

industry and offers a number of benefits: provide a new channel for gathering information and expanding knowledge about readership needs and interests, serving as a bridge to a new generation of audience, allow to significantly reduce administrative and organizational costs. Mobile applications are becoming more and more popular versions of online media. New forms of presentation and distribution of news via mobile communications have led to an objective need for standardization of the procedure for representation news in mobile applications and application programming interfaces, theoretical justification, creation and development of new data models. Today, new professional standards of news journalism are implemented in the Ukrainian information space. The introduction of international professional standards in domestic journalism practice remains an extremely important issue. The purpose of the article is to analyze the components of the Ninjs data model according to the standard of news representation in JSON (textual data-interchange format in JavaScript) developed by the International Press Telecommunications Council. The standard defines key properties and structures required to represent news and publishing information in JSON for application programming interfaces, mobile applications, database etc. The Ninjs data model is analyzed. The central component of model is a News item related with four blocks of objects, such as: Descriptive metadata, Administrative metadata, Content and Associations. The main characteristics of all component attributes of the model are given.

Keywords: mobile journalism, news, standard, data model, mobile applications

УДК 316.454.5

REPLIES VS. RESPONSES IN COMMUNICATION AND METACOMMUNICATION

I. V. GRABOVSKA, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,

E-mail: ivgrabovska@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4229-6298

Ya. S. KHARCHENKO, the Fourth-Year Student,

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

E-mail: fitoczaj@gmail.com

Abstract. The paper provides the study of the phenomena of replies and responses in communication and metacommunication. The article introduces two basic types of interrogative utterances in conversational dialogue, i. e., communicative and metacommunicative questions. The research conducted helps to acknowledge that communicative questions are opposite in meaning to metacommunicative questions. Communicative questions are information seeking lexical-semantic and syntactic formations, which require informative answers (replies) from the listener. Metacommunicative questions are noninformative interrogative utterances that urge the speaker and the listener to maintain conversation and require informal answers (responses). With the help of replies we may give full answers to questions, show our knowledge and awareness in the problem. Responses, on the other hand, are reactions that deliver metainformation within a message. The prospects for study consist in further in-depth synthesis of practical material, investigation of the function of regulation of the emotional tone of interaction via responses in conversational dialogues.

Keywords: reply, response, communication, metacommunication, communicative question, metacommunicative question

Introduction. Topicality of this scientific paper is determined by the anthropocentricity of modern linguistics, which enables the study of speech in the light of pragmatic factors and requires special attention to the communicative behaviour of the interlocutors, the discovery of the recipient's factor as one of the main anthropocomponents of the communicative act, and the investigation of pragmatics of the discursive behaviour of the addressee in the process of question-and-answer turn-exchange under the influence of the social status. The complex nature of the question-and-answer dialogic unity reflects the specificity of the communicative process, which is considered not only from the point of view of the relationship between the speaker and the listener, but also from the standpoint of each of the speakers' individual contribution to the solution of the communicative tasks. Question-and-answer dialogic unity is the basic interactive structure used by the interlocutors as the communicative skills of the listeners are manifested primarily through their answers to the speakers' questions, regardless of the type of the communicative situation.

Verbal communication is a two-way process. Firstly, it is a communicative process associated with the essential meaning of utterances and with handling of language objectives in communication, and, secondly, it is a metacommunicative process pertaining both to the regulation of the verbal communication process proper via language means and to the organization of social interaction.

The purpose of this research is to differentiate replies and responses as answers pertaining to communicative and metacommunicative aspects of dialogic discourse.

The methods of investigation are the following: the studying and critical analysis of the literature on the problem, the methods of deduction, synthesis and contextual analysis.

Results. Questions may express a great variety of shades. The speaker asks questions in order to check whether the listener knows an answer, can listen or amaze interlocutors [7, p. 413]. Therefore, those questions that make requests for information and necessary reply are considered to be communicative. Communicative questions are opposed to metacommunicative questions. The category of metacommunicative question comprises interrogative constructions that enable us to define competence, attitude or purpose of an inquirer pertaining to the organizational aspect of communication. Though metacommunicative questions have interrogative elements in their structure, they do not express any inquiry. Thus, such questions are determined as interrogative sentences with atypical semantics [5].

Metacommunicative questions possess stimulating semantics that during the communicative contact manifests inducement to a **response** rather than to a reply, i. e., not to deliver any vitally important information with a verbal informative message, but with metainformation. For instance, the listeners' attention to the delivered message may be a sign of a slight amazement on their face, a concerned look at the speaker, a sigh of sympathy, etc. We may note that contact semantics, naturally peculiar to metacommunicative questions, serves for maintaining the listener's attention on a certain level.

Responses can only be identified according to their pragmatic and interactive functions in dialogic discourse. The occurrence of the response serves as a criterion for the question: since there is the response, the question must have preceded [4, p. 49]. We should deal with the response in the broad sense of the reply to the statement. There are two main criteria for responses: one is the placement of an utterance in a sequence of utterances produced by different speakers, and the second one is appropriateness in relation to "here-and-now", which involves "the context of the situation" and "the common ground". With the

question defined as the utterance that may elicit the response, the response is bound to be the utterance elicited by the question. But this does not signify that any utterance following the question may be qualified as the response. The term does not simply mean “cause the addressee to say something” [12, p. 25] or what they say should be coherently related to the question. In other words, the utterance following the question is an appropriate response only if this second condition is fulfilled.

Contrary to the question, the response can hardly be described as an illocutionary act at all. An utterance may function as the illocutionary act whether or not this is made explicit by the “hereby formula” [2, p. 57] and irrespective of placement in the discourse, it can be intended as the question without eliciting the response. The response, on the other hand, is bound to its position in the discourse; the hereby formula does not turn the utterance into the response, unless this particular utterance can be related to the preceding question. Thus, the response is basically an interactional phenomenon which must, however, be coherently linked with the question in order to be appropriate.

Whatever B says or does after the question has been addressed to the listener will be interpreted by A as the response until the speaker fails to see its relevance [4, p. 53]. This is a corollary of the adjacency pair principle. It is, of course, debatable whether what follows the question can always be recognized as a member of the pair, as an appropriate response. Nor is it really possible to predict, in the strict sense of the word, that response will follow and what that response will be. Following J. Sinclair and M. Coulthard [11, p. 22], we shall regard what B will do in the next utterance as a matter of anticipation – what B can be expected to do considering the effect of a certain question. The “continuation options” that are available after a request for confirmation are divided into three classes with varying degrees of social / interactional acceptability:

1. the preferred reaction which consists of acceptance or positive confirmation;
2. the less wanted, postponing reactions like checkbacks;
3. the least wanted reaction, refusal or doubt.

E. Goffman [4, p. 99] defines the specific type of response which he calls “response cry”. “A response cry is a ritualized act in something like the ethological sense of that term” [4, p. 100]. These are exclamatory interjections which are not full-fledged words. They are represented by *Oops!*, *Brr!*, *Ahh!*, *Phew!*, *Yipe!*, *Eek!*, *Euew!* These nonlexicalized, discrete interjections comport neatly with our doctrine of human nature. This commonsense view of response cries should give way to the co-occurrence analysis that is encouraged by sociolinguists. Response cry does not seem to be a statement in the linguistic sense, purportedly doing its work through the concatenated semantic reference of words. Let us consider some examples:

(1) The dentist: *Open your mouth please. Does this tooth hurt? Ok, I see caries. We'll have to seal it up!*

The patient: Oww! Ouch! [4, p. 256].

Here the functioning of this exclamation is rather clear. While sitting in a dentist's chair, we use a pain cry as a warning that the drill has begun to hurt. The cry in this case can serve as a self-regulated indicator of what is happening, providing a reading for the instigator of the pain, who might not otherwise have access to the information needed. The meaning may not be “*I have been hurt*”, but rather, “*You are just now coming to hurt me.*”

(2) Husband (*sitting in an armchair*): *At last I can relax after a hard-working day and read the evening paper!*

His wife was cleaning the room.

Husband: Good God!

Wife: *What is it?* [4, p. 358].

A husband reading the evening paper suddenly brays with laughter (*Good God!*), thereby causing his wife to orient her listening and even to ease the transition into talk by asking what it is.

(3) The waiter: *Are you ready with your order?*

The girl: *Yes, a piece of chocolate cake with nuts and a cup of coffee, please.*

After a while the waiter brings the order.

The girl: *Oooooo!* [4, p. 259]

A lower-middle-class adolescent girl sitting with her friends at a table in a crowded cafe is brought her order, a large piece of chocolate cake with nuts. As the dish is set before her, she is transfixed for a moment. Wonder and pleasure are expressed with an *Oooooo!* – the audible glee.

M. A. K. Halliday [6, p. 38] makes a distinction between *direct* and *indirect responses*. The direct response answers the question. The indirect response can either comment on the question (commentary), deny its relevance (disclaimer), or give supplementary information (supplementary response), which implies but does not actually express an answer. Commentary and disclaimer are replies since they are related to the act of questioning and not to the question itself.

Let us consider an illustration:

(4) JERRY: *Why? You have everything in the world you want; you've told me about your home, and your family, and your own little zoo. You have everything, and now you want this bench. Are these the things men fight for? Tell me, Peter, is this bench, this iron and this wood, is this your honour? Is this the thing in the world you'd fight for? Can you think of anything more absurd?*

PETER: *Absurd? Look, I'm not going to talk to you about honour, or even try to explain it to you. Besides, it isn't a question of honour; but even if it were, you wouldn't understand* [1, p. 14].

In the above example, Peter asks a metacommunicative echo-question in order to notice Peter's attention. We may regard it as the response the main aim of which is to maintain the communicative contact.

We have to extend our dialogic format – our adjacency pairs – to cover the whole range of pairs, not merely questions and answers, terms more specific than “question” and “answer” ought to be introduced. For, after all, an assertion is not quite a question, and the rejoinder is not quite an answer. E. Goffman speaks of “statements” and “replies”, intentionally using “statement” [12, p. 57] in a broader way than is sometimes found in language studies, but still retaining the notion that an initiating element is involved, to which reply is to be oriented.

And a **reply** is assumed as “a response in which the alignment implied and the object to which reference is made are both conveyed through words or their substitutes; furthermore, this being addressed by response is itself something that a prior speaker had referred to through words” [4, p. 48]. The reply refers responses to the performative [8]. For example:

(5) A: *Hello.*

B: *Hello.*

The second greeting is not the reply to the first, both are reactive responses to the sudden availability of the participants to each other, and the point of performing these small rituals is not to solicit the reply from the interlocutor but to enact an emotion that attests to the pleasure produced by the communicative contact.

The simplest communicative questions implicitly or explicitly request information (an answer) from a certain range (finite or infinite) of alternatives:

(6) A: *Why did you throw away the milk?*

B: *Because it had gone off* [9, p. 114].

With the help of the reply we may give full answers to questions, show our knowledge and awareness in the problem. Replies are found in the artful dialogue of the theatre and in novels, part of the transmutation of a conversation into a sprightly game in which the position of each player is reestablished or changed through each of these utterances, each of which is given central place as the referent of following replies [4, p. 49]. Let us consider the example:

(7) *"I know, of course," he said, "that bacon for breakfast is an English institution almost as old as parliamentary government. But still, don't you think we might OCCASIONALLY have a change, Dorothy?"*

"Bacon's so cheap now," said Dorothy regretfully. "It seems a sin not to buy it. This was only five pence a pound, and I saw some quite decent-looking bacon as low as three pence" [10, p. 18].

The speaker asks the general question. The listener gives the full answer to it. We may regard it as the reply because it contains certain information.

For many speech acts, like *Can you tell me what time it is?*, it is logically adequate to reply with one move, *It's six*. Why should B ever respond with more, as in *Yes, I can – it's six*, which is unnecessarily redundant. According to H. H. Clark's suggestion [3, p. 434-437], one reason is politeness. The response *Yes, I can – it's six* is normally taken to be more polite than *It's six*.

Replies are highly elliptical. For *Can you tell me what time it is?* the first expected move could conceivably be *Yes, I can tell you what time it is*, but it would ordinarily be reduced to *Yes, I can* or merely *Yes*. The second expected move could likewise be *The time now is six o'clock*, but it would ordinarily be reduced to *It's six* or merely *Six*. Such ellipsis results in two-move replies like *Yes, it's six* or *Yes, six*.

Replies are of three main types. First, there is the class of replies that A intends B to give. When the speaker asks the hearer *When does the museum close tonight?*, the speaker expects the addressee to produce an assertion that reveals the time the museum closes, as in *It closes at six* or *At six* or *Just before dark*. If B is fully cooperative and the circumstances are right, they will produce such a reply. This class of answers is called *expected replies*. Of course, A could be wrong in their presuppositions about the situation. If the museum is not open, B will say *It isn't open today*. If B does not know the answer, they will respond *Sorry, I don't know*. If B cannot figure out which museum the speaker is talking about, the addressee will ask *Which museum?* These are *cooperative replies*, but not the expected ones. And there is a variety of *uncooperative replies* like *How can I know?*

Discussion. To sum up, responses usually answer metacommunicative questions and deliver metainformation. While replies transfer vitally important information with a verbal informative message and answer communicative questions. The prospects for study consist in further in-depth synthesis of practical material, investigation of the function of regulation of the emotional tone of interaction via responses in conversational dialogues.

References

1. Albee, E. (1960). *The zoo story*. New York, Penguin Books, 42.
2. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 168.

3. Clark, H. H. (1979). Responding to indirect speech acts. *Cognitive psychology*. N. 11, 430–477.
4. Goffman, E. (1983). *Forms of talk*. Pennsylvania, University of Pennsylvania Press, 335.
5. Grabovska, I. V. (2014). Metakomunikatyvni pytannia v suchasnomu anglomovnomu dialogichnomu dyskursi: semantyka i pragmatyka [Metacommunicative questions in modern English dialogic discourse: semantics and pragmatics]. *Candidate's thesis*. Kyiv, KNLU, 223 [in Ukrainian].
6. Halliday, M. A. K. (1967). Notes on transitivity and theme in English: part 2. *Journal of linguistics*. N. 3, 177–274.
7. Huddleston, R. (1994). The contrast between interrogatives and questions. *Journal of linguistics*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. V. 30, n. 2, 411–439.
8. Lakoff, R. T. (1972). *Language in context*. Baltimore, Academic Press. N. 4, 907–927.
9. Orwell, G. (1998). *Burmese days*. *Fifty Essays*. London, Penguin Books, 102–118.
10. Orwell, G. (1998). *A clergyman daughter*. *Fifty Essays*. London, Penguin Books, 127–145.
11. Sinclair, J., Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils*. London, Oxford University Press, 25–36.
12. Stenström, A-B. (1984). *Questions and responses in English conversation*. Malmö, CWK GLEERUP, 296.

ІНФОРМАТИВНІ ВІДПОВІДІ VS. РЕСПОНСИВНІ РЕАКЦІЇ В КОМУНІКАЦІЇ І МЕТАКОМУНІКАЦІЇ

І. В. Грабовська, Я. С. Харченко

Анотація. У роботі розглядаються поняття інформативної відповіді та респонсивної реакції у комунікації та метакомунікації. У статті висвітлюються два основних типи питальних висловлень в інтеракції, а саме: комунікативні та метакомунікативні питання. Проведене дослідження допомагає встановити, що комунікативні питання і метакомунікативні питання є явищами, протилежними за своїм значенням. Комунікативні питання – це інформативно пошукові лексико-семантичні і синтаксичні утворення, основною метою яких є отримання необхідної для адресанта інформації (інформативної відповіді). Метакомунікативні питання формально не припиняють бути питаннями і тому вимагають певної реакції співрозмовника (респонсивної реакції). Перспективи дослідження полягають у подальшому поглибленому узагальненні практичного матеріалу, дослідженні функції регуляції емоційної тональності розмови за допомогою респонсивних реакцій.

Ключові слова: інформативна відповідь, респонсивна реакція, комунікація, метакомунікація, комунікативне питання, метакомунікативне питання

ИНФОРМАТИВНЫЕ ОТВЕТЫ VS. РЕСПОНСИВНЫЕ РЕАКЦИИ В КОММУНИКАЦИИ И МЕТАКОММУНИКАЦИИ

И. В. Грабовская, Я. С. Харченко

Аннотация. В работе рассматриваются понятия информативного ответа и респонсивной реакции в коммуникации и метакоммуникации. В статье освещаются два основных типа вопросительных высказываний в интеракции, а именно: коммуникативный и метакоммуникативный вопрос. Проведенное исследование помогает установить, что коммуникативные вопросы и метакоммуникативные

вопросы есть явлениями, противоположными по своему значению. Коммуникативные вопросы – это информативно поисковые лексико-семантические и синтаксические образования, основной целью которых является получение необходимой для адресанта информации (информативного ответа). Метакоммуникативные вопросы формально не прекращают быть вопросами и поэтому требуют определенной реакции собеседника (респонсивной реакции). Перспективы исследования заключаются в дальнейшем углубленном обобщении практического материала, исследовании функции регуляции эмоциональной тональности разговора с помощью респонсивных реакций.

Ключевые слова: информативный ответ, респонсивная реакция, коммуникация, метакоммуникация, коммуникативный вопрос, метакоммуникативный вопрос

ПРОБЛЕМИ ТЕОРІЇ І МЕТОДИКИ НАВЧАННЯ ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ

УДК: 37:316,3(477)

ТЕХНОЛОГІЯ « ЗАНУРЕННЯ » ПІД ЧАС ВИВЧЕННЯ ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ

В. С. МАКСИМЧУК, кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент,

E- mail : maks954@i.ua

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3521-7114

Г. І. СИДОРУК, кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,

Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України

E- mail : seagalina@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0850-0352

Анотація. У статті розглядається досвід застосування імерсійного методу (занурення) під час вивчення іноземних мов у розвинутих країнах світу та можливість його широкого впровадження в Україні. Проаналізовано сучасні погляди вітчизняних та закордонних мовознавців щодо його ролі в опануванні іноземних мов та значення у навчанні. Запропоновано краще дослідити зв'язок методу й індивідуальних можливостей студентів, залежно від їх темпераменту та впливу на результативність навчання в наших умовах. Особливо вважали б необхідним проведення досліджень у застосуванні імерсійного методу в умовах компактного проживання угорської, румунської та інших меншин в Україні, де мовне питання займає особливе місце.

Ключові слова: імерсійне навчання, офіційна мова, білінгвізм, материнська мова, полікультурна освіта, європейський досвід, адаптація

Актуальність. Будь-яке суспільство в наш час швидко змінюється, що веде також до помітних мовних змін, ролі та значення мов. Внаслідок суспільного тиску відбувається потужний вплив на методи вивчення іноземних мов, йде становлення більш сучасних і ефективних технологій. Імерсійний метод зарекомендував себе як дієвий метод на протязі десятиків років в Америці і Європі, про що свідчать дослідження багатьох центрів імерсійної освіти.