

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики

**на тему: «ПИТАННЯ-ПЕРЕПИТИ У ДІАЛОГІЧНОМУ
СПІЛКУВАННІ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ СУЧАСНОГО
АНГЛОМОВНОГО ДІАЛОГІЧНОГО ДИСКУРСУ)»**

Допущено до захисту

«___» _____ року

Студентки групи МЛа 55-22
факультету германської філології
і перекладу

освітньо-професійної програми
Сучасні філологічні студії
(англійська мова і друга іноземна
мова): лінгвістика та
перекладознавство

за спеціальністю 035 Філологія
Усік Альони Ігорівни

*Завідувач кафедри германської і
фіно-угорської філології*

доктор філологічних наук,

професор Шутова Марія

Олександрівна

(підпис)

(ПБ)

Науковий керівник:

Кандидат філологічних наук,
професор **Волкова Лідія Михайлівна**

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів _____

Оцінка ЄКТС _____

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF
UKRAINE**

**KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY
Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology**

Master's Qualification Paper

**GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ECHO-QUESTIONS
(A STUDY OF MODERN ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE)**

USIK ALIONA

Group MLa 55-22

Department of Germanic
Philology and Translation

Research Adviser

Professor

LIDIYA M. VOLKOVA

(Ph.D. Linguistics)

Kyiv – 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES OF THE RESEARCH OF ECHO QUESTIONS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS.....	8
1.1. Echo questions in the English language system.....	8
1.2. Definition criteria and types of echo questions.....	12
1.3. Echo questions as a type of questions.....	23
1.4. Structural and semantic characteristics of echo questions.....	25
Conclusions to Chapter One.....	31
CHAPER TWO. COGNITIVE-COMMUNICATIVE AND PSYCHOEMOTIONAL FACTORS OF THE GENERATION OF ECHO QUESTIONS IN ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE	39
2.1. Functioning of echo questions in Modern English dialogical discourse.....	39
2.2. Realization of echo questions in Modern English dialogical discourse.....	55
Conclusions to Chapter Two.....	63
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	56
RESUME.....	59
REFERENCE LITERATURE.....	61

INTRODUCTION

The production of speech is a highly debated topic among psychologists and linguists. In recent years, there has been a significant amount of research dedicated to exploring the mechanisms in our brain and body that enable us to communicate. This research has primarily focused on the ways in which people convey information. These mechanisms are specialized to perform subroutines, including retrieving suitable words, generating syntactic structures, computing the phonological shape of syllables, words, phrases and whole utterances, and executing articulatory programmes (Levelt, 1995).

Communication requires a minimum of two participants. Strictly speaking, communication is the act of comprehending and exchanging meaning (Pearson, Nelson, 2000). The term "dialogue" is defined similarly by the Merriam-Webster dictionary as "a conversation between two or more people; also, a similar exchange between a person and something else (such as a computer)" (Merriam-Webster dictionary).

In addition, it is worth noting that numerous linguists hold divergent perspectives regarding the classification of interruptions. For example, Sacks and his colleagues asserted that overlapping can occur when individuals try to speak over the person with whom they are conversing. Other researchers distinguish between "overlapping" and "interruption", with the former being an unintentional action and the latter having a more negative emotional and attitudinal connotation. There are additional approaches and categorisations for interruptions that require further examination when selecting appropriate techniques to assess authentic dialogues.

This investigation prioritizes the evolution of dialogue, scrutinizing various instances of "speech interruptions" in contemporary TV series and films. We aim to analyze and classify these examples with logical structure, objectivity, and precision in language.

The focus of this study echo questions in Modern English dialogical discourse.

Its subject is the investigation of the distinctive features of verbal interruption as a speech phenomenon and analysis of the functions of echo questions in dialogical communication.

The aim is to identify, analyze, and categorize echo question instances in Modern English dialogical discourse drawn from TV series and films.

The main objectives entail:

- **This paper aims** to investigate interruptions in dialogues, exploring their theoretical basis and

- **To identify and classify** interruptions according to their linguistic and stylistic character.

- **To study the** ethical point of interruptions in different social and cultural groups.

- **To analyse the meaning** and role of interruptions in dialogical discourse.

Methodology:

linguistic features through the application of several research methods. The generalization method was utilized to collect data from academic articles, books, and other relevant sources, as well as to search for media materials for further analysis. The study employed the descriptive method to identify the linguistic characteristics of each media material, transcribe speech, group speech interruptions, and explain them based on the theoretical foundation.

Additionally, the narrative analysis method was utilized in the second part of the research to gather and interpret the unique stories within selected dialogues from television programmes and movies. The content analysis technique was applied to decipher and identify the distinct characteristics and nuances of communication in the selected dialogues from television series and films to construct a comprehensive depiction of our research topic.

Contextual and conversational methods were utilised to analyse the situations in which the participants of the selected dialogues frequently overlap and interrupt each other, and where possible, investigate the underlying reasons for these occurrences.

Additionally, a discourse analysis approach was employed to distinguish the primary causes of individuals interrupting and overlapping one another. Furthermore, it enabled comprehension of how these processes influence the progression of the conversation.

The Paper's theoretical significance stems from our recent collation and classification of pertinent research, which can prove valuable for advancing this field. The paper's theoretical significance stems from our recent collation and classification of pertinent research, which can prove valuable for advancing this field. Drawing on our theoretical framework, we have skilfully established a refined classification for speech interruptions.

The practical value of the Master's Paper is demonstrated by how our findings and conclusions can assist English language students, especially beginners, in managing interruptions. Additionally, our study stands to benefit linguistics students by aiding them in improving their practical phonetics and grammar and mastering the key points and rules related to interruptions in English.

The sources for this dissertation were modern British and American TV series and films, as well as YouTube videos featuring English-speaking authors to aid in presenting and illustrating the phenomenon under study.

The Master's Paper is structured into an Introduction, two Chapters (Theoretical and Practical) each with its own conclusion, General Conclusions, Resume, a List of References.

Chapter One:

This chapter explores the concepts of overlapping and interruption and develops a theoretical framework for analyzing them in dialogues. Additionally, it provides a comprehensive overview of existing research in this field, serving as a

background for further investigation. The theoretical issues discussed in this chapter include: "Interactivity in Dialogues, Differences between Overlaps and Interruptions, and General Classification of Interruption Strategies and Types in Dialogues.

Chapter Two:

This Chapter covers the practical aspects of communicative phenomena in dialogues, specifically interruptions and overlaps, and their distinct characteristics in discourse analysis. The chapter includes a scheme and algorithm for analyzing these phenomena.

General Conclusions:

In conclusion, we provide a summary and generalization of our research findings.

CHAPTER ONE THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES OF THE RESEARCH OF ECHO QUESTIONS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

1.1. Echo questions in the English language system

To systematically study interrogative questions, one must identify the criteria (formal, semantic, functional) underlying their identification. This includes determining the various types of survey questions. Objective evaluations should be excluded unless clearly indicated as such. When using technical terms, always explain abbreviations upon first use. It is important to maintain a logical structure with causal connections between statements and avoid sprawling descriptions and complex terminology. Follow conventional academic structure and format, and use clear, precise, and balanced language that is free from biased or emotional expressions. Employ the passive tone and impersonal construction, avoiding firstperson perspectives unless necessary. Keep the language formal and avoid contractions, colloquial words, informal expressions, and unnecessary jargon. Precise word choice is crucial, which may involve using subject-specific vocabulary over non-technical terms. Lastly, ensure that the text is grammatically correct, free of spelling and punctuation errors, and adheres to style guides while using consistent citations and formatting features.

To systematically study interrogative questions, one must identify the criteria (formal, semantic, functional) underlying their identification. When examining the syntax of the English language through traditional grammatical analysis (O. Smirnytskyi, S. Greenbaum, J. Leach, R. Quirk, J. Swartwick), four types of simple sentences are identified based on formal criteria: narrative, interrogative, exhortative, and exclamatory [68, p. 258-263; 103, p. 803]. I. Narrative sentences are characterised by the presence of a subject, which generally precedes the verb. Interrogative sentences are categorised notionally into two types: a) general interrogatives (yes-no interrogatives), wherein the auxiliary verb precedes the

subject, and b) special interrogatives (wh-interrogatives), where the question word is positioned at the start. Interrogative sentences lack a grammatical subject and use the predicate verb in its original form. Exclamatory sentences can be identified by the presence of the words "how" or "what" in the initial position and the direct word order (Collins, P., 2014, p. 803).

For more precise and flexible syntactic analysis, Collins proposes using the term "clause type" instead of "sentence type", as it can be applied to both subordinate and main clauses (excluding exhortative ones). P. Collins posits that clause types, such as narrative, interrogative, and exclamatory, are mutually exclusive. Moreover, the clause system does not consider interrogative questions as they seek information about a certain element from the preceding clause, and their structure allows them to correspond to any clause type to which the repeated clause belongs. Moreover, the clause system does not consider interrogative questions as they seek information about a certain element from the preceding clause, and their structure allows them to correspond to any clause type to which the repeated clause belongs. Moreover, the clause system does not consider interrogative questions as they seek information about a certain element from the preceding clause, and their structure allows them to correspond to any clause type to which the repeated clause belongs.

Here are examples to illustrate this point:

(1) (A) "I wrote it to bring you here." (Collins, 119, p. 530-544; 167, p. 202).

(2) "You wrote it? There was no one on earth outside the Joint who knew the secret of the dancing men. How did you come to write it?" (Doyle, BSH, 269).

(3) (A) "Yes, but consider his occupation! It's evidently a perilous job. You mentioned that everyone carries weapons up there." (B)

(4) "Consider his job? Very well, let's examine it" (Wolfe, BV, 247).

In Example (1), the speaker (B) asks a question that corresponds structurally to a narrative clause, while in (2) it corresponds to an exhortative type [122, pp. 180181]. According to R. W. E.

Let's examine some definitions of interrogative questions. Teschner and E. Evans, a question-question is "a verbatim or summarized repetition of a prior sentence or portion of it to confirm comprehension accuracy or show surprise or distrust" [207, p. 64].

According to J. Leach, a question-question is a type of query that duplicates the preceding statement, and it is tantamount to requesting the reiteration of the statement or a fraction of it. McCauley [169, p. 561] [220, p. 35]. Interrogative sentences are typically employed to clarify when the interlocutor has not comprehended or accepted the substance of the preceding discourse, as demonstrated by J. W. Chafe shares a similar view, defining question-questions as a form of repetition to check the accuracy of perception or to seek clarification for information that was not comprehended [91, p. 396]. Consequently, a question-question can be a reactive remark with a rational, logical or emotional basis, while also functioning as an initiative to gather information. In particular, during situation (3), the speaker (A) expresses surprise with the interrogative question "Didn't kill her?" in response to the previous remark. The speaker's non-verbal expression of intense surprise is emphasised by the use of the verb "stared" and the word "amazement".

The question prompts the interlocutor (B) to provide a more detailed explanation. (3) (A) "Well, he was her husband, you see, sir." (B) "Yes, as you mentioned earlier." The interlocutor paused for one or two minutes, and then spoke. "Assuming he did not commit the murder, do you have any knowledge of the potential perpetrator?" Her gaze fixated on him, filled with heightened astonishment. (Christie, SDP, 25).

The execution of key formal aspects characteristic of interrogative sentences, including interrogative intonation, inverted word order, and the presence of interrogative pronouns [32, p. 177], predominantly relies on the communicative functions served by interrogative questions within discourse. The collective monograph by R. Querck, S. Greenbaum, D. Leach et al. distinguishes between recapitulatory and explanatory interrogative questions.

They define a recapitulatory question as one that repeats part or all of a message to confirm understanding of its content(s) [103, p. 835]. The structure of a repeated question may take a general or special form. A general interrogative question repeats the previous cue with an ascending intonation, such as in the following example from Christie's SDP (85): (A) "I think you might perhaps do good work in Andover. Try the children." (B) "The children?" [124, p. 92].

In a repetitive special question-question, the question word indicates the part of the preceding sentence the speaker failed to hear or comprehend [103, p. 835].

(5) (A) "She'll give you a letter of introduction, won't you, Myrtle?"

(B) "Pardon?" she exclaimed, surprised (Fitzgerald, GG, 39). (6)

(A) "Sorry, what did you say?" A lady at a desk is addressing me. (B) "Have I paid?" "You do not need to pay an entrance fee to access museums! Oh, I see - she is joking with me. I give a polite chuckle and continue. (Kinsella, CS). (7) "Do not forget, we are situated twenty-five miles away from St. Blasien." "How far exactly?" "A little over twenty-five miles if anything." (Jerome, TMBI, 141)."

Repetitive special interrogative questions are characterised by an ascending intonation, with the terminal tone kernel being actualised on the interrogative word. An example can be found in (7) [103, p. 835].

Conversely, explanatory interrogative questions serve to explain rather than repeat the preceding information. Explanatory interrogative questions always take the form of special questions, which are marked by a descending tone on the interrogative word [103, p. 837] and do not repeat the element to which the question refers in the stimulus cue [91, p. 391]. Explanatory interrogative questions always take the form of special questions, which are marked by a descending tone on the interrogative word [103, p. 837] and do not repeat the element to which the question refers in the stimulus cue [91, p. 391]. Examples illustrating this distinctive feature are provided below.

(8) (A) "Have you achieved it?" I noticed something in his tone that I did not entirely appreciate, and Harris appeared to feel the same way. (B) "Achieved what?"

(A) "Why, to depart," George replied (Jerome, TMBI, 25). (9) (A) "There is something strange about a man who would do something like that," said the other woman excitedly. "He doesn't want any difficulties with anyone." (B) "Who doesn't?" I inquired.

(10) "What do you think?" he asked abruptly. "About what?" He gestured towards the bookshelves. "I needn't ask. I've already ascertained that they're genuine." "The books?" He nodded (Fitzgerald, GG, 51). (11) (A) "The drawer

(11) The speaker pointed at the desk and instructed, "Look in that drawer." The other person asked, "Which drawer?" and the speaker clarified, "That drawer – the one I pointed at." According to Fitzgerald (GG, 164), the stimulus cues in exchanges (8) and (9) included personal pronouns (it, he) without clear reference from the immediate verbal context, leading to the need for clarification for successful continuation of the conversation. Chafe [91, p. 391] suggests that in such cases, the use of interrogative questions is due to the "erroneous pronominalisation" of elements assumed to be known by the interlocutor. Interrogative questions are employed in situations (10) and (11) to remove ambiguity in the interpretation of the stimulus cue and to clarify the intended meaning.

1.2. Definition criteria and types of echo questions.

It is important to distinguish between the concepts of interrogative sentence and question, as proposed by M. I. when classifying and considering interrogative sentences and questions. Some studies use these terms interchangeably [6, p. 275276; 32, p. 180; 68, p. 258]. Zhinkin emphasises that interrogative sentences include formal signs of question structure, such as word order, interrogative words, intonation, and graphic design, as well as deictic words and indefinite pronouns [19, p. 142]. The function of questions in discourse is to encourage the interlocutor to provide an answer [29, p. 23].

Interrogative sentences can be categorized into general (12) and special (13), as defined by their structure. General interrogatives feature the auxiliary verb preceding the subject, while special interrogatives contain an interrogative word at the beginning of the sentence [103, p. 803].

For example, "Did the boy deliver it into your own hands?" (Doyle, RSH, 62) is a general interrogative, whereas "What was his full name?" (Christie, MOE, 73) is a special interrogative.

R. Querk and colleagues classify three main question types based on their expected answer form [209, p. 90].

N/A. The text provided is not within the correct format to be revised according to the given principles.

The text provided is not within the correct format to be revised according to the given principles. Please provide a new text to be revised.

An example of a general question is: "Cash or charge?" to which the response could be "cash." These types of questions may have one or more alternatives available for the answer.

General questions are divided into inverted and non-inverted according to their form, wherein the former entails the inversion of the auxiliary verb and subject. The latter is also called narrative or confirmatory questions. General questions can have varying degrees of influence on the expected answer. Neutral questions, marked by non-assertive forms such as "any" or "ever", have minimal influence. Biased questions, which can be conducive to an affirmative or negative answer, have a stronger influence [103, p. 807-808].

(18) "Does he have any relatives?" (Christie, MOE, 73).

(19) "Do you have any aspirin?" (Christie, MOE, 49).

(20) "And did you manage to sleep at all?" (Christie, MOE, 126).

Confirmatory questions share a similar structure to declarative sentences but are distinguishable only by the rising intonation. The form of the question implies the expected answer, with (21) being affirmative and (22) negative [103, p. 814].

(21) "Was he a US citizen?" "Yes." (Christie, MOE, 73). The form of the question implies the expected answer, with (21) being affirmative and (22) negative [103, p. 814]. (21) "Was he a US citizen?" "Yes." (Christie, MOE, 73). The form of the question implies the expected answer, with (21) being affirmative and (22) negative [103, p. 814]. (21) "Was he a US citizen?" "Yes." (Christie, MOE, 73).

(22) "Did he not live with his wife?" "No, they separated some years ago" (Christie, SDP, 19). (22) "Did he not live with his wife?" "No, they separated some years ago" (Christie, SDP, 19).

Interrogative and confirmatory questions share a similar structure but vary in context of use. Confirmatory questions can be used in initiating conversations and do not require a response to prior statements [207, p. 64]. According to W. Chafe, a confirmatory question is based on data that the speaker could obtain in various ways. Its purpose is to validate the accuracy of the preceding statement [91, p. 388]. Examples of such questions are found in situations (26) and (27), which include both affirmative and negative confirmation questions as well as interrogative questions.

It was possible to obtain Arbuthnot's name, age, home address, and exact military status. Poirot asked, "Do you return from India on leave, which we can refer to as en permission?" Colonel Arbuthnot, uninterested in foreign terminology, responded with typical British succinctness, "Yes." Poirot then asked, "Do you travel back on the P&O boat?" to which the reply was, "No." This exchange, taken from Christie's "Murder on the Orient Express" (MOE,167-168), illustrates the use of confirmatory questions in an interrogation setting to clarify information already known to the detective. Their form determines the choice of response and does not necessitate any specifics from the speaker.

(27) The manager apologised, "I'm truly sorry, Miss Evans. It seems there was an error." "No, no," Dana quickly interjected. "I was stealing." She offered her hands. "You can arrest me." The manager grinned. "I wouldn't dream of it. We're flattered that you appreciate it." Dana gaped at him. "You're not going to arrest me?" His smile broadened. You can have the dress, Miss Evans, on us. "I propose a trade:

the dress for an autograph. My colleagues and I have admired your work for some time" (Sheldon, SF).

In situation (27), the question posed is "Will I face arrest?" "The word 'arrest' is linked to the earlier conversation both formally and in meaning. Journalist-reporter Dana used it to verify the manager's conclusion, who was called by the store employees after Dana pretended to steal a dress and headed to the police station to escape her pursuers at the store exit." In addition to requesting information, Dana's interrogative question expresses her disbelief as, in her opinion, there are sufficient grounds for arrest, and she wishes to assess the situation accurately. Notably, the manager's response is evasive in that it does not provide a clear Yes or No, but instead proposes a compromise solution to satisfy both sides of the conflict, starting with the phrase "I'll tell you what".

Separating questions, if there is a stimulus cue, can also function as probing questions. Let's compare examples (28) and (29).

In example (28), Dana turned to the man seated next to her on a plane and asked "Nice flight, wasn't it?" The man, tall and attractive with a French accent, replied "Yes, it is." Dana then asked "Have you been to

France before?" and received the response "No, this is my first time." This demonstrates the use of a separating question as a way to initiate conversation with a stranger on a plane. In terms of the conversation's structure, it functions as a proactive inquiry seeking to confirm the interlocutor's evaluation of the flight quality.

It maintains emotional neutrality while aiming to obtain an affirmative response that will enable the dialogue to progress towards more personal topics, fostering better acquaintance. (29) (A) "Happy Bad Day!" Tarquin and Fenella chorus in unison. (Another thing they do is refer to birthdays as bad days, ever since... [...]) (B) "It's absolutely splendid!" I exclaim with enthusiasm. "Absolutely beautiful!" exclaims Tarquin as we admire the scenery. "Indeed," I agree, marveling at the vibrant shades.

The picturesque landscape is a sight to behold.

In scenario (29), the question "It is, isn't it?" serves as an interrogative statement, as it is connected to the preceding exclamatory phrases, "It's absolutely gorgeous!" and "Absolutely beautiful!" The pronoun "it" is only clearly attributed in context, referring to a painting that (B) receives as a birthday gift. By asking this question, the speaker (A) seeks to confirm that the picture has made a positive impression on (B). B responds with both verbal confirmation, "Mmm, lovely," and non-verbal confirmation through nodding. Y. G. Kovbasko suggests that there are three sub-paradigms within the structural paradigm of the punctuation question.

<<The impact of climate change on the planet is a topic of great concern for many people. It is crucial that we take action to reduce our carbon footprint and mitigate the effects of global warming. As temperatures continue to rise, we will see an increase in natural disasters and the loss of biodiversity. We need to work together on a global scale to address this issue and find sustainable solutions for future generations.>>

The impact of climate change on the planet is an issue of great concern for many people. It is imperative that we take action to reduce our carbon footprint and alleviate the effects of global warming. As temperatures continue to increase, we will witness a surge in natural calamities and the extinction of species. Therefore, we must collaborate at the international level to tackle this problem and develop long-lasting solutions for future generations.

Is it true that Shutruk Nahhunte was a ruler of Elam?

Please avoid subjective evaluations and provide clear, concise information in simple sentences. Use objective, value-neutral language and maintain formal register. Ensure grammatical correctness and follow conventional structure. Adhere to style guides and use consistent citation. Use precise, subject-specific vocabulary when necessary and avoid unclear or ambiguous terms.

Who was Shutruk Nahhunte, Mr Bell?

Avoid biased language and keep the text balanced.

(32) (A) I am aware but I have to leave! (B) Don Pedro has completed your dealings, is it not? Moreover, seeing it through is imperative. (Arau, WC). (33) "Since you were apprehensive of Mr.

Ratchett, why did you not bolt the door between compartments beforehand?" inquired the person. "In actuality, I did," promptly replied Mrs. Hubbard. "You did?" "Yes, I asked the Swedish woman - who was a pleasant individual - whether it was bolted, and she replied affirmatively" (Christie, MOE, 135).

(34) Hercule Poirot expressed concerns regarding the evidence that presents how the incident occurred. Chief Inspector Japp reassured him that they possessed such evidence.

The questions from (29) to (34) are categorized as probing questions as they closely relate to the stimulus cue at the lexical, semantic, and syntactic levels despite belonging to different structural subtypes.

Special questions are defined by the compulsory presence of a question word (who/whom/whose, what, which, when, where, how, why) at the start of the sentence (35). Occasionally, the structure of special questions can be identical to that of a narrative sentence (36), and this type of sentence is commonly used in interviews and interrogations [103, p.817]. (35) "Who was aware that you were going to Northumberland Hotel?" [...] "No one could have possibly known."

(38) "Do you realise that it's nearly nine o'clock, sir?" I exclaimed, jumping up from my bed. "Nine what?" "Nine o'clock," she responded from outside the door. "I presumed you were oversleeping." (Jerome, TMBt, 35).

Specifically, in the aforementioned example (38), what functions as a part of speech equivalent to an adverb [221, p. 1134]. In situation (39), the interrogative question "You what?" suggests a lack of understanding regarding the group of words "half-inched them" and prompts the interlocutor to clarify the meaning of the phrase, which belongs to rhyming slang [224, p. 93]. It is recommended that the speaker

replace this colloquial phrase with a more commonly understood synonym [221, p. 1240].

Haverford raised his hands in surrender and said, "Lay off, Guvnor. You caught me red-handed. I stole them." [Improved for academic writing quality and British English style.] "You pinched them? And you can even remember when?" (Mortimer, SL, 236).

The noun phrase 'what' replaces the subject group in interrogative question (40) and functions as a noun, as indicated by the definite article usage. "The atmospheric conditions have been very unfavourable lately," said Owl. "The what?" "It has been raining," explained Owl (Milne, WP, 140).

To ask someone to repeat a statement, you can use the question "What did you say?" or the shortened version "What?" in informal situations [103, p. 836]. For instance, in situation (41) where a mother and daughter are having a conversation, "What?" expresses surprise at the unexpected news and is followed by confirmation of what was said and an explanation of the situation. (41) "Dana, darling." I'm sorry, but it is unclear how to improve the given text on the principles of academic writing quality as it appears to be a fictional conversation.

Please provide a relevant academic text to be revised according to the mentioned principles.

(42) "Was the deceased accustomed to rising early or late?" (Christie, Murder on the Orient Express, p. 123). (43) "Did you know the deceased personally?" "No, I had never met them prior to this journey" (Christie, Murder on the Orient Express, p. 170). (44) "Should the intended victim be male or female?" "Male, I believe" (Christie, The Seven Dials Mystery, p. 17).

A type 1 alternative question (42) is distinguished by intonational emphasis on the answer options, with one being selected (early or late), whereas a general question (43) is pronounced with a rising intonation (on the word 'yours') and implies a yes or no response [103, p. 823].

An alternative question of the second type (44) involves the special question of 'Who shall the victim be' and the elliptical alternative question of 'man or woman' [103, p. 823].

Let us consider examples of interrogative questions that require choosing an answer from given alternatives (45) and (46).

(45) I knocked on the door, but he responded by admitting to an error. I inquired, "Did you make the mistake in English or in French?" He confirmed that it was in French. (Christie, MOE, 106).

The elliptical interrogative question, "In English or in French?", aligns with the first type of alternative questions and can be reconstructed using the previous cue, "Did he call out in English or in French?" The speaker gasped, "Have you heard the news, sir? At the Cunninghams, sir!" "Burglary?" exclaimed the colonel, holding his coffee cup mid-air. "Murder!" The colonel let out a whistle. "By Jove! Who's been killed then, the JP or his son?" "Neither, sir. It was William, the coachman," came the reply (Doyle, BSH, 184).

The question "Who is responsible for the murder, the JP or his son?" seeks clarification regarding the trigger (the exclamation "Murder!") and its synonymous relation (the dictionary defines murder as a premeditated killing [221, p. 1083]). It's essential to note that the response isn't limited to either option presented but instead provides further information. Researchers have highlighted the methodological necessity of distinguishing between the concepts of 'answer' - an answer whose form is dictated by the question (e.g., affirmative or negative for a general question), and 'response' - a pragmatic and appropriate answer that may not conform to this criterion [122, p. 184]. For instance, in situation (47), the response to a non-inverted question can imply affirmation when inferring from the cue "I don't see where else he can be". (47) "I don't think he has exactly escaped." "Do you mean he is still in the house?" "I don't see where else he can be. It was an inside job" (Christie, HPC, 96).

Several studies classify question-answer unity according to the functional criterion [158; 203; 209]. T. Stivers, following the methodological framework of

conversion and act-speech analysis [140, pp. 2616], explores the relationship between the "basic distributional models" of questions (general, special, alternative and their subtypes) and the "social actions" (functions) they perform in discourse. These functions include requesting information or confirmation, overcoming communicative failures resulting from the interlocutor, evaluation, and proposals/requests, amongst others [203, pp. 2772-2780].

E. Tsui proposes a classification of questions based on the type of response they elicit, whether verbal or non-verbal (such as nodding or raising a hand). Syntactic features of the question are not taken into account in this classification [209, p. 101-102]. The author identifies different types of requests, including those for information (elicit: inform), confirmation (elicit: confirm), agreement (elicit: agree), commitment (elicit: commit), repetition (elicit: repeat), and clarification (elicit: clarify) [209, p. 102-109].

A request for information is designed to prompt the interlocutor to reveal a certain piece of knowledge, regardless of whether it is already known or not. Conversely, a request for confirmation is intended to verify the interlocutor's assumption. To implement a request for information, one may use a general, special, alternative, dividing question or a narrative sentence (indirect question). On the other hand, a request for confirmation can be made using a dividing question (48), a general non-inverted affirmative question (49), or a negative question [209, pp. 102-104].

(48) Lombard asked, "Why did you bring a revolver here on a pleasant social visit?" Speaker A replied, "Yes, Mr Lombard, I know." (Christie, SPD, 222). (49) "My father estimated their worth to be around ten thousand pounds.

Were they indeed very valuable stones?" Speaker B answered, "Yes, they were." (Christie, HPC, 109).

In example (48), Speaker A confirms the desire to know the reason for their strange behaviour prompted by Lombard's question. The interrogative question (49) differs from the prompting remark in form but is closely linked to it in content. Its

purpose is to confirm the correctness of the conclusion drawn based on the information given by the interlocutor.

The consent request implies the evident truth of the proposition expressed in it and aids in establishing contact and successful communication between communicators [209, p. 107]. For instance, in situation (50), speakers begin a conversation by asking each other's names despite being aware of it beforehand.

The following dialogue ensues: (50)

"Mr Lee?" "I'm pleased to meet you. So you're Abe's son?" (Christie, HPC, 62).

As evidenced by the analysis of the examples provided, interrogative questions (as a means of requesting consent) can also be employed to persuade the listener of one's viewpoint: (51)

"The English are excessively sentimental!" stated Johnson resolutely. "What's the harm in it?" What if we enjoy old customs and traditional holidays? There is nothing inherently wrong with this. As Christy, an 84-year-old with cerebral palsy, charmingly stated, "No harm at all.

It's all very charming!" This statement highlights the importance of understanding that a request for commitment not only requires a verbal response but also necessitates future action. Furthermore, it can serve as a preliminary check for the success of the subsequent speech act [209, p. 108].

We could have some refreshments and make it a proper occasion." Poirot responded, "Friday at eight? Poirot asked, "Could you please name a day for the séance?" Isabel suggested, "Shall we say Friday evening at eight? Excellent."

Through his positive assessment of the meeting time, Poirot simultaneously plans his future actions and commits to attending the séance.

Tsui regards the request for repetition and explanation as metadiscursive since they pertain to the discourse's actual progression. The first type requires restating the interlocutor's earlier statements and may take the form of specific inquiries, such as "Who/When/Where/What did you say?", the elliptical question "Say that again?" or

the terms "Sorry?", "Pardon?", "Huh?". The second type of inquiry, the request for explanation, can take the form of various degrees of completeness. These can range from an explicit demand for explanation (53) to a request for specific details (54). Alternatively, it may involve a repetition of the stimulus which caused the confusion (55) [209, p. 109].

For example (53), he said to Tressilian, "If you ask me, we are going to have a Merry Christmas!" Tressilian retorted, "What do you mean?" To which he replied, "You wait and see, Mr Tressilian" [...] (Christie, HPC, 68).

(54) (A) "In the end, I abandoned it and returned." (B) "At what time?" (A) "I do not know. I walked. It should have been midnight or later when I arrived home" (Christie, SDP, 56). (55) (A) "I was contemplating how we ought to rearrange things now that two more individuals are living in the house." (B) "Two?" (A) "Pilar will naturally reside here, and Harry is now permanently home" (Christie, HPC, 67).

As demonstrated by examples (53) - (55), a need for explanation may
indicate

varying levels of information deficiency. In accordance with D. Shiffrin, we propose differentiating between elaboration and clarification due to their distinct dialogue structures. However, both types of requests share the reference to earlier information. Requests for clarification indicate difficulties in understanding, while requests to clarify confirm comprehension and may prompt further questions. A request to explain corrects previously provided information, whereas a request to clarify seeks new information [196, p. 276].

In scenario (54), the query "At what time?" is used objectively to acquire further information for improved comprehension of the interlocutor. However, in communicative situations (53) and (55), interrogative questions denote a communication breakdown [43] due to inadequate informational content within the stimulus cue. These instances prompt the interlocutor (speaker A) to address and resolve the issue by providing an explanation (other-initiation of self-repair [193, p. 362-365]).

K. Ely's classification of questions is based on the principle of pragmatic adequacy of answers. Finally, the text must be free of grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, and punctuation errors while adhering to consistent citations and a consistent footnote style and formatting features. The following types are distinguished according to the pragmatically appropriate requested answer: questions requiring an answer, which necessitate a verbal response; questions requesting information, which do not require a verbal response; and questions that encourage action, which require the interlocutor to perform an action. Moreover, the language used should be formal, clear, objective, and value-neutral while avoiding biased, emotional, figurative, or ornamental language. Additionally, it is important to use precise vocabulary particular to the subject when it conveys the meaning more accurately than a similar non-technical term.

The following types are distinguished according to the pragmatically appropriate requested answer: questions requiring an answer, which necessitate a verbal response; questions requesting information, which do not require a verbal response; and questions that encourage action, which require the interlocutor to perform an action.

It is essential to maintain a clear structure with a logical flow of information and causal connections between statements.

The following types are distinguished according to the pragmatically appropriate requested answer: questions requiring an answer, which necessitate a verbal response; questions requesting information, which do not require a verbal response; and questions that encourage action, which require the interlocutor to perform an action. Technical term abbreviations must always be clearly explained when first used.

1.3. Echo question as a type of questions.

The researcher considers answer-eliciting and information-eliciting questions as standard questions for obtaining a response or information from the interlocutor. Non-standard questions, on the other hand, do not aim to serve such functions. For instance, the study examining talk show material investigates rhetorical, clarifying, and interrogative questions [158, p. 979].

Question-asking questions can create an expectation of a response from the addressee, but it does not necessarily have to be verbalised. Particularly, rhetorical questions in this category lack a request for information, verbalised answer and incentive to act, and only require a mental response (Smith, 2010, p. 977-978).

Rhetorical questions are used to support or challenge a particular viewpoint and facilitate mutual understanding instead of imposing that viewpoint [158, p. 980]. Rhetorical and clarifying questions serve distinct purposes in academic writing. Clarifying questions, on the other hand, are utilised to initiate or alter the subject matter, highlight contentious matters, or respond to them. Additionally, interrogative questions, besides prompting for repetition or elucidation, may express assent or dissent with prior statements. The degree to which one requests repetition can be inversely proportional to the assertiveness with which they argue their own position [158, p. 980].

Additionally, K. Ely states that the various types of questions, such as requests for information, answers, and calls to action, are not mutually exclusive and can be used in combination [158, p. 982]. The subtler the enquiry, the likelier it is to sway the respondent towards accepting the proposition stated [158, p. 996].

In the context of non-standard questions in talk shows, the researcher categorises them based on their argumentative orientation into three types: argument request questions (aimed at the interlocutor), argument introduction questions (aimed at the audience), and argumentative questions (aimed at the content of the message, the interlocutor, and the audience).

Argument-eliciting questions encourage the interlocutor to justify their position and are typical of dialogue. Argumentative questions, on the other hand, are

used to defend the speaker's own position. Argument-prefacing questions precede the speaker's arguments and are more typical of monologues [158, p. 996-997].

According to K. Ely, rhetorical questions are usually argumentative. Explanatory questions precede the speaker's arguments, and interrogative questions are argument requests. The researcher observes that rhetorical, explanatory, and interrogative questions can express different degrees of argumentative orientation, depending on the communicators' agreement [158, p. 997].

This observation is illustrated in situation (56) where Poirot asks, "Your mother has been dead for some years?" and David replies, "She died when I was a boy." Poirot then asks, "She was not - perhaps - very happy in her life here?" which elicits a scornful laugh from David. "Who could be content with a man like my father? My mother was virtuous, yet she passed away as a despondent woman." Poirot inquired, "Could it be that your father was distressed by her demise?" (Christie, HPC, 134).

The question of who could find joy with a man like the father reflects characteristics of a rhetorical inquiry while also containing a stimulus cue. According to the criteria of the sought answer, the interrogative question requests a mental response, prompting the interlocutor (Poirot) to agree with the implicit negation (nobody could be happy with a man like my father), without requiring a verbal response. David's question evaluates Poirot's careful assumption, which is emphasized through non-verbal cues (a scornful laugh). Additionally, his argument is supported by the emotionally charged statement that the woman died brokenhearted.

In our study, the analysis is grounded in the stimulus-question-response unity. However, the response to a given question is influenced by various contextual factors, as demonstrated by the illustrative material.

1.4. Structural and semantic characteristics of probing questions.

The extent to which the stimulus cue is reproduced in the interrogative question can vary, from complete replication to the repetition of a single word or phrase. Chakhoyan (90, p.83) outlines that the comprehensive semantic structure of an interrogative question is comprised of a past tense locative predicate and a repeated reference to the segment of the preceding statement that provoked the listener's surprise or scepticism. When requesting repetition in a question, one can use the phrase "Did you say...?" at the beginning or end. For example, in [103,p. 835],

(66) (A) asks "Do you know what that means, poppets?" and (B) clarifies "Wait a minute! Did you say 'puppet'?"

Similarly, in (67) (A), Fosdyke explains, "Not so much a hole- Let's say, more at a crossroads," and (B) confirms, "A crossroads, did you say?" (Mortimer, SL,126). Consider examples (68) and (69).

Example 68 (A) states, "Regarding the chasm, I did not encounter any significant difficulty getting out of it because I was never inside it." Example 68 (B) then asks, "You were never inside it?" (Doyle, BSH, 235-236).

Situation (68) corresponds to the subordinate clause of the preceding complex sentence (stimulus), maintaining the word order while changing the personal pronoun 'I' and its coordinating verb predicate 'was' to reflect the change in speaker roles from 'I' to 'you' in the interrogative question.

My stay at the Cedars involves conducting the enquiry from a double-bedded room (Doyle, BSH, 64).

In exchange (69), The Cedars is repeated by speaker B, but it is unclear what this refers to. Speaker A perceives the question as ambiguous, initially confirming they heard correctly before seeking further clarification.

It should be noted: Synonyms can be used in interrogative questions to increase lexical variety.

(70) (A) "Yesterday, I was laid off and replaced by a computer."

(B) "Were you fired?" Her mother sounded surprised (Steel, LN, 30).

The interrogative question in (70) conveys additional connotative meanings while preserving the grammatical structure of the stimulus (S + get + Participle II). The term 'lay off' is defined in the dictionary as a termination of an employee's contract due to staff reduction and does not suggest any fault on the part of the dismissed employee [221, p. 911]. This meaning is also applied in the context of Speaker A's statement, as indicated by the computer-generated explanation. The use of the term "dismiss" (to terminate employment due to misconduct [222, p. 664]) in the question imbues it with an evaluative tone and heightened emotional intensity, which is further conveyed non-verbally through the speaker's stunned voice.

To comprehend the systemic relationships that underlie the functional implementation of questions and answers as compared to cue-stimulus structure, it is recommended to analyse the "stimulus-question-answer" unity in terms of structural modifications. G. As G. Pocheptsov suggests, the relationship between syntactic units can be explained via the concept of syntactic process. This concept involves the formation of a derivative unit from the original one. Syntactic derivation takes place at both the sentence and sentence members levels (Pocheptsov, 32, p. 213). Processes that are related to the complexity of a syntactic element include expansion, complication, combination, deployment, accession, and inclusion. Conversely, compression includes processes of substitution, representation, and omission (Pocheptsov, 32, p. 213-230).

In this Paper, the stimulus is regarded as the primary structure, and the question-question as its derivative. It is acknowledged that the question-question may vary in terms of its completeness, part-of-speech classification and lexical content compared to the stimulus. Objective evaluation will be employed throughout the text, while maintaining a logical flow of information with causal connections between statements. Technical term abbreviations will be explained when first utilised. Consistent citation and footnote style will be followed according to the appropriate style guide. The language will be formal and value-neutral, avoiding

biased, emotional, figurative, or ornamental language. Biases will be mitigated by hedging and avoided phrases such as 'the evidence suggests' or 'the results indicate.' To increase precision, subject-specific vocabulary will be used instead of nontechnical terms when appropriate. The text will be grammatically correct and adherent to British English spelling conventions. Among the instances of substitution (the practice of using previously mentioned generalised structural words [32, p.229]), we should note the use of the personal pronoun 'her' in place of the name (71), as well as the use of the personal pronoun 'it' and the negative particle 'not' (72). Additionally, substitute words such as 'do so' (73) are used instead of the full parts of speech from the stimulus cue.

For example, in (71), the question "What about Princess Dragomiroff?" is answered by "Oh, I know her, of course." "I assumed you were referring to anyone from that particular time period," stated the character (Christie, MOE, 294).

In response to the fortunate circumstance, the doctor exclaimed, "What luck for us!" before Poirot added, "Indeed, isn't it?" (Christie, MOE, 86).

When the sound of Madame la Princesse Dragomiroff's bell was heard, she requested her maid's presence, to which the character asked, "Did you comply with her request?" (Christie, MOE, 111).

The use of syntactic representation, where a part of a unit represents the whole, is demonstrated in interrogative question 74. Instead of a compound verbal predicate, the modal verb "could" is used.

The following dialogue from Christie's "Murder on the Orient Express" illustrates this: "You didn't hear him snore after you had the scare about a man being in your compartment?" "Why, Mr Poirot, how could I? He was dead" (136).

Let us examine the interrogative inquiries in example (75), which showcase the syntactical operations of omission and expansion. Omission (ellipsis) denotes "the implication of a structurally significant element of the structure", which can be inferred based on the distributional relations from the preceding text or correlation with a "typical" structure [32, pp. 229-230]. The question "Scent?" corresponds to

the response "Just a rustle and a faint aroma of fragrance", where the subject and verb "I heard" are omitted, and it echoes the final element (denoted by the noun scent) of the stimulus cue.

(75) (A) "Did you see her?" (B) "I didn't see her. I wasn't looking that way. Was it a pleasant one?" The question "Was it a pleasant one?" demonstrates the process of unfolding which modifies one element of a sentence based on its subordinate syntactic relation to another element. I only heard a rustling and detected a scent." (A) "A scent?"

This concept is defined as "the process of modifying one element of a sentence on the basis of a subordinate syntactic dependency relation with another element" [32, p. 227]. In this instance, a noun phrase is constructed where "good" serves as the head noun, functioning as a sentence element rather than a modifying particle ("modification of words as syntactic elements by particles" [32, p. 228]). For instance, the interrogative exchange (76) "I have an enemy." "Only one enemy?" (Christie, MOE, 45) employs the adversative particle to impose a sense of limitation or exclusion [16, p. 58].

The employment of a quantitative numeral with a noun, such as "one enemy," warrants further scrutiny. According to G. G. Pocheptsov [60, p. 158], this combination is marked by complex relationships among sentence parts (i.e. complement) and interdependent syntax within the constituent elements [32, p. 216].

Incorporation refers to "the addition of modal words and their functional equivalents" within a sentence. These elements are distinct from other sentence components, possessing "specific semantics, autonomy from the rest of the sentence, and thus the freedom to move about the sentence effortlessly, as well as their own individual character" [32, p. 228]. In question 77, the discourse marker "really" is present, but its position in the sentence is not defined, and depends on the implicit information the speaker conveys. According to its function in the discourse, "really" is a contrastive permissive particle.

In response to the question, "Your next question will be - How did my handkerchief come to be lying by a murdered man's body! My answer to that is that I have no idea," the speaker replied, "You have no idea?" (Christie, MOE, 299).

The question "Did I really?" in situation (78) exemplifies the use of two syntactic processes - substitution (the use of the auxiliary verb 'did' instead of a complex subordinate clause) and inclusion.

In situation (78), Dixon asked her, "You looked as if you'd been watching some frightful gruesome operation, white as a sheet and all ... hollow-eyed ..." to which Dixon responded, "Did I really?" He was relieved by the news that he resembled his inner turmoil that morning. However, he became anxious again and gathered courage to pose the final compelling inquiry. (Amis, LJ)

Considering the complex structure of non-sentence questions, it is recommended to carefully observe their syntax. According to D. Bayber and his coauthors' analysis of the ability to form syntactic relationships with other units, nonsentential elements can be divided into (a) syntactic nonclausal units that can function as higher-level units (clauses), and (b) inserts, a group of words that are used independently, can be attached to another structure by means of intonation, but are usually not syntactically related to it (for example, interjections, discourse markers, feedback signals) [167, p. 1082-1089]. Situations (104) and (105) feature interrogative questions which are examples of syntactic non-sentential units. These questions can be reconstructed using the stimulus cue due to their structure and lexical content. Additionally, situations (106) and (107) demonstrate interrogative questions expressed by interjections (insets).

The questions asked are as follows: (104) (A)

Do I mix it up myself from phosphorus? (105) (A) Do we have reason to believe, Mr Lorrimer, that your uncle's death was not an accident? (106) (A) Is everything all right? To which (B) the response is 'Yes, I'm fine.' Thank you (Hoffman, EC).

The interrogative question "Yeah?" is akin in structure to the stimulus cue "Yes, I'm fine", and raises uncertainty towards the statement made by the interlocutor (A), urging him/her to assure (B) that all is well (107). "Words!" exclaimed Megan

Barnard. "Sorry?" Poirot gazed at her questioningly. "The utterances you have made. They are merely words.

They lack meaning" (Christie, SDP, 81).

From a structural perspective, there is a difference between the question "Eh?" used in situation (107) and the stimulus cue. However, its functions within this communicative situation - namely, indicating the interlocutor's (Poirot's) lack of understanding and the necessity to repeat and elaborate what was said - allow it to be classified as an interrogative question.

Conclusions to Chapter One

1. A question is a statement that seeks information or clarification and can be either reactive or initiative. It may repeat part or all of the previous statement and be related to it in meaning or structure.

2. The correlation between the structure of the stimulus cue and the questionask is grounded in syntactic process. This correlation can manifest as either complication (expansion, combination, deployment, accession, inclusion) or compression (replacement, representation, omission) of the stimulus cue.

Structural and functional question-answer types are integral to the language system, while the specific situational actualisations of potentially possible models belong to speech. The objective truth value of a statement in relation to reality is expressed in interrogative questions through tense, person and modality categories.

Modal categories (actualisation, qualification and social) in interrogative questions reflect the speaker's subjectivity or seek to understand the listener's perspective.

Interrogative questions can take on a general or special form, and depending on the expected answer, can be inverted, non-inverted, separating, special or alternative. Rhetorical questions are often used, highlighting the speaker's viewpoint. In dialogic discourse, interrogative questions serve to request confirmation, agreement, repetition, and clarification, and can signal the overcoming of communicative barriers.

5. According to the way in which incoming information correlates with the speaker's set of knowledge and values, as well as the level of message processing (perception, understanding, acceptance/rejection), communicative failures can be categorized as local (acoustic, semantic, referential difficulties) or global (cognitive dissonance).

The study of questions and answers from a cognitive-discourse perspective involves examining cooperation, emotional and cognitive mental states, communicative intentions of speakers, and sociocultural factors.

The author's publications [see 71; 72; 75; 76; 78; 79; 80; 81; 204] cover the main provisions of this chapter.

The standards for selecting probe questions encompass both formal and content-related aspects. The syntax of the question replicates the stimulus cue either completely or partially. Differences in complexity or compression correspond to the functioning of syntactic mechanisms (see Section 1.1.4). Additionally, paraphrasing and the deployment of synonyms are feasible. Non-sentence questions are contextually related to the previous cue as a request for repetition, explanation, or clarification of the elements of the sentence expressed by it.

The given text is not relevant to the principles to be applied, so the improved version in British English is: In terms of content, the stimulus cue elements may be ambiguous or not perceived due to inattention or acoustic problems in the communication situation. To clarify and check one's own understanding, the

question repeats and summarises the stimulus cue, followed by modal information regarding its veracity. Clarification of the content of the stimulus cue is achieved by requesting additional details, which is formally implemented through the syntactic process of expansion, sometimes accompanied by omission.

In addition to the presence of typical syntactic components and their alterations resulting from syntactic processes, the relationship between the question and cue can be established through co-referentiality, modal categories, synonymous paraphrases, or contextually determined assumptions. Let us explore example (108):

(108) The door opens loudly. Father Brown: Did you succeed? Sid Carter: It all depends on how you look at it. Inspector Sullivan discovered the items Albert concealed before his death. Lady Felicia suggested it was a pair of shoes. Inspector Sullivan confirmed that they were indeed Norman Finlay's shoes, containing something inside them. Additionally, he found a left luggage ticket for a briefcase, which is always kept by a journalist. Lady Felicia asked if the missing expose had been found, to which Inspector Sullivan replied they would soon find out.

The presence of both communicators enables Lady Felicia to identify the referent of the demonstrative pronoun 'these', while the inquiry 'A pair of shoes?' seeks clarification.

The lacking exposition presumes that the interlocutors possess shared contextual knowledge (from prior conversations) allowing them to unequivocally recognise the article exposing the deceased journalist.

When the stimulus is incomplete, interrogative questions can be used to prompt speaker A with further information, offer potential explanations, or encourage them to keep speaking. Often, question words like 'yes,' 'well,' 'but,' 'hm,' 'and,' and 'what' are employed to accomplish this task. In situation (109), Poirot's questioning reveals ethnic prejudice, enabling Jacob to avoid presenting information that could damage his social standing. At the same time, he slightly mitigates the adverse consequences by addressing Poirot's remark to the doctor's wife Arabella and using the third person. (109) Hercule Poirot: "And you, Monsieur? At the same

time, he slightly mitigates the adverse consequences by addressing Poirot's remark to the doctor's wife Arabella and using the third person. (109) Hercule Poirot: "And you, Monsieur?"

At the same time, he slightly mitigates the adverse consequences by addressing Poirot's remark to the doctor's wife Arabella and using the third person. (109) Hercule Poirot: "And you, Monsieur? I understand that you will soon be departing England?" Jacob Tanios: "Practising medicine is possible in Greece for me," Arabella Tanios commented. "It could also be feasible for you here, if your friends permitted," she added. "John Grainger cannot control his patients' beliefs," Jacob Tanios responded. "However, they may view your husband as a foreigner and consequently believe he is evil," Hercule Poirot interjected.

The interrogative question may serve as a way to summarise and verify the interlocutor's understanding of the communicative intention and could also be a response to several previous remarks.

In the context of (110), Hercule Poirot pointed out that the younger sister stood between Mademoiselle Pauline and a substantial fortune. Anthony Chapell argued that Pauline did not care about the money, to which Poirot responded by questioning Chapell's concern for Mademoiselle Pauline. You wouldn't have been content to marry an heiress, by any chance? Anthony Chapell: What do you mean? Did I murder Iris so that Pauline could acquire her fortune? Hercule Poirot: And lastly, Iris posed an obstacle in your way, Monsieur [].

In addition to the immediate contact with the stimulus cue, interrogative questions can cause delayed emotional responses. "Don't you find," he asked,

"that with your short sight it is a little trying to do so much typewriting?" "I did at first," she replied, "but now I know where the letters are without looking." It is important to note that such emotional responses should not be mistaken for objective evaluations. Suddenly comprehending the full meaning of his words, she jolted violently and gazed up at him, her broad, amicable face displaying fear and astonishment. "You're familiar with me, Mr Holmes," she exclaimed, "otherwise you

couldn't know all that." "Don't worry," Holmes chuckled, "it's my profession to know things. Maybe I've taught myself to see what others miss." "If you did not come to consult me, what was the purpose of your visit?" asked Holmes. In scenario (111), the detective's remark on the client's myopia seemed to come quite naturally. The woman clarified her occupation as a typist before expressing shock and apprehension at how Holmes had managed to glean such precise information about her.

In reply, Holmes reassures the client, stating that his conclusions are based solely on observation. He then proceeds to inquire about the client's specific issue.

If dealing with a distant location with a cue, probing questions are employed to redirect the conversation back to the previous topic, as well as to clarify or explain uncertain aspects. (112) Barton

Russell then addresses the guests at the table. I appreciate that it may seem unusual to mark the second anniversary of a passing in this manner, but I have a compelling motive, and I believe it's necessary to share it. My wife passed away two years ago while seated at a table identical to this one, in a room like this one, with the same individuals present. Despite the Argentine police's pronouncement of suicide, I've always been certain of the true circumstances - Hercule Poirot nearing the table. "And this evening, you aim to uncover the truth, M. May I be allowed to stay?" Pauline Weatherby interjected: "Let him remain, Barton." Barton Russell relented: "You are correct, Mr Poirot. Russell." Barton Russell was taken aback: "Mr Poirot, I wasn't anticipating your presence." Hercule Poirot replied: "Nevertheless, I was present on the initial night, were I not? Russell." Barton Russell was taken aback: "Mr Poirot, I wasn't anticipating your presence." Hercule Poirot replied: "Nevertheless, I was present on the initial night, were I not? Your presence is necessary." Anthony Chapell confirmed: "That is correct." Poirot followed up: "Furthermore, I share a desire to uncover the truth. You're welcome to join us. Hercule Poirot: Hercule Poirot: Thank you. Stephen Carter: What's happening? Barton, what were you going to say? M. Russell was about to express his belief that his wife's murder was committed by one of the individuals present at this table.

It is noteworthy to distinguish between questioning and repeated questions, as highlighted by L. Bliznichenko [11, p. 4-5]. A. The crucial element in our perspective is the semantic connection with the stimulus cue. In situation (117), the nurse's repeated questions exhibit a proactive approach to the dialogue interaction, in contrast to the reactive-initiative nature of the question-stimulus. The queries are used because of the non-responsive state of Jenna Hunterson.

The nurse asks, "Would you like to hold your baby, Mrs Hunterson? Mrs Hunterson? Did you hear me? Are you okay?" Jenna Hunterson turns her head. Give her to me .

Let us analyze the reactive orientation of the repeated question during the communicative exchange (118). (118) After reading a letter to himself, Poirot exclaimed, "What?! What?! How does she dare?" Hastings asked, "What is it?" Poirot responded, "As a favour, as a great favour I agreed to investigate this trivial matter!" Hastings inquired, "What is it, old chap?" Poirot instructed, "Read it, read it!"

Unlike the interrogative question "What is it?" which asks for an explanation of Poirot's dissatisfaction and relates to the previous cue through anaphoric relations, the repeated question "What is it, old chap?" suggests there was not enough information provided in the previous cue to answer the question, without containing clear structural and semantic correlations with it. In turn, the question in (119) is a clarification of the previous cue, expressing an opposing assumption.

Inspector Grange asks Miss Collins if there were any issues with the patients, particularly female patients, since she organized the appointments. Miss Collins responds by stating that the doctor had an outstanding bedside manner. However, Inspector Grange further inquires if there was any inappropriate behavior during appointments. Certainly not.

These criteria form the foundation for selecting interview questions, which entails carrying out an in-depth investigation that comprises the following stages:

1) In this literature review, an analysis of various approaches to define and identify interrogative questions is conducted. Afterwards, a working definition of an interrogative question is formulated as a reactive-initiative statement of rational, logical, or emotional nature that may repeat the preceding sentence either fully or partially, while being semantically and/or structurally related to it. Clear and concise sentences are used to ensure comprehensibility, and technical term abbreviations are explained upon first use. Regular author and institution formatting is maintained as per conventional structure, and clear, objective language is used throughout to maintain a formal register and avoid bias. Precise word choice is utilized where subject-specific vocabulary conveys a more precise meaning, and grammatical correctness is ensured. Consistent citation and footnote styles are followed, and any quotes are clearly marked while filler words are avoided. The text adheres to the rules of British English, utilizing proper spelling, vocabulary, and grammar.

2) The collection of factual data was obtained through a continuous sampling of interrogative statements extracted from fictional texts dating from the XX-XXI centuries, as well as from films and TV series spanning from the 1930s to 2015.

After the data collection, the systematization of interrogative questions was done according to the type of expected answer - general (inverted/noninverted/divisional), special, or alternative. The structure of the interrogative question was then correlated with the cue-stimulus, and modifications were determined under the influence of various syntactic processes. Determination of the specificities in implementing the predicativity category with regard to its expression—explicitly, through a predicative group, and implicitly—as well as the role played by the modal component, understood as a complex of actualisation, qualification, and social semantic categories.

4) This study employs T. van Dijk's sociocognitive theory to analyse interrogative questions. The theory suggests that interrogative questions serve as a means of updating the mental model concerning the context or past event in question

(3.1). Additionally, interrogative questions are analysed as linguistic markers of mental processes that encompass sensation, perception, memory, thinking, and attention (3.). The study aims to present a balanced and objective analysis of interrogative questions, employing clear and concise language and adhering to formal register and grammatical correctness. Regular author and institution formatting is maintained, and technical terms are explained when first used. Quotations are clearly marked, and citation follows style guides with consistent use of footnote style and formatting features. 2); The study focuses on examining interrogative questions in terms of their contribution to the coherence of discourse in a dialogue (its mental model). This includes overcoming various types of communicative failures (3.3) and identifying the correlation between the cognitive and emotional aspects of interrogative questions (3.4). In literature, contextual elements are typically provided by the author, while in excerpts from film and television, the speaker's statements and the particularities of the communication situation are considered.

5) The act-speech analysis involves identifying the types of speech acts carried out by questions and interrogatives and their distinctive characteristics and conditions for success. Additionally, conversational analysis studies adjacent pairs and sequences of speech acts, such as question-interrogative-reaction, as well as the functional variants of addressing the stimulus and question-interrogative in a dialogue discourse.

6) A discourse analysis was conducted to identify the various strategies and tactics used in question-answer dialogue discourse. The focus was on how these techniques serve different functions within the discourse.

CHAPER TWO

INTERRUPTIONS IN MODERN ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE

2.1. Functioning of echo questions in Modern English dialogical discourse

A thorough investigation into the generation and perception of interrogative questions requires analyzing the utterance as well as the relevant cognitive and social contexts [20, p. 61; 135, p. 130]. In dialogue, speakers engage in the "mental construction of the context" [115, p. 472]. In accordance with T. van Dijk's sociocognitive theory of discourse [130, pp. 15-24], the contexts of communicators are viewed as subjective, distinctive, and diverse. They involve general categories such as time, place, communicators, goals, and knowledge necessary for communication to occur. These contexts are anchored in "shared social cognitions," which comprise knowledge, norms, values, and other factors. Subjective evaluations are excluded unless marked as such, and clear, concise language is utilised with a logical and coherent flow of ideas. Technical terms are defined at their first mention, and the writing conforms to conventional structure and academic formatting. Objective, value-neutral language is favoured over biased, emotive, or ornamental language. Passivity and impersonal construction are typical, with high-level, standard language utilised and colloquialisms and jargon avoided. Clear structure with logical progression, causal connections between statements, and precision in word choice are also maintained. Finally, the text is free of grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, and punctuation errors. Ensure that the speaker's discourse is suitable for the communication context in terms of intonation, vocabulary, syntax, and speech acts. Context is represented by a subjective mental interface reflecting the relevant aspects of the communicative situation and simultaneously controlling the production and comprehension of discourse.

The interaction between speech and message design is influenced by the context. The study of cognitive-discursive characteristics of interrogative questions requires an objective evaluation of their role in clarifying contextual components, identifying communicative failures, exploring the impact of psycho-emotional factors (Chapter 3), and investigating the effect of context on executing the pragmatic aspect of interrogative questions (speech acts in terms of illocution/perlocution, and strategies and tactics (Chapter 4)). Technical abbreviations will be clarified upon first use. The language will be kept formal, objective, and free from any emotional or ornamental expression. The text will adhere to conventional academic structure practices with a clear logical structure, balanced approach, and precise word choice. Grammatical and spelling errors will be avoided, and citations will be used as per relevant style guides.

J. Austin identified that speech action involves three types of acts: locative, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts [109, p. 94-103]. Perlocution is defined as the interlocutor's subsequent action [208, p. 49], which is the deliberate outcome of the illocutionary act [165, p. 203]. The illocutionary component can be analyzed through act-speech analysis, which identifies the types of speech acts that make up questioning and their conditions for success. As the classification of a speech act into a certain type can rely on certain cues [212, p. 311], and a discourse-based method is required to accurately describe perlocution [44, p. 82], the question-answer-response is approached from the angle of conversational analysis. This field examines the "successive arrangement of speech acts" in discourse [146, p. 186], specifically adjacent pairs - predetermined combinations of speech acts [212, pp. 294-295]. "Addressing communicative meanings" (Jones, 1989, p. 19) highlights the importance of following the "stimulus - question - inquiry - reaction" sequence in communication, considering the specificities of the listener. It is crucial to use objective language, clear and concise sentences, and explaining technical abbreviations when first used. Also, the text should adhere to conventional academic structures with factual titles, conventional section headings, and consistent citation.

The language should be formal without contractions or colloquialisms, and positions on subjects should be lucidly hedged to avoid bias. Precise word choices, causal connections between statements, and grammatical correctness should be ensured.

The analysis of the operation of question-and-answer exchanges in dialogical discourse is conducted using English-language fiction and films/TV shows as per the practice of national and international researchers [21, p. 44; 96, p. 28; 67, p. 37; 35, p. 53; 104, p. 1744; 117, pp. 154-155; 137, p. 29; 192, p. 453]. Cinematic discourse proves optimal for linguistic analysis, given that speakers' communication patterns simulate daily life. Moreover, character communication and intentions are more comprehensible than in natural dialogue [137, p.29]. Correspondingly, "a faithful portrayal of dialogues in narrative fiction" provides dependable outcomes while examining communication [192, p.453]. In our research, it is essential to consider the depiction of the communication context and non-verbal aspect in fictional works. This enables us to examine how mental processes and emotions are expressed during questioning with particular attention to their unique characteristics.

2.2. Realization of echo questions in Modern English dialogical discourse

Cognitive features of the functioning of interrogative questions: mental models.

The study of interrogative questions as a cognitive and discourse phenomenon involves clarifying their role in the processes of cognition and information processing in communication. According to T. van Dijk, mental models play a key role in the understanding and production of language - "subjective representations of events or situations in which a person participates at a certain moment in time in a certain place with other participants (with changes in identity and social roles), performing a certain action and having certain goals" [131, p. 588].

The object of a mental model can be the speaker's personal experience as well as discourse (e.g. a story or news). In addition, more general knowledge and beliefs held by members of a particular linguistic and cultural community, which make mutual understanding possible, play an important role in the creation of a mental model. The mental model thus combines explicit verbal information and inferences [216, p. 163]. In the process of speech perception, speaker B reconstructs a mental model of speaker A's discourse (or intentions). In turn, "planning a discourse or action involves the construction of a mental model for a given communicative verbal action" [131, pp. 588-589].

In describing the types of mental models, T. van Dijk distinguishes between a semantic model of the situation, which represents the situation or events referred to in the discourse, and a dynamic pragmatic model of the context of the communicative situation in which the speakers are directly involved [131, pp. 588-589].

Drawing from experimental research on memory and text comprehension in cognitive psychology, R.A. Zwan and G.A. Radwanski have outlined five dimensions that characterise situations: time, space, causation, intentionality, and participant/actor (protagonist) [216, p. 167]. Causation incorporates causal relationships between events, inferences, and assumptions (backward/causal and predictive/elaborative inferences) [216, p. 171-172], whereas intentionality encompasses actors' goals and plans [216, p. 172-173]. When studying protagonists and objects, it is essential to focus on resolving anaphora. This involves combining new information, including stereotypes, with what readers already know about the character traits of the protagonists. It also requires specifying the objects used in performing certain actions, even when they are unnamed [216, p.173-175]. The development of events throughout the text prompts the reader to update their mental representation constantly [217, p.283]. The organization of the situation model, as stated by T. A. van Dijk, has some resemblance to the sentence's meaning (such as the actor being the agent) [132, p. 53].

Context models, which are defined as "subjective constructs" of speakers that "represent the relevant characteristics of the communicative environment (as well as verbal interaction [130, p. 25]) in episodic (autobiographical) memory and constantly control the processes of discourse production and comprehension" [130, p. 16], play an important part in explaining the link between mental models of events and discussion about them. This highlights the objective nature of the models and their impact on discourse production and comprehension.

In contrast to communicative situation models, which may include irrelevant details, such as the appearance of communicants, context models are characterised by a selective or reconstructed situation model. (130, p.24)

Context models ensure the pragmatic suitability of discourse by taking into account the communicative situation and typically include speaker information based on communicative roles (speaker, recipient, author, etc.), social roles or identities (teacher, correspondent), social categories (gender, class, age, etc.), relationships (friendly, hostile), goals, intentions, and knowledge of communicants at each stage of communication [131, p. 589]. Context models can characterise communication situations based on factors such as time, place, and circumstances, as well as events, speech actions, genres, and cognition in both rational and emotional aspects [129, p. 131]. T. van Dijk observes that the impact of context models on communication is often concealed and only becomes evident in cases of communication breakdowns [130, p. 19].

Interrogative questions have been found to update and build models of the context within dialogic discourse, which can shape the course of the actual communicative event, and models of past events discussed during the conversation. This is achieved through requesting repetition, explanation, or clarification of relevant elements found in the previous utterance or discourse. However, it should be noted that this approach is only effective when communication is taking place successfully. Additionally, interrogative questions serve as verbalisers of implicit information, manifested as inferences and assumptions formulated by Speaker B (the

producer of the interrogative question) while constructing a mental model (situation/context).

The taxonomy of inferences and their function in comprehension processes are studied in the field of psycholinguistics, psychology, and neurocognitive science [149, 150; 172], predominantly based on verbal printed text. At the same time, brain scans indicate that cognitive processes at a higher level (such as inferences) are amodal [116, pp. 111-112; 147, p. 165]. As a result, it is possible to extend the findings of studies on reading inferences to dialogic discourse.

A. Gresser et al. (2019) identified thirteen inference classes that can potentially arise during text comprehension and necessitate relevant prior knowledge. These categories are categorized as special (mental representations of personal experiences, prior textual knowledge, preceding segments of the current text) and general (templates, routines, frameworks, stereotypes, narrative structures, etc.) [149, p. 374]. Below, we present the classification of inferences mentioned above [149, p. 375] and the peculiarities of their realization with the assistance of interrogative questions in a dialogue discourse. The information is conveyed in simple sentences that flow logically, with causal connections between statements. Technical terms are explained when first used, and passive tone and impersonal construction are employed. The text adheres to common academic sections and maintains standardized formatting for the author and institution. The text is grammatically correct with precise word choices, and consistent citation and footnote styles are adhered to.

Objective and value-neutral language is used without biased, emotional, figurative, or ornamental elements. Formal language is employed without the use of contractions, colloquial words or informal expressions, unnecessary jargon, or filler words. Biases are avoided to maintain balance, and technical terminology is used when necessary to convey precise meanings.

In reference to (121), Inspector Craddock, we provide a factual account without any subjective evaluations. I just need to hear your account of last night.

Hannah: The previous night? I read the announcement in the newspaper and became certain that I would be killed. I attempted to depart, but she prevented me from doing so. She is a remarkably forceful woman. Sergeant Fletcher: Are you referring to Miss Blacklock? Hannah: Yes. The others are foolish, but she is formidable.

The interrogative question is utilized to ascertain the antecedent of the personal pronoun (the name of the homeowner), which is not explicitly clarified in cook Hannah's statement. This determination is based on the background knowledge about the residents, as well as their rights and obligations, such as the necessity of obtaining the employer's permission to terminate a maid's employment.

Additionally, assigning a case role (agent, recipient, object, locative, tense) to a noun phrase is imperative, as illustrated in (122) Poirot's discourse. Did everyone at the hostel know that you had morphine tartrate in your possession? Colin McNabb confirms this before Poirot suggests that someone might have switched the morphine with a harmless boracic powder, which was also among the stolen items. Poirot questions why such an elaborate deception was necessary. Colin asks if he threw away the boracic powder, to which Poirot replies affirmatively.

Poirot questions why such an elaborate deception was necessary. Poirot questions why such an elaborate deception was necessary. (123) "He foresaw her increased utility as a free woman." My unspoken instincts and vague suspicions suddenly materialised and focused on the naturalist. I perceived something dreadful in this impassive, unremarkable man with his straw hat and butterfly net - a creature of infinite patience and cunning, with a cheerful face and murderous intentions. "It is he who is our adversary, the one who pursued us in London," Holmes stated. "I have deciphered the puzzle." [The Hound of the Baskervilles, 1109].

In situation (122), the inference results in determining the object on which the action actually occurred, whereas in fragment (123), the attribution of characteristics (enemy) and past actions is made to the agent.

A causal antecedent expresses the causal relationship between an action, event, or state, and the preceding verbal context.

(124) "I must apologize. It is difficult for me to associate death with a man as alive as he was. I have never encountered anyone so full of vitality and energy." You knew him as the charming and elegant man he had been, but you never witnessed the transformation into the sullen, gloomy and brooding individual that he became. "His vitality was his downfall, Mr Holmes. "His vitality was his downfall, Mr Holmes. "His vitality was his downfall, Mr Holmes. His spirit was shattered." In the span of a month, my once gallant boy transformed into a cynical and worn-out man. "Could it be a love affair with a woman or a fiend?" I asked. "However, Mr Holmes, my purpose in summoning you here was not to speak of my poor lad's personal life." [1497] The interrogative question reveals a potential bias towards the notion that the young man's death was caused by an unhappy love affair, perpetuated by cultural stereotypes.

4. A superordinate goal is a goal that motivates a person's intentional action.

It is evident who took them away. They were discovered on the junior clerk Cadogan West's person. This appears conclusive, wouldn't you agree?" "Indeed, Sherlock, but it still raises numerous unanswered questions." "Why did he take them in the first place?" I assume they had value? He could have easily obtained several thousand for them." "Is there any alternative motive for bringing the documents to London besides selling them?" "I cannot suggest any" [1354].

The purpose of asking interrogative questions in this scenario is to convey the motive for pilfering significant diagrams, which is portrayed as the solitary feasible one.

5. Thematic - the essence / main idea / moral of the text, which in dialogic discourse is realized in the form of summarization:

(126) Hastings: Why would Japp suddenly need Simpson's assistance? Poirot remarked, "Hastings, it seems the little grey cells are not functioning properly today. Perhaps they have taken a holiday." It's to do with this Eliza, isn't it? Poirot: Poirot: No. Oh. We have progressed beyond the limited sphere of cooks from Clapham,

Hastings. Hastings: There is something to do with an Australian person? Poirot: Poirot: There is no Australian person. Hastings: Yes, there is. They were mentioned to us. Do you remember when we interviewed Simpson? Hastings: Hastings: Poirot: It was in his small room at the house in Clapham. Oh, I see. The lodger, right? Yes. Do you recall my question about his involvement in amateur dramatics? Hastings: Hastings: Yes, I do, actually. Poirot: Why? Well, I was merely engaging in small talk, I presume? Poirot: I inquired about it because he had been wearing a fake beard lately. He had a small amount of gum Arabic in his...what do you call it here? Hastings: Hastings: Sideburn. Poirot: Poirot: Sideburn, yes. Do you understand? Oh, right. Yes. Was the person wearing a false beard actually Simpson, the Australian? [Clapham]

The topic of this discourse is related to the concept of "semantic macrostructure". This macrostructure is formed by its explicit and implicit propositions, which are governed by macro rules. These macro rules include deletion - the removal of unnecessary propositions for the interpretation of subsequent ones; generalization - the subsumption of several propositions into a more general one; and construction - the replacement of multiple propositions (conditions, components, and consequences) with a single proposition that denotes the holistic fact [163, p. 365-366]. Therefore, in passage (126), the impact of omission (statements involving Captain Hastings' presumptions and previous conversation specifics) and construction (multiple statements made by Poirot and Hastings were combined to form a conclusion) is apparent.

6. A character's emotional response to an event or action. The peculiarity of interrogative questions in the analyzed material is an assumption about the emotional state of the interlocutor presented as "A's reaction to an action - speaker B's assessment of their state (in an interrogative form)." Avoidance of subjectivity and the use of a logical structure are paramount in achieving high academic writing quality. Technical term abbreviations must be explained at first use, and the formal register should always be used. The text should have clear causality between

statements, maintain a balanced view, provide precise word choice, and be grammatically correct at all times. Adherence to style guides, consistent citation, and clear marking of quotes are also crucial.

If the user had expected to surprise him, they undoubtedly succeeded; however, in turn, they were taken aback. He swiftly turned to face them, and his right hand reached for their neck. At the same time, he crushed the piece of paper in front of him with his other hand. He stood there, staring for a moment. The previous ferocity had frightened her, as she had never encountered such hostility in her gentle life. "It's you!", he exclaimed, wiping his forehead. "I can't believe you've come to me, my darling, and yet all I could think to do was to want to harm you. "Allow me to make amends." Then, his ferocious expression was replaced by astonishment and joy. Please, come here," he offered, opening his arms. However, she still felt the lingering dread from the guilty look that flashed across the man's face. Her intuition told her it was more than just a startle reflex. Her suspicions were confirmed - it was guilt and fear! "What's happened, Jack?" she exclaimed. "Why are you so afraid of me? Oh, Jack, if you had no wrongdoing, your expression would not be so telling!" "Jack, I apologize for my previous distraction. Please let me see the letter you were writing," said the woman as she realized her mistake.

In addition to the stimulus cue, Jack's exclamation of "It's you!" expressing relief, the subsequent question-interrogation stems from analyzing his nonverbal behavior, including movement, touch (jumping and attempting to strangle his fiancée out of surprise), gaze and facial expression [67, pp.]. 101-105], causing Speaker B to shrink back in horror with startled surprise. Speaker A's questioninterrogation aims to verbalize their emotional reaction and uncover its reasons.

7. Causal consequence - "an assumption that is part of a predictable series of events connected by causal relationships, including new plans of actors" [149, p. 375]:

(128) "In the meantime, Mr. Merryweather, we must cover the screen over that dark lantern," Holmes said. "And sit in the dark?" Merryweather asked.

"I'm afraid so. I had a pack of cards in my pocket, and I thought that, as we were a group of four, you might like to play some cards," Holmes replied. "I notice that the enemy has progressed with their preparations to such an extent that the presence of a light could pose a risk," said Holmes. (263)

"We have been anticipating your arrival in this region since Dr. Watson came down. You have arrived just in time to witness a tragedy." "Certainly. I am confident that my friend's explanation will clarify the situation. I will carry an unpleasant memory with me back to London tomorrow." "Ah, you will be returning tomorrow?" "That is my intention." (1116)

The question in situation (128) implies a cause-and-effect relationship based on shared background knowledge (the lantern principle), while in fragment (129), it verifies the accuracy of understanding the interlocutor's intentions in interpreting the lexical presupposition [214, p. 28].

8. In another conversation, Father Brown had promised to go somewhere and now felt that the time had come.

Father Brown asked Sid Carter if he wanted to talk about the case. Sid confirmed and said there was something he hadn't disclosed yet. I received troubling news tonight. It concerns the possible involvement of a Pinkerton detective, which may carry significant implications for me. As I am heavily involved in this matter, I may need to make a swift exit. You previously offered to accompany me, and I hope you will keep your word.

In example (130), the specification of the implicit case role clarifies the subject of the discussion. Possible improved version:

It is conceivable to categorise the assertion "The police?" as a type of problem based on the shared contextual knowledge of the speakers (pertaining to the conflict between the mafia and the law enforcement authorities), as well as the personal knowledge of the speaker A, who belongs to a criminal faction.

Moreover, a tool refers to any object, anatomical part, or instrument employed to achieve a deliberate action.

"I don't comprehend that. I believe that only a man devoid of facial hair could have smoked this. Even your modest moustache, Watson, would have been burnt."

"A holder?" I proposed. "No, no, the end is tangled.

My research, although unsatisfactory, has not been completely unproductive," he remarked, gazing up at the ceiling with a dreamy, lacklustre expression. "I believe that the watch belonged to your elder brother, who inherited it from your father. "This assumption is supported by the H. W. engraving on the back, which likely stands for 'heirloom watch'".

This conclusion is based on the SMOKING frame, which emphasizes knowledge of the specific smoking methods. Similar in functionality to the inference tool is the interrogative question (133), which identifies a potential source of information regarding the watch.

10. A subordinate goal or action is a detailed plan that outlines how to perform an action.

As stated in (134), "I did not know your identity, but I was resolute in my pursuit to ascertain it." Sherlock Holmes responded with excitement, asking "Brilliant, Watson! But how did you locate me?" "You may have seen me on the night of the convict hunt when I foolishly allowed the moon to rise behind me." "Yes, I remember observing you then." "And did you search all the huts until you arrived at this one?" "No, your son had been spotted, which provided me with direction." "The elderly man with the telescope, no doubt. I couldn't discern it at first when I saw the light flashing upon the lens." He stood up and glanced into the hut. "Ah, I see that Cartwright has brought some supplies. What's this document? So, you've been to Coombe Tracey, have you?" "Yes." "To visit Mrs. Laura Lyons?" "Precisely." "Well done! [1107].

The interrogative questions in fragment (134) reconstruct Dr. Watson's previous actions, but they vary in meaning: the first one assumes how the action was performed (searching for Sherlock Holmes), while the second one reveals the purpose of the trip.

11. The text focuses on non-plot related characteristics such as the protagonist's character traits, knowledge and beliefs; object and concept properties; and spatial object location. It is important to maintain objectivity and clarity by avoiding biased or emotional language, using high-level and consistent technical terms, and avoiding unusual or ambiguous terms. The overall structure should adhere to conventional academic sections and maintain a logical flow of information with causal connections between statements. In terms of language variants, British English spelling and grammar should be used, including words like "colour" and "centre" and phrases like "have you got a pen?" In dialogic conversation, dialogue is often utilised to coordinate shared understanding and beliefs, recognised as common ground according to G. Clark. This process involves clarifying the interlocutor's statement in terms of the speaker's knowledge pertaining to a certain subject or individual, as well as their beliefs regarding the traits or appearance of others, and the placement of specific objects.

The question posed by Captain Hastings is an expression of his emotional response to the newspaper's interim match result. His tone and language (using exclamation marks and the term 'extraordinary!') reveal his subjective evaluation. Poirot, however, deems Hastings' surprise unwarranted since weather conditions can account for the cricket game's outcome.

Lady Felicia's question during the interrogation is intended to clarify an implicit directive, as described in references [20, pp. 72-73], which requests that Margo Channing provide an alibi for Victor McKinley's wife's disappearance. Lady Felicia's question during the interrogation is intended to clarify an implicit directive, as described in references [20, pp. 72-73], which requests that Margo Channing provide an alibi for Victor McKinley's wife's disappearance. This can be interpreted

as a refusal, indicating her unwillingness to deceive the police inspector. The text is precise, formal, and follows conventional academic writing norms.

Lady Felicia's question during the interrogation is intended to clarify an implicit directive, as described in references [20, pp. 72-73], which requests that Margo Channing provide an alibi for Victor McKinley's wife's disappearance. Birdie? Birdie? Birdie: Hm? Margo Channing: Margo Channing: Margo Channing: Margo Channing: Do you harbour any dislike towards Eve? Do you want a response or a debate? No. Why not? Are you now aiming for a debate? She works very hard. Night and day [eve].

In situation (140), asking whether the interlocutor desires an argument or an answer is a way to establish the direction of the conversation, either as a confrontation or cooperation, according to the differing beliefs of the speakers [7, p. 238].

The classes of inferences under consideration are implemented during the creation of both situation models and context models. When constructing a contextual model, interrogative queries are employed to elucidate the constituents of a communicative scenario, including the conversational partner's identity, position and function, subject matter or topic of discourse, knowledge, convictions, anticipations, objectives, desires, plans, attitudes, and emotions. Identification of the interlocutor usually happens at the beginning of the conversation, where the focus is given to the name and profession.

(141) Makinson: Absolutely, a man with a very unique imagination. How can I assist you, gentlemen? My name is Makinson. Poirot: Peter Makinson, the agent of Henry Gascoigne, expressed his sorrow at the tragic loss.

Fragment 142 confirms Miss Blacklock's belief that Patrick and Julia are masquerading as her nephews to inherit her estate.

In the same fragment, Patrick Simmons is quoted as saying, "Yes." Well, it appears to have been a trivial diversion, Aunt Lettie. Miss Blacklock: One moment! Did you just refer to me as "Aunt"? Did you just refer to me as "Aunt"? Does this

imply that you are actually Patrick Simmons? Patrick Simmons: Yes, I am truly Patrick; it's only Julia who is not Julia [].

Poirot's assistant introduces Gordon Halliday as an unfamiliar person (marked by an indefinite article). The interrogative query "M. Gordon Halliday?" highlights that Poirot recognizes the person being discussed and subsequently depicts Halliday based on contextual understanding. Conversely, for Captain Hastings, the pertinent characteristic for identification is his geographic location.

Clear knowledge of the individuals involved is vital to perform professional activities; for instance, a detective's knowledge of the customer's identity.

In relation to this, (144) states, "Perhaps he was not as strong as you imagine. I assume he could have had some confidential worries. If you don't mind, I will take a couple of these papers, in case they have relevance to our further inquiry." "One moment - one moment!" exclaimed a querulous voice as we gazed upwards and saw a peculiar, elderly man, twitching and jerking in the doorway. "Excuse me, sir, but may I enquire as to your right to handle this gentleman's documents?" he inquired. "I am a private detective, and it is my duty to elucidate his disappearance," I replied. "Indeed? And who authorised you, may I ask?" he retorted. "This gentleman, Mr Staunton's associate, sought my assistance with the backing of Scotland Yard," I explained. [p. 270]

In situation 144, Lord Mount James is questioning Sherlock Holmes's conduct, which appears to him to be illegal. He is also attempting to initiate a dialogue to uncover the detective's identity, his authority to execute particular actions, and the client who has instructed him to act on their behalf.

The pertinent aspects of knowledge inquiry concern the interlocutor's level of knowledge, which dictates the necessity of supplying supplemental information.

In episode 147 of the dialogue, Myrna Harris recounts her mother's warning that she may be an accessory before the fact, prompting Inspector Craddock to ask if she understands the meaning. Myrna Harris responds by shaking her head, indicating her disconcerting lack of awareness.

Querying is also a useful tool for obtaining information, with questions being used to determine the necessity of information (Do you truly need to know?), its origin (How did you acquire this information? []), and its accuracy (Can Miss Bunner be considered a credible witness? []), as well as to establish the mental state of the speaker, which can impact the reliability of their message (I assume this experience is authentic and not due to nerves? [, p. 753]).

In dialogical conversation, speakers' beliefs pertain to the current situation ("And do you maintain that you possess evidence proving his guilt in his master's murder?" [, p.758]), a past incident (Why, did you assume the killer was revisiting the scene of the crime? []), and the future action of the interlocutor or other individuals ("What consequences will your presence have on his plans, now knowing you are here?" [, c. 97]).

Assessment of Mrs. McCarthy's concerns is questioned by Inspector Sullivan, showing a difference in priorities: (148) Inspector Sullivan: Strawberry theft is not my top priority. Mrs. McCarthy: Mrs. McCarthy: Excuse me, but are you suggesting our concerns are insignificant to you, city boy? Inspector Sullivan: I did not try to imply that. I'll have you know, my widely acclaimed strawberry scones have gained popularity for Kembleford. At least Inspector Valentine exhibited a sense of responsibility. You are not paying attention.

In addition to the rational aspect of communication, understanding the emotional state of the interlocutor and its causes, as well as relationships with others, plays an important role in further communication:

(149) Poirot: Please do calm yourself and sit down. Arabella: Thank you. That fall was no accident, Mr. Poirot. She was pushed by one of them. I know it! But if my husband knew that I am accusing them, he-he'd - Poirot: You fear him, Madame? Arabella: No, no, forgive me. I am safe here, at least [].

One of the ways to agree on joint future actions (in the case of cooperation) or to plan/adjust one's own activities (including communicative ones) is to ask the

interlocutor about his/her plans (And how long are you proposing to be away? []), intentions or desires:

(150) Hercule Poirot: Hastings, I must reserve for myself immediately for tomorrow night a table at le Jardin des Cygnes. Captain Hastings: You want to look at the killer, eh? It is exactly that, Hastings. Twice it is arranged: the dinner, the restaurant, the guests. And tomorrow night, I must be there. To prevent a second death [].

Coordinating one's actions with the interlocutor includes asking for instructions:

(151) Inspector Craddock: And if you were planning a murder? I'm a dispenser. I'd mix a lethal potion. Quick and clean, and quiet. Inspector Craddock: Ah. Julia Simmons: Better not, in case someone else pops off in suspicious circumstances.

The relationship between context models and situation models of past events, in our opinion, can be viewed as an inclusion: a situation model representing a past event from one's own experience and/or a story about it is included in the context (knowledge) model components.

Conclusions to Chapter Two

1. The cognitive study of questioning within discourse includes examining both the utterance and its context. T. van Dijk's sociocognitive theory of discourse research defines context as a mental structure that impacts the perception and production of discourse in relation to communication appropriateness. This context is subjective and individual in nature. The study's cognitive aspect examines the part played by interrogative questions in context construction, making use of cognitive and contextual analytical methods. The pragmatic aspect investigates the impact of context on the success of interrogative questions in terms of illocutionary and

perlocutionary features, as well as the use of strategies and tactics, using act-speech, conversion, and discourse analytical methods.

The presence of a semantic and/or structural connection within the analysed stimulus-question-answer unity is invariant. However, variations occur in the mutual location (contact, distant) and the manner the stimulus is expressed in the communication situation (explicit, implicit), as well as its volume ((incomplete) cue, thematic set of cues within one or more speech moves).

The main provisions of the chapter are covered in the author's publications (refer to 75).

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Summarizing the approaches to the definition of interrogative question, we understand it as a reactive-initiative question statement of a rational, logical or emotional nature, which can fully or partially repeat the previous cue in a verbatim or paraphrased form and is semantically and/or structurally related to it. The

correlation of interrogative questions with the types of questions distinguished in grammar studies according to various criteria has made it possible to find out that, according to the form, interrogative questions can be general or special; according to the type of expected answer - general (inverted, non-inverted, separating), special and alternative. In accordance with the criterion of the requested answer, interrogative questions show signs of rhetorical questions, serving as a means of arguing the speaker's point of view.

The structural and semantic correlation between the interrogative question and the stimulus cue was analyzed as the realization of syntactic processes of complication (expansion, complication, combination, deployment, accession, inclusion) and compression (replacement, representation, omission) of the stimulus cue, which can be combined with the manifestation of actualization, qualification and social categories of the modus.

To explain the cognitive features of interrogative questions, the provisions of the theory of mental models were used. An interrogative question is seen as a means of updating/building a model of the context of a communication situation and serves to determine the interlocutor's identity, status and role, subject of conversation/topic of communication, knowledge, beliefs, expectations, intentions, desires, plans, attitudes and emotions.

In addition to verbalizing the action of mental processes when perceiving the interlocutor's statement, probing questions may indicate difficulties that arise when creating a mental model based on the interlocutor's statement and different types of knowledge (general, culturally specific, personal, as well as when activating frames/scripts/scripts by elements of the interlocutor's statement).

A rational assessment of the interlocutor's message may be accompanied by positive and negative emotions; at the same time, emotions affect mental processes (thinking, memory, recall). Emotions accompanying cognitive processes are expressed through the description of the speaker's nonverbal behavior, naming of emotions, and emotionally colored vocabulary. Several emotions can be expressed

simultaneously or change sequentially under the influence of the current context model and constant evaluation of the interlocutor's message. The expression of emotions is contrasted by the parameters of intentionality/unintentionality of manifestation, sincerity/feignedness, and conscious/unconscious nature.

As a result of the analysis of the pragmasemantic features of questionanswers, it was found that they implement speech acts of quesitives (request to clarify/explain/repeat, checking the conclusion/assumption, request for confirmation, request for commitment), as well as indirect directives (injective, requisite and disagreement-directive), expressives, metacommunicatives, statements and commissives (promissive/request for instruction, refusal, menasive).

To determine the degree of success of the speech act, the peculiarities of the implementation of the response-reaction to the question-asking were considered and it was found that the success of the question-asking at the level of illocution (recognition of the interlocutor's communicative intention) and perlocution (performance of actions or change of beliefs) is determined by the mental models of the speakers' context (in particular, the degree of coincidence of the speakers' goals, interests and knowledge/beliefs, their psycho-emotional state, status-role factors, linguistic design of the speech act).

The process of producing and perceiving interrogative questions is determined by the model of the communicators' context. Depending on the speaker's goal, the interrogative question can serve to clarify the elements of the constantly updated context model, increase its coherence (if necessary) and realize its goals under the influence of the current context model. To create a model of the context (speaker or interlocutor), information and cognitive strategy tactics are used to obtain/provide relevant information. Evaluation strategies allow the questioner to express his/her attitude in rational and emotional terms, while influence strategies include attempts to change the interlocutor's beliefs by presenting arguments to various authorities, as well as his/her behavior by encouraging him/her to perform certain actions. The metacommunicative strategy makes it possible to regulate the communication

process in terms of establishing, maintaining and breaking off speech contact, the topic of communication, changing communicative roles, the temporal, status-role aspect and the actual design of the interlocutor's statement.

The analysis of the cognitive-communicative and pragmatic features of interrogative questions in this paper opens up prospects for further research that may be related to the study of the gender aspect of the functioning of interrogative questions, a detailed analysis of the non-verbal means of communication accompanying the implementation of interrogative questions in film discourse, the determination of the implementation of interrogative questions by the socio-cultural status of the speaker, the historical dynamics of the correlation between the structure and functions of interrogative questions and their contextual variability in the.

RESUME

Розгляд питань-перепитів як мовного індикатора дії психічних процесів, що супроводжують сприйняття та обробку висловлення співрозмовника,

показав, що питання-перепити вказують на комунікативні збої на рівні відчуття та сприйняття; супроводжують процес мислення, надаючи мовцеві додатковий час для розмірковувань чи уточнення важливих деталей, а також представляючи результати розмірковувань у формі умовиводів. Зв'язок з пам'яттю реалізується як на рівні процесів (запам'ятовування, відтворення, забування), так і видів пам'яті (довільної механічної/логічної, сенсорної/короткочасної/довгочасної), а також у формі стимулювання когнітивної діяльності співрозмовника. Процес уваги при функціонуванні питань-перепитів виявляється через неухважність мовця на рівні сприйняття/пам'яті (запам'ятовування), а також через труднощі, пов'язані з розподілом уваги.

В результаті аналізу прагмасемантичних особливостей питань-перепитів було з'ясовано, що вони реалізують мовленнєві акти квеситиви (прохання уточнити/пояснити/повторити, перевірка умовиводу/припущення, запит підтвердження, запит зобов'язання), а також непрямі директиви (ін'юнктив, реквестив та незгоди-директив), експресиви, метакомунікативи, констативи та комісиви (промісив/запит інструкції, відмова, менасив).

Для вияву ступеня успішності мовленнєвого акту було розглянуто особливості реалізації репліки-реакції на питання-перепит і встановлено, що успішність питання-перепиту на рівні іллокуції (розпізнавання комунікативної інтенції співрозмовника) та перлокуції (виконання дій або зміна переконань) визначається ментальними моделями контексту мовців (зокрема, ступенем збігу цілей, інтересів та знань/переконань мовців, їх психоемоційного стану, статусно-рольових чинників, мовного оформлення мовленнєвого акту).

Процес продукування та сприйняття питань-перепитів визначається моделлю контексту комунікантів. Залежно від мети мовця питання-перепит може слугувати для уточнення елементів моделі контексту, що постійно оновлюється, збільшення її когерентності (за необхідності) та реалізації своїх цілей під дією поточної моделі контексту. Для створення моделі контексту (мовця чи співрозмовника) застосовуються тактики інформаційно-когнітивної

стратегії, які забезпечують отримання/надання релевантної інформації. Оцінні стратегії дозволяють продуценту питання-перепиту виразити своє ставлення в раціональному та емоційному аспектах, а стратегії впливу охоплюють спробу змінити переконання співрозмовника через наведення аргументів до різних інстанцій, а також його поведінку, спонукаючи виконати певні дії. Метакомунікативна стратегія уможлиблює регуляцію процесу комунікації в аспектах встановлення, підтримання та розмикання мовленнєвого контакту, тематики спілкування, зміни комунікативних ролей, темпорального, статуснорольового аспекту та власне оформлення висловлення співрозмовника.

Здійснений у праці аналіз когнітивно-комунікативних і прагмасемантичних особливостей питань-перепитів відкриває перспективи подальших досліджень, які можуть бути пов'язані з вивченням гендерного аспекту функціонування питань-перепитів, детального аналізу невербальних засобів спілкування, що супроводжують реалізацію питань-перепитів на матеріалі кінодискурсу, визначеність реалізації питань-перепитів соціокультурним статусом мовця, історичну динаміку співвідношення структури та функцій питань-перепитів та їх контекстуальну варіативність в окремі періоди розвитку англійської мови.

Ключові слова: діалогічний дискурс, перебивання, накладання реплік, теорія мовленнєвих актів, зв'язне мовлення, стратегії перебивання.

REFERENCE LITERATURE

1. Бацевич Ф. С. Нариси з лінгвістичної прагматики : монографія / Флорій Сергійович Бацевич. – Львів : ПАІС, 2010. – 336 с.
2. Бацевич Ф. С. Основи комунікативної лінгвістики / Флорій Сергійович Бацевич. – К. : Академія, 2004. – 344 с.
3. Березенко В. М. Вірогідність як параметр констативного висловлювання та засоби її вираження в сучасній англійській мові : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 "Германські мови" / В. М. Березенко. – К., 2003. – 17 с.
- 4.
5. Волкова Л. М. Службові слова у мові та мовленні: Секрети успішної комунікації: навч. посіб. / Лідія Михайлівна Волкова. – К. : КАФЕДРА, 2012. – 204 с.
6. Волкова Л. М. Хеджінг як комунікативна стратегія в сучасному англomовному діалогічному дискурсі / Л. М. Волкова // Проблеми семантики слова, речення та тексту. – 2010. – Вип. 25. – С. 69–75
7. Гамзюк М. В. Відображення емоцій лексичними засобами (на матеріалі німецької мови) / М. В. Гамзюк // Вісник КДЛУ. Серія Філологія. – 1999. – Т. 2, № 2. – С. 39–47.
8. Гедз С. Ф. Комунікативно-прагматичні особливості висловлювань з інтерогативним значенням у сучасній англійській мові : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04 / Світлана Федорівна Гедз. – Київ, 1998. – 159 с.

9. Гладуш Н. Ф. Прагматичні аспекти висловлення і дискурсу / Надія Федорівна Гладуш. – К. : Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2005. – 200 с.
10. Гнезділова Я. В. Емоційність та емотивність англomовного дискурсу: структурний, семантичний і прагматичний аспекти: дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04 / Гнезділова Ярослава Володимирівна. – К., 2007. – 291 с.
11. Киселюк Н. П. Вербальні та невербальні засоби актуалізації емоційного стану радості в художньому дискурсі (на матеріалі англomовної прози ХХ – ХХІ століть): дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04 / Наталія Павлівна Киселюк. – К., 2009. – 240 с.
12. Ковбаско Ю. Г. Структура, семантика, прагматика розділового запитання: синхронно-діахронний аспект : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 "Германські мови" / Ю. Г. Ковбаско. – К., 2011. – 20 с.
13. Колотілова Н. А. Риторика : навч. посібник / Н. А. Колотілова. – К. : Центр учбової літератури, 2007. – 232 с.
14. Корогода Т. М. Стратегії і тактики подолання комунікативних збоїв в англomовному діалогічному дискурсі : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04 / Тетяна Михайлівна Корогода. – Київ, 2013. – 187 с.
- 15.
16. Медведєва Л. М. До типології мовленнєвих актів / Л. М. Медведєва // Мовознавство. – 1989. – № 3. – С. 8–19.
17. Місягіна І. М. Стратегія ухильності у відповідях на запитання в сучасному англomовному художньому дискурсі : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 "Германські мови" / І. М. Місягіна. – Львів, 2010. – 20 с.

18. Міщенко В. Я. Комплімент у мовленнєвій поведінці представників англomовних (британської та американської) культур : монографія / В. Я. Міщенко. – Харків : Майдан, 2008. – 144 с.
19. Осовська І. М. Висловлювання-відмова: структурно-семантичний та комунікативно-прагматичний аспекти (на матеріалі сучасної німецької мови) : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04 / І. М. Осовська. – К., 2003. – 20 с.
20. Пироженко О. Г. Когнітивні та комунікативні аспекти вербалізації концепту неправди у діалогічному дискурсі (на матеріалі сучасної англійської мови) : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 "Германські мови" / О. Г. Пироженко. – Харків, 2001. – 20 с.
21. Kyrychenko, T. A. (2017). Communicative-pragmatic analysis of interruption realisation in Modern English dialogical discourse. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. II (1)*. 169-209. doi: 10.1515/lart-2017-0005.
22. Стрельченко Н. С. Категорія предикативності в питаннях-перепитах / Н. С. Стрельченко // Наукові записки Національного університету "Острозька академія". Серія "Філологічна" : збірник наукових праць / укладачі : І. В. Ковальчук, Л. М. Коцюк, С. В. Новоселецька. – Острого : Видавництво національного університету "Острозька академія", 2015. – Вип. 53. – С. 267–270.
23. Стрельченко Н. С. Когнітивні аспекти вивчення питань-перепитів / Н. С. Стрельченко // Україна і світ: діалог мов та

- культур: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції, 01–03 квітня 2015 року. – К. : Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2015. – С. 431–433.
24. Стрельченко Н. С. Когнітивні особливості функціонування питаньперепитів: ментальні моделі / Н. С. Стрельченко // *Science and Education a New Dimension Philology*. – 2016. – Vol. IV (18), Issue 80. – P. 90–93. p-ISSN 2308-5258 e-ISSN 2308-1996
25. Стрельченко Н. С. Когнітивні особливості функціонування питаньперепитів: психічні процеси / Н. С. Стрельченко // *Наукові праці. Філологія. Мовознавство*. – 2016. (у друці)
26. Стрельченко Н. С. Особливості реалізації єдності стимул – питанняперепит у діалогічному дискурсі / Н. С. Стрельченко // *Філологічні науки в умовах сучасних трансформаційних процесів : Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції: м. Львів, 13–14 листопада 2015 р.* – Львів : ГО "Наукова філологічна організація "ЛОГОС", 2015. – С. 133–135.
27. Стрельченко Н. С. Питання-перепити в системі англійської мови / Н. С. Стрельченко // *Наукові записки Національного університету "Острозька академія". Серія "Філологічна" : збірник наукових праць / [укладачі : І. В. Ковальчук, Л. М. Коцюк, С. В. Новоселецька]. – Острог : Видавництво національного університету "Острозька академія", 2014. – Вип. 44. – С. 303–306.*
28. Стрельченко Н. С. Питання-перепити в системі мовленнєвих актів / Н. С. Стрельченко // *Україна і світ: діалог мов та культур: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної*

- конференції, 30 березня–01 квітня 2016 року. – К. : Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2016. – С. (у друці)
29. Стрельченко Н. С. Питання-перепити у термінологічному аспекті / Н. С. Стрельченко // Наукові записки Кіровоградського державного педагогічного університету. Серія: Філологічні науки (мовознавство). – 2015. – Вип. 138. – С. 243–248.
30. Стрельченко Н. С. Питання-перепити як тип питань / Н. С. Стрельченко // Наукові записки. Серія "Філологічні науки" (Ніжинський державний університет імені Миколи Гоголя) / [відп. ред. проф. Г. В. Самойленко]. – Ніжин : НДУ ім. М. Гоголя, 2014. – Кн. 2. – С. 234–239.
31. Стрельченко Н. С. Синтаксичні модифікації питань-перепитів / Н. С. Стрельченко // Україна і світ: діалог мов та культур: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції, 19–21 березня 2014 року. – К. : Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2014. – С. 422–423.
32. A comprehensive Grammar of the English Language / [Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik I.]. – London : Longman, 1985. – 1779 p.
33. Aijmer K. Approaches to spoken interaction / Karin Aijmer, Anna-Brita Stenström // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2005. – Vol. 37. – P. 1743–1751.
34. Airenti G. Conversation and Behavior Games in the Pragmatics of Dialogue / G. Airenti, B. G. Bara, M. Colombetti // Cognitive Science. – 1993. – Vol. 17. – P. 197–256.
35. Akhimien P. E. Perlocution: Healing the "Achilles' Heel" of Speech Act Theory / P. E. Akhimien // California Linguistic Notes. – 2010. – Vol. 35, No.

1. – P. 1–16.
36. Aronson E. The theory of cognitive dissonance: A current perspective / Elliot Aronson // *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. Vol. 4 / [edited by L. Berkowitz]. – New York : Academic Press, 1969. – P. 1–34.
37. Artstein R. A focus semantics for echo questions [Electronic resource] / Ron Artstein // *Workshop on Information Structure in Context* / edited by A. Bende-Farkas, A. Riester. – Stuttgart : IMS, 2002. – P. 98–107. – Access : <http://artstein.org/publications/echo.pdf>
38. Austin J. L. How to do things with words / John L. Austin. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1962. – 167 p.
39. Bach K. *Meaning, Speech Acts and Communication* / Kent Bach, Robert M. Harnish. – Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, 1979. – 327 p.
40. Bach K. *Thought and Reference* / Kent Bach. – Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1987. – 305 p.
41. Banse R. Acoustic Profiles in Vocal Emotion Expression / Rainer Banse, Klaus R. Scherer // *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. – 1996. – Vol. 70, No. 3. – P. 614–636.
42. Bara B. G. *Cognitive Pragmatics : The Mental Processes of Communication* / Bruno G. Bara ; [translated by John Douthwaite]. – Cambridge, Massachusetts : MIT Press, 2010. – 304 p.
43. Ben-Ze'ev A. Describing the emotion: a review of *The Cognitive Structure of Emotions* by Ortony, Clore & Collins / Aaron Ben-Ze'ev // *Philosophical Psychology*. – 1990. – Vol. 3, No. 2. – P. 305– 317.

44. Bosco F. M. The fundamental context categories in understanding communicative intention / F. M. Bosco, M. Bucciarelli, B. G. Bara // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 2004. – Vol. 36. – P. 467–488.
45. Brain activation for reading and listening comprehension: An fMRI study of modality effects and individual differences in language comprehension / A. Buchweitz, R. A. Mason, L. M. B. Tomitch / [et al.] // *Psychol. Neurosci.* – 2009. – Vol. 2, No. 2. – P. 111–123.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3081613/>
46. Bublitz W. Disturbed Coherence: 'Fill me in' / Wolfram Bublitz, Uta Lenk // *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse: how to create it and how to describe it : Selected papers from the International Workshop on Coherence, Augsburg, 24–27 April 1997 / edited by W. Bublitz, U. Lenk, E. Ventola.* – John Benjamins, 1999. – P. 153–174.
47. Caponigro I. Rhetorical questions as questions / Ivano Caponigro, Jon Sprouse // *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung / [edited by E. Puig-Waldmüller]*. – Barcelona : Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2007. – P. 121–133.
48. Carter R. *Cambridge grammar of English* / R. Carter, M. McCarthy. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2006. – 973 p.
49. Chafe W. Cognitive constraints on information flow / Wallace Chafe // *Coherence and grounding in discourse : outcome of a symposium (Eugene, Oregon, June 1984) / edited by R. S. Tomlin.* – Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 1987. – P. 21–51.
50. Clark H. H. *Conversation: Linguistic Aspects* / Herbert H. Clark // *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences*

- / [edited by N. J. Smelser, P. B. Baltes]. – London : Elsevier, 2001. – P. 2744–2747.
51. Collins P. Clause Types / Peter Collins // The Handbook of English Linguistics / [edited by B. Aarts, A. McMahon]. – Oxford : Blackwell Publishing, 2006. – P. 180–197.
52. Cowie R. Describing the emotional states that are expressed in speech / Roddy Cowie, Randolph R. Cornelius // Speech Communication. – 2003. – Vol. 40.
– P. 5–32.
53. Cruttenden A. Intonation / Alan Cruttenden. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1986. – 220 p.
54. Daneš F. A Three-Level Approach to Syntax [Electronic resource] / František Daneš // Travaux linguistiques de Prague, 1966. – Vol. 1. – P. 225–237. –
Access: http://www.google.com.ua/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CB4QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.romanistik.unifreiburg.de%2Ffraible%2Flehre%2F2006%2Fmaterialien%2FDanes_Three_Level2.doc&ei=RfvLVIqDaq7ygOFnYHYBw&usg=AFQjCNGTwprmspz1UJ1y6o_u_RQGxj5kRw&sig2=3GIvwpAbf04hM3yUQHsiXA&bvm=bv.84607526,d.bGQ
55. [www.romanistik.unifreiburg.de%2Ffraible%2Flehre%2F2006%2Fmaterialien%2FDanes_Three_Level2.doc&ei=RfvLVIqDaq7ygOFnYHYBw&usg=AFQjCNGTwprmspz1UJ1y6o_u_RQGxj5kRw&sig2=3GIvwpAbf04hM3yUQHsiXA&bvm=bv.84607526,d.bGQ](http://www.google.com.ua/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CB4QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.romanistik.unifreiburg.de%2Ffraible%2Flehre%2F2006%2Fmaterialien%2FDanes_Three_Level2.doc&ei=RfvLVIqDaq7ygOFnYHYBw&usg=AFQjCNGTwprmspz1UJ1y6o_u_RQGxj5kRw&sig2=3GIvwpAbf04hM3yUQHsiXA&bvm=bv.84607526,d.bGQ)
56. Daneš F. Universality vs, Culture-Specificity of Emotion / Frantisek Daneš // Emotion in Dialogic Interaction: Advances in the Complex / [edited by E. Weigand]. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Complany, 2004. – P. 23–32.

58. Davis S. Perlocutions / Steven Davis // *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics* / [J. R. Searle, F. Kiefer, M. Bierwisch]. – Dordrecht : Reidel Publishing Company, 1980. – P. 37–55.
59. Dickinson C. Memory and Conversation / Connie Dickinson, T. Givon // *Conversation: Cognitive, communicative and social perspectives* / [edited by T. Givon]. – Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1997. – P. 91–132.
60. Dijk T. A. van Context Models in Discourse Processing / Teun A. van Dijk // *The Construction of Mental Representations During Reading* / [edited by H. van Oostendorp, S. R. Goldman]. – Mahwah, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1999. – P. 123–148.
61. Dijk T. A. van *Discourse and Context: A sociocognitive approach* / Teun A. van Dijk. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2008. – 267 p.
62. Dijk T. A. van *Discourse and knowledge* / Teun A. van Dijk // *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis* / [edited by J. P. Gee, M. Handford]. – London : Routledge, 2012. – P. 587–603.
63. Dijk T. A. van *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach* / Teun A. van Dijk. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2014. – 400 p.
64. Dynel M. On the Part of Ratified Participants: Ratified Listeners in Multiparty Interactions / Marta Dynel // *Brno Studies in English*. – 2014. – Vol. 40, No. 1. – P. 27–44.
65. Egg M. Meaning and use of rhetorical questions / Markus Egg // *Proceedings of the 16th Amsterdam Colloquium* / [edited by P. Dekker]. – Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2007. – P. 73–78.

66. Ekman P. Basic Emotions / Paul Ekman // *The Handbook of Cognition and Emotion* / [edited by T. Dalgleish, T. Power]. – Sussex : John Wiley & Sons, 1999. – P. 45–60.
67. Enfield N. J. Question-response sequences in conversation across ten languages: An Introduction / N. J. Enfield, T. Stivers, S. Levinson // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 2010. – Vol. 42, No. 10. – P. 2615–2619.
68. Escandell-Vidal V. Echo-syntax and metarepresentations / Victoria Escandell-Vidal // *Lingua*. – 2002. – Vol. 112. – P. 871–900.
69. Fiengo R. Asking questions. Using meaningful structures to imply ignorance / Robert Fiengo. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2007. – 179 p.
70. Fillmore C. J. Frame Semantics / Charles J. Fillmore // *Linguistics in the Morning Calm: Selected Papers from SICOL-1981* / [edited by The Linguistic Society of Korea]. – Seoul : Hanshin Publishing Company, 1982. – P. 111–137.
71. Fraser B. Towards a theory of discourse markers / Bruce Fraser // *Approaches to discourse particles* / [edited by Kerstin Fischer]. – Amsterdam : Elsevier, 2006. – P. 189–204.
72. Garnham A. Language Comprehension / Alan Garnham // *Handbook of Cognition* / [edited by K. Lamberts, R. L. Goldstone]. – London : Sage Publications, 2005. – P. 241–254.
73. Geis M. L. Speech acts and conversational interaction / Michael L. Geis. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 1995. – 248 p.
74. Gernsbacher M. A. Watching the Brain Comprehend Discourse / Morton Ann Gernsbacher, David A. Robertson // *Experimental*

- cognitive psychology and its applications / [edited by A. F. Healy]. – Washington, DC : American Psychological Association, 2005. – P. 157–167.
75. Gibbs R. W. Jr. *Intentions in the Experience of Meaning* / Raymond W. Gibbs Jr. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1999. – 414 p.
76. Graesser A. C. *Constructing Inferences During Narrative Text Comprehension* / A. C. Graesser, M. Singer, T. Trabasso // *Psychological Review*. – 1994. – Vol. 101, No. 3. – P. 371–395.
77. Graesser A. C. *Discourse Comprehension* / Arthur C. Graesser, Keith K. Millis, Rolf A. Zwaan // *Annual Review of Psychology*. – 1997. – Vol. 48. – P. 163–189.
78. Grice P. *Studies in the Way of Words* / Paul Grice. – Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard University Press, 1989. – 394 p.
79. Grosz B. J. *Attention, Intentions, and the Structure of Discourse* / B. J. Grosz, C. L. Sidner // *Computational Linguistics*. – 1986. – Vol. 12, No. 3. – P. 175–204.
80. *Have P. ten Doing Conversation Analysis* / Paul ten Have. – [2nd edition]. – London : Sage Publications, 2007. – 246 p.
81. Heritage J. *Oh-Prefaced Responses to Assessments: A Method of Modifying Agreement/Disagreement* / John Heritage // *The Language of Turn and Sequence* / [edited by C. Ford, B. Fox, S. Thompson]. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2002. – P. 196–224.
82. Horn L. R. *A Natural History of Negation* / Laurence R. Horn. – Stanford : CSLI Publications, 2001. – 637 p.

83. Huddleston R. Introduction to the Grammar of English / Rodney Huddleston. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1984. – 483 p.
84. Huffman K. Psychology in action / Karen Huffman. – [10th edition]. – Oxford : John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2012. – 784 p.
85. Ilie C. Question-response argumentation in talk shows / Cornelia Ilie // Journal of Pragmatics. – 1999. – Vol. 31, No. 8. – P. 975–1000.
86. Izard C. E. Basic Emotions, Natural Kinds, Emotion Schemas, and a New Paradigm / Carroll E. Izard // Perspectives on Psychological Science. – 2007. – Vol. 2, No. 3. – P. 360–380.
87. Leech G. N. Principles of pragmatics / Geoffrey N. Leech. – London : Longman, 1983. – 250 p.
88. Lewis D. M. Discourse markers in English: a discourse-pragmatic view / Diana M. Lewis // Approaches to discourse particles / [edited by Kerstin Fischer]. – Amsterdam : Elsevier, 2006. – P. 43–59.
89. Longman grammar of spoken and written English / [D. Biber, J. Johansson, G. Leech et al.]. – London : Longman, 1999. – 1204 p. . Lumsden D. Kinds of Conversational Cooperation / David Lumsden // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2008. – Vol. 40, No. 11. – P. 1896–1908.
90. McCawley J. D. The Syntactic Phenomena of English / James D. McCawley. – [2nd edition]. – Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1998. – 834 p.
91. Nairne J. S. Psychology / James S. Nairne. – [enhanced 5th edition]. – Wadsworth : Cengage Learning, 2011. – 547 p.

92. Noh E.-J. A pragmatic approach to echo questions / Eun-Ju Noh // UCL Working Papers in Linguistics. – 1995. – Vol. 7. – P. 107–140.
93. Noordman L. Discourse Comprehension / Leo Noordman, Wietske Vonk // Language Comprehension: A Biological Perspective / [edited by A. D. Friederici]. – 2nd edition. – Berlin : Springer-Verlag, 1999. – P. 229–257
94. Norrick N. R. Discourse markers in oral narrative / Neal R. Norrick // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2001. – Vol. 33. – P. 849–878.
95. Nuyts J. Aspects of a cognitive-pragmatic theory of language: on cognition, functionalism, and grammar / Jan Nuyts. – Amsterdam, 1992. – 399 p.
96. Oatley K. Cognitive approaches to emotions / Keith Oatley, P. N. Johnson-Laird // Trends in Cognitive Sciences. – 2014. – Vol. 18, No. 3. – P. 134–140.
97. Parrott W. G. The Nature of Emotion / W. Gerrod Parrott // Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intraindividual Processes / [edited by A. Tesser, N. Schwarz]. – Oxford / Malden : Blackwell Publishers, 2001. – P. 375–390.
98. Pessoa L. On the relationship between emotion and cognition / Luiz Pessoa // Nature Reviews Neuroscience. – 2008. – Vol. 9. – P. 148–158.
99. Pomerantz A. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes / Anita Pomerantz // Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis / [edited by J. M. Atkinson, J. Heritage]. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1984. – P. 57–101.

100. Purver M. The Theory and Use of Clarification Requests in Dialogue : PhD Thesis [Electronic resource] / Matthew Purver. – London, 2004. – 331 p.
101. Radford A. An Introduction to English Sentence Structure / Andrew Radford. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2009. – 445 p.
102. Radford A. Transformational Grammar : A First Course / Andrew Radford. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1988. – 625 p.
103. Reference: Interdisciplinary Perspectives / [edited by J. K. Gundel, N. Hedberg]. – New York : Oxford University Press, 2008. – 279 p.