УДК 811.111.'42

H. Vysotska
Ph.D. (philology)
Head of the Department of translation, docent
Pryazovskyi State Technical University SHEI

A. Rude
senior Lecture of the Department of foreign languages
Pryazovskyi State Technical University SHEI

DEFINING THE ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS WITH REGARD TO THE ANALYSES OF QUESTION AND ANSWER DIALOGUE AS A FUNCTIONAL-ADAPTIVE SYSTEM

A keen interest to the problems of actual functioning of language units, typical of linguistics of nowadays promotes establishing of system-defined, practical methodology.

Investigation of individuals' communicative interaction, oriented on dialogical understanding with due regard to the language, environmental and cultural parameters is a paramount objective of nowadays linguistics [1]. Understanding of communication as informational exchange presumes unending interest that researchers pay to the problems of question and answer dialogue [2]. That is why question-answer unity represents the object, intensely analyzed in linguistic research works. Such scholars like G. V. Byrdina [3], R. Conrad [4], V. P. Nikolayev [5] et al. have thoroughly analyzed its structural, syntax and thematic organization.

Communicative, pragmatic and auto-speech characteristics were described in the works by E. V. Vochrysheva [6], S. F. Guedz [7] et al. E. Schegloff, H. Sacks [8] paid much attention to question and answer-dialogue as a unit of structural organization of dialogue.

In this work, for investigation of question-and-answer dialogue we resort to the theory of functional and adaptive system, within the framework of which the question-and-answer dialogue is analyzed as a particular speech system, thus ensuring *the actuality* of this investigation.

Also vital, in this work is the analysis of verbal communication as a specific component of human activities and the systematic nature of dialogue as a unity of verbal and extra-linguistic (national-cultural, social-cultural, personal) manifestations.

Factors of the environment, causing functional adaptation of the components of question-answer dialogue in the speech discourse became **the object** of our investigation, **the subject** being their representation within the discourse context. **The objective** of this investigation is to determine the definition of the environment factors of question-and-answer dialogue functioning as a multi-layer formation.

On the assumption of understanding the question-and-answer dialogue as information exchange, it may be well-grounded to conceive information as a relevant factor of the environment. Here, we originate from the point of view that information, existing as a certain component of the objective universe is represented in human mind with mental representations, hence, influencing the process of communication indirectly, rather than in a direct way [9].

The theory of information separates the quantitative and qualitative sides of information. The quantitative approach is represented in the theory of C. Shannon. The author believes information to be "released uncertainty". The degree of uncertainty in the theory of communication is defined as "entropy", so information can be considered as something opposite to entropy (quotation acc. to [10, p. 27]). Bearing in mind such interpretation the authors suppose that only the data, reducing uncertainty, i.e. handing over semantically and cognitively significant can be, the message comprehension being defined by one or another measure of novelty it carries [11, c. 82].

Two aspects of information are singled out within the framework of the qualitative approach: semantic and pragmatic. In this connection its meaningful side and the sense of these or those data, in other words semantic and/or pragmatic worthiness of information, rather than the amount of information are brought to the forefront for investigation of the process of real communication [12, p. 216]. "An exceptional trend … to reduce all queries to counting of information amount must be replaced with the search for ways of more complete characterization of different types of information and its qualitative originality" [13, p. 245].

In this investigation information is understood, in a wide sense, as the data, regarding something, communicated by people in the process of different types of human activity. Information, as a relevant factor of the environment is represented in context, ensuring interaction between the system and environment, promoting the process of functional adaptation.

For the analysis of information representation at different context layers we proceed from the assumption that beside knowledge, human mentality also comprises faith, confidence, understanding, opinion, imagination and memory [14, p. 48]. In epistemology prevails the point of view, according to which knowledge and opinion cannot be brought together. Just because the concepts underwent the process of "psychologization" and acquired the notion of subject-the bearer of both knowledge and opinion there emerged a new stage in research of opinion.

Knowledge started to assume opinion as a component of confidence that is why objective/factual opinion and subjective/personal opinion were singled out [15, p. 36]. The fundamentals of this approach were laid down in the works of I. R. Galperin, distinguishing meaningful/factual, meaningful-concept and meaningful-implication types of information [10].

The author understands as factual information the data, regarding facts, events, processes that occurred, occur or will occur in the outward world. The concept information includes the concepts of the world, existing among the participants of communication, expressing their relation to factual information [10, p. 36].

Interpreting meta-context, following E. V. Tarasova as "the context of thought and knowledge, characterizing the concept system, within the framework of which a speaker is thinking a and which reflects the vision of the world prevailing in a particular society" [16, p. 274], the author suppose that these types of information represent the level of meta-context [17], being permanently preserved in the cognitive base of all representative of the society. Thus, information regarding objective/factual knowledge and subjective/personal opinions are but relevant environmental factors of the level of metacontext.

According to the author's opinion "an ability of person of parallel perception of reality in several layers" lies in the foundation of concept-implication information [10, p. 4]. I. R. Galperin, singles out situation and associative-meaningful-implication information, emphasizing vagueness and fuzziness of meaningful-implication information, correlating it with implication and presupposition.

Taking comprehension of meaningful-implication information, proposed by the author as a foundation we believe that it is possible to correlate meaningful-implication information with information, regarding the communication situation, conditions of communication in a wide sense, including social, role, personal characteristics of communicants etc. Information variety and its correspondence of its representation to the structures of collective cognitive space and individual cognitive space cause defining social-implication information as a multitude of factors of the level of macro and micro-context. Particularly, according to the definition, proposed by E. V. Tarasova, we understand macro-context as "social and cultural context, characterizing communicants as representatives of their own society and own (sub) culture" [16, p. 274].

The author notes, quite justly, that human speech is regulated by the society, the speakers live in, and the place and the role, the society gives us in one or another (communicative) context. T. Van Deuk stresses that "considering the context strategies we should start with more detailed level – social, cultural and communicative situation. From the point of situation it is determined quite well by the types of the social context and types of characters acting, their possible interaction, as well as the set of objects [18, p. 54].

Traditionally, the authors include into the communicants' socially meaningful parameters such anthropometric and social characteristics like age, gender, professional and educational status and so on, role characteristics (guest, buyer, patient etc.) and arrange these characteristics on a vertical scale of status relations, according to the 'superior' – 'inferior' and on according to 'proximate' – 'distant' principle on a horizontal scale. In the foundation of such distribution there lies "the distance of power" in the first case and in the second – the degree of communicants' acquaintance (see [19], for example). The location of the communicants on the vertical scale, V. I. Karasik notes, correlates quite ambiguously with the positions, occupied by the communicants on the horizontal scale of status relations [20, p. 20].

Thus, we conclude that social-role status of communicants is the parameter of the environment of micro-context.

Micro-context, representing interpersonal context of momentary psychological states, including intentions, desires, expectations of the speaker and the addressee characterizes the speaker as "a particular language personality, who realizes within the given communicative episode his/her particular communicative intention" [16, p. 273].

Evidently it's impossible to analyze the multitude of factors, determining the speech behaviour of a particular speech personality within the framework of one investigation. In this investigation the communicants' speech strategies – the most important means of achieving by the communicants communicative cooperation and mutual understanding was taken for the parameter of the environment of the level of micro-context [21, p. 235].

The choice of speech strategies as a environment parameter was also predetermined by the fact that "speech communication is a strategic process and selection of optimal language resources being its basis" [22, p. 10].

Selection of some or other communicative strategies is caused by individual and personal characteristics of communicants, their psychological personal types, their emotional states etc [23]. Different language personalities stick to different speech strategies, thus making "the interpersonal level the least systematic" [16, p. 275].

O. Issers notes that "one of the most important models of speech strategy is "targeting on conflict speech behaviour, as well as on cooperation to be revealed through the category of politeness" [22, p. 70].

Strategies of politeness, based on particular language manifestations are communicative universals, possessing clearly expressed national cultural peculiarities, largely determining the social and cultural existing stereotypes and principles of interpersonal communication, formed in particular language cultures [24].

On the basis of the aforementioned, we consider information representation, regarding strategies of speech actions to be a relevant factor of the environment of the level of micro-context.

Thus, treating the environment in a wider sense as an extra-linguistic reality we consider the environment, in a narrow sense, as a discourse context. We believe information to be the most relevant factor of the environment information types, like factual/conceptual, information regarding social characteristics of communicants, their strategies being represented on different context levels.

We see **the prospect** of the investigation in the analysis of correlations between the characteristics of the system parameters and the environmental factors.

References:

1. Селиванова Е.А. Основы лингвистической теории текста и коммуникации / Е.А. Селиванова. – К. : ЦУЛ, «Фитосоциоцентр», 2002. – 336 с.
2. Красных В.В. «Свой» среди «чужих»: миф или реальность? / В.В. Красных. – М. : ИТДГК "Гнозис", 2003. – 375 с.
3. Бырдина Г.В. Конструктивная роль исходной реплики в вопросно-ответном диалогическом единстве : автореф. дис. ...канд. филол. наук: 10.02.01 / Г.В. Бырдина / Воронежский гос. ун-т. – Воронеж, 1985. – 19 с.
4. Конрад Р. Теоретические проблемы изучения вопросно-ответных структур в диалогической речи / Р. Конрад // Диалогическая речь – основы и процесс. – Тбилиси : Изд-во Тбил. ун-та, 1980. – С. 161–170.
5. Николаев В.П. Взаимосвязь реплик в диалогических группах со специальными вопросами в современном английском языке : автореф. дис. …канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04 / В.П. Николаев / Одес. гос.ун-т им. И.И. Мечникова. – Одесса, 1982. – 22 с.
6. Вохрышева Е.В. Специфика и структура диалогических единств с идентифицирующим вопросом : автореф. дис. …канд. филол. Наук : 10.02.04 / Е.В. Вохрышева / Ленингр. гос. ун-т им. А.А. Жданова. – Л., 1990. – 21 с.
7. Гедз С.Ф. Комунікативно-прагматичні особливості висловлювань з інтерогативним значенням у сучасній англійській мові : дис. ...канд. філол. Наук : 10.02.04 / С.Ф. Гедз. – К., 1998. – 215 с.
8. Schegloff E. Opening up closing / E. Schegloff, H. Sacks // Semiotica. – Amsterdam etc., 1973 – Vol. 8. – P. 289–327.
9. Бабушкин А.П. Типы концептов в лексико-фразеологической семантике языка / А.П. Бабушкин . – Воронеж : Изд-во Воронежск. гос. ун-та, 1996. – 104 с.
10. Гальперин И.Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования / И.Р. Гальперин. – М. : Наука, 1981. – 139 с.
11. Наер В.Л. Об одном аспекте языковой специфики массовой коммуникации / В.Л. Наер // Сб. научн. трудов. – М. : МГПИИЯ им. М. Тореза, 1980. – Вып. 151. – С. 82.
12. Матюхина Ю.В. Розвиток системи фатичної метакомунікації в англійському дискурсі XVI–XX ст. : автореф. дис. …канд. філол. Наук : 10.02.04 / Ю.В. Матюхина / Харк. нац. ун-т ім. В. Н. Каразіна. – Харків, 2004. – 20 с.
13. Филипьев Ю.В. Информационные сигналы и проблема художественности / Ю.В. Филипьев // Кибернетика ожидаемая и кибернетика неожиданная. – М. : Наука, 1968. – С. 244.
14. Апресян Ю.Д. Образ человека по данным языка: Попытка системного описания / Ю.Д. Апресян // Вопросы языкознания. – 1995. – № 1. – С. 37.
15. Белова А.Д. Лингвистические аспекты аргументации / А.Д. Белова. – Киев : Астрея, 1997. – 299 с.
16. Тарасова Е.В. Речевая системность в терминах лингвопрагматики // Вісник Харківського національного університету ім. В.Н. Каразіна / Е.В. Тарасова. – Х. : Константа, 2000. – 471. – С. 273.
17. Высоцкая А.В. ДЕ интерогатив-риплай как средство адаптации когнитивных уровней коммуникантов / А.В. Высоцкая // Матеріали Всеукраїнської науково-методичної конференції Другі Каразінські читання: «Два століття Харківської лінгвістичної школи». – Харків, 2003. – С. 32.
18. Дейк ван Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация: Пер. с англ. / Т.А. Дейк ван / Сост. Петров В.В.; Под ред. Гарасимова. – М. : Прогресс, 1989. – 312 с.
19. Белл Р. Т. Социолингвистика. Цели, методы, проблемы: Пер. с англ / Р. Т. Белл. – М. : Междунар. отношения, 1980. – 318 с.
20. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс / В.И. Карасик. – Волгоград : Перемена, 2002. – 477 с.
21. Селиванова Е.А. Основы лингвистической теории текста и коммуникации / Е.А. Селиванова. – К. : ЦУЛ, «Фитосоциоцентр», 2002. – 336 с.
22. Иссерс О.С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи / О.С. Иссерс. – М. : Едиториал УРСС, 2002. – 284 с.
23. Горелов И.Н. Основы психолингвистики / И.Н. Горелов , К.Ф. Седов. – М. : Лабиринт, 2001. – 310 с.
24. Hofstede G. Culture's Consequences / G. Hofstede. – Beverly Hills, CA : Sage, 1980. – 178 p.

Анотація

Г. ВИСОЦЬКА, А. РУДЬ. ВИЗНАЧЕННЯ СЕРЕДОВИЩА СТОСОВНО АНАЛІЗУ ДІАЛОГУ ПИТАННЯ-ВІДПОВІДЬ ЯК ФУНКЦІОНАЛЬНО-АДАПТИВНОЇ СИСТЕМИ

Стаття присвячена визначенню середовища стосовно аналізу діалогічної єдності питання-відповідь як функціонально-адаптивної системи. Таким чином, визначаючи середовище в широкому розумінні як екстралінгвістичну реальність, середовище у вузькому розумінні визначаємо тут як дискурсивний контекст. Інформацію вважаємо найбільш релевантним фактором середовища. Типи інформації: фактуальна/концептуальна, інформація про соціальні характеристики комунікантів, про їх стратегії, репрезентовані на різних рівнях контексту

Ключові слова: діалог питання-відповідь, функціонально-адаптивна система, чинники зовнішнього середовища, інформація, соціальні характеристики, стратегії.

Аннотация
**Г. ВЫСОЦКАЯ, А. РУДЬ. ОПРЕДЕЛЕНИЕ СРЕДЫ ПРИМЕНИТЕЛЬНО К АНАЛИЗУ
ВОПРОСНО-ОТВЕТНОГО ДИАЛОГА КАК ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНО-АДАПТИВНОЙ СИСТЕМЫ**

Статья посвящена определению среды применительно к анализу диалогического единства вопрос-ответ как функционально-адаптивной системы. Таким образом, трактуя среду в широком смысле как экстралингвистическую реальность, под средой в узком смысле понимаем дискурсивный контекст. Информацию считаем наиболее релевантным фактором среды; типы информации: фактуальная/концептуальная, информация о социальных характеристиках коммуникантов, об их стратегиях, репрезентированных на различных уровнях контекста.

Ключевые слова: вопросно-ответный диалог, функционально-адаптивная система, факторы среды, информация, социальные характеристики, стратегии.

Summary
**H. VYSOTSKA, A. RUDE. DEFINING THE ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS WITH REGARD
TO THE ANALYSES OF QUESTION AND ANSWER DIALOGUE AS A FUNCTIONAL-ADAPTIVE SYSTEM**

The article deals with the defining the environmental factors with regard to the analyses of question and answer dialogue as a functional-adaptive system. Treating the environment in a wider sense as an extra-linguistic reality we consider the environment, in a narrow sense, as a discourse context. We believe information to be the most relevant factor of the environment information types, like factual/conceptual, information regarding social characteristics of communicants, their strategies being represented on different context levels.

Key words: question and answer dialogue, functional-adaptive system, environmental factors, information, social characteristics, strategies.