

STUDYING DIALOGUE IN LINGUISTICS:

MAIN ASPECTS

Vita Radkevych

*Institute of Foreign Philology, Zhytomyr State University named after Ivan
Franko,*

Velyka Berdychivska Str., 40

Zhytomyr, Ukraine, 10008

Tel. / fax: +380 412 43-14-17

e-mail: patu1@rambler.ru

Abstract. The problem of dialogue and its communicative units is studied in many branches of Linguistics, including Pragmatics and Speech-act theory. The author cites different definitions of the notion «dialogue» in Linguistics. The problem of the number of participants in dialogue is studied. Dialogue is viewed as a form of active communicative interaction between two or more people, the result of which is the emergence of a specific discourse. One of the participants may be of integrated, polymodal nature, that is be represented by a group. Discourse is defined as text together with extra - pragmatic, cultural and other factors; text taken in respect of events occurring. The article aims at summing up the main modern Linguistics aspects as for features, functions, structure and types of dialogues. Classificational characteristics of dialogical discourses are systematized. The author summarizes different approaches to dialogical discourses classification by Ukrainian and foreign linguists. Division of dialogical discourses on communicative and pragmatic, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, thematic, modal and communicative features is suggested. Dialogical discourse characteristics

prove its role of a dominant form of verbal communication and one of the most significant forms of language functioning.

Keywords: dialogue; discourse; communication; producent; addressee; conversational turn; sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, communicative-and-pragmatic, thematic features.

Introduction

Topicality of English dialogical discourses study by Ukrainian and foreign linguists is determined by the universality of dialogical speech and general orientation of modern linguistic schools on integration of traditional and advanced approaches to the study of different types of discourse.

The majority of linguistic terminology dictionaries define «dialogue» or «dialogical speech» as situation-and-compositional speech form when a speaker (producent) and a listener (addressee) are in a direct verbal contact, the very communicative process is an active speech interaction: producent`s utterances (conversational turns) interchange with addressee`s utterances (conversational turns) (Rusanivskyj, Taranenko, 2000, S. 139-140; Ahmanova, 1966; Jarceva,1990, S. 136-137).

The narrow view on a dialogue is concerned with direct speech communication of two or more persons which depends on various extralinguistic factors: the form of oral speech, the conversation between two or more persons; kind of speech which is characterized by situationality (depending on conversation conditions), contextuality (dependence on preceding uttering), spontaneity, poor organization (unplanned nature); functional kind of language realized in the process of direct communication between interlocutors and consisting of sequential interchange of stimulating and reacting utterances (conversational turns); in a broad sense the utterance is viewed as a response in the form of an action, a gesture or silence (Ljubashyna, 2006, S.146-147; Pochepcov, 2000).

In the study of a dialogue the number of participants is a matter of dispute. In this respect we share the view of I.P. Susov who is not inclined to use the term "polylogue". Firstly, in the word *dialogue*, the component *dia-* does not mean "two" or "dual", rather reciprocity of actions, the exchange of the acts of speaking are emphasized. Secondly, the participation in a dialogue of more than two speakers under normal conditions provides division of a communicative event into fragments which follow one another, in each of them one of the participants acts as a producent and the rest as a collective addressee. After I.P. Susov *dialogue* is the main, primary form of verbal communication where there is a change of communicative roles and speech moves; and the minimum integral formation is an adjacency pair (greeting - greeting act in response, invitations - acceptance or refusal to accept it, and so on. One of the moves may be non-verbal (a request to pass a book may be followed by a silent action of gesture) (Susov, 2009, S. 64).

At a present stage of linguistic`s development several conversational turns in human interaction with a computer are also called a dialogue. A dialogue is also human communication via mobile phone (distant dialogue) where we can use SMS. Such dialogues are opposed to belles-lettres dialogues as in computer and SMS-dialogues communicants use a large number of incorrectly formed words (to save time and place of writing). This contradicts the norms of a literary language, besides these dialogues lack certain language norms (Romanjuk, 2007, S. 139).

One of the primary goals of our research work is the presentation of communicative and pragmatic factors of a dialogue in the aspect of its initiation. The issues mentioned above are surveyed by Discourse Linguistics. Consequently fulfillment of the **main goal** of the given paper involves the study of discursive characteristics of dialogue.

The method used is analysis of the literature in question and the synthesis of the data obtained, which serve the grounds of the classification suggested.

Overview

Following numerous researchers we understand discourse as "coherent text together with extralinguistic - pragmatic, sociocultural and other factors; text taken in respect of events occurring; speech seen as a deliberate social action, as a component involved in the interaction between people and mechanisms of consciousness (cognitive processes). Discourse is speech, "immersed in life" (Kolokolceva, 2001, S. 24; Jarceva, 1990, S. 136-137).

Nowadays a number of dialogical discourse investigations is known. We understand dialogical discourse as a cooperative communication between two or more individuals, including (except speech process) a set of extralinguistic features that provide an adequate understanding of the message (Orjehova, 2000, S.144).

Let's review the classification and typology of dialogical discourses proposed by linguists on the basis of *sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, communicative-and-pragmatic* and *thematic features*. In 1901 T.Hard proposed sociological typology of dialogical discourses. He proposed to distinguish "1) *a dialogue between a subordinate and a supervisor* as opposed to *a dialogue of equals*; 2) *a dialogue as a struggle* and *a dialogue as an exchange*; 3) *a dialogue regulated (e.g, ceremonial)* versus *unregulated*. The types of dialogues were distinguished according to social parameters, modes of interaction and degree of officiality (Kolokolceva, 2001, S. 25).

A.K. Solovyova distinguishes types of dialogues taking into consideration the peculiarities of partners' psychological interaction, and the correlation between logical and expressive factors. The classification includes the following dialogical discourses: *dialogue-dispute; dialogue-confidential explanation; dialogue-emotional conflict (quarrel); dialogue-unison* (Kolokolceva, 2001, S. 26; Soloveva, 1965, S.103-110).

For N.D. Arutyunova in classification of dialogical discourses the main category is of communicative orientation. According to the main communicative goals the following types of dialogical discourse are distinguished: 1) *make-know discourse*); 2) *make-do discourse*; 3) *make-believe discourse*; 4) *interpersonal-relations discourse*; 5) *fatic discourses*: a) *emotional dialogue*, b) *artistic dialogue*, c) *intellectual dialogue* (Arutjunova, 1992, S. 52-53).

S.O. Sukhyh suggests a communicative-and-pragmatic classification of dialogical discourses based on communicants` macro-intentions. He identifies four main types of a dialogue: 1) *affiliative* (with expressive macro-intention); 2) *dialogue-interview* (with heuristic macro-intention); 3) *interpretative* (with coordinative macro-intention); 4) *instrumental* (with regulatory macro-intention) (Kolokolceva, 2001, S. 27; Suhih, 1998, S.14-15).

Y.V. Rozhdestvenskyi in "Theory of Rhetoric" classifies dialogical discourses according to the degree of development intensity, aim, communicative turns correlation and (most thoroughly) according to the subject of discussion. According to the latter sign *family dialogue* is opposed to *imperious dialogue* (including *state dialogue*). *Imperious dialogue* in its turn is divided into *military, diplomatic, exploratory, investigative and judicial, financial, administrative, educational, academic (informative), business and ritual ones* (Rozhdestvenskij, 1997, S. 383-387; 440-443).

T.N. Kolokoltseva suggests a systematic classification of dialogical discourses belonging to different functional areas.

- According to *peculiarities of creation*: *primary* (natural) and *secondary* (reproduced with belles-lettres or other means).
- According to the *form of realization*: *oral and written*.
- According to the *type of communication*: *private dialogues* (colloquial, professional, scientific, business spheres) are opposed to *public dialogues* (sphere of mass communication: dialogues in press, on radio, on TV).

- Taking into consideration the parameter *officiality/informality* dialogical discourses are divided into *formal* and *informal*.
- According to *goal-orientation* dialogues can be *single-purpose* (calls in Call Center) and *multipurpose* (most discourses).
- According to *subject under discussion: monothematic* (fixed subject) and *polythematic* (thematically unlimited) dialogues are opposed.
- According to the *peculiarities of participants` communicative interaction* dialogues are divided into *harmonious/cooperative/dialogues-unisons* (abundance by rules of effective verbal interaction) and *inharmonious/dialogues- dissonances* (violating the rules of effective verbal interaction) (Kolokolceva, 2001, S. 28-29).

In accordance with the *structural-and-communicative composition* V.V.Buzarov distinguishes two functional-and-semantic types of dialogue: 1) *question-response* dialogue and 2) *non-question – response* dialogue with the subdivision into a) *motivation-response* dialogue and b) *narrative-response* dialogue (Buzarov, 1988, S. 15). T.O. Zaitseva adds to this classification another type of dialogue – *emotion-response* dialogue (Zajceva, 1998, S. 26). M. Buber distinguishes three types of dialogue: *true* dialogue, *technical* dialogue and *dialogue-monologue* (Kononova, 2011).

Several approaches to classification of dialogues are distinguished: *functional*, *modal-didactic* and *activity approaches*. In the functional approach, the criterion of classification is the nature of dialogue and its external form. Within this approach the following dialogues are distinguished: dialogue-interrogation, dialogue-conversation, dialogue-dispute, dialogue-controversy (M. Borodulina, M. Demjanenko, K. Lazarenko, S.Kysla).

Within *modal-didactic approach* they distinguish: *dialogue-interrogation*, *dialogue-ascertainment*, *dialogue-specification*, *dialogue-polemic*, *dialogue-unison* (N. Arutyunova. A. Balayan).

Within *activity approach* the following dialogues are distinguished: *dialogue-explanation, dialogue-agreement, dialogue-emotional experience, dialogue-dispute, situationally conditioned dialogue, conversation-impressions exchange, conversation-dispute* (T.Saharova, A.Holodovych).

Dialogues are distinguished:

- ✓ *in terms of preparedness degree*: completely prepared, learned by heart dialogue; partially transformed and personal dialogues;
- ✓ *in terms of purposefulness*: purposive and purposeless dialogues;
- ✓ *in terms of participants number*: double and group dialogues (P.Gurvich, S. Shatilov) (Ljubashyna, 2006, S.148-149; Bahtin, 1986, S. 355-380; Pochepcov, 2000).

N.D. Arutyunova notes that in real speech "the speech genres named are rarely presented in a pure form" (Arutjunova, 1992, S. 52-53). S.O. Sukhyh notes that in one dialogue "several multipurposes can be realized". In this case we are dealing with a complex dialogical discourse "(Suhih, 1998,15).

We propose a generalized classification of dialogical discourses based on their communicative-and-pragmatic, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, thematic, modal and communicative features.

Communicative–and-pragmatic features:

- informative dialogue;
- prescriptive dialogue;
- exchange of views in order to make a decision or clarify the truth;
- dialogue aimed at establishing or regulating interpersonal relationships;
- fatic discourse;
- emotional dialogue;
- artistic dialogue;
- intellectual dialogue;
- dialogue-interview;

- single-purpose dialogue.

Sociolinguistic features:

- dialogue of equals;
- dialogue between a subordinate and a supervisor;
- regulated dialogue (e.g, ceremonial).

Psycholinguistic features:

- dialogue-dispute (dissonant);
- dialogue-confidential explanation;
- dialogue-emotional conflict (quarrel);
- dialogue-monologue (self-expression).

Thematic features:

- monothematic dialogue;
- polythematic dialogue;
- family dialogue;
- imperious dialogue (including state dialogue): military, diplomatic, exploratory, investigative and judicial, financial, administrative, educational, academic (informative), business and ritual dialogues.

Modal-and-communicative composition:

- question-response dialogue;
- non-question – response dialogue: motivation-response dialogue, narrative-response dialogue emotion-response dialogue.

Conclusion

The suggested generalized classification of dialogical discourses based on their communicative-and-pragmatic, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, thematic, modal and communicative features allows us to conclude that communicative-and-pragmatic features of dialogical discourse are characterized by the highest frequency. Consequently further study perspective is studying the rules of verbal interaction in a dialogue, explicit and implicit purposes of utterances, verbal tactics

and types of verbal behavior. Pragmatic presuppositions, utterance impact on a recipient, types of verbal response on received stimulus, the impact of speech situation on topics and forms of communication are especially worth studying.

References:

Ahmanova, O. (1966) *Slovar lingvisticheskikh terminov*. Moskva: Sovetskaja enciklopedija.

Arutjunova, N. (1992) Dialogicheskaja modalnost i javlenie citacii. *Chelovecheskij faktor v jazyke. Kommunikacija, modalnost, dejksis* (Glava 3) S. 52 -79.

Bahtin, M. (1986) Iz zapisej 1970-1971. *Estetika slovesnogo tvorcestva*, S. 355.

Buzarov, V. (1988) *Nekotorye aspekty vzaimodejstvija gramatiki govorjashhego i gramatiki slushajushhego v anglijskoj dialogicheskoj rechi* . Pjatigorsk

Zajceva, T. (1998) *Iniciirujushhie kommunikativnye hody v anglijskoj dialogicheskoj rechi*: dis. ... Kandidata filol. nauk: 10.02.04 - germanske jazyki. Cherepovec.

Kolokolceva, T. (2001) *Specificheskie kommunikativnye edinicy dialogicheskoj rechi*, Volgograd: Izdatelstvo Volgogradskogo universiteta.

Kononova, O. (2011) Dialog jak vyrishennja problemy samotnosti. *Filosofski vymiry suchasnoi socialnoi realnosti*, (2) 249s.

Ljubashyna, V. (2006) Dialogichne movlennja jak lingvodydaktychna problema. *Rozvytok osvity v umovah polietnichnogo regionu: Materialy vseukrainskoi naukovopraktychnoi konferencii, 26-28 kvitnja 2006 r.*, (2) 216s.

Orjehova, L. (2000) Do pytannja pro dialog. *Naukovyj visnyk pivdenoukrainskogo derzhavnogo pedagogichnogo universytetu im. K.D. Ushynskogo*, (9-10) S.144.

- Pochepcov, G. (2000). *Kommunikativnye tehnologi XX veka*. Moskva: Refl-buk.
- Romanjuk, I. (2007) Dialog jak tekstova organizacija. *Lingvistychni doslidzhennja: Zbirnyk naukovyh prac*, (22) 196 s.
- Rozhdestvenskij, J. (1997) *Teorija ritoriki*. Moskva.
- Rusanivskyj, V., Taranenko, O.(2000) *Ukrainska mova. Encyklopedija* . Kyiv: Ukrainska encyklopedija.
- Soloveva, A. (1965) O nekotoryh obshhij voprosah dialoga. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, (6) S. 103-110.
- Suhij, S. (1998) *Pragmalingvisticheskoe izmerenie kommunikativnogo processa: Avtoref. dis. na soiskanie uchenoj stepeni d-ra filol. nauk*. Krasnodar.
- Jarceva, V. (1990) *Lingvisticheskij enciklopedicheskij slovar*. Moskva: Sovetskaja encyklopedija.

