Inna GRABOVSKA,
orcid.org/0000-0002-4229-6298,
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of English for Technical
and Agrobiological Specialities
of National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine
(Kyiv, Ukraine) ivgrabovska@gmail.com

Oleksandra REVENKO,
The Second-Year Student at the Faculty of Humanities and Pedagogy
of National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine
(Kyiv, Ukraine) aleksa.revenko@gmail.com

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH DIALOGIC DISCOURSE

This paper aims to discuss turn-taking from the perspective of structural organisation of dialogic discourse. The distionction was made between the dialogue, the monologue and the multi-party conversation. In monologue, only one person is speaking, all other potential present persons build the audience. In dialogue, two persons are involved in the interaction, taking turns one after the other. If one person is speaking, the other person is addressed and listening and will take the next turn during which the first speaker will then be addressed and take the subsequent turn and so on. In multi-party conversation more than two speakers are involved in the interaction as active participants. The article provides the study of the phenomenon of dialogic discourse as an exchange of speech acts between two interlocutors in turn-taking sequence aimed at collaboration and gaining a collective goal. Turn-taking is one of the basic mechanisms in conversation, and the convention of turn-taking varies between cultures and languages; therefore, learners of a foreign language may find it difficult to take their turns naturally and properly in other tongues. For smooth turn-taking, the knowledge of both the linguistic rules and the conversational rules of the target language is required. It was stated that a turn is a technical term that works at a pragmatic level and is used to describe the segmentation of a conversation into each speaker's continuous talk. Our investigation proves that the order in which people take turns in a conversation is rule bound. Whatever one speaker says acts as a stimulus for the other participants to react, and the reaction is usually coherently related to the preceding utterance. In this respect discourse organization is prospective, which implies that one speaker's utterance not only anticipates a response from the other interlocutor, but also sets up expectations as to what type of response is appropriate; a question anticipates an answer, a statement – an acknowledgement.

Key words: *dialogic discourse, monologue, multi-party conversation, turn-taking, communicative contact.*

Інна ГРАБОВСЬКА,
orcid.org/0000-0002-4229-6298,
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри англійської мови для технічних
та агробіологічних спеціальностей
Національного університету біоресурсів і природокористування України
(Київ, Україна) ivgrabovska@gmail.com

Олександра РЕВЕНКО,
студентка II курсу
гуманітарно-педагогічного факультету
Національного університету біоресурсів і природокористування України
(Київ, Україна) aleksa.revenko@gmail.com

ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНІ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ АНГЛОМОВНОГО ДІАЛОГІЧНОГО ДИСКУРСУ

Ця стаття спрямована на обговорення техніки чергування комунікативних ролей із погляду структурної організації діалогічного дискурсу. У роботі діалогічний дискурс визначається як обмін комунікативними актами між двома співрозмовниками за допомогою чергування комунікативних ролей мовця й слухача з метою спів-робітництва та досягнення спільної мети мовленнєвої взаємодії. Комунікативна роль насамперед характери-зує функцію комуніканта відповідно до продукції чи рецепції повідомлення, тобто комунікант у певний момент

комунікативного процесу може або створювати й передавати вербальне повідомлення, або сприймати й інтер-претувати його. Для плавної зміни комунікативної ролі необхідні знання як мовних норм, так і правил спілкування. Наше дослідження доводить, що є правила, відповідно до яких відбувається чергування комунікативних ролей в англомовному діалогічному дискурсі.

Ключові слова: *діалогічний дискурс, монолог, полілог, комунікативна роль, мовленнєвий контакт.*

Introduction. A dialogue is a culturally and historically specific way of social interaction accomplished through the use of language and verbal transactions. It suggests community and mutuality. The dialogue provides a common ground and manifests itself in a variety of spontaneous and ritual modes of a discourse. Etymologically, the dialogue means a speech across, between, through two or more people. The word "dialogue" originates from the Greek *dialogos. Dia* is a preposition that means 'through', "between", "across", "by" and "of". *Dia* does not mean two, as in two separate entities; rather, *dia* suggests a "passing through". *Logos* comes from *legein,* "to speak". *Logos* means "the word", created by "passing through", as in the use of language as a symbolic tool and conversation as a medium. *Logos* may also mean thought as well as an utterance that is conceived individually or collectively, and/or expressed materially (Banathy, Jenlink 2005: 4). Consequently, the dialogue is a sharing through language as a cultural symbolic tool and a conversation as a medium for sharing. Spoken interaction can be classified according to different factors, one of which is the direction of the communicative contact and the character of participation of the speaker and the addressee. The given factors bring us closer to the delimitation of such notions as monologue, dialogue and multi-party conversation.

Analysis of researches and publications. "The monologue" is the term that belongs to the sphere of the literary study: "formatting of the speech directed to oneself, not deliberated to spontaneous verbal reaction of the interlocutor" (Devkin, 1981: 10). The difference between the dialogue and the monologue is based on the principle of exchange of the communicative role by the interlocutors. Thus, the interaction pattern is clearly defined. The distinction between the dialogue and the multi-party conversation lies in the growing number of "joint authors" of the text that exchange their communicative roles as in the dialogue. In multi-party conversation more than two speakers are involved in the interaction as active participants (Strauß, Minker 2010: 20). It is not self-evident who will take the next turn as there are no strict interaction patterns. Multi-party conversation is thus more flexible with turn-taking as anyone could possibly take the next turn, even if this person is the addressee in the previous turn.

Purpose. The purpose of this article is to investigate the dialogue as the dominating type of the spoken interaction. Not only speech is dialogic, but the consciousness of the interlocutors is also dialogic. "Dialogue is not the ground for action, it is the action itself. "To be" means to communicate with the help of the dialogue. When dialogue terminates, everything comes to an end too" (Bakhtin, 1986: 284). Dialogue is not only the model of mutual interaction and understanding, but it is also the main category of processes in human consciousness, cognition and communication.

Results. Dialogue has been defined in numerous ways but primarily as an exchange of speech acts between two communicative partners in turn-taking sequence (adjacency pairs) aimed at a collective goal. Dialogue is coherent to the extent that the individual speech acts fit together to contribute to this goal. Each participant has an individual goal in the dialogue, and both participants have an obligation in the dialogue, defined by the nature of their collective and individual goals (Leech, 1983: 211). We would prefer the term "dialogic discourse" to "dialogue" as it gives emphasis to the mechanism of the maintenance of the communicative contact.

Dialogic discourse was described from the point of view of cohesion, manifested by the particular syntactic, lexical, and prosodic cohesion existing between an utterance made by the second speaker and an immediately preceding utterance made by the first speaker. Cohesively tied second utterances are called "rejoinders". There are two main types of "rejoinders": those following questions, "replies" and "responses" and, those following non-questions, "other rejoinders" (Halliday, 1976: 207).

Dialogic discourse is realized by turn-taking and much has been made in discourse analysis in the study of this notion. Turn is a technical term that works at a pragmatic level and is used to describe the segmentation of conversation into each speaker's continuous talk. There are different approaches to the definition of the notion "turn" in linguistics: it was determined as an utterance that may contain anything from a single *mm* to a string of complex sentences (Schegloff, 1972: 376); "natural message" in terms of the "sign behaviour of the speaker during the whole period of time through which a focus of attention is continuously directed at them" (Goffman, 1953: 165); "chain

principle" (Good, 1979: 152); "solo talking" (Markel, 1975: 190) and finally, a somewhat different approach that regards pauses as utterance boundaries (Stephen, Mishler, 1952: 600). We shall consider an "utterance" as equivalent to a turn. Turn-taking basically distinguishes dialogue from monologue. A normal string in dialogic conversation is ABAB:

(1) Father: *What have I done?*

Midwife: *You've given the world its first female wizard. Whosa itsywitsy, den?*

Father: *What?*

Midwife: *I was talking to the baby* (Pratchett. Equal Rites, p. 5).

In the classic ethnomethodological way, discourse analysts have observed how participants organize themselves to take turns at talk. In any piece of natural English discourse, turns will occur smoothly, with only little overlap and interruption, and only very brief silences between turns (on average, less than a second). People take turns when they are selected or nominated by the current speaker, or if no one is selected, they may speak of their own accord (self-selection). If neither of these conditions applies, the person who is currently speaking may continue (McCarthy, 1991: 121). In conversations, there is no limit to the length of a turn. A turn can vary in length from a single word or partial word to a complete utterance or a story, but they all have the characteristics of projectability; once began, it generally becomes known what type of turn is underway and what it will take to complete it (Renkema, 2004: 27). In general, projectability is assumed to be determined by the intonational and syntactic properties of the turns. Interactants apparently have the ability to identify the end of a turn. There are no rules concerning the number of turns a participant can take or the possible content of a turn.

In order to use a language successfully one has to know the rules governing that particular language and communicative competence, that is the awareness of what is appropriate in a certain situation (Zimmerman, West, 1975: 213). It is necessary for an effective communication with other people. Like language in general, conversations are governed by rules that determine what is appropriate. The order in which people take turns in a conversation is rule bound. The turn-taking rules also determine the length of each person's turn in order to ensure that one person speaks at a time and that change of speaker takes place. Research on the turn-taking mechanism that governs conversation has been carried out by H. Sacks, E. Schegloff and G. Jefferson (1974) who outlined the rules of a turn-taking mechanism in everyday conversation (turn-taking model). According to H. Sacks et

al., the speaker-transition takes place at a given point in the conversation. There are three different ways how this can be done. The current speaker can name or direct a question to the next speaker, initiating a speaker change. If the change is speaker-initiated, the new speaker has an exclusive right to speak and must do so (Zimmerman, West, 1975: 216). If the current speaker does not select the new speaker, the other participants in the conversation are free to speak (Coates 1993: 108). It is up to the other speakers to self-select, to choose if they want to speak or not. If two speakers start to speak almost at the same time, the person who started first has the right to speak and finish the turn. If no self-selection or speaker initiation takes place, the current speaker is not obligated to continue speaking but can do so if they want to. These ways of taking turns in the conversation make it possible for the participants to know when it is their turn to speak next. If the rules of turn-taking are followed, the transitions between speakers are done smoothly; two people talking at the same time is avoided and each speaker is allowed to finish their turn.

The following example illustrates how this turn-taking model works.

(2) A: *Well (eh) pretty bad actually 'cause I'd really learned.*

B: *How did the exam go yesterday?*

(3) A: *The stuff you know but when I was sitting in that lecture hall (eh) I just couldn't come.*

B: *(pause)*

(4) A*: Up with the answers and well (eh) yeah, I was.*

B: *You got a blackout.*

(5) A: *Trying to concentrate, but could only think of not coming up with proper answers.*

B: Well, you shouldn't worry about it too much now.

C: *Yeah, no indeed* (Coates, 1993: 109).

In (2) the speaker B chooses A as the subsequent speaker according to the first rule: "If the turn-so-far is constructed as to involve the use of a "current speaker selects next" technique, then the participant thus selected has the right and is obliged to take the next turn to speak; no others have such rights or obligations, and transfer occurs at the place". Speaker A continues until, after a moment of silence, B takes a turn in (4) following the second rule: "If the turn-so-far is constructed as not to involve the use of a "current speaker selects next" technique, then self-selection for the next speakership may, but need not, be instituted. The person who first starts at the moment acquires the right to a turn, and transfer occurs at that place or the third one: "If the turn-so-far is constructed as not to involve the use of a "current speaker selects

next" technique, then the current speaker may, but need not continue, unless another self-selects". After the silence that then follows, the third rule becomes applicable (Renkema, 2004: 27).

Both the current speaker and the next speaker use different clues that signal they want to speak next, or that they are coming close to the end of their utterance and a possible transition point. All these clues and signs exist to avoid two people speaking at the same time and avoid long silences in the conversation (Eckert, McConnell-Ginet, 2003: 110). There are specific linguistic devices for getting the turn when one is unable to enter the normal flow of turn-taking or when the setting demands specific conventions should be followed. They vary greatly in the level of formality and appropriacy to different situations (*"If I may, Mr. Chairman", "I wonder if I might say something", "Hang on a minute"*). There are also linguistic means of not taking the turn when one has the opportunity, or making it clear to the speaker that the hearer is attending to the message. These are usually referred to as back-channel responses, and consist of vocalizations such as *mm, ah-ha,* and short words and phrases such as *yeah, no, right, sure.* Back-channel, utterance-completions and overlaps make natural conversation seem chaotic, as in this extract:

(6) (A and B are discussing domestic pets).

A: *Well, of course, people who go to the vet's [are*

B: *[Mm.*

A: *interested in the cats and dogs, aren't they?*

B: *[Yeah, but the people that first have pets kit – pets er don't [realize what's [involved, do they?*

A: *[care [Well it sorts them out, you know, those that don't care that's it so <...> but*

B: *[Mm [Mm*

A: *if you want to, you know, somebody that's keen on having a pet*

B *[Mm [Mm*

A: *and want it in [good order.*

B: *[Done <...> done properly, that's right, yeah* (Yngve, 1970: 568).

The grammatical structure of a turn serves as an important turn-yielding device. What a particular item does in a discourse is related to its position. A good example of this is *you know*, which can occur in initial, medial, and final position in the utterance:

(7) *You know, I could tell he was telling the truth.*

(8) *I could tell, you know, he was telling the truth.*

(9) *I could tell he was telling the truth, you know.*

You know in (7) is turn-taking, indicating that the speaker has something to tell, thereby arousing the hearer's interest; in (8) it is turn-holding in its capacity of delaying the message, and in (9) it is

turn-yielding, signalling that the message is delivered and that the hearer's reaction is welcome.

Turn-taking generally results in a meaningful (transactional) dialogic discourse. Whatever one speaker says acts as a stimulus for the other participants to react, and the reaction is usually coherently related to the preceding utterance. In this respect discourse organization is prospective, which implies that one speaker's utterance not only anticipates a response from the other party, but also sets up expectations as to what type of response is appropriate; a question anticipates an answer, a statement – an acknowledgement (Sinclair, 1980: 111).

Communicative context is an integral component in the structure of dialogic discourse. Every communication is contextual, i. e., occurs under certain conditions that influence its character. Analysis of dialogic discourse in isolation from the context is incomplete. Immanent linguistics that pulls the text out from the real situation of communication cannot analyze its meaning adequately, i. e., the sense itself is formed in the process of mutual interaction of the addressee's knowledge, information extracted from the context and linguistic meaning of the text. The notion of communicative (pragmatic) context is discussed in connection with the degree of the influence of its factors on the choice of language means that constitute turn-taking. Communicative context is defined as the part of the communicative situation – those components that have direct significance for creation and interpretation of utterances.

D. Hymes (1974: 35) includes constituent components of the communicative context in the acronym SPEAKING. Each letter of this word corresponds to the certain contextual component: **S**etting – time and place of communication; **P**articipants – interlocutors of communication and witnesses of it; **E**nds – aims of communication; **A**ct sequence – succession of interlocutors' acts; **K**ey – tonality (emotional and psychological mood of interlocutors); **I**nstrumentalities – the channels of transmission of information; **N**orms – norms that regulate the usage of the language; **G**enres – genres of the language that organize the content of communication in definite forms (discussion, lecture, etc.).

Discussion. Pragmatic dimension of dialogic discourse provides logical and conditional transition from appraisal of the communicative contact to understanding of the real activity in the objective reality. The dialogic discourse is an exchange of speech acts between two interlocutors in turn-taking sequence aimed at collaboration and gaining a collective goal. Turn is a technical term that works at a pragmatic level and is used to describe the segmenta-

tion of conversation into each speaker's continuous talk. The order in which people take turns in a conver-

sation is rule bound. Turn-taking generally results in a meaningful (transactional) dialogic discourse.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Бахтин М. Высказывания как единица речевого общения. Эстетика словесного творчества. М.: Исскуство, 1986. 444 с.

2. Девкин В. Диалог. Немецкая диалогическая речь в сопоставлении с русской. М.: Высшая школа, 1981. 160 с.

3. Banathy B., Jenlink P. Dialogue as a Means of Collective Communication. New York : Springer, 2005. 440 p.

4. Coates J. Women, men and language. Essex: Longman, 1993. 627 p.

5. Eckert P., McConnel-Ginet S. Language and gender. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. 366 p.

6. Goffman E. Communication conduct in an island community. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1953. Pp. 164–165.

7. Good C. Some structural aspects of casual conversation. UEA Papers in Linguistics. Norwich: University of East Anglia Press, 1977. pp.18–37.

8. Halliday M. Notes on transitivity and theme in English. Journal of Linguistics. 1967. Part 2. N. 3. Pp. 177–274.

9. Hymes D. Foundations of sociolinguistics: an ethnographic approach. London : Routledge, 1974. 264 p.

10. Leech J. Principles of pragmatics. London : Longman, 1983. 250 p.

11. Markel N. Coverbal behaviour associated with conversation turns. Organization of behaviour in face-to-face interaction. New York : Academic Press, 1975. p. 190.

12. McCarthy M. Discouse analysis for language teachers. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1991. 213 p.

13. Pratchett T. Equal rites: a discworld novel. London : Harper Paperbacks, 2005. 240 p.

14. Renkema J. Introduction to discourse studies. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publising Company, 2004. 363 p.

15. Sacks H., Schegloff E., Jefferson G. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language. Baltimore. 1974. Vol. 50. N 4. Pp. 696–735.

16. Schegloff E. Sequencing in conversational openings. Advances in the sociology of language. Paris: Pierre-Andre, 1972. Pp. 91–125.

17. Sinclair J. Discourse in relation to language structure and semiotics. London: Longman, 1980. 115 p.

18. Stephen F., Mishler E. The distribution of participation in small groups: an exponential approximation. American sociological review. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1952. Pp. 598–608.

19. Strauß P.-M., Minker W. Proactive spoken dialogue interaction in multi-party environments. New York :Springer Science & Business Media, 2010. 175 p.

20. Yngve V. On getting a word in edgewise. Papers from the sixth regional meeting. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1970. Pp. 567–578.

21. Zimmerman D., West C. Sex roles, interruptions and silencies in conversation. Language and sex: differencies and dominance. Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1975. Pp. 211–233.

REFERENCES

1. Bakhtin M. Vyskazyvaniye kak edinitsa rechevogo obshcheniya [Utterance as the unit of verbal communication. Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva [Aesthetics of verbal creativity]. M.: Iskusstvo, 1986. 444 p. [in Russian].

2. Banathy B., Jenlink P. Dialogue as a Means of Collective Communication. New York : Springer, 2005. 440 p.

3. Coates J. Women, men and language. Essex: Longman, 1993. 627 p.

4. Devkin V. D. Dialog: Nemetskaya razgovornaya rech v sopostavlenii s russkoy [Dialogue: The German spoken language vs. Russian]. M.: Vysshaya shkola, 1981. 160 p. [in Russian].

5. Eckert P., McConnel-Ginet S. Language and gender. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 366 p.

6. Goffman E. Communication conduct in an island community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953. Pp. 164–165.

7. Good C. H. Some structural aspects of casual conversation. UEA Papers in Linguistics. Norwich : University of East Anglia Press, 1977. pp.18–37.

8. Halliday M. A. K. Notes on transitivity and theme in English. Journal of Linguistics. 1967. Part 2. N. 3. Pp. 177–274.

9. Hymes D. Foundations of sociolinguistics: an ethnographic approach. London : Routledge, 1974. 264 p.

10. Leech J. Principles of pragmatics. London : Longman, 1983. 250 p.

11. Markel N. Coverbal behaviour associated with conversation turns. Organization of behaviour in face-to-face interaction. New York : Academic Press, 1975. p. 190.

12. McCarthy M. Discouse analysis for language teachers. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1991. 213 p.

13. Pratchett T. Equal rites: a discworld novel. London : Harper Paperbacks, 2005. 240 p.

14. Renkema J. Introduction to discourse studies. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publising Company, 2004. 363 p.

15. Sacks H., Schegloff E., Jefferson G. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language. Baltimore. 1974. Vol. 50. N 4. Pp. 696–735.

16. Schegloff E. Sequencing in conversational openings. Advances in the sociology of language. Paris : Pierre-Andre, 1972. Pp. 91–125.

17. Sinclair J. Discourse in relation to language structure and semiotics. London: Longman, 1980. 115 p.

18. Stephen F., Mishler E. The distribution of participation in small groups: an exponential approximation. American sociological review. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1952. Pp. 598–608.

19. Strauß P.-M., Minker W. Proactive spoken dialogue interaction in multi-party environments. New York :Springer Science & Business Media, 2010. 175 p.

20. Yngve V. On getting a word in edgewise. Papers from the sixth regional meeting. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1970. Pp. 567–578.

21. Zimmerman D., West C. Sex roles, interruptions and silencies in conversation. Language and sex: differencies and dominance. Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1975. Pp. 211–233.