

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ**  
**КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ**

**Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології**  
**імені професора Г. Г. Почепцова**

**Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики**

**на тему: «ТАКТИКИ УХИЛЕННЯ ВІД ВІДПОВІДІ ТА ЗАСОБИ ЇЇ**  
**РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ В СУЧАСНОМУ АНГЛОМОВНОМУ ДІАЛОГІЧНОМУ**  
**ДИСКУРСІ»**

*Допущено до захисту*

« \_\_\_\_ » \_\_\_\_\_ року

студентки групи МЛа 51-20

факультету германської філології

освітньо-професійної програми

Сучасні філологічні студії (англійська

мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика та

перекладознавство

за спеціальністю 035 Філологія

**Шевченко Наталії Сергіївни**

*Завідувач кафедри*

*германської і фіно-угорської*

*філології*

Науковий керівник

Кандидат філологічних наук, професор

**Волкова Лідія Михайлівна**

Національна шкала \_\_\_\_\_

Кількість балів \_\_\_\_\_

Оцінка ЄКТС \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ (підпис) (ПІБ)

КИЇВ – 2021

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE**

**KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY**

**Professor G. G. Pocheptsov Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology**

**Master's Qualification Paper**

**ANSWER-EVADING TACTICS AND MEANS OF THEIR REALIZATION  
IN MODERN ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE**

**NATALIIA SHEVCHENKO**

Group MLa 51-20

Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser

Professor

**LIDIYA M. VOLKOVA**

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv – 2021

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE. ANSWER-EVADING IN COMMUNICATION.....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1. The reason for evading answers.....	6
1.2. Tactics and ways of answer-evading in communication.....	8
1.3. Psycholinguistic aspect of answer-evading.....	18
<b>Conclusions to Chapter One.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>CHAPTER TWO. ANSWER-EVADING IN DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE..</b>	<b>26</b>
2.1. Answer-evading in political discourse.....	26
2.2. Answer-evading tactics: a study of the film “Bridget Jones Diary” ....	65
<b>Conclusions to Chapter Two.....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>RESUME.....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>REFERENCE LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS.....</b>	<b>87</b>

## INTRODUCTION

The Master's Paper is devoted to investigating the phenomenon of answer evasion tactics and their implementation in communication. Dodging answers pervades human interaction, including interpersonal interactions, relational conversations, media interviews and political debates. Various referred to as equivocation, evasion, obfuscation, strategic ambiguity and topic avoidance, among other terms, the concept has a rich history in the communication literature. **The relevance of the study is primarily due to** the fact that covertly dodging answers presents serious social and political problems. The Paper focuses on theoretical issues of dodging answers, specifically the ability of the interlocutor to change the subject by providing an irrelevant answer.

**The purpose** of the Master's Paper is to find out, study and classify the tactics of answer-evading in Modern English dialogical discourse.

**The object** of the Diploma Paper is answer evading tactics in the speech of interlocutors belonging to different spheres of human activity: politicians (in particular, British and American), and also the characters in the film "Bridget Jones' Diary".

**The subject** of the Diploma Paper is the study of functional characteristics and peculiarities of answer-evading tactics and means of their implementation in Modern English dialogical discourse. These tactics are used in interaction as a means of the communication strategy for responding to questions.

**Materials** for the investigation: the study of the above-mentioned speech tactics was conducted on the basis of interviews of foreign politicians, as well as peculiarities of conversational speech behavior of the characters of the film "Bridget Jones' Diary".

To achieve this goal, we need to solve the following **tasks**:

1. find out the reasons for answer-evading;
2. study psychological aspects of answer-evading.
3. investigate lexical means that are used in answer-evading tactics;
4. analyze answer-evading tactics used in political discourse;
5. point out and analyze answer-evading tactics the speakers resort to in everyday communication.

**The practical value** of the Diploma Paper lies in the fact that its results can be used for the purpose of teaching English practice, and also in the course of theoretical grammar as well as electives.

**Personal contribution of the Master student.** The results of the Master's Paper were obtained by the author personally. The author carries out: investigation and the analysis of tactics and means of answer-evading in Modern English dialogical discourse based on the study of the interviews with politicians as well as characters of the film.

**Structurally** the Paper consists of Introduction, two Chapters, Conclusions to each Chapter, General Conclusions, resume, the list of references and the list of illustration materials.

**Chapter One** is concerned with theoretical description of the main features of answer-evading in Modern English dialogical discourse, the reason for evading answers, tactics and ways of answer-evading in communication and a psycholinguistic aspect of answer-evading.

**Chapter Two** deals with answer-evading tactics in Modern English political discourse and answer-evading tactics in the book «Bridget Jones Diary». Various communicative answer-evading situations are singled out and analyzed.

**In General Conclusions** we sum up the results of our investigation.

## **CHAPTER ONE. ANSWER-EVADING IN COMMUNICATION**

### **1.1. The reason for evading answers**

When trying to make a case for some position or idea, we frequently face questions which challenge the coherency or validity of that position. When we are able to adequately answer those questions, our position becomes stronger. When we cannot answer the questions, then our position is weaker. If, however, we avoid the question altogether, then our reasoning process itself is revealed as possibly weak. To our mind, there are some reasons for that.

It is, unfortunately, common that many important questions and challenges go unanswered – but why do people do this? There are surely many reasons, but a common one may be a desire to avoid admitting that they might be wrong. They might not have a good answer, and while «I don't know» is certainly acceptable, it may represent an unacceptable admission of at least a potential error.

A possible reason is that answering the question might lead one to the realization that their position is not valid, but that position plays an important role in their self-image. For example, someone's ego might be dependent upon the premise that some other group is inferior to them – in such a situation, the person might be strongly inclined not to directly answer questions about the justification of that alleged inferiority, otherwise, they might have to acknowledge that they aren't so superior after all.

Not every instance where a person seems to be avoiding the question is qualified as such – sometimes a person may think that they answered it earlier or at another point in the process of communication. Sometimes a genuine answer does not look like an answer at all. Consider the following:

Patient: *Is my condition life-threatening, doctor?*

Doctor: *We'll need to do more tests before we can determine that.*

In this example, the doctor informs the patient that she doesn't know if his condition is life-threatening, but she didn't say that explicitly. Thus, although it could appear as though she avoided the question, in reality, she did give an answer – perhaps the one which she thought would be a bit gentler. Consider the following:

Patient: *Is my condition life-threatening, doctor?*

Doctor: *Don't worry about that right now. You get some rest tonight, and I'll be by tomorrow.*

Here, the doctor has avoided answering the question directly. There is no hint that the doctor still needs to do more work in order to arrive at an answer; instead, we get an evasion that sounds suspiciously like he doesn't want to tell his patient that she might die.

When someone avoids direct and challenging questions, that does not justify concluding that their position is wrong; it is possible that their position is 100% correct. Instead, what we can conclude is that the reasoning process which leads them to assert their position may be flawed. A strong reasoning process requires that one either have already dealt with or be capable of addressing important issues. It, of course, means being able to answer challenging questions.

Typically, when a person avoids answering a question, that question was posed by another person in a debate or discussion. In such cases, the person is not only evincing flawed reasoning but also violating basic principles of discussion. If you are going to engage in a conversation with someone, you need to be willing to address their comments, concerns, and queries. If you don't, then it's no longer a two-way exchange of information and views. However, that is not the only context in which a person might avoid answering questions. It's also possible to describe

that as occurring even when a person is alone with his thoughts and considering a new idea. In such cases, they will surely face a variety of questions they ask themselves, and they might avoid answering them for some of the reasons suggested above.

## **1.2. Tactics and ways of answer-evading in communication**

Speech is a complex and multidimensional phenomenon that has been the object of scientific research in the field of linguistics for centuries. There is no doubt that the main function of speech is to carry out communication. In the process of communication, speech allows the speaker to convey the necessary information to the listener, reflecting the specifics of the possession of the canons of the language. In turn, the essence of communication, its generation and functions consist not only in the transmission of information, but also in the ongoing cognitive and emotional mental processes that reveal the internal needs, goals and intentions of the interlocutors. The current stage of society's development, in our opinion, is characterized by high dynamics of life and creativity, the desire for success in personal and business spheres and, as a result, the harmonization of communication. This trend has prompted the emergence of scientific works in the field of psychology on such issues as communication and emotions, problem-free communication, genuine communication, communication styles, conflict psychology, etc. It is obvious that the study of speech as an individual and social phenomenon should be carried out taking into account the results obtained in various scientific fields, both in linguistics and in psycholinguistics, sociology and psychology. In order to conduct effective and meaningful research, first of all, it is necessary to identify such categories that could be attributed both to the field of linguistics and to the field of communication psychology. In our opinion, one of these key categories includes the categories "strategy" and "tactics", which reveal the specifics of the expression of semantic content, as well as hidden, semantic signs of the communication process. We



believe that these categories, on the one hand, are extremely significant for the scientific study of the nature of communication, on the other hand, they are still insufficiently studied. So, a communicative strategy is a type of behavior of one of the partners in a situation of (dialogic) communication, which is conditioned and correlated with a plan for achieving communicative goals within a typical scenario. As a typical scenario, any communication strategy is based on a certain scheme of actions, in which an act, a move, an exchange, a transaction and a speech event are distinguished. Acts and moves are verbal and (or) non-verbal actions of the speaker, minimally significant elements of communication. There are different initiating, continuing, supporting, framing, closing, responding, focusing and metacommunicative moves. Exchanges are structurally divided into elementary or simple and complex or complex. The exchange of communicative roles can be a change with interrupting, a «smooth» exchange and a change of communicative roles after a pause. A transaction is a larger segment of communication than a move. A speech event is the largest structural segment of language communication, which is a unit of the macro-level of discourse. One of the main components of the communicative strategy scheme is a replica – a formal structural unit of the exchange of communicative roles. A replica (replica step) can be simple and complex, and in terms of orientation – progressive, initiative or regressive, reactive and reactive. All these categories of communication strategy are subject to the general rules of metacommunicative self-organization. It is worth noting that there are strategic or global goals, as well as tactical or local goals subordinate to them, corresponding to individual stages, particular phases of an entire communicative event. Thus, within the framework of the communicative strategy, tactics are distinguished as local techniques and lines of speech behavior. Conventionalized etiquette has led to the emergence of indirect forms of speech interaction and, as a result, to an increase in the prestige of those communicative strategies that allow the speaker to achieve his goal within the framework of a diplomatic scenario. The analysis made it possible to establish that one of the communicative strategies that

allow implementing a diplomatic scenario of speech interaction is the strategy of avoiding a direct answer. In a question-and-answer situation, the conflict of the dialogue may be hidden in an explicit refusal to answer, thus, the study of the mechanisms of diplomatic, implicit avoidance of a direct answer is relevant. In general, we define the strategy of avoiding a direct answer as a type of behavior of one of the partners in a situation of dialogical communication, which is conditioned and correlates with the plan to achieve the communicative goal of veiling a negative answer to a question; a chain of decisions of the speaker, communicative choices of speech actions and language means that allow to veil, hide the true meaning of the response replica or completely evade an answer. The study showed that in the metacommunicative self-organization of the strategy of avoiding a direct answer, this function is performed by the following elements of discourse: pause placeholders corresponding to the phenomena of hesitation; repeated questions – “loops” on the addressee's side; elements that regulate the clarification, closure or replacement of the topic; elements that reflect the relevance of speech; elements that reflect the relevance in the situation; elements that regulate the style of speech and the tone of communication. To analyze the internal process of metacommunicative self-organization of the strategy of avoiding a direct answer, we identified the following variables: the time and place of the communicative process, the external environment and the cultural definition; communication participants (the speaker and the hearer); the expected result and the individual and general goals of the communicants; psychological, emotional tonality of a communicative event; a speech genre that assumes the consolidation of structurally organized linguistic material for culturally defined forms of communication. It was found that the strategy of avoiding a direct answer is implemented in the case of the speaker reflecting his own contradictory emotional and psychological state generated by the circumstances; the speaker builds a speech according to the type of internal monologue-description or reflection, focused on introspection; the speaker experiences status uncertainty in the presence

of subordinate relations, as well as the speaker's desire to satisfy his own selfish interests and achieve the set communicative goals. As a result of the analysis of the practical material, it was revealed that the core of the strategy of avoiding a direct answer is inclusive implicit meanings (implicit meanings are complications related to the pragmatic level of the utterance), based on the social ethical norms of society. This strategy is implemented through tactics – local techniques and lines of speech behavior. The unit of research is a dialogical unity, including a question-and-answer remark. All the responses considered are simple, reacting in their orientation. In the process of communication, the strategy of avoiding a direct answer is implemented through a wide range of means at all language levels – lexicogrammatical, semantic and syntactic, communicative. One of the tactics that implement the strategy of avoiding a direct answer in the speaker's remarks is the generalization tactic. The tactics of generalization is quite frequent and is a way of avoiding an answer, in which the speaker does not give an answer to a specific question, but generalizes the topic of the conversation or even translates it to another topic. In such a response, certain information is transmitted, but the specified goal of the interlocutor is not realized. Instead of answering the question and thereby realizing the intention of the interlocutor, the speaker achieves his goal – to evade a direct answer. Within the framework of oral discourse, the tactics of generalization are mainly represented by lexical and grammatical means of the language: words and phrases with diffuse semantics, generalized meaning; words that strengthen and increase the expressiveness of the entire utterance, as well as generalizing and generalized personal pronouns. In the case of the functioning of words and phrases that have diffuse semantics and generalized meaning, as well as words that enhance the expressiveness of the entire utterance, it is necessary to know the context of the situation and take it into account when interpreting and analyzing response replicas. Thus, taking into account the context of the situation, the following categories can be attributed to lexical means with diffuse semantics

and generalized meaning: *it happens, it would be, soon, long ago, from day to day* and others.

(1) Nora: *But Jane, how could that be?*

Jane: *(smiling wearily and smoothing her hair) Oh, sometimes it happens, Nora.*

*(Jane Eyre)*

So, in example (1), in her response, along with the tactics of softening the categorical response (smiling, operating with the name of the interlocutor) and delaying the response (smoothing hair, using the interjection *Oh*) Jane used generalization tactics to avoid a direct answer. To Nora's question «*How could that be?*», Jane answers with the extremely general phrase «*Sometimes it happens*», philosophizing on the given topic. Such a phrase would be quite appropriate for answering any other question; therefore it is regarded by us as a means of generalization. The response is an indirect speech act that expresses a representative illocutionary function. In the following example, Jim poses a specific question, formulating it in the form of a sentence word, eliminating all other members, apparently to strengthen the utterance. Despite the increased concretization of the question, Tom manages to evade a direct answer by using the tactics of generalization.

(2) Jim: *When?*

Tom: *Soon.*

*(Jane Eyre)*

In example (3), the son asks his father when mother died («*When did mother die?*»). Not wanting to stir up past memories and feelings, Willie evades a direct answer to his son's question and answers that his mother (his wife) died a long time

ago. In his response, certain information is transmitted, but it is not necessary to regard this information as a specific, direct answer. Willie does not mention the day, month or even year of death to his son, who left his parents a long time ago and did not know anything about the events taking place. During the conversation, Willie does not use a repeat or repeat, does not delay the answer; he builds a response within the framework of the topic under discussion, but does not specify, but, on the contrary, expands and generalizes it.

(3) Ben: *When did Mother die?*

Willy: *Long ago.*

(*Jane Eyre*)

Within the framework of this tactic, words also function, which, in general, enhance the expressiveness of the utterance and generalize the answer. In addition to the reinforcement that these words have, they often contain a deliberate exaggeration in their semantics: *a great, very big deal (of work), very big things, a lot of things, most of us* and others.

(4) Mr. James: *Dirty towels! Not much of a housekeeper, would you say, ladies?*

Mrs. Peters: *There's a great deal of work to be done on a farm.*

(*Jane Eyre*)

In example (4), Mrs. Peters, being herself a woman and a hostess, evades a direct answer to Mr. James' question about dirty towels. On the one hand, she does not want to refute the fact of her neighbor's dirty towels (they are really dirty), on the other hand, she does not intend to discuss this with a man. With her retaliatory move, she tries to protect and justify not only her neighbor, but also all female housewives, including herself. The following example illustrates the dialogue

between two friends-mature men, fathers of a family, one of whom-Howard – is more successful in life, the other-Willie-is faced with the problem of loneliness, lack of money, having two adult sons. According to the plot of the play, Willie himself often asks himself the question of why his sons do not help him, do not come to his aid. Having heard this question from the mouth of another person, even his old friend, he does not just begin to justify his sons in his eyes, as much as he does not admit that his sons are not support for him. Avoiding a direct answer, Willie chooses the tactics of generalization, using a blurry, clearly exaggerated structure *on a very big deal*.

(5) Howard: *Where are your sons? Why don't your sons give you a hand?*

Willy: *They're working on a very big deal.*

(Jane Eyre)

Generalizing pronouns play a significant role in the implementation of generalization tactics: *all, each, every, everybody, everything* and the generalized pronoun *one*. The meaning of generalization is conveyed by these pronouns through the concepts of collectivity and separateness. The pronouns *all, everybody, everything* have the meaning of collectivity; the pronouns *each* and *every* have the value of separability.

(6) Linda: *Can you do anything about the shower? It drips.*

Willy: *All of a sudden everything falls to pieces!*

(Jane Eyre)

In his response to example (6), Willie implements a generalization tactic, expressing dissatisfaction not so much with the fact that the shower is dripping, but with the events taking place: he is old, lost his job and went bankrupt. Without

giving a direct answer to the question, Willie goes beyond discussing a broken shower and how to fix it, outlining the far – reaching boundaries of a vital problem for him- the problem of survival. Evasion from a direct answer is implicitly expressed by a speech act-a declarative in the function of irritation. The pronouns «each» and «every» express generalization through singularity, like Ukrainian units «всякий» and «кожен». The meaning of singularity in these pronouns is inseparably connected with generalization: what is correct for each individual unit is typical for all other homogeneous concepts.

(7) *Tom: Do all of them find adventure in their careers?*

*Amanda: They do or they do without it! Not everybody has a craze for adventure.*

*(Jane Eyre)*

Example (7) illustrates a conversation between a son and a mother. The son is outwardly a mature middle-aged man, single, who has a pretty good job, but in his heart he is still an adventurous young man. The mother, realizing this feature of her son – a thirst for adventure – tries to reason with him. In her response, she does not answer her son directly, for fear of appearing rude. In her phrase, the generalizing pronoun *everybody* appears, which, in her opinion, orients her son to the general model of human behavior in society and indirectly criticizes the negative, in her opinion, feature of her son. The pronoun *one* has a generalized personal meaning, indicating that the action expressed by the predicate can be attributed to any subject. *One* always denotes a person, and, regardless of the breadth of generalization, it usually includes the speaker himself; grammatically, *one* can be associated with the meaning of the singular. The uncertainty and generality of the person determines the choice of the predicate form combined with *one*. An utterance that is not associated with a certain person, as a rule, is not formed in specific forms. The structure of the predicate with the pronoun *one* is the

forms of the present and past simple tense (Present Simple Tense, Past Simple Tense). Due to the wide degree of generalization, sentences can approach impersonal ones, which is especially clear when this pronoun is combined with a compound verbal modal predicate. Of great importance is the context that helps to reveal the nature of the generalization or uncertainty conveyed by *one*. As a rule, with the help of this pronoun, the statement refers to all people, has the character of a well-known truth, but also in the context of the situation, a close connection with the speaker himself can be revealed.

(8) Rank: *Is that the best cure for overexertion?*

Jane: *One has to live.*

(*Jane Eyre*)

In this episode, Jane evades a direct answer to the question posed. The topic of their conversation with Rank really touches Jane very much, but she does not allow herself to speak directly about the problem that has arisen, answering the question with restraint and rather generalization. The response is an indirect speech act that implements a representative illocutionary function. So, in speech activity, the speaker pursues his goals and acts according to his plan, intentions. The strategy of avoiding a direct answer is implemented if the speaker does not want to share the necessary information or does not intend to perform the action requested by his communication partner. At the same time, one or another response containing evasion is built implicitly and implements a separate line of behavior – tactics. In the course of the research, it became obvious that this discursive strategy can be implemented not only through one tactic, but also by their combinations. In this case, we are talking about the factor of strengthening the action of the strategy. The incentive to implement two, three or even four tactics of the strategy of avoiding a direct answer in one response and, consequently, to strengthen the action of the strategy may be: the need to get additional time to think about the



current situation, as well as the need for an expressive, if possible, unambiguous answer for the listener (at the implicit level) in order to avoid repeating the question.

(9) Biff: *Shouldn't we do anything?*

Linda: *Oh, my dear, you should do a lot of things, but there's nothing to do, so go to sleep.*

(*Jane Eyre*)

In example (9), the tactic of softening the categorical response is implemented, it is verbally expressed by the interjection *Oh* and the appeal *my dear*. Then, in the response, the generalization tactic is used, it is revealed in the phrase *you should do a lot of things, but there's nothing to do*. Actually, the implicit refusal sounds already at the end of the replica by means of the phrase in the imperative mood *go to sleep*. Due to the treatment, which sounds, although softening, but quite familiar, somewhat condescending, as well as the use of the imperative mood, in general, the response sounds instructive. So, the generalization tactic is a way of avoiding a direct answer, in which the speaker generalizes the topic of the conversation or transforms it to another topic. The response is uninformative and cannot be regarded as an answer to a specific question. This tactic is implemented through words and phrases with vague semantics, lexical means of the language. Within the framework of this tactic, an additional representative illocutionary function can also be allocated, which consists in reflecting the actual state of things. This tactic is mainly represented by lexicogrammatical means of the language: words and phrases with diffuse semantics, generalized meaning (*it happens, it would be*), *soon, long ago, from day to day* and others; words that enhance, increase the expressiveness of the entire utterance (*a great, very big deal (of work), very big things, a lot of things, most of us* and

others; generalizing pronouns *all, each, every, everybody, everything* and the generalized personal pronoun *one*.

### **1.3. Psycholinguistic aspect of answer-evading**

Evading answering questions pervades human interaction, including interpersonal interactions, relational conversations, media interviews and political debates. Various referred to as equivocation, evasion, obfuscation, strategic ambiguity and topic avoidance, among other terms, the concept has a rich history in the communication literature. Covertly dodging questions presents serious social and political problems. This thesis focuses on theoretical issues of dodging, specifically the ability for a person to change the subject with an irrelevant answer. Discussion primarily draws upon P. Grice's theory of conversational implicature and deception research inspired by P. Grice. Theoretical impediments to detecting evasion are discussed, as well as barriers to accuracy from the perspective of discourse analysts and societal perception evading questions pervades human interaction, including interpersonal interactions, relational conversations, media interviews and political debates. Various referred to as equivocation, evasion, obfuscation, strategic ambiguity and topic avoidance, among other terms, the concept has a rich history in the studies devoted to communication. Covertly evading questions presents serious social and political problems. Discussion primarily draws upon P. Grice's theory of conversational implicature and deception research inspired by P. Grice. Theoretical impediments to detecting evading answers are discussed, as well as barriers to accuracy from the perspective of discourse analysts and societal perceptions. When introducing his cooperative principle, P. Grice (1989, 1975) laid out maxims that govern conversational exchanges. He said one maxim presents "problems that exercise me a good deal" (P. Grice, 1989). Titled the Relation maxim, it exhorts interactants to "be relevant". For example, sometimes people go off-topic and change the subject. Such a violation may escape detection or otherwise be acceptable. Grice wondered "how

to allow for the fact that subjects of conversation are legitimately changed”. He added, ‘I find the treatment of such questions exceedingly difficult, and I hope to revert to them in a later work’ (P. Grice, 1989). Decades later, researchers returned to theorizing about irrelevant responses changing the subject. Information manipulation theory 2 (McCornack et al., 2014) discusses P. Grice’s Relation maxim being the most difficult to violate covertly. IMT2 proposes that «changing the topic or ignoring the question altogether» are too overt to successfully deceive (McCornack et al., 2014). “If you abruptly change topic, or fail to answer a question, such deviations from conversational coherence are grossly apparent to listeners” (McCornack et al., 2014). Levinson similarly hypothesized that «in conversational transcripts, and indeed in conversation, one can detect on-topic talk, topic-shift, and topic slide – that is, gradual movement across topics with some measure of coherence and connection» (Levinson, 1981). Empirical literature bears this out. Discourse analysts detect dodges in transcripts and inspire theorizing, such as the face model of interviews (Bull et al., 1996), politeness models (Brown & Levinson, 1978), politeness in political discourse (Harris, 2001) and the situational theory of communicative conflict (Bull, 2008). However, across society, people seem to have trouble perceiving and detecting dodges. Experiments have revealed that an off-topic answer can escape detection rather easily. Swann et al. (1982) found that observers of a question–response sequence tend to assume that if an answer to a question is about one topic, then the question must have asked about that topic. Rogers and Norton (2011) found that unless observers are instructed to pay attention to whether an answer aligns with the question, then many will fail to notice off-topic responses. from conversational coherence are grossly apparent to listeners’ (McCornack et al., 2014). Levinson similarly hypothesized that «in conversational transcripts, and indeed in conversation, one can detect on-topic talk, topic-shift, and topic slide – that is, gradual movement across topics with some measure of coherence and connection» (Levinson, 1981). Empirical literature bears this out. Discourse analysts detect dodges in transcripts and inspire theorizing, such

as the face model of interviews (Bull et al., 1996), politeness models (Brown & Levinson, 1978), politeness in political discourse (Harris, 2001) and the situational theory of communicative conflict (Bull, 2008). However, across society, people seem to have trouble perceiving and detecting evasion. Experiments have revealed that an off-topic answer can escape detection rather easily. Swann et al. (1982) found that observers of a question-response sequence tend to assume that if an answer to a question is about one topic, then the question must have asked about that topic. Rogers and Norton (2011) found that unless observers are instructed to pay attention to whether an answer aligns with the question, then many will fail to notice off-topic responses.

A discursive evasion is a form of information manipulation. A person intentionally produces discourse in response to a question by departing from fully disclosive truth (McCornack, 1992; Turner et al., 1975). Literature seems to use the term “answer-evading” as an umbrella term encompassing terms including evasion, equivocation, strategic ambiguity, obfuscation and topic avoidance. The type of evading that our thesis focuses on – covertly and deceptively changing the subject – is at times referred to as a bridge (Goffman, 1976), deflection (Clayman, 2001), diversion (Turner et al., 1975), off-topic response (Clementson, 2016; Clementson & Eveland, 2016), or topic shift and topic slide (Levinson, 1981). This opening section briefly explains the more common terms for types of evading.

### **a) Evasion**

Equivocation is contrary to evasion, which denotes harmful intentions. Evasiveness is a derogatory, pejorative term (Bull & Fetzer, 2010). It suggests more aversive, devious intentions than avoiding a question to keep the peace, appease vying constituencies or wholesomely save face (Bull, 1998). If evasion is an umbrella term, and equivocation is on one end of the spectrum with more defensible rationales, then evasion would be on the other end as an intentional deflection with less noble aims.

## **b) Topic avoidance**

Topic avoidance is defined in the interpersonal discussion literature as a goal-oriented, explicit response by a competent communicator to a sensitive inquiry (Donovan-Kicken et al., 2013). Topic avoidance is primarily studied as a continuum or degree of avoiding a particular topic, or by categorizing topics people purposefully avoid (Afifi et al., 2008). The enactment of topic avoidance is called behavioral avoidance. Behavioral avoidance can include changing the topic benevolently or evasively. Topic avoidance is a form of evading that is not always deceptive. For example, a person might announce that she wants to avoid talking about her parents' divorce. But topic avoidance also includes "shifting the topic, evasiveness" (Afifi et al., 2008).

## **c) Artful evasion**

To artfully evade is to answer a question about one topic by talking about a totally different topic without observers noticing (Rogers & Norton, 2011). Inspired by the Dickens character The Artful Dodger, Rogers and Norton brought the term into academic literature. In *Oliver Twist* (Dickens, 1839), The Artful Evader was an orphan and thief who had «a rather flighty and dissolute mode of conversing» (p. 127). Rogers and Norton define a successful artful evasion as one in which observers have forgotten exactly what the question asked by the end of the response to the question. Theorists might vary on whether evading is lying and how deceptive it is, because evading is sometimes perceived as aversive while sometimes perceived as necessary or even beneficial. We now look at the subjective nature of evasiveness from a societal standpoint. Grice (1989) was exercised over how to treat his Relation maxim. According to McCornack et al. (2014), violations of the maxim should be apparent, because an off-topic dodge should appear overt to observers (Levinson, 1981). Yet in their daily interactions, people deflect questions with relative ease (Turner et al., 1975). Indeed,

experiments have revealed that off-topic evasions can escape notice (Rogers & Norton 2011). Evading questions through changing the subject may technically be deceptive yet its sometimes-benevolent usage may address apparent discrepancies in its theoretical and empirical perception and detection.

#### **d) Face saving**

Another impediment to discerning answer-evading when it happens may involve the notion of “face” (Goffman, 1955). Face refers to the management of a person’s image in social situations. In people’s desire to maintain smooth societal interactions, we avoid offending each other’s public image. We protect our own reputation and that of others. In Turner et al.’s (1975) analysis of conversations where people changed the subject or otherwise controlled information such that their replies were not fully disclosive, face was the top justification people gave for why they engaged in such (perhaps deceptive) communication. Most (55.2%) of the reasons people gave for why they avoided answering a direct question involved wanting to protect the face of themselves and/or someone else (p. 89).

Having discussed theoretical impetuses for communicants producing evasion and people failing to perceive irrelevant deflections, we now shift gears from perception to detection. There are differences between people’s perceptions of answer-evading and its accurate detection. For example, Rogers and Norton (2011, study 2) measured whether participants reported the correct question that a politician was asked and then the researchers inferred whether the participants caught the politician answer-evading. They reported that participants must have noticed the evasion because they tended to accurately select the topic of the question – which varied between health care (aligning with the correct on-topic answer provided by the politician), illegal drugs (similar but slightly different from the politician’s health care response) and the War on Terror (totally off-topic). Participants’ judgments could have been based on accurately attending to the

question and answer. Or observations could have emerged amid “noise”. Perceptions are different from accuracy. One is perceptual and wholly subjective. The other bespeaks precision.

## Conclusions to Chapter One

Answer-evading holds a special place in dialogical interactions, from everyday relational encounters to mass-mediated, high-stakes interviews. The ability to evade answers is a natural component of human discourse. People typically express aversion to others evading questions. Medical patients feel dissatisfied when physicians are unclear in answering questions. Romantic relationships dissolve when conversations go unresolved from partners evading questions. Politicians' evasiveness keeps people uninformed and disinterested in democratic participation. Yet, dialogical discourse often requires evading questions. The ability to navigate human interactions can hinge on the ability to evade rhetorical minefields. Some factors, which address Grice's question as to why violations of relevance may skirt detection or otherwise find acceptance among interactants, were summarized. Furthermore, studies were summarized, which reveal reasons people go off-topic and how dodges escape detection – from the standpoint of the message sender and message receiver. Future research may continue examining distinctions between the perception and detection of answer-evading and signal detection theory can aid in operationalizing accuracy. Scholars must be careful in using proper terminology to describe the exact process they are tackling when measuring or testing occurrences of evasions, rather than conflating terms. There are a lot of studies devoted to the phenomenon of evading questions. However, there are a lot of problems that still remain unanswered. Hopefully, the explication of key terms and discussion of answer-evading such as deception helps us advance this line of research.

Thus, the strategy of evasion is a chain of decisions of the speaker, a certain set of linguistic means that allow you to disguise, hide the true meaning of the response or evade a direct answer. Within the framework of this Diploma Paper, the strategy of evasion, implemented with the help of a large variety of tactics, will be considered in more detail from the point of view of the communicative



approach in Modern English political discourse, and also the study of the film “Bridget Jones’ Diary” in the Second Chapter.

## **CHAPTER TWO. ANSWER-EVADING IN DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE**

### **2.1. Answer-evading in political discourse**

The opinions of researchers concerning the question of the greatest importance of certain strategies and tactics differ. One of the main strategies of political discourse is the strategy of evasion. In foreign studies, the term «evasion of an answer» is rarely found, and cases when politicians do not provide the requested information are terminologically designated as «non-answers» (non-replies). This term has become more preferable than the pejorative term «evasion», since under certain circumstances avoiding an answer can be justified. Based on the theory of the illocutionary structure of the dialogue, in this study under the avoidance response in the political discourse is understood as «a speech act in which a politician deliberately draws attention to the illocutionary coercion, enclosed in a previous reply, journalist (the interlocutor), purposefully not reporting the full information that, using the terminology of G. Grice, does not correspond to the maxims of “quantity” and “method” (Grice, 1985). In other words, the evasion of the answer to the question in political communication is a response to a stimulus – a replica of the journalist, and one in which the illocutionary ignores forcing sets a question. P. M. Churikov under the avoidance understands the reaction of the policy, which is to avoid a direct answer to the question, for refusing to publicly comment on events and facts, to conceal their own opinions on an issue (Чуриков, 2005). L. B. Golovash defines the strategy of evasion as «a chain of decisions of the speaker, the choice of speech actions and language means that allow veiling, hiding the true meaning of the response or implicitly deviating from a direct answer» (Головаш, 2008). There are two approaches to studying this strategy: the communicative approach and the structural-semantic approach.

Representatives of the first (communicative) approach are, for example, P. Bull and K. Mayer. Having considered the political interviews of the leaders of the three political parties during the election campaign in the UK in 1992, they distinguish the following types of “non-answers”:

1) the politician ignores the question;

2) the politician recognizes the importance of the problem raised, but does not answer the question;

3) the politician proves the inappropriateness of the question for the following reasons:

- the question does not affect the essence of the problem;

- the question is based on a false premise

4) the politician refuses to answer for the reason:

- inability to give it;

- the inability to speak for someone else;

- untimeness of the question (the answer is postponed to a later date);

- ignorance of the laws of the relevant field or other details

5) the politician focuses on the actual political activity:

- represents the policy;

- justifies the policy;

- performs political analysis;

- engaged in self-justification

6) the response of the politician is incomplete, for example, partial, covering only some aspects of the problem;

7) the politician repeats the answer to the previous question;

8) the politician declares that the interviewer (interlocutor) misunderstood the previous answer (Bull & Mayer, 1993).

L. B. Golovash identifies the following tactics of evading answers to the questions:

1) repetitions and repeated questions;

2) response delays;

3) softening the categorical response;

4) generalizations;

5) assent;

6) the actual implicit refusal;

7) ignoring;

8) irony;

9) hint;

10) the nomination of the condition (Головаш, 2008).

M. P. Churikov includes the following tactics to the evasion strategy:

1) admission of incompetence;

2) avoiding commenting;

3) evasion by appealing to the time factor;

- 4) evasion by appealing to the complexity factor;
- 5) evasion by appealing to a more competent source;
- 6) ignoring the interviewer's question;
- 7) putting a counter-question (Чуриков, 2005).

D. Galasinsky, a supporter of the structural-semantic approach, identifies three ways of evading the answer to the question:

- 1) changing the context of the question;
- 2) changing the core of the question;
- 3) simultaneous change of the context and the core of the question asked (Галасинский, 2000).

In this Paper, the evasion of the answer to the question is analyzed from the standpoint of a communicative approach. This version of the analysis allows us to distinguish between explicit and implicit evasion of the answer to the question.

In the case of explicit evasion, he implicitly, in a more or less rigid form, declares his refusal to cooperate. In the case of implicit evasion, the refusal of cooperation is not declared: trying to hide his unwillingness to give a clear answer to the question, the speaker, as a rule, speaks for quite a long time, which gives the impression of compliance with the principle of cooperation according to G. P. Grice. However, according to E. I. Sheigal: “politicians are able to say a lot and at the same time say nothing” (Шейгал, 2004).

As part of the work, it is established that the strategy of avoiding a direct answer, which is used by US and UK politicians, is implemented through a number of tactics:

- 1) tactics of refusing to comment (30% for the US and 25% for the UK),

- 2) tactics of switching to another topic (20% for the US and UK),
- 3) generalization tactics (16% for the US and the UK),
- 4) tactics of indicating the lack of information (10% for the US and 8% for the UK),
- 5) tactics of expressing doubts about the validity of the answer to the question (7% for the US and the UK),
- 6) ignoring tactics (7% for the US and 1% for the UK),
- 7) misleading tactics (2% for the US and 5% for the UK),
- 8) tactics of repetitions and repeated questions (clarification) (5% for the UK),
- 9) tactics of appealing to a more competent source (1%),
- 10) approval support tactics (1%),
- 11) denial tactics (1%);
- 12) combined tactics (including various combinations of all the above tactics)

The tactics of switching to another topic, the tactics of generalization and the tactics of expressing doubt about the validity of the answer to the question are common for both linguistic cultures, and politicians resort to their use in equal measure. Due to the linguistic and cultural characteristics of the two countries, there are differences in the frequency of use and cases of use of the remaining 5 tactics studied (refusal to comment, indicating the lack of necessary information, orientation, misleading, repetitions and repeated questions).

### **Refusal to comment**

The tactic of refusing to comment is the most frequent. It is presented in 94 responses (14 units of dialogical units), which is 30% of the total number of examples of evasion by American and 25% by British politicians.

As a rule, the discussion of scandals within the country, election campaigns, as well as foreign policy issues requires politicians to resort to the tactics of refusing to comment. Politicians often resort to its use in cases when it comes to very acute international issues, and, accordingly, any answer very acute international issues, and, accordingly, any response can be regarded as political aggression.

This tactic is implemented by direct verbalization of the intention not to answer the question. As lexical, grammatical and syntactic means of expressing evasion in the tactics of explicit refusal proper, imperative sentences with the semantics of the prohibition to ask a question *Don't ask*, as well as the reluctance to comment, to speak on the proposed topic (*don't talk and don't / didn't want to, not going to comment*) act.

In addition, the use of such verbs with the semantics of failure, like *to pass* (*to decide not to criticize someone when he says something unpleasant or makes a mistake*, (Cambridge dictionary), *to stop* (*to prevent something from happening or someone from doing something* (Cambridge dictionary) and *to avoid* (*to intentionally not to do something* (Cambridge dictionary) is also a marker of tactics of refusal to comment.

For example, in one of the interviews, while discussing the topic of the Flint water crisis, Donald Trump was asked a question in which they were interested in his opinion on this issue. The politician answered the question in the following way:

*Donald Trump: I don't want to comment on this. They have a very difficult problem, and I don't want to comment on that. They ve got a very*

*difficult problem and, I know, have a very difficult time going, but I shouldn't be commenting on Flint*

*(By ABC12 News Team | Posted: Mon 5:52 PM, Jan 18, 2016)*

In this context, the tactic is implemented using the negative form of the verb *want* (*I don't want to comment*) and the modal form of the verb *to comment* (*shouldn't be commenting*). The politician clearly does not want to talk about this topic and uses two negative sentences at once in his answer.

The use of a speech turnover expressing a personal attitude of *I don't want to* indicates that the speaker does not intend to comment on the scandal, thereby relieving himself of responsibility for providing any information. The politician refuses to comment on this problem, because this scandal, which has reached the state level; and its discussion could lead to a serious blow to the reputation of the government. At one of the interviews about the election campaign in Washington, concerning the question of the birthplace of former US President Barack Obama, Donald Trump was asked the question “*Was Barack Obama born in the United States?*” The answer to it was the following statement: *You wanna know? I don't talk about it anymore* (By Veronica Stracqualursi, Washington CNN).

A marker of the tactic of avoiding commenting in a politician's response is the negative form of the verb *to talk* (*I don't talk*). In addition, the politician quite sharply expresses his unwillingness to answer such questions, resorting to the use of a counter-question (*You wanna know?*).

The use of the abbreviated form *to want to* is typical for colloquial speech and unacceptable in the official business style. This is how Donald Trump expresses his disdain for the question asked and the interviewer.

The use of the verb in the negative form *don't talk*, as well as the adverb *anymore*, serves as a marker to demonstrate that this issue has already been raised



more than once in the interview, and due to certain circumstances, the politician no longer intends to discuss it.

In another interview, Donald Trump had to use this tactic, answering a question about the timing of the construction of a wall on the border with Mexico:

*Donald Trump: Well, you just brought it up. I didn't bring it up. I didn't wanna talk about it in the inauguration speech*

*(By ABC NEWS Jan 25, 2017)*

Negative forms of the verbs *to bring* and *to talk* (*I didn't bring it and I didn't wanna talk*) indicate that he, Donald Trump couldn't stand the matter for discussion, so his refusal to comment on this situation is quite logical and justified. In addition, he is once again in his statement uses the abbreviated colloquial form of the verb *to want* (*I didn't want to talk*), where in this situation it expresses carelessness and indifference to the topic under discussion. The politician seems absolutely self-confident and not afraid to say that he was not going to discuss the issue of building a wall.

At the press conference concerning the issue of changing the plan for spending money from the state budget, Chloe Rebecca Smith, a member of the Conservative Party of Great Britain, replied:

*Jeremy Paxman: When were you told of this change of plan?*

*Chloe Smith: Well, as a minister in the Treasury and indeed dealing with fuel matters this has been under consideration for some time...*

*Paxman: I'm not asking for a running commentary, I'm asking for a statement of facts about when you were told. You were told some time today, clearly. Was it before lunch or after lunch?*

*Smith: I'm not going to give you a commentary of who says what and when, that's about how government policy is made behind the scenes*

*(By Jonathan Freedland, The Guardian)*

A marker of the tactics of avoiding commenting in the response to Chloe Smith is the negative form of the construction *to be going to* in her response I'm not going to give you a commentary. The politician motivates his refusal to comment on the impossibility of disclosing the decision-making process itself in politics, thereby mitigating his refusal (*that's about how government policy is made behind the scenes*).

The former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, when asked by a journalist whether Keith Vaz, a member of the lower house of the British Parliament from the Labour Party, will remain in the government, answers:

*Tony Blair: Well, we're not going to move ahead with that at the moment, Jeremy. The election has not happened.*

*(By Jonathan Freedland, The Guardian)*

In addition to the negative form of *be going to* construction, the adverbial modifier of time *at the moment* is used as an explanation of the politician, indicating that the reason for the refusal is the fact that the election campaign has not yet begun, so it is too early to give any comments (*The election has not happened*). Tony Blair also calls his interviewer by name (*Jeremy*), in order to deliberately reduce the distance and create the impression of a friendly conversation.

Tony Blair also refuses to give any comments regarding his supposed future successor, Gordon Brown.

Tony Blair: *It's unwise for me to speculate as to whether I will have this job after Thursday. Well, and certainly not to start speculating who my successor may be.*

*(By Jonathan Freedland, The Guardian)*

In this case, using the negative adjective *unwise*, the semantics of which conveys the meaning of an unreasonable act (*stupid and likely to cause problems* (Cambridge dictionary)), as well as the verb *to speculate*, the politician very tactfully and politely evades the answer, referring to that it would be unwise for him to make any assumptions. In addition, in the second part of the answer, the use of the negative particle *not* and the adverb *certainly* conveys the reluctance of the politician to continue this topic and help him avoid subsequent questions (*and certainly not to start speculating who my successor may be*).

The tactic of refusing to comment is also used by the Secretary for International Cooperation under the British government, Justine Greening, when he was asked a question about social mobility in the UK on the Andrew Marr talk show:

Justine Greening: *Well, Alan Milburn and I both care deeply about social mobility and equality of opportunity.*

Andrew Marr: *He said that and he said that you wanted to keep him on. Is that true?*

Justine Greening: *I'm not going to get into the discussions we have inside the government*

*(UK BBC News)*

The negative construction of *not going to* in this case is an indicator of the fact that Justine Greening is not going to give an answer to this issue, in particular, because it concerns matters within the Government.

A striking example of the tactic of refusing to comment is the response of Amber Rudd, the British Home Secretary, in an interview:

*Interviewer: Could you ever imagine that you would serve under Boris Johnson?*

*A. Rudd: This is such a difficult question on so many different levels that I'm going to go through*

*(Bloomberg politics)*

In this case, Amber Rudd, using a verb with the semantics of refusal *to pass* and the construction *to be going to*, which softens the categorical refusal, evades the question of whether she could work under the leadership of British Foreign Minister Boris Johnson (*Could you ever imagine serving under Boris Johnson?*). She also states that this is a complex issue that requires careful consideration, where the adjective *difficult* is used (*not easy or simple; difficult to do or do understand*, (Cambridge Dictionary) serves as an excuse for the politician's unwillingness to answer the interviewer (*this is such a difficult question on so many different levels*).

In the course of the study it was revealed that the use of the refusal tactics to comment on American politics is often resorted to in those cases where the questions addressed to them, relate to political conflicts and crises, and any response politician can be regarded as an intention to compromise your and/or other country, while British politicians tend to shy away from the answer, when it comes to domestic events, which they do not want to speak in order to avoid the condemnation of his people and to preserve his reputation. In addition, an

indicative difference between the American linguistic culture and the British is the fact that British politicians always try to give a reason for refusal or reduce the distance between the interlocutors with the help of an appeal. This way they manage to soften the refusal and look less categorical.

### **Switching to another topic**

Switching to another topic is the second most frequent tactic that is resorted to by both American and British politicians in equal measure. It makes up 20% of the corpus of examples available in this work. Politicians choose this tactic, answering questions related to international actions of states, as well as events taking place inside the country. Interviewers try to get exclusive information by asking provocative questions. By choosing this tactic, the politician, in turn, does not react to the question itself, but tries to switch the attention of the interlocutors to a topic that is often indirectly related or not related to the topic of the question at all.

A characteristic feature of the tactics of switching to another topic is the redirection of the dialogue by means of a counter question and another microtheme or a new rhema, in which a political figure, ignoring the question asked to him, switches the attention of the interlocutor to a completely different problem. In addition, politicians often try to manipulate the attention of interviewers with the help of attention-getting verbs look, listen, which makes their desire to get away from the question asked even more obvious.

The tactic of introducing a counter question and another microtheme used by politicians are the most common (every second case in the available corpus of examples), while the introduction of new information about the subject of conversation occurs in 20% of the available examples. One of the most striking examples of the analyzed tactics is the answer Hillary Clinton in an interview in

which she answers the question of why her candidacy for the US presidency is more suitable:

*Interviewer: Why are you a better choice than your opponent to create such jobs that bring more money into the pockets of American workers?*

*Clinton: Thank you letter and thank you to Hofstra for hosting us.*

*H. Clinton: Thank you, Lester, and thanks to Hofstra for hosting us. The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be in, what kind of future we'll build together*

*(Presidential Debate at Hofstra University, New York)*

In this case, switching to another topic occurs by redirecting the dialog. The theme remains the same – the actions of politicians aimed at improving the welfare of the country (*what kind of country we want to be in, what kind of future we'll build together*), which creates a false impression of the continuation of the interviewer's idea, while artificially rema is being implemented (something that the politician promotes from his side). Hillary Clinton leaves unanswered the journalist's question about why she is the best candidate (*The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be in...*), and begins her speech by posing a new problem-talking about the country in which people want to live, and the future, which they will build together, thereby switching the attention of the interlocutors to more global problems related to the development of the country (*what kind of country we want to be in*) and its prospects in general (*what kind of offuture we'll build together*). Another example is the response of Donald Trump to a provocative question from a journalist regarding the construction of a wall on the border with Mexico:

*Interviewer: You said that you would force Mexico to build a wall on the border. How do you plan to do this?*

*Donald Trump: Well, if I were in your place, what would you say to me?*

*(By Jonathan Freedland, The Guardian)*

In this case, the tactic is implemented by answering a question to question. The counter-question is practically unrelated to the problem of the construction of the Mexican wall, which interests the journalist. This indicates evasion of the answer by indirect means of speech influence. This technique allows the politician to save his face in an uncomfortable situation and transfer attention to the one who asks this question (*Well, if I were you, what would you tell me?*). The topic of the dialogue remains unchanged, however, the politician manages to redirect the question asked to the interviewer, forcing him to answer. An example of using this tactic is also Barack Obama's response to one of Steve Kroft's questions about his attitude about the rational use of \$ 700 billion:

*Kroft: Do you agree with Secretary Paulson on how \$ 700 billion is being used?*

*Barack Obama: Well, listen, Hank Paulson worked tirelessly in some very difficult circumstances... But I'm less interested in looking back than looking forwards*

*(CBS News, November 2016)*

Barack Obama does not give a specific answer about the funds spent (*Are you in sync with Secretary Paulson in terms of how the \$700 billion is being used?*). In this case, the president continues to talk about Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson (*Well, look, Hank Paulson has worked tirelessly under some very difficult circumstances*), which creates the illusion of an answer. However, the interviewer does not receive information regarding the question he asked about the money spent. The tactics of switching to another topic is illustrated by the new microteme

of the minister's labor activity (*Paulson has worked tirelessly*). The adverb *tirelessly* and the adjective *difficult* emphasize the seriousness of the problem of using budget funds, but do not give any explanation. The conjunction *but* breaks off the logical sequence of the statement, thereby directing the interlocutor to a new thought.

A parallel construction constructed by comparison in the last sentence, in which the speaker himself expresses his feelings and emotions (*I'm less interested in looking backwards than I am in looking forwards*) leads the listener away from the topic of the question. An example of the use of tactics of switching to another topic by British politicians is the tax before the parliamentary debate between Theresa May and Andrew Marr, in which the Prime Minister evades answering the question of whether she knows about the malfunction of *Trident* nuclear missiles:

Mr Marr: *Did you know that it had happened?*

Ms May: *I think we should defend our country.*

Mr Marr: *This is a very serious incident. Did you know about it?*

*Ms May again skirted the issue and did not give a yes-or-no answer*

Mr Marr: *Prime Minister, did you know?*

Ms May: *There are tests that take place all the time, regularly, for our nuclear deterrent.*

Finally Mr Marr conceded: *I'm not going to get an answer*

*(Independent, UK Politics, 22 January 2017)*

In this case, the British Prime Minister does not react to the question itself, turning the conversation to another topic. With the introduction of new lexical units and military terms (*defend, nuclear deterrent*), which were not previously mentioned in the dialogue, Theresa May twice tries to create a new microtheme



regarding the country's self-defense. The desire of the politician to change the topic of conversation turns out to be extremely obvious and persistent, since Theresa May does not give an answer to the question posed in any response, that the journalist concludes that he will not get an answer to his question (*I am not going to get an answer*). Tony Blair, in one of his interviews also tries to answer the question concerning the gap between rich and poor in the country:

*Paxman: Is it acceptable for gap between the rich and the poor to get bigger?*

*Blair: What I am saying is the issue in fact whether the very richest person ends up ecoming richer. The issue is whether the poorest person is given the chance that they don't otherwise have.*

*Paxman: I understand what you are saying. The question is about the gap.*

*Blair: Yes, I know what your question is. I am choosing to answer it in my way rather than yours.*

*Paxman: But you're not answering it.*

*Blair: I am.*

*Paxman: You are answering another question*

*(British BBC News)*

In this case, the use of the same lexical units by the politician, which Paxman uses in his question, such as *rich*, *poor*, creates the illusion of an answer to the question. Moreover, Tony Blair claims that he understands Paxman's question (*Yes, I know what your question is*) and insistently promotes his version of the answer to it, applying the introductory construction of *what I am saying is* and focusing on the fact that he gives an answer to the question posed, but in his own

way (*I am choosing to answer it in my own way rather than yours*). This tactic is immediately recognized by the interviewer, who does not receive the necessary information and, as a result, sums up that Tony Blair still answers another question, despite his steadfastness and perseverance. The leader of the Labour Party, Jeremy Corbyn, uses the tactic of switching to another topic, answering a question about the abolition of the monarchy:

*Paxman: There's nothing in this manifesto about abolishing the monarchy which is another thing you believe in, isn't it?*

*Corbyn: Well look there's nothing in there because we're not going to do it.*

*Paxman: But do you believe in it, don't you?*

*Corbyn: Listen it's not on anybody's agenda it's certainly not on mine and do you know what I had a very nice chat with the Queen*

*(By Andrew Sparrow, The Guardian)*

In the above context, the illusion of an answer to the question is created, since the dialogue continues, and the topic of the dialogue it remains unchanged. However, Paxman does not get an answer, because Jeremy Corbyn in his first remark uses manipulation techniques to help the politician draw the interviewer's attention to the new microtheme that he introduces when talking about his conversation with the queen. This is done using the verbs to attract attention *well, look* (*Well look there's nothing in there because we're not going to do it*), *listen* (*Listen it's not on anybody's agenda it's certainly not on mine and do you know what I had a very nice chat with the Queen*).

Thus, the tactic of switching to another topic is frequent and characteristic of politicians of both linguistic cultures. American and British politicians resort to its use when they want to evade the answer to a provocative question and keep secret

information concerning the issue of state affairs. Questions of this kind, as a rule, make politicians feel uncomfortable and unwilling to continue the conversation. In this case, they try to unobtrusively and imperceptibly change the topic of conversation and redirect the dialogue to discuss other problems.

### **Generalization tactic**

The generalization tactic is the third most frequently used, accounting for 16% of the total number of analyzed examples. It is a way of avoiding a direct answer, in which the speaker generalizes the topic of the conversation and does not give an answer to a specifically posed question. The response is uninformative and cannot be regarded as an answer to the question posed. American and British politicians resort to using this tactic when it comes to domestic affairs, such as the methods and timing of events and the exact, specific measures that the government intends to take. The answers to the questions are necessary for the journalist to draw up a clear picture of the current political situation. Within the framework of this tactic, an additional pragmatic function can be identified, which consists in reflecting the generalized actual state of things. The tactics of generalization are mainly represented by lexical and grammatical means of the language: words and phrases that have a generalized meaning, words that enhance or increase the expressiveness of the entire utterance, stylistic means (for example, repetitions), generalizing and generically personal pronouns *all, each, every, anything*, as well as phrases with diffuse semantics, the generalized meaning of *it happens / it would be, soon, it will be spelt out*, which are prevalent in the existing corpus of examples. A striking example of the use of this tactic is Donald Trump's answer to the question concerning the creation of new jobs in the country. The politician persistently evades the answer due to his ignorance about current affairs, trying to show himself in the most favorable light:

*Interviewer: How are you gonna create jobs in this country?*

Donald Trump: *I'm just gonna do it.*

Interviewer: *Right... Right... but how?*

Donald Trump: *By doing it. It's just happens*

*(BBC News, January 2017)*

In this example, the politician evades the question (*How are you gonna create jobs in this country*) by using the phrase with diffuse semantics *it happens* in the sense of «*it happens*». Donald Trump does not doubt the possibility of implementing the plan, but does not explain exactly how it will take place. The adverb *just* in meaning (*not involving anything more than the thing that you are mentioning* (MacMillan Dictionary) gives emotionality to the politician's utterance, emphasizing his calmness and self-confidence. Despite the fact that the illusion of continuing the dialogue is created, the politician, nevertheless, does not give an answer regarding the way to create jobs. Donald Trump generically and without details (*By doing it. It just happens*) assures that, nevertheless, the creation of jobs, as a process, will take place. The politician answers each question of the journalist with general phrases and remains adamant in his intention to evade a direct answer. The generalization tactic is one of the most frequently used tactics by Donald Trump. So, other examples of its use are his responses to a journalist's question about the beginning of the construction of the Mexican wall:

Interviewer: *When does construction start?*

Donald Trump: *As soon as we can. As soon as we can physically do it.*

*(By Jonathan Freedland, The Guardian)*

In this example, the generalization tactic is implemented using the adverb *soon*, a language unit with a diffuse meaning that has semantic uncertainty. Lexical repetition of this adverb in the meaning «in the nearest future» (*at the same time or*

*a very short time after*) (Cambridge dictionary) carries an expressive character, making the answer more meaningful and global. Moreover, in the second part of his answer, the president repeats the modal verb *can* and specifies using the adverb *physically* (*as soon as we can physically do it*) that construction will begin as soon as it is physically possible. This explanation helps the politician to explain the impossibility of starting construction now and at the same time not to specify a specific time frame for its start.

Barack Obama also often evades answering direct questions with the help of generalization tactics. So, by asking the question *Exactly what are you prepared to negotiate on, and when?* and by using the adverb *exactly*, thereby hoping to get a specific example, the journalist does not get an answer to the question posed. In my response, *I'm prepared to negotiate on anything* Barack Obama uses the generalized personal pronoun *anything*, trying to create the impression of an absolutely confident and wise politician who is ready to negotiate on any topic. During the interview, Tony Blair was asked whether he was honest with his people during the military operations in Iraq. The politician's response was as follows: *Can I slightly reword that to say I think any prime minister taking a country into war has got to be straight with the nation and carry it so far as possible with him or her.*

(UK Metro, July 2017)

With the help of generalization tactics, the former prime minister competently evades the answer. To do this, he uses the indefinite pronoun *any* in his statement, which helps him to remove responsibility from himself and assign it to all prime ministers. The use of the construction *as far as possible* sets a longer, an indefinite period of time. These techniques allow you to generalize the statement and thereby avoid a direct answer. In addition, in English, where the word order in a sentence is fixed, the appearance of an inversion serves as an

indicator that the speaker usually wants to highlight some elements of the sentence and emphasize certain words.

In this case, the use of inversion at the beginning of the sentence served as another proof of the politician's unwillingness to answer the question, which is expressed in his original intention to change the wording of the original statement. Another example is the response of Natalie Bennett, the leader of the Green Party of Great Britain, in one of her interviews, in which they talked about the benefits of housing mortgage lending:

*Nick: How much would that be worth, mortgage relief for private landlords?*

*Natalie: Erm... well... it's... that's part of the whole costing.*

*Nick: Yes, but how much would that bring? The cost of 500,000 homes, let's start with that. How much would that be?*

*Natalie: Right, well, that's, erm... you've a total cost... erm... that we're... that will be spelt out in our manifesto*

*(LBC UK, February 2015)*

Natalie Bennett's remarks do not convey any specific information and, accordingly, there is no answer to the question asked. The politician supports the dialogue by responding with general phrases and describing the situation in general terms (*that's part of the whole costing*). The tactics of generalization are implemented through the use of adverbs and adjectives, having a generalized meaning of *the whole, total* that is necessary to switch attention from certain figures to more general and large costs. Natalie Bennett does not give a clear answer even when the interviewer gives a specific figure in his question (*The cost of 500,000 homes, let's start with that*). The politician only makes a promise that the exact numbers will be spelt out in the manifesto using the form of the future

tense of the verb (*that will be spelt out in our manifesto*). Moreover, there are many hesitation pauses in the politician's answers (*Erm... well... it's...*), which are necessary for reflection and serve as an indicator of self-doubt, a certain degree of confusion. Theresa May, in an interview concerning the financing of the national health service of the Kingdom, evaded the answer as follows:

AN: *The manifesto pledges, quote, "the most ambitious programme on investment and buildings and technology the NHS has ever seen". Is that part of the 8 billion?*

PM: *It's £10 billion.*

AN: *And where will that come from?*

PM: *That will come from a variety of sources*

*(By Denis Campbell, The Guardian, May 2017)*

In this case, the illusion of a full-fledged dialogue is created, since both communicants continue to conduct a conversation, and each replica carries a certain meaning. The politician in this situation evades the answer by pointing to a variety of sources of money (*That will come from a variety of sources*), which is represented in the language with the help of the generalizing noun variety. Therefore, the interviewer receives an answer to the question about the sources of funding without details. Besides, Theresa May uses the modal verb *will* in the meaning of a promise, which helps her convince the interlocutor of her words. Nevertheless, despite the fact that certain information is revealed in her remark, it is not possible to regard this information as a specific, direct answer, because the interviewer did not receive the necessary detailed information.

Thus, the tactics of generalization are equally often used by politicians of both linguistic cultures under consideration, since it is one of the leading tactics

that constitute a strategy of evasion. This tactic allows politicians to avoid responsibility for their words and (or) demonstrate their level of competence in a given question. The response of a politician, as a rule, is uninformative and cannot be regarded as an answer to a specific question. In such a response, certain information is transmitted, but the specified goal of the interlocutor is not realized. Instead of answering the question, the speaker evades a direct answer.

### **Tactic of indicating the lack of information**

The reference to the lack of necessary information as a form of evasion is also characteristic of American and British politicians and makes up 10% for the US and 8% for the UK of the available corpus of examples.

American and British politicians often refer to the lack of necessary information in order to avoid guesses from journalists and get out of the awkward situation in which they find themselves due to their ignorance of any state issue.

This tactic is characterized by explicit verbalization. It is manifested by the fact that politicians directly declare that they do not possess certain information in order to avoid guesses and conjectures on the part of journalists and the audience. In their statements, we can see a syntactic construction of the type *don't know / have + a noun with informative semantics, and the fact, etc.* (I don't know the answer, I don't know all the facts, I don't have more information), where the nouns like *information, answer* and *facts* are often found. In addition, the markers of this tactic are introductory words and interjections, such as *well, you know*, which give the politician time to think about the answer to the question. This tactic is illustrated by the response of Mark Toner, an official representative of the US State Department, to a journalist's question about the attack on Turkey by Russia:

*Interviewer: You are saying Turkey has the right to defend itself; President Obama said the same thing. What defense are you talking about? Does anyone think Russia was going to attack Turkey?*



*MT: Again, I mean, this is...*

*Interviewer: Do you think so*

*MT: Look, I don't want to parse out this incident. I said very clearly that we don't know all the facts yet, so for me to speak categorically about what happened is – frankly, would be irresponsible*

*(Obama White house archives, 16 November 2015)*

In response, Mark Toner uses the phrase *I don't know all the facts*, where directly States does not possess full information needed to answer the question... moreover, he finds it impossible to share your speculation, explaining that it would be irresponsible his hand, because he doesn't know about the real state of things (*I said very clearly that we don't know all the facts yet, so for me to speak categorically about what happened is – frankly, would be irresponsible*). This meaning is realized using the form of the subjunctive mood would and the negative adjective *irresponsible* (*it would be irresponsible*). The influencing effect on the interlocutor is also enhanced by the sentence *I said very clearly*, in which the politician uses the adverb *very clearly* in order to prevent unwanted questions from the journalist.

The tactic of pointing out the lack of information is also found in the statements of the representative of the State Department, Kellyanne Conway, who in one of the interviews was asked a question about eavesdropping on telephone conversations of top officials of the state:

*Interviewer: Could you comment on the wiretapping claim?*

*Kellyanne Conway: I don't know the answer to that. It's under investigation*

*(Independent UK, 5 March 2017)*

Callianne Conway uses the negative form of the verb *know* (*don't know the answer*), which demonstrates that she does not have the information necessary to answer the journalist's question. The politician tries to compensate for his ignorance in this matter by using the phrase *It is under investigation*, thus showing that the state bodies are engaged in their work.

Hillary Clinton also resorts to using this tactic. She refers to the lack of necessary information when a journalist asks her a question about Donald Trump's belonging to racists at a briefing:

*Interviewer: Do you think Donald Trump is a racist?*

*Hillary Clinton: Well, I don't know what's in his heart. I have no way of telling that*

*(CNN, 17 February 2017)*

Hillary Clinton uses the negative form of the verb *know* (*I don't know*), stating that he does not have the necessary information. In addition, the interjection *well* at the beginning of the statement, indicating that the politician intends to give an answer, softens the departure from the question asked. In turn, the metaphor of *what's in his heart* gives emotionality to the statement. Avoiding the answer is realized by using the construction *to have no way of* (*I have no way of telling that*), with the help of which a politician expresses the impossibility and it is incorrect on her part to give an answer to the question posed.

A British politician, the leader of the Conservative Party, David Cameron, evades answering the question of what the population thinks about the recovery of the UK economy, as follows:

*I don't know. You'll have to ask them. I don't feel remotely laid back about what I'm doing*

(*Economist*, 24 April 2015)

David Cameron evades the answer with a negative form the verb *know* in the phrase *I don't know*, with the help of which it reports that it does not have the information that may be of interest to the interviewer. With the help of a phrase in the form of an imperative mood using the modal verb *have to* (*you'll have to ask them*), the politician manages to transfer responsibility to another person. This tactic is not comfortable for politicians. This is confirmed, for example, by the fact that the politician resorts to the use of the negative form of the verb of sensory perception *feel* and the adjective *laid-back* in order to show how uncomfortable he feels when answering a question, and in order to prevent subsequent possible questions about this topic.

Another example of using this tactic is the response of the Minister for the policy of the UK's exit from the European Union (*Brexit*) the shadow cabinet of the British government, Keira Starmer. On one of the TV shows, he was asked about plans to support the amendments being made:

Interviewer: *So you will back those amendments?*

Keir Starmer: *Well, we haven't made a final decision on that*

(*The Guardian*, 5 October 2017)

In his response, the politician uses the interjection *well*, which is necessary for him to express consent to the invitation to continue the conversation and think about the answer. Answering, Keir Starmer refers to the fact that the decision has not yet been made, which is illustrated by the negative form of the action verb *make* and the phrase *final decision*, where the adjective *final* is used in the meaning of «coming at the end» (*we haven't made a final decision on that*).

Thus, the use of the tactic of indicating the lack of information is characterized by the specifics of its manifestation in different linguistic cultures.

So, American politicians refer to the lack of necessary information when it comes to foreign policy issues, while British politicians prefer to refer to their incompetence or ignorance in matters related to the internal policy of the state.

### **Tactics of expressing doubts about the validity of the answer to the question**

Often, during interviews and TV debates, such questions are asked, the answers to which the addressee does not know. In such cases, the politician does not want to admit his incompetence, is embarrassed and tries to hide his own confusion. In such cases, he sabotages the replica of the interlocutor, implementing the tactic of expressing doubt about the legality of the answer to the question.

Refusal to answer due to the lack of authority is very popular among foreign politicians, accounting for 7% of the total number of examples. Politicians resort to this tactic in order to avoid questions of a private nature or cases that are considered a state secret.

The tactics of expressing doubt about the legitimacy of the answer to a question are characterized by the frequent use of the adjective *appropriate* (*not appropriate for me to comment, aren't appropriate for me to discuss or opine*), as well as the phrases *politically correct, hypothetical questions* and *inappropriate questions* that indicate that it is unacceptable for a politician to express an opinion on the questions asked to him.

In addition, politicians often use negative the forms of the verbs of reflection *to know, to think and to be* (*I don't think that's appropriate, it's not appropriate to comment, they aren't appropriate to discuss*), as well as the verbs of commenting, discussing, expressing opinions (*to discuss, to comment, to opine*).

The response of the State Department representative, Marie Harf, in the interview concerning the military operations in Ukraine, is an illustrative example of the use of this tactic:

Interviewer: *Why here and not elsewhere?*

Marie Harf: *Those are historical conversations that I think are not inappropriate, but that aren't appropriate for me to discuss or opine on from up here*

*(Daily Press Briefing, 8 August 2017)*

Marie Harf uses the verb of expressing opinion *to think* (*I think*) in order to to express her own opinion about the topic under discussion. Using the negative form of the verb *to be*, as well as the verb of expression of opinion *to opine* (*aren't appropriate to opine, they aren't appropriate to discuss*), the politician declares that this topic is incorrect and incorrect for discussion. The use of the *aren't appropriate for me* construction, in which the pronoun for those is added to the adjective *appropriate* with the meaning «suitable for a certain situation», conveys the doubt of the respondent himself in the legitimacy of the answer to the question.

Hillary Clinton resorts to using this tactic when answering the question about the leak of confidential information:

Interviewer: *It seems that there's a disconnect there. If the information coming from those leaks is real, then how can the stories be fake?*

Hillary Clinton: *I'm sorry, but I have been given the questions that I feel inappropriate, and I want to turn in CNN for not doing a good job*

*(CNN, 17 February 2017)*

In this case, the evasion of the answer occurs in a polite form, as evidenced by the expression *I'm sorry*, which is necessary for Hillary Clinton to prepare the interlocutor for the fact that he will not be given the expected answer. The use of the verb of sensory perception *feel* and the negative adjective *inappropriate* with the semantics of a negative assessment (questions that I feel inappropriate)

illustrates the expression of doubt on her part in the legitimacy of the answer to the question posed. This is due to the fact that Hillary Clinton considers the disclosure of this information unacceptable. Moreover, the politician appeals to CNN, reproaching them for incorrect questions (*I want to turn in CNN for not doing a good job*), thereby demonstrating his indignation at the question asked.

Bernie Sanders, Senator of Vermont, in one of his interviews refers to this tactic, answering a journalist's question about representatives of opposite parties:

*Interviewer: get to a very fundamental question – left wing individuals and right wing individuals, and let's take, for now, only America. As people, in other ways, how different do you think they are?*

*Bernie Sanders: We should be very politically correct to answer this question*

*(Conversations with Tyler, March 28, 2016)*

In this case, when answering, Bernie Sanders uses the phrase *politically correct* (*avoiding language or behavior that any particular group of people might feel is unkind or offensive* (Cambridge Dictionary), which indicates the complexity of the question, which should be answered with the utmost the degree of accuracy and correctness. Using this phrase, the politician declares that it is impossible to answer the question at this point in time, because he cannot provide the interviewer with detailed information on a specific problem.

In the statements of British politicians, the tactic of expressing doubt about the legitimacy of the answer to the question is practically not found or is extremely rare. It seems possible to assume that this is due to the fact that the British culture is less straightforward than the American one; and it is not typical for it to point out to the interlocutor the inappropriateness of the question asked. However, British politicians also sometimes resort to using this tactic.

For example, Jeremy Corbyn, the leader of the Labour Party, in an interview, when asked if he would like to strike with an unmanned aerial vehicle at terrorists on the territory of other countries, answers:

*I would want know the circumstances. You can't answer a hypothetical question without the evidence. It is a completely hypothetical question for me*

*(The Guardian, 30 May 2017)*

Jeremy Corbyn twice resorts to using the adjective *hypothetical* in the sense of “hypothecy; supposition” (*imagined or suggested but not necessarily real or true, Cambridge Dictionary*) and adverbs with the semantics «completely» (*very great, without limit, or to the largest degree possible, Cambridge Dictionary*) in the phrase *hypothetical questions* for me in order to show that he considers it completely unacceptable to express his opinion on this topic, and that he is categorical in his decision. The use of the modal verb *would* indicates the desire of the politician to have more information than he actually owns to answer this question (*I would want know the circumstances*), in turn, the negative form of the modal verb *can* indicates the impossibility of expressing an opinion on the given question (*You can't answer a hypothetical question without the evidence*).

Thus, the tactic of expressing doubt about the legitimacy of the answer to a question is used by politicians in cases when they do not know the answer to the question posed and/or do not want to admit their incompetence. This tactic is typical mainly for American politicians. This is largely due to the linguistic and cultural characteristics. British politicians are less categorical, and it is not typical for them to evade the answer, justifying avoiding the answer by the incorrectness of the question asked.

### **Tactic of ignoring the question**

The tactic of ignoring the question can be compared in frequency of use with the previous tactic of expressing doubt in maintaining the discussion of the topic. This tactic is a line of behavior in which the topic of conversation is not supported, rejected by the politician. Questions concerning acute topics of international relations or problems within the country and addressed to the interlocutor, when the latter implements this tactic, remain without an informative answer. The recognition of ignoring tactics in the speaker's responses is carried out solely on the basis of context. As part of the ignoring tactic, an additional expressive function is actualized, which serves to express a negative feeling on the part of a politician, as a rule, neglecting.

The tactic of ignoring is implemented with the help of the incentive construction *let's move to a new question/call* and thank you replicas *thank you all* and *thank you*. A characteristic feature of this tactic is the lack of a direct connection between the question and the answer.

A striking example of ignoring the question is Hilary Clinton's answer in an interview when discussing the Iran deal:

*Interviewer: Madame Secretary, any comments on the Iran deal?*

*Hillary Clinton: Thank you all*

*(The Brookings Institution, 9 September 2015)*

Hillary Clinton's answer consists exclusively of the conventional *Thank you all* phrases, where the main marker is the thank you remark, after which there was no response. It can be assumed that Hillary Clinton evaded the answer with this tactic, because the political situation at that time was tense, and the politician did not want to create an environment for additional discussions around the nuclear deal with Iran.



Prime Minister Nick Clegg uses the tactic of ignoring the question in his answer to the question concerning the use of medicines among adolescents:

*Interviewer: Under 16 year old, Mr Clegg, I have to repeat, under 16, you're happy with that?*

*Nick Clegg: Let's move to the next call, please*

*(The Guardian, 31 March 2015)*

In this case, evasion is achieved by using the incentive construction *let's do something (move to a new call)* with the semantics of joint action, which allows you to switch to another question, leaving the journalist's question unanswered. The answer is not categorical, which is achieved by using the adverb please, which softens the politician's statement and makes his evasion more polite.

Participating in the debate, Sarah Palin, the governor of Alaska and a member of the Republican Party, also resorts to using this tactic:

*Interviewer: Governor, please, if you want to respond to what he said about Sen. McCain's comments about health care?*

*Sarah Palin: I'd like to respond about the tax increases*

*(CNN, 8 October 2015)*

In this case, Sarah Palin managed to evade the answer, completely ignoring the interviewer's question about the healthcare system in the United States of America and expressing her desire to discuss the topic of growing taxes (*I'd like to respond about the tax increases*). Thus, there is no direct connection between the question and the answer. However, despite avoiding the answer, Sarah Palin politely expresses her preferences about a new topic for discussion. For this purpose, the subjunctive form of the verb *would* is used in the meaning of «*would like to respond*». The tactic of ignoring the question, as well as the tactic of

expressing doubt in maintaining the discussion of the topic, is unusual for British politicians. This is largely due to their inherent politeness and the peculiarities of the English national character. The only case from the entire analyzed corpus of examples can be the answer of David Cameron during a political debate, when he was simultaneously asked two questions: one regarding the use of funds and the second – juvenile offenders.

*Thank you! Let me take on directly this question of money and public spending*

*(The Guardian, 17 January 2014)*

To implement this tactic, David Cameron uses the conventional phrase *Thank you* as a gratitude for asking questions and showing politeness. The use of the verb *let* in the imperative mood (*let me take on*), as well as the use of the demonstrative pronoun *this* to indicate a specific question, helps the politician to turn attention to only one of the questions posed, ignoring the second.

Thus, David Cameron expressed a desire to answer the first question, while there was no answer to the second question. Therefore, the tactic of ignoring implies rejection by the politician of any topic related to the state of affairs, and leaving the interviewer's question without an informative answer. This tactic is used by American politicians much more often than by British ones. This tactic allows not only to evade the answer, but also to create an image of a politician who appears to the public arrogant and arrogant, which is unusual for British politicians. As a rule, American politicians thank for the question/participation/discussion with the help of etiquette words, demonstrating their unwillingness to answer and warning subsequent questions.

### **Misleading tactic**

Misleading, or playing with words, is a deliberate logical mistake, making which vague formulations are used to hide the meaning, avoid counterarguments and avoid complex domestic and foreign policy issues, thereby avoiding a clear answer to the question.

Misleading tactics are not widely used among politicians. This tactic is more typical for British politicians – 70% of the examples of using this tactic in the available corpus of examples belong to British politicians. Despite the fact that all the answers are provided in a polite manner, they do not carry any relevant information.

This tactic can be represented both with the help of lexical repetitions, rhetorical questions, and similar-sounding words that are necessary in order to distract the interlocutor's attention from the question asked. In addition, in each of his answers, the politician, relying on the fact or event that took place, places accents in his interpretation so as to interpret or reinterpret the topic in the way he needs. This is necessary to create the illusion of continuing the dialogue, as well as to ensure that evasion from the answer is not extremely obvious.

An example of the use of misleading tactics can be the statement of the fact by Donald Trump at one of the press conferences concerning the rally. The politician was asked a question about the reasons for the riots at a rally in Charlottesville, to which he answered:

*There was terrible violence. On many sides. You had a group on one side that was bad and you had a group on the other side that was also very violent. And nobody wants to say that, but I'll say it right now. So, this week it's Robert E. Lee. Noticed that Stonewall Jackson is coming down. I wonder is it George Washington next week and is it Thomas Jefferson the week after?*

*(NY Times, 15 August 2017)*

The use of misleading tactics in this case «blurs» any statements made by Trump regarding a specific problem. Speaking about the violent actions coming from counter-protesters, the politician simultaneously mentions that these actions also come from the ultra-right (a movement of supporters of ultra-right views that reject traditional American conservatism) (*You had a group on one side that was bad and you had a group on the other side that was also very violent*). Thus, Donald Trump avoids discussing the real subject: the rally and its subsequent violence were caused by the organized actions of white racists. The whole word game it focuses on who committed the violence, instead of explaining its causes. The politician also misleads the interlocutor with the help of comments about Robert Lee. The transition to personality serves as a distraction. Thus, there are numerous lexical repetitions *On many sides, terrible violence, very violent*, such distractions as a personal transition and a rhetorical question (*I wonder is this George Washington next week and is it Thomas Jefferson the week after?*) in order to switch the interlocutor's attention to a new object of conversation, they help Trump distract attention from what really matters, namely from the perpetrators of the riots, and evade the answer to the question.

This tactic is rare in the speech of American politicians. The example of Donald Trump's use of misleading tactics is one of the few illustrating misleading tactics.

British politicians are more inclined to use this tactic. So, the speeches of Theresa May are a vivid example of the use of misleading tactics. In one of the interviews, when asked whether she will prevent the convening of a second referendum in Scotland, she answers:

*I don't think the question is whether there can be a second referendum, it's whether there should be a second referendum.*

*(The Guardian, 28 October 2016)*

In this case, the illusion of answering the question and continuing the dialogue is created. Theresa May evades the answer, because she can interpret the topic in a favorable way for her and switch the interlocutor's attention to the expediency of calling a referendum. Answer-evasion is achieved by contrasting the modal verbs *could* (physical possibility) and *should* (potential implementation of the action) (*whether there could be, whether there should be*), which allows the politician to stay within the framework of the referendum discussion, but change the aspect of the problem. Thus, the politician avoids a direct answer to the question raised and also implicitly expresses her opinion, indicating that the referendum should take place. Despite the fact that Theresa May is considered to be the politician who most often resorts to the use of misleading tactics, this tactic is also actively used by other politicians, for example, Jeremy Corbyn. In the interview, he was asked about the amount of money that he would be willing to pay for leaving the European Union:

*Interviewer: Have you got a figure in your head for how much it's worth paying to get out of this club?*

*Jeremy Corbyn: It isn't a question of what it's worth paying to get out it's a question of what is going to be the right deal for us*

*(Debating Europe, 20 June 2016)*

Jeremy Corbyn's answer is very similar in structure to the answer of Theresa May. Repetition of the syntactic structure with the use of the noun *question* (*it isn't a question u it's a question*), repetition of the construction expressing a future action *it's going to be* (*what is going to be the right deal for us*) mislead the interlocutor and make him forget about the question asked. Meanwhile, the politician is already implicitly promoting a new topic, namely the topic of a profitable deal (*the right deal for us*). Thus, the tactics of misleading are a game of words and the use of vague formulations in answers to questions related to foreign

and domestic political issues, in particular as a result of a comparative analysis, it was revealed that British politicians are more inclined to use the tactics of misleading (playing with words). They use this tactic because of their culturally determined differences in speech behavior from Americans. The British are less direct and more evasive in communication. According to M. Stewart, they are focused on avoiding a conflict and prefer negative politeness and unconventional evasiveness, which implies the need for the listener or reader to draw certain conclusions (Stewart, 2005). They are more likely to achieve the desired result in communication with the help of wordplay and manipulation, while it is more convenient for Americans to achieve it with the help of frankness. Moreover, there is a difference in the cases of using this tactic. American politicians resort to playing with words when it comes to domestic political issues, while British politicians prefer to use this tactic when discussing foreign policy issues.

### **Tactics of repetitions and repeated questions (clarifications)**

The strategy of evasion can also be implemented through the tactics of repetitions and re-questions (clarifications), which, like the tactics of misleading, makes up 5% of the available corpus of examples. Within the framework of the subject-logical field of communication, repetitions and repeated questions are usually regarded as redundant, since they do not they add new information, however, within the framework of the strategy of avoiding a direct answer, the tactics of repetitions and repeated questions are significant and frequent.

This tactic is mainly used by British politicians. They resort to using it when they cannot give a clear answer to a question asked, because they do not have enough information, when questions put them in an awkward position and when they do not want to accidentally compromise themselves by giving an answer to a misunderstood question. As a rule, questions addressed to politicians are personal the nature or are directed to the discussion of domestic affairs.

The tactics of repetitions and re-questions is represented, firstly, by the visual means of the language, which are mainly lexical. In this case, it is based on the association of the words and expressions chosen by the speaker with other words that are close to them in meaning, but not represented in the utterance, the tactics of repetitions and re-questions are also represented by expressive means of language, i.e. means that increase the expressiveness of speech and enhance its emotionality with the help of special syntactic constructions, in particular, expressive and rhetorical questions, ellipsis and parallel structures. In the tactics of repetitions and repeated questions, it is worth noting the presence of magnifying expressiveness, which involves the use of intensifying words. The most frequent are simple intensifiers (*all, ever, even, quite, really, absolutely, such, so*) and amplifying adverbs denoting emotions (*frightfully, awfully, terribly*).

A striking example of the tactics of repetitions and repeated questions is the answer of Nigel Paul Farage, the British politician from 2010 to 2016 and leader of the United Kingdom Independence Party. In one of his interviews, when asked if he considers himself a racist, he answers:

*Nigel Farage: What is racism? Is racism between races?*

*Interviewer: Don't you know? How can you say you're not something if you don't know what it is?*

*Nigel Farage: Is race about colour? Is race about race? Is it about nationality?*

*(The Guardian, 16 May 2015)*

In this example, Nigel Farage uses lexical unit *racism*, borrowed from the interviewer's question mark (*What is racism? Is racism between races?*). Lexical repetition in this case (*What is racism? Is racism between races?*) is necessary in order to create the illusion of continuing the dialogue and show the interest of the

politician in the issue. The structure of the repeated questions conveys surprise bordering on irony or irritation, the example is a speech act of clarification, implicitly implementing avoidance of a direct answer with the help of numerous questions (*Is race about colour? Is race about race? Is it about nationality?*), which force the interviewer to clarify them, and the politician himself leaves the original question unanswered. Another example is the dialogue between Tony Blair and the interviewer on the topic of company profits:

*Paxman: Do you think that a company can make too much in profits?*

*Tony Blair: In what sense do you mean?*

*Paxman: Do you believe that an individual can earn too much money?*

*Tony Blair: I don't really – it is not – no, it's not a view I have. Do you mean that we should cap someone's income?*

*(BBC UK News)*

In this case, the tactics of questioning (clarification) is implemented through repetition of the interrogative construction *what do you mean* that conveys Tony Blair's excitement, indecision and hesitation, in addition, negative constructions, forms of verbs and particles *don't, it's not, no*, the intensifier *really* (*I don't really – it is not – no, it's not a view I have*) explicitly indicate the reluctance of policy to answer the question. The use of the modal verb *should* in the meaning of “*has to*” gives the question more expressiveness and actualizes its function (*Do you mean that we should cap someone's income?*).

Thus, the use of the tactics of repetition and questioning (clarifications) is necessary for politicians to save face in the situations of intercultural communication, when questions put politicians in an awkward situation, and accordingly, repetition or refinement gives them time to ponder over the question and ponder over a necessary and beneficial policy response. In addition, this tactic



is characteristic first of all, of British politicians, because on the one hand, it allows the politician to evade a direct answer, and on the other hand, due to the saturation of expressive and pictorial means, it acts as a communicative method of enhancing expressiveness and emotionality.

## **2.2. Answer-evading tactics: a study of the film “Bridget Jones Diary”**

Having no desire to share the required information with the questioner, the respondent, through a direct refusal, often turns communication from cooperative into conflict. The reason is that the refusal to answer the question is at the bottom of the politeness scale. Using the example of the film «Bridget Jones Diary», this part of the Diploma Paper provides a comprehensive description of techniques aimed at ensuring that the questioner does not achieve his communicative goal – getting an answer.

In the works within the scope of pragmatics devoted to the study of communicative strategies, a communicative strategy is understood as “a set of theoretical moves planned by the speaker in advance and implemented during the communicative act aimed at achieving the communicative goal”. The implementation of the communicative strategy consists in the application of communicative rules. So, in question-and-answer communication, the questioner strives to comply with the necessary conditions for the question to be heard and understood and at the same time to be ethically and situationally justified. In addition, the question should not give the respondent grounds for refusing to provide the requested information. The respondent, as one of the necessary participants engaged in speech interaction, by virtue of compliance with the rules, is obliged to realize the question posed and answer it. The implementation of a communicative strategy is also carried out by so-called «strategems», or, in other words, mental moves that violate a particular condition for effective communication. In case of unwillingness to share information with the questioner,

the respondent can directly refuse to cooperate. However, in order to prevent possible conflict situations in the process of speech communication, create a respectful interpersonal relationship with the questioner and to make a favorable impression on the questioner, refusal to answer is best realized through evasion. Answer-evasion is an indirect refusal, in which the respondent, through special communicative techniques, signals that, that it is not his intention to answer. Answer-evasion can take place when the respondent indirectly expresses his unwillingness to share information with the questioner, pretending that he does not hear/does not recognize/does not perceive the question posed or does not have the required information. In this part of the Diploma Paper, using the example of the film «Bridget Jones Diary», specific communicative methods of hiding information are considered in order to describe a strategy of evasion.

### **The respondent pretends that he did not hear the question**

Avoiding the answer, the respondent can pretend that he did not hear the questioner. See: [Mother telephones her daughter and wants to tell her something about their visit to Mavis Enderbury's Brunch Time Karaoke]:

*“Oh, hello, darling, guess what?” – my mother. “We’ve just been at Mavis Enderbury’s Brunch Time Karaoke and guess what? Julie Enderbury’s just had her . . .”*

*You could practically hear the screeching of tires: like she was about to say the word “fat” to a morbidly obese person. “Just had her what? I muttered, frantically putting the remains of a slice of goat cheese log in my mouth followed by half a protein bar to ease the hangover, whilst trying to pull some sort of vaguely christening-friendly outfit from the mess all over the bed.*

*“Nothing, darling!” she trilled.*

*“What has Julie Enderbury just had?” I retched. “Her boobs made even more gigantic? A lithe young Brazilian?”*

*“Oh, nothing, nothing, darling. She just had her third, but what I was really ringing to say was . . .”*

*(Bridget Jones Diary)*

The daughter deliberately pretends that she does not hear and does not understand the question asked. Thus, she makes it clear that she is still interested in what her mother wants to tell her about. So we see how she again asks her mother about this.

### **Indifference to the question**

In the film, the speaker (the actress) uses this technique most effectively when there is a provocation or aggression in her direction, when they are trying to tease her, put her at a disadvantage. The *still* language unit, which also has functional features of the information content marker, is a carrier of temporal-contrasting semantics and has a bidirectional scope – retrospective and prospective. The semantic content of the *still* language unit is described as “storing the previous state of affairs with the prospect of changes in the future”. So, for example, *still* in the expression «John is still at work» implies two sentences at the macro level: (1) *John was at work before* and (2) *John will not be at work later*. This bidirectional scope of the analyzed discursive marker makes it an important component of implementing various strategies and tactics, for example:

*“So, come on, then, Bridget! How’s yer love-life!» quipped Geoffrey, giving me one of his special hugs, then going all pink and adjusting his slacks”.*

*“Fine”.*

*“So you still haven’t got a chap. Durr! What are we going to do with you!”*

*(Bridget Jones Diary)*

The language unit *still* acts this time as a means of implementing the tactic of giving a negative assessment: the producer of the statement hints that Bridget did not have a boyfriend in the past and does not have one now, which, in his opinion, is bad for a young girl. At the macro-discursive level, negative evaluation tactics are an integral part of a hedging strategy. In this case, it is best not to show absolutely any emotions, even if everything is “boiling” inside the actress. For the answer, she uses either some general phrases or silence in general. The most important thing is she does not go into specifics and doesn’t show that the interlocutor has hooked her. With this method, she can put any person in a stupid position. Moreover, even if they laugh at her or criticize her, she feels a complete failure inside, because initially they expected a different reaction from the actress, and she remained indifferent, i.e. neither the question nor the interlocutor means anything to Bridget.

### **Ignoring the main question**

Most often, this method is used in cases when too many questions are asked. From the whole number of questions asked, you should choose the most harmless of them, and then speak out about it, emotionally speaking out and going into a lot of all sorts of details. You just need to put all other questions on the back burner.

In the film, we see how Bridget ignores questions about her singleness. She hates it very much. One reason for that is that everyone around her irritates her by asking why she is still single, as if it is her fault. The following example illustrates it clearly

- *Bridget! Well, what should we do with you!* – Yuna exclaimed. – *These girls who think only about their career are really for me! Look, we can't put this off indefinitely. Tick-tock-tick-tock.*

- *Yes. How can a woman manage to live up to your age and not get married? Brian Enderby (Mavis' husband, a former president of the Rotary Club in Kettering) bellowed, waving a glass of sherry in the air. Fortunately, my dad helped me out.*

*(Bridget Jones Diary)*

In several other scenes it is clear that there is a certain pressure put on her by society to be married already if you are approaching 30. Another reason is that the rest of her life is also a bit of a disaster – her parents have separated and her job is a dead-end, among other things. And it is also true that she is unhappily single because she wants a relationship and does not have one. While at first it seems like she will take any man walking – as evidenced by her relationship with Daniel Cleaver when her self-respect goes utterly out the window – she, in the end, is not completely desperate. She wants something extraordinary, something worth giving her life to, although she does not fully realize this until she is loved, simply as she is, by Mark Darcy.

### **Answering a question with a question**

This method is one of the most widely used and can appear in many different situations: when there is some kind of provocation, when uncomfortable questions are asked, as well as in cases when it is necessary to learn more information about the person asking the question. The respondent's label is thrown to the questioner here – now it remains to wait for his/her reaction. But this method, although effective, because of its prevalence, often causes irritation of other participants of communication, and sometimes even a feeling of disgust and some apprehension. For this reason, if you need to maintain a good relationship with the interlocutor or

he means something to you, it will be easier not to answer his question with your own words, but to answer first in the most neutral form and then ask your question. The clear example of it is when Bridget is asked about her singleness. She answers this painful question with a question that indicates she does not like personal questions:

*“Have you got married yet?”*

*“Do you want to know more about my private life?”*

*(Bridget Jones Diary)*

This tactic means that when you are asked an incorrect question and you do not want to answer it, then it is best to answer it by using a counter-question.

### **Answering your own question**

What we mean by this is that you are not answering the question you were asked, instead you provide an answer of your interpretation of this question, i.e. your answer is a reflection of your line; the strategy that you adhere to. But there are both pros and cons here. Of course, Bridget tries to avoid answering uncomfortable questions, but at the same time, she causes irritation of the interlocutor and others, especially, if it is done too openly and straightforwardly. In addition, the actress also puts herself in an awkward position by becoming a person who cannot figure out what is required from her.

Although, the question consists of several parts, Bridget takes a separate part of it and answers it exactly, and does it as she actually sees fit. In such a situation, the interlocutor finds himself in a delicate position. It is especially good that she combines the answer with the manifestation of her acting talent – to transform the situation so that the interlocutor understands that it is not she who does not understand what he is asking, but he himself asks his questions in an incomprehensible form.

### **Bringing the interlocutor to the right question**

This technique requires high skill in communication, because there is a complete manipulation of the person asking questions. The interesting thing is that for this Bridget does not even need to ask the interlocutor about something. She just needs to push him to ask the question she needs, constantly returning to the topic you she is interested in and connecting it with everything that the interlocutor says. To do this, Bridget needs to choose a specific topic for the conversation, answer a few simple questions put by the interlocutor, and then she continues the conversation on the topic she is interested in. And when the interlocutor starts to support this conversation with her, then his questions and her answers to them are exactly those that are effective for her personally.

### **Answering the question the way the interlocutor wants**

In other words, we try to tell the hearer what he wants to hear. Most of all, this method is effective if it is used when the character needs to convince another person of something, enlist his support or calm him down. She needs to answer the questions the way the interlocutor would like her to answer them. It is possible (and sometimes even necessary) to tell a lie. After all, in fact, this is not a deception, but only an indulgence of a person in his desire to be deceived. It is necessary to consider this method as providing a person with what he wants; as supporting the illusion with which (or in which) his life is easier for him. Moreover, Bridget does evade the answer, but she answers with a benefit for herself. It can be very simple to determine which answer a person needs: his question is asked in such a form that implies a certain answer. Bridget just has to decide: which way is the best way to answer and what result it will have.

## **Conclusions to Chapter Two**

The strategy of avoiding a direct answer is a chain of the speaker's decisions, his communicative choice of speech actions and language means that allow him to disguise, hide the true meaning of the response, or even evade a direct answer. During the study, answer-evading tactics in the film "Bridget Jones Diary", as well as 314 cases of evasion by American and British politicians were identified, and the main evasion tactics that politicians most often resort to during their speeches were analyzed. These tactics are the tactics of refusing to comment (30% for the United States and 25% for the United Kingdom), the tactics of switching to another topic (20% for the United States and Great Britain), the tactics of generalization (16% for the United States and Great Britain), the tactics of indicating the lack of information (10% for the USA and 8% for the UK), the tactics that express doubting the legality of the answer to the question (7% for the US and UK), the tactics of ignoring the question (7% for the United States and 1% for the UK), the tactics of confusion (2% for US and 5% for the UK), the tactics of repetition and asking for clarification (5% for the UK).

In the course of the study, it was revealed that there are both similarities and differences in the use of the analyzed 8 tactics by American and British politicians.

- Three tactics (switching to another topic, generalizations, expressing doubts about the legitimacy of the answer to the question) are used equally and in the same situations (in a situation of maintaining a conversation).
- The tactics of refusing to comment and the tactics of pointing out the lack of necessary information differ in their functioning. American politicians tend to resort to the use of these tactics when it comes to foreign policy issues, while British politicians prefer to avoid answering questions concerning domestic affairs. This difference is connected with the different political situation of the countries,



their place in the political arena. Different events that both countries experience make it possible to set different types of answer evading tactics.

- Ignoring tactics and misleading tactics differ in the frequency of use by political figures. The tactic of ignoring is more typical of American politicians, while the tactic of misleading is more typical of British ones. The existence of this difference is due to the linguistic and cultural characteristics of the two countries. It was noticed that American politicians are more direct and dismissive in their statements, while British politicians, in their turn, are more evasive and friendly in their responses.

Due to the differences in the national character of the politicians of the two countries, the manner of evading answers to questions differs. British politicians often try to reduce the distance in conversation, to be more friendly and polite. American politicians often do not take into account how tactful their statements are, since they are strictly focused on evading the answer.

## GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

At present, we can observe an ongoing growth of interest in political discourse in linguistics and other fields of scientific knowledge. This is primarily due to the key role of this type of discourse in the formation of public consciousness. The presence of a mass addressee gives political discourse even more importance. Therefore, the analysis of political discourse can reveal the mechanisms of public opinion management.

In linguistics, political discourse is presented as a multidimensional and multidimensional phenomenon. Like any discourse, it is implemented by strategies and tactics, of which one of the leading is the strategy of evasion.

This Diploma Paper was aimed at studying the features of the use of tactics that implement the strategy of evasion in modern political discourse in American and British linguistic cultures.

In the course of the research, the following tasks were solved:

1. the reasons for answer-evading were found out;
2. psychological aspects of answer-evading were studied;
3. lexical means that are used in answer-evading tactics were investigated;
4. answer-evading tactics used in political discourse were analyzed;
5. answer-evading tactics the speakers resort to in everyday communication were pointed out and analyzed.

In this Diploma Paper, we also described the essence of political discourse, studied the peculiarities of communicative strategies and tactics and their interaction in a single communicative space, pointed out essential characteristics of the communicative tactics of evasion from a direct answer, carried out functional analysis of the factors leading to their activation in communication. The

communicative strategy of evading the answer is implemented through tactics of answer-evading. In the process of communication, the strategy of avoiding a direct answer is implemented through a wide range of linguistic means at lexical and syntactic levels.

As the result of our analysis, 314 cases of evasion by American and British politicians were identified, 8 most popular evasion tactics were analyzed, which most often resorted to by politicians during their interviews. The tactics of refusing to comment, the tactics of switching to another topic and the tactics of generalization are the most frequent among American and British politicians. The tactics of pointing out the lack of necessary information, the tactics of expressing doubt about the legitimacy of the answer to the question and the tactics of ignoring are less frequent, In turn, the tactics of misleading and the tactics of repetition and re-questioning are new in the political discourse of these linguistic cultures.

The use of each tactic by American and British politicians has its own characteristics. For example, there are only three tactics (switching to another topic, generalizations, expressions of doubt) of the eight analyzed are used equally and in the same situations, the remaining five (refusal to comment, indicating the lack of necessary information, ignoring, misleading and repetitions and repeated questions) differ in the cases of use and frequency of use.

It seems possible to assume that the obtained data are typical only for the present time period. Due to the fact that the political situation in the world is constantly changing, politicians resort to different communication tactics to achieve their goals, depending on changes in the political arena.

It will be promising to consider these tactics, constituting a strategy of evasion, in dynamics. Further study of the communicative strategy of evasion in other types of discourse and on the material of other languages can also be carried out.

## RESUME

Сучасний етап розвитку суспільства відрізняється високою динамікою життя і творчості, прагненням до успішності в особистій і діловій сферах і, як результат, гармонізації спілкування. Дана тенденція підштовхнула до появи наукових праць в області психології з таких питань, як спілкування і емоції, безпроблемне спілкування, справжнє спілкування, стилі спілкування, психологія конфлікту, уникнення відповіді та ін.

Очевидно, що дослідження мови як явища індивідуального і соціального має здійснюватися з урахуванням результатів, отриманих в різних наукових сферах, як в лінгвістиці, так і в психолінгвістиці, соціології та психології. Для проведення результативного значущого дослідження, в першу чергу, необхідно виявлення таких категорій, які могли б бути віднесені як до області лінгвістики, так і до області психології спілкування. До одних з таких важливих явищ відносяться тактики спілкування взагалі, а особливо тактики ухилення від відповіді.

Необхідність, дослідження в першу чергу, тактик ухилення від прямої відповіді визначено з урахуванням наступних положень. По-перше, здійснення міжособистісного спілкування неможливо без постановки відповідей на питання, в іншому випадку, процес комунікації втрачає сенс. Тим самим, відповідна репліка розглядається як невід'ємна частина діалогу, що вимагає свого вивчення. У ситуації «запитання-відповідь» конфлікт діалогу може ховатися в експліцитній відмові від відповіді, тим самим, актуально дослідження механізмів дипломатичного, імпліцитного ухилення від прямої відповіді. По-друге, тактика ухилення від прямої відповіді, на наш погляд, є універсальним засобом мовленнєвої взаємодії, тому що характерна для людської комунікації в цілому, незалежно від конкретної мови, яка виступає в якості засобу комунікації.

В ході дослідження була визначена необхідність вивчення особливостей ухилення від прямої відповіді, як однієї з форм актуалізації діалогічного дискурсу. Тим самим, в даному дослідженні на основі уточнення характеристикації категорії «тактика» була виділена і описана комунікативна тактика ухилення від прямої відповіді; визначені її характеристики; описаний репертуар комунікативних тактик, що констатують дану стратегію (на матеріалі англійської мови) і виявлено набір вербальних і невербальних засобів, що репрезентують тактики комунікативної стратегії ухилення від прямої відповіді.

Всі випадки комунікативної стратегії ухилення від прямої відповіді підпорядковуються загальним правилам метакомунікативної самоорганізації. При метакомунікативній самоорганізації даної стратегії реалізуються такі елементи дискурсу, як заповнювачі пауз, відповідні явищам хезитації; перепитування-«петлі» з боку адресата; елементи, що регулюють уточнення, закриття або заміну теми; елементи, що відображають релевантність мови, доречність в ситуації; а також елементи, що регулюють стиль мови і тональність спілкування.

Внутрішні процеси метакомунікативної самоорганізації стратегії ухилення від прямої відповіді будуються на таких змінних, як час і місце комунікативного процесу, зовнішнє оточення і культурне визначення; учасники спілкування (говорить і слухає), передбачуваний результат і індивідуальні і спільні цілі комунікантів; психологічна, емоційна тональність комунікативної події.

У процесі комунікації стратегія ухилення від прямої відповіді реалізується за допомогою широкого спектру засобів всіх мовних рівнів-лексико-граматичними, семантичними і синтаксичними, комунікативними.

За ілюстративну основу взято мовленнєві фрагменти, які репрезентують тактики ухилення від відповіді, представлені у американських та британських газетах (*The Times, CNN, The Washington Post, Real Clear Politics, USA Today, The Guardian, The New York Times, Los Angeles Times, The Telegraph, The Independent, Daily Press Briefings*) за період з 2013 по 2018 рр.

В роботі такж аналізуються діалогічні фрагменти, в яких застосовуються тактики ухилення від відповіді, з кінофільму «Щоденник Бриджит Джоунз».

Дипломна робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів та висновків. У списку використаної літератури нараховується 86 джерел теоретичного матеріалу.

Основна увага в роботі увага зосереджується на причинах виникнення ухилення від відповіді в англомоному діалогічному дискурсу та функціональному аналізі тактик та способів ухилення від відповіді під час спілкування.

**Ключові слова:** тактика ухилення від відповіді, англомовний діалогічний дискурс, прагматика, лексичні засоби, комунікативна стратегія, політичне інтерв'ю, політичні дебати, політичний дискурс.

## REFERENCE LITERATURE

1. Авдеева, О. И. (1994). *Фразеологические единицы со значением утверждения и отрицания* (Автореферат диссертации кандидата филологических наук). Ростов-на-Дону.
2. Адмони, В. Г. (1958). *Введение в синтаксис современного английского языка*. Москва.
3. Апресян, Ю. Д. (1995). *Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка*. Москва: Языки русской культуры.
4. Апресян, Ю. Д. (1986). *Перформативы в грамматике и словаре*. Москва: Изв. АН СССР.
5. Арнольд, И. В. (1990). *Стилистика современного английского языка*. Москва: Просвещение.
6. Арутюнова, Н. Д. (2003). *Предложение и его смысл*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.
7. Баранов, А. Н., Крейдлин, Г. Е. (1992). *Иллокутивное вынуждение в структуре диалога*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.
8. Бахтин, М. М. (1996). *Проблема речевых жанров*. Москва: Русские словари.
9. Белецкая, О. Д. (1998). *Запрос информации и характеризующие его коммуникативные схемы*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.
10. Бенвенист, Э. (2002). *Общая лингвистика*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.

11. Богданов, В. В. (1985). *Перформативное предложение и его парадигмы*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры.
12. Богданов, В. В. (1989). *Классификация речевых актов*. Москва: Наука.
13. Бондарко, А. В. (2003). *Принципы функциональной грамматики и вопросы аспектологии*. Москва: Наука.
14. Вайнрих, Х. (1998). *Лингвистика лжи: язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия*. Благовещенск: Гнозис.
15. Вежбицкая, А. (2001). *Сопоставление культур через посредство лексики и прагматики*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.
16. Вендлер, З. (1985). *Иллокутивное самоубийство*. Москва: МОДЭК.
17. Витгенштейн, Л. (1958). *Логико-философский трактат*. Москва: Изв. АН СССР.
18. Витгенштейн, Л. (1994). *Философские работы*. Москва: КубГУ.
19. Воркачев, С. Г. (1997). *Безразличие как этносемантическая характеристика личности: опыт сопоставительной паремиологии*. Москва: Мысль.
20. Выготский, Л. С. (2003). *Психология развития человека*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.
21. Вундерлих, Д. (2007). *Коммуникативно-деятельностные теории языка*. Москва: Наука.
22. Гойхман, О. Я., Надеина, Т. М. (1997). *Основы речевой коммуникации*. Москва: Издательская группа «Прогресс».



23. Грайс, Г. (1985). *Логика и речевое общение*. Москва: Книга.
24. Громоздова, Л. В. (2000). *Модальность утверждения и отрицания в английском и русском языках*. Москва: Идея-Пресс.
25. Дейк, Т. А., ван, Кинч, В. (1988). *Стратегии понимания связного текста*. Москва: ИТДГК Гнозис.
26. Демьянков, В. П. (1979). *Интерпретация текста и стратегемы поведения: семантика языковых единиц и текста (лингвистические и психоллингвистические исследования)*. Москва: Ин-т языкознания АН СССР.
27. Жигадло, В. Н., Иванова, И. П., Иофик, Л. Л. (1956). *Современный английский язык: теоретический курс грамматики*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.
28. Звегинцев, В. А. (2001). *Предложение и его отношение к языку и речи*. Москва: Академия.
29. Зернецкий, П. В. (1987). *Лингвистические аспекты теории речевой деятельности: языковое общение*. Москва: Мысль.
30. Зимняя, И. А. (2001). *Лингвopsихология речевой деятельности*. Москва
31. Исаева, Л. А. (1996). *Виды скрытых смыслов и способы их представления в тексте*. Краснодар: КубГУ.
32. Карасик, В. И. (2002). *Язык социального статуса: социоллингвистический аспект; прагматический аспект; лингвосемантический аспект*. Москва: ИТДГК Гнозис.

33. Карасик, В. И. (1996). *О категориях дискурса: языковая личность: социолингвистические и эмотивные аспекты*. Волгоград-Архангельск: Едиториал УРСС.
34. Кацнельсон, С. Д. (2004). *Типология языка и речевое мышление*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.
35. Кобозева, И. М., Лауфер, Н. И. (1980). *Об одном способе косвенного информирования*. Москва: Изв. АН СССР.
36. Кобозева, И. М., Лауфер, Н. И. (1994). *Интерпретирующие речевые акты: логический анализ языка*. Москва: Мысль.
37. Кормилицына, М. А. (2000). *Рефлективы в речевой коммуникации*. Саратов: Академия.
38. Кронгауз, М. А. *«Воплощенное» и «невоплощенное» имя собственное: некоторые аспекты референции*. Москва: Наука.
39. Крым, И. А. (2004). *Жестовые компоненты речевой коммуникации (теоретико-экспериментальное исследование)*. Кемерово.
40. Лисоченко, Л. В. (1993). *Высказывание с имплицитной имплицитивной семантикой* (Автореферат диссертации доктора филологических наук). Краснодар.
41. Лурия, А. Р. (2004). *Основы нейропсихологии*. Москва: Академия.
42. Макаров, М. Л. (2003). *Основы теории дискурса*. Москва: ИТДГК Гнозис.
43. Маркова, Л. Ф. (1994). *Структура образцов речевого поведения: диалог глазами лингвиста*. Краснодар: КубГУ.

44. Масленникова, А. А. (1999). *Лингвистическая интерпретация скрытых смыслов*. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во С.-Петербург. ун-та.
45. Осинская, И. А. (2007). *Ироническое странничество. Ироник как сатирик и бог*. Москва: Идея-Пресс.
46. Остин, Дж. *Избранное*. Москва: Идея-Пресс.
47. Павиленис, Р. И. (1983). *Проблема смысла*. Москва: Мысль.
48. Падучева, Е. В. (2002). *Высказывание и его соотношенность с действительностью*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС.
49. Панфилов, В. П., Якушкин, Б. В., Исаев, М. И. (1983). *Онтология языка как общественного явления*. Москва: Академия.
50. Пенина, Т. П. (2003). *Ответные реплики с имплицитным содержанием несогласия в структуре диалогического текста (Автореферат диссертации кандидата филологических наук)*. Ставрополь.
51. Плотникова, С. Н. (2000). *Неискренний дискурс (в когнитивном и структурно-функциональном аспектах)*. Иркутск: Изд-во Иркутского государственного лингвистического ун-та.
52. Потенция, А. А. (2003). *Теоретическая поэтика*. Москва: Академия (СПб: Филологический факультет СПбГУ).
53. Пронников, В. А. (2001). *Язык мимики и жестов*. Москва: Наука.
54. Радзиевская, Т. В. (1992). *Текстовая коммуникация. Текстобразование*. Москва: Наука.
55. Рассел, Б. (1997). *Человеческое познание, его сфера и границы*. Киев.

56. Романов, А. А. (1988). *Системный анализ регулятивных средств диалогического общения*. Москва: Книга.
57. Рубакин, Н. А. (1977). *Психология читателя и книги*. Москва: Книга.
58. Рябова, М. Ю. (2007). *Анализ грамматического строя английского языка*. Кемерово: Кузбассвузиздат.
59. Рябцева, Н. К. (2002). *Мысль как действие, или риторика рассуждения: логический анализ языка: модели действия*. Москва: Наука.
60. Серль, Дж. (1986). *Что такое речевой акт*. Москва: Вып. 17: Теория речевых актов. – С. 39.
61. Серль, Дж. (1999). *Классификация иллокутивных актов*. Москва: Издательская группа «Прогресс».
62. Скребнев, Ю. М. (1971). *Общелингвистические проблемы описания синтаксиса разговорной речи*. Москва.
63. Старикова, Е. Н. (1991). *Уточнение как элементарная единица дискурса: прагматические аспекты функционирования языковых единиц*. Москва.
64. Сусов, И. П. (1984). *Коммуникативно-прагматическая лингвистика и ее единицы: прагматика и семантика синтаксических единиц*. Москва.
65. Сусов, И. П. (2007). *Язык и коммуникативное поведение*. Москва.
66. Филипс, Л. Дж., Йоргенсен, М. В. (2004). *Дискурс анализ. Теория и метод*. Москва: Изд-во Гуманитарный Центр.
67. Фуко, М. (1990). *Археология знания*. Киев.

68. Хабермас, Ю. (1989). *Понятие индивидуальности*. Краснодар: Вопросы философии.
69. Хаймс, Д. (1975). *Этнография речи*. Москва: Вып. 7: Социоллингвистика.
70. Чахоян, Л. П., Поспелова, А. Г. (1994). *Некоторые итоги и перспективы изучения единиц речевого общения: диалог глазами лингвиста*. Краснодар: КубГУ.
71. Чейф, У. Т. (1983). *Память и вербализация прошлого опыта*. Москва: Вып. 12: Прикладная лингвистика.
72. Шпербер, Д., Уилсон, Д. (1988). *Релевантность*. Москва: Вып. 8: Лингвистика текста.
73. Щедровицкий, Г. П. (1995). *Избранные труды*. Москва.
74. Bach, K., Harnish, M. R. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
75. Ballmer, T. T., Brennenstuhl, W. (1981). *Speech Act Classification: A Study in the Lexical Analysis of English Speech Activity Verbs*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
76. Brown, G., Yule, G. (1996). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge textbooks in linguistics.
77. Carlson, L. (1982). *Dialogue Games: An Approach to Discourse Analysis*. Boston: D. Reidel.
78. Coulthard, M. (1977). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman Group Ltd.

79. Coulthard, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
80. Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Van Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. New York: Longman Group Ltd.
81. Dijk, T. A. (1981). *Van Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse*. New York: Longman Group Ltd.
82. Edmondson, W. (1981). *Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
83. Fairclough, N. (2001). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
84. Fillmore, C. J. (1981). *Pragmatics and the Description of Discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
85. Halliday, M. A., Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
86. Harris, Z. S. (1952). *Discourse analysis*. London: Longman.

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

1. Bevan T., Fellner E., Cavendish J., & Maguire S. (2001). *Bridget Jones' Diary* [film]. UK: StudioCanal.
2. Cherry, M., Skouras C., Hagen S., Cunningham A., Gorenberg J., Etten K., Stern T., Lin P., Weisman A., & Grossman D. (2004-2012). *Desperate Housewives* [comedy-drama]. USA: Universal Studios Hollywood Production.
3. Fielding, H. (1996). *Bridget Jones' Diary*. UK: Picador.
4. Srubshchik I., Slater C., Malek R., & Weide R. B. (2015-2019). *Mr Robot* [TV-series]. USA: Universal Cable Production.
5. Stanton, R. (2017, April 18). Highest and hardest glass ceiling. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.latimes.com/projects/la-na-all-things-clinton/>.
6. Stanton, R. (2018, June 28). Money money money. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.latimes.com/projects/la-na-all-things-clinton/>.
7. Stanton, R. (2016, August 21). Wage war. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.latimes.com/projects/la-na-all-things-clinton/>.
8. Stanton, R. (2014, May 5). Wage war. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.latimes.com/projects/la-na-all-things-clinton/>.
9. Vinerd, K. (2012, October 14). Somalis in the UK targeted with death threats and abuse after David Amess killing. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/politics>.

10. Vinerd, K. (2009, November 16). Vote for the right type of professionals or the poor will pay. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/politics>.

11. Vinerd, K. (2018, January 25). Who is Clinton? *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/politics>.