DIALOGUE AS A PARTICULAR TYPE OF TEXT BASED ON COLLABORATION

VIORICA CONDRAT[*]

Dialogue as an essential form of communication constitutes a complex phenomenon that is worth examining from both linguistic and pragmatic perspectives. Far from being chaotic, its structure comprises a mechanism of formulas and specific conventions that contribute to the creation of a coherent interactive discourse. It is, in essence, the praxiological realization of the speech, and "speech (as saying) is, definitely, communication" (Coşeriu 2009: 10).

It is well structured having a coherent internal organization, which comes as a result of the participants' conventional agreement to be clear, brief, correct and relevant if they want to decode the implied meaning correctly (Grice 1989: 28), and, thus, have a successful verbal interaction. It implies that dialogue is above all collaboration; it is "a flexible text negotiated between the various participants" (Pridham 2001: 42).

It is important to point to the presence of certain circumstances that ensures the smooth negotiation of meanings in a dialogue. The interlocutors are involved in a collaborative process of realizing their communicative intentions. The way they structure their dialogue depends on the context of their interaction.

The role of the context is indisputable, as the replies in a verbal interaction may not be connected one with another on the surface. It is the concrete situation and the interpersonal relations of the participants that should be taken into consideration in order to decode the dialogue. In this way, the spatio-temporal particularities and the participants' relations are of extreme importance in the process of speech[1].

[*] „Alecu Russo" State University, Bălţi, Pushkin Street, no. 38, Republic of Moldova.

[1] According to Catherine Kerbrat-Orecchioni (1997) the context comprises the following elements: a. the setting that includes the temporal and spatial locations; b. the goal; and she distinguishes between the global and punctual goals; and c. the participants. The linguist emphasizes

ALIL, t. LI, 2011, Bucureşti, p. 135–142

BDD-A1222 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:43:14 UTC)

The study of dialogue should be done at all levels of the language. At the same time, it should focus on the pragmatic and socio-cultural aspects of communication as well. Thus, it should be analyzed taking into account:

(1) segmental and supersegmental characteristics;
(2) the morphological and lexical properties of the sequences (specific words, such as: introductions, closings, words that have a more or less ritualistic character);
(3) syntactic relations;
(4) semantic relations;
(5) the pragmatic features of the dialogue regarded as a sequence of speech acts;
(6) the control of the interaction;
(7) the socio-cultural properties, the participants and the context.

As the interactive discourse involves the presence of both social and linguistic behavior, dialogue should be analyzed through two perspectives: interactional and illocutionary. Each dialogue is built on its interactants' utterances that carry with them their individualities and attitudes that may be sometimes conflicting. That is why every interactant willing to have a successful interaction engages in "a dynamic process of negotiation" (Edmondson 1981: 54).

Let's consider the following example which is an instance of social activity done via speech:

'Now, who's going to wash his teeth?'
'But I don't want to go to bed.'

At the surface, it is an exchange of two replies: the first is initiative and the second – reactive. It is an adjacency pair that motivates from within the participants' cooperation. The first has the role of a sender (S), while the second of a receiver (R). However, these roles change with the second reply. This pair is structured in such a way that the first line implies the necessity of having the second.

In this case S1 orients her listener towards the answer's direction. Indeed, "the word in living conversation is directly, blatantly oriented toward a future answer word: it provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer's direction" (Quinn 2006: 117). However, the response from her interlocutor is a dispreferred one, as the second responds negatively to the previously asked question.

At the same time, this is a praxiological manifestation of speech that is constituted of a series of speech acts, the coherence of which is seen in the social structure in which they are realized (Edmonson 1981: 81). If we analyze this sequence outside its context, it will not make sense. We understand its meaning the moment we take into consideration its participants (the mother and her son), the time (evening) and the place (their home). It is

that fact that when it comes to the last element one should consider the number of the participants, their individual characteristics, and their interpersonal relations.

BDD-A1222 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:43:14 UTC)

generally acknowledged that before going to bed one, as a rule, washes their teeth. So the child understands what his mother actually implies by this indirect directive and gives his response by avoiding mentioning the actual action of washing his teeth. As both participants are part of the same socio-cultural background they manage to negotiate the meaning of the utterances correctly.

At the supersegmental level, the intonation of the utterance plays a significant role. If said with a raising tone, this directive will have a less categorical meaning, leaving the possibility to negotiate the postponing of that act, even if it may be declined. While said with a falling tone, it already implies definiteness and expectations to be obeyed.

From the point of view of grammar and semantics this communicative event is correct. However, they only help decode the literal meaning, not the illocutionary force.

It is known that on any occasion, the action performed by producing an utterance will consists of three related acts: locutionary act, illocutionary act and perlocutionary act (Austin 1978: 108). When producing an utterance, one does not only say something about the world (locution), but we also perform an act (illocution) which will have an effect on the listener (perlocution).

Thus, dialogue is an intricate progression of encoding and decoding intended meanings via inferential processes. The interpreter is to take into consideration all the aspects of the communication in order to be able to interpret it.

The example below can be regarded as a casual interaction between two people one inquiring with no evident purpose about the other's way of spending free time:

'What are you doing after work?'
'You don't hang about, do you, Ian?'

However, it is a pre-sequence to an upcoming invitation. Moreover, the reply is already a preparation for the coming refusal. In this way, both interlocutors prepare each other for what is to come next. They orient their interaction in the answers' direction so that there is no misunderstanding between them. The first speaker, wanting to avoid a refusing act, tries to use a face saving strategy, a pre-sequence, which is in the form of a casual question 'What are you doing after work?'. The second speaker does not want to be blunt and chooses another strategy: instead of saying what she is doing after work, she expresses her hopes that he has not been considering to spend time with her after work. By not answering, the addresser's question the addressee prepares himself for an upcoming refusal. The use of the tag question emphasizes the fact that she is ironic and probably she will turn him down.

This delay of refusing directly can be accounted for the fact that the addressee wants to save the face of the addresser, as the refusal is a face-threatening act. Face, in Brown and Levinson's definition, is "the public self image that every member wants to claim for himself" (Brown, Levinson 1987: 61). If a person says something that represents a threat to the expectations that a hearer has towards his self-image, then we speak about a face

BDD-A1222 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:43:14 UTC)

threatening act. Refusing something contradicts the speaker's expectations, thus it is a face threatening act. It is important for the refuser to give the impression that he still cares about the speaker's needs and feelings making use of positive politeness strategies, as avoiding disagreement, being optimistic, giving reasons, etc.

Robin Lakoff formulated the three maxims of the politeness principle:

(1) don't impose;
(2) give options;
(3) make the receiver feel good.

In this way, the speaker should be careful not to sound too categorical. He should ensure his interlocutor that he always has the possibility to choose. In addition, he should create a pleasant atmosphere to have a successful communication.

Politeness is, in fact, the way in which the interactants mark their social distance. The politeness phenomenon is closely related to the socio-cultural relations of the interactants. Brown and Levinson have studied this phenomenon and came to the conclusion that all people who want to have a particular social relation with their interlocutors should recognize the face of the latter.

The politeness principle also implies that both speakers should enjoy equal speaking powers. While defining conversation, Guy Cook mentions that it occurs when five criteria are met:

(1) It is not primarily necessitated by a practical task;
(2) Any unequal power of participants is partially suspended;
(3) The number of the participants is small;
(4) Turns are quite short;
(5) Talk is primarily for the participants not for an outside audience (Cook 2001: 51).

However, every dialogue is motivated by a practical need, which can be of various natures (either to preserve the social relations or to invite someone out). Moreover, the enactment of power can not be equal: somebody will have more speaking powers as the other due to the fact that people are different, even in the case when they try to save the appearance of their interlocutor.

We would like to analyze the dialogue taking between the two characters of Dorothy Parker's short story *The Last Tea*. Undoubtedly, natural and fictional conversations differ in many ways. Michael Toolan points: "It is not merely that in fiction the talk is 'tidied up', that there are relatively few unclear utterances, overlaps, false starts, hesitations, and repetitions: there are also literary conventions at work governing the fictional representations of talk, so that the rendered text is quite other than a faithful transcription of a natural conversation. However, certain structural and functional principles govern fictional dialogue, as they do natural dialogue" (Toolan 2005: 193).

BDD-A1222 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:43:14 UTC)

The choice of the short story was due to the fact that it is essentially a two-party communicative exchange taking place between two ex-lovers. We could say that the entire story consists of their dialogue. Both participants know each other very well which justifies the informal tone of their conversation. Moreover, they share the same knowledge of the world which makes their interaction meaningful and coherent.

The context of this dialogue is important, as the woman has been sitting in a café alone waiting for the man to appear for forty minutes. This detail indicates the woman's warm feelings towards the man, on one hand, and his indifference towards her, on the other.

When he finally appears he utters the apology "Guess I must be late. Sorry you been waiting", which is an expressive speech act. However, he is a pseudo apologizer who rejects responsibility and tends to be superficial. As a matter of fact, this is a negative politeness strategy which is meant to render the distance, rather than friendliness, between the interlocutors imposed from the very beginning by the man. It would have been more appropriate if the positive politeness strategy were used in this context. This incongruity with the situation already highlights the man's domineering role in this dialogue as well as his intentions.

The woman's strategy is different. At the beginning she does everything to make her receiver feel good. She feels truly sorry for the man who complains of being "in terrible shape". The way they begin their dialogue predicts the upcoming conversational turbulence. It also shapes the participant who enjoys more speaking powers and is more manipulative.

One cannot help noticing that the young man skips the ritualistic formulas of starting a dialogue. Instead of inquiring how the young girl is, he directly starts complaining. This fact proves that he has no intention of having a conversation with her. Actually, it emphasizes that he wants it to be as short as possible. It is extremely rude, and makes the woman feel uncomfortable.

Acting like a victim, he manages to convince his interlocutor that she is the one to blame for his boredom and tiredness. He openly states that this dialogue is undesirable.

The man's sequences are uttered in such a way as to reveal his indifference and annoyance towards the woman. His unwillingness to cooperate in this dialogue is seen in his refusal to decode the illocutionary force of the girl's reactive replies. He is the only one inciting in this verbal interaction, not allowing a change of roles once throughout the entire conversation. Moreover, his utterances: "Hey, hey, easy on the sugar – one lump is fair enough. And take away those cakes" reveal that he is accustomed of being obeyed. Thus, he utters the directive without taking into consideration his interlocutor's preferences. It becomes clear that he enjoys superior rights whereas the young girl has lesser speaking rights here.

Unlike the man, the woman decodes his intended meaning properly. She understands the illocutionary force of his utterances where he praises the good looks of another woman. She desperately tries to make him reconsider his point of view by choosing her interlocutor's

BDD-A1222 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:43:14 UTC)

strategy: she feigns not to decode his message by uttering representatives of her non-existent admirers. By choosing this strategy she hopes to have the same effect his strategy has on her (i.e. become jealous). However, she fails as her interlocutor is not negotiating in having a successful communication. He does not collaborate in any way to continue this dialogue.

The dueling discourse that takes place between them marks the girl's defeat and the man's victory. Her communicative goals are not fulfilled because of the man's refusal to cooperate. She fails to impose her vision on him, and this marks an end to their relationship. Their communicative strategies are very different, as can be seen in the following table:

The man's strategy	**The woman's strategy**
blame	acceptance
rudeness (praise of another woman qualities)	reaction (an attempt to rehabilitate her self-image by lying)
insult (drawing a parallel between her and old ladies)	retort (another lie stating that she does not care)
impatience (a desire to end this dialogue as soon as possible)	delay (a desire to postpone it hoping to make her interlocutor change his mind)
commissive (a promise made hastily to get rid of the annoying woman)	acceptance (a last hope of seeing him again)

However, we may notice that the woman's strategies are not that categorical as throughout their conversation she twice accepts what she has been told without any objections. Even in her attempts to rehabilitate her self-image she is not imposing, she gives her interlocutor options. Although the man commits himself to call her in the near future she has no other choice but to believe, knowing already that it will never happen.

It is clear that their dialogue is centered on a topic that causes in the couple many problems of various natures: psychological, verbal, social. Verbally, they cannot even openly speak out of the upcoming breakup (the man tries to end this relationship by being too rude, while the woman lies in order to make him reconsider his decision). Psychologically, the participants try to impose their view upon the other (the man tries to convince that his new flame is a better 'looker' than the girl he is talking to and the girl, in her turn, speaks of inexistent wooers). Here, the one who holds the domineering position is bound to succeed. Socially, the man's unexpected infatuation with another woman causes a breakdown in their relationship. That is why their interaction results in a communication failure as one of the participants refuses to collaborate and negotiate the meaning.

As seen, constructing a successful dialogue is an intricate process. It has its own internal structure and is governed by specific rules and conventions which are expected to be followed. Once they are flouted, conversation failure occurs. As a rule, the interactants try to orient their turns towards the answer's direction, i.e. they expect a specific reaction from the

BDD-A1222 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:43:14 UTC)

receiver. It implies that all the turns are intended to get preferred responses, yet, it depends on the interlocutor's desire to collaborate in this verbal interaction.

Dialogue is not just a form of verbal action, but also one of a verbal interaction where the participants act in turns, changing and, at the same time, imposing their visions. It is a process of an on-going collaboration where the meaning is negotiated via speech acts. The sender wants not only to realize his communicative intentions, but also to change the receiver's attitude as well. The latter, by using different inferential processes, wants to decode correctly the speaker's intended meaning.

REFERENCES

Austin 1978 = John Langshaw Austin, *How to do things with words*, editors J.O. Urmson and Marina Sbisà, Harvard University Press.

Brown, Levinson 1987 = Penelope Brown, Stephen C. Levinson, *Politeness: some universals in language usage*, Cambridge University Press.

Cook 2000 = Guy Cook, *Discourse*, Oxford University Press.

Coşeriu 2009 = Eugeniu Coşeriu, *Omul şi limbajul său. Studii de filozofie a limbajului, teorie a limbii şi lingvistică generală*, antologie, argument şi note de Dorel Fînaru, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza".

Edmondson 1981 = Willis Edmondson, *Spoken discourse: a model for analysis*, London, Longman.

Grice 1989 = Paul Grice, *Studies in the Way of Words*, Harvard University Press.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1997 = Catherine Kerbrat-Orecchioni, *La Conversation*, Paris, Seuil.

Pridham 2001 = Francesca Pridham, *The Language of Conversation*, London and New York, Routledge.

Quinn 2006 = E. Quinn, *A Dictionary of Literary and Thematic Terms*, Second Edition, Facts on File, Inc.

Reboul, Moeschler 2001 = Anne Reboul, Jacques Moeschler, *Pragmatica, azi*, trad. de Liana Pop, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Echinox.

Tannen 2007 = Deborah Tannen, *Talking Voices. Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*, Cambridge University Press.

Toolan 2005 = Michael Toolan, *Analysing Conversation in Fiction: an Example from Joyce's* ***Portrait***, in Ronald Carter, Paul Simpson (eds.), *Language, Discourse and Literature. An Introductory Reading in Discourse Stylistics*, London and New York, Routledge, p. 193–208.

Wooffitt 2005 = Robin Wooffitt, *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, SAGE Publications.

Yule 2000 = George Yule, *Pragmatics*, Oxford University Press.

BDD-A1222 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:43:14 UTC)

DIALOGUE AS A PARTICULAR TYPE OF TEXT BASED ON COLLABORATION

ABSTRACT

Dialogue is constituted of a sequence of replies exchanged between two people. These replies cannot be examined separately as they are interrelated, that is, one depends upon the other. Moreover, they form a unified whole together with the interactants and the context. All these constituents form the dialogic text, which is a particular type of text due to its spontaneous character, on the one hand, and its orientation towards an immediate feedback, on the other. In this article we try to analyze the causes that hamper the successful realization of a dialogue.

Key-words: *dialogue*, *interaction*, *collaboration*, *politeness strategy*, *interpersonal relations*, *context*, *communication*, *interactants*.

BDD-A1222 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:43:14 UTC)