

Published by the decision of the Scientific Council
of Khachatur Abovian
Armenian State Pedagogical University



Department of Philosophy and Logic
named after Academician Gevorg Brutian



W I S D O M

4(24), 2022



*WISDOM is covered in Clarivate Analytics' Emerging Sources
Citation Index service*

ASPU Publication

YEREVAN – 2022

DOI: 10.24234/wisdom.v24i4.927

METHODOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF STRATEGIES AND TACTICS IN LITERARY DISCOURSE

Ganna PRIHODKO^{1,*} | Oleksandra PRYKHODCHENKO² | Halyna MOROSHKINA³ |
Maryna ZALUZHNA⁴ | Oksana MERKULOVA⁵

1 Chair of English Philology and Linguodidactics, Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine

2 Chair of Foreign Languages for Special Purposes, Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine

3 Chair of Romance Philology and Translation, Dean of the Faculty of Foreign Philology, Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine

4 Chair of English Philology and Linguodidactics, Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine

5 Chair of Ukrainian Philology, Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine

* *Correspondence*

Ganna PRIHODKO, 69018, Ukraine,
Zaporizhzhia, Pobeda street, 46/29
E-mail: anna.prikhodko.55@gmail.com

Abstract: The objective of this paper is analysis of the prevalent strategies and tactics of evaluation used in the literary discourse. Evaluation is regarded as a cognitive-communicative phenomenon. It is viewed as the essential part of human comprehension and reflection of the outer reality. The pragmatic aspect of strategies and tactics is considered as the major means of expressing the author's intention and the goal. All evaluation strategies and tactics used in the literary discourse are divided into two groups: semantic and pragmatic. The semantic strategies consist of the persuasion strategy and the discrediting strategy, and the pragmatic ones contain the emotive-tuning strategies and the self-presentation strategy.

The results achieved confirm the idea that strategies and tactics of evaluation must undergo profound and detailed analysis in order to reveal the complex process of communication in the literary discourse.

Keywords: evaluation, evaluation strategy, evaluation tactics, literary discourse, semantic, pragmatic.

Introduction

In the process of cognition of the surrounding world, a human being inevitably assesses the events of objective reality demonstrating the personal perception and understanding of them that can be revealed through the language. As far as evaluation is one of the tools of cognition, it is identified as a powerful way of influence on human consciousness, and formation of its value worldview.

This way, the power of evaluation in cognition may be diverse because appraisal is an all-pervading process which is characteristic of most

aspects and activities of individual's existence. That is why assessment is cognitive-pragmatic in its very essence.

Moreover, evaluation as a communicative concept is considered to be a specific language means that reveals expressive and emotional attitude of the speaker to the utterance, and is mainly connected with the pragmatic purpose of communication.

In modern scientific discourse evaluation is determined as a wide cover term for the expression of the speaker's approaches, opinions, ideas, standpoints or suggestions as to what they are talking about (Ananko, 2017; Thompson &

Hunston, 2000, p. 5; Bigunova, 2017, 2019; Prihodko, 2016; Myroniuk, 2017). In other words, the speaker attempts to make the interlocutor change their own vision of various facts and share these attitudes and views expressed by means of value judgments.

The investigation of anthropocentric phenomena comprising appraisal is the productive aspect of communication studies. This research is an attempt to determine, classify and characterize the chief strategies and tactics of evaluation manifested in the literary discourse from the point of view of cognitive and communicative linguistics.

Present-day linguistics based on discourse analysis investigates the process of communication from the perspective of its participants. Therefore, the problem of selecting proper communicative strategies and tactics (Issers, 2013) is of utter importance for scientists. Appraisal strategies and tactics are represented by a set of strategies and tactics of communication, the study of which is still underway because there are not many investigations in this field (Iskakova & Islam, 2020; Azimova, 2021).

The *object* of this paper is the analysis of evaluation strategies and tactics manifested in literary discourse.

The *purpose* of this article is to represent a linguistic approach to characterization of strategies and tactics implemented in literary discourse.

The application of modern methodology provided by communicative and cognitive linguistics enables to reveal the innovative ways in the research of assessment strategies and tactics. They can be viewed as the stages focusing on the understanding of the discourse's pragmatic goals.

The *material*, which is subjected to analysis, was a selection of approximately 340 citations from the works by contemporary British and American writers. The criterion of the selection was the existence of evaluative words and word combinations in the utterance.

Methods and techniques are determined by the purposes, the material, the theoretical character of the paper and are of complex character. They integrate theses of the cognitive theory and pragmalinguistics. The essential points of Evaluation Theory and of the Theory of Discourse present basic ideas for the linguistic investigation (Arutyunova, 2012; Dijk, 2009; Myroniuk, 2017; Prihodko, 2016, 2018; Volf, 2009). The aim of

discourse analysis is to represent language facts within various contexts, namely cognitive, cultural, situational (He, 2017) and at the same time to single out linguistic means by which we can structure the reality.

Problem of Contemporary Discourse Studies in Linguistics

The term "discourse" has a long and eventful history. It emerged in Latin as "*discursus*" and denoted "to run back and forth" back in ancient times. At present, this notion is used in all spheres of science and is still keeping its advancement in various fields of the human knowledge.

The previous century generated the new scientific paradigm which combined the achievements of functional approach with those of cognitive one. This paradigm has become dominant in modern language studies. It was based on the legacy it has received from the preceding paradigms, mainly from basic ideas comprising the current field of scientific research. Its development resulted in reinterpretation of numerous language phenomena, even the definition of language was reformulated in terms of mental processes performed by the individual.

Some linguists state that "in this new paradigm, the language is considered as a peculiar sign system, which permits the person to treat their own kind for the purpose to exchange the information or to apply it any other way and provides us with different forms of human behavior studies in general" (Aleksandrova, 2017, p. 298). Through this position, the language serves as the means of cognition within the communication with the help of which we can solve and explain communicative-pragmatic tasks.

Most modern scientists state that discourse studies are aimed at the analysis of phrases or sentences, and of the context which is not only linguistic, but also extra-linguistic one (Bax, 2011; Fei et al., 2013). Evidently, the language is not just a tool of reflection, as far as it possesses the power of both representing, constructing and transforming the reality. An essential idea of discourse studies is that language is viewed as the basic constituent of building the individual worldview (Hart, 2011; Babelyuk & Aleksandrjuk, 2018). Thus, to examine the discourse it is

particularly relevant to take into account the fact that the outer reality is constructed by the discourse we apply.

Studying discourse, researchers do not disregard its main object, that is the language. Discourse is a new concept which emerged in the linguistic studies before the end of the 20th century. In the image of discourse, the language turned to the linguist with its extraordinarily complex dynamic side. It requires an exploration for new approaches and techniques that are different from traditional ones.

Now, there is no agreement on the meaning of the term “discourse” and its parameters. This is due to the fact that discourse classifications are based on various principles

The structure of discourse includes both linguistic and extra-linguistic constituents, which work in communicative process in a particular context. Consequently, analysis of discourse has to take into consideration not only its universal features, but also specific ones peculiar of its type (Baker, 2006) which can depend on its topicality or chronology.

Discourse possesses definite components: the addressee, the addresser, the aim, the time limit, the social and cultural context. It should be noted that these constituents are mandatory in defining the discourse type, as they are in the focus of linguistic investigation.

In our paper we consider discourse as a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic (pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other) factors; communicative process is characterized as an intended social action, as a relevant element of people’s interaction and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes).

Strategies and Tactics of Evaluation

It is common knowledge that the writer’s communicative aim of assessment is always connected with the search for sufficient ways and means of its expression. These language means are selected not randomly, but are combined within a range of steps that all contribute to the author’s intended purpose.

The terms “strategy” and “tactics” derive from Latin, and were originally used in warfare theory, in which “strategy” denotes “coordinated

application of all the forces of a nation to achieve a goal” (Britannica Concise Encyclopædia, 2006, p. 1829), whereas “tactics” means “the art and science of fighting battles, and deals with the problems encountered in actual fighting” (Britannica Concise Encyclopædia, 2006, p. 1861). Both terms have expanded far beyond their original military meanings, and were incorporated into the terminological apparatus of many other sciences, including linguistics.

The notion “strategy” has developed its semantics in language studies, where it is currently regarded as:

- a pattern of realization of the author’s intention in discourse with the help of different language means (Drewniansy & Jewler, 2010, p. 130);
- a combination of successive speech acts which express the aims of communication (Cook, 2006, p. 172);
- specific organization of communicative activity influenced by peculiar social context and individual characteristics of interlocutors (Dijk & Kintsch, 1983, p. 54).

From our viewpoint, the most appropriate definition of strategy in terms of discourse studies is its explanation as an integrity of actions of speech targeted at the reaching the speaker’s pragmatic goal. This definition gives us the foundation to consider strategy as a fundamental concept of cognitive-communicative approach to literary discourse analysis.

There exist various interpretations of the notion “communicative tactics”. They can be determined as certain means of a strategy realization (Chernjavskaja, 2006, pp. 45-46), a sequence of speech acts that provide efficient implementation of the strategy (Issers, 2013, p. 110), a series of particular tools which serve to express the message and the intention of the author. The tactics are also considered to be the stages of communication that help to meet the general strategic goal.

These stages are realized by a complex of speech acts involved in representation this or that strategy (Coleman & Ross, 2003, p. 8). We consider the most appropriate definition of communicative tactics as a combination of communicative actions in terms of linguistic and non-linguistic means that contribute to the productive carrying out of a certain strategy.

All evaluation strategies and tactics used in

the literary discourse are divided into two groups: semantic and pragmatic.

The semantic strategies consist of the persuasion strategy and the discrediting strategy, and the pragmatic ones contain the emotive-tuning strategies and the self-presentation strategy.

The strategies of evaluation are represented in a discourse (in our case, in literary one), by means of local tactics corresponding to particular discourse components.

The semantic strategies are represented by the following local tactics:

- 1) nomination (making up names of phenomena);
- 2) predication (correspondence of names with environment);
- 3) thematization (integration of meanings into a single entity);
- 4) stylization (choice of proper lingual means providing the discourse with intended connotations in particular contexts);
- 5) topical division of discourse;
- 6) integrity of language units in the discourse.

The pragmatic strategies involve the tactics of:

- 1) recognition of the existence of the problem;
- 2) accusation and reproach;
- 3) disagreement;
- 4) ways to solve the problem;
- 5) gratitude and recognition of merit;
- 6) tactic of indication of success.

To demonstrate the above mentioned statements let us resort to the instance below:

“Soames watched him for a moment dance crazily on the pavement to his own drawling jagged sounds, then crossed over to avoid contact with this piece of drunken foolery... What asses people were!” (Galsworthy, 2013, p. 2009).

In this utterance the word *drunken* preserves its denotation (alcohol-intoxicated). This meaning is mandatory one, but in the passage we observe the transference of the feature attributed to a person's condition to their conduct. The reader's attention is mainly concentrated on analogous characteristics considering its originality and incongruity between conventional and contextual signifier (*piece of foolery of drunken man*).

Besides, the lexeme *drunken* retaining its denotative meaning implies the communicative-pragmatic meaning of “disregard” expressed by Soames. The marker of this scornful attitude of

the character is the word *ass* which adds negative meaning to the whole context. Soames's inner speech which is based on the oppositions “right – wrong”, “good – bad”, reveals the pragmatic strategy of negative evaluation.

The following fragments of literary discourse illustrate the implementation of strategies and tactics of evaluation:

“Bartlett began quietly, ‘The patient was referred to me on May 12.’ ‘A little louder, Gil.’ The request came from down the table. Bartlett raised his voice. ‘I’ll try. But maybe you’d better see McEwan afterward.’ A laugh ran round the group in which the e.n.t. man joined” (Hailey, 2015, p. 38).

The pragmatic aim of this utterance is the hidden mockery of the speaker. It is realized with the help of the phrase *but maybe you’d better see McEwan afterward* which expresses contextual irony (as Mr. McEwan is an otolaryngologist and both interlocutors' colleague). In this situation the hint displays the author's strategy of negative evaluative characterization of one of the heroes which becomes clear only for those familiar with the context of the novel. It is a conscious discourse strategy of an author to imply real assessment rather than explicate it.

Let us resort to another case representing evaluative strategy:

“‘Dad,’ I said, ‘you don’t seriously think your letter made them give you a prize?’ ‘Three prizes!’ Course it did! I got ‘em rattled. They said to themselves, this Harry Bates is no fool. He’s going to cause trouble if we’re not careful” (Lodge, 2008, p. 171).

In the example above, the utterance, though interrogative in form, conveys the character's negative evaluation of his father's actions, which is further intensified with the negative auxiliary *don't* and the adjective *seriously*. Though verbalized with the help of emotionally neutral words, the statement jokingly insults the person addressed.

The speaker is so surprised with his dad's deed that he expresses a massive disbelief of what he finds out about it. This is implied by the type of question which is obviously rhetorical. Its communicative intention is not to interrogate, but to demonstrate the speaker's utter astonishment at his interlocutor's ridiculous behavior and claim his foolery, which becomes clear from the sentence form (direct word order is characteristic

of statements rather than questions). This implicit communicative strategy of mockery reaches its aim, as dad decodes the message correctly and responds to his son that *this Harry Bates is no fool* (speaking so of himself).

The example below demonstrates another representation of evaluative strategy and corresponding tactics in modern literary discourse:

Ernie's blood was up. "Foolproof depends on the size of the fool." "Witty homily, that." My sarcasm disgusted me. "You must be a genius in Scotland" (Mitchell, 2004, p. 313).

The juxtaposition of the explicit praise and the implied mockery in this example is actualized by contrasting the positively-coloured lexemes *witty* and *genius* with the negative, even derogatory *fool* in a narrow context. Sarcasm is the effective tool of negative evaluation, though if not mentioned in the utterance it could hardly be recognized by the recipient unaware of the context. The communicative goal of the speaker is to scoff the interlocutor, and the way to reach it is indirect.

We can observe the same in the following example:

"The Gas Ring of Ernie flared. "Where I stop isn't for you to pass judgments on, Timothy Cavendish!" (A Scot can turn a perfectly decent name into a head-butt.) (Mitchell, 2004, p. 313).

When the speaker addresses anyone directly, they tend to use the latter's full name only in official situations, as it sounds solemn and somewhat pompous. In the statement above, on the contrary, the full name thrown in the addressee's face is intended to serve as an insult and demonstrates the speaker's disregard of the interlocutor. This intention is disclosed via parenthesis that clarifies the communicative goal of the utterance.

Another case of literary discourse represents the usage of pragmatic strategy and tactics for achieving implicit evaluation:

"Gawky boys, unblest by charm or other human attributes like empathy and generative grammar, cleverer cousins of the fools I had smashed at chess, leered as I struggled with concepts they took for granted" (McEwan, 2012, p. 11).

The utterance under discussion is an illustration of an implicit expression of a negative appraisal by means of the indirect reference. The choice of the manifestation of the situation components is explained by the implication as one of

the main forms of nomination, and by the wish to expand on the features of "gawky boys". The implication can be both an indication of the protagonist's unwillingness to offend those boys with direct characterization, and at the same time draw parallels with their physical and mental abilities.

The negative assessment is achieved by the usage of the words "fool", "unblest", which are explicitly negative. We can observe the implication in this statement which is based on the contrast between the descriptions of their appearance and intelligence. Also the narrator combines in the passage the descriptions of the boys and himself, thus trying to put himself in the best light by means of repetition of the pronoun "I".

As far as literary discourse represents the changing and dynamic reality as projected in our mind and reflects in the process of cognition, the inventory of the evaluative strategies and tactics employed in it can be extended since the discourse is the result of socially conditioned communicative activity.

The communicative strategies and tactics of evaluation take part in the creation of value worldview by constructing people's attitudes, opinions, ideas, thoughts. All this can't be achieved without the integration of language studies with other sciences (psychology, sociolinguistics, linguoculturology, linguistic anthropology, etc.).

Conclusion

This study has explored the expression of evaluation strategies and tactics in the literary discourse.

The typology of strategies and tactics of communication is suggested within the framework of the opposition "theory - practice", in terms of which strategy is a complex of intended discourse stages that are manifested in the process of speech interaction and targeted at attaining an appropriate pragmatic aim. Communicative tactics can be considered as the inventory of speech actions applied by interlocutors in communication practice.

The analysis revealed that the studied discourse both informs the readers and contributes to the formation of their evaluative attitude to the events described. The strategic plan determines

the choice of means and methods of its implementation; therefore, communicative strategy and communicative tactics are related as genus and species.

Evaluative strategies and tactics in the literary discourse are directly linked to different communicative intentions and illocutionary forces, and create a unique intentional context. They form the conceptual integrity of this type of discourse, permit expressing more than words mean and represent extra-linguistic, contextual or mental (estimating) interaction of communicants thus comprising the global meaning of communication. It expresses the pragmatic principle of human communication.

In the further studies, it will be promising to resort to comparative analysis of the ways evaluation strategies and tactics are realized in different types of discourse.

References

- Aleksandrova, O. V. (2017). On the problem of contemporary discourse in linguistics. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences* 3, 10, 298-302.
- Ananko, T. (2017). The category of evaluation in political discourse. *Advanced Education*, 8, 128-137.
- Arutyunova, N. D. (2012). *Logicheskij analiz yazyka. Adresatsiya diskursa* (Logical analysis of the language. Discourse addressing, in Russian). Moscow: Indrik.
- Azimova, Sh. I. (2021). The role of communicative strategy and tactics in family discourse. *Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature*, 12, 97-101. Retrieved November 10, 2022, from <https://literature.academicjournal.io>
- Babelyuk, O., & Aleksandruk, I. (2018). Conceptual category person and means of its verbal presentation in the fantasy genre. *Advanced Education*, 10, 158-165. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.142802>
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Bax, S. (2011). *Discourse and genre. Analysing language in context*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bigunova, N. (2019). Cognitive pragmatic regularities in communicative manifestation of positive evaluation. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*, IV(1), 2-46.
- Bigunova, N. O. (2017). *Pozytyvna otsinka: Vid kohnityvnoho sudzhennia do komunikativnoho vyslovliuvannia* (Positive evaluation: From cognitive judgment to communicative utterance, in Ukrainian). Odesa: OMD.
- Britannica Concise Encyclopædia* (2006). Chicago, London, New Delhi, Paris, Seoul, Sydney, Taipei, Tokyo: Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc.
- Chernjanskaja, V. E. (2006). *Dyskurs vlasty y vlastj dyskursa: problemy rehovogho vozdejsytyja* (Discourse of power and power of discourse: Problems of speech influence, in Russian). Moscow: Flynta: Nauka.
- Coleman, S., & Ross, K. (2003). *The media and the public. 'Them' and 'Us' in media discourse*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cook, G. (2006). *The discourse of advertising*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Dijk, T. (2009). *Society and discourse. How social contexts influence text and talk*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dijk, T. A. van, & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Drewniany, B., & Jewler, A. (2010). *Creative strategy in advertising*. Wadsworth Publishing.
- Fei, W., Yunfang, W., & Likun Q. (2013). Exploiting hierarchical discourse structure for review sentiment analysis. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Asian Language Processing (IALP) Urumqui, China 2013* (pp. 121-124). doi: 10.1109/IALP.2013.42
- Galsworthy, J. (2013). In Chancery. *The complete works of John Galsworthy* (series three) (pp. 1930-2106). Delphi Classics.
- Hailey, A. (2015). *The final diagnosis*. New York: Open Road Media.
- Hart, C. (Ed.) (2011). *Critical discourse studies*

- in context and cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- He, A.W. (2017). Discourse analysis. In M. Aronoff, & J. Rees-Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119072256.ch21>
- Iskakova, N. S., & Islam, A. (2020). Evaluation strategies and tactics of immigration issues in social media discourse. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 12(6), 1-10.
- Issers, O. S. (2013). *Rechevoye vozdeystviye* (Speech influence, in Russian). Moscow: Nauka.
- Lodge, D. (2008). *Deaf sentence*. London: Penguin Books.
- McEwan, I. (2012). *Sweet tooth*. Alfred A. Knopf Canada.
- Mitchell, D. (2004). *Cloud Atlas*. New York: Random House.
- Myroniuk, T. (2017). Evaluative responses in modern English fiction. *Advanced Education*, 8, 103-108.
- Prihodko, G. (2018). Specific nature of evaluative speech acts. *Advanced Education*, 9, 201-205.
- Prihodko, G. I. (2016). *Katehoriia otsinky v konteksti zminy linhvistychnykh paradyhm* (The category of evaluation in the context of the change of linguistic paradigms, in Ukrainian). Zaporizhzhia: Kruhozir.
- Thompson, G., & Hunston, S. (2000). Evaluation: An introduction. In G. Thompson, & S. Hunston (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Volf, E. M. (2009). *Funktsionalnaya semantika otsenki* (Functional semantics of evaluation, in Russian). Moscow: Editorial URSS.