

IMPLIED MEANINGS IN POLICE INTERROGATION DISCOURSE

Pavlichenko Larysa Vasylivna,
*Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Assistant at the Department of English Philology
and Intercultural Communication
Institute of Philology
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
la.pavlichenko@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0003-3801-2587*

The purpose of the study is to examine, investigate and analyse the implied meanings in police interrogation discourse from the perspective of the role markers of participants in communication (a police officer and an interrogated person) at the stage of pre-trial interrogation. The following **research methods** have been applied in the study: pragmatic and semantic analyses including the concepts of “face” and “politeness”, methods of identification of conversational implicatures to describe pragmatic indices of communicative roles; in the format of discursive analysis a special place belongs to the study of elements of the method of critical discourse analysis to identify patterns of planning and course of interrogation discourse given the factors of institutional, interpersonal and psychological contexts; elements of the method of conversational analysis of discourse to determine such parameters as paired opposing roles, relevant and preferential / non-preferential role positions. **The results** of the work show that the roles of an investigator and an interrogated person in the discourse of pre-trial investigation are presented in the explicit and implicit ways. The markers of the communicative role of an investigator and an interrogated person depend on the degree of implicitness or explicitness of their presentation in the interrogation. From the analysis we can **conclude** that the roles are most explicitly marked by lexical means reinforced by adverbs-intensifiers. Non-preferential roles of an investigator (implicit and explicit ones) at the pre-trial stage of investigation require verbal means to mitigate the ‘threat’ of the respondent (indefinite pronouns, modal verbs, idiomatic expressions that reduce the categorical nature of the accusation). More implicit presentation of communicative roles of a police officer and an interrogated person cause the use of nominalization and double negation and is a weakened kind of statement. Implicit forms of expression of the communicative roles of an interrogated person are marked by various means of syntactic and semantic-syntactic levels.

Key words: discourse of pre-trial investigation, interrogation, communicative role, implicature, presupposition.

ІМПЛІЦИТНІ ЗНАЧЕННЯ ДИСКУРСУ ПОЛІЦЕЙСЬКОГО ДОПИТУ

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

Мета статті – вивчити, дослідити і проаналізувати імпліцитні значення в дискурсі поліцейського допиту на етапі досудового слідства з точки зору маркерів ролей учасників спілкування (слідчого та допитуваного). Матеріалом дослідження слугували транскрипти допитів на етапі досудового слідства США і Великої Британії, отримані методом суцільної вибірки. У роботі були застосовані такі **методи** дослідження: прагматичний та семантичний аналіз, включаючи концепти «обличчя» та «ввічливість», методи ідентифікації конwersаційних імплікатур для опису прагматичних показників комунікативних ролей; у форматі дискурсивного аналізу особливе місце належить дослідженню елементів методу критичного аналізу дискурсу для виявлення закономірностей планування та перебігу дискурсу допиту з урахуванням факторів інституційного, міжособистісного та психологічного контекстів; елементи методу конwersаційного аналізу дискурсу для визначення таких параметрів, як парні зустрічні ролі, релевантні і преференційні / непреференційні рольові позиції, а також для з’ясування структуростворювального потенціалу зміни комунікативних ролей в розвитку сценарію допиту. **Результати** дослідження показують, що ролі слідчого та допитуваного в дискурсі досудового слідства можуть бути представлені експліцитно і імпліцитно. У результаті аналізу матеріалу ми приходимо до **висновку**, що маркери комунікативних ролей слідчого та допитуваного залежать від ступеня експліцитності й імпліцитності їх представлення у дискурсі допиту. Аналіз показав, що ролі найбільш чітко позначені лексичними засобами і прислівниками інтенсифікаторами. Непреференційні ролі слідчого (імпліцитні та експліцитні) на етапі досудового розслідування вимагають лінгвістичних засобів для мітгації «загрози» допитуваному (неозначені займенники, модальні дієслова, ідіоматичні вирази, що зменшують категоричність звинувачення). Більш імпліцитне програвання комунікативних ролей слідчого та допитуваного вимагає використання номіналізації (зокрема, герундія) та подвійного заперечення і є ослабленим видом твердження. Імпліцитні форми вираження комунікативних ролей допитуваної особи відзначаються різноманітними засобами синтаксичного та семантико-синтаксичного рівнів.

Ключові слова: дискурс допиту, досудове слідство, комунікативна роль, імплікатура, пресупозиція.

Introduction. In modern linguistics, the problem of role differentiation of communicators has been covered by such researchers as E. Goffman (1983), V. Karasik (2002), N. Kravchenko (2017, 2018), L. Krysin (1977, 1989), T. Pasternak (2017, 2018, 2020), G. Sacks (1992), K. Sedov (1999), O. Selivanova (2004), E. Tarasova (2000), S. Walker (1987), M. Wetherell (1998) and others.

The roles of speakers in the discourse of pre-trial (and judicial) investigation have been studied in individual works from the perspective of asymmetric attitudes and institutional expectations of participants (Heydon, 2004: 27–49), taking into account the usage of different speech resources by communicators depending on the development of interrogation and taking into consideration the “support” by E. Hoffman (Heydon, 2005).

But the examination of the records reveals that there is no comprehensive study of semantic and pragmatic role markers: observance / violation of cooperation maxims, implicatures, presuppositions, means of positive, negative, direct and indirect “politeness” as markers of communicative and pragmatic parameters.

The purpose of this study is to analyse implied meanings in police interrogation from the perspective of semantic and pragmatic role markers of the participants of communication (a police officer and an interrogated person) at the stage of pre-trial interrogation.

Methods of the research include pragmatic and semantic analyses involving the concepts of “face” and “politeness”, methods of the identification of conversational implicatures to describe pragmatic indices of communicative roles; in the format of discursive analysis the study of elements of the method of critical discourse analysis is of special importance: to identify patterns of planning and the course of interrogation discourse given the factors of institutional, interpersonal and psychological contexts, and elements of the method of conversational analysis of discourse to determine such parameters as paired opposing roles, relevant and preferential / non-preferential role positions.

The characteristic features of the interrogation discourse. The specificity of the interrogation discourse is that pragmatic presuppositions about an interrogated person to some extent form the discursive personality of an investigator in the interrogation discourse, their communicative roles as it is on this ‘pre-text’ knowledge an investigator relies when planning and conducting a conversation with the interrogee, establishing techniques of the psychological contact, preparing interrogation tactics including communicative tactics of language code switching, adjustment to the interrogee’s speech register, usage of ‘politeness’ strategies, ‘subtraction’ of conversational implicatures in manipulative behavior of an interrogated person, determination of ‘conditions of success’ of their own speech.

Presuppositional knowledge of an interviewee’s personality is the basis for expectation of a certain line (or even scenario) of communicative behavior, planning an approximate list of issues and avoiding communicative failures not so much due to the procedural status of a respondent, but to sociocultural, ideological and other differences. Thus, pragmatic presuppositions are in the discourse of interrogation an integral condition for optimizing the interaction between an investigator and an interrogee.

It seems essential to emphasize that pragmatic presuppositions as key ‘pre-textual’ knowledge about an interrogee for the strategic planning of the interrogation allow an investigator to involve models of awareness of events and communicative behaviour in discussing such events that are ‘compatible’ with the situation and communicative scenario of an interrogee. The coordination of these contextual frames (E. Goffman, 1983: 1–17; N. Denzin, Ch. Keller, 2000: 65–79) affects the prediction of conversation structures and mutual reactions, i.e. the actualization of interaction frames that is the main condition for understanding and correct interpretation of each other’s communicative intentions by the participants of communication.

1. **Results and discussions.** Through an accurate analysis of the available material it has been possible to identify and analyse the communicative roles of the participants of the interrogation discourse (a police officer and an interrogated person).

Communicative roles of the participants of interrogation. The analysis shows that the speech of an investigator in the role of ‘accuser’ verbalizes the components of the concept of ‘distrust’, ‘accusation’. The degree of accusation varies from the implicit negative qualification of an interrogated person and actions to the explicit negative assessment which is illustrated below by fragments of interrogations: 1 (1.A, 1.B i 1.C) i 2 (2.A i 2.B).

1. *A. Police officer: I feel the reason that you are not coming up front with the answer is because you feel at the back of your mind, you have got something to hide.*

B. Police Officer: So you feel that question places you in a position that might incriminate yourself.

Smith: No, no, it does not.

C. Police Officer: I am establishing quite clearly your dishonesty in this particular point.’ (20)

2. *A. You are a liar.’ (20)*

B. I’m now going to play for you a tape recording, that will prove that the answers that you gave me yesterday, to that very question, will prove that you were lying’. (20) (acts of negative assessment of the interrogated person and his actions as a threat to his ‘positive’ ‘face’).

The main pragmatic indices of the role of ‘accuser’ are speech acts that ‘threaten’ the positive ‘face’ of the respondent, i.e. contain a threat to his positive self-esteem (unlike acts of advice, orders, warnings that restrict the freedom of action of the interactant, ‘threatening’ his negative face). That is why in both cases (implicit and explicit) the role of the ‘accuser’ at the pre-trial stage of investigation is not preferential, as it serves as a speech act that requires the usage of verbal means to mitigate the ‘threat’ of the interrogee.

According to the postulates of the conversational analysis (among the most original and influential works in this field are Clayman, 2002: 229–53; Lerner, 1996: 303–21; Sacks, 1987: 54–69; Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977: 361–82), in contrast to preferential, non-preferential speech moves are structurally complex, i.e. they incorporate different types

of complications in the form of self-correction and other markers of uncertainty, means of mitigation and evasion, detailed explanations such as why there is a non-preferential act, etc. (Kravchenko, 2017: 160).

In this regard, consider the lexical, grammatical and stylistic features of the role of ‘accuser’ on the principle of increasing the explicit manifestation of the accusation. In the first of these sentences (in particular, in replies 1A and 1B), this role has implicit indices of expression in accordance with the minimum charge. The trigger of the conversational implicature (‘if he hides, he may be involved in the crime or in the circumstances of its commission’) is an indefinite pronoun in combination with the infinitive with the seme ‘to hide’: ‘you have got *something to hide*’ (20).

It should be noted that the information about involvement, despite its implicit nature, makes the speech move non-preferential and requires means of mitigation and structural complication (structural complication is a violation of the maximum of the quantity of information, initiating the restoration of meaning through the above mentioned conversational implicature).

The analysis of the material has shown that lexically mitigation is marked by the indefinite pronoun *something*, which in combination with the verb *to hide* serves to mitigate the charge of involvement, as well as the phraseological unit *at the back of your mind* with the seme ‘subconsciously’ (hence ‘unconsciously’). The lexeme *to feel* is also a means of non-preferential role’s mitigation. Unlike verbs *to know*, *to be aware*, *to regret*, *to realize*, the meaning of the verb *to feel* is not characterized by a presupposition of the truth of the judgment associated with it by a conjunctive predication. As a result, the seme of ‘uncertainty’ is actualized, which is confirmed by a similar characteristic given by the investigator to the condition of the interrogated person also through the use of the verb *to feel* (see 1A, 1B), including in the position of non-active verb, the meaning of which does not contain a presumption that his proposition is true (‘So you feel that question places you in a position that might incriminate yourself’ (20)).

In the speech move 1B, the mitigation of the accusation is achieved with the help of the modal verb *might* which significantly weakens the meaning of the lexeme *incriminate*, as well as the phrase *places (...) in a position* as a means of reducing the categorialness of the accusation.

At the same time, the respondent’s rebuttal, which rejects the accusation of his even hypothetical involvement, initiates a change in the role position of the investigator and an increase in the intensity of the accusation (move 1C). In line 1C, the role of the investigator is indexed by a lexeme to denote a negative assessment of *dishonesty*, which is amplified by the adverb-intensifier *quite clearly* and the deictic noun group (*in this particular point*), which identifies and concretizes the dishonesty of the interrogee, both in space and time: *quite clearly your dishonesty in this particular point*. (20)

It is worth pointing out that the role of ‘accuser’ typically involves the use of morphological means of mitigation of non-preferential speech act in the form of alternation of different tense forms, such as Present Continuous, Present Simple and Present Perfect tense forms (as in 1A), which indicates the emotional stress of the investigator during expressing the distrust to the interrogated person. The use of syntactic stylistic technique *asyndeton* (the absence of the subordinative conjunction *that*) (which in this example is graphically represented in square brackets) and, accordingly, a certain violation of the logical connection between parts of a compound sentence as a sign of a certain emotional tension proves this interpretation of the role behaviour.

The markers of the status-category role of the investigator ‘prosecutor’ vary depending on the degree of implicitness or explicitness of the charge. Most explicitly, this role is marked by negatively connoted vocabulary to denote criticism of the actions or personal qualities of the interrogated person, reinforced by adverbs-intensifiers, which in a pragmatic aspect correlates with speech acts ‘threat’ to the positive ‘face’ of the interrogee (1C, 2A i 2B). In the syntactic and stylistic aspect, the manifestations of the role are structures to denote the emotional tension and excitement of the investigator, including polytemporality, repetitions, *asyndeton* techniques (the absence of a conjunction with a certain violation of the logical connection between parts of a compound sentence) and a *polysyndeton*. The non-preferential role of the ‘accuser’ can be mitigated by indefinite pronouns, modal verbs, idiomatic expressions that reduce the categorial nature of the accusation.

The communicative role of ‘the one who cooperates with the investigation’ presupposes the use of lexical units with the seme ‘cooperation’ (*to cooperate*, *cooperation*), which serve as an adjunct to the verb *to want* with the meaning ‘desire’: ‘I’ve got no interest in being uncooperative. I want cooperation, and as fast as possible’ (20).

Intensifiers are used to express a confident, categorical agreement to cooperate at the lexical level (*fully*, *as fast as possible*, *certainly*, etc.: ‘Well I want to co-operate fully’ (20)). A less categorical and more implicit manifestation of the role of ‘co-operative’ is the use of nominalization (in particular, gerund) and litotes as a stylistic figure (*no interest in being uncooperative*), which gives a definition in the form of a double objection and is in fact a weakened assertion that in the context of interrogation can be considered a pseudo-agreement to cooperate.

In the status-categorical role of ‘ready to bargain / make concessions’, the respondents explicitly express or imply the meaning that the performance of certain actions by the investigator should be a prerequisite for further cooperation (i.e. answering questions). Explicitly, the role is manifested by speech moves that have the structure of a complex conditional sentence with a subordinate clause, which formulates the prerequisites for giving evidence and, accordingly, is combined with the main sentence by conditional conjunctions or by temporal conjunctions in the function of conditional ones. The action that can be performed is expressed by means of Future Simple or the construction *to be going to* to indicate the high probability of its implementation by the interrogated person in the case of fulfillment of the counter-premise by the investigator:

‘I’m not going to tell you until you tell me why you are asking that question’; ‘I’m not going to discuss that with you, until you get me some evidence’; ‘I’m not going to tell you until you tell me why you are asking that question’; ‘I’ll remain silent then, because until you give me the information I require, I cannot answer that question, I’m sorry’, ‘It’s, it’s not

that I'm trying to cover anything up, I'm certainly not, but until you reveal further information on your side, I feel that it's pointless me commenting, and having an endless discussion'; 'I've got nothing to hide, and, but I don't think there's any point in commenting any further until I've got more information'; 'I do not want to comment any further on this case, until you've given me some hard facts on which to base what I'm supposed to have done'; 'Until you show me in writing something that says you have the right to ...', 'I've told you I don't wish to comment on things until you, you come clean with what it is you're charging me with', 'It's partly that, but it's partly because I don't think it's right to discuss this until you put more cards on the table', 'Look, I've got no comment until we get on to the facts of the case. Then we can discuss it' (20)/

An action that cannot be performed due to the lack of certain preconditions ('correct' actions of the investigator from the point of view of the interrogated person), is expressed by the negation in Present Simple (*It's partly that, but it's partly because I don't think it's right to discuss this until you put more cards on the table*, 'I do not want to comment any further on this case, until you've given me some hard facts on which to base what I'm supposed to have done'; 'until you reveal further information on your side, I feel that it's pointless me commenting, and having an endless discussion') or denial of future action, expressed by the construction *not to be going to*: 'I'm not going to tell you, until you tell me why you are asking that question'; 'I'm not going to discuss that with you, until you get me some evidence'.

Implicit forms of expression of the role 'ready to bargain / make concessions' are complex or simple sentences that do not have formal indicators of the conditional structure, but activate the conditional-consequential meaning of the model: *If you Do (appropriate action) instead of doing (inappropriate action) / instead of not doing (appropriate action) <...> I will cooperate*:

'Ask me a sensible question, instead of talking about something that didn't happen'; 'I'd much rather you give me the evidence – we can discuss it', 'it's your turn to give me some information before I co-operate with you'. I'm sorry'. (20)

The condition (testimony, cooperation with the investigation), implied in the first part of such sentences, at the same time explains the reasons for refusal to cooperate. As the material of the analysis has showed, the condition can be implied by different types of syntactic and lexico-syntactic structures in the form of Present Continuous (*you are not giving me the information which you are obviously basing this on*), constructions *it's your turn + to infinitive*, constructions *I'd much rather you (...)* in the sense of 'give preference' (by the way, in this example the respondents used a colloquial version of the construction, because grammatically normative version *would rather* different subject (+ *past tense*) involves, provided there are different subjects, the use of the past tense (i.e. it would be correct to say: 'I'd much rather you gave').

Regardless of the form of implicit expression of the condition, all these phrases contain an illocution of the directive as a call by the interrogated person to change the investigator's role in relation to him as the main prerequisite for their further cooperation ('Ask me a sensible question'; 'Give me some information', 'do not talk about something that did not happen' etc.). The willingness to make concessions if the condition is met can be explained (*we can discuss it; before I co-operate with you*) or restored by the investigator as a conversational implicature.

Thus, the implicit play of the role of the respondent 'ready to bargain / make concessions' involves the transformation of the model 'Do (some action) instead of' into a model: *If you do (some action) <...> I will respond / cooperate*. The role of 'ready to bargain / make concessions' is marked, first of all, by means of syntactic and semantic-syntactic levels. Explicitly, the role is played by speech moves that correspond to the structure of a complex – conditional sentence which formulates the preconditions for giving evidence; implicitly sentences that do not have formal indicators of the conditional structure, but activate the conditional-consequential meaning by lexical-semantic means. The explicit or implied condition of the interrogatee's cooperation pragmatically correlates with directive illocution, urging the investigator to change the line of his role behaviour.

The next status-category role variant of the institutional role of the interrogatee is, as the analysis of the interrogation discourse showed, the role of 'one who obstructs the investigation / gives false testimony' or the implicit correlate of this role ('the one who does not understand what is required'). This role is usually manipulative in its operational implementations and is indexed by implicatures, structurally complex non-preferential moves or, conversely, a laconic negative sentence *I don't know*. Usually this role involves the use of objections in the predicate ('I don't know', 'I'm not sure I should answer this, because I don't understand the question', 'I mean, how can I possibly comment on something when I don't know this man?', 'I, I've never seen this man before. I certainly wasn't going to meet him today, because I've never met the guy', 'I can't tell you something that I don't have any information on', 'I don't know (...). No I don't. I don't know this man', 'I don't know who the guy is'), a number of objections in a compound nominal predicate ('I'm not sure, I'm not aware of that', 'I am not sure in what sense you mean that?', 'If you say there are, I have to accept that, but I am not aware of that' (21)), less often the objection in the appendix ('I've got no, no reason to hide it'), including the ones reinforced by grammatical compression due to the omission of the subject and predicate, which in stylistics aspect correlate with the stylistic figure of the ellipse, which is used for emphasizing the fact of the respondent's own ignorance ('No idea').

Like other roles of a respondent, can be both explicitly expressed and implied. In particular, respondents' denial of their own awareness may be masked by rhetorical questions ('how would I know?', 'How could I possibly be aware of (...)?'; 'What, what am I supposed to have done this morning?'; 'How could I comment on something you're giving me no information about - who this man is, or what he does, or where he lives. I mean, how can I possibly comment on something when I don't know this man?', 'I, I've never seen this man before. How can I possibly say I know him (...). How do I remember back, you're talking about 15 years ago'. (20)

2. **Conclusions.** The specific feature of the interrogation discourse is that pragmatic presuppositions about an interrogated person form the discursive personality of an investigator, their communicative roles as they use this

‘pre-text’ knowledge to plan and conduct a conversation, adjust to the interrogatee’s speech register, use ‘politeness’ strategies, ‘subtract’ conversational implicatures in manipulative behaviour of an interrogated person.

The roles of an investigator and an interrogated person in the discourse of interrogation at the stage of pre-trial investigation can be expressed explicitly and implicitly. Markers of the role of an investigator and an interrogatee vary depending on the degree of implicitness or explicitness of the accusation. The roles are most explicitly marked by negatively connoted vocabulary, reinforced by adverbs-intensifiers. In both cases, the non-preferential roles of an investigator (implicit and explicit) require the use of verbal means to mitigate the ‘threat’ of the respondent.

Non-preferential speech requires means of mitigation and structural complication. The survey led to the conclusion that non-preferential roles can be mitigated by indefinite pronouns, modal verbs, idiomatic expressions that reduce the categorical nature of the accusation.

A less categorical and more implicit manifestation of the roles involves the usage of nominalization (in particular, gerund) and lithotes as a stylistic figure (no interest in being uncooperative), which gives a definition in the form of a double negation and is in fact a weakened statement. Implicit forms of expression of the roles of an interrogatee are also marked by means of syntactic and semantic-syntactic levels.

Література:

1. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг : личность, концепты, дискурс. Волгоград : Перемена, 2002. 477 с.
2. Кравченко Н.К. Дискурс и дискурс-анализ: краткая энциклопедия. Киев : ‘Интерсервис’. 2017. 286 с.
3. Кравченко Н.К., Пастернак Т.А. Прагматическая аттракция: Постановка проблемы и введение термина. *Вісник кийвського національного лінгвістичного університету. Серія Філологія*. Том 21, № 1. Київ, 2018.
4. Крысин Л.П. Речевое общение и социальные роли говорящих. *Социально-лингвистические исследования*. Москва : Наука, 1977. С. 42–51.
5. Крысин Л.П. Социолингвистические аспекты изучения современного русского языка. Москва : Наука, 1989. 186 с.
6. Пастернак Т.А. Когнітивний компонент комунікативних ролей в інституційному діалозі. *Науковий вісник НУБіП України*. Серія: Філологічні науки. Київ, 2017/4/1.
7. Пастернак Т.А. Екопрагматичний аспект комунікативних ролей в епідейктичному дискурсі. *Роль іноземних мов у соціокультурному становленні особистості: збірник наукових праць*. Київ : НАУ, 2020. 144 с. С. 103–107.
8. Седов К.Ф. Становление дискурсивного мышления языковой личности: Психо- и социолингвистические аспекты. Саратов : Изд-во Сарат. ун-та, 1999. 179 с.
9. Селиванова Е.А. Основы лингвистической теории текста и коммуникации. Киев : Брама, 2004. 336 с.
10. Тарасова Е.В. Речевая системность в терминах лингвопрагматики. *Вісник Харків. нац. ун-ту*, 2000. № 471. С. 273–279.
11. Clayman S.E. Sequence and Solidarity, in E. J. Lawler and S. R. Thye (eds) *Advances in Group Processes: Group Cohesion, Trust, and Solidarity*, 2002. P. 229–53.
12. Denzin N., Keller Ch. Frame analysis reconsidered. Ed. by G.A. Fine, G. Smith. London: Sage Publications, Vol. 4, 2000. P. 65–79.
13. Goffman E. The interaction order. *American Sociological Review* 48, 1983. P. 1–17.
14. Heydon G. Establishing the structure of police evidentiary interviews with suspects’. *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law* 11(1), 2004. P. 27–49.
15. Heydon G. The language of police interviewing: A critical analysis. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan Inc, 2005. 240 p.
16. Lerner G. H. Finding Face in the Preference Structures of Talk-in-interaction, *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59(4), 1996. P. 303–21.
17. Sacks H. Lectures on conversation. 2 vols. /H. Sacks / Emanuel A. Schegloff. Oxford : BasilBlackwell, 1992. 343 p.
18. Sacks H. On the Preferences for Agreement and Contiguity in Sequences in Conversation, in G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds). *Talk and Social Organization*. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters, 1987. P. 54–69.
19. Schegloff E.A., Jefferson G. and Sacks H. The Preference for Self-correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation, *Language* 53, 1977. P. 361–82.
20. Smith, M. J. Police interviews. URL : <http://Cryptome.org/smith-inter.zip> (дата звернення: 21.01.21).
21. Transcripts of interview D.A. Illingworth. URL : <http://www.hillsborough.independent.gov.uk/repository/docs/SYP00038870001.pdf> (дата звернення: 21.01.21).
22. Walker S. Role theory and foreign policy analysis. Durham, NC : Duke University Press, 1987. 196 p.
23. Wetherell M. Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse and Society*, 1998, Vol. 9. P. 387–412.

References:

1. Clayman, S.E. (2002) ‘Sequence and Solidarity’, in E. J. Lawler and S. R. Thye (eds) *Advances in Group Processes: Group Cohesion, Trust, and Solidarity*. P. 229–53.
2. Denzin N., Keller Ch. (2000) *Frame analysis reconsidered*. Ed. by G.A. Fine, G. Smith. London: Sage Publications, Vol. 4, P. 65–79.
3. Goffman E. (1983) The interaction order. *American Sociological Review* 48, P. 1–17.

4. Heydon, G. (2004) Establishing the structure of police evidentiary interviews with suspects'. *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law* 11(1), P. 27-49.
5. Heydon, G. (2005) *The language of police interviewing: A critical analysis*. Houndmills, UK. Palgrave Macmillan Inc, 240 p.
6. Karasik V. I. *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs*. [Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse.] – Volgograd : Peremena, 2002. – 477 p.
7. Kravchenko N., Pasternak T. (2018) Pragmaticheskaya attraktsyya: Postanovka problemy I vvedeniye termina. [Pragmatic attraction: Setting of the problem and introduction of the term]. // *Visnyk Kyivskogo Natsionalnogo lingvistychnogo Universytetu. Philology*. Vol. 21, #1. Kyiv, 2018.
8. Kravchenko, N. (2017) *Diskurs i diskurs-analiz: kratkaya entsiklopediya*. [Discourse and Discourse Analysis: A Brief Encyclopedia]. Kyiv: 'Interservice'. 286 p.
9. Krysin L. *Rechevoye obshcheniye i sotcialnyye roli govoryashchich*. [Speech communication and social roles of speakers]. // *Sotsialno-lingvisticheskiye issledovaniya*. – Moskva.: Nauka, 1977. – p. 42–51.
10. Krysin L. *Sotsiolingvisticheskiye aspekty izucheniya sovremennogo russkogo yazyka*. [Sociolinguistic aspects of the study of the modern Russian language]. – Moskva: Nauka, 1989. – 186 p.
11. Lerner, G.H. (1996) Finding 'Face' in the Preference Structures of Talk-in-interaction, *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59(4). P. 303-21.
12. Pasternak T. *Ekoprahmatychnyy aspekt komunikatyvnykh roley v epideyktichnomu diskursi*. [Ecopragmatic aspect of communicative roles in epideictic discourse] // *Rol' inozemnykh mov u sotsiokul'turnomu stanovlenni osobystosti: zbirnyk naukovykh prats'*. Kyiv: NAU, 2020. 144 p., p. 103-107.
13. Pasternak T. *Kohnityvnyy komponent komunikatyvnykh roley v instytutsiynomu dialozi*. [Cognitive component of communicative roles in institutional dialogue] // *Naukovyy visnyk NUBiP Ukrainy. Seriya: Filolohichni nauky*. Kyiv, 2017/4/1.
14. Sacks H. *Lectures on conversation*. 2 vols. /H. Sacks / Emanuel A. Schegloff. – Oxford : BasilBlackwell, 1992. – 343 p.
15. Sacks, H. (1987) On the Preferences for Agreement and Contiguity in Sequences in Conversation, in G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds). *Talk and Social Organization*. Philadelphia, PA : Multilingual Matters. P. 54–69.
16. Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks H. (1977) The Preference for Self-correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation, *Language* 53. P. 361–82.
17. Sedov K. *Stanovleniye discursivnogo myshleniya yazykovoy lichnosti: psikho- i sotsiolingvisticheskiye aspekty*. [Formation of discursive thinking of a linguistic personality: Psycho- and sociolinguistic aspects]. Saratov: Izdatelstvo Saratovskogo Universiteta, 1999. 179 p.
18. Selivanova E. *Osnovy lingvisticheskoy teorii teksta I kommunikatsii* [Fundamentals of linguistic theory of text and communication]. –Kyiv : Brama, 2004. – 336 p.
19. Smith, M. J. *Police interviews* [Electronic Resource]. – Mode of access: <http://Cryptome.org/smith-inter.zip>
20. Tarasova E. V. *Rehevaya sistemnost v terminakh lingvopragmatyki* [Speech consistency in terms of Linguistic Pragmatics.] // *Visnyk Kharkivskogo Natsionalnogo Universytetu*, 2000. – № 471. – p. 273–279.
21. *Transcripts of interview D.A. Illingworth* [Electronic Resource]. – Mode of access: <https://repository.independent.gov.uk/docs/SYP00038870001.pdf>.
22. Walker S. *Role theory and foreign policy analysis*. Durham, NC : Duke University Press, 1987. 196 p.
23. Wetherell M. *Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue*. *Discourse and Society*, 1998, Vol. 9. P. 387–412.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 29.03.2021
The article was received 29 March 2021