

DOI: 10.51480/1899-5101.15.2(31).6

Communicative Analysis of Dialogical Interaction: Methodology of Research

Oleksii Borysov ORCID: 0000-0001-6159-199X

T. H. Shevchenko National University "Chernihiv Colehium", Ukraine

Olena Vasylieva ORCID: 0000-0003-3241-4892

T. H. Shevchenko National University "Chernihiv Colehium", Ukraine

Abstract: Dialogue studies suggest keys to understanding communicative behavior. The purpose of this article is to put forth a more complex and comprehensive approach to the analysis of interaction that incorporates quantitative metrics to reveal its entire communicative depth. The methods of discourse-analysis, initiative-response analysis, a theory of speech acts, conversational, cognitive, stylistic, statistical analyses as well as descriptive and interpretative methods have been united in one system to interpret the procedure and results of the cooperative and conflict dialogues chosen as an example. The integrated methodology produces a broader investigative view of communication, also because it allows measuring the level of dominance of interlocutors and explaining it in terms of power relations. In this way, it contributes to a better understanding of the multifaceted nature of dialogue without any characteristics to be underestimated. The methodology is an open system and is suggested as a sample of dialogical communication research.

Keywords: methodology; communication; dialogue; power; influence.

INTRODUCTION

Today's linguistics seems more than ever to reveal its keen interest in human communication. The obvious reasons for it are globalization and virtualization processes, which greatly modify personal interactions, and the dominance of the anthropocentric episteme as a rather balanced and fruitful approach to language studies (Linell, 2015; Malchanau et al., 2018; Schmied, 2020; van Dijk, 2008; Wodak & Meyer, 2015). As a result, the problems of effective communication, understanding, and, ultimately, of genuine dialogue, which unites individuals and helps

them achieve their goals, fall into the focus of numerous investigations. So, the topicality of the paper is brought out by the general anthropocentric tendencies of modern linguistic studies that tend to acknowledge dialogue as a communicative realization of the universal and at the same time culturally predetermined concept of DIALOGUE existing in the individual and ethnic consciousness.

Even though dialogical communication has been an object of study since antique times, there is a never-ending interest in such a phenomenon mainly because it does not possess explicit outlines. Dialogue is rightly believed in Rudnick et al. (2014) to be an elusive notion and a complex phenomenon due to the communicative, cognitive, psychological, socio-cultural and physical coordinates of its realization (Linell, 2015). These are the exact reasons why dialogue has got a number of interpretations, namely as a form of speech (Kelly, 2013), communicative action (Atkinson, 2013; Carbaugh, 2013), human (or social) practice (Jensen, 2018; van Dijk, 2008), a method of cognition (Langlotz, 2015; Preston, 2017), a way of enabling learning (Martínez del Castillo, 2015), overcoming difficulties of understanding (Koike & Blyth, 2015; Vaskivska et al., 2019) and conflicts (Schmied, 2020).

These different interpretations lead to understanding that dialogue studies need to take into account a broader socio-cultural, communicative and psychological context of interactions (Fairclough, 2001; Jakubowska-Branicka, 2014; Malchanau et al., 2018; Povolná, 2016; Simić J. & Simić R., 2019). The reason is that relationships in social groups are based on communicative actions which reflect both social and individual motivation, aspirations and mutual interdependence (Searle, 1979; Tarasov, 1990), which means that individuals tend to influence each other in communication (Liu et al., 2021) and this influence is conceptualized in terms of *power* (Atkinson, 2013; Martínez del Castillo, 2015; van Dijk, 2008). Curiously enough, while interacting linguistically, people are generally not aware of the fact that a power struggle takes place in an ordinary dialogue (Fairclough, 2001), which is actually a symbiosis of cooperation and, finally, egocentrism (Honghui & Dongchun, 2019).

The research objective of this article is to demonstrate a thorough communicative analysis of dialogical interaction when a maximum number of its parameters including power as an indispensable part of a human's motivational sphere is taken into consideration. This methodological procedure is carried out in the framework of cratological (from the Greek *cratos* (power)) theory of discourse (Foucault, 1998; Potseluev, 2008; Rikjor, 2002; Shejgal, 2001). The theory is referred to critical discourse-analysis that also comprises linguistic, semiotic and socio-communicative discourse interpretations (Barthes, 1994; Fairclough, 2001; van Dijk, 2008; Wodak & Meyer, 2015).

THEORY: POWER IN COMMUNICATION

T. van Dijk (2008, vii) states that discourse and power are two fundamental phenomena in society that go hand in hand with one another. Power can be interpreted as discourse relation between interacting partners, who produce an impact on each other (Jahedy et al., 2014; Wodak & Meyer, 2015), and it is in power that an interlocutors' will is realized. Power reveals itself in communication, for example, in the person's right to speak and deprive the others of this right *ad hoc* (Fairclough, 2001; Shejgal, 2001). Power's motive reflects a desire to produce some necessary changes in a person's surroundings and leads to the best strategic line of communicative behavior elaboration.

Language, a need to communicate and power are inherent features of *Homo sapiens* nature (Barth-Weingarten, 2008; Gill & Azhar, 2018; Jakubowska-Branicka, 2014; Preston, 2017). The primary stimulus to the desire for power realization lies in the principle "the Care of the Self" (Foucault, 1998). This view of the world makes an individual do their best in taking self-care (Appiah & Bosiwah, 2015). The principle is a basis for human existence and a social practice formed in ancient times, when subordination and dominance were an integral part of prehistoric society (Spirkin, 2006). Nowadays, the cultivation of this principle is embodied in people's manipulation of each other, to which even a simple compulsion of the addressee to start an unplanned communication refers. Implicit (interactive) or explicit (status) power is revealed in strategic program construction and control over its realization in the communicative situation (Makarov, 2003; Pitts & Giles, 2008; Potseluev, 2008). Social relations are inevitably based on power, which makes them more purposeful and mobilizes individuals in their actions (Rikjor, 2002). In this way, dialogical discourse can also be defined as a cause-consequence phenomenon which shapes social relations in terms of unequal capacity to exercise control over text construction in cultural contexts (Linell, 1990).

Accordingly, even seemingly equal relations demonstrate communicators inequality. In dialogue, while one person talks, another is involved in the process of speech interpretation (Malchanau et al., 2018) and is *forced* to wait and think about how to react next. The change of the addresser and the addressee means an act of mutual compulsion or intersubject power demonstration to produce a verbal or non-verbal reaction (Barthes, 1994; Foucault, 1998; Linell, 1990). Success in dialogue depends to a great extent on the ability to regulate the whole communication process (Ivashkevych & Prymachok, 2019). Ultimately, that is the way for, as Prihodko (2018) states, "the recipient to recognize and perceive the speaker's attitude and ideas".

A discourse form of power embodiment is "communicative influence". Influence is an either or both purposeful verbal and non-verbal action meant to change

the listener's system of knowledge, emotions, attitude, behavior (Tarasov, 1990) by means of the imposition of different types of constraints on the way interlocutors process information (Potapenko, 2016). To influence in order to achieve the results is the essence of any interaction (Pitts & Giles, 2008) and reflects the addresser's capacity to control and correct the addressee's behavior. Successful influence means the fulfillment of speakers' intentions. In this context, dialogue is rightfully interpreted as a communicative space of power exercise (Potseluev, 2008). Taking all things together, we understand dialogue as a genetically inherent and socially realized cognitive-communicative human resource employed by a person when the necessary state of things in one's intellectual, psychological, physical or communicative world depends on the interaction with others.

Interlocutors' influence is directly connected with "communicative initiative". The latter is a different level of activity in their strategy implementation, a natural parameter of any communication (Makarov, 2003). Displaying partners' different language and speech competence, intellect, characters, a propensity towards conflict realization, the initiatives build a particular style and tone of communication (Acitelli, 2002; Makarov, 2003) and reveal its asymmetric character (Kucherenko, 2016). Moreover, the initiative (or leadership) means a reduction of communicative rights of the partner despite one's resistance (Potseluev, 2008). In other words, the key aspect of initiative is communicative violence which is realized in cognitive, affective and axiological intrusion into personal space (Rikjor, 2002) and can be either positive or negative. The positive presupposes a contextual or institutionally approved change of the roles of "the addresser" and "the addressee" or cooperative interventions to support one's ideas, opinions, attitudes. The negative is aggression characterized by communicative bans of partner's reactions, one's status or authority defamation and humiliation. This type is realized through the usage of swear words, imperative structures of commands, menaces, the tone of neglect, rudeness and scorn (Appiah & Bosiwah, 2015; Potseluev, 2008).

In short, the interlocutor who happens to be more active in communication has better chances of greater influence. However, from the interactional perspective, the main thing is not just about who introduces more topics or how much they talk but is about the ability and interest to sustain and actively contribute to the interaction (Linell, 1990). This means for an investigator that the study of dialogue cannot be reduced either to the number of turns and their wording, to communication acts in their cognitive, communicative or social perspectives, or to the symbols of power exclusively (Atkinson, 2013) as most studies of dialogue have used (Fairclough, 2001; Karasik, 2013; Shejgal, 2001; Wodak & Meyer 2015, etc.). To estimate the dynamics of interaction and its results properly, the researcher needs to employ an all-embracing linguistic analysis which will grasp all the communicative constructs emerging in the constantly changing interaction space

also due in no small part to contextual power realization. As Pitts & Giles (2008, p. 20) rightfully state “conversational and relational goals constantly change... the interactants can become distracted due to some factors to communicate effectively”. Researchers should take everything into consideration in their research. Here we argue for the statement that a constant reference—to the motivational, intellectual, emotional, social, etc. contents of interaction—necessitates any communicative research being provided with a wide scope of various linguistic methods. Furthermore, the analysis should be enriched by an initiative-response method of analysis (IR analysis) (Linell et al., 1988; Linell, 2015), which allows dialogue to be coded from the interactional perspective (Reuzel et al., 2013).

METHODOLOGY

The investigation was conducted with the help of the general scientific methods of induction, deduction, analysis and synthesis, seven linguistic methods as well as descriptive and interpretative methods of analysis. The linguistic methods were: (i) discourse analysis—to establish strategies and tactics of communication, their consequences and pragmatics (Makarov, 2003; van Dijk, 2008); (ii) a theory of speech acts—differentiate the illocution goals and force of utterances (Pocheptsov, 1981; Searle, 1971); (iii) conversational analysis—to identify the dialogical type, genre, topics and turn-taking (Makarov, 2003; Sacks et al., 1974); (iv) initiative response analysis—to establish communicative dominance, control, initiative, asymmetry as well as initiative and response replicas (Linell, et al., 1988; Reuzel et al., 2013); (v) cognitive analysis—to characterize the conceptual side of the dialogical turns (Makarov, 2003; van Dijk, 2008); (vi) stylistic analysis—to find out stylistic devices and expressive means of influence as well as lexical units of different functional styles (Shejgal, 2001); and (vii) the method of statistics—to calculate the level of one’s dominance and dialogue asymmetry (Reuzel et al., 2013).

The choice of these methods for this methodological procedure which, if necessary, is open to be further enriched with other methods seems to be logical. The linguist must focus on all the objective and subjective parameters of communication as they shape meanings in interaction (Malchanau et al., 2018). Only then such an approach will enable the investigator to produce a fully-fledged description and interpretation and to come to exact, convincing results. We hope that the elaborated methodology of research gives such an opportunity. The developed investigative strategy of looking at dialogue consistently, systematically and from different angles is an attempt made in the situation when the theory of communication is in constant search of its methodological practices (Pitts & Giles, 2008).

The acknowledgment of lingual and non-lingual signs reflecting the power aspirations of the interlocutors and, in this way, representing the dynamics of the whole communication process answers the question as to why these units appear in dialogue at all. Power manifestation has various means and ways of expression. For example, at the levels of phonetic, morphological, lexical, syntactical language, and through stylistic elements, communicative strategies, tactics, speech acts, genres (Barth-Weingarten, 2008; Karasik, 2013; Shejgal, 2001). Furthermore, communicators' different language and speech contributions to dialogue construction are explained by different levels of their initiative. Thus, from the angle of interactants' activity dialogue must also be analyzed on the "symmetry–asymmetry" scale.

The level of asymmetry can be calculated through the comparison of the level of dominance of speakers (Linell, 1990). Dominance is a complex phenomenon and consists of three types – interactional, topical and quantitative (Linell et al., 1988, p. 415). *Quantitative* dominance depends on the number of words produced (a dominant person takes more time in dialogue production). *Topical* dominance presupposes that a number of thematic concepts are introduced. Nevertheless, it is *interactional* dominance that is crucial for the whole dialogue. The dominant party is the one who manages to direct and control the other party's actions and who also avoids being directed and controlled (Linell et al., 1988). This type is revealed in *interactional turns*, the basic units of analysis, which concentrate either local or global communicative power (Adelswärd et al., 1987). Each turn is analyzed either in terms of an *initiative* or *response*, which concerns how it links to the next or previous turn. Initiatives continue communication by requesting a response from either or both the partner and by the introduction of a new topic. Responses ensure coherence with the preceding discourse by linking up to what the interlocutor said (Linell et al., 1988; Reuzel et al., 2013). Each type of the turn refers to one of the eighteen categories that can be ordered on a six-point ordinal scale from the strongest initiative (>) to the weakest response without any potential for promoting the dialogue further (—) (see Table 1, Linell et al., 1988).

The category system consists of a set of features for initiative and response that include:

- 1) function: initiatives and responses are coded with > / ^ :: <;
- 2) strength: strong (soliciting or demanding) and weakly (asserting or submissive) turns are symbolized as > :: ^;
- 3) adequacy of responses: adequate or inadequate are presented with < :: — ;
- 4) scope of links: local and non-local (linking up with preceding / more distant turn) turns have the signs: < or :: ' ;
- 5) focality of links: focal and non-focal (linking up with focal or peripheral aspects of the preceding turn) turns are graphically presented as < :: ;

6) alter – or self-linked responses (linking up with the interlocutor’s preceding turn/ speaker’s own preceding turn) are symbolized as < :: = / < = (see Linell et al., 1988, p. 417).

Table 1. Turn Categories and Interactional Strength

1	2	3	4	5	6
		“ <	“ ^	“ >	
		(>	: ^	: >	
		<)	< = ^	< = >	
	—>	= ^	= >		
—	<	< ^	< >	^	>
Totally dependent and not at all proactive					Independent and strongly proactive

Source: Linell et al. (1988)

The corresponding figures form the basis for computing IR indices and IR differences. *IR indices* of interlocutors are defined as the median value of the scores on the ordinal scale (Reuzel et al., 2013). The *IR difference* between IR indices is an indicator of the degree of interactional asymmetry or the level of dominance of one of the communicators (Linell et al., 1988). That is why the measurement of the activity level of partners gives a chance to look closer at the realized relations.

The level of dominance is derived from an *initiative-response profile* (IR profile) or a summary of the frequencies of the parties’ turn categories on the mentioned six-point ordinal scale (Linell et al., 1988). The frequencies of various turn types as a percentage of all turns used by each partner yield interaction coefficients (Reuzel et al., 2013):

- 1) B(balance)-coefficient (the number of expanded responses) shows how often an individual responds to what was said and provides sufficient initiative to allow dialogue to continue on the same topic;
- 2) S(solicitation)-coefficient (the number of imperative or interrogative structures) demonstrates how often individuals explicitly solicit their interlocutors into responding on their initiative;
- 3) F(fragmentation)-coefficient shows the number of abrupt topic shifts or turns that break the interaction into fragments by the introduction of new and unrelated topics, thus contributing to local incoherence;
- 4) O(obliqueness)-coefficient reflects the number of turns involving self-linking responses symbolized as : or =. It is designed to capture how often speakers avoid linking up with the main content of their interlocutor’s adjacent turn.

The implicit turns hold monologues, ignore a meaningful contribution of the partner, and challenge its form or function (Linell et al., 1988).

We, consequently, suggest the following procedure of communicative analysis of dialogue. First, the *genre* of the dialogue that constructs communicative practice, its *chronotope*, *socio-cultural context*, *interlocutors* (their physical, psychological, social, age, gender, etc. characteristics being in the foreground) and *relationships* (relatives, friends, lovers, colleges, etc.) are described. Second, the type of communication is established, i.e., *real vs. stylized*; *oral vs. written vs. virtual*; *everyday vs. official*, *person-oriented vs. status-oriented*; *stereotyped vs. creative*. Third, the tonality of the dialogue (*formal vs. informal*) and social distance (*intimate vs. personal vs. public*) are described. Fourth, the form of communicative interaction (*cooperation vs. conflict*) and the set *aims* of the partners are revealed. Fifth, the type of power relations (*interactive vs. status*) and the level of dialogue *asymmetry* are established and described. At this stage, the dynamics of communication geared by the intellectual, emotional, volitional, etc. spheres of interlocutors' consciousness and realized in the scope of their strong/weak initiatives or responses are in the focus of the investigator's attention. More than that, those new pragmatic parameters of interaction (e.g., the interlocutors' goals changed during the dialogue, situational implications, etc.) that determine the appearance of a definite unit in language, as well as its contextual semantics, are taken into consideration. The sixth and penultimate stage has the interaction viewed through *speech acts*' components, *communicative strategies* and *tactics* used. Ultimately, the strategic communicative behavior of partners is analyzed through the means of its realization on the *phonetic*, *morphological*, *lexical*, *syntactical* levels as well as through the filter of *stylistics* and *non-verbal* language. The results are then discussed and conclusions are drawn.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The great value of the IR analysis that we state to be a necessary constituent of a thorough communicative analysis of any interaction is its qualitative-quantitative potential, since such power parameters as *dominance* and *asymmetry* are measurable quantities. The cooperative and conflict dialogical situations that serve as an example of the analysis are telephone conversations taken from the best-selling novels *If Tomorrow Comes* and *Angels Flight* by the renowned authors Sidney Sheldon and Michael Connelly. Here it is worth mentioning that a detailed analysis of dialogues in the genre of telephone interactions fixed in belles-lettres has not previously been presented. If with the help of the IR analysis in Linell et al. (1988) and Reuzel et al. (2013) the genres of interviews were

analyzed, then Borysov (2017) examined the genres of face-to-face conversation, talk, argument and quarrel taken from British and Ukrainian films and surely contributed to understanding the genres stylized in cinematography. Here we hope to demonstrate an explanatory power of the communicative analysis enriched by the IR method, which we applied to a few stylized dialogues found in literature.

All the turns of the chosen dialogues were coded according to the degree of their strength in the context of interaction. Inner speech and non-verbal reactions were presented in square brackets:

(1) Tracy: ^ Hello?

Mother: < > Tracy... *I just felt like hearing the sound of your voice, darling.*

Tracy: < ^ What a nice surprise, Mother.

Mother: ^ I hope I didn't wake you up.

Tracy: < > No. *I was reading. Just getting ready to go to sleep. Charles and I were going out for dinner, but the weather's too nasty. It's snowing hard here. What's it doing there?*

Mother: – [Silence] [*Dear God, we're talking about the weather, Doris Whitney thought, when there's so much I want to tell her. And can't*].

Tracy: > Mother? Are you there?

Mother: ``^ It's raining.

Tracy: > What's that noise?

Mother: < > *That's thunder, Tracy... Tell me what's happening in Philadelphia.*

Tracy: ^ I feel like a princess in a fairy tale, Mother. *I never believed anyone could be so happy. Tomorrow night I'm meeting Charles's parents... The Stanhopes, of Chestnut Hill... They're an institution. I have butterflies the size of dinosaurs.*

Mother: <^ Don't worry. *They'll love you, darling.*

Tracy: <^ Charles says it doesn't matter. *He loves me. And I adore him. I can't wait for you to meet him. He's fantastic.*

Mother: < > *I'm sure he is. [She would never meet Charles. She would never hold a grandchild in her lap. No. I must not think about that]. Does he know how lucky he is to have you, baby?*

Tracy: < > *I keep telling him. Enough about me. Tell me what's going on there. How are you feeling?*

Mother: < I feel wonderful.

Tracy: > Got a boyfriend yet?

Mother: < > No boyfriends... *How is your job? Still enjoying it?*

Tracy: < ^ I love it. *Charles doesn't mind if I keep working after we're married.*

Mother: < ^ That's wonderful, baby. *He sounds like a very understanding man.*

Tracy: < ^ He is. *You'll see for yourself.*

Mother: > *Good-bye, my darling.*

Tracy: < ^ I'll see you at the wedding, Mother. I'll call you as soon as Charles and I set a date.

Mother: < ^ Yes... I love you very, very much, Tracy (Sheldon, 1985: 3).

The analyzed excerpt presents a telephone conversation that happens at *night* between two close *relatives* – daughter (Tracy Whitney) and her mother (Doris Whitney) who dwell in different *states of the USA*. The *oral* communication is *stylized, stereotyped* and *person-oriented*. It is the *speech* type of communication meant for informational exchange and emotional relaxation.

Though these are the *positional roles* (mother vs daughter) that are realized in the dialogue, the situation can be qualified as *socially symmetrical* or *status-neutral*. The reason is that *the social distance* is intimate, and the *informal* dialogue between good friends takes place. The interaction is *cooperative*. The *aim* of the mother who secretly intends to commit suicide is to say goodbye to her daughter and get to know about her previous months of life as well as about a future wedding; Tracy kindly produces expanded answers as her aim is two-fold: to fill her mother in and have a psychologically encouraging chat with the closest relative of hers.

The dialogue is characterized by *interactive power* demonstration from both parties of equal status. Nevertheless, according to the IR profile, it is *rather asymmetrical* because it is Tracy who controls it. The preliminary data of interlocutors' activity constitute the IR profile of the characters shown in table 2.

Table 2. The IR Profile of the Characters

The type of turns	^	< ^	>	<>	+	^^	<	Number of points
Tracy	2	5	3	2	0	0	0	51
Mother	1	3	1	4	1	1	1	42

Source: Authors

The *IR indices* are IR index1=4,25, IR index2=3,5, the *IR difference* (that shows the level of asymmetry and, thus, dominance) is correspondingly 0,75. The imbalance emerges because Tracy naturally produces much more information than her mother. The biggest number of her turns is expanded, the *B-coefficients* difference is 15,4%, cf. *B-coefficient1*=46,7% (7 expanded answers) and *B-coefficient2*=31,3% (5 expanded answers). She confidently keeps the conversation going replying to the initiatives of her mother and thematically unfolding the dialogue on her own.

More than that, being dominant, Tracy puts as twice as many questions, which are stronger turns than Doris's. The fact is revealed in the *S-coefficients* difference (21,2%), cf. *S-coefficient1*=40% (6 questions) and *S-coefficient2*=18,8% (3 questions). Though a number of the turns which are not connected with the previous interlocutor's turns

or signalize the shift of the topic is equal – $F\text{-coefficient}_1=6,7\%$ (1 turn) and $F\text{-coefficient}_2=6,3\%$ (1 turn), mother introduces one turn which avoids the answer ignoring her partner, cf. $O\text{-coefficient}_1=0\%$ and $O\text{-coefficient}_2=6,3\%$ (1 turn).

So, Tracy controls the dialogue in all aspects. Firstly, the level of her *interactive dominance* is higher (for 15,4%) as she produces more expanded questions and answers. Secondly, the *quantitative dominance* is as twice as much higher because of the number of words used (cf. 169 vs. 84). Thirdly, Tracy naturally then dominates *thematically* employing 10 topical concepts against 5 of her mother's. The cognitive approach involved at this stage is aimed at elucidation of the topical organization of the informational space. So, the macroconcept around which the dialogical text is built is FAMILY. It is structured with the help of the concepts TRACY'S LIFE and MOTHER'S LIFE. They are united together with the emotional concept LOVE and background concepts SUICIDE and FAREWELL which reflect the mother's intention and the impulse of the call. The first one consists of such subconcepts as, for example, WEDDING, BRIDEGROOM, FUTURE FAMILY, JOB, HAPPINESS, while the second one possesses the cognitive structures of PRIVATE LIFE, FUTURE PLANS, SADNESS. The number of the concepts, the means of their verbalization shows that the initiative is firmly held by the daughter. She is an actual leader. She uses more syntactical units (cf. 33 vs. 19), including elliptical ones, creates more monologues as responses, produces more arguments as for the righteousness of the awaited event.

The analysis of the *speech act* component of the conversation established a greater tendency of *constatives* (affirmations) usage (cf. Tracy: 63,6% vs. mother: 57,9%), with Tracy being more active. While *promisives* (the utterances of promise) (cf. Tracy: 3,1% vs. mother: 5,3%) and *performatives* (the utterances perform an act instead of describing it) (cf. Tracy: 6,1% vs. mother: 10,5%) do not play a crucial role in their discourse, *menacives* (the utterances of threat) are completely absent. But the strongest turns comprise *quesetives* (questions) and *directives* (advice, instructions, requests), cf. Tracy: 27,2% (18,1% / 9,1%) vs. mother: 26,3% (15,8% / 10,5%). It is Tracy who is dominant in this aspect.

The *cooperative strategy* employed by both speakers to disclose their thoughts, emotions, views comprise such tactics of influence as the tactics of positive evaluation (e.g. Tracy: *I feel like a princess in a fairy tale*, Mother: *That's wonderful, baby*), the tactics of trust (e.g. Mother, *I never believed anyone could be so happy*), the tactics of care and support (e.g. Tracy: *Tell me what's going on there. How are you feeling?* Mother: *Don't worry. They'll love you, darling*), the tactics of sincerity (e.g. Tracy: *I have butterflies the size of dinosaurs*), the tactics of praise (e.g. Mother: *He sounds like a very understanding man*), the tactics of encouragement (e.g. Tracy: *What a nice surprise*, Mother, Mother: *Does he know how lucky he is to have you, baby?*), the tactics of solidarity (e.g. Tracy: *He is [a very understanding man]*).

You'll see for yourself). The *tactics of genuine interest* by Tracy seems to have contextually changed into the *tactics of annoying request* followed by the *tactics of mother's explanation evasion* and the *change of the subject*, i.e. these are tactics of non-cooperative character: e.g. Tracy: *Got a boyfriend yet?* Mother: *No boyfriends... How is your job? Still enjoying it?* Generally, Tracy demonstrates more initiative in the aspect of tactics usage as well, as they are mostly directed to preserve the topic and subtopics of the cooperative conversation.

The tactics expression is carried out via emotional-evaluative lexemes (*adore, love, wonderful, baby, fairy tale, princess*, an idiomatic expression *to have butterflies the size of dinosaurs* with metaphorical and hyperbolic effects), emotional-expressive constructions with direct address (e.g. Mother: *They'll love you, darling*), elliptical sentences (e.g. Tracy: *Enough about me*; Mother: *Still enjoying it?*) chosen as the best variants of influence in the pursuit of the speakers' intentions realization.

To sum it up, the interlocutors' *aims* were realized as the informational and emotional exchange was successful. Tracy got additional emotional satisfaction of sharing her bright future plans while mother rejoiced at her daughter's news and said goodbye, which was the main goal of the telephone call.

Another dialogue under analysis is a conflict one:

(2) ^ *You bastard.*

> *Who is this?*

> *Carla Entrenkin, who do you think? Do you really think I wouldn't know what you did?*

<> *I don't know what you're talking about. What happened?*

<^ *I just watched Channel Four. Your buddy Harvey Button.*

> *What did he have?*

<^ *Oh, he blew it up real big. Let's see if I can quote him correctly. 'A link between Elias and an Internet prostitution ring was found in Elias's office, a source close to the investigation says. It is believed by this source that Elias may have had liaisons with at least one of the women who advertised her services as a dominatrix on the web site.' I think that about sums it up. I hope you are happy.*

<^ *I didn't—*

> *Don't bother. [She hung up] [Connelly, 2002: 177-178].*

The dialogue in the form of a *stylized* telephone conversation in the *late evening* unfolds between two *newly acquainted colleagues* – Harry Bosch, a detective, and Carla Entrenkin, inspector general – involved in an investigation of the murder of the famous *LA* lawyer, Howard Elias. The interaction is *stereotyped* and *person-oriented*. The interlocutors are in *formal business-like* relations, with the corresponding *status* roles. United by the common secret not to be revealed

to anyone, they are involved in the *informal everyday discourse*. The communicative situation is thus *status-neutral*, and the *social distance* is *intimate* – a quarrel takes place. It is the *speech* type of communication meant for *emotional release* and *informational exchange*. *Interactive power* is exercised in the dialogue which is a *conflict* one. The communicative *goal* of Carla Entrenkin is to blame a detective, have moral and emotional satisfaction whereas the *goal* of the man is to get as much information as possible. The dialogue is slightly *asymmetrical*: the *IR indices* are $IR\ index_1=4,6$, $IR\ index_2=4,75$ and the *IR difference* is 0,15 (the *IR profiles* are shown in Table 3).

Table 3. The IR Profile of the Characters

The type of turns	^	< ^	>	<>	Number of points
Carla	1	2	2	0	23
Harry	0	1	2	1	19

Source: Authors

Carla attempts to lead the dialogue, she is rather aggressive. The number of her expanded answers is bigger (the *B-coefficients* difference is 41,6%, cf. $B\ coefficient_1=66,6\%$ (4 expanded answers) and $B\ coefficient_2=25\%$ (1 expanded answer). It means that the level of her *interactive dominance* is higher, and the *quantitative one* is much higher (cf. 107 words vs. 18 words). The *thematic dominance* is also in her favor, cf. 13 topical concepts against 4 for her partner. She uses more syntactical units (cf. 12 vs. 5). The woman seems to be an actual leader in everything.

But the *IR analysis* proves it is Harry who is actually a director of the dialogue, the person who makes the woman speak up intensively. That is because of the strong moves one makes constantly demanding information. He talks little but asks questions, so the *S-coefficients* difference is 41,7%, cf. $S\ coefficient_1=33,3\%$ (2 questions) and $S\ coefficient_2=75\%$ (3 questions). That is Harry's strategy to reach his primary goal. The context revealed aim of his to defend oneself failed because of the overwhelming activity and emotiveness of the woman. The dialogue in itself is logical and not fragmentary ($O\ /F\ coefficients=0\%$).

The communication generally unfolds around the macroconcept INVESTIGATION subdivided into the concepts CASE, INVESTIGATIVE AGENCIES, MASS MEDIA, CONFLICT. Contextually they are united with the concepts RESENTMENT and HONESTY/DISHONESTY. The specifying concepts are INSPECTOR GENERAL, DETECTIVE, JOURNALIST and LEAK.

The analysis of the *speech act* component revealed a natural tendency for the usage of *constatives* (cf. Carla: 66,6% vs. Harry: 40%). *Quesetives* are more peculiar

of Harry (cf. Carla: 16,7% vs. Harry: 60%), while *directives* are of Carla (cf. Carla: 16,7% vs. Harry: 0%). *Promisives*, *performatives* and *menacives* are absent.

Despite the fact the dialogue reveals a conflict, only one party is responsible for this. More than that, Carla eagerly answers the questions put to her. The facts lead to the statement of the conflict-cooperative character of the interaction.

The *conflict* strategy is realized in the tactics of insult (*You bastard*), anger (*Do you really think I wouldn't know what you did?*), sarcasm (*Your buddy Harvey Button*), abrupt interfering (*Don't bother*). The *cooperative* strategy is actualized in the tactics of informing (Carla: *I just watched Channel Four*. Harry: *I don't know what you're talking about*).

The tactics realization is carried out through the lexemes *bastard* (vulgar language), *buddy* (negative context connotation), an emotional one-member sentence *You bastard*, and an elliptical sentence *Your buddy Harvey Button*.

These units were used as Carla was sure of her suspicions and did not want to know whether it was Harry or not who leaked information to the press. The woman felt betrayed. That is why communication was abruptly finished by her. To lead it was quite easy, because the detective, pursuing his goal to extract information, made the scenario which she followed with pleasure. With Harry being the dominant figure, the dialogue is slightly asymmetrical. The genre frames of the telephone conversation created objective limitations to convert it into a cooperative dialogue and put a heart-to-heart talk of the characters till another time. This was not the case with the first interaction. The findings from the analysis also clearly show that either in a cooperative or conflict dialogue interlocutors revealed different initiatives in communication coordination. These activities directed at constructing coherent dialogues naturally reflect the characteristics of discourse power that the speakers demonstrated. The understanding of this is crucial because, as a rule, this parameter is missing, omitted or partly taken into consideration in those discourse studies conducted without IR analysis.

CONCLUSIONS

Quite a few studies devoted to the problem of communication progress have highlighted that interactions are based on power relations. Surprisingly, a complex and consistent methodological procedure of dialogical interaction has still not been developed. To elaborate dialogical interaction and to understand it as a dynamic cognitive-communicative construct realized in social relations of information exchange and influence is of paramount importance. Influence as discourse power embodiment is realized in mutual freedom limitation and coordinating the actions of each other by the partners. A simple acknowledgement that the interlocutors demonstrate this or that degree of communicative activity turns

out to be insufficient for a thorough dialogue investigation as quantitative proofs are needed. It is the IR methodology implementation, which is used in the communicative analysis to reveal the level of dominance and asymmetry, that produces more objective data as for the true nature of cooperative and conflict conversations.

The given methodology is a union of structural-semantic, cognitive, pragmatic, cratological, socio-cultural views on communication. In this way, the investigation promotes the statement that any communication should be analyzed rather thoroughly without overestimating or underestimating any parameter. In our opinion, the methodology generalizes the strategic line of any dialogue investigation and gives a much closer look at an unfolding interaction. The explanatory potential of the proposed procedure lies in revealing how the ability to influence the partner in communication is realized. The results of the analysis of the stylized telephone dialogues provoke a hypothesis that communicative failures in real life may result from neglect of latent aspects of communication, which usually slip out from our attention under the pressure of a stereotypical belief that the leader in the dialogue is the one who talks more. The analysis shows that it is not necessarily so. Rather, it is the unity of different parameters that defines the amount of power one can use. The hypothesis is to be verified in a thorough scientific investigation of real-life communication and may add to the theory of manipulation, which may be quite useful for understanding the mechanisms of influence on various levels of personal interaction.

The analysis procedure is in no way closed. Depending on the further aims of the research, for example, such methods as intent analysis (for a more detailed categorization and interpretation of partners' intentions) (see Vraj et al., 2020), content analysis (for revealing frequency units of the thematically united lexicon or explaining the problematic parts of the texts) (see Elo et al., 2014) can be employed.

REFERENCES

- Acitelli, K. L. (2002). Relationship Awareness: Crossing the Bridge Between Cognition and Communication. *Communication Theory*, 12(1), 92–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2002.tb00261.x>
- Adelswärd, V., Aronsson, K., Jönsson, L., & Linell, P. (1987). The unequal distribution of interactional space: Dominance and control in courtroom interaction. *Text*, 7, 313–346.
- Appiah, A., & Lawrence, B. (2015). Pragmatic study of verbal threats among the Fantes: A case of Ape-wosika. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and Translation*, 1(1), 8–17.
- Atkinson, M. (2013). Intergroup dialogue: A theoretical positioning. *Journal of Dialogue Studies* 1(1), 63–81.
- Barthes, R. (1994). Lekcija [The Lecture]. In K. Kosikova (Ed.), *Semiotika. Pojetika* (pp. 545–568). Moscow: “Progress, Unifers”.

- Barth-Weingarten, D. (2008). Interactional Linguistics. In G. Antos, & E. Ventola (Eds.), *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 77–107). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Borysov, O. O. (2017). *Typologhija brytanskykh ta ukrajinskykh dialoghovykh dyskursyvykh praktyk* [The typology of British and Ukrainian dialogical discourse practices]. The thesis of PhD Dissertation, *National Pedagogical Dragomanov University*, Kyiv, Ukraine.
- Carbaugh, D. (2013). On dialogue studies. *Journal of Dialogue Studies*, 1(1), 9–29.
- Connelly, M. (2002). *Angels Flight*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
- Elo, S., Kääriäinen, M., Kanste O., Tarja, P., Utriainen, K., & Kyngäs, H. (2014). Qualitative content analysis: A focus on trustworthiness. *Sage Open*, 4(1). 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014522633>
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Foucault, M. (1998). *Istorija seksual'nosti. Zabota o sebe* [The history of sex-appeal. The care of the self]. Kiev-Moskva: Gruntrefl-buk, 1998.
- Gill, F., & Azhar, A. M. (2018). Critical discourse analysis of PM N. Sharif's UNOGA discourse deciphering covert rhetoric–dialectical perspective. *Communication and Linguistics Studies*, 4(1), 14–22. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.cls.20180401.12>
- Honghui, Z., & Dongchun, C. (2019). Understanding misunderstandings from socio-cognitive approach to pragmatics. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 7(5), 194–201. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20190705.13>
- Ivashkevych, E. & Prymachok, L. (2019). Psycholinguistic peculiarities of the development of communicative competence of teachers of secondary schools. *Psycholinguistics*, 26(2), 11–26.
- Jahedy, M., Faiz, A., & Mukundan, J. (2014). An overview of focal approaches of critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 2(4), 28–35.
- Jakubowska-Branicka, I. (2014). Language as a tool creating and dividing communities. Dangerous use of asymmetric counterconcepts. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 18(1), 22–40. <https://doi.org/10.2478/plc-2014-0002>
- Jensen, M. (2018). A survey to find the most likely general reasons why people engage in communication. *Central European Journal of Communication*, 1, 25–38. [https://doi.org/10.19195/1899-5101.11.1\(20\).2](https://doi.org/10.19195/1899-5101.11.1(20).2)
- Karasik, V. I. (2013). Konceptualizacija social'nogo neravenstva [The social inequality conceptualization]. In A. Levickiy, S. Potapenko, & I. Nedajnova (Eds.), *Lingvokonceptologija: perspektivnye napravlenija* (pp. 536–571). Lugansk: Izd-vo “LNU imeni Tarasa Shevchenko”.
- Kelly, U. (2013). Studying dialogue – some reflections. *Journal of Dialogue Studies*, 1(1), 51–63.
- Koike, D., & Blyth, C. (2015). Introduction. In D. Koike, & C. Blyth (Eds.), *Dialogue in Multilingual and Multimodal Communities* (pp. 1–25). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kucherenko, S. N. (2016). Power in communication: Revisiting power studies. *Topics in Linguistics*, 17(1), 92–110. <https://doi.org/10.1515/topling-2016-0007>
- Langlotz, A. (2015). *Creating social orientation through language. A Socio-cognitive theory of situational social meaning*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Linell, P. (2015). Dialogism and the distributed language approach: A rejoinder to Steffensen. *Language Sciences*, 50, 120–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2015.01.003>
- Linell, P. (1990). The Power of dialogue dynamics. In I. Markova (Ed.), *The Dynamics of Dialogue* (pp. 147–177). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Linell, P., Gustavsson, L., & Juvonen, P. (1988). Interactional dominance in dyadic communication: A presentation of initiative-response analysis. *Linguistics*, 26(3), 415–442.
- Liu, K., D'Arcey, T. J., Walker, M., & Tree, F. E. J. (2021). Referential communication between friends and strangers in the wild. *Dialogue & Discourse*, 12(1), 45–72. <https://doi.org/10.5210/dad.2021.103>
- Makarov, M. L. (2003). *Osnovy teorii diskursa* [Discourse theory basis]. Moskva: ITDGG “Gnozis”.
- Malchanau, A., Petukhova, V., & Bunt, H. (2018). Towards integration of cognitive models in dialogue management: designing the virtual negotiation coach application. *Dialogue & Discourse*, 9(2), 35–79.
- Martínez del Castillo, J. (2015). The meaningful intentional purpose of the individual speaker. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(6-1), 5–10. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.s.2015030601.12>
- Pitts, J. M., & Giles, H. (2008). Social psychology and personal relationships; Accomodation and relational influence across time and contexts. In G. Antos, & E. Ventola (Eds.), *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 15–33). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Pocheptsov, G. G. (1981). *Predlozheniye. Teoreticheskaya grammatika sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka* [The Sentence. Theoretical grammar of the present-day English]. Moskva: Progress.
- Potapenko, S. (2016). Cognitive rhetoric of effect: energy as a means of persuasion in inaugurals. *Topics in Linguistics*, 17(2), 12–25. <https://doi.org/10.1515/topling-2016-0010>
- Potseluev, S. P. (2008). *Politicheskie paradialogi* [Political paradialogues]. Rostov n/D: Izd-vo JuFU.
- Povolná, R. (2016). A cross cultural analysis of conjuncts as indicators of the interaction and negotiation of meaning in research articles. *Topics in Linguistics*, 17(1), 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.1515/topling-2016-0004>
- Preston, D. (2017). The cognitive foundations of language regard. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 53(1), 17–43. <https://doi.org/10.1515/psicl-2017-0002>
- Prihodko, G. (2018). Specific nature of evaluative speech acts. *Advanced Education*, 9, 201–205. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.128232>
- Reuzel, E., Embregts, P., Bosman, A., Nieuwenhuijzen, van M., & Jahoda, A. (2013). Interactional Patterns between Staff and Clients with Borderline to Mild Intellectual Disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 57(1), 53–66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01515.x>
- Rikjor, P. (2002). *Istorija i istina* [History and truth]. Sankt-Peterburg: Aletejja.
- Rudnick, A., Priya, S., Hazel, M., & Cizman, J. (2014). Involving disadvantaged people in dialogue: arguments and examples from mental health care. *Journal of Dialogue Studies*, 2(2), 93–109.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Schmied, J. (2020). Limits of discourse: Examples from political, academic, and human-agent interaction. *Discourse and interaction*, 13(2), 89–118. <https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2020-2-89>
- Searle, J. (1971). *Expression and meaning. Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shejgal, E. I. (2001). *Vlast' kak koncept i kategorija diskursa* [Power as a concept and discourse category]. *Biblioteka Gumer – Politology*. http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Polit/Article/scheig_vlast.php
- Sheldon, S. (1985). *If tomorrow comes*. https://royallib.com/read/Sheldon_Sidney/If_Tomorrow_Comes.html

- Simić, J., & Simić, R. (2019). Some Theoretical Observations on Discourse (and Text). *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 7(1), 8–12. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20190701.12>
- Spirkin, A. G. (2006). *Filosofija* [Philosophy]. Moskva: Gardariki, 2006.
- Tarasov, E. F. (1990). Rechevoe vozdejstvie: metodologija i teorija [Speech influence: methodology and theory]. In V.F. Petrenko (Ed.), *Optimizacija rechevogo vozdejstvija* (pp. 5–18). Moscow: Nauka.
- van Dijk, T. (2008). *Discourse and power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vaskivska, H., Palamar, S., & Poriadchenko, L. (2019). Psycholinguistic aspects of formation of culture of dialogical communication. *Psycholinguistics*, 26(2), 11–26.
- Vraj, D., Sidarth, W., Anurag, A., & Bhisham, B. (2020). Text-Based Intent Analysis Using Deep Learning. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 5(7), 267–274.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2015). Critical discourse studies: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies* (pp. 1–23). London: Sage Publications.