

UDC 811.111'06'42:343.102](043.3)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.2/26.195879>**Larysa PAVLICHENKO,***orcid.org/0000-0003-3801-2587**Candidate of Philological Sciences,**Assistant of the Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication**of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv**(Kyiv, Ukraine) la.pavlichenko@gmail.com*

## COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGY AS A CONSTITUTIVE CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE OF INTERROGATION DISCOURSE

*This paper deals with the analysis of the strategies and tactics of an investigator and an interrogated person in pre-trial investigation discourse, correlation of manipulative strategies and tactics of an investigator and an interrogated person. In the process of interrogation an interactive couple is formed according to the procedural status of the participants of the dialogue. In the course of interrogation, different types of relationships may develop which are not permanent and depend on the effectiveness of the selection and use of certain communication strategies and tactics by investigators. Conflict strategies and tactics can change to non-conflict and vice versa affecting the procedural status of interrogated persons. Depending on the interrogation situation different strategies can be implemented by the same linguistic behaviour tactics and linguistic means of expression. Interactions between the participants can be grouped into three main types by the communicative behaviour of an interviewee: cooperation, sabotage, false information. The communicative strategies of an investigator are implemented by: the strategy of establishing contact, which is realized through tactics of direct questioning, explanation, advice, positive confrontation, understanding, justification, prompting to answer; the strategy of obtaining new information, which is realized through the tactics of insistence, direct (indirect) question, questioning, concretization, detailing, clarification, development of the topic; control strategy with the tactics of questioning, clarification, specification, verification, repetition; a number of strategies of manipulative influence on an interviewee. A key role in the discourse of pre-trial investigation belongs to the strategies and tactics of manipulation. An interrogator's manipulative strategies and tactics depend on an interviewee's strategies and tactics and are primarily aimed at defense and attack as a form of defense.*

**Key words:** *institutional discourse, pre-trial investigation, interrogation, strategy, tactics, procedural status.*

**Лариса ПАВЛІЧЕНКО,***orcid.org/0000-0003-3801-2587**кандидат філологічних наук,**асистент кафедри англійської філології та міжкультурної комунікації**Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка**(Київ, Україна) la.pavlichenko@gmail.com*

## КОМУНІКАТИВНА СТРАТЕГІЯ ЯК КОНСТИТУТИВНА ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКА ДИСКУРСУ ДОПИТУ

*У статті проведено аналіз стратегій і тактик слідчого і допитуваного в дискурсі досудового слідства, ідентифіковано особливості кореляції маніпулятивних стратегій і тактик слідчого та допитуваного. Під час проведення допиту на стадії досудового слідства формується інтерактивна пара залежно від процесуального статусу учасників діалогу. У ході допиту можуть розвиватися різні типи відносин, які не є постійними і залежать від ефективності вибору та використання слідчими певних стратегій та тактик спілкування. Конфліктні стратегії та тактики можуть змінюватися на безконфліктні та навпаки, впливаючи на процесуальний статус допитаних осіб, хід допиту. Залежно від ситуації допиту різні стратегії можуть бути реалізовані одними і тими ж комунікативними тактиками поведінки та мовними засобами вираження. Всі інтеракції між учасниками діалогу можуть бути згруповані у три основні типи залежно від комунікативної поведінки допитаного: співпраця, саботаж, надання неправдивої інформації. У результаті аналізу матеріалу були ідентифіковані такі комунікативні стратегії слідчого, як: стратегія встановлення контакту, що реалізується за допомогою тактики прямого опитування, пояснення, поради, позитивної конфронтації, порозуміння, обґрунтування, спонукання до відповіді; стратегія отримання нової інформації, що реалізується за допомогою тактики наполягання, прямого (непрямого) запитання, конкретизації, деталізації, уточнення, розвитку теми; стратегія контролю з тактикою опитування, уточнення, конкретизації, перевірки, повторення; низка стратегій маніпулятивного впливу на опитаного. Ключова роль у дискурсі досудового розслідування належить маніпулятивним стратегіям та тактикам. Маніпулятивні стратегії та тактики допитуваного залежать від стратегій та тактик слідчого і спрямовані на захист та напад як форму захисту.*

**Ключові слова:** *інституційний дискурс, досудове слідство, допит, стратегія, тактика, процесуальний статус.*

**Analysis of recent research and publications.**

Studies of the strategies and tactics of speech influence are not new to linguistics. Many linguists have been engaged in the study of dialogic communication, its planning and mechanisms of implementation: Sachs (1974), Dem'yankov (2001), Dijk, W. Kinch (1983), Baranov (1990), Arutyunova (1990), Isers (2003, 2009), Radzievskaya (1999), Yarho (2004), and others.

**Defining the problem and argumentation of the topicality of its consideration.** Nowadays, there is no universal classification of communication strategies, this area has not been sufficiently studied yet. There are different views on defining a communication strategy. Considering the targeting of the addressee's strategic program, Batsevich (Batsevich, 2009) defines strategy as the optimal implementation of the speaker's intentions to achieve a specific communication goal, determining it as a combination of control and choice of effective communication moves and flexible modification in a particular situation. Selivanova (Selivanova, 2010) defines a communicative strategy as "<...> a component of the heuristic intentional program of discourse planning, its conduct and management with a view to achieving cooperative result, efficiency of information exchange and communicative influence". According to Makarov (Makarov, 2003) communicative strategy is a speaker's decision, communicative choices of speech actions and linguistic means, the realization of goals in the structure of communication.

We will stick to the definition of the communicative strategy by Isers (Isers, 2003: 100–101), which regards a strategy as a cognitive plan of communication, through which a speaker controls the optimal solution of communicative problems in the context of lack of information on a partner's actions; as a means of influencing an addressee. The researcher emphasizes on such properties of speech strategies as their flexibility, which is determined by the possibilities of their implementation through various speech tactics and communicative moves and complex use of language resources and techniques of speech influence.

Dijk (Dijk, 1989: 274) defines a communicative move as a functional unit that contributes to the solution of local and global tasks under the control of a similar strategy, the functional role of each speech course in the most general strategies will be determined in relation to the preceding and assumed subsequent moves, and this role will locally control the details of pragmatic, semantic, syntactic and stylistic representations.

The interrogation is a verbal dialogic speech, which is performed in an interactive pair of a repre-

sentative of the institution (investigator) and "a client" (an interrogated person), who may have different procedural status (victim, witness, suspect, accused). It is conducted by an investigator who, after gathering and analyzing information, constructing his own version of the crime, plans the course of interrogation, questions to be asked, the impact that will be exerted on the interviewee, as well as a set of strategies and tactics of speech influence.

Speech influence means the influence on a conceptual system of an interlocutor, guided by the target direction of speech communication, aimed at changing behavior, psychological state, thinking of an addressee, evaluation of a certain phenomenon, etc. (Selivanova, 2010: 430).

In the discursive genre of interrogation, an investigator can influence an interlocutor through a set of strategies and tactics, both institutionally constrained and spontaneous ones, motivated by the needs of interaction during the dialogue and the roles of the interactants in order to achieve the global goal.

The participants in the dialogue adjust their actions according to the situation remaining within the common goal. And the task and communication moves are correlated with the concepts of strategy and tactics.

**The aim of the study.** In the article, we will look at the strategies of both an interviewee and an interrogator, who are interrelated within the interaction: the set of strategies of one of the interactants influences the choice of strategies of the partner. Constructing the dialogue, we consider it important to analyze the components of interaction that influence the change in strategies, as well as the indicators of the effectiveness of the strategies and sets of the most effective strategies in various interrogation situations.

**The outline of the main research material.** The specificity of interrogation as an institutional discourse predetermines the established set of strategies and tactics that implement institutional goals at different stages of the deployment of this discursive pattern. The purpose of interrogation as an institutional type of communication is, first and foremost, to obtain the information necessary for investigation of case, to present it at the stage of trial for making a ruling in a case.

The main purpose of the interrogation predetermines the set of strategies of an investigator (the main ones as the most significant and auxiliary ones, as conditioned by the situation), and the tactics are the means of concrete realization of an intention and a purpose of a speaker. Lack of information about a partner causes the construction of two hypotheses of a speaker, reflecting the polar orientation of an

addressee as preference for cooperation or conflict. In the initial interrogation, the procedure of which is planned in advance by an investigator, the lack of sufficient information and unpredictable behavior of an interrogated person forces an investigator to construct two types of behavior (ancillary strategies) aimed at cooperation (providing information) or conflict (refusal, manipulation), which have one common purpose (strategy) – getting information. We will analyze specific examples of different types of interrogation.

The procedure for conducting the interrogation, regardless of the procedural status of an interrogated person, has a structure with clearly established constitutional elements. The interrogation begins with the identification of an interviewee, clarification of his or her rights and obligations, warning – when referring to a witness or a victim – of criminal responsibility for evading or refusing to give evidence or giving false testimony. Therefore, at this stage of the interrogation, which can be called “identification”, an investigator’s main strategy is to establish contact and obtain new information. This strategy of an investigator is implemented through the tactics of questioning, warning, explanation, questioning, specification, clarification, adjusting to the professional register of an interviewee. Example:

(1) Det. Sudler: I’m sorry ... Mr. Greenwood ... for the record I would like to state your name, umm ... date of birth, and your present address.

Greenwood: Okay. My name is .. uh ... and

Det. Sudler: Okay. Street here and ...?

Greenwood: Uh Huh ... and Clearwater ... right.

Det. Sudler: How long have you resided at that address? (interrogation tactics)

Greenwood: Well, that’s where ... that’s where I work. Uh .. about a year. (The Lisa McPherson Files, Interviews).

(2) Pepe: When any person is arrested they have certain rights, Ok, the right to say nothing, that is, you do not have to say anything unless you wish to do so, but what you say may be used as evidence. Now I want you to understand that, that any answer that you give to me is at your own free will. (Smith M.J. Police interviews) (explanation tactics).

The language of an investigator, as an official representative of an institution, contains a considerable number of linguistic clichés, professionalisms, set phrases, is characterized by the use of hedges as means of mitigation, the Present Continuous Tense, Passive Voice, which are characteristic of the official style: *you’re aware ...*, *and as we have discussed earlier ...*, *could you state your name and date of birth ...*, *we’re going to be umm ... recording this conversation as a matter of record for our investigation and that*

*is being done with your permission and approval...*, *How long have you resided...*) (Smith M.J. Police interviews).

Tactics for implementing a strategy of making contact and obtaining new information are presented in an investigator’s speech by the following means: indirect speech acts (directives) with an infinitive complex (*I’d like you to state your name*), direct speech acts (quotes) (*How long have you resided at that address?*), representative with the illocutionary force of the quesives (*we have discussed earlier, and I have met with you, you’re aware that we are conducting an interrogation*), by imperatives, hedged by politeness strategy (*Could you state your name and date of birth?*).

An effective means of establishing contact with an interrogated person at the initial stages of interrogation is the use by an investigator tactics of belonging to his environment, which are implemented by the use of professionalisms, set phrases specific for official and business style (tactics of specification, concretization, theme development):

(3) Minkoff: So when exactly that happened I’m not sure. But within a few probably two minutes of getting to the Emergency Room it looked like she had. ... there wasn’t ...there wasn’t any vital signs.

Det. Sudler: Okay. Was she at all cyanotic when ... when she arrived at the hospital like she had... you know... oxygen deprivation... or was she not breathing or anything like that or..?

Minkoff: Oh yeah.

Det. Sudler: She ...she already had a pretty much turned cyanotic? (The Lisa McPherson Files, Interviews).

In the example above, an investigator uses the tactics of belonging to the person’s environment as a congruent tactic of being a professional in order to arouse confidence and provoke a detailed presentation of information by tuning into the interlocutor’s speech code.

The use by an investigator of the tactics of establishing contact and belonging to the environment of an interviewee is implemented in the colloquial speech with the aim of adjusting to the spoken code of the interviewee, to speak in his language, to soften the atmosphere of the interrogation, to establish with the interviewee more open, close relationships, influence him, inspire trust, and gain recognition (contact strategy):

(4) Det. Carrasquillo: Ms. Cutty, did you happen to know Lisa?

Cutty: No.

Det. Carrasquillo: Never met her ... no association?

Cutty: Well, I just came down here a few months ago.

Det. Carrasquillo: Where from?

Cutty: Boston.

Det. Carrasquillo: Oh ... bean town.

Agent Feola: I think you came at a good time.

Det. Carrasquillo: Got away from that nasty snow.

Cutty: Why?

Agent Feola: The weather ...

Cutty: It's not ... it's actually a mild winter up there.

Agent Feola: It has been ... yes ... but this is beautiful isn't it?

Cutty: It's okay.

Det. Carrasquillo: Let me ask you one more thing that just popped ... popped into my mind. When did you first meet Lisa, were you introduced or was it a chance meeting?

Paine: Uh ... it was a chance meeting. (The Lisa McPherson Files, Interviews).

In the example above, the tactic of making contact is realized by using the interrogative word "happen" in the question, which reduces the directivity of the expression and, accordingly, sounds more polite, the use of the name *Boston* (*bean town*), which, like the use of any nickname, is a marker of strategies of positive politeness as a courtesy of rapprochement, community and solidarity. Another way to implement this strategy is to change the line of conversation and to start speaking about the weather. On the one hand, the topic of "weather" is the English-language means establishing contact with the interlocutor. The phatic function of talking about the weather is amplified by the use of disjunctive questions (*This is beautiful, isn't it?*) in the speech of an investigator. On the other hand, the additional connotative meaning of an investigator's weather phrases in the passage above is an expression of the understanding "to the listener's interests, needs, and desires" (*Got away from that nasty snow?*), which corresponds to the well-known strategies for positive politeness (Brown, Levinson, 1987: 103). In addition, the tactic of contacting with the interviewee is implemented in the investigator's speech through the use of colloquialisms (*that nasty snow; just popped ... popped into my mind*), which, according to scientists, is an effective means of the fourth strategies of positive courtesy "Use Group Membership Makers" (Brown, Levinson, 1987: 107–108).

In the next stage, which can be called the "free narration stage", the investigator gives the interviewee the opportunity to present his version of the crime and offers to present the information and facts in the sequence he deems necessary and with his own estimates. The narration stage is crucial for an interviewee

to position themselves and other people in the events of the crime, iconically representing an interviewee's core strategy and behavior, identifying an investigator's behavior at subsequent stages, and choice of strategies by an investigator in order to achieve the ultimate goal. Minimizing the impact of an investigator at the free narration stage is one of the essential features of this stage of interrogation, which aims not only at defining the interviewee's strategies, but also at adjusting to his or her strategies and language code for successful interaction. Any interventions by an investigator in the form of questions, replies, etc. can cause a sudden change in the version of the crime by a respondent, disrupt its sequence and prevent the receipt of complete information and its interpretation.

The investigator uses tactics to conceal his/her awareness in the case: (interrogation control strategy):

(5) MacLeod: *I suggest, Mr Smith, it wasn't just a simple walk to buy a newspaper.* It was a ...

Smith: What happened then on this route?

MacLeod: *This is what I want you to tell me.*

Smith: I want, no, I, absolutely nothing happened.

MacLeod: *I'm giving you the opportunity to tell me ...*

Smith: Look, if I could tell you something happened, I, I would love to do that. I would love to say I, I'd kicked a dog, or something, but nothing happened.

MacLeod: *If nothing happened then, why can you not answer the simple question.* (Smith M.J. Police interviews).

The focus of the investigator is to control the primary strategy and make the interviewee continue presenting information.

Example:

(6) D. Wilson: I have to stop talking to the guy.

Det.: Because... . (Transcripts of police interviews).

Not only does he use a variety of tactics to help the respondent remember all the information in detail, he also compares new information with the previously obtained, verifies the truth through the use of information comparison tactics, validation tactics, and guidance questions (implemented through linguistic means such as repetitions, prompts (...*that was in the papers that you wanted to...*, *misconception about the current...*), as well as techniques for the implementation of incomplete information tactics (unfinished phrases (...*that was...*), tactics of provoking denials or agreement (...*bring up with us the other day...*). The use of indicators of participating in the conversation (*um...*) is a complementary means of keeping the conversation and provoking narration.

An interrogator's tactics of interrogation, concretization, detailing, refinement, verification, control are characterized by the use of incomplete sentences, compression, along with redundancy (repetition).

Upon completion of the interviewer's free narration, an investigator moves on to the stage of questions, the purpose of which may be clarification and more detailed disclosure of information contained in the free narration, the reproduction of missed or hidden facts or events that are essential to the case, that is, obtaining of new information.

The formulation of questions and their order are very important at this stage, which should correspond to the nature of interrogation, the personality of an interviewee and his procedural status (witness, victim, suspect or accused), that is, the choice by an investigator as an interlocutor interested in successful progress, the means are determined by the set of strategies and tactics of an interviewee. At the questioning stage, the investigator usually applies direct-question tactics:

(7) – I am investigating false Co2 credits. Have you ever been given false Co2 credits?

– No. (Broke eye contact. Leaned away from interviewer. Change in pitch of voice. Bit lower lip.) (Case studies).

The non-verbal behavior of the interviewee is more eloquent than the words. In this, as in the following situations, the non-verbal behavior was recorded in the transcripts, that contradicts their words and is an indicator of false testimony, to which the investigator should draw attention and make a relevant conclusion.

(8) – If you had anything to do with taking the wallet or the money that was in the wallet, you should go ahead and tell me now.

– See, the wallet wasn't took. The wallet was found. I found the wallet. It was empty except for an I.D. and a few papers. (The suspect was tense throughout the interview. He often displayed extreme eye contact and occasionally blinked his eyes in an odd way) (Case studies).

(9) – If you had anything to do with the money coming up missing you should tell me now.

– No, I don't know anything about how the money came up missing.

(stared without ever looking away). (Case studies).

The means of implementing of investigation tactics are direct questions (*Have you ever given false Co2 credits?*), directives with modal mitigation (*You should tell me...*).

Responding to such a non-standard question of the investigator, the interviewee inadvertently gives information about the motives for the bank robbery,

through which there is a suspicion of his involvement in the crime (manipulative strategy, tactics of provoking confession):

(10) – Why do you think an employee here at the bank would steal money?

– They needed it to pay bills, expenses? (Case studies).

In the following example, the investigator puts the interviewee before the choice, which is limited to two variants of the answer, which are not correct: tactics of provoking confession, tactics of pseudo-selection.

(11) Did you take checks to pay bills for your family or are you angry with the bank and wanted to get them? (Case studies).

In the next example, the investigator, recalling the previous testimony, gives the interviewee the opportunity to change it, hinting that it is not truth without applying face-threatening acts. Constructions with the adverb *still*, which is a token of implication about the inaccuracy of information and the expectation of a change of testimony, are used as a means of preserving the "face" of the interviewee in the event of his /her decision to change the testimony:

(12) MacLeod: I was asking you yesterday about a phone call you had in the morning from a man named George. You told me it was a mis-directed, mis-routed telephone number. Is that *still* your answer?

Smith: No comment. (Smith M.J. Police interviews).

The analysis of the material showed the ineffectiveness of this tactic. Sabotage tactics of the interviewee (*No comment*) causes the use of direct invective speech acts that "threaten" the "face" of the interviewee (*You were lying*), which are the means of implementing threatening, intimidation, presenting of evidence to expose the lie.

After recognizing by a suspect that he is guilty, an investigator must receive a written (handwritten, typed) confession. It is important to establish the voluntary nature of such a confession, as it is one of the components of a fair trial that for all parties involved in the criminal justice process, especially the accused persons.

**Conclusions and perspectives of further research in this field.** During the interrogation, an interactive couple is formed depending on the procedural status of the participants in the dialogue, namely: investigator-suspect (accused), investigator-witness, investigator-victim. There is a relationship between the participants in the dialogue that determines the use of certain communication strategies and tactics. In the course of interrogation, such types of relationships may develop which are not permanent and depend on the effectiveness of the

selection and use of certain communication strategies and tactics by investigators. Conflict strategies and tactics can change to non-conflict and vice versa, affecting the procedural status of interrogated persons.

All interactions between the participants of the interrogation are divided into three main types depending on the communicative behavior of an interviewee: cooperation, sabotage, false information.

Among the communicative strategies of an investigator the following strategies are identified: the strategy of establishing contact, which is realized through tactics of direct questioning, explanation, advice, positive confrontation, understanding, justification, prompting to answer; the strategy of obtaining new information, which is realized through the tactics of insistence, direct (indirect) question, questioning, concretization, detailing, clarification, development of the topic; control strategy with tactics of questioning, clarification, specification, verification, repetition; a number of strategies of manipulative influence on an interviewee. For an interviewee, the most typical is the use of communicative strategies of giving true testimony, providing false testimony (implemented through tactics of deception, denial, repetition, clarification, evasion, self-denial (for the interviewee-victim) and refusal to give evidence (sabotage strategy).

Important are investigative strategies and tactics of manipulative influence, which are predetermined by the type of relations that have developed between an investigator and an interviewee, as well as a procedural status of an interviewee. An interrogator's manipulative strategies and tactics depend on an interviewee's strategies and tactics and are primarily aimed at defense and attack as a form of defense. The strategy of influencing an interviewee is realized through tactics of exaggeration of their awareness of the case, positive confrontation, warning, sympathy, stimulating frankness, stimulating to refute false information, understanding, "clues", sympathy, intimidation, presentation of evidence, transfer to a respondent of the right of communicative domination, domination and assault, implicit accusation, blocking, assignment, provocation of confession, demonstration of knowledge, others. The use of tactics is determined by the status of an interviewee as a witness/victim or as a suspect/accused. An investigator uses different types of questions and structures with implication at all stages of the interrogation.

The results of the study of the strategies and tactics of contemporary English-language discourse of pre-trial investigation open up the prospect of further research that may be related to the study of strategic-tactical parameters in the discourses of judicial communication and in other institutional discourses.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Арутюнова Н. Д. Дискурс. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. Москва : Советская энциклопедия, 1990. С. 136–137.
2. Баранов А. Н. Лингвистическая теория аргументации (когнитивный подход) : автореф. дисс. док. филол. наук. Москва, 1990. 48 с.
3. Бацевич Ф. С. Основы комунікативної лінгвістики : підручник, 2-ге вид. доп. Київ : Видавничий центр «Академія», 2009. 376 с.
4. Brown P. Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. Questions and politeness: strategies in social interaction. Cambridge : UP, 1987.
5. Демьянков В. З. Лингвистическая интерпретация текста: Универсальные и национальные (идиоэтнические) стратегии. Язык и культура: Факты и ценности: К 70-летию Юрия Сергеевича Степанова. / Отв. редакторы: Е. С. Кубрякова, Т. Е. Янко. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2001. С. 309–323.
6. Дейк ван Т. А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация / пер. с англ. Сост. В. В. Петрова ; под ред. В. И. Герасимова ; вступ. ст. Ю. Н. Караулова и В. В. Петрова. Москва : Прогресс, 1989. 312 с.
7. Dijk T. A., & Kintsch W. Strategies of Discourse Comprehension. New York : Academic Press, 1983.
8. Иссерс О. С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи, Москва, 2003. 284 с.
9. Иссерс О. С. Стратегия речевой провокации в публичном диалоге. *Русский язык в научном освещении*. № 2 (18). Москва, 2009. С. 92–104.
10. Макаров М. Л. Основы теории дискурса. Москва : Гнозис, 2003. 280 с.
11. Павліченко Л. В. Сучасний англомовний дискурс досудового слідства: комунікативно-прагматичний аспект : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 – «Германські мови». Київ, 2018. 258 с.
12. Радзівєвська Т. В. Комунікативно-прагматичні аспекти текстотворення : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня доктора філол. наук : спец. 10.02.15 «Загальне мовознавство». Київ 1999. 33с.
13. Sacks H. A., Schegloff E., Jefferson G. Simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 1974. No 50. Pp. 696–735.
14. Селіванова О. О. Лінгвістична енциклопедія. Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2010. 844 с.
15. Ярхо А. В. Комунікативна стратегія невпевненості в сучасному англомовному діалогічному дискурсі : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 «Германські мови». Харків, 2004. 20 с.

## SOURCES OF ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

1. Case studies. Retrieved from: [http://www.reid.com/success\\_reid/r\\_cstudies.html](http://www.reid.com/success_reid/r_cstudies.html).
2. Smith M. J. Police interviews. Retrieved from: <http://Cryptome.org/smith-inter.zip>.
3. The Lisa McPherson Files, Interviews. Retrieved from: <http://www.lisafiles.com/police/interviews/219.html>.
4. Transcripts of police interviews. Retrieved from: <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/1384042-fed-int-witness-40.html>.

## REFERENCES

1. Arutyunova, N. D. (1990). Diskurs. Lingvisticheskiy ensyklopedicheskiy slovar'. [Discourse. Linguistics encyclopedia]. Moscow: Sovetskaya ensyklopediya, pp. 136–137 [in Russian].
2. Baranov, A. N. (1990). Lingvisticheskaya teoriya argumentatsii (kognitivnyy podkhod) [Linguistic theory of argumentation (cognitive approach)]. Extended abstract of doctor's dissertation. Moscow, Russia: Russian encyclopedia, 1990 [in Russian].
3. Batsevich, F. S. (2009). Osnovy komunikativnoyi linhvistyky [Fundamentals of Communicative Linguistics]. Kyiv, Akademiya, p. 136 [in Ukrainian].
4. Brown, P. (1987). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. Questions and politeness: strategies in social interaction. Cambridge: UP.
5. Dem'yankov, V. Z. (2001). Lingvisticheskaya interpretatsiya teksta: Universal'nyye i natsional'nyye (idioetnicheskiye) strategii. Yazyk i kul'tura: Fakty i tsennosti: K 70–letiyu Yuriya Sergeevich Stepanova. Otv. redaktory: Ye. S. Kubryakova, T. Ye. Yanko [Linguistic interpretation of the text: Universal and national (idio-ethnic) strategies. Language and culture: Facts and values: On the 70th anniversary of Yuri Sergeevich Stepanov. Repl. Editors: E. S. Kubryakova, T. E. Yanko]. Moscow : Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury, pp. 309–323 [in Russian].
6. Dijk, T. A. (1989). Yazyk. Poznaniye. Kommunikatsiya / per. s angl. [Language. Cognition. Communication (trans. from the English) [sost. V. V. Petrova; pod red. V. I. Gerasimova; vstup. st. YU. N. Karaulova i V. V. Petrova]. Moscow: Progress, p. 274. [in Russian]
7. Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch W. (1983). Strategies of Discourse Comprehension. New York: Academic Press.
8. Issers, O. S. (2003). Kommunikativnyye strategii i taktiki russkoy rechi [Communicative strategies and tactics of Russian], Moscow [in Russian].
9. Issers, O. S. (2009). Strategiya rechevoy provokatsii v publichnom dialoge. Russkiy yazyk v nauchnom osveshchenii. [The strategy of speech provocation in a public dialogue. Russian language in scientific coverage]. No 2 (18). Moscow, pp. 92–104 [in Russian].
10. Makarov, M. L. (2003). Osnovy teorii diskursa. [Fundamentals of Discourse Theory] Moscow: Gnosis [in Russian].
11. Pavlichenko, L. V. (2018). Suchasnyy anhlomovnyy diskurs dosudovoho slidstva: komunikativno-prahmatychnyy aspekt. [Contemporary English discourse of pre-trial investigation: communicative-pragmatic aspect]. Unpublished Candidate's thesis. Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
12. Radziyevska, T. V. (1999). Komunikativno-prahmatychni aspekty tekstotvorenniya: avtoref. dys. na zdobuttya nauk. stupenya doktora filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.15 "Zahal'ne movoznavstvo" [Communicative and pragmatic aspects of text-making: author. diss. for the sciences. degree of Dr. Philol. Sciences: Special. 02/10/15 "General Linguistics"]. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
13. Sacks, H. A., Schegloff E., Jefferson G. (1974). Simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation. Language, No 50, pp. 696–735.
14. Selivanova, O. O. (2010). Linhvistychna ensyklopediya [Linguistic Encyclopedia.] Poltava: Dovkillya-K [in Ukrainian].
15. Yarcho, A. V. (2004). Komunikativna stratehiya nevpvnenosti v suchasnomu anhlomovnomu dialohichnomu diskursi: avtoref. dys. na zdobuttya nauk. stupenya kand. filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.04 "Hermans'ki movy" [Communicative uncertainty strategy in contemporary English dialogic discourse: abstract. diss. for the sciences. degree of Cand. philol. Sciences: Special. 02/10/04 "Germanic Languages"]. Kharkiv [in Ukrainian].