

УДК 811.112

COGNITIVE-CONCEPTUAL PROPERTIES OF DIALOGUE IN THEIR FORMAL-CONVERSATIONAL AND PRAGMATIC MANIFESTATIONS

N.K. Kravchenko (Kiev, Ukraine)

N.K. Kravchenko. Cognitive-conceptual properties of dialogue in their formal-conversational and pragmatic manifestations. The article views the dialogue as a compound conceptual space based on the interactants' cognitive contexts as key sources of Dialogue's comprehensive intertextuality. Typology of concepts constructing dialogic conceptual space include categorical identity concepts, operative identity concepts, interactive concepts, concepts-ideas, a genre concept, and social-semiotic concepts. Concepts are manifested or marked by formal-conversational and pragmatic means. There seem to be some regular correspondences between concepts' types and their indexing formal and pragmatic properties of the dialogue.

Keywords: concepts, conceptual space, cognitive contexts, dialogue, intertextuality, formal-conversational, pragmatic.

Н.К. Кравченко. Когнітивно-концептуальні особливості діалогу в формально-конверсаційних і прагматичних виявах. В статті діалог усвідомлюється як багатосаровий концептуальний простір, пов'язаний з когнітивними контекстами інтерактантів як основними джерелами всеосяжної інтертекстуальності діалогу. Типологія концептів, що конструюють концептуальний простір діалогу, включає концепти категорійної ідентичності, концепти оперативної ідентичності, інтерактивні концепти, концепти-ідеї, жанровий концепт, соціосеміотичні концепти. Концепти виражаються або маркуються формально-конверсаційними і прагматичними засобами. Існують певні регулярні відповідності між концептуальними типами і формальними й прагматичними характеристиками діалогу, що індексують такі типи.

Ключові слова: діалог, інтертекстуальність, когнітивні контексти, концепти, концептуальний простір, прагматичний, формально-конверсаційний.

Н.К. Кравченко. Когнитивно-концептуальные особенности диалога в формально-конверсационных и прагматических проявлениях. В статье диалог понимается как многоуровневое концептуальное пространство, связанное с когнитивными контекстами интерактантов как основными источниками всеобъемлющей интертекстуальности диалога. Типология концептов, конструирующих концептуальное пространство диалога, включает: концепты категориальной идентичности, концепты оперативной идентичности, интерактивные концепты, концепты-идеи, жанровый концепт, социосемiotические концепты. Концепты выражаются или маркируются формально-конверсационными и прагматическими средствами. Представляется возможным говорить о некоторых регулярных соответствиях между концептуальными типами и формальными и прагматическими характеристиками диалога, индексирующими такие типы.

Ключевые слова: диалог, интертекстуальность, когнитивные контексты, концепты, концептуальное пространство, прагматический, формально-конверсационный.

1. Introduction

The choice of the research subject of the article bases on the idea of discourse as a multidimensional phenomenon incorporating interrelated communicative-situational,

formal-structural, textual, interactive, cognitive-conceptual, social-semiotic and intertextual levels [Van Dijk 2008; Kravchenko 2012, 2015] of its manifestation. Levels form hierarchical relationship, confirming the structural quality of discourse. Cognitive and conceptual properties determine the discourse “pragmatics”: speaker’s cognitive contexts shape his / her intention to convey some concepts while the addressee’s cognitive background determines his / her wish and possibilities to infer what the speaker intends to communicate. Pragmatics in its turn, directs the textual reference, i.e. a relatedness of the texts’ “reality” to the real situations, events, objects or “possible worlds”. Finally, the real or simulated referent is encoded by verbal, local formal-conversational and pragmatic means.

Applying “top to bottom” analysis the article will focus on the cognitive-conceptual properties of the dialogue and their implementation by certain formal and pragmatic parameters while paying particular attention to the question of correspondence between above parameters and identified concepts’ types.

2. Conceptual structure of the dialogue

We view any dialogue as a compound conceptual space associated with the participants’ cognitive contexts as the main sources of its intertextuality. The groups of conversational concepts include categorical identity concepts, operative identity concepts, interactive concepts, concepts-ideas, a genre concept, and social-semiotic concepts [Kravchenko 2015a: 135–141].

In order to reveal conversational concepts and their multilevel markers we have analyzed a dialogic extract from the novel “Herzog” by Saul Bellow.

A1: *Perhaps, you feel a natural superiority because of your education.*

B1: *Education! But I don’t know anything...*

A2: *Your accomplishments. You’re in Who’s Who. I’m only a merchant – a petit-bourgeois type.*

B2: *You don’t really believe this, Ramona.*

A3: *Then why do you keep aloof, and make me chase you? I realize you want to play the field. After great disappointment, I’ve done it myself, for ego-reinforcement.*

B3: *A high-minded intellectual ninny, square...*

A4: *Who?*

B4: *Myself, I mean* [Bellow 1970: 187].

2.1. Categorical and operative identity concepts

Based on the theories of identities [Antaki 1998; Benwell, Stokoe 2006; Brockmeier, Carbaugh 2001; Hausendorf 2002: 173–179], positioning [Davies, Harré 1990: 43-63; Linehan, McCarthy 2000: 435-453; McLean, Pasupathi, Pals 2007: 262–278; Swan, Linehan 2001: 403–427; Wetherell 1998: 387–412] and communicative roles [Sacks 1992; Schegloff, 1996: 3-38; Zurcher 1983] we view the dialogue participants’ identities as the parametrized cognitive structures composed of relatively invariant (individual and collective) and variable (interactionally bound) components. The former (“*categorical identity concepts*”) pertain to identity self-identification and self-representation determining relatively regular patterns of its communicative behavior and therefore its categorization by others. The latter (*operative identity concepts*) are relevant for the positional roles performance and local interaction needs. However, such performance is also based on the relatively invariant cognitive structures including

(a) The aforementioned categorical concepts generalizing immanent personality characteristics;

(b) the universal, ethno-specific or institutional intertextual macro scenarios (“Sacrifice”, “Macho”, “Cinderella”, “Official”, “Superior”, “Subordinate”, “Nanny”);

(c) patterns of previous dialogic practices to meet the socio-communicative expectations of others (distribution into identity categories [Sacks 1992] with conventional communicative actions, common role pairs and agreed communicative scenarios, i.e. of “lovers”, “friends”, “relatives”, “colleagues”, etc.).

The communicative behavior of *A* actuates the concepts of “control”, “planning”, “determination”, “rationality”, “dominancy” revealing the psychological dominant of this participant. The concepts are manifested by (a) conversational relevancy of all *A*’s moves, (b) logical conjunction *then*, (c) a face-saver in Move *A1* introducing a pre-sequence to establish the appropriateness of the dispreferred act of Reproach (in Move *A3*) while clarifying the *B*’s motives as well as (d) side sequences introduced by Moves *A3*, *A4* to highlight the unclear item.

At the pragmatic level *A*’s psychological dominant determines a set of manipulative strategies implemented by corresponding pragmatic means:

(a) Combination of positive and negative politeness strategies with face threatening acts. Positive politeness means include flattery (moves *A1*, *A2*: *Your accomplishments. You’re in Who’s Who*), expressions of sympathy (move *A3*), the creation of «common ground» based on similar negative experience with the communication partner (*After great disappointment, I’ve done it myself, for ego-reinforcement*). At the same time, *A* uses the face threatening acts, i.e. direct question in Move *A3* with negative assessment of the *B*’s behavior and move *A4* as well as negative politeness means: non-preferential marker of “uncertainty» (*perhaps, only*), pre-sequence (move *A1*), mitigation of a face threatening act by the second part of Move *A3*. Move *A1* evades a face threatening act applying an indirect strategy “off record” (an intended unclearness) allowing *B* to infer the necessary information. The same off-record strategy is realized by means of sarcasm in Move *A3*.

(b) Flouting the Maxims of Quality and Quantity of Information (Moves *A1* and *A2*). The speaker *A* does not believe that *B* feels own superiority, but insists on *B*’s exclusiveness by co-referent means (*your education, your accomplishments. You’re in Who’s Who*) in order to make *B* refute such a trivial motive of his behavior and reveal a true one. Furthermore, the speaker *A* does not think of herself as *only a merchant, a petit-bourgeois type*. In particular, the markers of the Quality Maxim flouting include lexical-semantic means, i.e. scientific and bookish words (*ego-reinforcement, natural superiority, a petit-bourgeois type*) used by *A* to prove own erudition and originality. Move *A1* flouts the Maxim of Manner being quite obscure as well as the Maxim of Quantity since *A* has not disclosed an essential part of information about *B*’s feeling “*superiority*” towards her. The implicature expected from *B* is: “I don’t understand your behavior. Help me understand it”.

(c) Applying the strategy of positive self-representation implemented by pragmatic moves of (1) Apparent Concession with own subordinate status (Moves *A1*, *A2*, second part of *A3*); (2) Vagueness including hedging, mitigation, and other impression management means to block a negative impression from the *face threatening acts*, contained in Move *A3*; (3) Apparent Empathy; (4) Evidentiality as a

form of intertextuality to prove the *A*'s statement / belief through references to her personal experience (second part of Move *A3*) as well as (5) Expert opinion (*You're in Who's Who*) and (6) Contrast (*You're in Who's Who. I'm only a merchant*).

(d) Pseudo self-distribution in a “wrong” role category (*a petit-bourgeois type*) as a part of the poly-functional conversational communicative strategy applied by *A* to make *B* (1) refute a pseudo role suggested by *A*, recognizing communicants' equal status; (2) explain his “discriminatory” behavior towards *A*; (3) behave with her as with an equal subject.

Along with rationality *A*'s moves mark her professional status (business affiliation) and female type of communication (manipulative strategy and instructive discourse), with some masculine characteristics, i.e. communicative initiative, direct “face threatening” questions, overlapping (Moves *A2*, *A4*).

The categorical concept of “rational” integrates the operative variables: “shrewd” (Move *A1*, partly – Move *A3*: “*I realize...*”), “intelligent” (Moves *A1-A3*) and “practical” (second part of Move *A3*). Sometimes *A*'s rationality disguises under roles of tolerant and loving woman-friend for achieving rational goals. The “masking” devices are pragmatic moves of Apparent Concession and Apparent Empathy as well as non-competitive overlap interrupting (by move *A2*) to encourage and support “disappointed” partner.

B's moves manifest the concepts of “unpredictability”, “complexity”, “paradox”, “uncertainty”, “ambiguity”, indicating *B* as irrational personality type. Move *B1* constitutes dispreferred second part of the sequence since it evades an explanation forcing the interlocutor to initiate a side sequence to clarify *B*'s actual motives. Besides, it incorporates non-preferred pause. Moves *B2* and *B3* seem to be irrelevant (in *A*'s view): despite its negation nature, Move *B2* has not met *A*'s expectations since *B* avoids a direct negation expected from him (*you are not a petit-bourgeois type*) as well as his behavior's explanation (as an implicit ground of a side sequence). Move *B3* is irrelevant and topically incoherent since it is unclear (marked by indefinite article, inversion), reduced (elliptical clause with missing subject and auxiliary verb in the compound predicate) and seems to be contextualized with *B*'s inner speech. As a result, *A* requires an explanation of the unclear item introducing a closing side-sequence by Move *A4*.

At the pragmatic level *B* reveals his irrational identity by flouting the Maxims of Manner and Quantity in Moves *B1*, *B2* (*B* is obscure and insufficiently informative). Move *B2* implies at least two implicatures since it is unclear what exactly *A* “does not believe” – that she is *only a merchant – a petit-bourgeois type* or that *B* has *accomplishments*. Consequently, *A* may infer two conversational implicatures, i.e. (a) that *B* suspects her of insincerity and (b) that *B* shies away from a frank conversation again. Move *B3* (*A high-minded intellectual ninny, square...*) violates both Quantity and Manner Maxims. *B* is neither informative nor clear resulting in his misapprehension by the communicative partner. An implicature inferred by *A* is: perhaps he is talking about me, not about himself (this assumption is checked then by a direct question *Who?*). *B* regularly applies the negative politeness strategies. He is conventionally indirect (Moves *B2*, *B3*), pessimistic (Moves *B1*, *B3*), impersonalizing (Move *B3*: indefinite article, word order), minimizing the imposition (move *B3*), not noticing *A*'s wants and needs, not seeking agreement or asserting common ground (all *B*'s Moves).

B's categorical concept of “irrationality” is manifested by operative identity concepts and their corresponding roles of “unexpected” and “evasive” (Moves *B1-B3*).

In their turn, all identified operative concepts seem to be “supported” by macro-cultural narratives disclosing the intertextual nature of participants’ moves and role positioning, e.g. sacrifice – selfishness, devotion of women – volatility of men, etc. *The line of A from the A’s point of view* is the story of a woman, able to understand and forgive (*A’s* positional roles of “tolerant” and “loving woman-friend”). *The line of B from the A’s point of view* is the story of a person who does not know what is good for him and needs control for his own sake (*A’s* positional roles of “shrewd”, “intelligent” and “practical” woman). *The line of A from the B’s point of view* is the story of excessive care and control. He does not want to be accountable to his woman and evades direct answers being indirect, obscure, insufficiently informative and dispreferred in his moves (*B’s* positional roles of “unexpected”, “illogical” and “non-cooperative”). *The line of B from the B’s point of view* is the story of a person who wants others to leave him alone (*B’s* positional roles of “unexpected” and “evasive”).

The next source of the operative identity concepts is the patterns of previous dialogic practices of communicants. During the dialogue *B* is expected to play roles of “not indifferent”, “aware of his misconduct”, “understanding”, “worthy of my love” manifesting relative identities “husband-wife”, “penitent – forgiving”, “friend-friend” with regular rights and obligations of communicants in relation to each other. Instead, *B* plays roles of “inattentive”, “uncomprehending”, “unpredictable” and explicitly distributes himself in identity category of “worthless”. The absence of the “pair” roles shows that the dialogue participants are in a situation of the communicative conflict as each of them identifies himself (herself) with an identity category alien to another. To avoid a communicative conflict and achieve a “settled” role scenario *A* applies side sequences and manipulative pragmatics means. For the same purpose *B’s* moves are sometimes non-relevant, incorporates dispreferred pauses and other markers of uncertainty *I mean, don’t really believe, I don’t know*

2.2. Interactive concepts

Interactive concepts are based on the interlocutors’ knowledge of personal information about each other, their belonging to the common group, the level of familiarity and social distance as well as other information assessed according to the archetypic dichotomy of “own-alien” as the universal principle of the relations’ conceptualization.

Separating concept of “otherness” is manifested lexically, by *A’s* moves pointing to *B’s* feeling “natural superiority” and his separating actions: *Then why do you keep aloof, and make me chase you?*); pragmatically (by *B’s* applying negative politeness strategies increasing the “distance” between communicants), as well as by formal-conversational means (*B’s* irrelevant and non-preferred Moves).

Uniting concept of similarity (*we have something in common*) as a cognitive base of the cooperative strategy is manifested by (a) pragmatic moves of *A’s* Apparent Empathy and Apparent Consession; (b) non-competitive overlap aimed to support the partner and (c) scientific terms intended to be in-group markers creating the participants’ common ground.

2.3. Social-semiotic concepts

Social-semiotic concepts are based on the frames of the dominant ideological, social and institutional contexts [Halliday 1978; Dijk 1997; 2003; 2008] as well as on consumer “common sense” ideology marked by stereotypical means of assessment, conceptual

metaphors, topoi, etc. metonymically associated with certain agents, institutions, situations, events and communicative scenarios restricting discourse creation and interpretation to socially / institutionally sanctioned patterns.

Thus, the symbolic values of "education", "achievement," "superiority" index *A*'s philistine discourse based on topoi of "well-being", "prosperity", "elite", "prestige", "fundamental values", while the discourse of *B* is based on topoi of "independence", "individuality", "personality", "dissimilarity", marking an individualistic discourse.

2.4. Genre concept

Genre concept or concept-scenario is a generalized representation of a discourse type (instruction, gossip, complaint, etc.), structured by information about a genre thematic component, its verbal parameters, as well as typical participants with their stereotypical scenarios, roles, relationships, goals and strategies (a cognitive structure of genre concept is similar to the notion of contextual model by Van Dijk [2008]).

An extract above makes a genre of the reproach mitigated by pre-sequence, markers of understanding and agreement. Move-reproach (especially if it constitutes the first part of the adjacency pair and has a form of a question) normally predicates the occurrence of the second part containing justification, agreement or refutation of the reproach. *B* produces a relevant Move *B3* since (a) as a self-accusation, it is an appropriate second part to a move-reproach and (b) it is an answer to the direct special why-question (I behave so because I am *a high-minded intellectual ninny, square*). Moreover, it is contextualized with the move *A1* and, consequently, "able" to complete a side sequence. However *A* considers the move *B3* irrelevant and topically incoherent. As a result, *A* requires an explanation of the unclear item introducing a closing side-sequence by Move *A4*.

2.5. Concepts-ideas

Concepts-idea can either match the identity, interactive and social-semiotic concept or be the conceptual representation of the situation denoted by dialogic text. Therefore, it is based on local situational and textual context versus the participants' situational models. Communicants may produce similar or different concepts-ideas, which depend on similarity or difference of their situation models, world pictures and perceptions of each other.

The referent of the dialogue is the *A-B* relationships. The relationships' concept-idea is different for participants, determining the differences in representation of the referent. For *A* the relationship is a mutual understanding, demanding concessions and commitment. *A* imposes her concept-idea by direct and indirect speech acts, manipulative strategies and techniques and other formal and pragmatic means.

For *B* the dialogue' referent is the *A-B* relationships threatening his freedom and personal autonomy. *B* realizes that if he designates "his" referent by textual means, it will result in a communicative misunderstanding and a conflict. Therefore, *B* does not reveal his situational model neither by logical nor associative co-referent means, and his moves seem non-preferred and indirect, deviating from cooperative maxims.

3. Conclusion

There are some regular correspondences between the formal and pragmatic means:

Categorical identity concepts associate with Self-Identification Cognitive Context constructed by participants' ideas about selves as psychological and social integrities as well

as gender, nationality and age group members. Categorical identity concepts are manifested by all sets of formal-conversational, lexical, grammatical and pragmatic means indexing the interactants' psychological, gender, nationality and age specifics.

Operative identity concepts relate to Communicative Cognitive Context as the knowledge of roles and scenarios adopted to local interactions' needs and derived from (a) Self-Identification Cognitive Context, (b) Context of intertextual macro scenarios patterning the personality relation to semiotic products of the ethnos and civilization – from fairy tales and cartoons to the theatre, fiction, etc. as well as (c) Context of Identities' Membership with models of distribution into identity categories with conventional communicative actions, standardized role pairs and agreed communicative scenarios resulted from participants' previous dialogic practices.

Operative concepts are indexed by intertextual means referring to socialization and macro-cultural scenarios, which can be detected in any discourse due to their relevance for the identity construction.

Interactive concepts are based on Interactive Context as the interlocutors' knowledge of the personal information about each other, their belonging to a common group, the level of familiarity and social distance as well as other information assessed according to the archetypic dichotomy of "own-alien". Uniting concept of similarity is marked by non-competitive overlapping of moves, relevant and preferential moves, congruent role pairs, topical coherence, side sequence eliminating a source of misunderstanding as well as positive politeness means showing support, participation and interest; pragmatic technics of Apparent Empathy and Apparent Concession, flouting of Quantity Maxim aimed at presupposing "shared knowledge" and implicating close relationship or group membership, etc.

Separating concept of "otherness" is manifested by negative politeness strategies increasing the "distance" between communicants, face threatening acts, indexing dominance or status difference, irrelevant and dispreferred Moves, competitive overlapping of Moves, Maxims of Manner and Relation flouting, non-compliance with the proposed role category, topical incoherence / conflict, etc.

Concepts-ideas as similar or different conceptual representations of the referent situation by dialogue's participants derive from their situational models *versus* local situational and textual context. Concepts-ideas are indexed by co-referent utterances, implications and implicatures, thematic words, topically coherent fragments. The formal markers of the concepts-ideas' similarity are topical cohesion and coherence, preferential moves, minimum of insertion and side sequences, emotionally "supportive" overlapping as well as positive politeness means, correctly decoded implicatures, mutual acknowledgment of roles, role congruency, etc. Concepts-ideas' mismatch is indexed by frequent topic's changes and topic conflicts, pauses and other non-preferred moves, negative politeness strategies and face threatening acts, etc.

Genre concept derives from Genre Prototypes specific for a particular communicative culture. It is marked by prototypical sequences' structure, regular sets of counter-roles with corresponding scenarios, goals and strategies, lexical markers of the genre theme.

LITERATURE

1. Кравченко Н.К. Интегративный метод и оперативные методики дискурс-анализа / Н.К. Кравченко. – Саарбрюккен : Palmarium LAMBERT Academic Publishing, 2015. – 95 с.
2. Кравченко Н.К. Практическая дискурсология: школы, методы, методики современного дискурс-анализа / Н.К. Кравченко. – Луцьк : Волиньполіграф, 2012. – 251 с.
3. Antaki C. Identities in Talk / C. Antaki, S. Widdicombe. – London : Sage Publications, 1998. – 224 p.
4. Benwell B. Discourse and Identity / B. Benwell, E. Stokoe. – Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2006. – 314 p.
5. Brockmeier J. Narrative and Identity: Studies in Autobiography, self and culture / Jens Brockmeier, Donald Carbaugh. – Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing Co, 2001. – 307 p.
6. Brown P. Politeness: Some Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena / P. Brown, S.C. Levinson. – Cambridge : Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987. – 345 p.
7. Davies B. Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves / B. Davies, R. Harré // Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 1990. – V. 20 (1). – P. 43–63.
8. Goffman E. Response cries / Erving Goffman // Forms of Talk. – Oxford : Basil Blackwell, 1981. – P. 78–122.
9. Grice H. P. Logic and conversation / H. P. Grice // Syntax and semantics. – N. Y. : Academic Press, 1975. – Vol. 3. – P. 41–58.
10. Halliday M.A.K. Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning / M.K. Halliday. – London : Edward Arnold, 1978. – 256 p.
11. Hausendorf H. Social identity work in storytelling: Methodological remarks / H. Hausendorf // Narrative Inquiry. – 2002. – V. 12 (1). – P. 173–179.
12. Jefferson G. Side sequences / G. Jefferson // Studies in social interaction. – New York : Free Press, 1972. – P. 294–338.
13. Kravchenko N. Formal conversational and pragmatic properties of dialogue: to the question of correspondences // Проблеми зіставної семантики. – К. 2015а – P. 135–141.
14. Linehan C. Positioning in practice: Understanding participation in the social world / C. Linehan, J. McCarthy // The Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour. – 2000. – № 30 (4). – P. 435–453.
15. McLean K. C. Selves creating stories creating selves: A process model of self-development / McLean, K. C., Pasupathi, M., & J. L. Pals // Personality and Social Psychology Review. – 2007. – № 11. – P. 262–278.
16. Potter J. Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behavior / J. Potter, M. Wetherell. – London : Sage, 1987. – 216 p.
17. Sacks H. Lectures on Conversation / H. Sacks. – Oxford : Wiley-Blackwell, 1992. – Vol.1, 2. – 1520 p.
18. Schegloff E.A. Issues of Relevance for Discourse Analysis: Contingency in Action, Interaction and Co-Participant Context / Emanuel A. Schegloff // Computational and Conversational Discourse: Burning Issues – An Interdisciplinary Account. – Heidelberg : Springer Verlag, 1996. – P. 3–38.

19. Schegloff E.A. Discourse, Pragmatics, Conversation, Analysis / Emanuel A. Schegloff // *Discourse Studies*. – 1999. – V. 1:4. – P. 405-435.
20. Schegloff E.A. Overlapping Talk and the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation / Emanuel A. Schegloff // *Language in Society*. – 2000. – V. 29:1. – P. 63.
21. Searle John R. Foundations of Illocutionary Logic / John R. Searle, Vanderveken Daniel. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1985. – 230 p.
22. Searle John R. Indirect speech acts / John R. Searle // *Syntax and Semantics*. – New York, San Francisco, London : Academic Press, 1975. – Vol. 3: Speech Acts. – P. 59–82.
23. Swan D. Positioning as a means of understanding the narrative construction of self: A story of lesbian escorting / D. Swan, C. Linehan // *Narrative Inquiry*. – 2001. – V. 10 (2). – P. 403–427.
24. Van Dijk, T.A. Discourse and Context. A Sociocognitive Approach / T.A. van Dijk. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2008. – 267 p.
25. Van Dijk T.A. The Study of Discourse / T.A. Van Dijk // *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. – London : Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1997. – Vol. 1 – P. 1–34.
26. Van Dijk T.A. Ideology and discourse. A multidisciplinary introduction / Van Dijk T.A. – Barcelona : Ariel, 2003. – 118 p.
27. Wetherell M. Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue / M. Wetherell // *Discourse and Society*. – 1998. – Vol. 9. – P. 387–412.
28. Zurcher L. A. Social Roles: Conformity, Conflict and Creativity./ L.A. Zurcher. – Beverly Hills : Sage, 1983. – 295 p.

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIALS

29. Saul Bellow. Herzog. – New York: Fowcett Crest Book, 1970. – 416 p.

REFERENCES:

- Antaki, C. (1998). *Identities in Talk*. London : Sage Publications.
- Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press.
- Brockmeier, J., Carbaugh. (2001). *Narrative and Identity: Studies in Autobiography, self and culture*. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Brown, P., & Levinson. S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena*. Cambridge : Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 20 (1), 43-63.
- Goffman, E. (1981). Response cries. *Forms of Talk*. Oxford : Basil Blackwell, 78-122.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. *Syntax and semantics*, 3, 41-58.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London : Edward Arnold.
- Hausendorf, H. (2002). Social identity work in storytelling: Methodological remarks. *Narrative Inquiry*, 12 (1), 173–179.
- Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. *Studies in social interaction*, 294-338.

- Kravchenko, N.K. (2015). *Integrativnyj metod I operativnyje metodiki dyskurs-analyza [Integrative method and operative technics of discourse-analysis]*. Saabrukken : Palmarium LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Kravchenko, N.K. (2012). *Practicheskaja dyskursologija: shkoly, metody, matodyky sovremennogo dyskurs-analyza [Practical discoursology: schools, methods and technics of modern discourse-analysis]*. Luck : Volyn'polygraph.
- Kravchenko, N. (2015a). Formal conversational and pragmatic properties of dialogue: to the question of correspondences. *Problemy zistavnoji semantyky*, 135-141.
- Linehan, C., McCarthy, J. (2000). Positioning in practice: Understanding participation in the social world. *The Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 30 (4), 435-453.
- McLean, K.C., Pasupathi, M., Pals, J.L. (2007). Selves creating stories creating selves: A process model of self-development. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11, 262-278.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behavior*. London: Sage.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford : Wiley-Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1996). Issues of Relevance for Discourse Analysis: Contingency in Action, Interaction and Co-Participant Context. *Computational and Conversational Discourse: Burning Issues – An Interdisciplinary Account*, 3-38.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1999). Discourse, Pragmatics, Conversation, Analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 1(4), 405-435.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2000). Overlapping Talk and the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation *Language in Society*, 29 (1), 63.
- Searle, J. R., & Vanderveken, D. (1985) *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. *Syntax and Semantics*, 3: *Speech Acts*, 59-82.
- Swan, D., & Linehan, C. (2001). Positioning as a means of understanding the narrative construction of self: A story of lesbian escorting. *Narrative Inquiry*, 10 (2), 403-427.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2008). *Discourse and Context. A Sociocognitive Approach*. New York : Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1997). The Study of Discourse. *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, 1, 1-34.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2003). *Ideology and discourse. A multidisciplinary introduction*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse and Society*, 9, 387-412.
- Zurcher, L.A. (1983). *Social Roles: Conformity, Conflict and Creativity*. London: Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIALS

Saul Bellow. (1970). *Herzog*. New York: Fowcett Crest Book.

Kravchenko Nataliia Kimovna – Doctor of Philology, Full Professor, Kyiv National Linguistic University (Velyka Vasylkivska Str., 73, Kyiv, Ukraine); e-mail: nkravchenko@outlook.com