



АКТУАЛЬНІ МЕТОДИКИ – ЕФЕКТИВНА ПРАКТИКА

UDC 811.111+81'42

Humeniuk I. I.

*Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Head of the Foreign Languages Department
Higher Educational Institution "Podillia State University"
Kamianets-Podilskyi, Ukraine*

E-mail: irynahumenyuk79@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-7905-9771

ILLOCUTIVE STRUCTURE OF THE MAIN PART OF DIALOGICAL INTERVIEW TEXTS

Abstract

Examining interview texts from the point of view of structure, semantics, and pragmatics is important because it allows us to clarify the features of secondary and hybrid formation. From the point of view of the general theory of the text, it is very important to develop a prototype model of the interview text, which is used in the modern English-language press. The purpose of this study is to develop a prototypical model of the interview text in order to investigate the discursive, structural, semantic and pragmatic aspects of the interview text in the contemporary English-language press. The article examines the illocutionary structure of the main part of the interview texts. The system of minimal dialogues is an illocutive structure of a dialogic text-interview. The lines are connected by illocutionary relations within the minimal dialogue. The universality of illocutionary relations allows you to determine the boundaries and markers of the beginning and end of minimal dialogues. Text interviews are used by respondents to obtain information and determine their attitude to the interviewer's message. The strategies used by respondents can be conflictual or non-conflictual. Informative techniques include direct questioning, anticipatory response, demonstrating one's ability to conduct a conversation, indicating the inappropriateness of the question, referring to the fact that the interviewer knows the answer to the question, incomplete answer, general answer, counter question, and ignoring the content of the question. If you want to show your attitude to the interviewer's statement, you can use tactics such as direct correlation, explanation, contrast, pointing out that the interviewer's statement is incorrect, explaining why you disagree with him, biased response and silence.

***Key words:** general theory of texts, illocutionary relations, text-interview, system of minimal dialogues.*

Introduction. Linguistic research in recent years is characterized by a growing interest among researchers in considering the secondary and hybrid nature of texts, which leads to the relevance of considering dialogical and non-dialogical interview texts in the modern English-language press.

The **purpose** of this paper is to study a prototypical model of the interview text in order to investigate the discursive, structural, semantic and pragmatic aspects of the interview text in the contemporary English-language media.

The analysis of interview texts in structural, semantic and pragmatic aspects is relevant, as it enables the disclosure of the specifics of this type of text as a secondary and hybrid formation. The development of a model of the prototype text-interview in the modern English-language press is important from the point of view of the general theory of the text. Within the framework of communication theory, it is important to clarify the typology of strategies and tactics of the interviewer and the respondent.

When analyzing the actual material, the following **methods** were comprehensively applied in the work: the method of semantic-conceptual modeling, within which the method of frame analysis and the method of building a network of conceptual integration, the method of pragmatic-semantic analysis of speech acts and contextual-situational analysis were used.

Results and Discussion. The main part is a verbal component of the compositional structure of the interview text. The main part, as a rule, is the largest compositional element of the interview text. It is this part that directly develops and concretizes the information presented in the titles and introductory part. The main part of the text reflects the essence of the interview that the respondent gave to the interviewer, that is, it conveys the respondent's message and/or reveals his views and opinions on a particular issue.

The main part of the interview text, as a rule, has the form of a dialogue, since the interview text is a newspaper or magazine article that conveys the content of a journalist's conversation with a certain person, and conducting a conversation is an activity oriented to a communication partner and has dialogic structure by its nature [6]. Among modern linguists, the idea of dialogue as the most natural form of speech is widespread. Dialogue as a universal natural form of human communication is a set of replicas that complement each other and correlate with each other in structural, semantic and functional terms. The dialogic form of interview texts in the press is aimed at creating the effect of probability, truthfulness and uniqueness or novelty of information. It is this form that should show not only the essence of the survey, but also its sequence down to the smallest nuances, which characterize both the course of revealing the topic and the personality of the respondent [2]. Dialogue is counted among linguistic (and non-linguistic) strategies that create the effect of "involvement", which should captivate the reader. "Involvement" is defined as an internal and, even, emotional connection that a person feels, and which connects him with other people, as well as with places, things, thoughts, words, etc. [9]. Dialogue auditorily creates a "scene with characters", a scene that the reader reproduces, and the transmission of thoughts as someone else's speech is an important source of discourse [9, p. 4].

So, dialogue is a common form of the main part of the interview text. The communicative unit of dialogue is a replica. The boundaries of the replica are determined by changing the communicative roles of the interlocutors.

For a linguistic description of the interaction of communicators in a dialogue, it is necessary to select a basic unit that would reflect the communicative activity of all participants of communication at a certain minimum segment of communication. Such a minimal unit is a minimal dialogue unit (minimal dialogue). A minimal dialogue unit is a sequence of replicas of two dialogue participants - the addressee and the addressee, which is characterized by certain features:

- 1) all lines of a minimal dialogue unit are linked by a single topic;
- 2) a minimal dialogue unit begins with an absolutely independent and ends with an absolutely dependent speech act;
- 3) within this sequence of lines, all illocutionary relations are closed;
- 4) in the middle of a given sequence of replicas there is no sequence different from it that would satisfy the conditions (1) – (3).

Illocutionally dependent and illocutionally independent speech acts are speech acts that are connected in a certain speech context by illocutionary relations. The term "illocutive relations" (illocutive forcing) explains the relationship between replicas: it is believed that one replica (or a speech act corresponding to it) illocutionarily causes another (or another speech act). So, an illocutionary independent speech act (at a certain segment of the dialogue) is a speech act whose illocutionary purpose at a certain step is determined exclusively by the intentions of the speaker himself, and an illocutionally dependent speech act (at a certain segment of the dialogue) is a speech act whose illocutionary purpose is completely determined illocutionary purpose of some previous line (from this speech segment).

Relations operating in the space of speech acts are formed not only under the influence of the illocutionary function of speech utterances, but also under the influence of the general laws of dialogue. The latter, in particular, include conversational maxims and the principle of politeness [4].

A speech act is considered illocutionary, completely independent, if there is no such replica in the dialogue that would cause it. Such a speech act is in an illocutionary-strong position. A speech act is considered illocutionary absolutely dependent, if there is no such replica in the dialogue that it would illocutionally cause. As a rule, illocutionary absolutely dependent speech acts are the respondent's lines. The reactive replica is in an illocutionary-weak position, since, first of all, the respondent's replicas are focused on the previous speech act. Let's consider examples of minimal dialogues in dialogic interview texts of the modern English-language press:

NW: *Okay, the first question is easy: Is your real name Roberta?*

BB: *No. It's really Bobbi (Woman Alive 05.2022).*

The initial line is a question and is an illocutionary completely independent speech act: there is no such line in the dialogue that it would cause. The appearance of this question is caused only by the internal intentions of the interviewer. The second cue is caused by the previous one and is an illocutionary absolutely dependent speech act, since there is no such cue in the dialogue that it would cause.

Here is an example of a minimal dialogue with more lines:

NW: *We heard you're having a baby. [Brown and her husband, lawyer and real estate developer Steven Plofker, already have two sons, Dylan, 8, and Dakota, 5.]*

BB: *Yes, my third.*

NW: *Congratulations. Do you know if it's a girl or a boy?*

BB: *It's a boy (Woman Alive 06.2022).*

In the given example, the first replica is illocutionary and completely independent. The response of the respondent Yes, my third is illocutionary dependent on the previous one. Otherwise, the illocutionary relation would be open-ended. The first speech act of the interviewer's next line, *Congratulations*, is an illocutionary absolutely dependent speech act, since there is no such line in the dialogue that it would cause. It is not related to other lines in the dialogue by illocutionary relations. Regarding the second speech act of this line *Do you know if it's a girl or a boy?* - then in the illocutionary sense it is independent: the interviewer was free to choose any type of speech act. Thus, it is an illocutionary completely independent speech act that causes the interlocutor's response and starts the next minimal dialogue unit.

Within the replica of a minimal dialogue, speech acts can also be connected illocutionally (illocutive self-imposed), for example:

“...Writing about the past?”

Yes, know why? Because novelty is coming so quickly these days that only a younger person is able to swallow and digest it, while an older is slower in doing that. Why? An older person has a lot of experience, knows a lot of things and can very well work on more established problems than the young people who do not know enough to do that.

“Well, no, they don't have enough insight of course...”

(Woman Alive 07.2022).

In the presented minimal dialogue, the interviewer's cue (an illocutionary independent speech act) elicits the respondent's response *Yes, know why?*, which is an illocutionary dependent speech act. The next speech act is illocutionally related to the previous one, as it is illocutionally dependent on it.

– *Because novelty is coming so quickly these days that only a younger person is able to swallow and digest it, while an older is slower in doing that. Why?* In turn, the above speech act causes another speech act of the respondent. *An older person has a lot of experience, knows a lot of things and can very well work on more established problems than the young people who do not know enough to do that.* Therefore, in this minimal dialogue, all the speech acts of the respondent are illocutionarily linked within the lines of the speech.

Illocutionary relations do not depend on a specific type of dialogic text, which allows defining the boundaries of minimal dialogic units and describing their internal structure. For this purpose, markers of the beginning and end of minimal dialogue units are highlighted. Markers are linguistic units that perform structuring and organizing functions [5, p. 246], that is, they indicate the type of connection of the marked statement with the immediate context [7, p. 1168], and are characterized by syntactic non-integration into sentences [1, p. 889]. Markers of the beginning and end of minimal dialogue units were studied in various texts.

In the interview texts, markers for the beginning and end of minimal dialogue units are highlighted. **Etiquette greetings** belong to the beginning markers of minimal dialogue units. It should be noted that etiquette greetings do not often occur in this type of text, which is explained by the secondary (derived) nature of the interview text. When transitioning from oral discourse to writing, this text loses a number of characteristics of an oral text, including etiquette greetings. In the case when the interview text contains etiquette greetings, this indicates the intention of the author to provide additional information about the respondent, for example:

Speaker 1: *Well, he's sounding the alarm again this morning. His new book *How to Prevent the Next Pandemic* is out today. It's also been a year of upheaval in his own life after he and Melinda, his wife of 27 years, announced their divorce one year ago today. So, Bill, we have so much to catch up on. It's good to see you. Good morning.*

Bill Gates: Good to see you. (Rev 05.2022).

In this example, the interviewer's cue includes an etiquette greeting that should create the effect of presence. The respondent's reply (an illocutionary absolutely dependent speech act) characterizes the respondent as a witty person. An etiquette greeting is a marker for the beginning of a minimal dialogue. Let's consider another example:

Q: Bonjour, Gérard Depardieu.

A: Bonjour. Bonjour (Woman Alive 06.2022).

In the above example, the etiquette greeting carries additional information about the interlocutor, namely: it indicates the nationality of the respondent and creates the effect of presence.

The analysis of the material allows us to conclude that the marker of the beginning of a minimal dialogue is **an address**, for example:

Time: *Chancellor, a lot of people are dissatisfied with reunification, especially in the former East German federal states, where unemployment is high. Why is that?*

Schröder: *There are psychological reasons for this feeling of discontent*

(Woman Alive 04.2022).

It should be noted that both the address and the etiquette greeting usually mark the beginning of the first minimal dialogue unit of the interview text. Exceptions are interviews with several respondents, for example:

Lorna, Susan, what are your backgrounds?

Lorna: *Clothing design. I started when Susan was still in high school. Then we became partners, and she went on to design her own line. I think that's one of the reasons the magazine is so visually appealing* (Woman Alive 02.2022).

This is an example of an interview text with three interviewees and some minimal dialogues in it have an address marker.

Expressions that introduce a new topic of conversation and indicate the previous statements of the respondent (*recently, you said, you have said that, you stated, you were quoted, you have described, you say, etc.*) or other the source of information concerning the respondent (*much has been said about, it's said, you are sometimes called, you are regularly described as, you have a reputation for, there has been a lot of talk/ mean gossip/ reports/ a joke going around that, critics/ some people say etc.*), for example:

Critics say you have a tendency to say yes to everyone: the military, farmers, civil servants, business. Can you be decisive?

I was the army's commanding general, so I'm clearly not soft or a yes man. When I have to decide, I will. The military, for example, needs submarines and a military satellite system. I tell them, yes, but that they will have to wait. We have to consider the Thai economy first. Everyone, even the military, will have to tighten their belts so we can regain financial credibility (Woman Alive 03.2022).

This example is a minimal dialogue that contains an expression that introduces a new topic of conversation and indicates a source of information about the respondent (critics say). The analysis of the studied material shows that such a marker of the beginning of a minimal dialogue is widespread in the interview text. This is due to the interviewer's intention to maintain a positive self-presentation by shifting responsibility for negative information about the respondent to another source. Let's consider another example:

DA: *You mentioned the PDP-10 as a computer that was important to you. In what ways do you think working with that particular machine set you up for the kind of developments that you did later?*

BG: *DEC always named their computers PDP, Programmable Data Processor. It is actually funny, because they kind of skip numbers. PDP-1 was their first. And it is kind of strange, I did a lot of work on the PDP-1, but not until I got to Harvard, late in my career. They had so few computers there, a couple of really decrepit PDP-1s hanging around were the best graphics display machines. Anyway, the PDP-10 which whose predecessor was the PDP-6 very similar and and later called the PDP-20 or DEC 20, and was, in a sense, the first time-sharing system. It was written, well, it was the first...I don't know how they said that? It was DEC's first time-sharing system, in any case. And it was a very good time-sharing system. That means that you could have lots of people working at the same time sharing the storages and the CPU. (Bill Gates Interview <https://americanhistory.si.edu/comphist/gates.htm#tc1>).*

The above minimal dialogue contains an expression that indicates the respondent's own words (*You mentioned*) and introduces a new topic of conversation.

The minimal dialogue beginning markers also include expressions for summarizing what was said or for returning to what was said (*still, how-ever, so, are you saying, I understand that, you are talking about, etc.*). Markers of this type are a signal of a discourse border and the transition of the conversation to another thematic channel - "reintroduction of the topic" [10, p. 91; 3, p. 1328], for example:

David Muir: *I know you have told Palestinian civilians to move to the south. We know that there have been strikes in the South as well. We should just point that out. When you talk about the tactics used by Hamas, the world is aware of those tactics. Are you taking that into account because when you start to see numbers that are difficult to wrap your head around, 10,000 Palestinian civilians, is there a more targeted approach in going after Hamas being explored here to try to minimize the number of Palestinian civilians who are not Hamas, who are not militants, who've lost their lives here?*

Benjamin Netanyahu: *The answer is yes. First of all, I wouldn't take those numbers at face value. I think we have to check them and there are quite a few, several thousand Palestinian combatants there that is Hamas terrorists that are incorporated in those numbers. It's a very tough enemy, but we can't let them have immunity. If we let them have immunity, David, then barbarians win. (Rev 11.2023).*

The marker for the beginning of a minimal dialogue is an expression that should return the respondent to what was said (*you have told*).

Interviewer: *So, you mentioned 'Quora' as your hobby. What is it? A musical instrument?*

Me: *No Sir, it is actually a very popular question-answer site which connects people to people. People can ask the questions as well as answer them.*

Interviewer: *Nice! So, what type of questions?*

Me: *Any type of questions. From childhood, parenting to competitive exams to cracking interviews to world politics. It covers all domains and if not, you can create that domain by asking that type of questions. (Quora 11.2023).*

The expression that sums up what has been said (*So*) is the marker of the beginning of this minimal dialogue.

The study of the material showed that the end of the minimal dialogue, as a rule, is not marked - except for expressions of **agreement** or **disagreement**. If the interviewer's illocutionary claims are satisfied, he moves on to another topic and starts a new minimal dialogue. The markers for the end of a minimal dialogue include the following expressions of agreement or confirmation: *right, yes, absolutely, I'm sure etc.* [8, p. 126–127]; and expressions of disagreement: *no, not in the slightest, наприклад:*

Judy Woodruff: *And are you sharing your view with members of Congress as they face some of these votes in the weeks to come?*

Bill Gates: *Absolutely. I've actually got two topics that I've been in lots of discussions with members of Congress on. One is funding work to avoid having another pandemic. What is the research and things we need to do there? And the President's science advisor, Eric Lander put forward a plan that we worked with him on that's very good there, but it needs to be funded. And then these climate issues, which now is the time to get serious about those things and tap into US innovation power. (Rev 09.2021).*

In the example above, the *Absolutely* confirmation expression marks the end of the minimal dialog. The interviewer's next speech act *I've actually got two topics...* starts a new minimal dialogue unit. Let's consider other examples:

Interviewer: *The oil companies, are you saying that for years, the government relied on them to supply their own data and the consequences?*

Gavin Newsom: *No. They funded science, they funded research with precision and accuracy... (Rev 09.2023).*

– Does public recognition make it more difficult for you to write to your standards?

– *Not in the slightest* (Woman Alive 06.2022).

The expressions of disagreement *No*; *Not in the slightest* are the markers for the end of a minimal dialogue.

Conclusion.

So, the dialogical text-interview is a system of minimal dialogic units that create a static illocutionary structure of the dialog. Within the minimal dialogue units, the replicas of the communicators are connected by illocutionary relations. The universal nature of these connections (their independence from individual dialogue texts) allows us to highlight the limits of minimal dialogues.

Certain linguistic expressions in the text serve as indicators of the limits of the minimal dialogue unit (its beginning and end). Etiquette greetings are among the beginning markers of a minimal dialogue unit; appeal; sentences that introduce a new topic of conversation (indicate the source of information or the respondent's own words); expressions to summarize what was said or to return to what was said. Expressions of agreement and disagreement are markers of the end of a minimal dialogue unit.

Thus, minimal dialogues with a monoact utterance in the initial speech turn are those in which the interviewer uses a prompt to ask a specific, general, or alternative question. A quesitive is a dominant speech act in an interviewer's course if it includes several speech acts. The reader receives additional information from the statements that are part of such speech flow.

The acquired study findings can be applied to additional investigations into the pragmatic, semantic, and structural characteristics of texts of different kinds.

References

1. Caffi, C. (1999). On mitigation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31 (7). 881-909.
2. Kholod, O. M. (2012). *Osnovy telezhurnalistyky [Basics of telejournalism]*. Kyiv: KМУ. [in Ukrainian].
3. Kyratzis, A., Ervin-Tripp, S. (1999). The development of discourse markers in peer interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31 (10). 1321-1338.
4. Leech, J. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Lenk, U. (1998). Discourse markers and global coherence in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30 (2). 245-257.
6. *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu zhurnalistyky [Scientific notes of the Institute of Journalism]*. (2019). 2 (75). Kyiv. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.17721/2522-1272> [in Ukrainian].
7. Redeker, G. (1991). Linguistic markers of discourse structure. *Linguistics*, 29 (10). 1139-1172.
8. Rudyk, I. M. (1998). Movlenniivi kharakterystyky katehorii pidtverdzhennia ta zaperechennia [Speech characteristics of the categories of confirmation and denial]. *Bulletin of Kyiv State University of Linguistics*, 1 (1). 126-130. [in Ukrainian].
9. Tannen, D. (1992). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
10. Zasekin, S. V. (2001). Dyskursyvni markery koherentnosti anhlovnoho dialohichnoho tekstu: kohnityvnyi ta prahmatychnyi aspekty [Discursive markers of coherence of an English dialogic text: cognitive and pragmatic aspects]. *Candidate's thesis*. Lutsk: Lutsk state University [in Ukrainian].

Гуменюк І. І.

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри іноземних мов,

Заклад вищої освіти «Подільський державний університет»

Кам'янець-Подільський, Україна

E-mail: irynahumenyuk79@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-7905-9771

ІЛОКУТИВНА БУДОВА ОСНОВНОЇ ЧАСТИНИ ДІАЛОГІЧНИХ ТЕКСТІВ ІНТЕРВ'Ю

Анотація

Розгляд текстів-інтерв'ю з точки зору структури, семантики та прагматики є актуальним, оскільки це дозволяє з'ясувати особливості вторинного та гібридного утворення. З погляду загальної теорії тексту дуже важливо розробити модель прототипу тексту-інтерв'ю, яка використовується в сучасній англомовній пресі. Метою даного дослідження є дослідження прототипної моделі тексту-інтерв'ю, щоб визначити дискурсивні, структурні, семантичні та прагматичні аспекти тексту-інтерв'ю в сучасній англомовній пресі. У статті розглядається ілокутивна структура основної частини текстів-інтерв'ю. Система мінімальних діалогів є ілокутивною структурою діалогічного тексту-інтерв'ю. Репліки пов'язуються ілокутивними відносинами в межах мінімального діалогу. Універсальність ілокутивних відносин дозволяє визначити межі та маркери початку та кінця мінімальних діалогів. Текстові інтерв'ю використовуються респондентами для отримання інформації та визначення свого ставлення до повідомлення інтерв'юера. Стратегії, які використовують респонденти, можуть бути конфліктними або неконфліктними. Методи інформування включають пряму відповідь на запитання, випереджувальну відповідь, демонстрацію власної здатності вести бесіду, вказівки на недоречність запитання, посилання на те, що інтерв'юер знає відповідь на його запитання, неповну відповідь, загальну відповідь, зустрічне запитання та ігнорування змісту запитання.

Ключові слова: загальна теорія текстів, ілокутивні відносини, текст-інтерв'ю, система мінімальних діалогів.

Список використаних джерел

1. Caffi, C. (1999). On mitigation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31 (7). 881-909.
2. Холод, О. М. (2012). *Основи тележурналістики*. Київ: КМУ.
3. Kyratzis, A., Ervin-Tripp, S. (1999). The development of discourse markers in peer interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31 (10). 1321-1338.
4. Leech, J. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Lenk, U. (1998). Discourse markers and global coherence in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30 (2). 245-257.
6. *Наукові записки Інституту журналістики*. (2019). 2 (75). Київ. Режим доступу: <https://doi.org/10.17721/2522-1272>
7. Redeker, G. (1991). Linguistic markers of discourse structure. *Linguistics*, 29 (10). 1139-1172.
8. Рудик, І. М. (1998). Мовленнєві характеристики категорії підтвердження та заперечення. *Збірник праць Київського державного лінгвістичного університету*, 1 (1). 126-130.
9. Tannen, D. (1992). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
10. Засєкін, С. В. (2001). Дискурсивні маркери когерентності англomовного діалогічного тексту: когнітивний та прагматичний аспекти. *Автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук*. Луцьк: Луцький державний університет.