Iconicity and Arbitrariness of Linguistic Expressions in Speech Acts

Iconicity and Arbitrariness of Linguistic Expressions in Speech Acts

By

Cristina Mirela Nicolaescu

Editors: Mehmet Ertuğ Yavuz, Uğur Altın and Barış Okatan

Iconicity and Arbitrariness of Linguistic Expressions in Speech Acts

By Cristina Mirela Nicolaescu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

FOREWORD

This study proposes new ways to acquire linguistic competence by considering the relation between linguistic expressions and their meaning, ranging from iconicity to arbitrariness. It shows how language's semantic and pragmatic dimensions are complementary. This understanding is necessary for everyone interested in the philosophy of language.

Speech acts represent some complex communicative units made by producing statements in concrete communication situations. This theory was taken into account relatively late, which determined that the study of speech acts in interpersonal communication remains an area of research that has been addressed little. It means analysing the behaviour of speech acts at the discourse level by revealing their discursive functions from a double perspective: illocutionary and interactional at the discourse level. This analysis goes beyond the mere description of the most general conversational patterns specific to the most frequent acts of speech: assertion, question, and request, acts made, usually through statements of an assertive type, interrogative, and imperative. It starts from the premise, which linguists have already stated, that speech acts should be researched not only from the aspect of their pragmatic-semantic value but also from the aspect of their interactional, dialogic dimension. Speech acts must be examined from a paradigmatic and syntagmatic perspective, relevant for organising communicative sequences using specific speech acts with initiation or response roles.

The theoretical basis comprises studies in fields such as the theory of speech acts, interactionist pragmatics, and discourse analysis. The theoretical framework of the present work is represented by the ideas presented in the works of J. Austin, J. Searle, J. Moeschler, N. Chomsky, and others. The methodology of scientific research is based on pragmatic and contextual analysis aimed to emphasize the specificity of the speech acts' illocution value with the interpretation of research results and formulation of conclusions.

The study is based on consulting a corpus of representative speeches or short sequences of adjacency pairs (groups of two consecutive statements) belonging to various language registers (familiar, colloquial, elevated). Some adjacency pairs have been recorded by direct observation of the conversational interactions within the communication dailies or were obtained through surveys. The other side of the adjacency pairs was extracted from texts related to different language styles. The results of this documentation are presented and analysed in this study to serve a practical purpose. An exhaustive analysis is impossible; therefore, the book presents examples that broadly illustrate the scrutinized linguistic phenomenon. The discursive perspective in the study of speech acts proposes a review of the numerous ways of analysing and classifying speech acts, creating a typology of speech acts relevant to their discursive behaviour. The specific features of conversational interaction and adjacency pairs are then described as minimal sequences of dialogical interaction.

The novelty and scientific originality of the research lie in the fact that the relationship was established between illocutionary and discursive features of speech acts. The present work focuses on combinatory virtualities of speech acts used in conversational interaction, having as a point of starting with the functional-semantic analysis of speech acts. Work is thus not limited to a description of speech acts from a perspective that involves analysis of the illocutionary force of the means and conditions of achievement but also from a perspective that makes possible modelling of conversational interaction. In this way, the research undertaken in this study demonstrated that the illocutionary force specific to speech acts has a vital role in the organisation and development of conversational interaction.

The research undertaken in this work opens the way to the modelling of conversational interaction. Regarding the contribution work on the amplification of scientific theories, it must be specified that it combines the theory of speech acts with discourse analysis, which linguists define as dialogising speech acts.

The research results can be used to study speech acts as a whole, and they are also usable in teaching and practical language learning. The theoretical significance of the study derives primarily from the problems addressed. The paper proposes a solution to the issues involved in the functioning of speech acts in conversational interaction. Interactional

schemes specific to each type of speech act are particularly interesting for understanding how these minimal discursive parts function in conversations. The obtained results are thus relevant for understanding how to organise the dialogue. They could be used to develop university courses on linguistic pragmatics, communication culture, and teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). The work given could serve as a starting point for further research on the manifestation of speech acts at the discursive level in the language. The change of perspective in the present case would mean moving from the classic question, what does the act of speaking represent? to the question, how do speech acts work in discourse?

The methodology will include contrasting/comparing examples from speeches, literary texts, and everyday linguistic interactions and presenting the effects of missing out on subliminal meanings. Key findings, such as how some translation errors can be prevented in language processing and how we can deal with multiple interpretations in the performance of speech acts, will open new avenues of discourse analysis. The limitations come from the diversity of linguistic expressions and the speakers' creative use of language for which no patterns can be established. The expected impact is to raise awareness of the situational use of language for better communication, translation, or reaction to language in various psychological, sociological, and cultural contexts.

The contribution envisaged for this study is as a tool for understanding language "beyond words" and a helper to MA and doctoral students authoring theses in this field and any researchers who may get inspired to take this endeavour even further. The research that was carried out followed and confirmed that speech acts are characterized not only by an illocutionary value but also by a conversational function. The chaining of speech acts in conversational sequences is determined, to a considerable extent, by their pragma semantic features. Particular combinatory possibilities characterize the specific illocutionary value of speech acts; it represents the determining factor in the discursive stringing of speech acts within conversational interaction.

Each type of speech act is characterized by specific conversational patterns, proving a correlation between the illocutionary features and the discursive features of Romanian speech acts. Being determined by the first, the combinatorial value of speech acts is updated utilizing binary

conversational structures. The type and value of speech acts used as a response reaction of the receiver depends on the features of the speech act used in the initiative intervention, particularly the specifics of their illocutionary force and propositional content. Conversational interaction as a type of dialogic communication can be described in terms of the sequence of speech acts; the speech acts that can appear as a reaction to the act in the initiative reply is differentiated by the degree of probability and acceptability. The investigation results can be used in developing teaching materials or presented in the framework of scientific events.

INTRODUCTION

At the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the millennium, communication became one of the most researched fields of human life. The study of communication is perhaps the most complex due to the diverse opinions of researchers on its approach. The development of human communication in the 20th century led to the diversification of concerns for studying discourse from all spheres of life. Academic discourse in the scientific sphere is less in the attention of researchers because this type of discourse presupposes an objective, official, neutral, concise language with a well-articulated, compact, rigorous, austere composition, which at first sight would not violate the norms and rules of construction of discourse. The pragmatic perspective of academic discourse also remains an open topic with multiple aspects generating discussion, as academic discourse significantly impacts science, society, and their development.

Producing an adequate theory of speech is an interdisciplinary task. Not only linguists, psychologists, sociologists, and logicians have been actively working toward verbal communication in recent years with noteworthy results. Interuniversity projects with object semantics and pragmatics coordinate research activities and publish their findings on speech behaviour in social interactions influenced by speakers' culture and strategic purpose. No matter how accurate and rigorous, the surveys cannot ensure final solutions to the relevant issues subject to analysis since the language presents a tremendous diversity of possible expressions. Chapter 1 of this study highlights the creativity system within which people use language based on an adequate methodological base by narrowing the generalities of linguistic courses to particular dialogic instances for a deeper examination of their meanings. The practical purpose of this endeavour is to avoid translation errors, missing out on bits of information embedded in the lexical expressions, or inadequate ways of putting ideas into words. The theory of speech acts is a functional approach to language in its conventional and intentional components under the conditions in which they occur, considered in Chapter 2, with an analysis of perspectives and description

models. The utterances' structural particularities (syntactic and morphological structure) are targeted, highlighting the means used as markers of illocutionary force and those of propositional content. Special attention is also paid to describing the means of language used in the direct and indirect realizations of speech acts in the discourse. How is the conversational interaction organised, starting from the chaining of speech acts in the discourse (how is the dialogic communication structured)?

Regarding the arguments of the dispute about the truth between Strawson, Austin, and Searle, it has been shown above how the controversy about truth was at the basis of the formulation of speech act theory. The dispute drew our attention to the fact that speaking of propositions, their correspondence with reality is not the only criterion we categorize propositions. There is at least one other aspect that emphasizes their performative nature. The theory proposed by Austin is based on the idea that language does not have only a descriptive function but is also used to carry out specific actions with different purposes. According to the given theory, the meaning of a statement is not only reduced to its condition of truth but also involves considering the purpose for which it is used in the concrete act of communication.

If we were to present a summary description of the classical theory of speech acts, as conceived by its founder, we should mention that, for Austin, saying is synonymous with doing. In this way, the theory in question is based on the concept of action performed by using language in concrete communication situations. Being the equivalent of an action, a deed accomplished by uttering them, performative utterances do not presuppose a reference to something in reality. Because of this characteristic, they can be neither true nor false. In Austin's terms, they can only be evaluated as successful or unsuccessful, or felicitous or infelicitous.

In Chapter 3, semantic changes are addressed from diachronic and synchronic perspectives by diving into their actual effects on verbal and written communication, undisclosed by traditional historical linguistics, rather than focusing on the broad principles of this discipline. In other words, the presentation is succinct and applicative rather than theoretical and extensive, as this study aims to correlate and interpret data from the connected branches of linguistics for practical uses related to illocutionary relevance. The theoretical models and their related terminology are presumed

to be known by readers so that more applicative objectives are aimed at, as an essential indeterminacy characterizes natural language. The meaning of each expression has boundaries defined only partially, depending on the knowledge of the speakers, of their interests and objectives, of the activities in which they are involved: this makes them open to new uses, to the creation of new conventions in unexpected contexts.

Traditionally, language study is divided into three disciplines: syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. The syntax is the analysis of the relationships between signs, the semantics of the relationships between signs and objects, and the pragmatics of relations between signs and speakers. Syntax is the study of signs as such, of how linguistic expressions can be combined from a strictly grammatical point of view, which does not consider meaning. It establishes whether a sequence of signs, such as the sentence, there is a mouse in the barn, is well formed or poorly formed, as are the sentences preceded by an asterisk indicating the ungrammaticality. Semantics deals with the meaning of linguistic expressions – words or sentences – outside the situations in which they are used; it studies the relationships between linguistic expressions and objects of the world. The central semantic thesis is that the rules or conventions of a language like English finally fix the meaning of every expression of the language - word or phrase.

Chapter 4 deals with aspects of lexical semantics and their relevance in verbal communication, considering Grice's idea of the teleology of communication, accompanied by a view of the rhetoric of scientific argumentation, and justificatory responsibility attached to claims.

The objectives of Chapter 5 are to provide conceptual milestones by which to investigate ambiguity in speeches as informed by applied linguistics to the study of speech acts to establish general laws that allow the identification of the most specific prototypical interactional schemes of frequent speech acts. When emphasizing the correlation between illocutionary function and linguistic achievement, researchers describe the linguistic means of encoding speech acts (the syntactic structures through which speech acts and performative verbs are expressed). The aspects of discourse organisation and information distribution in the syntactic structure are presented as a merger in textual analysis. Chapter 6 provides a stylistic

perspective of connotative meanings on two levels of analysis: discursive strategies and internal structure of the communication.

The work is thus not limited to a description of speech acts from a perspective that involves analysis of the illocutionary force of the means and conditions of achievement but also from a perspective that makes it possible to model conversational interaction. The critical issue investigated in that field consists in the identification and description of the general principles that regulate the discursive behaviour of speech acts in the communication process, which made it possible to establish the interactional schemes or conversational patterns specific to the bare speech acts: assertion, question and the request. The discursive perspective in the analysis of speech acts proposes a review of the numerous ways of analysing and classifying speech acts, creating a typology of speech acts relevant to their discursive behaviour. The specific features of the conversational interaction and the adjacency pairs are then described as minimal sequences of the conversational interaction based on linguistic analysis of the lexical expressions that constitute them. Language has a descriptive function that is used to conduct actions with different goals. Speech, as a form of language manifestation, represents a human behaviour determined by a specific intentionality.

This point of view on the functions with which language is used in communication was highlighted by the theory of speech acts since language is not only a descriptive function; it is used for realising actions with different goals. In other words, utterances are used not only to describe events in reality but also to perform certain acts in so much as their meaning of a statement is not reduced only to its truth condition but also involves the consideration of the purpose for which it is used in a concrete form of communication. Despite the high frequency of specialised studies that aim to analyse different types of speech acts, not all aspects of this phenomenon have been fully elucidated and described at the interactional level regarding lexical composition, its functional value, and the respective supporting syntactic structure. As for the discursive behaviour of speech acts, it should be mentioned that this is a phenomenon whose research was taken into account recently, which determined that the study of speech acts in interpersonal communication still needs to be addressed in the specialised literature.

J. Austin initially founded the speech acts theory on the distinction between constative statements (describing the real world) and performative utterances (performing an action). The performative utterances represent "the performance of an action" (Austin, 1969: 27). They involve the designation of an action and its realisation, which means saying is doing. Since they cannot be related to a situation from reality, performative statements can be considered neither true nor false. They can only be evaluated as being successful or unsuccessful, or, in Austin's terms, "felicitous" or "infelicitous" (Austin, 1969: 34). According to subsequent developments of the theory, he concluded that constative statements could be assimilated to performatives.

Representing some complex communicative units achieved by producing utterances in concrete communication situations, speech acts admit different approaches. As stated in the studies of pragmatic linguistics, the acts of speech can be viewed from a double perspective: 1) from the point of view of how they are organised individually in the language system and 2) from the point of view of how they manifest at the level of discourse. Examining the ways of analysing speech acts, J. Moeschler distinguishes the following types: 1) analysis of speech acts carried out at the utterance level and analysis of speech acts conducted at the level of discourse. By applying these modes of analysis, the author aims to distinguish the acts of speech as speaking as unity of discourse.

The structural particularities (morphological and syntactic) of the utterances through which the speech acts are performed are put in the foreground by the main lexical-semantic classes with the role of illocutionary force markers. Special attention is also given to describing the means of language used in the direct and indirect realisation of the speech acts.

In analysing speech acts of individual utterances, the researchers follow the illocutionary force of different types of speech acts and how the sender carries them out in the communication process through verbal means. However, it has been demonstrated that the communication process involves not only the production by the sender of some utterances to be understood by the recipient but also a response reaction of the latter about those uttered by the speaker. As individual units, speech acts are interpreted without their behaviour considered in the structure of verbal exchanges.

Still, they are analysed in isolation, disregarding the interactional, discursive context in which they are carried out.

In the interactionist approach, the emphasis is on the rules that regulate their chaining in the structure of adjacency pairs. Being defined as a "minimum unit of the interactional structure" (Austin, 1969: 17), the speech act is examined this time through the lens of the act of correlation speech - context of achievement. In this way, the acts of speech are characterised not only by realisation, as happens in the case of atomistic analyses, but also in relation to the circumstances and concrete aspects of communication in which the speaker formulates his statement.

This approach offers a complete representation of the speech act as a minimal communication unit, which ensures the interconnection between a specific value and a linguistic and extralinguistic context. Therefore, describing a speech act from a pragmatic perspective means identifying the illocutionary force (a pragmatic component) applied to propositional content (a semantic component).

Speech acts represent linguistic segments that manifest themselves at the level of conversational interaction, thus being characterised by a specific discursive behaviour. Consequently, if examined only from the illocutionary perspective, the linguistic composition of such acts would remain outside the scope of analysis. This is why the theory of speech acts in Austin and Searle's version does not apply to conversation analysis. This aspect is brought back to the centre of researchers' attention through the investigations of modern linguists, among which the French linguist C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni completes the theory with the interactive concept.

Therefore, the theory of speech acts begins to be interested not only in speech acts as independent entities but also in the interactional sequences in which they are used. At the same time, speech acts are examined in close connection with the context and the communicative situation in which they functioned. The basic unit of conversational interaction is no longer the speech act seen as an isolated entity, but a sequence consisting of at least two acts, one of which initiates the adjacency pair and the other concludes. In this context, it is essential to remember that conversational interaction is also possibly characterized by two sides: a semantic side (of the conditions of the functional interpretation within the interactional sequences) and a syntactic side (defines the conditions regarding their good formation).

All this proves that speech acts also have two dimensions: a semantic dimension (highlighted by the individual unit's analysis type) and a syntactic dimension (highlighted by the interactionist analysis). The first dimension establishes the conditions for interpreting and functional-semantic typology of acts of speech. The other dimension is relevant to establishing the conditions of speech acts in speech. These two dimensions are interdependent; therefore, examining the semantic dimension can serve as a basis for understanding the syntactic structure.

In conclusion, speech acts can be interpreted from a double perspective by considering their characteristic values (the semantics of speech acts) and their relationships in their conversational interaction (the syntax of speech acts). In this way, examining the discursive behaviour of speech acts represents essential support for understanding dialogic communication. Therefore, speech acts are defined not only by a specific illocutionary force, by certain pragmatic conditions of production, by specific linguistic means of realization, but also by a particular discursive valence that determines their use in typical conversational patterns and allows the identification of prototypical interactional schemes specific to the most frequent speech acts. Conversational interaction consists of verbal exchanges, which in turn comprise interventions that contain speech acts in their structure. Linguistic expressions in a speech act are the minimal segment of dialogic communication; the interactional structures are manifested through sequences constituted by the succession of speech acts.

The discursive behaviour of assertive speech acts (informational) and their pragmatic-semantic features, question speech acts, and the crucial factors for their integration into conversational sequences alongside the response type will be analysed. Request-type speech acts will be investigated in combination with acceptance or rejection on the hearer's part. All these patterns are attempted to emphasise their functionality and the required linguistic competence for understanding.

Being a type of communication regulated by specific discursive strategies, dialogues play an essential role in everyday communication, either formal or informal. Despite the multitude of points of view regarding the constitutive parts of conversation, most researchers agree that two plans for organising conversational interaction are presented as hierarchical and sequential organisation (or as integrative and linear models).

The hierarchical organisation plan aims to identify the lexical segments and establish how to structure the conversational interaction vertically. The conversational interaction represents a combination of units of higher and lower ranks. Furthermore, the plan of sequential organisation has a significant role in clarifying their functioning at various levels in the structure of conversational interaction. It aims to develop a succession of the same rank in the structure of constitutive sequences in the communication process. In the act of communication, these units function by integrating into specific sequences of a semantic-pragmatic nature.

The structure of verbal exchanges, subsumed under discussion as a type of dialogic communication, can be described in terms of the sequence of speech acts. In this vein, J. Moeschler considers extending the theory of speech acts to discourse analysis (Moeschler 2011: 239).

Conversational interaction as a particular form of dialogue (alternative interventions of some participants in the act of communication) does not represent an arbitrary string of utterances. However, the initiation and the replies are intricately connected structurally and semantically, giving coherence to the overall speech. The adjacency pairs thus represent some verbal sequences formed by interventions closely related to each other. The fact that the lines that constitute an adjacency pair are closely related can be demonstrated by the fact that, usually, the two lines cannot be understood without each other. As a result, adjacency pairs provide a broad perspective on the functioning of speech acts in verbal communication. Being understood as a combination of speech acts and constituting a minimal discursive unit, the adjacency pair is characterised by a particular format, content, and functional features. These aspects can be highlighted by analysing the components, structure, and functioning.

At the end of the work, a critical observation within an epistemological-scientific context was formulated by identifying and describing the general principles that regulate the discursive behaviour of speech acts in the communication process. This procedure opens the way to remodelling conversational interaction in the hope that it could serve as an impetus for further research on the manifestation of speech acts at the discursive level.

1

THE CREATIVE SYSTEM OF LANGUAGE

1.1. Types of communication: simple and complex

In the formal logic system, we attach semantic values to the basic categories of logical grammar: we attach things to names and truth values to propositions. Valuation and interpretation are two operations that, in the case of a formal system like logic, link semantics to pragmatics. Valuation is the operation that assigns values to the ambiguous expressions in a sentence, thereby giving us the interpretation of the sentences.

Representing some complex communicative units made by producing statements in concrete communication situations, speech acts admit different approaches and interpretations, bringing various aspects of the phenomenon to light. As specified in the studies of pragmatic linguistics, speech acts can be viewed from a double perspective: a) from the point of view of how they are organised in the language system and b) from the point of view of how they manifest themselves at the discourse level. Speaking about analysing speech acts, J. Moeschler distinguishes the following types: an analysis of speech acts carried out at the statement level, and an analysis of speech acts carried out at the discourse level. By applying these analysis models, the author aims to distinguish the speech act as a communication unit from the speech act as a discourse unit.

The first model of analysis, namely the analysis at the utterance level, involves an examination of speech acts from the aspect of their existence in the language, which is equivalent to the analysis of the segments in question from the point of view of their isolated manifestation, without taking into account their behaviour in the structure of verbal exchanges. This analysis method, which is of the "atomist" type, describes the speech act as an entity characterized by a specific illocutionary force applied to a propositional content. In the case of this model, speech acts are analysed in isolation, disregarding the interactional, discursive context in

which they are carried out. Researchers generally focus their attention on the structure of speech acts, identifying a locutionary component (the utterance of a verbal sequence), an illocutionary component (the realization of a communication intention), and a perlocutionary (provoking a reaction of the interlocutor as a result of receiving and interpreting the statement).

The first analysis grid examines the essential aspects of speech acts, particularly those that allow their definition and identification as language units. The goal of applying such an analysis model is to ensure the release of particularities, semantic-pragmatic, and structural characteristics of different subtypes of speech acts, providing a broad picture of the speech acts.

The second analysis model examines speech acts in a broader functional plan from the discourse perspective. Speech acts are seen as actions performed by using language in concrete communication situations involving the interaction of the interlocutors. The essential difference between these two types of speech act analysis resides in the fact that, while the first is an action analysis (the speech act is seen as the production of an utterance), the second is an interactionist analysis (the speech act as a unit used within specific conversational structures). The interactionist analysis grid aims to reveal the aspect related to the use of speech acts in discourse. In other words, this type of analysis involves the examination of speech acts as elements of conversational interaction, emphasising the rules that regulate their chaining in the structure of adjacency pairs.

Being defined as a "minimum unit of the interactional structure," the speech act is examined this time through the prism of the speech act - performance context correlation. In this way, speech acts are characterised not only in relation to the means of achievement, as in the case of an atomistic analysis, but also to the concrete circumstances of communication in which the speaker formulates a statement. It should be mentioned that this approach provides a complete picture of the speech act in its capacity as a minimal unit of communication through which the interconnection between a specific value and a linguistic and extralinguistic context is ensured. We should say that the study of speech acts from an interactional, conversational perspective implies, broadly speaking, the delimitation of the following aspects:

a) identifying the illocutionary value specific to the speech act.
b) analysis of the chaining of speech acts in specific interactional structures.
c) establishing the functions with which speech acts are used in the composition of adjacency pairs.
d) examining the relationships established between utterances as means of performing speech acts.

Speech act theory constitutes a theory within which speech acts are examined from an illocutionary perspective, namely from the perspective of the values that characterise them and from the point of view of the means used for their expression. However, it is well known that speech acts represent some units that manifest themselves at the level of conversational interaction, thus being characterised by a specific discursive behaviour. Therefore, if the speech acts were examined only from an illocutionary perspective, this aspect remained outside the scope of the researchers' investigation. This is why it is sometimes stated that the theory of speech acts in Austin and Searle's version does not apply to the field of conversation.

The classical conception of speech acts is supplemented with an interactive conception in contemporary linguistics. Therefore, speech act theory becomes interested in speech acts as independent entities and the interactional sequences in which they are used. At the same time, speech acts are examined in close connection with the context and the communicative situation in which they function. The basic unit of conversational interaction is no longer the speech act seen as an isolated entity but a sequence consisting of at least two acts, one of which initiates the adjacency pair and the other concludes it.

However, despite the multitude of points of view regarding the constitutive units of conversation, most researchers agree that two plans for organising conversational interaction can be delimited:

a) hierarchical organisation and
b) sequential (or linear) organisation.

The hierarchical organisation plan aims to identify a succession and establish a way of structuring the conversational interaction vertically. The hierarchical principle underlies this level of organisation and stipulates that conversational interaction represents an assemblage of elements structured on several levels. This means that a higher-order communicative unit from the structure of conversational interaction is formed by a combination of immediately lower rank, which are, in turn, more straightforward and smaller.

The plan of sequential organisation is relevant for clarifying the functioning of communicative elements of various levels in the structure of conversational interaction. It aims to develop the succession of segments of the same rank in the structure of constitutive sequences in the communication process. In communication, they integrate into specific sequences, certain interactional chains of a semantic-pragmatic nature. In this way, the conversational interaction is structured on several levels under principles that are hierarchical and functional, namely,

a) The principle of hierarchical organisation involves a particular arrangement of communicative units in the structure of conversational interaction. According to this principle, complex conversational interactions are made up of simpler and smaller elements; in other words, the conversation is constituted by articulating simple elements into increasingly complex ones.

b) The principle of sequential organisation. In the structure of the conversation, the sequence of speech acts takes place in their capacity as minimal entities of a dialogue.

These principles are the basis of the two models for describing conversational interaction: the integrative and linear models of conversational interaction. The first level at which the organisation of conversational interaction can be traced is the hierarchical level. According to this principle, a unit of a certain rank consists of a combination of units of the immediately lower rank or even of a single unit. It follows from the definition that the structure of the language is presented in the form of

"floors", levels arranged hierarchically. This hierarchy consists of the fact that each higher unit is functionally different from a lower unit.

Defining the conversation as a chain of replicas produced consecutively by two or more people participating in the dialogue, the researchers delimit specific communicative elements in its structure. The number and type of these communicative elements differ from one work to another. Analysing the studies devoted to the description of conversational interaction demonstrates a remarkable diversity regarding the components of the interactional structure identified within this type of communication. The structure of the dialogue results from the articulation of simple units into increasingly complex ones. The minimal unit is considered to be the speech act. The unit of immediately higher rank, which has speech acts as constituent parts, is the communicative movement. Several movements are included in each speaker's interventions. Two or more interventions make up the exchange. Exchanges form a transaction.

The minimal unit that makes up the dialogue is the reply. A reply is equivalent to a participant's verbal and non-verbal contribution to the dialogue, considered the smallest unit of the dialogic construction. How the utterances are chained represents the interactive, local structure of the dialogue. Given that the basis of any conversational interaction is the speech act made through the statements uttered by the participants, a conversation can be seen as a sequence of exchanges composed of speech acts. Considering the above, the structure of verbal exchanges, subsumed under discussion as a type of dialogic communication, can be described in terms of the sequence of speech acts. In this vein, Moeschler talks about extending the theory of speech acts to discourse analysis. The central problem related to analysing the sequential organisation of conversational interactions is the clarification of the principles and rules of chaining the interventions within which certain speech acts are performed. Explaining how the two parts of a conversational sequence interact on a semantic-pragmatic level is especially important for understanding the adjacency pair and its pragmatic functions.

Representing some building units of conversational interaction, adjacency pairs offer a broad perspective for analysing the functioning of speech acts in verbal communication. At the same time, the characteristic of the adjacency pair, in its capacity as a minimal functional unit in the composition of the dialogue, allows a correct description of the features and

mechanisms of the conversational interaction. Being understood as a combination of speech acts and constituting a minimal discursive unit, the adjacency pair is characterised by specific formal, content, and functional features. These aspects can be highlighted by analysing adjacency pairs' component elements, structure, and functioning in conversational interaction. In conversational interaction, they show themselves interactively, having a different behaviour. Thus, if the transmitter is guided in the production of his intervention by his communicative intention, then the receiver is obliged to react verbally to the intervention of the first speaker; in other words, in formulating his reply, he must consider the intervention of the first speaker. Under these conditions, the intervention-type constituents in the structure of the adjacency pair, realized by the involvement of the two participants in the act of communication, also have a different status: they differ both in terms of position and according to their role in the conversational interaction: initiative intervention and reactive intervention. An intervention can often include two or even more speech acts. Independent speech is an act whose illocutionary purpose is determined by the speaker's communicative intention.

At the same time, the dependent speech act is a speech act whose illocutionary purpose is determined by the illocutionary purpose of the speech act from the previous intervention. Unlike the first replica of the adjacency pair, the second one depends on the previous context, which is often incomprehensible outside of this context. In the intervention position, initiatives usually include questions such as requests, proposals, and promises, and in the position of reactive interventions, answers, denials, acceptances, refusals, thanks, justifications, apologies, etc., are used. Each initiative intervention admits more or less numerous realization possibilities. For example, an answer typically follows a question, but the interlocutor may react to the speaker's question with another. At the same time, a proposal can be followed not only by an acceptance but also by a refusal, an excuse, showing how wide the structural possibility is to build an adjacency pair.

The receiver takes into account the initiatory intervention of the sender, having, at the same time, the freedom to choose, from several possibilities, the variant that best corresponds to his communicative intention. Therefore, the study of the specialized literature revealed that the

arrangement of adjacency pairs, constituted by the chaining of closely related speech acts, is mainly explained in terms of dependence or involvement and terms of preference (selection, expectation, prediction). In discourse analysis research, the chaining rule that regulates the relationship between the two parts of the adjacency pair is formulated by referring to other concepts, among which the one of relevance, conditional relevance, and that of constraint, chaining illocutionary restriction.

After describing the principles on which the determining rules of conversational organisation are based, the factors that regulate the sequence of the chaining of speech acts in the structure are to be elucidated adjacency pairs. The analysis of the conversation by cutting out the adjacency pairs implies clarifying the plans for arranging the conversational interaction and establishing the contextual factors and linguistic elements on which the combination of speech acts in the structure of the adjacency pair depends. J. Moeschler, examining different types of adjacency pairs, finds that the following four conditions express the chaining restrictions of speech acts in the structure of adjacency pairs:

(i)   The thematic condition imposes on the reactive constituent a theme identical to that of the initiative constituent.

(ii) The propositional content condition requires the reactive constituent to establish a semantic relationship (opposite, implicative, or paraphrastic) with the initiative constituent.

(iii) The illocutionary condition imposes a particular illocutionary function on the reactive constituent.

(iv) The argumentative orientation condition requires the reactive constituent to be argumentatively oriented in the same direction as the initiative constituent.

As shown by Moeschler, the extent to which the above restrictions are met determines the degree of cohesion and coherence of the discursive sequence. Concerning these conditions, it is necessary to emphasize that the chaining restrictions that the reactive intervention must satisfy to comply with the conditions imposed by the interlocutor's stimulus intervention depend on semantic and pragmatic factors to the greatest extent. Semantic-pragmatic coherence is required. Thus, for a pair of adjacencies to be well-

formed, two primary conditions must be observed: the propositional content condition and the illocutionary condition. These conditions concern the relationship between the initiative constituent and the reactive constituent from the structure of the adjacency pair. The one that must satisfy the chaining restrictions, in other words, correspond to the initiative intervention, is the reactive intervention represented by a particular speech act. It becomes evident that when an adjacency pair in the structure of conversational interaction is well-formed and coherent, it is characterised by the following:

a) by semantic unity (ensured by the matching of the two statements in the composition of the adjacency pair at the level of the propositional content), and

b) through illocutionary unity (which means that the force with which the speech act is performed reactive is consistent with the illocutionary force of the initiative speech act).

However, it is crucial to see the chaining mechanism of speech in conversational interaction. The discursive chaining of speech acts in the structure of adjacency pairs is based on discursive valence. The principles of describing and characterizing the valence of lexical units in the structure of the statement could also be extended to the description of the valence specific to utterances as a means of performing speech acts in conversational interaction. Thus, respecting this proximity between the valence of the lexeme and that of the utterance, we should consider that any utterance in its quality as a means of realising a speech act functioning as a part of a minimal discursive unit should be defined by two types of discursive valence. At the discourse level, some features depend on the nature of the illocutionary force of the utterance, and the specifics of the propositional content determine others.

Therefore, in the process of formulating the reactive reply, the interlocutor is obliged to take into account both components. However, as the language facts demonstrate, it can mainly refer to the propositional content or the illocutionary force of the statement expressing the reactive reply. Below are two adjacency pairs:

1. ─ *Mark is going on vacation.*
─ *Where?* (Focus is on propositional content)
2. ─ *Mark is going on vacation.*
─ *Why are you telling me so late?* (focus is on illocution)

The reactive intervention depends on the focus of the interlocutor, which is different in the two examples above. Therefore, a conversational sequence is characterised by semantic and pragmatic coherence, one of the principles that regulate the dynamics of conversational structures. Certain specific conversational patterns characterize each type of speech act. For example, the speech act assertion constitutes adjacency pairs with the structure assertion + acceptance, assertion + rejection, etc. The speech act question is used in the composition of adjacency pairs with the structure question + answer (assertion), question + question, etc. The request speech act comprises adjacency pairs with the structure: request + acceptance, request + refusal, etc. Knowing the prototypical interactional schemes specific to each type of speech act is particularly interesting for understanding how these minimal discursive units function in conversational interaction.

Given the substantial number of speech acts that admit several possibilities of combination, we should note that in conversational interaction, it is possible to have a relative number of adjacency pairs. However, being analysed from specific points of view, the adjacency pairs could be reduced to a few elementary types of articulation of speech acts characterized by a given sequential scheme. According to the principle of preferential arrangement of adjacency pairs, initiative interventions in the structure of these conversational units can be followed by two types of reactive interventions: a) preferred (or expected) and b) non-preferred (or unexpected). Accepting a request will represent a preferred speech act, and rejecting the request will represent a non-preferred speech act. In these conditions, unexpected, non-preferred speech acts are, in fact, triggers for new reactions from the interlocutor, thus presupposing the continuation of the conversation. The completeness or incompleteness of verbal exchanges depends on the achievement / non-achievement of the goal pursued by the speaker.

In the second case, speech acts seen as component elements of some interactional sequences are examined from the point of view of how

they manifest at the discourse level. These consist of at least two speech acts, one that initiates the adjacency pair and another that ends it. To describe the discursive functions of speech acts, it was necessary to create a classification of these units that would consider not only aspects related to their implicit contents (illocutionary force, propositional content) but also certain particularities regarding their discursive behaviour.

In conclusion, the elements of the interactional structure that constitute a conversation are arranged hierarchically: elements of lower rank are combined into units of immediately higher rank. In terms of hierarchical organisation, conversational interaction consists of verbal exchanges, which in turn are comprised of interventions, which contain in their structure acts of speaking. The interactional structures are manifested through sequences constituted by the succession of speech acts. The analysis of pragmatics studies demonstrates that speech acts can be viewed from a double perspective: actional (illocutionary) and interactional. The first type of analysis, carried out at the level of the utterance, aims at establishing and characterising the illocutionary value of the respective speech act (the kind of action performed by using the utterance in concrete communication situations), identifying the means of language used to express this value and revealing the conditions for its realisation (successful or unsuccessful) of speech acts. The classical theory of speech acts in the version of J. Austin and his successors (J. Searle, D. Vanderveken, and others) is the one that concerns itself with the action aspects of speech acts.

1.2. Creating new styles of communication

Language is a complex phenomenon that involves several simultaneous aspects, but they occur on diverse levels and can, therefore, be approached from different points of view. First, there are distinguished syntactic constituents and the systems they are integrated into. At the same time, they present internal differentiations.

From the socio-cultural and stylistic point of view, for all the functions that can be considered in the language, it is possible and necessary to distinguish the two aspects of norm and system for a deeper understanding of facts. The norm may coincide with the system (when the system offers a single possibility), and the individual embodiment may