can.”
- “Why is your husband going to Rome?”
- “I don’t know.”
- “Have you got any friends there?”
- “No.”
- “What is your husband’s job?”
- “He was a builder.”

- “Was? Isn't he now?”
- “Things went – wrong” [38]

The given fragment from the text illustrates the correlation of different types of the responsive sentences. Heuristic replies are connected semantically with the tautological, formal, determined ones etc. But as we can see from the above-mentioned example, the direct answers are the most important and sufficient links, that let us to understand the content of the dialogue, they explain the other remarks and are complementing the other types of the responsive sentences presenting in the given fragment.

The second main type of the heuristic responsive sentences is the reduced responsive. The reduction in this class of answers may be structural – when some lexical units are avoid in the reply, but it is insufficient for the listener and he/she can easily realize the missed word or word-combination. As for the example, presented in the article: “What is the matter? – We should go home!”, here the full answer would be like the following one: “The matter is that we should go home”. But in the practical speech the word-combination “the matter is that”, repeating the lexical units of the question is contracted because the participant of the communication will understand everything without it. It is also doing for the purpose of the language units' economy and, as a rule, for the economy time. Besides structural reduction it can also be semantic – when it is missed one or several lines from the dialogue, but it does not affect the process of the communication and the interlocutors understand each other without problems: “What is the score? – Liverpool has won”; “Have you seen the weather forecast for tomorrow? – It will be raining the whole day!” etc. So, the intention of the asking person is not actually to hear the answer to their question, but it is understood, that this question will be followed with the other one. In the first example, the speaker asks about the score of the match, but, actually, he is interested only the score itself, for him it is important to know who wins the match. And if the answer to the first question (What is the score of the match) were, for example, 2:0, it would not have been satisfactory for the speaker, because such type of the answer does not present the information he needs.

The same situation is with the other example – the speaker hardly needs the information about the fact has his conversation partner seen the weather forecast or not. He needs the information from this forecast itself. So, the answer “It will be raining the whole day” satisfies the speaker.

And the third main type of the heuristic responsive sentences is an extended one. This class has something in common in semantic aspect with the previous type of the responsive sentences, because here we also have one or even several missed lines from the dialogue, but the speaker does not need them. But the previous – reduced type of the responses – represented only the main information and only the data needed for the person who asks. And the extended responsive sentences are intended to give not only the needed information but also the additional one: Have you done your home composition? –

I will not give it to you!; Have you done some notes from the lecture? – I have given it to the other student; Do you need a bag? – A little one; etc.

Here the speaker begins the communication with a question, but his/her conversation partner can easily understand the real intention of the speaker and gives him/her the answer not to the question itself, but to the question, that will follow this question in case he/she replies: for instance, the first example with the composition: the speaker asks his/her conversation partner whether he/she has done the homework. Of course, the person, who is asked, realizes why the speaker put such a question and reacts in this way. He/she knows that if he/she answers “Yes”, his/her conversation partner will ask to read it or even to rewrite to his/her copybook. The same is the situation with the other example, concerning the notes from the lecture. The asking person implies by his/her question the latent request to give these notes to him/her. And the conversation partner, understanding it, answers that he/she gave the notes to the other person. It may be also done for the purpose of the time economy and from the linguistic point of view, economy of language means, i.e. words and word-combinations.

Conclusions

The heuristic responsive sentences are widely used not only in the modern English prose, but also in the oral speech. According to the statistical analysis, that has been held on the material of the 10000 dialogues in English, above 4000 responsive sentences here are the heuristic responsive sentences which are presenting the satisfactory for the speaker answer to the interrogative sentence put by him. The heuristic responsive sentences are also used in the so-called mixed type responses when, for example, formal reply “Yes/No” is complemented with the heuristic one, or maybe the tautological responsive is supplemented with the heuristic responsive sentences etc.

The study of the possibilities of speech acts of the “question-answer” discourse in taking into account the interpersonal and social relations of communicants is very important.

It seems that the model of analysis proposed in the study has both theoretical and practical significance, it allows to reveal the possibilities of language units in the implementation of any ideas of the speaker and listener in speech acts, to shade the nuances of human thought. This model can be used as a basis for contrastive-pragmatic studies, this will allow to present language material in an easily comparable form with access to applied linguistics and methods of teaching foreign language speech, taking into account various communicative situations and pragmatic contexts.

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

- [1] Carnie A. *Syntax*. Oxford: University Press; 2001.
- [2] Crystal D. *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge: University Press; 1995.

- [3] Cummins J. Beyond language: Academic communication and student success. *Ling Educ.* 2014;26:145-154.
- [4] Messina A, Crescimanno C, Cucci G, Caraci F, Signorelli MS. Cell Adhesion Molecules in the Pathogenesis of Schizophrenia. *Fol Med.* 2023;65(5):707-712.
- [5] Beliutina JuA. Pragmatic and sociolinguistic determinants of violations in the communicative act of apology. *Cult Text.* 2007;7:144-148.
- [6] Vezhbitska A. Speech acts. *New Foreign Ling.* 1985;16:251-276.
- [7] Brown P. *Speech.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1979.
- [8] Gordon D, Lakoff D. Fundamentals of speech communication. *New Foreign Ling.* 1985;16:276-302.
- [9] Tufanova YuV. Linguistic politeness as a way to maintain the balance of interests of communicants in the speech situation of apology. *Bull Bashkir State Uni. Series: Roman-German Phil.* 2010;11:102-106.
- [10] Raitmar R. *The pragmatics of an apology: a comparative study on the material of the Russian language and Russian culture.* Moscow: Nauka; 2003.
- [11] Leshchenko MV, Semko V. Thermal characteristics of the external walling made of cold-formed steel studs and polystyrene concrete. *Magaz Civil Eng.* 2015;60(8):44-55.
- [12] Alkaabi AK, King JC. Benchmarking COMSOL Multiphysics Single-Subchannel Thermal-Hydraulic Analysis of a TRIGA Reactor with RELAP5 Results and Experimental Data. *Sci Tech Nucl Install.* 2019;2019:4375782.
- [13] Kang L, Tan Ch-H, Zhao J. Do cognitive and affective expressions matter in purchase conversion? A live chat perspective. *J Associat Info Sci Tech.* 2020;71(4):436-449. DOI: 10.1002/asi.24254.
- [14] Ajabshir ZF. The Effect of Teachers' Scaffolding and Peers' Collaborative Dialogue on Speech Act Production in Symmetrical and Asymmetrical Groups. *Iran J Lang Teach Res.* 2020;8(1):45-61.
- [15] Cousens Ch. Are ableist insults secretly slurs? *Lang Sci.* 2020;77:101252. DOI: 10.1016/j.langsci.2019.101252;
- [16] Franco PL. Speech Act Theory and the Multiple Aims of Science. *Phil Sci.* 2019;86(5):1005-1015. DOI: 10.1086/705452;
- [17] Johnson-Laird PN. Possibilities as the foundation of reasoning. *Cognit.* 2019;193:103950. DOI: 10.1016/j.cognition.2019.04.019;
- [18] Evans N. Nen assentives and the phenomenon of dialogic parallelisms. *Pract Theor Empiric Pract: Ling Perspect.* 2012;40:159-183.
- [19] Gallo CM. Building Discursive Identity: The Case of Question-Answer-Follow up System in Two Interviews. *Rev Roumain Ling – Roman Rev Ling.* 2016;61(3):265-284.
- [20] Wood A, Rodeghero P, Armaly A, McMillan C. Detecting Speech Act Types in Developer Question/Answer Conversations during Bug Repair. In: *Esec/Fse'18: Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (pp. 491-502).* New York: Assoc Computing Machinery; 2018. DOI: 10.1145/3236024.3236031;
- [21] Santana KC. The ironic impoliteness speech act on digital social network Facebook. *Soletr.* 2020;39:50-77.
- [22] van Dijk TA. *Prejudice in Discourse: An Analysis of Ethnic Prejudice in Cognition and Conversation.* Amsterdam: Benjamins; 1984.
- [23] Searle J. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.* Cambridge: CUP; 1969.
- [24] Pavilionis RJ. On Meaning and Understanding. *Acta Phil Fennic.* 1985;38:117-126.
- [25] Brown K. *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics.* Oxford: University Press; 2005.
- [26] Leech G, Deucher M, Hoogenraad R. *English Grammar for today.* Oxford: University Press; 1982.
- [27] Arutiunova ND. *Language and world of the human being.* Moscow: Nauka; 1999.
- [28] Paducheva EV. Pragmatic aspects of dialogical integrity. Moscow: Prospekt; 1982.
- [29] Kuzin AN. Communicatively oriented connection of illocutive tactics of question-answer dialogue. *Ling. Bull BDU. Series.* 2006;4(3):63-68.
- [30] Spytska L. Symptoms and main features of personality formation of a psychopath. *Arch Psych Psych.* 2024;26(1):34-43.
- [31] Vinantova NV. *Questions as a type of speech acts.* 2008. http://www.rusnauka.com/13_NPT_2008/Philologia/31431.doc.htm
- [32] Belyaev NI. Principle of politeness in interrogative speech acts. *Foreign Lang Sch.* 1990;1:43-47.
- [33] Kerbrat-Orecchioni C. *La question.* Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon; 1991.
- [34] Piskunov VG, Gorik AV, Cherednikov VN. Modeling of transverse shears of piecewise homogeneous composite bars using an iterative process with account of tangential loads 2. Resolving equations and results. *Mech Compos Mater.* 2000;36(6):445-452.
- [35] Vishnu R, Selvakumar RD, Alkaabi AK, Vengadesan S. Active vortex generation and enhanced heat transfer in a 3D minichannel by Onsager-Wien effect. *Appl Therm Eng.* 2023;233:121064.
- [36] Lehnert T, Krolak-Schwerdt S, Hörstermann T. Explicit and implicit speaker evaluations and their differential attitudinal determinants. *Lang Sci.* 2018;69:68-79.
- [37] Rappaa A, Kok-Sing T. Integrating disciplinary-specific genre structure in discourse strategies to support disciplinary literacy. *Ling Educ.* 2018;43:1-12.
- [38] Zinovyeva LA, Omeljanenko VI. *All phrases of the English.* Rostov-on-Don: Nauka; 2012.
- [39] Becker R. Materials for English Historical Linguistics: an Annotated Bibliography of Concordances. *J Eng Ling.* 1978;12(1):1-11.
- [40] Kumar R, Yunus R. Linguistics in Language Education. *Contemp Educ Dialog.* 2014;11(2):197-220.

- [41] Fialko NM, Prokopov VG, Meranova NO, Borisov YuS, Korzhik VN, Sherenkovskaya GP. Thermal physics of gasothermal coatings formation processes. State of investigations. *Fiz Khim Obrabot Mater.* 1993;(4):83-93.
- [42] Zhumadiluli AD, Panfilov IV, Ismailova JA. Improvement of uniform oil displacement technology on the example of Kazakhstani fields. *J Environ Manag Tour.* 2018;9(3):542-552.
- [43] Li S, Said F, O'Neill B, Ancarno C, Niksic M. Using linguistic methods in clinical communication education. *MedEdPub.* 2016;5:119.
- [44] Gurzynski-Weiss L. Systemic Functional Linguistics as applicable linguistics. *Ling Educ.* 2011;22(3):300-301.
- [45] Hudson R, Sheldon N. Linguistics at School: The UK Linguistics Olympiad. *Lang Ling Comp.* 2013;7(2):91–104.
- [46] Messina A, Caraci F, Aguglia E, Signorelli MS. Catatonia-like behavior and immune activation: a crosstalk between psychopathology and pathology in schizophrenia. *Ann Gen Psych.* 2023;22(1):39.
- [47] Korzhik VN. Theoretical analysis of the conditions required for rendering metallic alloys amorphous during gas-thermal spraying. III. Transformations in the amorphous layer during the growth process of the coating. *Sov Pow Metall Metal Ceram.* 1992;31(11):943-948.
- [48] Spytzka L. Anxiety and depressive personality disorders in the modern world. *Acta Psych.* 2024;246:104285.
- [49] Korzhyk V, Illiashenko E, Khaskin V, Peleshenko S, Perepychay A. Forecasting the results of hybrid laser-plasma cutting of carbon steel. *East-Eur J Enter Tech.* 2020;2(1-104):6-15.
- [50] Bannikov DO. Analysis of the causes of accidents of steel capacitive structures for bulk materials. *Metall Min Ind.* 2011;3(5):243-249.

Наміри та реакції співрозмовників у діалозі: імплікація та вербалізація

Ірина Суйма

Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара
49107, проспект Гагаріна, 72, Дніпро, Україна

Наталія Дячок

Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара
49107, проспект Гагаріна, 72, Дніпро, Україна

Наталія Власенко

Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара
49107, проспект Гагаріна, 72, Дніпро, Україна

Анастасія Плахтій

Придніпровська державна академія будівництва та архітектури
49044, вул. Чернишевського, 24а, м. Дніпро, Україна

Анотація

Актуальність. Репліки-відповіді евристичного типу полегшують комунікацію для її учасників, але в реальному житті інші типи відповідей, які містять нові лексичні одиниці, є більш достатніми, більш прагматично орієнтованими і більш важливими для процесу комунікативної взаємодії.

Мета. У статті розглядається широкий спектр варіантів відповідей у системі "запитання-відповідь".

Методологія. Дослідження зосереджується на взаємозв'язку інтенції, що розкриває комунікативне завдання в різних типах речень, з реакцією, вираженою у реченні-відповіді.

Результати. На основі аналізу структури і семантики евристичних речень-відповідей та їх зв'язку з висловлюваннями інтенцій співрозмовників на матеріалі англійської художньої прози подано метаопис цих форм відповіді, який співвідносить їх структурні, лексико-семантичні та функціональні особливості, визначені у багатомовному вимірі та реалізовані як критерії типологізації, з їх особливостями, що виявляють системні характеристики англійської мови.

Висновки. Дослідження виявило, що в більшості випадків синтаксична конструкція, утворена для вербальної реакції на питальне речення, так само як і на декларативне та імперативне, не обмежується лише відповіддю "Так/Ні", а поширюється на низку слів або навіть фраз, що виражають відповідь.

Ключові слова: комунікація; питально-відповідний дискурс; інтенційне речення; респонсивне речення; евристична репліка; мовленнєвий акт.