

ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

(шифр научной специальности: 5.9.8)

Научная статья

УДК 81

doi: 10.18522/2070-1403-2024-105-4-118-124

КОММУНИКАТИВНО-ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИЕ ТИПЫ РЕАКЦИЙ – ОТКАЗОВ НА КОСВЕННЫЕ ДИРЕКТИВЫ В АНГЛИЙСКОЙ ДИАЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ РЕЧИ

© *Алексей Алексеевич Чухно¹, Ирина Геннадьевна Рябцева²*

^{1,2}*Донской государственный технический университет, г. Ростов-на-Дону, Россия*

¹*alexa-ch@list.ru* ²*irina-17@yandex.ru*

Аннотация. Выявлены коммуникативно-прагматические типы реакций отказа на косвенные стимулы в англоязычных диалогах. Представлен ряд фрагментов диалогов, содержащих косвенные указания и отказы, из литературных произведений современных английских писателей и их классификация. Проанализировано использование реакций отказа в диалогической коммуникации. Приведены примеры и предложена классификация типов отказа.

Ключевые слова: речевой акт, реакции – отказы, косвенные директивы, диалог.

Для цитирования: Чухно А.А., Рябцева И.Г. Коммуникативно-прагматические типы реакций – отказов на косвенные директивы в английской диалогической речи // Гуманитарные и социальные науки. 2024. Т. 105. № 4. С. 118-124. doi:10.18522/2070-1403-2024-105-4-118-124

PHILOLOGY

(specialty: 5.9.8)

Original article

doi:10.18522/2070-1403-2024-105-4-137-144

Communicative-pragmatic types of refusal reactions to indirect directives in english dialogues

© *Alexey A. Chukhno¹, Irina G. Ryabtseva²*

^{1,2}*Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation*

¹*alexa-ch@list.ru* ²*irina-17@yandex.ru*

Abstract. The communicative and pragmatic types of rejection reactions to indirect stimuli in English-language dialogues are revealed. A number of fragments of dialogues containing indirect indications and refusals from literary works of modern English writers and their classification are presented. The use of rejection reactions in dialogic communication is analyzed. Examples are given and a classification of failure types is proposed.

Key words: act of speech, refusals, indirect directives, dialogue communication.

For citation: Chukhno A.A., Ryabtseva I.G. Communicative-pragmatic types of refusal reactions to indirect directives in English dialogues. *The Humanities and Social Sciences*. 2024. Vol. 105. No 4. P. 118-124. doi:10.18522/2070-1403-2024-105-4-118-124

Introduction

The problems of dialogue communication have been in focus of many linguists and researchers. Such phenomena as acts of speech, speakers' intention, indirect directives, interlocutors' interaction, indirect requests, strategies and tactics used in the dialogues have risen a lot of interest and attention.

Lingvopragmatics deals today mainly with studying personal factors of dialogues effectiveness and success thus determining the need to research how an addressee factor is reflected in an indirect directive and how they behave while reacting to an indirect directive. In our view, it would be very interesting to research interlocutors' cooperation in terms of addressee's reactions to the indirect stimulus. It is also worth combining grammar and pragmatic approaches and

considering speech acts as an integral part of dialogue communication in order to set up universal typology of reactions to such acts of speech.

Indirect directives, which frequently take place in dialogues, always imply the addressee's reaction. The latter often regards oneself as a key person in the dialogue. Consequently, the comparison of interlocutors' position can lead to various reactions and possible outcomes of communication. However, in our view positive, cooperative manner of conversation prevails in English speech. To prove this hypothesis in our article we aim to identify the communicative-pragmatic types of refusal reactions to indirect directives in dialogue speech and to calculate the proportion of positive (cooperative) reactions versus negative (uncooperative or conflicting ones).

Discussion

The indirect speech acts have been a focus of many researchers. Some of them, thought that indirectness is motivated primarily by politeness [12; 13]. Brown and Levinson [3, p. 118] adhere to the idea that indirect acts are used “to soften the damage to the hearer and disguise a request”. Clark thinks that they both may function as questions and requests [4, p. 442]. Ch. Austin connects the form of indirect utterance with the condition of communication success [1].

To identify the meaning of indirect directives an addressee has to extract it from the direct meaning of the utterance and match it to the consituation. In this respect we take into account the idea of “interpretation frames”, when the interlocutor, trying to understand the excerpt, interprets it by putting its contents within framework which is known irrespective of the text [5]. Decoding of implicit information not only includes the processing of the perceived but also involves an appeal to internal cognitive information. T.A. Van Dijk and Kintsch [15] consider such information as cognitive basis for model construction and call it “presuppositional model foundation”. Modern linguists have also been long concentrating on the study of personal factors determining the success of communication. The people's personality is expressed through language as well as their consciousness and view of reality. Current linguo-pragmatic research aims at creating a model of a language personality in interpersonal communication as important basis of human existence and its anthropological value [11]. It is the sphere of communication where the person wants to reach mutual understanding and set successful interaction [8, p. 38].

The study of the object of speech influence gained both theoretical and practical value. The addressee factor in linguistics helped to identify a new function in language. Jakobson regards the function of the second participant in the dialogue, the receiver of the message as “conative”. M. Halliday analyzes the focus on the receiver of the message together with the sender of the message defining them as conative and expressive functions and putting them together as interpersonal function [9, p. 106]

The addressee factor makes the speaker think about pragmatic function of the utterance. The addresser formulates the utterance depending on the explicit reaction of the addressee. The initial statement has to be informative, as its main purpose is conveyance of some information, expressive – in order to obtain perlocutionary effect and clear. So pragmalinguists distinguish hidden strategies of speech impact on an addressee. In this respect P. Greis proposed his well-known maxims, describing principles that interlocutors intuitively follow in order to make their communication effort effective [7]. In recent years M.L. Geis [6] also researched the speech acts theory and underlined the significance of its application in dialogue communication.

The literary works of English and American writers have also been used by a number of researchers to illustrate semantic, structural and pragmatic peculiarities of indirect directives or to carry out a usage-based analysis of indirect directives in English [16]. The research methodology is based on the concept that language is a social and cultural phenomenon, which is used in communication. The most common purpose of any communication is to achieve the speakers' goals. In our research we also based upon the principles of systematic approach, anthropocentrism and determinism. The method of discourse analysis was used to research practically the connection between discourse (that is “context, background information or knowledge shared between a

speaker and hearer," [2] and social and cultural factors which influenced the speakers in the dialogues that we have found.

The data that we collected for our research was taken from modern English and American literature. We preferred the books devoted to everyday life topics, as indirect directives are most commonly found in everyday conversations. Both descriptive and linguistic observation methods were applied to identify the dialogues containing indirect directives and reactions to them. Comparative methods were used to identify differences and similarities in the data analyzed as well as to work out the types of reaction (rejections) to indirect stimulus. Quantitative methods helped to illustrate the research results and give their quantitative description. Examples (*sentences in italics*) from the data are the dialogue excerpts containing indirect directive and the reaction to it. The source where the excerpt was taken from is an abbreviation in brackets after each excerpt. The APPENDIX to the paper contains the list of abbreviations with the titles of the books and the authors. The Speech Act theory helped to analyze the communication process, which, in fact, consists of two consecutive interlocutors' acts – addresser's stimulus and addressee's reaction.

Interlocutors' cooperation in dialogues, when the indirect stimulus is expressed, can take different forms. Obviously, in certain situations, the atmosphere of cooperation deteriorates and thus we face the possible conflict. In this case, the addressee is willing to break the intentions of the speaker (the addresser). Here we deal with the strategy of rejection to indirect statement from the part of the listener (the addressee). The degree of uncooperative speech behavior might vary and depend on extra linguistic conditions of the dialogue, such as time, place, the presence of other participants. In most cases, it happens because of defensive reasons. The addressee refuses to cooperate mostly due to inner psychological state, his/her emotional tension and perception of the indirect directive as a threat or attack on his social self. Such circumstances lead to appearance of utterances, which the addressee uses to reject the addresser's indirect directive. These utterances show unwillingness to cooperate and lack of positive results of the speaker's (addresser's) indirect intentions.

As the analysis of our selected material has shown, refusal reactions play a vital role in the system of reactions to indirect directives in general. They also can be expressed via different language means, which surely require detailed description and further analysis.

The study shows that refusal tactics can be differentiated according to following criteria:

- communicative-pragmatic criterion (the role they play in listener's response)
- functional criterion (their role in development of dialogue discourse)

According to the first criterion, we differentiate direct and indirect refusal tactics. Direct refusal tactics include utterances used to express addressee's unwillingness or impossibility to follow indirect directive. They can be flat or polite. The first one means that the addressee will under no circumstances follow the speaker's order.

For instance:

Ned Beamount's reply was given carelessly: "I don't have any chance" (DHGK); – the listener contradicts the speaker implying it is impossible to do what he/she wants him to do

"Man, I won't risk doing the job I have no knack to," said Do-Wop, pretending to sulk. (DHGK) – the listener refers to having no appropriate skill to do what the speaker wishes

"Will you come with me"?

"But I don't know where to find any", I protested, shaken by the boldness of her proposition, by how close she stood to me (DMPT) – the listener refuses to follow speaker's intention referring to seeing no point in it as he/she has no knowledge needed. Direct refusal to follow indirect stimulus normally reflects negative relationship between interlocutors. If the relationship between them is rather friendly, but there are circumstances preventing the addressee from following the indirect stimulus, the latter uses polite refusal tactic. Such refusals frequently include either reasoning or apologies, which soften their flat manner and to some extent modify illocutionary force. For instance:

"Will we talk about those photographs?"

“*Sorry, but won't have a spare minute this week*” (IMA); the addressee find an excuse to avoid the given stimulus referring to time shortage

“You'd better ignore her offer.”

“*But it might upset her*” (GMGC) – the addressee gives reasoning why it is impossible to do what the speaker wants him/her to do saying he/she does not want to hurt someone's feelings

“You have to promise never to tell. We will live, we will die, and that will be the end of it.”

“*I am able to promise, but people should know I am your cousin*” (JEM) the addressee tries to explain why he/she will not follow the speaker's directive referring to some social/non-linguistic factors preventing him/her from following the directive. Direct refusals to follow the indirect stimulus indicate about intentions to change the topic of the conversation. As a result, the dialogue between the interlocutors either stops or transforms into conflict.

Indirect refusal tactics are reactions that implicitly show unwillingness or impossibility to follow indirect directive. While conducting our analysis we have identified the following types of indirect refusal tactics:

– contextually limiting, declining, parrying, conflicting, ignoring

One of the most common types of indirect refusals is when an addressee does not accept certain conditions or circumstances of current interpersonal interaction. The interlocutors evaluate the situation differently and therefore the addressee refuses to follow the indirect stimulus referring to a hindering element of the situating. We determine such refusal tactic as *contextually limiting*. Here we often find the reference to inconvenient time, place or other conditions of communication.

For instance:

“Could I have a drink of water?” he says to the air. “Please”, he adds.

“*We have already closed*” (MAHT). The addressee refers to inconvenient time and impossibility to do an action as a result.

“You may use a large notebook as a journal,” Jumbo said, “chronicling your exploits throughout the remainder of the season.”

“I have no large notebooks” (MAHT)

Here we see the example when the addressee refuses to do something due to impossibility or some external reasons.

Refusal reactions frequently express emotional state of an addressee. They appear because an addressee is frightened, annoyed or cross. One of the most common ways to express refusal determined by emotional state is a request to calm down. This is usually done by means of such phrases as: be quiet (calm), patience, don't worry (fear), calm down, peace, steady yourself etc.

“Look, something you said this morning. I need to ask you. Could you say what day it was you were in the Lake District?”

“Don't worry, I tell you everything, but not here and now...” (IMA)

The addressee is probably annoyed and refers to some inconvenience.

“We just want to hear your side of it”, said Jess.

“*Be quiet. There isn't a “my side”. I was a bloody idiot and I am paying the price*” (DMPT) Here we see that the addressee is being angry and self-destructive in order not to do what he/she is wanted.

Another interesting way to express unwillingness to communicate is when an addressee denies the presupposition of the indirect directive stated as a question.

“*Jesus Christ! Donna? Could you revel the secret?*” *My voice must have been way too loud because both she and the moving men looked at me with wide eyes.*

“*There is no secret at all*” (JCKB) – the presupposition has been denied as the listener does not think it is a secret

“I will be in a day or two. Will you speak to the observer this morning?”

“*I don't know this wicked man*” (DHGK) – the listener denies acquaintance thus meaning there is no way to do what they want him/her to do

Such refusal reactions mean an addressee denies false presupposition expressed in the question. On the other hand, such questions can be regarded as conveyance of false information if an addresser is convinced in honesty of an addressee.

Indirect refusal tactic may also be expressed by using a *declining response*, which shows that the initial addressor's statement/question is inappropriate or unimportant in the current situation. In this case an addressee often gives negative evaluation of the initial directive or uses positive words (e.g. nice, good etc.) in negative meaning. In such examples we frequently deal with counter questions, which prove inappropriate character of indirect directive in the present dialogue. For instance:

Paul said, "Could you lead me to the space terminal?" He tried to make his request sound casual.

"Nice! You are going to take a dreadful risk," the slime mold said, "in going to any public place The POLPOL watch constantly" (FKDW) – a polite word is used in negative meaning showing the listener does not approve of the speaker's intentions. Declining tactic, showing inappropriate character of an indirect directive, reflects the state of annoyance or disturbance. An addressee dislikes the indirect impact that an addresser is trying to produce. As a result, the conversation is often stopped to avoid future conflict.

The next type of indirect refusal tactic is *parrying tactic*. Using such tactic an addressee is able to make an addresser not to apply indirect stimulus which may negatively affect him/her. Parrying refusals in some way represent "an attack on social face" of a person. As a rule, they may affect person's "negative face" – desire not to be a target of annoying impact or "positive face" – desire to make an interlocutor interested in the topic of the conversation and ideas conveyed.

Parrying refusals often provoke a kind of language game. The most versatile way to express parrying refusal is to ask a counter-question. For instance:

"You shouldn't ask too many questions, you hear?"

"Why are you so angry"? (BOFR) – parrying reply and an attempt to accuse the speaker of inappropriate behavior.

"Why do you always underestimate one who might be invading you?"

"Captain Clown, can you tell me that we are estimating the Hidden Ones as a big difficulty?" – said Qual (RAPHMT) – an attempt of the addressee to mock at the speaker's statement including usage of some provocative names as address.

Parrying refusals signal about annoyed emotional state of the person who reacts. Indirect types of refusal reactions also include such types as *conflicting* ones. In fact, they appear as a result of an addresser's "attack" on "the social face" of an addressee. This makes them similar to the previous type. The strategy of such refusals means an addressee attacks via their reply. However, conflicting refusals differ from parrying one in the way that they often express negative emotional attitude to the other side. It normally leads to mutual insults and the dialogue transforms into conflict or even aggression.

"Will you please accommodate in our hotel?" said Stanton, with a mock bow. "As it happens, I am the manager of hotel service".

Phule glared at the vidscreen. "Shut up! I don't want to hear you, monster of men" – he said. "None of your stock units (RAPHMT) – very aggressive manner including insults. An extremely emotional display of anger.

According to Watzlawik, Beavin, Jackson [16] conflict possibility does not necessarily break situational adaptability of the interlocutors in the dialogue. Hence conflict refusals to follow indirect directive are often satisfying since they help interlocutors to get rid of emotional stress. However, we consider them to be the outcome of "anticulture" in the dialogue communication.

Indirect refusal to reply can be expressed by ignoring the speaker's intentions. An addressee attempts to switch addresser's attention to the topic, which he finds important or new, thus realizing his/her own intentions.

"Why do you ask me to do this thing?!"

She sat across the marble table from me, her back to the open doors of the café. "The coffee is very strong here, isn't it? (ARM) – the addressee changes the topic of the conversation

"Will you ask me for the Dark Gift"? I had said to him when first we met. "I may not give it to you. But I want you to ask".

“*I love you without that gift....*” (*ARM*) – the addressee is trying to divert speakers’ attention from the object of the conversation.

When an addressee uses *ignoring* refusal tactic, the dialogue, as the examples above show, may develop in two possible ways – either aggressive or quiet. It depends both on an addresser (their emotional, physical state, attitude to the other side of the dialogue) and on an addressee (their intentions and strategic choice of further dialogue development).

We have collected the data from the works of modern English literature writers (abbreviations of the works are listed below). Thus, we have calculated the quantity and comprised the percentage of the analyzed types of reactions. Altogether, we have found 86 excerpts including indirect directives and reactions to them. Some of them have been given above in the research section as examples of communicative-pragmatic types. The results are presented in the table below. The left column indicates the type of refusing reactions. The right one shows the percentage of the examples found in the conversations.

Table 1

Types and number of refusal reactions (in percent) found in the excerpt

Type of refusing reactions	Percentage proportion in the dialogues
Contextually limiting	35%
Parrying	26%
Conflicting	18%
Declining	15%
Ignoring	6%

According to our observations, the most common type of refusal reactions in English dialogues is *contextually limiting*. Their frequency is determined by the interlocutors' willingness to continue conversation in a mutually beneficial, cooperative manner. Contextually-limiting reactions are spread because interlocutors often tend to refer to some external factors as a reason to refuse (these factors frequently include inappropriate time, place or presence of other people while the conversation takes place

The less common are *parrying* and *conflicting* refusals. Although they often tend to direct the dialogue into negative conflicting way or even cause its interruption, their role in communication remains undisputable. Parrying reactions are used because the listener tries to avoid dealing with a difficult question or some criticism at the same time trying not to cause conflict situation. Conflicting and declining types often show speaker's irritation or annoyance. They usually show reluctance to continue conversation and lead to its breakdown.

Conclusions

It is worth mentioning that according to our results the positive reactions appear in the dialogues twice more frequent than the negative ones.

Indirect refusals to indirect directives vary according to the degree of cooperation between interlocutors or the results of indirect impact on the further dialogue development since one of the purposes is to avoid conflict while the purpose of others is, on the contrary, to provoke or even intensify it.

In our view, the prevalence of refusals in the dialogues containing indirect directive might be explained by socio-cultural conditions of everyday life. Such conditions also include social relations between interlocutors. They significantly determine psychological characteristics of interlocutors at the beginning of the conversation, the wish to avoid responsibility, which is followed by the expression of indirect directive.

The data has shown that both speaker and listener are primarily interested in positive outcome of the conversation when the indirect directive is used. However, some conflicting or negative consequences do occur.

APPENDIX Abbreviations of the literary works used to collect data

ARM – Rice A. Merrick. – Vintage, 2005. – 125 p.

BOFR – Okri B. The famished Road. – Vintage, 2000. – 402 p.

DHGK – Hammet D. The Glass Key. – Vintage, 2003. – 287 p.

- DMPT – Mason D. The Piano Tuner. – HarperPerennial, 1999. – 365 p.
FKDW – Dick K.F. Waterspider. – Penguin, 1999. – 325 p
IMA – McEwan I. Amsterdam. – HarperPerennial, 2000. – 201 p.
JEM – Euginides J. Middlesex. – Picador, 1998. – 560 p.
GMGC – Martin G. R.R. The Feast for Crows. – Faber and Faber, 1999. – 893 p.
JCKB – Carrol J. Kissing the Beehive. – Penguin, 2001. – 347 p.
МАНТ – Atwood M. The Handmaids Tale. – Penguin, 1999. – 305 p.
RAPHPMT – Asprin R., Heck P.J. Phule Me Twice. – Faber and Faber, 1993. – 257 p.

References

1. *Austin J.L.* How to do things with words. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1962.
2. *Bloor Meriel, and Thomas Bloor.* Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction. Routledge, 2013.
3. *Brown P., & Levinson S.* (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E.N. Goody (Ed.), Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction (P. 56–311). Cambridge, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
4. *Clark H.H.* (1979). Responding to indirect speech acts. *Cognitive Psychology*, 11, 430–477. Retrieved 10 December, 2023 from <http://web.stanford.edu>
5. *Charles J.* Fillmore Frames and the semantics of understanding, 1985. Retrieved January 8, 2024 <https://www1.icsi.berkeley.edu/pubs/ai/framesand85.pdf>
6. *Geis M.L.* Speech acts and conversation interaction. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
7. *Greis H.P.* Studies in the Way of Words. Harvard University Press, Revised Edition, 1991
8. *Habermas J.* (2001b) On Pragmatics of Social Interaction: Preliminary Studies in the Theory of Communicative Action, Cambridge: The Mit Press.
9. *Halliday M,* Linguistic function and literary style. *Exploration in the Functions of Language*, 1974. P. 92–129.
10. *Jacobson R.* Linguistics and Poetics. *Style in Language* (P. 350–377). Cambridge: Massachusetts of Technology Press.
11. Levi-Strauss Claude, *Structural Anthropology*, Basic Books, New-York, 1963.
12. *Sadock J.M.* Speech acts. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.) *The handbook of pragmatics* (P. 53–73). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. (2004).
13. *Searle J.R.* (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.) *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts* (Vol. 3, P. 59–82). New York, NY: Academic Press.
14. *Takahashi H.* A usage-based analysis of indirect directives in English (2): *I'd appreciate it if you.* Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers: HUSCAP. 144, 2014. Retrieved 18 December, 2023 from <http://hdl.handle.net/2125/57479>
15. *Van Dijk T., Kintsch W.* Strategies of Discourse Comprehension, Academic Press, 1983.
16. *Watzlawick, Paul, Janet Helmick Beavin, and Don D. Jackson.* Study of Interactional Patterns, Pathologies, and Paradoxes London: Faber and Faber, Saint-Petersburg, 2000 Retrieved 14 December, 2023 from <https://pma.knigogid.ru/books/1217168-psihologiya-mezhlichnostnyh-kommunikaciy/toread?ysclid=lr4ppfk289630727208>

Статья поступила в редакцию 20.05.2024; одобрена после рецензирования 10.06.2024; принята к публикации 10.06.2024.

The article was submitted 20.05.2024; approved after reviewing 10.06.2024; accepted for publication 10.06.2024.