SSOAR

Open Access Repository
www.ssoar.info

Investigating the Communicative Functions of Interrogative Sentences in Dialogue Texts

Yessenbayeva, Assel M.; Yelikbayev, Bauyrzhan K.; Abdrahman, Gulnara K.; Makulova, Laura T.; Serdali, Bekzhigit K.

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Mitglied der
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Investigating the Communicative Functions of Interrogative Sentences in Dialogue Texts

Assel M. Yessenbayeva[1], **Bauyrzhan K. Yelikbayev**[2], **Gulnara K. Abdrahman**[3],
Laura T. Makulova[4], and **Bekzhigit K. Serdali**[5]
[1]Kazakh National Agrarian University, Kazakhstan
[2,5]Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Kazakhstan
[3,4]Taraz State Pedagogical University, Kazakhstan

Abstract

The article aims to study the problem of the peculiarities of the communicative functions of interrogative sentences. The relevance of the problem is connected with the rich pragmatic fullness of these linguistic units. The issue of communicative functions of interrogative sentences was considered from the theory of speech acts, in which they are realized. Thus, examples of interrogatives were analyzed in representative, directive, commission, and expressive speech acts based on dialogues from the sitcom "Big Bang Theory". Determining the quantitative ratio of interrogatives in the composition of different types of speech acts and comparing these statistics with the results of another study allowed the authors to decide the most productive types. The prospect of further research is a more in-depth study of the pragmatics of interrogative sentences, as well as interdisciplinary research.

Keywords: Communication theory, function, dialogues, pragmatics, speech acts, texts, languages

Introduction

The present work deals with the research of interrogative sentences in terms of the functions, which they perform in the communication process. The subject of the study is English interrogative sentences and their translation into Russian. The target of research is the peculiarities of the realization of various communicative functions in these linguistic units.

Interrogative sentences play a unique role in communication. Moreover, let us join the opinion of G. Gadamer (1991), who stated that people do not make any judgments at all, but "answer questions." Thus, he drew attention to the generality of this way of interpersonal communication. Indeed, most different communicative acts are not only a manifestation of the vital activity of any human society but, undoubtedly, the first condition for its existence as itself. Obviously, without any questions or, correspondingly, question-answer structures, there cannot be any effective communication in the relations between "leader-subordinates" and "training-trainees" – the key to the existence of any community (Sokolova, Skopova, & Rener, 2017; Broto, 2017; Yildizli, 2017).

It is necessary to pay attention to the wording of the topic of this work; there is the term "communication," which is very ambiguous (Rachman, 2017; Van Valin, 2017). We believe that it is necessary to take into account the specifics of the current information age

---

Correspondence to: Assel M. Yessenbayeva, Department of Foreign Languages, Kazakh National Agrarian University, 050010, 8 Abai Ave., Almaty, Kazakhstan.

and that the consideration of the topic should go beyond the linguistic act of the two communicating individuals. Therefore, we will mainly hold to the so-called "French" interpretation of communication issues, which is not limited to linguistic communication but includes various social problems of modern society (Nazarchuk, 2009).

In this vein, a significant argument in favor of the relevance of the topic of this article is contained in works by G.G. Pocheptsov (2001). Paying attention to many problems of the present, he notes, "The end of the twentieth century brought the processes of communication to a new level when the states in the military field were to a large extent interested in them. It is about the phenomenon of information wars (operations)". For the first time on this topic, A. Toffler (1995) spoke in his theory of the typology of wars. "The wars of the agrarian period were waged for territories, wars of the industrial period – for the means of production. Information age wars will be fought for the means of processing and generating information/knowledge ... The information has never been more significant" (Toffler, 1995).

The topic of this article is also relevant in connection with the "peaceful" manifestations of the steadily increasing informatization of human civilization. For example, it could be such applied sections of the theory of communication as neurolinguistic programming, advertising, propaganda and PR technologies, psychotherapy, media communication, artistic communication (Bass, 1999). It should be noted that technical and scientific communication is characterized primarily by interrogative sentences of a cardinal (pure) communicative type. In contrast, intermediate-type sentences are rarely used and are predominantly aimed at drawing attention to particular objects, their features, attributes (Kohler, 2017). In some places of work, we will also touch the non-verbal kind of communication, since its paralinguistic means (for example, intonation) is inextricably linked with the communicative functions of interrogative sentences.

Because of the development of linguistic research and given the importance of interrogative sentences indicated above, the topic identified at the beginning of the article should be thoroughly studied, with the involvement of specialists. The theoretical significance of the article is to systematize aspects of the theory of speech acts concerning the communicative functions of interrogative sentences. The practical relevance of the article is that the results of this study can be used to compose courses on the theory of communicative acts, pragmatics, stylistics, and translatology.

Literature Review

On the topic of this article, there is extensive material and quite ambiguous, because of the exceptional complexity of the phenomena occurring in the individual and public consciousness and subconsciousness. As a result of which linguistic concepts are incredibly abstract. Scientific research is distinguished by a variety of initial points of view and approaches to study. To compare the literature on this topic is difficult, at least because of differences in terminology. For example, the concepts "interrogative," "indirect speech act," and others are ambiguous.

The problems of interrogatives in the dialogue texts were devoted to the works of G.G. Pocheptsov (2001), G.R. Vlasyan (2006), E.N. Vorobyeva (2009), D. Bolinger (1957), R. Conrad (1983), D. Searle (1975), L. Song (1985) and many others. Among the literature directly related to the topic under consideration, we highlight the work "Interrogative sentences as indirect speech acts" by R. Conrad from the digest "New in foreign linguistics" (Arutyunova & Paduchev, 1985). R. Conrad (1983), considering the rules of speech behavior in the formation of implicit meanings of the utterance, systematized the typical ways of

using interrogative sentences on secondary meanings (parallel names —"pragmatic meaning," "communicative meaning") of speech acts. A study claims that the importance of dialogue as a means of communication in every aspect of society. The findings also reveal that dialogue fuels socio-economic development (Orlova, Musina, & Dzhanikesheva, 2020). Another study provides cues on the vitality of speech, which has bearings on understanding opinions and shaping public issues (Choi, 2020). Speech, a form of dialogue, remains instrumental in the process of communication.

Researching the potential of the impact of interrogative sentences on the behavior of communicants is devoted to the works of K.M. Shilikhina (1999). General questions concerning the communicative functions of interrogative sentences were stated in the textbook by N.S. Valgina (2000). G.G. Pocheptsov's (2001) book "The theory of communication" was used in this work as the primary source for communicativistics (the work has features of scientific work, textbook, and journalism about fateful social events). The author illuminated the topics of the theory of communication, which develops within the framework of linguistics, sociolinguistics, psychology, and sociology.

There are extensive studies of linguists on this topic in English. Researchers pay special attention to the analysis of the pragmatics of interrogative constructions (Fareh & Moussa, 2008; Song, 1985). The majority of researchers studied the problem of the functions of questions within the theory of speech acts (Darani & Afghari, 2013; Kasimova, 2017), including interrogative sentences from their implementation of indirect acts (Conrad, 1983; Searle, 1975). Some scientists have studied interrogative sentences within the framework of the structural method (Bolinger, 1957). R. Conrad (1983) attempted to combine the last two approaches, point out five types of interrogative sentences based at the same time on their structural organization and communicative functions.

Methodology

This study includes an analysis of the communicative functions of interrogative sentences in dialog texts, taking into account those language tools that express them in English and Russian. The material of the study was the interrogative sentences taken from the famous American sitcom "The Big Bang Theory," and their translation into Russian, performed by Kuraj-Bambey Company commissioned by Paramount Comedy (Big Bang Theory Transcripts, 2018). During the selection of the study material, we studied 1000 interrogatives, found in episodes of 1-10 seasons. We selected a total of 200 interrogative sentences, in which the pragmatic aspect of the statement was quite pronounced. The choice of this research material is motivated by the author's orientation to study contemporary English-speaking dialogic discourse with a high degree of precedence. This makes it possible to identify the most productive language trends in the implementation of the communicative functions of interrogative sentences.

Several linguistic methods were used during the study. The leading method of this study is the method of communicative-functional analysis, which is explained by choice of the target of the study. Part of this method is the method of pragmatic analysis. We were guided by a pragmatic approach during the selection of material, as well as during the analysis of sentences to determine the pragmatic fullness of the questions and its relationship to the communicative functions of sentences. Elements of structural analysis were used to determine which syntactic structures can express those or other communicative functions. The method of contextual analysis was used to reveal the connection between specific linguistic units and the context of their usage. The elements of the method of

stylistic analysis were used in determining which stylistically marked units reveal the pragmatic orientation and communicative function of interrogatives. The elements of the topic-rheumatic analysis were also used.

Comparative method and translational analysis method were used to compare language means English and Russian, with which is realized this or that communicative function. Finally, the statistical method was used to summarize the results of the research and determine the quantitative ratio of interrogative sentences with different communicative functions. When evaluating the sentences, we took into account the fact that some interrogatives implement the multiple communicative functions, so we assessed the proportion of cases, the implementation of each of the functions.

Results

The communicative approach to the consideration of the sentence allows us to assert that in a communication situation, all communicative types of sentences can give an infinite number of variants and shades of communicative intent. The interrogative sentence is viewed in the communicative aspect as an intentional means of verbal communication, which is used by the speaker to realize his communicative intentions. In this regard, interrogative statements can be considered as an integral part of the speech strategy of the speaker (Gusev, 2017).

The most frequent communicative function of the interrogative sentence is the request for information (Kasimova, 2017). The communicative setting of such sentences is quite ambiguous. It is impossible to find any additional communicative meanings in it. In other types of communicative settings, companion communicative tasks that fluctuate in a quite wide range and sometimes contain opposite meanings are easily defined. The use of interrogative constructions for the expression of non-interrogative values is carried out based on the neutralization of interrogative semantics (Conrad, 1983). After all, this is not a request for necessary information, but an expressive statement/negation, imperative, expression of emotion or evaluation, a means of maintaining contact or activating the interlocutor's attention. However, interrogative significance does not disappear and is not entirely replaced by indirect, because it is concentrated in the very structure of the interrogative.

The study of the communicative functions of interrogative sentences is directly linked with their syntactic characteristics. The structural and grammatical structure of the question is usually determined by the communicative intention of the speaker. However, there is an ambiguous correspondence between the intention and the formal organization of the interrogative sentence, which explains the existence of multiple meanings of syntactic constructions. N.S. Valgina (2000) classifies interrogative sentences based on the characteristics of communicative use: the actual interrogative sentence contains a question that necessarily presupposes an answer; the interrogative-affirmative sentence contains information that requires confirmation; an interrogative-negative sentence already contains a denial of what is being asked; the interrogative rhetorical sentence contains a statement or a negation and does not require an answer since the answer is contained in the question itself. In analyzing the communicative properties of a particular interrogative sentence, its actual division also plays an important role. The real division of the sentence proceeds from the expression of a specific meaning in the context of the given situation – in contrast to the formal division of the sentence into grammatical elements. If the theme precedes the rheme, the word order in the sentence is called objective; otherwise, it is subjective (Valgina, 2000). The actual division of the sentence can be expressed by the order of words, intonation, and other means.

The translation of non-interrogative communicative meanings is mainly used for interrogative sentences with a direct order of words (Kasimova, 2017). Such sentences, while keeping the interrogative information, are semantically close to the statement since they are oriented not so much to receiving information from the interlocutor as to transferring it. In situations when the speaker does not want to show his intentions openly and tries to influence the listener indirectly, he chooses structures with secondary meaning as a more convenient, diplomatic means of communication. The communicative intention contained in such utterance, due to interrogative intonation, determines the entire utterance as a question, not a statement: *Пенни: Эй, Радж! Все еще не говоришь со мной?* (Penny: Hey, Raj! Still not talking to me, huh?).

Interrogatives carrying out the communicative function of persuasion are often translated by structures with a direct order of words (Gusev, 2017). They suggest a higher degree of confidence of the speaker in the correctness of his assumption about the possibility of obtaining an answer. In most cases, a question of this type is characterized by conveying the speaker's desire to receive a response-confirmation. Putting this type of question, the speaker knows preliminary information, but he necessarily expects their repeated confirmation from the interlocutor: *Говард: То есть ты просто идиот?* (Howard: So, you're just an idiot?). In this case, we should note that the question also carries an offensive intention.

English interrogatives are syntactical units of a specific communicative-functional type, which is able not only to satisfy the cognitive intentions of the speaker but also to convey pragmatic meanings for other kinds of modal-intentional utterances. The use of interrogative constructions for the expression of non-interrogative meanings is accomplished by leveling the question meaning because the interrogative sentences can be used for carrying out a broad spectrum of communication functions (Malyuga, 2001). The interrogative meaning does not disappear entirely because it is fixed in the structure of the sentence. The variety of communicative intentions is so wide that, in some cases, the interrogative form of the sentence. Regardless of how the meaning of interrogation is conveying in it –by order of words, interrogative intonation, or the presence of a lexeme– conveys not the question but the statement (Fareh & Moussa, 2008). Therefore, the identification and interpretation of communicative intention become possible only in situations when many components that create a broad context are taken into account.

The request for information, which is a universal function of the interrogative sentence, requires for its implementation a minimal context. It can be identified very easily. However, to define other communicative functions, it is necessary to have a more extended context (Vorobyeva, 2009). Even the most apparent communicative intentions, for example, imperatives, become visible only in the general context of the communication situation. So, for example, Leonard's phrase: *Может, уже перестанешь?* (Will you stop that?) becomes clear only in a situational context (Sheldon never stopped to whip fringe). The communicative intention of the speaker determines the connotation of the interrogative, affects the possible expected response. The question can be imposed by various additional shades and connotations that do not directly concern using such structure. The speaker is guided by the following actual intentions: to induce the interlocutor to enter into the situation of verbal communication, to answer the question, to confirm his point of view, etc. Such communicative intentions, pursued by the speaker, are mainly studied in a pragmatic approach.

The study of the practical aspect of interrogative sentences is focused on the theory of speech acts (Ninio, 2018). This theory considers semantics in the broader context of communication and represents speech acts, not words or phrases, as the basic unit of

human communication. The existing group of leading scientists' works out the theory of speech acts; the most famous of them is D. Searle (1975). He argues that when people tell a sentence, they implement three types of speech acts, namely: a locutionary act (it is the pronunciation of an utterance possessing phonetic, lexical-grammatical and semantic structures); an illocutionary act (indicates the communicative purpose of the author of the utterance); and perlocutionary act (serves a deliberate effect on the speaker, the achievement of some result). The most detailed classification of speech acts is presented, in our opinion, in the thesis of K. M. Shilikhina (1999). The author singles out in a total of 24 types of speech acts (Table 1). It is important to note that every kind of speech act can be implemented with the help of interrogative structures.

Table 1. Classification of speech acts by K.M. Shilikhina (1999)

Groups of speech acts	Classes of speech acts	Types of speech acts
Directive speech acts	Prescriptive	Command
		Prescription
		Prohibition
		Demand
		Order
		Instruction
		Allowance
	Requests	Request
		Request for allowance
		Plea
		Invitation
	Advice (suggestions)	Advice
		Proposal
		Appeal
		Warning
Non-directive speech acts capable in certain situations to perform a modifying function	Assertive, or statements-assertions	Constants
		Morality
		Hint
	Expressions (expressive speech acts)	Expression-indigestion
		Bewilderment
		Reproach
	Commission speech acts	Promise
		Threat
Hybrid speech act		Comment

In our work, we will be guided by the classification of illocutionary acts by D. Searle (1975), who distinguished the following five groups of illocutionary acts: representative, directive, commission, expressive and declarative speech acts. Classification features of these five species are as follows:
(i) Representative acts – represent something, for example, a statement, description, statement, etc.
(ii) Directive acts – have the purpose of forcing someone to do something, for example, a command, a request, instructions, etc.
(iii) Commission acts – oblige the speaker to carry out actions in the future, for example, a promise, a proposal, a threat, etc.
(iv) Expressive acts – show the speaker's attitude toward something, for example, an apology, gratitude, greeting, etc.

(v)   Declarative acts – proclaim the making bargains, show participation in the mentioned events, for example, the state of war, the wedding ceremony, dismissal, etc.

Speech acts, expressed by English and Russian interrogative sentences, can be representative, directive, commissions, and expressive speech acts. Let us consider in detail each of these types of speech acts.

(I)   A representative speech act is an act of representing something that can be realized in the form of a statement, description, statement, etc. (Lindawati, 2016). Interrogative sentences that represent something can simultaneously carry a phatic function (for example, express greetings, affection or anxiety, suspicion, accusation, or denial). The following examples of interrogative sentences illustrate the category of a representative speech act:

* *Леонард: Ты хоть понимаешь, что, если Пенни проснется, у нас нет никакого разумного объяснения почему мы здесь?* (Leonard: Do you realize that if Penny wakes up, there is no reasonable explanation as to why we're here?). Although this sentence has the form of a question, it has signs of the statement. It conveys Leonard's point of view that cleaning at night in an apartment by a new acquaintance is at least unreasonable.

* *Шелдон: Ты что, думала, что антонимом «глупой неудачнице» будет «выпускница местного колледжа»?* (Sheldon: You thought the opposite of stupid loser was community college graduate?).

As we see, Sheldon's aim isn't to request information in this case but rather to express his opinion about such education. Representativeness in English is emphasized by the direct order of words, that usual narrative sentences. The question has a pronounced emotional coloring, which is translated in Russian by using the stylistically marked pronoun *that*. Such sentences are characterized by the discrepancy of the communicative meaning of the interrogative sentence with its grammatical structure. In particular, the question of realizing a representative speech act simultaneously understands two syntactic definitions: the meaning of the question and the meaning of the statement (affirmation/negation) (Kohler, 2017). The interrogative form gives an emotionally vivid color to this statement.

A pronounced pragmatic character is represented by interrogative structures in the composition of representative speech acts that contain the question as a means of maintaining contact, checking, and activating the interlocutor's attention (Malyuga, 2001). The interrogative form is an important stylistic device that is specially used by the speaker as a mean of concentrating and activating the interlocutor's attention to influence his will and imagination: *Вот видишь, Шелдон, ничего плохого и не случилось!* (See, Sheldon, it's not that bad, is it?). Interrogative sentences that convey a phatic function often have a separate structure in English (disjunctive question) (Bolinger, 1975). In some cases, they are translated using a phrase that *is not* in Russian. Another marker of such verbal acts are the verbs associated with the activity of the senses *посмотри, послушай* (see, listen).

(II)   The directive speech act is an expression of will addressed by the speaker of his interlocutor and directed to the realization by the listener of speech action, taking into account the speaker's intention (Lindawati, 2016). Directives are used with the intent to force someone to do something, for example, *an invitation, a command, a request, an instruction*, etc. English and Russian interrogative sentences expressing directives are intended to offer, recommend, remind, insist on something, order, or ask for something to do.

The most common form of directive speech act is a request. K. M. Shilikhina (1999) notes that in the Russian communicative culture, 16.3% of all speech acts are

requested. It is important to note that the request is necessarily related not only with the indication of importance but also with the expectation of a response from the person to whom it is addressed. In this case, it should be taken into account that the response may not always correspond to the expectations of the applicant, because in some cases, the speaker simply refuses to grant the request. This circumstance is because the basic settings of participants in the communicative process do not coincide in their target orientation.

In some cases, the request is related to the desire to induce the interlocutor to act (as expressed in the "do this" instruction). In others, on the contrary, the intention is expressed to block some of his behavior (in this case, the corresponding instruction is expressed in the form "do not do this"). The result of the dialogue as a whole depends on the willingness of the interlocutor to accept or reject the instruction proposed to him.

In many cases, directive acts are implemented with the help of interrogative sentences. Often in communicative situations related to the will of the speaker, he uses the interrogative construction as an indirect imperative act to maintain etiquette, more rarely to mitigate the hierarchy, or to express irony, etc. (Conrad, 1983). Finally, the question can be asked instead of a direct request just because there is a lack of knowledge of whether the request will be successful. Analysis of interrogative-imperative sentences leads to their classification according to the following types, depending on the clarification of situations related to the speaker (Vlasyan, 2006):

- Whether the addressee has the opportunity to act.
- Whether the addressee wishes or inclined to act, whether it is convenient for him.
- The addressee is notified of the need for him to perform a specific action.
- The addressee is informed of the reason for encouraging him to take specific actions.
- It is found out that the addressee has an object that is necessary for the speaker.

Examples of directive acts are:

(i) *Говард: Поможешь нам это исправить?* (Howard: Can you fix it for us?)
Шелдон: Хорошо, но это в последний раз. (Sheldon: Okay, but this is the last time.)

This speech act is a classic example of a request. It is important to note that, in this context, the speaker does not doubt whether Sheldon can act because he knows very well about Sheldon's intellectual abilities. The Russian variant conveys the request in a more explicit form (Help ...?). In contrast, the English original has more form of requesting information about whether the addressee has the opportunity to act.

(ii) *Леонард: Ладно, хватит уже о пуделях, прошу!* (Leonard: Can we please stop talking about poodles?). This example conveys not only the request but also the intent of the speaker to show his emotional state of irritation. That is why in the Russian translation, the sentence is not an interrogative but an exclamation.

(iii) *Шелдон: Поделишься со мной водой?* (Sheldon: May I borrow your water?). In the question, it turns out that the addressee has the object that the speaker needs. Such speech acts are quite common in everyday discourse and rarely occur in other discourses. The marker for the speech act of the request in the English variant is the modal verb *may*. In this case, in the Russian translation, the word can be omitted; the translator uses the verb in the future tense to convey the request.

(iv) *Шелдон: Пока не найду постоянного места, поживу у друзей.* (Sheldon: Until I find a permanent place, I will stay with friends.)
Говард: Пока. (Howard: Bye (runs out)).
Раж: Ну... ты не можешь жить у меня. У меня крошечная квартирка. (Raj: Well, you can't stay with me. I have a teeny tiny apartment.)

Шелдон: Извини, но разве не гостеприимство символизируется в Манушья яджна, одном из пяти великих жертвоприношений, предписанных домохозяевам? (Sheldon: Excuse me, but isn't hosting guests an aspect of Menushya Yajna, one of the five central religious duties or sacrifices of the Hindu householder?).

This example does not contain a direct request; it is veiled under another illocutionary act, namely, over-persuasion. Sheldon refers to the traditional culture of Raj to manipulate his behavior. We can say that compared to other analyzed directives, this dialogue has the most complex and rich pragmatic fullness.

(III) Commission acts – encourage acting in the future, for example, a promise, a proposal, a threat, etc. Commission acts, expressed in interrogative sentences, may carry communicative intentions: invite, offer help, and seek (Lindawati, 2016). The above examples of interrogative sentences are demonstrated by the following subfunctions of speech acts:

(i) A threat: *Пенни: А какой доктор вытаскивает ботинки из задницы?* (Penny: And what kind of doctor removes shoes from asses?). This speech act expresses Penny's indignation over the fact that Leonard and Sheldon have been cleaned her apartment without her permission. Penny wants to know about the medical intervention associated with a hypothetical injury only to emphasize her desire to cause such a trauma.

(ii) Offer: *Пенни: И если отношения зашли в тупик, ничего страшного в том, чтобы оглянуться вокруг.* (Penny: If it's not going anywhere, what does it hurt to look around?).One of the standard lexical markers of the speech act of the sentence is the structure what does it hurt, given by the Russian translator the structure *ничего страшного в том, чтобы* (it's okay to...).

(iii) Promise: *Шелдон: Ты что, просишь меня хранить тайну?* (Sheldon: You're asking me to keep a secret?). In this speech act Sheldon expresses his doubt about the intentions of the interlocutor, Penny, connected with the promise to keep her secret.

(IV) Expressive acts are speech acts that convey the speaker's attitude to something, for example, expression of apology, an expression of gratitude, an expression of greeting of someone, etc. (Lindawati, 2016). English interrogative sentences can reflect the relationship of the speaker, who is in various psychological conditions: surprise (shock), doubt, worry, disappointment, regret, resentment, complaint, and anger. These examples demonstrate the emotional function of English interrogative sentences, which express the following emotions:

(i) Resentment: *Леонард: Ты когда-нибудь слышал о том, что не все имеют навязчивую потребность в сортировке, организации и маркировке всего вокруг?* (Leonard: Did it ever occur to you that not everyone has the compulsive need to sort, organize, and label the entire world around them?).

(ii) Irritation: *Ради Бога, я должен показывать знак сарказма, когда открываю рот?* (For God's sake, do I have to hold up a sarcasm sign every time I open my mouth?).

(iii) *Шелдон: Соседское соглашение? Ты издеваешься? Мы живем в мире хаоса.* (Sheldon: Roommate agreement? Are you kidding? We are living in a world of chaos).

Markers of expressive speech acts are words that certainly exaggerate something (*ever, the whole world, every time, everyone*), as well as interjections *ради Бога* (for God's sake). Some interrogative sentences sometimes can be included in more than one type of speech act. At the same time, the interrogative sentence can belong to classes of representative and expressive speech acts (refuse and protest) (Shilikhina, 1999).

Interrogative sentences that serve to express proposals (directives) can simultaneously (in fact) also declare hospitality good manners or politeness, which belong to the expressive class in the theory of speech acts of D. Searle (1975). Interrogative sentences, expressed for indirect (indirect speech), are useful for keeping politeness, and sometimes, on the contrary, they are used for asserting something aggressively, rudely, and even unbearably. The sentence function, which expresses a wide range of illocutionary actions, essentially has the same form as the interrogative sentences that are used for the request.

Particular attention should be paid to the consideration of rhetorical questions as units that do not require an answer from the addressee (Kasimova, 2017). If we talk about rhetorical questions, then the need for the fulfillment of these basic functions by our sentences disappears, and there arises the problem of communicability of such language constructions. It is worthwhile to find out whether rhetorical questions are carriers of a communicative function, if, they do not carry a piece of "new" information. But such questions, firstly, inform the listener about the speaker's interest in a certain object; secondly, the level of knowledge of the subject, which is spoken about. Therefore, even the rhetorical question is informative for the listener, that is, the function of communication in it is nevertheless realized. *Итак, Шелдон, Почему это происходит со мной?* (So, why do these things always happen to me?). It gives the listener information that different unusual situations are not uncommon in Sheldon's life and also conveys his emotional attitude to these circumstances.

The dual nature of communication by posing questions allows us to talk about a particular function of interrogative sentences, which is secondary, but no less important than the essential communicative function. The difference between the rhetorical question and the actual question is determined in terms of content by the appropriate context, situation, and intonation (Vorobyeva, 2009). The same interrogative sentence, depending on the context, can express its primary or secondary functions, which undoubtedly prove to the syntactic polysemy of the interrogative sentence. So, for example, the question *Раж: Что со мной не так?* (Raj: What is wrong with me?) is rhetorical when he looks in the mirror and is engaged in self-reflection in one of the series. However, if Raj asked the same question visiting a doctor, this speech act would realize the communicative function of requesting information.

Rhetorical questions that realize an emotionally colored objection are quite common in dialogical speech. Sentences of this type emphasize the strong denial, the impossibility of something. Emotionally negative rhetorical questions contain a latent modal meaning of negation, a negative assessment of the current situation or a protest against the interlocutor's stated: *Леонард: Ты же не собираешься читать ему лекцию?* (Leonard: You are not going to give him a lecture?)

Interrogative forms that convey non-interrogative meanings are widely used in dialogues to express negative assessments and judgments as a means of some verbal aggression directed against the interlocutor. This use is especially characteristic of the colloquial-everyday discourse: *Пенни: О Боже, какое к черту это имеет отношение к моему чертовому плечу?!* (Penny: Oh, my God, what the hell does this have to do with my stupid shoulder?). The Russian translation of this sentence illustrates that a tautology can sometimes be a marker of the expressiveness of interrogatives.

As rhetorical, such interrogatives can be used, which are a reaction to the previous links of the discursive chain. Such structures can also be used in an ironic sense (Gusev, 2017). The ironic utterance, as a rule, is understood as the opposite of its direct meaning. Apart from condemnation, the intentions are very often included in the semantic complex of these structures. This follows logically from the existence of a component of

condemnation of actions since condemnation implicates in itself the urge to stop the implementation of these actions.

So, the interrogative sentences often convey the intentions of the speaker, which are not directly related to the contents of the locutionary act but rather aimed to influence the behavior (Shilikhina, 1999). Many questions are aimed not at the answer but appeal to the interlocutor to strengthen the statement. Interrogatives in English and Russian are able to draw attention to the intention that is now in the center of the speaker's attention and influence the formation of an emotional attitude towards it. The main factor of the impact of interrogative sentences in Russian and English is the category of a communicative-pragmatic setting.

Discussion

To summarize the results of our research, a statistical method was used. We note that the percentage of speech acts in Russian is as follows. Within the sample, the following quantitative correlation of speech acts was noted: Expressive acts – 86 sentences; Directive acts – 67 sentences; Representative acts – 27 sentences; and Commission acts – 10 sentences. Based on these data, the percentage ratio of different speech acts, which are implemented by interrogative sentences in dialog texts: Expressive acts 86%, Directive acts 67%, Representative acts 27%, and Commission acts 10%.

We can note that the statistical results that we have got during our research differ from the data of K.M. Shilikhina (1999). Thus, this author claims that directive speech acts are realized with a frequency of 50% of cases and are represented by prescriptions, requests, and advice. In our sample, the number of directive acts is 34% of cases, and the most they are requests. According to K.M. Shilikhina, part of all three non-directive speech acts is 18%. The remaining 32% of speech acts are hybrid acts. We explain the significant difference in the statistical results of the studies with the use of another classification, in which hybrid acts were not taken into account. Besides, the thesis work of K.M. Shilikhina was devoted to the study of speech acts expressed by all types of sentences (not only interrogative). Thus, our results are more specific and relate to the implementation of communicative functions, only interrogative sentences, which were stated in the introduction. At the same time, it should be taken into account the possibility of making errors, which is due to the subjective perception by the author of the pragmatic fullness of speech acts. So, the same speech act can contain both an expressive and directive beginning. Thus, the identification of a speech act may reflect a subjective perception of the practical aspect and intentions of the speaker.

During the research, language markers of interrogative sentences were identified, which are associated with a particular communicative function. Thus, representative speech acts were expressed mainly by questions that have a direct order of words. From the theme-rheme structure, the topic in such sentences precedes the rheme. Intonation has great importance for interrogative structures with a direct order of words (which is especially essential for the English, since questions with a direct order of words are atypical for English grammar). As part of the issues implementing representative speech acts, a group of sentences was highlighted, which carry out the phatic function. The function of establishing and maintaining contact is essential in communication. Its markers are the separate structure of the question (disjunctive question) and the use of verbs of perception.

Directive speech acts are often implemented with the help of questions due to the etiquette rules that there are in Russian and English. The use of imperative incentive constructions is not productive in this context, because it is perceived as impolite by the

majority of speakers of both Russian and English. At the suprasegmental level, the posing of this type of question is associated with the use of an upward intonation. The markers of the directive speech act in question are using modal verbs like *can, may, would,* and others. In Russian translation, these verbs, as a rule, are omitted. Instead, the translator uses verbs in the future tense, expressing a request (*help, share*). In this case, as a rule, the pronoun *you* is omitted, that is, the translator uses definite-personal sentences that sound more natural in dialogues in Russian. In work, we also studied the problem of the manipulative function of some directives.

Commission acts are the smallest group of speech acts within the sample (10%). Among the analyzed sentences, examples of the implementation of threats, promises, and proposals through questions were considered. Also, some examples in the sample implemented an invitation to action using some standard etiquette rules. The debatable question remains whether the speech acts of the proposal are commissions or directives. As it is known, many linguists refer to the acts of the advice as directives. The standard markers of the speech acts of the advice are constructions like *why do, not you, would not you, what does it hurt,* and so on.

Expressive acts are the most productive in the sample (43%). A high degree of expressivity is a main part of everyday dialogical speech (Kasimova, 2017). Expressions serve to convey a wide range of emotions: surprise (shock), doubt, concern, disappointment, regret, resentment, complaint, anger, and others. Expressions denoting negative emotions were most often used. At the same time, many negative expressions were used irony or sarcasm, which significantly softens the negative emotional impact of such issues on the addressee. Markers of expressive questions were interjections (*for God's sake*) and words conveying the extreme degree of something (*everything – nothing; every time – never)*. In some cases, the tautology was used in an expression (which is typical for oral dialogical speech in Russian and English).

Conclusion

Interrogative sentences in dialogues, as a rule, have class features of actually interrogative, as well as other types of sentences. Such constructions are one of the most vivid occurrences of functional transposition and the result of formal-semantic links of interrogative, narrative, and imperative sentences. Due to the integral character of the realization of the functional characteristics of interrogative sentences, they convey such a wide range of pragmatic meanings. Communicative functions of interrogatives are realized with the help of several constructions, lexical and syntactic units, which, as a rule, are typical for one or another type of speech act. In this work, we analyzed some of these markers, illustrating the main points with examples from the popular American sitcom "The Big Bang Theory" and its translation into Russian. The results of this work broaden the understanding of the communicative character of interrogatives in English and Russian. And although these units were examined mainly from the theory of speech acts, the work can jump-start for different generalizations and further research.

The prospect of further research may be related to several issues. The most promising is the development of problems at the juncture of several allied disciplines. So, for a deeper understanding of the logical structure of interrogative sentences, linguists can turn to erotetics, the branch of logic, the object of which is questions. A deeper comprehension of the processes that occur in the minds of interlocutors using interrogative constructs will be facilitated by cognitive researches of interrogatives. Studies of the brain's neuronal activity associated with the product and perception of interrogative

sentences can make a significant contribution to the development of neurolinguistics. More traditional studies related to the analysis of structural, stylistic, and pragmatic characteristics of interrogative sentences in the aspect of communication studies also have not lost their significance.

References

Arutyunova, N.D., & Paduchev, E.V. (1985). *New in foreign linguistics. Linguistic pragmatics*. Moscow: Progress.

Bass, C.D. (1999). Building castles on sand. Underestimating the tide of information operations. *Airpower Journal*, *7*, 27-45.

Big Bang Theory Transcripts. (2018). Retrieved from https://bigbangtrans.wordpress.com.

Bolinger, D.L.M. (1957). *Interrogative structures of American English: The direct question.* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Broto, F.S.A. (2017). Speech acts in interaction. *Dialectics Journal PBI*, *3*(1), 1-11.

Choi, J. (2020). Watchdog or cheerleader: The role of American news media in covering political leader's speech. *Media Watch*, *11*(2), 363-370.

Conrad, R. (1983). *Fragesätze als indirekte Sprechakte. Studia Grammatical, XXII*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Darani, L.H., & Afghari, A. (2013). Variability in English yes/no questions. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *70*, 1664-1670.

Fareh, S., & Moussa, M.B. (2008). Pragmatic functions of interrogative sentences in English. *International Journal of Arabic and English Studies, 9*, 208-215.

Gadamer, G.G. (1991). *The relevance of the beautiful*. Moscow: Iskusstvo.

Gusev, S.S. (2017). Communicative functions of interrogative sentences. *Human. Culture. Education, 3*, 117-132.

Kasimova, N.F. (2017). Communicative functions of the interrogative sentences in English. *Priority Directions of Science Development, 3*, 59-62.

Kohler, K.J. (2017). Communicative functions and linguistic forms in speech interaction. *Cambridge University Press*, *156*, 1-6.

Lindawati, L. (2016). Indonesian interrogative sentences: A study of forms and functions. *Humaniora*, *28*(3), 348-357.

Malyuga, E.N. (2001). *Functional and pragmatic aspects of English questioning*. Moscow: MAX Press.

Nazarchuk, A.V. (2009). *The theory of communication in modern philosophy*. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya.

Ninio, A. (2018). *Pragmatic development*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Orlova, L.V., Musina, Z.M., & Dzhanikesheva, B.T. (2020). Dialogue as a problem area of communication between the authorities and the public. *Media Watch*, *11*(1), 177-190.

Pocheptsov, G.G. (2001). *The theory of communication*. Moscow: Refl-Beech.

Rachman, Y. (2017). *An analysis of illocutionary act in beyond the blackboard movie.* Jakarta: Fakultas Adabdan Humaniora.

Searle, D. (1975). Indirect speech acts. *Syntax and Semantics*, *3*, 59-82.

Shilikhina, K.M. (1999). *Verbal ways of modifying the behavior and emotional-psychological state of the interlocutor in Russian and American communicative cultures*. Voronezh: Voronezh State University.

Sokolova, O.L., Skopova, L.V., & Rener, E.I. (2017). Speech acts of various communicative orientation: Pragmatic aspects (based on the French language). *Political Linguistics, 2*. Retrieved from https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/rechevye-akty-razlichnoy-kommunikativnoy-napravlennosti-pragmaticheskie-aspekty-na-materiale-frantsuzskogo-yazyka.

Song, L.Yi. (1985). *Functions of interrogative sentences in English.* Bangor: Linguistics.

Toffler, A. (1995). *Creating a new civilization: The politics of the third wave.* Atlanta: Turner Pub.

Valgina, N.S. (2000). *Syntax of the modern Russian language*. Moscow: Agar.

Van Valin, R.D. (2017). Functional linguistics: Communicative functions and language structure. *The Handbook of Linguistics*, *5*, 141-158.

Vlasyan, G.R. (2006). Interrogative sentences in light of the theory of speech acts. *Bulletin of the South Ural State University. Series: Linguistics, 6*(61). Retrieved from https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/voprositelnye-predlozheniya-v-svete-teorii-rechevyh-aktov.

Vorobyeva, E.N. (2009). Interrogative sentence and context. *Bulletin of the Kostroma State University*, *15*(1), 49-52.

Yildizli, A. (2017). *Pragmatic and conversational functions of tag questions in Turkish: Comparison between natural speech and classroom setting*. Ankara: Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Assel M. Yessenbayeva is a Lecturer in the Department of Foreign Languages at Kazakh National Agrarian University. Her scientific and methodological works are devoted to pressing problems of linguistics and education.

Bauyrzhan K. Yelikbayev (Full Doctor in Philology) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Kazakh Philology at Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University. His areas of research interest are sociolinguistics, public relations, and corporate communication.

Gulnara K. Abdrahman (Ph.D. in Philology) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Russian Philology at Taraz State Pedagogical University. Her areas of interest in research actual problems of linguistics and philosophy of education.

Laura T. Makulova (Ph.D. in Philology) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Kazakh Philology at Taraz State Pedagogical University. She specializes in media studies and journalism, communication theory and ethics, new media, reading, and development communication.

Bekzhigit K. Serdali (Ph.D. in Philology) is a Professor in the Department of Social Sciences and Journalism at Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkestan, Republic of Kazakhstan. His areas of academic interest include print journalism, media laws, and communication.