

THE COGNITIVE COMPONENT OF COMMUNICATIVE ROLES IN INSTITUTIONAL DIALOGUE

T. A. PASTERNAK, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

E-mail: tanya.pasternak@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0003-0589-6881

Abstract. *Communicative roles in the institutional dialogue are the carriers of cognitive information about the situation and its participants. The article explores and classifies communicative roles performed in the institutional dialogue. The aim of the study is to consider the cognitive component of communicative roles in the interviews for employment. Taking into account the specificity of the institutional dialogue, the cognitive component is considered in terms of role realization within status, status-categorical, categorical and positional communicative roles. Each category includes role-specific set of categorically related actions and characteristics associated with the actions and motives of the subjects featured member categories, including scenarios of communicative behavior. There are conventional expectations about standard actions of participants in a specific situation within definite institutional roles. However, unconventional scenarios of communicative behavior are considered a communication failure and require explanation contained in the communicators' speech steps, steering the direction of further discussion.*

Keywords: *institutional discourse; communicative roles; cognitive component; Membership categorization; interview for employment*

Introduction. Institutional discourse is a socio-communicative phenomenon which is generated by certain given institutional spheres of social interaction and therefore determined by the institutional requirements. In its turn, institutional communication simulates the norms of public institutions.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. Communicative roles, performed in the dialogue within institutional discourse, were researched by such scientists as Stephen Walker [16], Vladimir Karasik [1], Natalia Kravchenko [3; 5], Harvey Sacks [14; 15], John Heritage [12], Emanuel Schegloff, Vasil Shynkaruk [9], Svitlana Kharchenko [8] and others.

The founders of the role theory are thought to be an American social psychologist George Herbert Mead and an anthropologist Ralph Linton [11], who focused their researches on the study of interpersonal interaction of individuals. Such interaction resulted in engendered, fixed and then repeated social roles as expected behavioral models of communicative personality, which splits into various incarnations to perform communication roles.

Modern scientists consider the role as the system of communicative manifestations of an individual, characterized by stereotyped mutual rights and obligations [4]; role expectations; "fixed" communicative behavior, conditioned by social characteristics (e.g. social status, age, gender and others). Communicative roles in the institutional dialogue, as the most parameterized one, carry cognitive information about a communicative situation and its participants. Communicators often act in the dialogue not as "global" personalities, but as the preconditioned ones, choosing one of their social roles to dominate among others [7].

In modern linguistics there are two main approaches to the study of communicative roles in interaction: traditional and conversational analytical (ethnomethodological). The traditional approach is inherently performative, constructive. It is focused on the analysis of macrodiscursive categories and their performance in local interactions. According to this approach, any social role of a communicator is defined by his/her more or less permanent status, determining the type of communicative behavior in a particular dialogue, in view of the society' expectations relative to the person who has certain social functions. It implies more or less fixed standards of behavior and activities that actualize the relationship of the individual and social characteristics of the language. In other words, a person performs the role according to his/her particular set of social characteristics defined by his/her social status. According to sociologists, social status makes a certain position in the social structure of a group or society connected with other positions through the system of rights and obligations [2]. Analyzing communicative roles the researcher priori takes into account their social permanent characteristics and forecasts the roles which can be performed, based on his/her proper knowledge and understanding of the characteristics of social categories preempting their identification in interactions. Thus, analyzing the interview for employment, the investigator will be guided by his/her own experience or previous knowledge of the interview or the interviewer as an open minded chief, a competent person, an expert or a strict official, and will find the proof of his/her knowledge in the dialogue, neglecting other roles that arise during live interaction.

Unlike the traditional one, the conversational analytical approach (Harvey Sacks, John Heritage, Emanuel Schegloff) focuses on the microanalysis of the roles in the discursive environment. Conversational analysts are more interested not in how a certain role is performed, but how its realization influences the participants' passages and the whole interaction. The research is focused on the members of interaction themselves, that is which roles they choose to reach particular goals, which roles are accepted by them, and which ones are cancelled/declined as irrelevant for a certain moment of the dialogue. This approach is consistent with the idea of Erving Goffman, that the development of factors of personal cooperation, which are constantly changing depending on a certain situation or communicative turn, defines conscious or unconscious choice of a particular strategy or tactic as well as the communication manner of the speakers both in everyday and institutional communication [11]. Therefore, the choice of communicative roles by participants of institutional dialogue is defined not only by their institutional status due to the communicative situation, but also by definite communicative turns of interactants to reach local interactive goals. These goals may appear during the dialogue and relate to different individual interests; therefore they cannot be planned beforehand and expected by the other interactant.

Purpose of the academic paper is to consider the cognitive components of communicative roles in the interviews for employment.

Results. Taking into account the specificity of the institutional dialogue, the cognitive component is considered in terms of role realization within status, status-categorical, categorical and positional communicative roles [6].

Status roles define the communicative relations of domination / subordination (asymmetrical roles) and equality (symmetrical roles), regulating the rights and responsibilities of communicators in specific institution. Status roles in the institutional dialogue fulfill global interaction aims and have pairs. In the dialogue for employment we identified such status roles as the "HR Representative" and the "Applicant".

The interviewer's role "HR Representative" is marked by the rights:

- 1) to commence and finish the dialogue;

Let's get started; Please, take a seat. So, tell me ...; So, Alexander, have a seat. How are you doing today?; Well, we've just about finished; Well, thank for now;

2) to interrupt the speaker;

Interviewee: ...I'm five minutes late. I'm sorry, I ...

Interviewer: Don't worry about it. Please, sit down;

Candidate: ... Basically, the client was developing a new internet retail strategy, and we were in charge of examining possible costs ... Interviewer: (interrupts) Okay, thanks for that;

3) to make employment decisions;

We'll let you know when we make a decision; I am quite prepared to offer you a job with us;

4) to express approval or subjective opinion about the interlocutor;

So, you are ready for a change; I can see that you bring a lot of quantitative expertise to your work; That's good; it sounds pretty challenging; Sounds like you got a lot out of it;

5) to switch to another question;

1st interviewer's question: Where do you see yourself in five years' time?; 2nd interviewer's question: How do you cope with people who resent your success?;

The corresponding role "Applicant" is subordinate, and is marked by the obligation:

1) to answer the interviewer's questions (we did not find applicants' refusal to answer interviewers' questions);

2) to follow offered way of running the interview and to go along with interlocutor's talk;

George: Now, Linda has briefed me a little on your background, and I see that you interned at Armstrong; Sherry: Yes;

Status-categorical roles provide the most stereotypical, institutionally standardized role-related variants of institutional dialogue, and may include national, regional and ethnic features. The realization of these roles is conditioned by various social extra linguistic factors that affect the emergence of new categories, transformation and / or modification of existing ones, and disappearance of certain categories within the status role as withdrawn from active performance.

Having analyzed samples of the interviews for employment, we managed to identify such variants of status-categorical roles within the status role "HR Representative", as "Team Member", "Friendly Boss", "Malevolent Boss" and "Expert"; which form communicative pairs with the corresponding subordinate role "Applicant": "Team Member", "Subordinate", "Carrier of Skills and Knowledge estimated by the Expert". Each role performs certain functions for the global institutional aim. For example, the role "Team Member" is introduced by the interviewer:

1) to evaluate applicant's skills and qualities for teamwork;

Would you rather deal with a customer's problem yourself ...or let someone else handle it? How well do you think you cope with conflicts?;

2) to find out about applicant's attitude to hierarchical relationship in the company;

Who is your ideal boss? How do you feel about working with superiors who may be less intelligent or competent than you?;

3) to emphasize corporate ethics, dedication, team spirit;

We always try to put the customer first; I guess that's why we're all working here ...

.In order to match interviewer's expectations the applicant performs corresponding synonymic role "Team member" but with different pragmatic aims, namely:

1) to show awareness of company policy and activities;

I know you are a very promising company;

2) to show loyalty to company management, readiness to share company goals and policy;

I believe this company has an excellent product that would do very well in these and other overseas markets);

3) to demonstrate own team skills and qualities;

I had excellent relationships with my last two supervisors who rated me in the top five percent of the workforce in terms of cooperation.

Categorical roles characterize communicative personality, revealing his/her social and cultural belonging based on age, gender, cultural, professional, religious, psychological, and other features within status and status-categorical roles. The choice of specific category, containing stereotypical characteristics, serves as a source of additional information about participants as representatives of a particular social group. For example, the category “Investor” is used by the interviewer to identify long-term benefits from the applicant (local goal):

What do you see yourself doing in three years’ time? Where do you see yourself in 5 years?.

This role implies “readiness to invest time and money”, “profit”, “benefits”, etc. and evaluates the candidate’s readiness to grow and develop professionally in the limited time period.

Distribution lists involve interaction in certain categories on the principle of “categories of membership” (membership categorization), described by H. Sachs. It means that spontaneous dialogue communication is strictly regulated and membership categorization defines the direction of interaction within relevant categories. Each category includes role-specific set of categorically related actions and characteristics associated with the actions and motives of the subjects featured member categories, including scenarios of communicative behavior. For example, there are conventional expectations about the standard of actions of employment: candidate submits his/her resume and the technical staff analyze it. Normal behavior expected from the candidate during the interview includes: polite, “obedient” treatment of interviewer, required answers to the questions. On the contrary, lewd behavior and refusal to answer questions during the interview for employment will be considered “not related to the categories” and subject to explanation. Thus, the same categories are carriers of inferential knowledge to interpret the communicative behavior of speakers. So, if one of the participants in the interaction claims for “merchant”, then it would be expected from him / her such communication turns as “offer”, “auction”, “bargaining”, “advertising” and other activities related to the purchase and sale. However, unconventional scenario of communicative behavior is considered a communication failure and requires explanation contained in the communicators’ speech turns, steering the direction of further discussion.

Categorical roles may contain features of the other roles (status, status-categorical, and positional (see below)). In this case the function of the category in a definite situation matters to detect how the choice of categories (its acceptance or refusal by other speaker) results in successful or unsuccessful outcomes.

Positional roles, being the least institutionally standardized ones compared with status, status-categorical and categorical roles, embody personal component of discourse and provide information about states, moods, emotions of participants.

Positional roles do not have forecasted interactive pairs, as their performance is conditioned by the communicative tactics which may change in local speech steps due to local goals change.

The sequence of positional role-playing within categorical or status-categorical roles creates a role-playing scenario to meet local communicative aims.

In the interview for employment between Carlos (applicant) and Joe (interviewer). First the interviewer performs the categorical role “Investor” to evaluate long-term benefits for the company (*Where do you expect to be in five years’ time?*). The question is aimed to clarify the candidate’s job jumping experience, stated in his resume (*I’ve been refreshing my memory of your c.v. It makes interesting reading. Rather a mixed career so far*). In response the applicant plays the positional role “Unserious”, showing, that he still cannot set a career goal (*Well, a head of department – assistant head, anyway – in technical sales, or overseas marketing*). In the next speech turn the interviewer acts as the “Malevolent Boss” in the position of “Ironic Employer”, showing the doubt to hire a worker with unsuitable qualities (*You’re quite sure about that? You think your track record will help you?*), and expecting another role, relevant to the situation. However, the applicant does not change his position (*yes, I think it will*), and that activates other positional interviewer’s role “Unpleasantly Astonished” (*who really doesn’t know where he’s going*). The interviewer cannot accept applicant’s role “Unserious” (*Why do you say that?*) and in the next turn he becomes “Irritated” (*Well, you tell me, Dr Vila. Why did you move from banking to printing, to computer consultancy and now you want to move into heavy industry? And perhaps I ought to mention global navigation?*). This role makes the applicant to introduce repairing roles of “Experienced” (*In every position that I’ve had I was developing my knowledge of computer systems. That knowledge I can apply equally well to banking, or machine automation, or image recognition – anything you like*) and “Ready to Challenge” (*It was an adventure, of course, but we also carried out a research programme for computer-aided satellite navigation*) within categories “Apprentice” and “Researcher” to change interviewer’s position and steer the right direction of the dialogue. The choice of categories was successful as it resulted in acceptance of the role “Experienced” and the change of the interviewer’s position from “Unpleasantly Astonished” to “Pleasantly Surprised” (*I see. Well, may be you have a point*).

Conclusion. To sum up, institutional dialogue displays a sequence of categorical roles within certain status-categorical role that is determined and conditioned by the institutional status. Positional roles are more varied and flexible in terms of short-term goal realization.

Список використаних джерел

1. Карасик, В. И. Язык социального статуса: Социолингвистический аспект. Прагмалингвистический аспект. Лингвистический аспект. [Текст] / В. И. Карасик. – Москва: Гнозис, 2002. 333 с.
2. Кравченко, А. И. Социология. [Текст] / А. И. Кравченко. – Москва: Логос, 1999 – С. 86-109.
3. Кравченко, Н. К. Дискурс и дискурс-анализ: краткая энциклопедия [Текст] / Н. К. Кравченко – Киев: Интерсервис. – 2017. – 286 с.
4. Крысин, Л. П. Речевое общение и социальные роли говорящих. Социально-лингвистические исследования. [Текст] / Л. П. Крысин. – Москва: Наука, 1977 – С. 42-51.
5. Кравченко, Н. К., Пастернак, Т. А. Методика исследования разговорного дискурса в ракурсе теории релевантности (инференционно-прагматическая модель) [Текст] / Н. К. Кравченко, Т. А. Пастернак // Одеський лінгвістичний вісник. – Одеса, 2016. – Вип. 8. – С. 40-43.

6. Пастернак, Т. А. Прагматика інституційного дискурсу «співбесіда»: лінгвокомунікативний аспект. Монографія. [Текст] / Т.А. Пастернак. – К.: Інтерсервіс, 2017 – 206 с.
7. Селиванова, Е. А. Основы лингвистической теории текста и коммуникации. [Текст] / Е. А. Селиванова. – Киев: Фитосоциоцентр, 2002 – 336 с.
8. Харченко, С. В. Засоби вираження спонукання в українській літературній мові: семантико-синтаксичний і комунікативний аспекти: монографія [Текст] / С. В. Харченко. – К.: Міленіум, 2015. – 210 с.
9. Шинкарук, В. Д. Синтаксична структура речень з числівниковим компонентом в українській мові: монографія [Текст] / В. Д. Шинкарук, Н. М. Попович. – Чернівці: Чернівецький нац. ун-т, 2011. – 136с.
10. Fairclough, Norman. Analysing Discourse. [Print] / Norman Fairclough. – London: Routledge, 2004.
11. Goffman, E. The neglected situation. [Print] / Erving Goffman // Language in social context. – Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979. – P. 61-66.
12. Heritage, John. Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analysing data, [Print] / John Heritage // ed. Silverman D. Quantitative research: theory, method and practice. – London: Sage, 1997. – 161-182.
13. Role theory: concepts and research. [Print] // Eds. Biddle B. J., Thomas E. J. – Huntington (N. J.): Krieger, 1979.
14. Sacks, H. Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. [Print] / H. Sacks, E. Schegloff // Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology. – NY: Irvington Press, 1979, P. 15-21.
15. Sacks, H. Lectures on conversation. 2nd vol. [Print] / H. Sacks // Ed. Emanuel A. Schegloff. – Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992.
16. Walker, S. National role conceptions and systemic outcomes. [Print] / Stephen Walker // Psychological models in international politics. / Ed. Falkowski L. Boulder. – CO: Westview Press, 1979, P. 169-210.

References

1. Karasik, V. I. (2002) Yazyk sotsialnoho statusa: Sotsiolingvisticheskiy aspect. Pragmalingvisticheskiy aspect. Lingvisticheskiy aspect [The language of social status. Sociolinguistic aspect. Pragmalinguistic aspect. Linguistic aspect]. Moscow: Hnosis. 333.
2. Kravchenko, A. I. (1999) Sotsiolohiia [Sociology]. Moscow: Logos. 86-109.
3. Krysin, L. P. (1977) Rechevoe obschenie y sotsialnye roli govoryaschih. Sotsialno-lingvisticheskoe issledovanie [Communication and social roles of speakers. Social and linguistic research]. Moscow: Nauka, 42-51.
4. Kravchenko, N. K. (2017) Dyskurs y dyskurs-analiz: kratkaya entsyklopediia [Discourse and discourse analysis: brief encyclopedia] Kyev: Interservys, 286.
5. Kravchenko, N. K., Pasternak, T. A. (2016) Metodyka issledovaniya razhovornoho diskursa v rakurse teorii relevantnostiy (inferentsionno-prahmaticheskaya model) [Research methods of colloquial discourse in terms of relevance theory (inferential-pragmatic model)]. Odeskiy linhvistychnyy visnyk. Vyp. 8. Odesa, 40-43.
6. Pasternak, T. A. (2017) Pragmatyka instytutsiinoho dyskursu “spivbesida”: lingvokomunikativnyi aspekt. Monografiia [Pragmatics of institutional discourse “job interview”: linguo-communicative aspect. Monograph] Kyiv: Interservis, 206.
7. Selivanova, E. A. (2002) Osnovy lingvisticheskoi teorii teksta y komunikatsii [The basics of linguistic theory of text and communication]. Kiev: Fitosotsiotsentr, 336.

8. Kharchenko, S. V. (2015) *Zasoby vyrazhennia sponukannia v ukrainskii literaturnii movi: semantyko-syntaksychnyi i komunikatyvnyi aspekty* [Means of expressing imperative in the Ukrainian literary language: semantic-syntactic and communicative aspects:] : monografiia, Kyiv : Milenium, 210

9. Shynkaruk, V.D., Popovich N.M (2011) *Cyntaksychna struktura rechen z chyslivnykovym komponentom v ukrainskii movi: monografiia* [The syntactic structure of sentences with a numeric component in the Ukrainian language]: monografiia - Chernivtsi: Chernivtsi National Unt., 2011,136.

10. Fairclough, Norman. (2004) *Analysing Discourse*. London: Routledge.

11. Goffman, E. (1979) *The neglected situation. Language in social context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 61-66.

12. Heritage, John. (1997) *Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analysing data*, ed. Silverman D. *Quantitative research: theory, method and practice*. London: Sage, 161-182.

13. *Role theory: concepts and research*. (1979) Eds. Biddle B. J. & Thomas E. J. Huntington (N.J.): Krieger.

14. Sacks, H. & Schegloff, E. (1979) *Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction*. *Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology*. NY: Irvington Press, 15-21.

15. Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on conversation*. 2 vol. Ed. Emanuel A. Schegloff. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

16. Walker, Stephen. (1979) *National role conceptions and systemic outcomes. Psychological models in international politics*. Ed. Falkowski L. Boulder. CO: Westview Press, 169-210

КОГНІТИВНИЙ КОМПОНЕНТ КОМУНІКАТИВНИХ РОЛЕЙ В ІНСТИТУЦІЙНОМУ ДІАЛОЗІ

Т. А. Пастернак

Анотація. *Стаття присвячена дослідженню комунікативних ролей в інституційному дискурсі як носіїв когнітивної інформації про ситуацію спілкування та її учасників. У межах роботи розроблена класифікація комунікативних ролей та досліджена роль когнітивного компоненту в інституційному діалозі на матеріалі співбесід при прийомі на роботу. Беручи до уваги специфіку інституційного діалогу, когнітивний компонент розглядається у межах реалізації статусних, статусно-категоріальних, категоріальних та позиційних комунікативних ролей. Кожна категорія має певний набір категоріально пов'язаних дій і характеристик, котрі асоціюються з діями та цілями суб'єктів пов'язаних категорій, включаючи сценарії комунікативної поведінки. Існують конвенційні очікування стандартних дій учасників діалогу у певних обставинах, в межах визначених комунікативних ролей. Неконвенційні сценарії комунікативної поведінки вважаються комунікативним збоєм і вимагають пояснень, виражених у мовних кроках комунікантів, спрямуванні подальшого розгортання діалогу.*

Ключові слова: *інституційний дискурс; комунікативні ролі; когнітивний компонент; категорія членства; співбесіда при прийомі на роботу*

КОГНИТИВНЫЙ КОМПОНЕНТ КОММУНИКАТИВНЫХ РОЛЕЙ В ИНСТИТУЦИОННОМ ДИАЛОГЕ

Т. А. Пастернак

Аннотация. *Статья посвящается исследованию коммуникативных ролей в институциональном дискурсе как носителей когнитивной информации о*

ситуации общения и её участников. В рамках данной работы разработана классификация коммуникативных ролей, а также определена роль когнитивного компонента в институциональном диалоге на материале собеседований при приёме на работу. Принимая во внимание специфику институционального диалога, когнитивный компонент рассматривается в рамках реализации статусных, статусно-категориальных, категориальных и позиционных ролей. Каждая категория имеет определённый набор категориально связанных действий и характеристик, ассоциируемых с действиями и целями субъектов этих категорий, включая сценарии коммуникативного поведения. Существуют конвенциональные ожидания стандартных действий участников диалога в определенных обстоятельствах, в рамках определенных коммуникативных ролей. Неконвенциональные сценарии коммуникативного поведения считаются коммуникативным сбоем и требуют объяснений, содержащихся в коммуникативных ходах коммуникантов, направлении дальнейшего разворачивания диалога.

Ключевые слова: институциональный дискурс; коммуникативные роли; когнитивный компонент; категория членства; собеседование при приёме на работу

УДК: 811.124(477)

ДЕКІЛЬКА МІРКУВАНЬ ПРО ІМАНЕНТНІ ДЖЕРЕЛА ТВОРЕННЯ ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОЇ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ ВІД ДОБИ ПІЗНЬОГО СЕРЕДНЬОВІЧЧЯ ТА БАРОКО ДО НОВІТНІХ СВІТОГЛЯДНО-ЕСТЕТИЧНИХ ТЕНДЕНЦІЙ

О.М.СИТЬКО, кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
Одеський державний університет внутрішніх справ

E-mail: magistra2008@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9831-6182

Анотація У статті досліджується феномен української духовно-інтелектуальної причетності до європейського дискурсу, явлений ще в добу Середньовіччя та Бароко. Окремо вивчається багатоаспектний універсум сприйняття класичних латинських творів Сенеки та Марка Аврелія в новітньому українському гуманітарному дискурсі. Також осмислено базисні концепти світосприйняття й поетики римських мислителів, окреслюються обрії впливу їх ідей на сьогодення. В указаному контексті приділено окрему увагу осмисленню ідей сучасного духовного мислителя, митрополита, професора Єпіфанія (Думенка), який вивчає семіосферу формування й трансцендентального розвитку вітчизняної духовно-словесної культури. Розгортання досліджень у такому світоглядно-науковому дискурсі можуть мати перспективний характер і використовуватись у різних царинах вітчизняних соціально-гуманітарних дисциплін. Зосібна таких як мовознавство, літературознавство, українознавство, методики викладання мови та літератури, філософія, богослов'я, історичні дисципліни.

Ключові слова: класична латина, феномен української новолатинської культури, новітній український гуманітарний дискурс, Сенека, Марк Аврелій