Original Research

Verbalisation of encouragement in contemporary French dialogic discourse

by Nataliia V. Poliakova and Victoria V. Sibul

Nataliia V. Poliakova Moscow Region State University, Russia nv.polyakova@mgou.ru
Victoria V. Sibul Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Russia vsibul1970@mail.ru

The article conducted in the framework of the communicative-pragmatic paradigm of knowledge focuses on the analysis of linguistic means of encouraging the interlocutor on the recipient's end in the course of polite, socially acceptable communication that is also called conventional. The main objective of the article is to identify stereotypical ways of verbalising the tactics of speech behaviour of the recipient, which consists in encouraging the interlocutor in French dialogic discourse. The consideration of the nature and peculiar features of the speech act as a unit of normative socio-speech behaviour is of great theoretical interest as it helps examine the mechanisms of speech and identify specific trends, and practical significance, for example, for the adequate identification and description of discursive strategies to the full extent. The material of this study includes dialogic unities from the fictional works of contemporary French authors, in which the speech of the characters closely resembles spontaneous spoken interaction. The study concludes that the verbal behaviour of the recipient should take into account the duality of their position as they act not only as an object of speech persuasion but also as a subject of speech interaction. The analysis of the speech act of agreement, as one of the most important for dialogic communication, made it possible to single out a variety of communicative units involved in its implementation, as well as to reveal the diversity of the modal characteristics transmitted by them.

KEYWORDS: *dialogic discourse, communication, speaker, recipient, speech act, communicative tactics, French*

1. INTRODUCTION

The individual is the centre that transmits the coordinates defining the subject, tasks, methods, and value-based orientations of modern linguistics. Nowadays, there is no field of linguistic research that has not gained an anthropocentric orientation. The essence of the linguistics of anthropocentrism is clearly revealed in discursive studies. Evidently, discourse cannot be examined outside of the person who is the producer and recipient of speech.

The concepts of the anthropocentric basis of a language are developing in such areas as linguistic pragmatics, the theory of speech activity, psy-

cholinguistics, and cognitive linguistics. These linguistic areas allow researchers to identify the relationship between a person's speech and their activity and explicitly expose the evaluative (and, consequently, social, psychological, and cognitive) component that introduces such constants as the speaker, the purpose of speech, the conditions of speech flow, the evaluation subject, the recipient's personality, the communication result, and determine the required assessment parameters when considering a particular speech use, its communicative relevance, and aesthetic value.

Linguistic means of different levels demonstrate predetermined outcome of communication and guidelines for speech behaviour, due to this with the difference in research objectives in related linguistic disciplines, the phenomenon of dialogue has become a dominant topic.

The article conducted in the framework of the communicative and pragmatic paradigm of knowledge recognises the dialogic discourse segment as a minimum research base, a unit of analysis of interlocutors' verbal communication – the speaker and the recipient.

Any language has a tremendous persuasive power that is impossible to ignore. The issue of linguistic manipulation is not examined to the full extent even though the impact of words on a person has been of concern for a long period of time and, besides, a few special studies of this aspect and new scientific directions have been developing in recent years.

The scientific novelty of the present research lies in examining the cognitive nature of linguistic manipulation which is not completely covered in relation to various types of discourse. It is difficult to overestimate the significance of this objective since any statement is intrinsically connected with the aspect of manipulation and persuasion by means of the embedded information, affirmation function that is represented with the help of intonation, acoustic, and other means, the influence of the speaker's authority, etc. In this regard, it seems relevant to focus on the analysis of lexical and syntactic means of expressing encouragement of the interlocutor by the recipient who demonstrates

the reaction during polite, socially acceptable communication, which is also called conventional. Thus, the main objective of the article is to identify stereotypical ways of verbalising the tactics of speech behaviour of the recipient, which consists in encouraging the interlocutor in modern French dialogic discourse.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The material of this study includes dialogic unities from the fictional works of contemporary French authors, in which the speech of the characters closely resembles spontaneous spoken interaction. The total number of analysed examples accounted for 300 dialogic unities. The quantitative analysis conducted in the course of the research together with the method of contextual analysis made it possible to establish a typology of tactics of speech behaviour expressing encouragement for the interlocutor in modern French dialogic discourse, as well as to identify their main lexical and grammatical means of expression.

3. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND
3.1. Dialogic discourse as an object of linguistic research

Communication serves as a conduit for interaction. People are able to interact by means of communication. Otherwise stated, interaction represents a communicative activity that is considered in terms of its social structure. There are diverse models of communication, verbal communication being one of the major ones.

When we speak we produce a special act of speech. The implementation of a sign system predetermines the key difference between a speech act and other types of acts. However, it is always communicative. Correlation with thinking allows speech acts to fulfil a cognitive function that states that particular mental processes occur in the course of the planning of speech acts.

Speech activity encompasses three major aspects: communicative, interactive, and perceptual (Habermas, 1984; Kohler, 2017). The communicative side of communication, or communication activity in the strict sense, involves the exchange of

information between communicating individuals. The interactive side of communication involves the organisation of interaction between communicating individuals, i.e. the exchange of speech acts. The perceptual side of communication identifies the perceptual experience of a statement by communication partners and the establishment of mutual understanding. In terms of interpersonal communication, each statement depends on the previous or subsequent statement that modifies the interlocutors' intentions.

Interlocutors transmit information about certain goals via verbal communication. Littlejohn and Foss (2008) who analyse the sociological and psychological aspects of purposeful behaviour identify a goal as the ideal result of an action, i.e. motivated, conscious anticipation of a future outcome. The goal provides a person with an idea of the desired result of an action and defines it in terms of external objective processes and phenomena, and rationally chosen means. Finally, the goal conveys a certain desired level of needs satisfaction (Kurbanova-Ilyutko, 2021). Within the scope of the present research, the goal is to receive the recipient's reaction in the form of the encouragement of the interlocutor.

The interlocutor's encouragement arises as a result of the common mental state of people that is caused by the mutual understanding and associated with mutual interest and trust of the interacting parties. Encouragement is acknowledged and experienced by the subjects as a reinforcing factor of interaction, in which all the personal traits of the subjects of interaction are completely revealed. In other words, the internal support mechanisms include emotional and intellectual empathy, co-thinking, and contribution. Emotional empathy as a support mechanism is driven by the personal characteristics of the interacting subjects, the significance of the subject of interaction, the attitude of the parties to this process. This guarantees mutual understanding and a sense of community as well as concurrency of interaction.

Thus, the interlocutor's encouragement is identified as relations between the participants of the dialogue, which are characterised by the emer-

'The interactive side of communication involves the organisation of interaction between communicating individuals, i.e. the exchange of speech acts. The perceptual side of communication identifies the perceptual experience of a statement by communication partners and the establishment of mutual understanding. In terms of interpersonal communication, each statement depends on the previous or subsequent statement that modifies the interlocutors' intentions'

gence of mutual 'attraction' (sometimes unconscious), a keen and deep understanding of each other, congruity in views, beliefs, mindset, as well as the peculiarity of the recipient's response to emotional events that excite the interlocutor.

Verbal communication between the interlocutors is always aimed at achieving a certain goal. The consideration of speech as a goal-oriented activity in a dynamically developing interpersonal interaction within a social context has determined linguists' interest in such a phenomenon as discourse (Beaugrande, 1997).

The semantic capacity of the term 'discourse' has led to the need to use attributive specifiers with it. Scientists usually distinguish personal and institutional, everyday, business, computer, medical as well as narrative and poetic, written and spoken discourse, etc. Commonly, discourse is divided into monologic and dialogic. The key differences between monologic and dialogic speech are not about how many communicants are involved in verbal communication, but rather how the communicative process is motivated and structured. Thus, if argumentation develops in a dialectical way, if there is a change of perspective around the reflection axis of the central argument that is accompanied by the regular change of the communicative course, then we are to call such speech dialogic. All other speech forms belong to the

monologic category. In addition to speech representation, dialogic discourse includes a number of extralinguistic factors: the communicative attitude of the participants of speech interaction, the presence of common background knowledge, a common global theme, etc. The ultimate goal of dialogic discourse is its perception and understanding.

In this article, dialogic discourse is presented as the result of the joint communicative activity of two or more individuals, including, in addition to their speech activity, a certain set of extralinguistic features that provide an adequate understanding of what is being reported.

3.2. Hierarchy of dialogic interaction units

Researchers analysing conversation parties have done a lot in terms of the identification of dialogic interaction. They have also worked on the development of such categories of dialogic discourse as macro-level categories (conversation phases), intermediate level (utterances and speech moves), and micro-level categories (syntactic, lexical, phonological, and prosodic structures) (Fillmore, 1969; Horton, 2017; Kasper & Kellerman, 2014). The phases of dialogic interaction represent the largest segment of dialogic discourse and correspond to the beginning, middle, and end of an interaction. A smaller structural unit is an interchange, a simple interaction, a set of utterances. This category is close to the notion of 'dialogic unity' which essence is in the interchange of speech acts. As opposed to a speech act that is a communication unit with a one-sided focus, simple interaction includes the actions of both interlocutors. Simple interaction is easily distinguished in discourse based on the formal criteria such as the utterance of one communicant and the other's response. However, this is the case only in relation to simple interchanges whereas dialogic discourse involves complex interchanges like 'question-echo-question-clarifying question-response' or 'question-response-confirmation'.

The key unit of dialogic discourse is the speech act. Some researchers believe that the speech act is synonymous with the communicative

act. Such attributes as 'communicative' and 'speech' characterise the interaction act in natural language emphasising different sides of the same phenomenon. A speech act is usually defined as a statement, or a set of statements performed by one speaker taking into consideration the reaction of the other (Ballmer & Brennenstuhl, 1981). However, the communicative aspect in the consideration of speech acts sets a slightly different direction of view: the communicative act is a set of speech acts performed by the interlocutors towards each other. Thus, in this concept, the communicative act is hardly a speech interaction, but an interchange of speech acts.

When analysing the sequences of speech acts the following concepts are distinguished: 1) speech course which is usually associated with the change of communicative roles; 2) speech step is a statement or set of statements within one speech course. There are semantic connections between the speech courses that are determined by the identity of the topic, concord of intentions/illocutions (e.g. question-answer; request-refusal), etc. Speech steps can be of different volumes. They can consist of several sentences or words that serve as a sentence.

The concept of 'utterance' is used as the naming unit of the speech step. An utterance is considered as one of the interlocutors' words that are limited by the speech of the other or another marker. Thus, both the speech step and the utterance are associated with the statement and are the main communicative units and the smallest building units of dialogic discourse.

Structurally, utterances collapse into stimuli and reactions, but in the communicative and functional plan each utterance is aimed at the previous interaction of partners and at the same time at calling a new (verbal or non-verbal) action of the interlocutor. Formally, the direction of the utterance can be progressive, coming from the author, and regressive, which is a form of speech reaction to the communicative behaviour of the interlocutor or one's speech behaviour. The communicative focus of an utterance course of the progressive type is initiating, the reverse is reacting.

'Structurally, utterances collapse into stimuli and reactions, but in the communicative and functional plan each utterance is aimed at the previous interaction of partners and at the same time at calling a new (verbal or non-verbal) action of the interlocutor. Formally, the direction of the utterance can be progressive, coming from the author, and regressive, which is a form of speech reaction to the communicative behaviour of the interlocutor or one's speech behavioure'

A person speaks not only to express their thoughts but also to influence others and release their feelings. The author of the initial utterance expects that the interlocutor is to take into account the reported information and use it for specific purposes, share their feelings, approve or disapprove of their decisions. If the speaker's expectations are met, the initial informative utterance is followed by a responsive utterance.

The participants of communication in dialogic discourse are the speaker and the recipient (the speaker and the listener, the sender, and the recipient of the message). Conventionally, it is believed that the relationship between the speaker and the recipient is not equal in terms of communicative status: the first one is always in a more advantageous position, since they have a communicative initiative, while the role of the listener is restricted to the perception and processing of information conveyed by the speaker. Another interpretation of the relationship between the participants of dialogic interaction is also possible. Thus, Bakhtin (1986) claimed the existence of the active nature of the listener's position when the recipient not only perceives and understands the meaning of speech but also takes an active responsive position, agreeing or disagreeing with what was said. Any understanding of speech is of an actively responsive na-

ture and response, as a rule, is generated when the listener turns into the speaker. Better and holistic comprehension is nothing more than the initial preliminary stage of the response, and the speaker himself hopes for such an active understanding – they are not waiting for a passive understanding that copies their thought in someone else's head, but for a response (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 297-325). Notably, in the framework of dialogic interaction the speaker and the listener constantly change their roles and, consequently, the perception of the message and the preparation of the response are simultaneous, which allows us to state that the recipient also undertakes the active role.

3.3. Principles of verbal communication implementation

Cognitive and communicative paradigms are considered to be of higher priority in contemporary linguistics. The existence of cognitive-discursive and communicative-discursive approaches to the study of discourse is preconditioned by the semantics and pragmatics of a sign.

The cognitive approach (lat. *cognito* 'cognition, recognition, studying; concept, notion, knowledge; investigation; case hearing, probe; recognition and identification') is aimed at cognitive processes together with the processes of receiving, processing, documentation, and storage of data. Cognitive linguistics implies the knowledge-driven process of data encoding and extracting. From our point of view, the examination of the processual aspects of categorisation and conceptualisation opens new horizons for discursive semantics.

The primary focus in the communicative paradigm is on the communication functions, activity, and influence of implementation context on this activity means of the expression of the relevant intentions and assumptions. Concurrently, in order to solve some urgent issues of contemporary linguistics a kind of synthesis of these paradigms of knowledge is required. The communicative approach to the analysis of discourse that reintroduced the view on the language as an activity was embodied primarily in the theory of speech acts.

3.4. The theory of speech acts

The widespread usage of this theory has determined the ways of pragmatics development in general. The theory of speech acts is based on ideas that originated in the 1930s and were later stated by the English logician Austin (1973). These ideas were also developed in the works of the American logician Searle (1979). The persistent development of the theory of speech acts enabled the scientists to study the language in its functioning and examine the result of its influence on the interlocutor.

According to Austin's (1973) theory, a speech act contains three components: a locutionary act, an illocutionary act, and a perlocutionary act.

A locutionary act is an act of speaking, delivery of a speech segment with propositional content. It involves the pronunciation of sounds (phonation acts), the use of words and their linking in accordance with grammar rules, identification of certain objects with their help (reference acts), as well as attributing certain qualities and relationships to these objects (predication acts).

An illocutionary act is an act of the expression by the speaker of their communicative intention or the implementation of a communicative act. The defining attributes of an illocutionary act are intention, purposefulness, and conventionality. The content of the illocutionary act is reflected in the illocutionary force/function. The illocutionary force consists of the following components: the illocutionary goal (why the speech act is performed), the means of achieving it, the conditions of its achievement, and intensifiers.

A perlocutionary act is the result of the speaker's verbal impact on the listener's thoughts, feelings, and actions.

Research on the theory of speech acts is based mainly on the concept of 'illocutionary force' of a statement or 'illocutionary semantics.' The illocutionary force is a type of speech act that the speaker intends to perform at the moment of the delivery of the statement: an order, a question, a request, an affirmation, a promise, etc. However, for Austin (1973) and Searle (1979) the illocutionary force (the active, subjective aspect of the meaning) is not a description of the speaker's inner world. The illocutionary force does not any longer represent reality or describe the speaker's inner world, but only creates an act that the speaker performs at the moment of the delivery of the statement. Thus, the subjective aspect loses its informative character in the philosophy of the two logicians. However, the propositional content remained unchanged in the statement, which is an objective description of the world around us, which, in turn, can be true or false (Searle, 1979, p. 33).

Regarding the way of expression of the illocutionary force of a statement, speech acts are traditionally divided into direct and indirect. The use of the language means for the speech act development may be considered as the direct way of its implementation. These means were specialised by the language system to express the corresponding communicative meaning. Speech acts formed in this way are commonly referred to as direct speech acts.

Depending on the nature of the communicative function reference, it is possible to distinguish two forms of expression of direct speech acts: (a) explicit, when the communicative intention is expressed by a separate linguistic element (e.g. by a performative verb in its 'classical' use in the form of the present tense of the active voice of the indicative mood in combination with the pronominal subject of the first person singular); (b) implicit, when the communicative meaning is expressed by the semantic structure of the language form (e.g. imperative and interrogative sentences as grammaticalised forms of expression of motivation and question).

Indirect speech acts reveal themselves as a discrepancy between the meaning and the essence of the statement, between the expressed and implied content, between the proper and contextually determined (opportunistic) meaning (Dolgina & Makarova, 2021). Indirect speech acts can be considered as a specific speech strategy, which consists in the fact that the produced illocutionary speech act is intended to carry out a secondary role in the process of the implementation of another illocutionary act.

Firstly, the common use of indirect speech acts is explained by the speaker's desire to reduce the judgmental nature of the statement. This is especially important in those cases where direct speech acts cannot be properly used, while indirect ones provide the possibility of further verbal and non-verbal cooperation of communicants. At the same time, the order can be expressed in the form of a request, advice, question, or affirmation, but is unlikely in the form of a compliment.

The linguistic study contains diverse approaches to the interpretation of the given phenomenon. According to Searle (1979), who is the author of the theory of indirect speech acts, when the speaker indirectly expresses their communicative intention, one locutionary act corresponds to two illocutionary ones – the primary (indirect) and secondary (direct), which means that the statement in the implementation of an indirect speech act has two illocutionary forces (Searle, 1979, p. 196). Focusing his efforts on the issues of indirect speech acts' interpretation in discourse, Searle (1979) tries to identify whether there is any relationship between the meaning of an indirect speech act and the specific linguistic means used for its implementation.

Considering the solution of this problem from the point of view of the concept of conventionality, he concludes that statements that implement an indirect speech act must be associated with the conditions for the success of this speech act. The stereotyping and repetition of this connection in diverse communication situations lead to the formation of so-called 'conventions of use' in speech culture. A classic example of such a convention, common to many languages, is, according to Searle (1979), the possibility to express a request either by means of a question to the prerequisites or condition of the propositional content of the speech act of the request *(Would you mind doing this?)* or by stating that there is a condition for the sincerity of the speech act of the request *(I would like you to do this)*. From the standpoint of Konrad (1985), the decisive role in the identification of the discursive meaning of the statement and the type of speech act performed by it is played by the situa-

tion of communication and the presence in the minds of the interlocutors of behavioural patterns with some predetermined hierarchy of goals. He concludes that *'indirect speech acts refer to the potential, i.e., strictly speaking, missed, imaginary and not real speech acts that exist in the minds of communicants as 'being planned'* (Konrad, 1985, p. 358).

This interpretation is close to the idea proposed by Leech (1983) who considered an indirect speech act as a specific speech strategy identified as 'the strategy of suggestion' (Leech, 1983, p. 97). The idea behind this strategy is that the produced illocutionary speech act is intended to carry out a secondary role in the process of the implementation of another illocutionary act. The efficiency of the strategy of suggestion is based on Grice's (1975) relevance principle *(Do not deviate from the topic)*, based on which the recipient perceives the speech act that is performed as a preliminary illocutionary act that paves the way for the illocutionary act that follows.

Thus, the development of the theory of speech acts seems highly potential in the development of a typology of tactics of verbal communication (speech tactics). The tactic of verbal communication is identified as a set of methods for conducting a conversation and a line of behaviour at a certain stage within the framework of a separate conversation. It includes certain methods of attracting attention, establishing and maintaining contact with an interlocutor and influencing him, persuading or overpersuading of the recipient, bringing them into a certain emotional state, etc. The use of the typology of speech tactics in the analysis of discourse makes it possible to take into consideration the interpersonal relationships of partners, their social status, their internal state, and the regulation of subject behaviour (Wilson, 2001). The existing typology of speech tactics can be systemised as shown in Table 1.

For the purposes of this study, it seems necessary to identify those types of speech tactics that express psychological support. These are speech tactics of encouragement, reassurance, agreement, understanding, happiness, apology, and gratitude.

Table 1
Typology of speech tactics

TYPE OF SPEECH	TYPE FUNCTIONS	SPEECH TACTICS
Representatives	Understanding of the state of affairs	– expression of ideas – expression of opinion – expression of persuasion – expression of justification
Regulatives	Direct and indirect adjustment of the subject-predetermined behaviour and interlocutor's sentiment	– expression of orders – expression of requests – expression of reproaches – expression of proposal – expression of advice – expression of precaution – expression of threat – expression of approval – expression of reassurance – expression of promise
Contactives	Maintaining relationships between interlocutors	– expression of agreement – expression of understanding – expression of refusal – expression of greeting – expression of saying goodbye – expression of introducing formula
Interrogatives	Request for information	– interrogative statement
Expressives and quasiexpressives	Expression of the interlocutor's inner state	– expression of surprise – expression of complaints – expression of disappointment – expression of happiness – expression of fear – expression of irritation – expression of apology – expression of gratitude

4. STUDY AND RESULTS

4.1. Agreement as a tactic of verbal behaviour and means of its verbalisation in French dialogic discourse

The research part of the present study focuses on the verbalisation of agreement as it has a number of varieties and shades of meaning.

Bakhtin (1986) emphasised the significance of agreement in his works stressing that this is one of the most important forms of dialogic relations. The researcher believed that even utterances that verbally copy each other represent a certain dialogic event in the relationship of two but not an echo. Nevertheless, there could have been no agreement.

The agreement is a product of speech that functions in communication as a speech act. With the help of the criteria of the distinguishing of speech acts proposed by Searle (1979), it is possible to define a speech act of agreement as a semi-

independent speech act that represents a positive response to the preceding part of the discourse proposed by the interlocutor. The speech act of agreement can be reproduced in the present, past, or future tenses, in formal and informal speech situations by interlocutors with the same or different social statuses and expressed by verbal and nonverbal means. The given communicative meaning contains a lot of shades. Thus, for instance, we can distinguish the following types of agreement: playful, pathetic, reluctant, false, judgmental, and ironic. Some researchers differentiate between complete and incomplete agreement highlighting a set of semantic variants within each type. In this case, the complete agreement is represented by meanings such as agreement-confirmation, agreement-approval, agreement-permission, agreement-contract, agreement-promise, etc. The incomplete agreement, in its turn, includes such types as partial agreement, reluctant agreement, agreement-compromise, and others.

Considering the above classifications and the complex nature of the agreement, it is necessary to differentiate the following types: (a) agreement-confirmation; (b) agreement-compliance with an opinion; (c) agreement-reaction to persuasion.

4.1.1. Agreement-confirmation

The communicative structure of this type represents the following interaction: an utterance of stimulus contains some information or a request for information for confirmation, and an utterance of response expresses its confirmation. The utterance of stimulus may include not only particular information, but also the speaker's concern about its validity, actuality, and objectivity. In this regard, from a communicative point of view, the utterance of stimulus is represented mostly by an interrogative sentence since the question implies the presence of uncertainty and doubts. For example:

– *Tu as pris la voiture?*

– *Oui, elle est restée près de l'écluse* (Simenon, 2002, p. 7).

The example demonstrates that the interlocutor has particular information, however, is not sure about the location of the vehicle. The doubts are

expressed in the form of a question and a detailed and confirming feedback is given in response to this question.

The meaning of agreement-confirmation is normally realised in dialogues where the recipient's utterance contains a general question whereas the utterance of the response contains a positive reply to it. For example:

– *C'est vrai?*

– *Oui.*

– *Vous parliez comme dans ces histoires sordides?*

– *Oui.*

– *Vous lui demandiez d'être patiente et lui promettiez des tas de choses?*

– *Oui* (Gavalda, 2003, p. 121).

In addition, there is a number of dialogic unities where the utterance of stimulus is expressed by a declarative sentence that contains reliable – from the point of view of its author – information that does not require any confirmation. For example:

– *Vous m'avez dit que les ongles des mains n'étaient pas soignés.*

– *C'est exact* (Simenon, 2002, p. 39).

The commissioner's assurance in the reliability of the reported information may be identified in the following phrase: '*Vous m'avez dit'*. In such cases, the confirmation of the stated information is a way to establish contact between the interlocutors.

The meaning of confirmation in verbal dialogic speech is basically transferred with the help of the following communicatives.

A. The affirmative adverb *oui*. The communicative *oui* is considered as one of the most frequently used statements of the agreement-confirmation functional zone. Due to its semantics, the adverb *oui* may replace a response statement, 'include' one or even several sentences, which they 'substitute' in a specific speech situation. For instance, in a novel by Simenon (2002) surprised by the awareness of his patron, inspector Lapointe wonders:

– *C'est elle qui vous l'a dit?*

– *Oui* (Simenon, 2002, p. 44).

In the given example, the commissioner's agreement expressed with the help of the adverb *oui* implies a positive response '*C`est elle qui me l`a dit*'.

At the same time, agreement, containing only an affirmative adverb may indicate the isolation, reserve character of the recipient, and reluctance to respond. Unwilling to reveal Maigret the secret of her past, Mrs. Calas replies to all his questions in a distant and emotionless manner:

– *Vous êtes très amis?*

– *Oui.*

– *Il est entré, un beau jour, et vous avez lié connaissance?*

– *Oui* (Simenon, 2002, p. 62).

However, in most cases, the communicative *oui* is accompanied by additional information:

– *Pour y goûter vos fameux vins?*

– *Oui. Il y a une bouteille en particulier, un bordeaux cheval-blanc de 1982* (Musso, 2013, p. 206).

Here, the recipient considers it necessary not only to confirm the assumption but also to expand the answer.

B. Affirmative interjection *ouais*. The interjection *ouais* is referred to in most cases as a colloquial variant of the connotative *oui*, but, as a rule, with a hint of surprise and, in some cases, doubt or irony. Thus, in a novel by Musso (2013), the main character Sam finds his patient playing chess and he ironically notes that he lost to the computer:

– *Je l`ai laissé gagner.*

– *Vous avez laissé gagner une machine?*

– *Ouais, j`ai eu envie de faire un geste charitable* (Musso, 2013, p. 203).

C. Modal adverbs *bien sûr, très bien, bien entendu, certainement, exact, exactement, incontestablement, assurément,* etc. Modal adverbs converge in meaning and function with the affirmative adverb *oui*, however, unlike the neutral *oui*, modal adverbs have a connotation of the absolute assurance of the recipient in the actuality of this or that fact. If the adverb *oui* expresses agreement, then the modal adverb *bien sûr* expresses even more eager agreement. Thus, the character of Sagan's

(2011) novel attempts to dispel worries of a girl who has been bored with the company of her husband and has finally met her kindred soul:

– *Il faut se dépêcher. Vous n`imaginez pas, comme je suis ravie que Natalie habite enfin à Paris. Nous allons nous voir souvent, j`espère?*

– *Bien sûr. De temps en temps nous irons voir des westerns, pour changer, c`est tout* (Sagan, 2011, p. 148).

With the help of the modal adverb *exactement in* in the next example, the communicant not only confirms the assumptions of his interlocutor, but also demonstrates that it was the only one possible in the current situation:

– *Et vous n`êtes pas parti à cause de Françoise?*

– *Exactement…* (Gavalda, 2003, p. 121).

Modal adverbs that are in postposition in relation to the affirmative adverb *oui* reinforce the assurance of the recipient when confirming any piece of information. For example:

– *J`ai acheté du poulet froid, on va dîner à la maison. Tu es partie aussitôt après l`enterrement?*

– *Oui, bien sûr. Tu sais, Limoges n`était pas si agréable* (Sagan, 2011, p. 181).

Notably, in many situations the combination of *oui + modal adverb* demonstrates the assurance of the recipient as well as emphasises inappropriateness and absurdity of the question asked. For instance, in the novel by Levy (2012) the main character, undergoing an internship at the hospital, finds a question if she knows what the medical forms look like strange:

– *Alors c`est moi qui vais les subtiliser. Tu connais ces formulaires?*

– *Oui, bien sûr, j`en signais tous les jours* (Levy, 2012, p. 62).

D. Intensifying constructions *c`est ça, c`est vrai*. Intensifying constructions *c`est ça, c`est vrai* are common forms of responses of the functional zone of agreement-confirmation. Unlike the examples considered above, when in most cases the utterance of stimulus is an interrogative sentence, these connotatives are the most typical forms of responses to a declarative sentence in the French language. For example:

– *Si je vous ai bien compris, Mlle Beaumont serait sortie précipitamment de l'avion pour vous rejoindre...*

– *C'est ça* (Musso, 2013, p. 140).

The analysis of the factual material demonstrated that in a number of cases the response statements, despite the presence of the negative adverb *non* in them, express agreement with a shade of inevitability, complete certainty, or indisputability, since the original utterance contains a negation. There is a point of view according to which responses confirming denial are the most typical form of an answer to a negative question. Thus, the negative adverb *non* is the most common form of response confirming negation. For example:

– *Vos parents aussi?*

– *Oui.*

– *Vous ne lez avez pas revus?*

– *Non* (Simenon, 2002, p. 71).

Negative responses can also be expressed with the help of modal adverbs (sometimes accompanied by the negative particle *pas*), negative adverbs, and the pronouns *jamais, aucun*. For example:

– *Vous n'avez jamais été heureuse?*

– *Jamais* (Simenon, 2002, p. 83).

Agreement can be expressed not only in the form of a dialogue, that is, not only in colloquial form but also with the help of gestures, facial expressions, which are often presented in the author's utterances. For example:

– *Tu veux que je t'apprenne à dessiner comme lui?*

Elle hocha la tête (Gavalda, 2005, p. 58).

– *Du nouveau?*

– *Maigret fit signe que oui* (Simenon, 2002, p. 24).

Based on the analysis of the above examples, the most frequent means of expressing agreement-confirmation in contemporary French dialogic discourse are the affirmative adverb *oui* (in responses to the statement), and the negative adverb *non* (in responses to the negation inherent in the question). Modal adverbs *bien sûr, très bien, bien entendu, certainement, exact, exactement, incon-*

testablement, etc. are used less frequently, although they are more emotive compared to the adverb *oui*, which does not always imply sincere interest in the conversation.

4.1.2. Agreement-agreement

In this case, the agreement is a statement of the correctness or acceptability of the interlocutor's opinion, an assessment of this opinion as corresponding to reality, an expression of the similarity of the positions and views of the interlocutors. As the analysis of the factual material has shown, when realising the meaning of agreement with the opinion, there are no explicit indicators in the speaker's utterances, however, using responsive statements of this type, the speaker informs about their involvement in the communication process, about interest, solidarity with the recipient and the communicative encouragement provided to them. For example:

– *Cette ville est très dure.*

– *C'est vrai, admit Juliette. Chacun court dans son coin sans s'occuper du voisin. Les gens sont ésrasés les uns contre les autres et pourtant si seuls.*

– *C'est ainsi, répondit-il en écartant les bras* (Musso, 2013, p. 35).

The utterance of stimulus for a more delicate confirmation request can be expressed using a declarative sentence containing special components (introductory words, insertion sentences) that indicate that the interlocutor has doubts about the correctness or reliability of his message. For example:

– *Vous vous connaissez, je crois.*

– *C'est vrai* (Sagan, 2011, p. 66).

– *Je déteste ça, moi? Oh… C'est vrai… Encore un truc de vieux con, non?*

– *Euh... oui, je crois...* (Gavalda, 2003, p. 92).

In the first example, the communicant demonstrates the doubt about the correctness of the given information by means of the additional construction *je crois*, while in the second one – the negative adverb *non* is used.

The expression of the pragmatic meaning of agreement with the point of view is usually transferred by means of the following communicatives.

'As the analysis of the factual material has shown, when realising the meaning of agreement with the opinion, there are no explicit indicators in the speaker's utterances, however, using responsive statements of this type, the speaker informs about his involvement in the communication process, about interest, solidarity with the recipient and the communicative encouragement provided'

A. Intensifying constructions with demonstrative pronouns *c`est vrai, c`est ainsi, c`est ça* are most frequently used in the functional zone of agreement with someone's point of view. For example:

– *Laissez tomber, vous n`y connaissez rien!*

– *C`est vrai', admit Sam* (Musso, 2013, p. 206).

– *Je me souviens aussi que tu portais d`incroyables baskets…*

– *Des Converse jaunes, c`est vrai!*

– *Oui, c`est vrai* (Gavalda, 2003, p. 60).

B. Verbal expression *avoir raison*. The communicative *avoir raison* is the most emotional one in this group and is common in informal communication.

– *C`est un jour un peu spécial aujourd`hui, c`est cencé être une fête…*

– *Tu as raison Philip, c`est un jour très particulier et tu nous conduis sous la fenêtre de celle qui hante ta vie* (Levy, 2001, p. 129).

C. Affirmative adverb *oui*. Even though the present communicative is used quite often it does not typical to this functional zone. For example:

– *Remarquez, ma nièce, qui est du Morvan, pourtant, où il y en a de terribles, elle n`a jamais pu s`habituer. Elle peut être en train de dîner, si ça tonne, elle passe sous son lit. C`est les nerfs.*

– *Oui, dit Gilles enchanté, c`est les nerfs* (Sagan, 2011, p. 91).

– *Elle a l`air charmant. C`est dommage qu`elle ait épousé ce type-là.*

– *Oui. Grand dommage* (Sagan, 2011, p. 149).

As can be observed from the above examples, the affirmative adverb *oui* is usually accompanied by partial or complete repetition when expressing agreement with someone's point of view: (1) *'Oui , c`est les nerfs'*; (2) *'Oui. Grand dommage'*. These observations allow us to conclude that *oui* is used in this functional zone more as a means of maintaining a conversation rather than a sincere agreement with the interlocutor's point of view. The type of repetition, whether it is direct or partial, contains essential information about the speaker's position. Direct repetition (with the retaining of the grammatical form) signals the contradiction of the speakers' positions. The nature of the initial utterance reduction plays a significant role here as well. Partial repetition (with the changes in the grammatical form) demonstrates the similarities of the speakers' positions or the intention to find a compromise.

D. Adverb *d'accord*. The implementation of the adverb *d'accord* is also not typical for this functional group and is usually accompanied by a concessive connotation. Thus, in the novel by Levy (2009), the character agrees with his interlocutor realising that he has been exposed it is useless to continue lying:

– *Il faudra que tu t`entraînes, tu mens mal, Knap; je sais de quoi je parle; j`ai acquis une certaine expérience en la matière, ces derniers jours.*

– *Bon, d`accord* (Levy, 2009, p. 248).

The aim of the speech act of agreement with someone's point of view is to encourage the opinion of the interlocutor, as a rule, without providing additional argumentation. The overall meaning of evaluativity is more important to provide agreement rather than the complete nature of syntactic constructions.

4.1.3. Agreement-response

This type of agreement is a response to imperative speech acts (persuasion to take actions or to do something together). It is possible to single out a request, a proposal, advice, a demand, an order, a ban, etc. In order to express the pragmatic meaning within this functional zone, the following communicatives are used.

'Communicatives 'd`accord' and 'bon' are combined by the invariant meaning of the agreement, compliance with the situation or statement. However, the adverb 'd'accord' often also expresses approval of the message heard or the existing state of affairs'

A. Adverbs *d`accord, bon*. The analysis of the factual material revealed that these adverbs are the most frequent forms of the response of the agreement-response to persuasion functional zone. Communicatives *d`accord* and *bon* are combined by the invariant meaning of the agreement, compliance with the situation or statement. However, the adverb *d'accord* often also expresses approval of the message heard or the existing state of affairs.

– *Je vais mettre ma voiture au parking de l'hôtel. J`en ai pour une minute. Vous m`attendez dans le hall.*

– *D`accord* (Musso, 2013, p. 57).

The invariant meaning in the communicative *bon* may be accompanied by the concessive connotation. Thus, when expressing a response to imperative statements, the considered communicative units usually mean: *'I have heard your request and I agree to comply with it'*. Notably, it often contains the concession connotation in colloquial speech i.e. that a person is ready to act but without much desire. For example:

– *J`ai eu une nuit agitée.*
– *J`en suis heureuse pour vous.*
– *Ce n`est pas ce à quoi vous pensez.*
– *Oh! Vous n`avez pas à vous justifier.*
– *Bon, qu`est-ce que vous avez pour moi?* (Musso, 2013, p. 164).

In the example above, the main character, put in a difficult position by their interlocutor, concedes to change the subject as quickly as possible.

B. Adverb *ok*. The synonym for the adverb *d'accord,* borrowed from the English language, has the same meaning as the above adverbs but is used only as a phenomenon of oral colloquial speech. For example:

– *Maintenant vous allez m`écoutez sérieusement, en m`épargnant vos remarques et vos sarcasmes, compris?*

– *Ok, répondit Sam, partagé entre la curiosité et la peur* (Musso, 2013, p. 172).

If the meaning of a positive response to imperative (persuasive) speech acts for the statements *d'accord, bon, ok* is typical then the other communicatives act in this role episodically and only in the presence of certain contextual conditions.

Thus, modal adverbs *bien sûr, bien entendu, exactement, certainement, sans aucun doute* can fulfil this function mainly when the utterance of stimulus represents an indirect speech act of persuasion and has the form of an interrogative sentence. The communicative *bien sûr* is most actively used to express agreement in response to indirect speech acts in the present set of communicative units. The given function is not typical for the affirmative adverb *oui,* although it is not excluded:

– *Essayez de savoir si, les jours derniers, il n`y a pas eu de rixes dans les parages, peut-être des cris, des appels au secours.*

– *Oui, patron* (Sagan, 2011, p. 16).

A request contained in the utterance of stimulus can be formed with the help of diverse syntactic means. The key means are:

(a) interrogative sentences:

– *C`est sur vous que ça retombera, on est bien d`accord?*

– *On est bien d`accord, chef* (Musso, 2013, p. 37).

(b) imperative sentences:

– *Aujourd`hui, je sais que pour sauver Juliette je n`ai d`autre choix que de donner ma vie pour elle. Prenez-la, supplia Sam.*

– *D`accord, c`est vous qui viendrez* (Musso, 2013, p. 352).

(c) complex sentences with conditional clause:

– *Si tu m`aides sur ce coup-là, je ne te demanderai jamais plus rien.*

– *Ok, je vais donner des instructions* (Musso, 2013, p. 288).

The general characteristics of the communicatives of the functional zone of agreement are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

The general characteristics of the communicatives of the functional zone of agreement

COMMUNICATI	FUNCTIONAL ZONE	CONNOTATIVE ASPECT
Oui	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-confirmation	Neutral statement
Ouais	Agreement- agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-confirmation	Communicative, marked as a phenomenon of oral colloquial speech. Colloquial equivalent *oui*
Bien sûr	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-response to persuasion Agreement-confirmation	A greater degree of categoricity compared to *oui*. In many cases, the presence of a positive-evaluative component
C`est vrai	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-confirmation	Neutral statement, emotionally expressive connotations are possible only in certain context
C`est ainsi	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-confirmation	Neutral statement, emotionally expressive connotations are possible only in certain context
C`est ça	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-confirmation	Neutral statement, emotionally expressive connotations are possible only in certain context
D`accord	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-response to persuasion	Positive assessment (approval of a heard message or the existing state of affairs)
Ok	Agreement-response to persuasion	Communicative, marked as a phenomenon of oral colloquial speech
Avoir raison	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-confirmation	Neutral statement, emotionally expressive connotations are possible only in certain context
Certainement	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-response to persuasion Agreement-confirmation	A high degree of categoricity. Common in formal dialogic speech
Bien entendu	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-response to persuasion Agreement-confirmation	A high degree of categoricity. Common in formal dialogic speech
Sans aucun doute	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-response to persuasion	A high degree of categoricity. Common in formal dialogic speech
Bon	Agreement-response to persuasion	The connotation of the concession (the message or persuasion does not cause the recipient much joy). Common in a relaxed informal dialogue
Exact	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-response to persuasion Agreement-confirmation	Neutral statement, emotionally expressive connotations are possible only in certain context
Exactement	Agreement-agreement with someone's point of view Agreement-response to persuasion Agreement-confirmation	Neutral statement. Emotionally expressive connotations are possible only in certain context

5. CONCLUSION

The examination of the verbal behaviour of the recipient should take into account the duality of their position as they act not only as an object of speech persuasion but also as a subject of speech interaction. This study has found that the role of the speaker's aspect in the general model of a speech act is extremely extensive in scope as they not only determine the content of conversation but also affect the listener. Expressing their opinion and concern about a certain situation, the speaker predicts the possible reaction of the interlocutor, which consists in their verbal and psychological encouragement. At the same time, the speaker–recipient relationship is regulated by the communicative strategies of politeness.

The present research demonstrated that the expression of psychological support of the interlocutor from the recipient is reflected in the following speech tactics: agreement tactics, understanding tactics, empathy tactics, regret tactics, reassurance tactics, happiness tactics, approval tactics, apology tactics.

The main line of this research was the linguopragmatic analysis of means expressing encouragement for the interlocutor in contemporary French dialogic discourse. As the analysis of the factual material has shown, in most cases, simple sentences are used to express the encouragement in French dialogic discourse: *tu as raison, je suis désolé, calme-toi, ne t`inquiète pas, je t`en prie*. The trend towards the standard is explained by the principle of conservation, which is currently the leading sign of speech. However, it is possible to expand the scope of stereotyped formulas. This happens due to the introduction of a regulative appeal into the construction, the main task of which is to demonstrate the interest of the communicant in the interlocutor in order to prolong contact. Besides, the framework of these syntactic structures can be changed by adding intensifiers, e.g. adverbs or interjections. Depending on the degree of the communicant's emotional capability, the order of words in the construction may also change.

The necessity to express agreement is associated with the fact that the speaker often needs a special signal to confirm that they are being heard. Moreover, the agreement means not only awareness of the other person's position, their feelings and experiences, but also the ability to empathise. Analysis of the factual material showed that adverbs, intensifying constructions, interjections, verbal collocations are frequently used to express agreement. In addition, agreement can be realised not only in the form of a dialogue but also with the help of gestures (non-verbal means), which are accompanied by the desire of the communicant to encourage the interlocutor.

References

Austin, J. L. (1973). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198245537.001.0001

Bahtin, M. M. (1986). *Problema teksta v lingvistike, filologii i drugih gumanitarnyh naukah*. Iskusstvo. (In Russian)

Ballmer, T., & Brennenstuhl, W. (1981). *Speech act classification: A study in the lexical analysis of English speech activity verbs*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-67758-8

Beaugrande, R. (1997). The story of discourse analysis. Discourse as structure and process. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 35-62). SAGE Publications.

Dolgina, E., & Makarova, S. (2021). Indirect anaphoric reference in English: Specific features. *Moscow University Bulletin. Series 9: Philology, 1*, 90-100. https://goo-gl.me/WEeCp

Fillmore, C. J. (1969). Types of lexical information. In F. Kiefer (Ed.), *Studies in syntax and semantics* (pp. 109-137). Reidel.

Gavalda, A. (2003). *Je l`aimais*. J'ai lu. (In French)

Gavalda, A. (2005). *Ensemble, c`est tout*. J'ai lu. (In French)

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. *Syntax and Semantics, 3,* 41-58. https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811_003

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action*. Beacon Press.

Horton, W. S. (2017). Theories and approaches to the study of conversation and interactive discourse. In M. F. Schober, A. Britt, & D. N. Rapp (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse processes* (pp. 16-63). Routledge. https://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315687384

Kasper, G., & Kellerman, E. (2014). *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives.* Routledge. https://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315844350

Kohler, K. J. (2017). *Communicative functions and linguistic forms in speech interaction*. Cambridge University Press. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/9781316756782

Konrad, R. (1985). Voprositel'nye predlozheniya kak kosvennye rechevye akty. *Novoe v Zarubezhnoj Lingvistike, 16,* 349-382. (In Russian)

Kurbanova-Ilyutko, K. (2021). Understanding the status of French in the Aosta Valley: A mother tongue or a second language? *Moscow University Bulletin. Series 9: Philology, 2,* 71-82.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.

Levy, M. (2001). *Où es-tu ?* Pocket. (In French)

Levy, M. (2009). *Toutes ces choses qu`on ne s`est pas dites*. Pocket. (In French)

Levy, M. (2012). *Et si s`était vrai*. Pocket. (In French)

Littlejohn, S., & Foss, K. (2008). *Theories of human communication* (9th ed.). Thomson and Wadsworth.

Musso, G. (2013). *Sauve-moi*. Pocket. (In French)

Sagan, F. (2011). *Un peu de soleil dans l`eau froide*. Le livre de poche. (In French)

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.

Simenon, G. (2002). *Maigret et le corps sans tête*. Le livre de poche. (In French)

Wilson, L. J. (2001). Extending strategic planning to communication tactics. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 215-222). SAGE Publications. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452220727.n15

NATALIIA V. POLIAKOVA

Moscow Region State University | 24 Very Voloshinoy Str., 141014 Moscow Region, Mytishi, Russia

nv.polyakova@mgou.ru

VICTORIA V. SIBUL

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia | 6 Miklukho-Maklay Str., 117198 Moscow, Russia

vsibul1970@mail.ru