



Traduction et Langues Volume 23 Numéro 03/2024

Journal of Translation and Languages

مجلة الترجمة واللغات

ISSN (Print): 1112-3974

EISSN (Online): 2600-6235

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52919/translang.v23i03.1012>



## *Verbal Intention and Verbal Reaction: Psycholinguistic aspect*

Irina Suima 

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University - Ukraine

iri\_suima@ukr.net

Natalia Diachok 

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University - Ukraine

natadiachok@meta.ua

Tetiana Klymenko 

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University - Ukraine

klymenkotet@outlook.com

Oksana Bovkunova 

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University - Ukraine

bovkunova@ukr.net

### To cite this paper:

Suima, I., Diachok, N., Klymenko, T., & Bovkunova, O. (2024). Verbal Intention and Verbal Reaction: Psycholinguistic aspect. *Traduction et Langues*, 23(3), 75-90.

Received: 28/05/2024; Accepted: 22/08/2024, Published: 31/12/2024

---

**Keywords**

---

Dialogical  
entity;  
Speech act;  
Communicative  
task;  
Responsive;  
Stimulus;  
Imperative

---

---

**Abstract**

---

*Human communication is vital for the development and survival of society, yet it remains a complex and multifaceted process. This study aims to explore the concepts of "speech intention" and "speech response," examine their relationship within a conversation, and identify the main types of stimulus statements that express the speaker's intention, as well as the main types of verbal responses. To achieve the study's objectives, a descriptive and comparative approach is adopted. The research methods include collecting material examples, classifying language material, analysing components and context, conducting linguistic experiments, determining functional significance, using invariant analysis, and applying linguistic comparison techniques. In the process of communication, a dialogical exchange between two people includes components like language intention, which refers to the speaker's communicative goal or purpose, and verbal response, which is the listener's reply to the speaker's intentions, such as questions, requests, or information. The speaker's intention can be simplified into three main objectives: to inform the listener, to receive information through a response to a question, or to express a will that directs the listener to take or not take a specific action. These intentions are reflected in three main types of sentences: declarative, interrogative, and imperative. The study concludes that the relationship between speech intention and speech response is key to understanding dialogue. Furthermore, the typology of responses proposed in the study can be a useful framework for future research on communication. The practical value lies in providing insights that can enhance our understanding of communication dynamics and improve language teaching methods.*

---



**Ключові слова**

Діалогічний суб'єкт;  
мовленнєвий акт;  
комунікативне  
завдання;  
респондент; стимул;  
імператив

**Анотація**

*Мета дослідження - розглянути поняття «мовленнєва інтенція» та «мовленнєва реакція», дослідити їхній взаємозв'язок у межах діалогічного утворення, визначити основні типи реплік-стимулів, що містять мовленнєву інтенцію комуніканта, та основні типи вербальної реакції, або респонсивів. Основними методами дослідження у статті є описовий та зіставний. Прийоми дослідження: збір фактичного матеріалу; класифікація мовного матеріалу; компонентний і контекстуальний аналіз, прийом лінгвістичного експерименту; прийом встановлення функціональної значущості; використання інваріантного аналізу; прийом лінгвістичного зіставлення. Діалогічне утворення в процесі комунікації, що полягає в безпосередньому обміні висловлюваннями між двома особами, містить такі компоненти, як мовна інтенція - це намір мовця, його комунікативне завдання, постановка мети; вербальна реакція, яка є словесною відповіддю на інтенції мовця: його запитання, волевиявлення або певну інформацію. Інтенцію, як комунікативне завдання висловлювання, можна схематично звести до трьох основних установок мовця: проінформувати співрозмовника; отримати від співрозмовника необхідну інформацію у вигляді відповіді на поставлене йому запитання; висловити свою волю, яка спрямована на виконання або невиконання співрозмовником будь-якої дії, зазначеної мовцем. Відповідно, у лінгвістичному маркуванні ці інтенції можна звести до трьох основних типів речень за метою висловлення: розповідних, питальних та наказових. У дослідженні зроблено висновок, що кореляція між мовленнєвим наміром і мовленнєвою реакцією є фундаментальною для розуміння діалогу. Практична значущість полягає в тому, що отримані дані можуть сприяти кращому розумінню динаміки комунікації та вдосконаленню підходів до викладання мови.*

**1. Introduction**

The natural tendency of a person to speak freely about various topics is often associated by linguists and psycholinguists to two key phenomena. One of them is an act of speech, and the other is a set of other phenomena called practical events. From the point of view of the linguists, these events fall into three parts:

- Practical events preceded the act of speech.
- Speech.
- Practical events arising after the act of speech (Bloomfield, 1933).

It would be logical to associate Parts A and C with the first signal system as a sum of direct conditional arbors, caused by their excitement in the analysts and the conditional-



reflex processes. Part B should be associated with the second signal system, which represents the aggregate of verbal signals caused by their nervous processes and the system of temporal nervous connections that have arisen on this basis (Trask, 1996). Actually, only speech is the linguistic component of the mentioned trine by Bloomfield (1933) as a certain structural and functionally significant system entity embodied in language forms and categories and such that has its own specific content plan and expression plan. Practical events usually regulate the physically marked behavior of the communicants. They tend to be expressed in their actions and are conditioned not only by language but also by a very large number of the most diverse and often unpredictable factors. These factors include the character of personal relationships between the communicating people, their temperament and mental state or weather, as well as places, time, and conditions of communication (Spytska, 2024).

Therefore, practical events that take precedence of speech or occur after any expression most likely will not be subject to any clear detail. Presumably, they cannot be listed in all their variants and, in full, cannot be presented in a closed, final multiple formula with the corresponding, if necessary, reasoning. And here quite enough used L. Bloomfield (1933) the most general determinations of two practical events as an incentive of language (event A) and reaction of the listener (event C). However, there should be an introduction of used at the same time nominations under the system of more widespread linguistic terminology. These have to be connected with concepts of the intention and communicative purpose (purpose of speech) (Wekker and Haegeman, 1996), as well as with such a linguistic category as responsive, that is, a verbal reaction to one or both utterances (Gurevich, 2004; Menshikov, 2012). On the other hand, speech may also be in the given context qualified as a certain practical event, connected both with the stimulus of the language (intention, in particular, with communicative), and with the reaction of the listener (responsive, verbal reaction) to some message as a practical event (Vozniuk, 2023). Thus, the relevance of the study is conditioned by the necessity to analyze and describe verbal communication and verbal reaction as components of the stimuli-reactive unity that take place in modern English, as phenomena connected with both psychology and linguistics.

The purpose of the article is to consider the concepts of “speech intention” and “speech reaction,” to study their interrelations within the framework of the dialogue unity, to identify the basic types of stimulating rheology, which contain the communicant's speech intention, and the basic types of verbal reaction, or responsive.

## 2. Materials and Methods

The main methods of research in this article are descriptive and comparative. The descriptive approach was used for the formation of a set of dialogues unity. The comparative method was employed for the determination of the basic characteristics of the components of the dialogues being investigated. Continuous sampling was used for the collection of the necessary factual material (in the initial stage of the work).



Classification of the language material allowed for systematization of the investigated lexical units according to their structural-semantics, functional parameters, and peculiarities of their use. Component and contextual analysis helped to determine the character of the complex, considered dialectical unity, while reception of linguistic experiment allowed for studying the character of the responsive in combination with different intentions. The study of the semantics of the utterance, which belongs to dialogical unity, was possible due to the device of functional significance. Meanwhile, the device of invariant analysis helped with the allocation of the structural and semantics of the lexical units studied. The device of linguistic comparison is to define common and different features of different types of responsive descriptions of specifics of different intentions, and identification of factors that influence the peculiarities of the functioning of different verbal reactions.

The choice of methods in this study, particularly the comparative approach, is justified by the need to examine the similarities and differences in speech intention and verbal responses across various dialogues. Comparative methods are particularly suitable for this research as they allow for the identification of universal patterns and distinct features in communicative behavior, enhancing the understanding of how different speech acts operate in diverse contexts. The study can effectively illustrate how intentions manifest in various verbal responses by analyzing multiple instances of dialogue which provides a comprehensive view of the dynamics within dialogical unity. This methodology not only enriches the analysis of linguistic interactions but also aids in establishing a more robust framework for understanding the psycholinguistic aspects of communication.

According to several scientists, studying the communication process—specifically the balance between verbal and non-verbal components and the dynamics of dialogue—extends beyond the scope of linguistics and enters the realm of psycholinguistics. This interdisciplinary field, closely linked to psychology, focuses on interpersonal communication and addresses a wide range of language-related issues (Cummins, 2014). Communication necessarily implies a certain dialogue unity, which consists in direct exchange of statements between two or more persons, consists of the exchange of statements-remarks and includes, as a rule, two installments: spontaneous first and second, which shows full dependence on the first installment (Brown, 2005; Gleason, 1965).

### 3. Results and Discussion

Speech in the above trine (A. Practical events preceded the act of speech. B. Speech. C. Practical events that occur after the act of speech), as well as beyond it, can be found by using symbolic marks (Bloomfield (1933). These are incentive (I), including the language, replaced by (L), and reaction (R), which includes the reaction of the language, such as replacement by (r). The latter is also a practical event that defines the behavior of the communicants, and the event is no less significant than those, which are only preceded by their own language or occur after the saying, not being embodied in verbal designs.



If to focus on the possibility to link the way of life, the nature of activity, and the everyday behavior of a person with the attraction of it first of all only to two main events (the act of speech and practical event), then the components A and C can be lowered in this trine. But it is only possible after accepting the postulate, according to which language is also (or at least can be) a practical event. Speech as a practical event can be left as the only subject of linguistic research following the direct competence of the linguist. Hereof, there is an important and fundamental statement for the current research, which is that the realization of a language intention of a speaker can be connected and often fully coincide with practical events as a physical reaction of the listener and with his verbal reaction to the speech. Moreover, the setting for verbal reaction can prevail and even be the main and only in general several communicative situations, limited, for example, to the framework of the usual dialogue type: – *What are you reading?* – *That's my favourite book by Francois Lelord*; – *Do you live with your parents?* – *Yes, I do*; – *Do you usually eat here?* – *Yes, I do not have time to cook myself*; – *Do you plan to stay there for a long time?* – *No, I want to return to my family and friends and start looking for a job*; – *Why are you visiting Detroit?* – *To improve my English*.

Speech, in turn, is a bilateral process that includes two basic types of language behavior: speaking and listening. Component B (speech) is also at least two-dimensional, similar to the two kinds of practical behavior of a person in Bloomfield's (1933) triage (components A and C). According to the above-mentioned postulate, component B includes the linguistic component as a practical event connected with the speech intention of the language, as well as a practical event caused by the verbal reaction of the interlocutor to the said. Trine, therefore, in its own linguistic content may be transformed into a kind of communicative binomial, which has the following form:

- Language as setting of the addressant to a certain type of speech behavior of the interlocutor, listener. Something said, has, as an utterance, its purpose and necessarily contains a certain communicative purpose.
- Language as verbal reaction of the listener to the utterance of the addressant. Something perceived is correlated with the language and qualified as one or the other responsive.

The mentioned components of this binomial form a kind of text, a certain speech creation with a pronounced pragmatic setting both in the first (the intention of the speaker) and in the second (the presence of verbal reaction and its character) part of the corresponding dialogue. They form a non-verbal unity, the essence of which can be presented in the form of one linguistic figure of this kind: *Speech intention – Speech reaction*. The lexical (specific words) and syntax (specific syntax units, and in particular the sentence), the contents of this scheme can be varied, for example: *Would you like a cup of coffee or tea?* – *The flight was uneasy, so I need additional source of energy*; *Do you really want to know who was at fault?* – *Well, if you want me to take this seriously*;



*What is the figure in this report? – You should not deal with financial issues!; Is it possible to buy the book of this author in English? – His books appear so quickly that it is impossible to translate them into many languages; What are your reading? – It is my favourite book; Do you like dogs? – Dogs? Of course!*

In each of the required illustrations, there is a unity of structural-system order and not a mechanical, improvised combination of two language formations, which can be connected with different events and represent verbal chains with an absolutely different set of lexical material. This unity, both in its semantic content and in syntax drawing, necessarily contains something that rather rigidly determines the functioning of this scheme as the only whole. And the most convincing proof of the unity of the intention and the responsive in any real dialogue is the linguistic link of the second component with the first one. It is expressed in the impossibility of the answer without a clearly formulated question: *Have you read book by Ernest Hemingway? – What does he write about?; Why are you staying in London? – To solve my business issues; Hi, Maria! Have you finished your exam? – Yes, I have.* Of course, the answers of the type *What does he write about? Yes, I have.* without a question, obviously, there is no content.

Real communication of people can be carried out in a variety of forms: from the exchange of separate short utterances to very complex syntax, containing arguments of certain judgments, indications of their degree of authenticity, emotional-expressive support of them (Volkov & Poleshchuk, 2019). At the same time, it is most likely impossible to establish some restrictions on the number and character of linguistic means used in the dialogue and strictly limit its volume or expediency, as well as the degree of allowability and non-allowability of any rhetorical move. It is difficult to show the theoretically possible or maximum permissible structure of the dialogue and to build a model of the boundary based on the volume of the scheme of the above-mentioned binomial (Haselow & Hancil, 2018). As for the minimum of what can and should be qualified as a dialogue, which includes both components of the binomial, it probably does not require any special effort to mark this minimum. The dialogue can consist of two very short phrases, each of which will be built from one very short word, too, for example:

- *You?*
- *Me.*

And this is a real communicative situation, which can take place, for example, at an unexpected meeting, and in particular at a meeting of two friends, who have not seen each other for a long time. More examples of constructive minimal dialogue, but more developed, which consists of different syntax structures:

- *What are you doing now?* (Simple interrogative sentence).
- *As the weather is bad, so I cannot go for a walk!* (Complex sentence with clause of reason).
- *Anything else?* (Simple elliptical interrogative sentence).



– *Oh, there were a lot of other questions. Professor Jenkins asked me what my hobbies were and she asked me to write about them. Then, she sent me a picture and asked me to describe it. And later, I was asked to write a short composition on the online methods of teaching and learning.* (Complex syntax unit).

Authors will also give examples that go beyond the limits of the question-answer system.

– *Bring me the menu, please!* (Imperative).

– *One moment, sir!* (Simple elliptical sentence).

– *Go to the shop and buy something to eat, then, visit my friend and tell him I want to speak with him.* (Several imperative constructions in the one sentence).

– *I don't know, when I will do that.* (Complex sentence with clause of time).

– *I have breakfast at 8 o'clock in the morning.* (Simple declarative sentence).

– *That's nice.* (Simple complete sentence).

– *I like summer holidays because I can go to the seaside. We always go to the seaside by car. It is so convenient!* (Complex syntax unit).

– *I like to spend my summer holidays in the country. We sleep in a tent and go fishing early in the morning. It is also very interesting!* (Complex syntax unit).

Significantly here is the fact that the minimum of the corresponding binomial is determined by the functional determinacy of the dialogue as a linguistic figure, the possibility to qualify it as an act of communication, which took place. This act should be formally and constructively completed in the given communicative situation language structure. The structure, in turn, is similar to the text, which is qualified as a syntactic unit that meets the norms of language along with formal completion (Menshikov, 2012). It is also necessarily orientated pragmatically, that is, on the setting and resolution of some practical problem, including such that so that related to the process of communication of people. Schematically, using special terms, the structure of the minimal dialogue unity can, obviously, be presented as:

Intent → Speech → Responsive

Language intention is the intention of the addressant, his/her communicative task, target setting (to get some information, to induce any actions, to report something) (Lipowska & Sajewicz-Radtke, 2012). Speech is a verbal expression of intention and target setting of the language, which is manifested in a concrete expression with a certain communicative task (Kroliets, 2023). Verbal responsive is a verbal reaction to the language's intention: his/her question, volition, or information that he/her has received: – *Are you ready to order yet, sir? – Yes, a prawn cocktail for my wife, and the trout for me; – How long was your exam? – It took me 1,5 hour to do all the tasks. I really hope to get the exam results soon* (the intention to get some information from the interlocutor); – *Bring the menu, please! – Certainly. Here it is; – Come on, get in the car – Sounds like a plan! Will we go somewhere?* (expression of volition); – *I'm a tourist guide – So interesting!;* –





*We can take you downtown Detroit and you can practice your English at the same time – Thank you. I'd love to go with you* (informing the interlocutor of any information).

Intention (from the lat. *Intentio*), in the most general sense of the corresponding term appearing in different sciences, is an implicit prediction by the participant of communication of the desired result of communication, the orientation of consciousness towards such result. It is a concrete purpose of the utterance of the addressant, that is, he/she asks, or affirms, calls, judges or approves, advises, or demands (Crystal, 2008). It is also the intention, purpose, focus, or direction of conscience, volition, feeling on any subject (Lockwood et al., 2000). In psychology, intention is defined as the immanent orientation of consciousness on a certain subject that is not relative to whether it is real or only meaningful (Givon, 2001); any desire, plan, purpose, a task or belief that focuses on a particular goal is a certain final state (Gurevich, 2004). In psycholinguistics, the intention is qualified as the leading force in the field of subconscious and human thinking, which influences the proposal component of the internal language program, the choice of style, the way of the program implementation by moving it into a verbal form (Selivanova, 2011). In linguistics, it is usually mentioned about language intention as a target statement of a speech act, intent, intention of the addressant (Crystal, 2008; Degtiarova et al., 2023). Also, about the subjective desire of those who say to build utterance for a certain purpose, communicative intention (Carnie, 2001; Shynkaruk, 2023). In Selivanova (2011) intention means a preverbal, thought-out set of those who say that defines communicative strategies, an internal program of speech, and ways of its realization. The structure of the intention, according to the linguists, has the following elements (Wekker and Haegeman, 1996; Krupelnyska et al., 2019):

- a motivated desire to achieve a certain non-verbal effect;
- an understanding of the need to take certain speech actions to achieve this intention;
- a specific motivation of speech action as a push for the implementation of the communicative act.

The essence of speech intention as a concept reflects earlier classifications of communicative units for the purpose of utterance. And in fact, the intention of the speaker in one way or another is reflected in the character of the speech chain generated by him/her and the used sentences in this case (Lehnert et al., 2018). In the most general case, it can be directed to inform about something, to receive information about something, and to encourage something (the volition of the addressant). Hereof, the traditional, most widespread division of sentences into declarative, interrogative, and imperative (Iriskulov, 2006). In its turn, the concept of intention, which entered into a wide array of different sciences, promoted the expansion and refinement of linguistic categories that correspond to the communicative task of utterance.



The linguistic essence of the first component of the communicative binomial is thoroughly studied and described by scientists in various aspects of it, connected with both speech intention and communicative tasks or the purpose of utterance. As for the second part of this binomial as a linguistic figure, authors have no significant information. As a psychological phenomenon (which is a legitimate response of the body to external influence), the reaction can be of the following types: behavioral, physiological, emotional, arbitrary, involuntary, and others (Trask, 1996).

The most common variant of dialogue unity is shown itself, as a rule, in the systems of question-answer (*interrogative systems*) and is a dialogue between two people. One of them questions, and the other one answers (responds) to it, for example: – *Where do you live?* – *In London*; – *Have you read the latest newspapers?* – *Yes, but only “British Times”* or – *Have you read the latest newspapers?* – *I do not read newspapers at all*. The same kind of act, however, may take place in the following arguments (the system of expression of volition): – *Bring me some tea, please!* – *With sugar?*; – *Do me a favour, please!* – *Ok, how can I help you?*; – *Wash the dishes!* – *Maybe, I’ll do it in evening*. And if one of the participants in the dialogue wishes to inform his interlocutor of some information (*information system*): – *Our hotel is about thirty minutes if the traffic’s OK* – *Oh, I really hope we’ll get there quickly*; – *San Francisco is a great city!* – *Have you ever been there?*; – *The lift is over there!* – *Thank you*.

In each of these communication systems, there are obviously only appropriate language forms drawn from one of the communicants in the form of a question (*Where do you live?*; *Have you read the latest newspapers?*), motivation for action (*Bring me some tea, please!*; *Do me a favour, please!*; *Wash the dishes!*) or declarative sentence (*Our hotel is about thirty minutes if the traffic’s OK*; *San Francisco is a great city!* *The lift is over there!*), in another communicant – in the form of a speech responsive of a different character. Thus, in the given examples, the system of interrogative responsives represents in the first and second cases a direct answer to the question asked, in the third case – removal of the problem at all (*I do not read newspapers at all*). As for the examples given in the system of expression of volition, the responsive is a clarification of the request of the addressant (*with sugar?*); readiness to fulfill the volition, try to get specific instructions about it (*Ok, how can I help you?*); reluctance to do what they say is an attempt to postpone the case for a later period (*Maybe, I’ll do it in evening*).

In the examples given in the system of information, the responsive is verbal reaction, which indicates the attitude of the interlocutor to the said, expression of some emotions (*Oh, I really hope we’ll get there quickly*); the desire to specify the said, something to clarify (*Have you ever been there?*); thank you for the information provided (*Thank you*). The intention of the addressant opens a dialogue, and, as noted above, it is represented by the first component of the dialogue unity: a question, a fundamental, or a narrative. The second component of the dialogue unity is a reactive sentence, or a responsive, as a verbal reaction to the statements of another participant in the dialogue (Malmkaer, 2010).



Depending on the specific communicative situation, the nature of the responsive may be very different (Haselow, 2018).

Dialogical unity can be elementary two-component language formations, for example: –*Where have you been?* – *In London*; – *Where are you from?* – *From Italy*; – *What do you play?* – *Football*. In this case, the corresponding figures are represented only by two communicative units (on one of each of the subjects of the dialogue) and quite developed, but in fact, also two components, constructions, like: – *It's been a very useful trip. Thank you for organizing everything and for looking after us so well. We've done everything we wanted to do. Will we continue our cooperation in the next year?* – *Well, thank you for coming. We've really enjoyed having you as our guests. You must come and see us again next year*; – *Can I help you?* – *Yes, my name is Amy Brown and I have an appointment with Mr. Mitchell at ten o'clock. I am afraid I'm a bit late*; – *Will you join our party?* – *I'm sure it will be a great party. Sorry but I can not come. Wait a minute though. I know what I will do. I will go to the cinema with Chris on Friday, then I will be able to come to the party on Saturday* (Ermolaeva, 2006).

Here the actual intention in the form of the asked question is included in the set of sentences, which are not interrogative, but they specify the question and send it to the channel necessary for a subject that asks. This is similar to the first of the above examples, when the questions, related to the desire to learn about the possibilities of cooperation in the next year, accompanied by a number of phrases related to the positive experience of the previous cooperation of the participants of the dialogue. This, in fact, encourages the subject that answers to a positive answer to the question, which is in only one (in the fourth) sentence.

According to the general concept of this study, the dialogue with its components can be summarized only to the two most important components of the dialogue in a particular communicative situation. And, accordingly, to the two sentences as well, the first of which directly expressed the intention, the second – a verbal reaction to the expressed intention. These components are highlighted in the illustrations just shown: the intention in the phrases *Will we continue our cooperation in the next year? Can I help you? Will you join our party?*; the responsive in the phrases *You must come and see us again next year, Yes, I will be able to come to the party on Saturday*. In the works of Menshikov (2012), responsive sentences, or responsives, are indicated as functionally significant communicative units with an integer different from other types of speech. These responsives represent a reaction to the expressed utterance and correspond to the questions in their primary function. In the work of Menshikov (2012), an attempt was made to build a general system of responsive sentences as reactions to the question (or more broadly to the previous utterance). Differential features of such constructions were also mentioned. It cannot exist as independent communicative units and must be part of a larger than sentence, syntactic formation; responsive sentences are opposed to other types by the nature of the stimulus.



Just as there are different classifications of intention, including those related to the communicative task of utterance, different classifications of the reproduction-answer were proposed. Considering the concept of a relevant unity, Paducheva (2008) shares the answers in the dialogue groups to the following types: direct and indirect; complete and incomplete answers; answers that follow and do not follow the subject area questions; answers that are related and unrelated to the initial questions; answers that are informative and not informative for the person. The existing classifications, if they have a number of interesting and linguistic reasons, have two significant drawbacks. First of all, there is no single basis for typology, different scientists rely on different principles of classification. Second of all, there is no sufficient generalization of the types of answers, a lot of excessive specificity, as well as in the classification of sentences for the purpose of expression (Tallerman, 2011).

In the proposed article, responsives (as a kind of reaction to the feeling of expression) are classified mainly depending on the extent to which the interlocutor satisfies the result of tactical orientation and the character of the corresponding responsive sentences as a verbal reaction to the initiation of a verbal sentence. Theoretically, there are three main types of responsives:

- The responsive that answers to the question, which can be heard unambiguously, is quite definite. Authors call this type of responsive content, for example: – *How long may I have the books checked out?* – **You can have our books for 10 days**; – *And how much is the fine after that?* – **According to our rules, you'll be charged 20 cents every day you don't return it after 10 days**; – *What would you like to have?* – **A glass of orange juice, one serving of bacon and eggs, a toast with some butter and marmalade and a cup of black coffee, please** (Zinoveva & Omeljanenko, 2012).

The answer to each question is quite clear.

- The responsive, in which there is no answer at all or any specific answer to the question, which would be interpreted unambiguously. Authors call it empty-responsive, for example: – *How much it costs?* – **It is our special offer. These phones are 20 percent off**; – *Would you like anything for dessert?* – **Any suggestions?**; – *May I ask you who is calling?* – **It is not your problem** (Zinoveva & Omeljanenko, 2012).
- The responsive, which does not contain a direct answer to the question but also allows the inquiry to draw a conclusion about the nature of the answer. Authors call it a latent responsive, for example: – *Do you want to go with me to the beach tomorrow?* – **It is still quite cold for swimming**; – *Do you really want to know who was at fault?* – **If you want me to take this seriously**; – *Can I talk to you for a minute?* – **Quickly** (Zinoveva & Omeljanenko, 2012).



In the first example, the interrogator, having heard the answer is still very cold to swim, quite logically concludes that his interlocutor does not want to swim. Similar conclusions will probably be made in other examples. At the same time, it can be talked about the only basis for the classification of responsives – the nature of the answer according to the information contained in it. Also, according to whether the answer is aimed at satisfaction of the target setting (intention) of the person who asked the question: there is an answer; there is no answer; the addressant must guess himself/herself as to the content of the answer to his question (Reis, 1999). As for the different kinds of specifics when highlighting the main types of responsives sentences, here, as in the description of the intention, authors strive to their maximum generalization. That way any answer is either to meet the information needs or to refuse to give the necessary information, or to such a response, when the inquiry is given the opportunity to get the information, he/she needs (Rappaa & Kok-Sing, 2018).

Three basic categories of speech intentions were identified by the analysis, which corresponded to declarative, interrogative, and imperative sentences. These sentences sought to convey volition, request information, or inform, respectively. Three main categories were found for vocal responses or responsives: content responsives, which give straightforward answers; empty responsives, which withhold information; and latent responsives, which subtly suggest answers. Compared to earlier typologies, this classification system provides a more unified and generalized method of classifying dialogue components since it is based on how well responses fit the speaker's communicative goals. The study highlights how the character of the intention influences the matching responsive, emphasizing the inextricable link between intention and responsive within a dialogue. These results lay the groundwork for more investigation into the links between subtypes within each response category and their various purposes from a language and psycholinguistic standpoint.

#### 4. Conclusion

According to the analysis, speech intention (impetus) and speech reaction (responsive) are the two main components that make up dialogical unity. The communicative objectives of informing, asking for information, and expressing volition were found to be correlated with three fundamental categories of speech intentions. These fit the traditional classification of declarative, interrogative, and imperative sentences. Three primary categories of responses were identified about speech reactions: content responsives (which provide unambiguous answers), empty responsives (which avoid answers), and latent responses (which suggest replies indirectly). Compared to earlier typologies, this categorisation provides a more cohesive method of classifying dialogue components since it is predicated on the degree to which the response meets the speaker's communicative objectives.

Subtypes within each response category should be examined in more detail in future studies, with an emphasis on their nuances and frequency of application in various



circumstances. Examining the correlation between diverse intents and responses in a range of languages and cultural contexts may reveal potentially universal trends. Its applicability would be tested by analyzing real-world dialogues in various contexts using this paradigm. Another intriguing direction is to investigate how this understanding of dialogue structure might be used to enhance language training programs and teaching approaches. Last but not least, using psycholinguistic techniques to investigate the cognitive mechanisms behind the genesis and interpretation of various intents and responses may provide insightful information. These directions for future research could significantly enhance the understanding of human communication and contribute to practical applications in fields such as linguistics, psychology, education, and artificial intelligence.

## References

- [1] Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. Henry Holt and Company.
- [2] Brown, K. (2005). *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- [3] Carnie, A. (2001). *Syntax*. Blackwell Publishers.
- [4] Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Blackwell Publishing.
- [5] Cummins, J. (2014). Beyond language: Academic communication and student success. *Linguistic and Education*, 26, 145-154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.01.006>
- [6] Degtiarova, K., Zhyvolup, V., Karas, A., Kibenko, L., & Lyakhova, I. (2023). Features of teaching grammar in foreign language classes in non-linguistic institutions of higher education. *Scientific Bulletin of Mukachevo State University. Series "Pedagogy and Psychology"*, 9(2), 18-27. <https://doi.org/10.52534/msu-pp2.2023.18>
- [7] Ermolaeva, M.E. (2006). *The English language in dialogues*. Prospekt.
- [8] Givon, T. (2001). *Syntax*. John Benjamin's Publishing House.
- [9] Gleason, H.A.J. (1965). *Linguistics and English Grammar*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- [10] Gurevich, V.V. (2004). *Theoretical Grammar of the English language. Contrastive typology of the English and Russian languages*. Nauka.
- [11] Haselow, A. (2018). Language change from a psycholinguistic perspective: The long-term effects of frequency on language processing. *Language Sciences*, 68, 56-77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2017.12.006>
- [12] Haselow, A., & Hancil, S. (2018). Rethinking language change from a dialogic perspective. *Language Sciences*, 68, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2018.05.008>
- [13] Iriskulov, A.T. (2006). *Theoretical Grammar of English*. Tashkent: Norma.
- [14] Kroliets, Y.V. (2023). Development of speech motives for the construction of stories in preschool children. *Scientia et Societus*, 1(3), 154-165. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2786-6327/2023/3/154-165>



- [15] Krupelnytska, L., Zelenin, V., Ortikova, N., Sytnyk, V., & Emishyants, O. (2019). Features of staff motivation in the field of information technology. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 8(8), 27-30.
- [16] Lehnert, T., Krolak-Schwerdt, S., & Hörstermann, T. (2018). Explicit and implicit speaker evaluations and their differential attitudinal determinants. *Language Sciences*, 69, 68-79.
- [17] Lipowska, M., & Sajewicz-Radtke, U. (2012). Language as a moderator of memory-related processes in children with developmental dyslexia. *Acta Neuropsychologica*, 10(2), 205-214. <https://doi.org/10.5604/17307503.1008242>
- [18] Lockwood, D.G., Fries, P.H., & Copeland, J.E. (2000). *Functional approaches to language culture and cognition*. Michigan State University.
- [19] Malmkaer, K. (2010). *The linguistics. Encyclopedia*. Routledge.
- [20] Menshikov, I.I. (2012). *Typology of responsive sentences in modern Russian*. New Ideology.
- [21] Paducheva, E.V. (2008). *Statement and its correlation with reality. Referential aspects of the semantics of pronouns*. LKI Edition.
- [22] Rappaa, A., & Kok-Sing, T. (2018). Integrating disciplinary-specific genre structure in discourse strategies to support disciplinary literacy. *Linguistic and Education*, 43, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.12.003>
- [23] Reis, M. (1999). On sentence type in German: an enquiry into the relationship between grammar and pragmatics. *Interdisciplinary Journal for Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis*, 4(2), 195-236.
- [24] Selivanova, O. (2011). *Linguistic encyclopedia*. Environment.
- [25] Shynkaruk, V.D. (2023). Revisiting syntax of coherent speech. *International Journal of Philology*, 14(2), 6-12. [https://doi.org/10.31548/philolog14\(2\).2023.01](https://doi.org/10.31548/philolog14(2).2023.01)
- [26] Spytka, L. (2024). The difference in the world perception between a hysteric and a neurotic. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(6), 2229. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i6.2229>
- [27] Tallerman, M. (2011). *Understanding Syntax*. London: Hodder Education.
- [28] Trask, R.L. (1996). *A dictionary of grammatical terms in linguistics*. Routledge.
- [29] Volkov, V.V., & Poleshchuk, V.V. (2019). Current state of interethnic communication in Latvia and Estonia. *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*, 2019(2), 59-67. <https://doi.org/10.31857/S013216250004008-1>
- [30] Vozniuk, T. (2023). Dialogical speech activity as a necessary component of the formation of students' foreign language competence. *International Journal of Philology*, 14(3), 109-118. [https://doi.org/10.31548/philolog14\(3\).2023.012](https://doi.org/10.31548/philolog14(3).2023.012)
- [31] Wekker, H., & Haegeman, L. (1996). *A modern course in English syntax*. Routledge
- [32] Zinoveva, L.A., & Omeljanenko, V.I. (2012). *All phrases of the English language*. Feniks.



## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the editors and reviewers who helped with their guidance and assistance during the correction and layout of this manuscript.

## Authors' Biodata

**Iryna Suyma** is a PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Translation and Linguistic Training of Foreigners of the Oles Honchar Dnipro National University of Dnipro, Ukraine. She is the author of many scientific papers, textbooks, and collective monographs.

**Natalia Diachok** is a PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of General and Slavic Linguistics of the Oles Honchar Dnipro National University of Dnipro, Ukraine. She is the author and co-author of many articles, she is a philologist and a scientist.

**Tetiana Klymenko** is a PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Translation and Linguistic Training of Foreigners of the Oles Honchar Dnipro National University of Dnipro, Ukraine. Her specialization is Ukrainian as a foreign language. She has an experience of working with foreign students for 15 years.

**Oksana Bovkunova** is a Lecturer at the Department of English Language for Non-Philological Specialties of the Oles Honchar Dnipro National University of Dnipro, Ukraine. She specializes in linguistic analysis, philology, and communication.

## Authors' Contribution

All authors collaborated to the realization of this research work. The conceptualization was primarily made by *Iryna Suyma* and *Natalia Diachok*. The methodology was shaped by *Iryna Suyma*, *Tetiana Klymenko*, and *Oksana Bovkunova*. The investigation was a joint effort between *Iryna Suyma*, *Natalia Diachok*, and *Tetiana Klymenko* while resources were mainly managed by *Natalia Diachok*, *Tetiana Klymenko*, and *Oksana Bovkunova*. The data curation was done by *Natalia Diachok* and *Tetiana Klymenko*. The writing process, however, was led by *Tetiana Klymenko* and *Oksana Bovkunova*. The original draft was subsequently reviewed and refined by *Iryna Suyma* and *Natalia Diachok*.

## Declaration of conflicting interest

The authors declared no conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of the article.

