THE INTEGRATION OF GRATITUDE COMMUNICATIVE MOVES INTO ENGLISH LITERARY DIALOGUE DISCOURSE

Inna Kivenko[1]

Abstract

The given article reports on the results of Conversation Analysis application to Gratitude Communicative Move. The corpus of conversational data used for the research has been selected from modern English Literary Discourse. The data comprises 1600 communicative exchanges in which characters express Gratitude. Conversation Analysis application has enabled the author to focus on the linguistic aspect of Gratitude turn-taking. This paper reports on the social aspect of Gratitude turn-taking and the pragmatic goals of its participants. The article provides a theoretical background for gratitude Conversation Analysis as the empirical research method of dialogic speech. It provides a detailed survey on such linguistic concepts as *communicative move*, *communicative turn*, *adjacency pair*, *sequence*, *communicative exchange* and *speech episode*. Taking into consideration the viewpoints of various linguists concerning the nature of Gratitude and her own observations over the conversational data, the author offers basic communicative patterns of Gratitude utterances in a communicative exchange. The most commonly used one consists of two moves and develops according to the following scheme: stimulus – Gratitude. As it has been experimentally proved, Gratitude can occur in three-move patterns as well, functioning as either a responding communicative move or as a follow-up move. From the author's viewpoint, there are two patterns of three-move exchanges that include Gratitude. One of them comprises the following communicative moves: stimulus – Gratitude – follow-up. Another three-move exchange pattern develops according to the following pattern: stimulus – response – follow-up Gratitude. Moreover, it has been established that Gratitude cues can be parts of four-move exchanges. Their speech realization unfolds according to the following pattern: stimulus – response – follow-up Gratitude – follow-up. Also, a tendency has been registered: Gratitude utterances can start a communicative move, thus, functioning as an initiative communicative move.

Keywords
Gratitude, conversation analysis, communicative move, communicative turn, communicative exchange, turn-taking.

1. Introduction. The given article reports on the Conversation Analysis of Gratitude as a communicative move in Modern English Literary Discourse. The main point of interest is to determine the ways in which speakers produce and recipients understand gratitude, how they constitute it as speech actions trying to achieve their interactional goals. The relevance of the investigation is determined by the lack of linguistic studies devoted to the Gratitude cues communicative patterns in a dialogue exchange.

The last quarter of the century saw a systematic attack of Conversation Analysts on the basic problems of speech exchanges containing Gratitude. All the researchers refer to Gratitude as a responding move provoked by other expressives[2]. A speech exchange including gratitude formulae is governed by the social norms of affirming and supporting social relationships and respecting the preservation of self by individuals. It means that gratitude is caused by the preceding illocutionary act performed by the interlocutor. As a rule, gratitude cues follow a speech act which is regarded by the speaker as beneficial. Such turn-taking usually corresponds to the existing interaction conditions and, thus, closes up the speech exchange.

Nevertheless, our own observations over the conversational data show that Gratitude does not function as a responding move only. It can occur as a follow-up move or even start a new interaction between the participants of conversation, thus being an initiating communicative move.

The aim of the present research is explore the conversation properties of Gratitude utterances in Modern English Literary Discourse. The **object** of the investigation is Gratitude Communicative Move in Modern English Literary Discourse. The **subject** of the study is the communicative exchanges including Gratitude formulae in Modern English Literary Discourse.

2. Methodology.

2.1. Program of Conversation Analysis of Gratitude Communicative Move.

The program of Conversation Analysis of Gratitude Communicative Move in Modern Literary Discourse comprises four consecutive steps:

(1) to give a brief survey on Conversation Analysis as the method of analysing talk-in-interaction;

(2) to determine the basic terms applied in Conversation Analysis;

(3) to establish the direction of Gratitude Communicative Moves in turn-taking sequences;

(4) to describe the pragmatic aspect of Gratitude Communicative Moves interaction within Modern Literary Discourse.

2.2. Research materials. The linguistic concepts and models, which provide the theoretical motivation

---
[1] Senior lecturer, Odessa National Maritime University, 34 Mechnikova Str., 65029, Odessa, Ukraine, Email: innakivenko@yandex.ru

ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2044-5456

[2] Tsui, 1994; Ferguson, 1971; Wunderlich, 1976

for the framework, have been tested out by data. The corpus of conversational data used for this research has been selected from modern English novels. It includes 1600 speech episodes in which literary discourse characters express gratitude. The pragmatic aspect of these episodes has been analyzed with the help of certain linguistic general and special methods.

2.3. Methods of analysis. The linguistic analysis involved the application of **general scientific methods** such as follow: *the method of synthesis and analysis* for the holistic research of the literary discourse, as well as the study of certain communicative constructions that realize gratitude; *the method of observation* for finding out the peculiar characteristics of the data investigated; *the descriptive method* for identifying variant and invariant features of the data investigated. Among **special linguistic methods** the following ones were applied: *the contextual-interpretational method* for identifying the pragmatic properties of Gratitude, *the method of Conversation Analysis* for determining Gratitude utterances integration into a dialogue communicative situation.

3. Results and Discussion.

3.1. Theoretical premises of the study.

By means of Conversation Analysis, linguists offer different concepts within which they distinguish the minimal units of dialogic communication and variants of dialogic structures. According to Selivanova, *Conversation Analysis* is the method of empiric investigation of dialogic oral speech that is helpful when researching standardized forms of conversation caused by corresponding examples of social events, particularity and extralingual factors of turn-passing, customary tools used by communicants during conversation. Besides, Conversation Analysis is aimed at explaining the choice of verbal and non-verbal means of communication by the speaker, taking into account the addressee's background knowledge and expectations, possible violations of turn-taking, so on[3].

The previous studies of conversational data focused largely on how conversation is socially organized and managed by participants, and how participants are observed to do this. The term 'Conversation Analysis' has been coined to describe this area of study. The concern of this paper is distinct from the concerns of Conversation Analysis, although it shares the same object of study – conversation. This study focuses on the pragmatic aspects of expressing gratitude. The descriptive units that Conversation Analysts have been using in describing conversational organization are: turn, pair, and *sequence*. A *turn* is

seen as everything one speaker says before another speaker begins to speak. A *pair* is made up of two turns made by two different speakers. It has been referred to as an *adjacency pair*. A *sequence* is made lip of more than one turn.

Traditionally, scientists differentiate between two basic units of dialogic communication. They are *communicative move* and *communicative turn*. There are two different principles that serve to differentiate these two notions. The first one is *functional-structural* principle that is helpful to define a communicative move whereas *formal-structural* principle serves to identify a communicative turn. In other words, a *communicative move* is seen as a minimal functional unit of a dialogue that contributes to the interaction development while a *communicative turn* is seen as a formal structural unit of a dialogue, i.e. it comprises everything that one speaker says before another speaker begins to speak[4].

As Edmondson suggests, a turn does not always coincide with a move in its volume[5], because it can comprise one or two or even more communicative moves[6]. In this case, a speaker utters several speech acts, for instance, compliment, question, greeting. Move, in its turn, can be made up of some turns in case the speaker is interrupted with some inquiry, agreement, disagreement, etc.

Together communicative move and communicative turn make up conversation unities such as *dialogic unity, adjacency pair, speech episode, speech exchange, sequence*.

The term *dialogic unity* is wide spread in Russian linguistics. The scientists regard it as the simplest combination of dialogic speech, i.e. a two-part exchange in which one utterance depends on the other[7]. In recent decades, the term *dialogic unity* has lost its popularity. Linguists have noticed that in conditions of real communication people rarely exhaust the topic within a two-part exchange, as there are interruptions, misunderstandings, explanations, etc. That is why dialogic unity serves as a simplified model that cannot meet the needs of real communication. Thus, it cannot be a typical invariant pattern of dialogic communication. At present, the term dialogic unity is being substituted with other notions that denote other structural unities: *adjacency pair, speech episode, speech exchange, sequence*, etc. These notions have been introduced by linguists, mainly foreign ones, that deal with Conversation Analysis.

The term that is the closest one to dialogic unity is *adjacency pair*. It belongs to Schegloff and Sacks. Adjacency pair is commonly applied in American linguistics to denote utterances of two communicants. The scientists point out that an organizational pattern recurrent in conversation is that of two adjacent utterances, which are produced by different speakers, and are related to each other in such a way that they form a pair type. They call them an adjacency pair. Ques-

---

[3] Selivanova, 2006, 245

[4] Sacks, 1974

[5] Edmondson, 1981

[6] Coulthard, 1977; Owen, 1983

[7] Shvedova, 1960, 281

tion – answer, greeting – greeting, and offer – acceptance / refusal are some examples of adjacency pairs. Their basic rule of operation is as follows: "Given the recognizable production of a first pair part, on its first possible completion its speaker should stop and a next speaker should start and produce a second pair part from the pair type of which the first is recognizably a member"[8].

Hence, according to Schegloff and Sacks, utterances are related to form pair types so that a particular first pair part sets up the expectation of a particular second pair part. For example, a "question" expects a "reply" and they form a pair type; an "offer" expects an "accept" or a "decline", and each of the latter forms a pair type with the former. So strong is this expectation that if the second pair part does not occur, its absence will be noticeable and noticed by participants.

Ukrainian linguists operate the term *sequence* implying the sequence of actions of participants of a dialogue, whose connection is motivated and only possible (e.g. communicative turns like "question – answer", "request – acceptance / refusal", "accusation – withdrawal")[9]. Sometimes a sequence is actually a pair; at other times it's made up of three or four turns. Still, neither dialogic unity nor adjacency pair meet the needs of a communicative exchange. That is why currently there appear unities embracing more structural elements. One of them is *speech episode* which does not always correspond to adjacency pair as it can be made up of three or even four turns[10]. The British linguists, Coulthard and Sinclair, suggest that a typical exchange has three elements of structure: an initiating move, a responding move, and a follow-up move. They believe that an exchange which consists of two parts, or two elements of structure, is perceived as the "marked form" in which the third part is withheld for strategic reasons[11]. According to Makarov, an exchange is not just a total of moves, it is a structure that dynamically organizes their functional integration. The linguist strongly believes that this term should be applied to all kinds of dialogic structures (two-part, three-part, or four-part), specifying the exchange volume with adjectives *simple* (for two-part structures) and *complex* (for three-part or four-part structures)[12].

In our research, we adhere to the opinion that the terms *speech episode, speech exchange* and *sequence* can be applied as synonyms.

The viewpoints of Schegloff and Sacks, Coulthard and Sinclair concerning the criterion of structural location of speech acts have allowed Tsui to single out *initiating move, responding move* and *follow-up move*[13]. They are coherent and form a bounded three-part exchange which is considered more powerful as a description of the basic unit of conversational organization than an adjacency pair. Goffman expresses the same idea about *ritual interchanges*: "A response will on occasion leave matters in a ritually unsatisfactory state, and a turn by the initial speaker will be required, encouraged, or at least allowed, resulting in a three-part interchange"[14]. Every move in a three-part exchange is of great importance. The first move is initiated by the first speaker. Then it is followed by the reply of the second communicant. The interaction is closed up with the follow-up move. Special attention should be paid to the follow-up move. It is considered to be the most important element of an exchange in conversation. It is the element on which further interaction is based. It has a general function of acknowledging the outcome of the interaction that has taken place in the initiating and the responding moves.

As Heritage and Atkinson observe: "Any third action that implements some normal onward development of a sequence confirms the adequacy of the displayed understandings in the sequence so far. By means of this framework, speakers are released from what would otherwise be the endless task of explicitly confirming and reconfirming their understanding of one another's actions"[15].

Burton and Stubbs define the function of a follow-up move as evaluative.

The analysis conducted allows to sum up and come to the conclusion: the structural units of a dialogic speech are a communicative move and a communicative turn that are differentiated according to functional-structural and formal-structural principles respectively. Together communicative move and communicative turn can make up different unities such as dialogic unity, adjacency pair, sequence, speech episode, etc. In our research, we operate the terms speech episode, speech exchange and sequence as synonyms.

The investigations of British and American linguists have brought us round that of all speech unities only a three-part exchange is the most powerful as a description of the basic unit of conversational organization. The three moves of a three-part exchange are related to each other in such a way that each move sets up the expectation of the subsequent move. In the structure of a speech episode the follow-up move is an essential communicative component which implements the onward development of interaction.

3.2. Communicative patterns with Gratitude Communicative Move.

Conversation Analysis applied to our data has allowed us to study the structures of speech episodes comprising Gratitude Communicative Move. Tsui

[8] Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, 296

[9] Selivanova, 2011, 73

[10] Tsui, 1994, 7

[11] Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975

[12] Makarov, 2003, 188

[13] Tsui, 1994, 60

[14] Goffman, 1981, 23

[15] Heritage, 1984, 10

defines Gratitude as a *positive responding move*, preceded by other expressive speech acts as the social norms of establishing and supporting social relations as well as expressing respect require it[16]. The American linguist Ferguson denotes the reactive character of gratitude. He considers gratitude as the addresser's illocutionary act based on the addressee's previously performed act. The latter is to be beneficial for the addresser. Then he is grateful to the addressee and reveals his feeling by means of the speech act, i.e. gratitude[17]. Wunderlich shares Ferguson's viewpoint and calls gratitude both reactive and responding speech act. The scientist states that gratitude immediately follows the beneficial for the addresser act[18]. According to the Russian research Skovorodina, gratitude is a reactive speech act, too. In other words, gratitude is an immediate verbal response to a certain stimulus without which realization of such an act is impossible[19]. Other Russian linguists such as Adamakova, Imas, Tyagunova adhere to the same viewpoint. Moreover, they put forward a two-part scheme of expressing gratitude: *stimulus – gratitude*. This communicative pattern is basic.

We agree with the fact that Gratitude cues mainly function as a responding move. Nevertheless, our own observations show that gratitude can be used as an initiating move and as a follow-up move not only in two-part exchanges, but also in three- and even four-part exchanges. Distribution of turns that make up gratitude speech episodes occurs according to the following patterns:

1) stimulus – gratitude;
2) stimulus – gratitude – follow-up;
3) stimulus – response – follow-up gratitude;
4) stimulus – response – follow-up gratitude – follow-up;
5) stimulus-gratitude – response.

Pattern (1) – *stimulus – gratitude* – is regarded as the basic one as mentioned before.

According to pattern (2) – *stimulus – gratitude – follow-up* – gratitude functions as a responding move followed by the follow-up move. This pattern testifies the additional perlocutionary response to gratitude.

As far as we can see, in pattern (3) – *stimulus – response – follow-up gratitude* – gratitude functions as a follow-up move that terminates the speech episode. In this case gratitude is used as endorsement denoting positive outcome of interaction between communicants.

Pattern (4) – *stimulus – response – follow-up gratitude – follow-up* – demonstrates that follow-up

---

[16] Tsui, 1994, 152

[17] Ferguson, 1971

[18] Wunderlich, 1976

[19] Skovorodina, 2004, 79

[20] Trollope, 2002, 13

[21] James, 2012, 374

gratitude is followed by another follow-up move that expresses satisfaction from speech exchange.

Thus, expression of gratitude is mainly formulated as a responding or follow-up move. Nevertheless, the observations over the conversational data have proved that Gratitude cues can function as an initiating communicative move "inside" the dialogue contributing to its development. In this case, a gratitude cue gives a new start to speech exchange between interlocutors. This makes possible pattern (5) – *stimulus-gratitude – response*. Gratitude utterances can also be framed as an initiating move when the preceding stimulus is a non-verbal action or the time of verbal gratitude is postponed, i.e. when a gratitude cue is not responsive and does not immediately follow the preceding stimulus.

3.3. Integration of gratitude moves in the process of speech interaction.

The major communicative pattern of gratitude realization is a two-part exchange comprising stimulus and gratitude to it (78.6 %) which can be illustrated by the following speech episode:

"I'd help you, duck."

*Sophie nodded, gulping. "I know, I know, **thank you**"*[20].

In the speech episode provided above the stimulus is expressed by a commissive to help, given by the granny to her granddaughter in case of her parents' divorce. The response includes three moves: two constatives and gratitude-expressive.

The three-part pattern which develops according to the scheme *stimulus – gratitude – follow-up* occurs in 3.9 % of our research data. In this pattern, gratitude is a responding move after which comes the follow-up move. Here is a speech episode exemplifying this gratitude pattern:

"I think Mrs. Jones has laundered your clothes from yesterday. They're in the closet."

*"**Thank you**," I mutter.*

*"**You're most welcome**"*[21].

In the produced speech exchange the initial move includes two constatives. The responding move represents gratitude. Then comes the follow-up move which nominates the positive outcome of interaction.

In the other three-part pattern, gratitude can terminate the speech episode, i.e. it functions as a follow-up move. Consequently, gratitude speech exchange develops according to the following scheme: *stimulus – response – follow-up gratitude*, which comprises 6.8 % of our research data. In such three-part exchanges, the turn is expressed by a question or a directive (direct or indirect request, plea). Then comes the response to the first interlocutor's utterance that meets his expectations. After that gratitude closes up the speech exchange. Consequently, follow-up gratitude is predetermined by realization of the addresser's expectations. This statement can be exemplified by the next speech episode:

"And you didn't have any trouble boarding up the house?"

"No."

*"I'm glad. **I appreciate your doing that for me**"*[22].

In the given example, the first communicative move is represented by a question (a woman asks her friend if the latter had any troubles with running the hotel). It is followed by the answer which satisfies the woman's expectation. The interaction is terminated with two expressive follow-up moves, one of which is gratitude.

Four-part exchanges containing gratitude are quite rare and occur in only 0.9 % of all sequences investigated. In such interactions gratitude functions as a follow-up move as in the previously described pattern. However, in this case, it does not close up the interaction since there is one more follow-up move coming after it. Thus, gratitude four-part exchange develops according to the following pattern: *stimulus – response – follow-up gratitude – follow-up*. The final communicative move nominates the perlocutionary reaction to the gratitude expressed. Nevertheless, Tsui fairly points out: "such four-part exchanges seldom occur in real life; the fourth move (i.e. follow-up gratitude) serves as a turn-passing signal"[23]. This thought is confirmed by our research.

The fourth pattern of gratitude expression is exemplified by the following speech episode: Luke asks Becky to answer all his phone calls instead of him as he does not want to be disturbed during work. Becky agrees to do him a favour. Luke is sincerely grateful to her as kinesic and tactile means (*smile, touch to her hand*) testify it:

"Becky, if the phone rings, could you answer it? I don't want to be disturbed for a few minutes."

"OK!" I say.

*"**Thanks**." He smiles and touches my hand. "**That's a real help**."*

*"**No problem**!" I say brightly*[24].

In this sequence stimulus includes an indirect request (to answer phone calls) and a constative. Subsequently there is a responding move realized by a commissive speech act, as the woman makes commitment. Then comes a follow-up gratitude which comprises gratitude-expressive and constative. The interaction is terminated by one more follow-up move which "declines" the previously expressed gratitude.

As an initiating communicative move gratitude occurs in 9.8 % of all sequences investigated. Initiating gratitude does not begin an interaction, but it gives a start to the new exchange between communicants "inside" conversation, thus, contributing to its onward development. The speech episode provid-

ed below exemplifies this fact: Christian is worried about his wife. When he confines in her, she thanks him. Her gratitude opens a new turn of speech exchange between them:

"And my biggest worry is that they are after me. And if they are after me –" He stops, unable to continue.

"… They might get me," I whisper. He blanches, and I know that I have finally uncovered the root of his anxiety. I caress his face.

*"**Thank you**," I murmur.*

He frowns. "What for?"

"For telling me"[25].

This speech episode includes five communicative turns and four communicative moves. The first and the second turns of interlocutors are represented by communicative moves-constatives. The third and the fifth turns that belong to one communicant, realize one communicative move – argumentative gratitude which is interrupted by a question.

Another speech episode illustrates the situation in which time of gratitude has been postponed as it was a non-verbal action that preceded gratitude. Some time ago, Becky received a card from Luke. Once they meet for dinner at a restaurant, Becky begins thinking about it. She cannot understand if sending a card to her was just a polite sign on his part or maybe something more. Her gratitude-expressive opens a speech interaction between them, though gratitude itself is greatly postponed:

And now, for some reason, I'm thinking about that nice card Luke sent me. And I'm wondering whether it was just being friendly – or … or whether it was something else. At this thought my stomach flips so hard I almost feel sick, and very quickly I take another sip of wine. Well, a gulp, really. Then I put down my glass, count to five and say casually,

*"**Thanks for your card, by the way**."*

"What?" he says, looking up. "Oh, you're welcome." He reaches for his glass and takes a sip of wine. "It was nice to bump into you, that night"[26].

4. Conclusion. The current study contributes to the field of Conversation Analysis by investigating the pragmatic aspects of Gratitude Communicative Moves interaction.

We have described the most commonly used Gratitude sequences comprising a certain number of moves organized in a definite order. On no account should this classification be regarded as exhausting. Obviously, dialogic communication may take quite unexpected turns. Anyway, a marked tendency has been shown for gratitude utterances to occur in two-, three-, four- and even five-part speech exchanges.

Gratitude can be expressed either as a responding communicative move or as a follow-up move in two-, three- and four-part communicative exchanges. Moreover, in some speech situations, gratitude can be formulated as an initiating communicative move ei-

---

[22] Sparks, 2007, 152

[23] Tsui, 1994, 42

[24] Kinsella, 2004, 172

[25] James, 2012, 75

ther "inside" the ongoing conversation or beginning a new interaction when the time of expressing gratitude has been postponed.

Modelling of gratitude cues mainly occurs according to the pattern *stimulus – gratitude* which makes up 78.6 % of our data. Three-part exchange *stimulus – gratitude – follow-up* is less common and is observed in 3.9 % of speech episodes. In 6.8 % of the experimental data, Gratitude utterances occur as a follow-up move in the pattern *stimulus – response – follow-up gratitude*. Quite seldom they are present in four-part exchanges, coming across in only 0.9 %: *stimulus – response – follow-up gratitude – follow-up*. As an initiating move Gratitude is observed in the pattern *stimulus-gratitude – response* which makes up 9.8 % of the data investigated.

In conclusion, this study points towards the need for investigation into the illocutionary aims and perlocutionary effect of Gratitude Speech Act.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Макаров М. Л. Основы теории дискурса / М. Л. Макаров. – М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2003. – 280 с.

Селіванова О. О. Основи теорії мовної комунікації / О. О. Селіванова – Черкаси: Видавництво Чабаненко Ю. А., 2011. – 350 с.

Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика. Термінологічна енциклопедія / О. О. Селіванова – Полтава: Довкілля-К, 2006. – 716 с.

Сковородина С. В. Прагматика реактивных речевых актов в немецком диалогическом дискурсе (концепты «благодарность» и «извинение») / С. В. Сковородина – Дис. … канд. филол. наук. – Санкт-Петербург, 2004. – 219 с.

Шведова Н. Ю. Очерки по синтаксису русской разговорной речи / Н. Ю. Шведова. – М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1960. – 377 с.

Coulthard M. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis / M. Coulthard. – London: Longman Group Limited, 1977. – 215 p.

Edmondson W. Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis / W. Edmonson. – London: Longman, 1981. – 217 p.

Ferguson C. A. Language structure and language use / C. A. Ferguson. – CA, Stanford: Stanford, University Pres, 1971. – 356 p.

Goffman E. Forms of talk / E. Goffman. – Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981. – 335 p.

Heritage J. A change-of-state-token and aspects of its sequential placement / J. Heritage // Structures of social action: Studies in Conversation Analysis. – Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1984. – P. 299–345.

Owen M. Apologies and Remedial Interchanges: A Study of Language Use in Social Interaction. – Berlin: Mouton, 1983. – 192 p.

Sacks H., Schegloff E. Opening up closing / H. Sacks, E. Schegloff. – Semiotica. – Vol. 8. No. 4. – Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1973. – P. 289-327.

Sacks H., Schegloff E. A., Jefferson G. A. Simplest Systematics for the Organisation of Turn-Taking for Conversation // Language. – Vol. 50. – № 4. – USA: University of Michigan, 1974. – P. 696–735.

Sinclair J. M., Coulthard M. Towards an analysis of discourse / J. M. Sinclair, M. Coulthard. – London: Oxford University Press, 1975. – 163 p.

Tsui A. English Conversation / A. Tsui. – UK: Oxford University Press, 1994. – 295 p.

Wunderlich D. Studien zur Sprechakttheorie / D. Wunderlich. – Frankfurt / M., 1976. – 416 p.

SOURCE MATERIAL

James E. L. Fifty Shades Freed. – London: Arrow Books, 2012. – 579 p.

James E. L. Fifty Shades of Grey. – London: Arrow Books, 2012. – 514 p.

Kinsella S. Confessions of a Shopaholic. – London: Black Swan, 2000. – 320 p.

Kinsella S. Shopaholic and Sister. – London: Black Swan, 2004. – 382 p.

Sparks N. Nights in Rodanthe. – London: Sphere, 2007. – 214 p.

Trollope J. The Best of Friends. – NY: Berkley Books, 2002. – 299 p.

REFERENCES

Makarov, M. L. (2003). *Fundamentals of Discourse Theory* [Osnovy teorii diskursa]. M.: ITDGK «Gnozis», 280 s.

Selivanova, O. O. (2011). *Fundamentals of Speech Communication Theory* [Osnovi teorії movnoї komunikacії]. Cherkasi: Vidavnictvo Chabanenko Ju. A., 350 s.

Selivanova, O. O. (2006). *Modern linguistics: terminological encyclopedia* [Suchasna linhvistyka: terminolohichna entsyklopediya]. Poltava: Dovkillya-K, 716 s.

Skovorodina, S. V. (2004). *Pragmatics of Reactive Speech Acts in German Dialogue Discourse (Gratitude and Apology Concepts)* [Pragmatika reaktivnyh rechevyh aktov v nemeckom dialogicheskom diskurse (koncepty «blagodarnost'» i «izvinenie»)]: Dis. … kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.04, Sankt-Peterburg, 219 s.

Shvedova, N. Ju. (1960). *Essays on Syntax of the Russian Spoken Language* [Ocherki po sintaksisu russkoj razgovornoj rechi]. M.: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 377 s.

Coulthard, M. (1977). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman Group Limited, 215 p.

Edmondson, W. (1981). *Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis*. London: Longman, 217 p.

Ferguson, C. A. (1971). *Language structure and language use*. CA, Stanford: Stanford, University Press, 356 p.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp 335.

Heritage, J. (1984). *A change-of-state-token and aspects of its sequential placement* // Structures of social action: Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, pp. 299–345.

Owen, M. (1983). *Apologies and Remedial Interchanges: A Study of Language Use in Social Interaction*. Berlin: Mouton, 192 p.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. (1973). *Opening up closing* // Semiotica. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 289–327.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. A. (1974). *Simplest Systematics for the Organisation of Turn-Taking for Conversation* // Language. USA: University of Michigan, pp. 696–735.

Sinclair, J. M., Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. London: Oxford University Press, 163 p.

Tsui, A. (1994). *English Conversation*. UK: Oxford University Press, 295 p.

Wunderlich, D. (1976). *Studien zur Sprechakttheorie*. Frankfurt / M., 416 p.

SOURCE MATERIAL

James, E. L. (2012). *Fifty Shades Freed*. London: Arrow Books.

James, E. L. (2012). *Fifty Shades of Grey*. London: Arrow Books.

Kinsella, S. (2000). *Confessions of a Shopaholic*. London: Black Swan.

Kinsella, S. (2004). *Shopaholic and Sister*. London: Black Swan.

Sparks, N. (2007). *Nights in Rodanthe*. London: Sphere.

Trollope, J. (2002). *The Best of Friends*. NY: Berkley Books.

Анотація

Стаття присвячена конверсаційному аналізу подяки як комунікативного ходу у сучасному англомовному літературному дискурсі. Матеріалом дослідження слугували фрагменти сучасних англомовних романів. Вибірка склала 1600 мовленнєвих епізодів, в яких персонажі висловлюють подяку. В дослідженні було використано метод конверсаційного аналізу, який уможливив окреслення схем моделювання комунікації та описання закономірностей міни мовленнєвих ходів, які включають вираження подяки, а також поведінку коммунікантів. Теоретичні передумови дослідження передбачають визначення конверсаційного аналізу як емпіричного методу вивчення діалогічної мови та окреслити різницю між поняттями *хід, крок, суміжна пара, секвенція, мовленнєвий обмін* та *мовленнєвий епізод*. Приймаючи до уваги погляди різних вчених, авторка пропонує базові комунікативні моделі вираження подяки в комунікативному обміні. Найбільш поширена схема розгортання подяки складається з двох ходів: *стимул – подяка*. На думка авторки, можливо виділити дві трикрокові моделі вираження подяки, в яких остання може функціонувати або як реагувальний комунікативний хід, або як хід-післямова. Перший варіант трикрокової моделі розгортається за наступною схемою: *стимул – подяка – післямова*, – в якій останній хід номінує можливий перлокутивний ефект подяки. Згідно іншої трикрокової моделі подяка висловлюється наступним чином: *стимул – реакція – подяка-післямова*. Окрім цього встановлено, що комунікативний хід подяки має місце в чотирикрокових моделях, до складу яких входять *стимул – реакція – подяка-післямова – післямова*. Спостереження над вибіркою також дозволили виявити тенденцію до функціонування подяки як ініціювального комунікативного ходу, який розпочинає новий виток спілкування «всередині» діалогу або відкриває нову інтеракцію між співрозмовниками, коли час вербальної реалізації подяки відсунено. В такому випадку подяка не є реагувальним ходом, адже не висловлюється одразу ж після пропозиційної дії.

Ключові слова

Подяка, конверсаційний аналіз, комунікативний хід, комунікативний крок, комунікативний обмін, міна комунікативних ходів.