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1. **Introduction**

One of the most important social activities in the lives of human beings is conversation. Apart from thoughts and ideas, we can express our feelings and emotions by means of conversation. Moreover, since conversation is recognized as a reciprocal process, we can understand and grasp what the people involved in the interaction are displaying. Being all around us, conversation is a means which makes us social. Its description and analysis have become a concern for many scientists. For the past forty years, conversation has been a subject of study for sociologists, linguists and social psychologists. Since that time, we may speak of the emergence of conversation analysis (hereinafter referred to as CA).

The founding father of CA is considered to be the American sociologist Harvey Sacks. Later, he attracted a lot of followers among whom we can name Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. Although one can currently find a great many books and articles dedicated to CA, the basic points were developed by H. Sacks and his followers.

CA can be simply defined as “the study of talk,” and it answers such questions as: “how ordinary talk is organized, how do people coordinate their talk in interaction, and what is the role of talk in wider social process” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 1; 13). According to a more precise definition, one suggested by Ian Hutchby and Robin Wooffitt, conversation is “the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction” (2008: 13). However, to state that CA studies verbal speech only would be an oversimplification. The analysis of any conversation always includes all the gestures and postures of the participants involved in the interaction as well as the social context, e.g., under what circumstances the given conversation occurs. Thus, we may say that the objective of CA is to study “interactional organization of social activities” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008:14). The aim of CA then is to reveal how the parties of conversation gain recognition not only of the meaning of the conversation but also of when to take turns and what kind of response to produce in regard to the prior turn, all of which underlies the sequence of actions. Hutchby and Wooffitt put it this way:

*The objective of CA is to uncover the tacit reasoning procedures and sociolinguistic competences underlying the production and interpretation of talk in organized sequences of interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 13).*
Originating from a sociological science, CA aids in developing such linguistic branches as ethnography, pragmatics and discourse analysis. The data for CA should be collected properly. Sacks, mentioned above, was the first to start recording conversations in order to be able to transcribe and analyze them again and again. Requirements for the transcriptions underwent changes with time, however. Originally, telephone conversations were the only target, but in accordance with developments in technology, scientists now prefer to record high-quality videos in naturally occurring settings, closely transcribing them in a manner that represents all the gestures of participants and one which explores all circumstances relevant to the conversations.

While CA became very popular in western countries, not much research has been carried out in regard to naturally occurring Russian speech. As there are many works dedicated to CA which are based on English, it seemed interesting to the author to study the question-answer pairs represented in Russian.

The aim of this study is to explain the variety of response production found in ordinary spoken communication occurring in the Russian language. For this purpose, it is considered essential to analyze responses in close connection to the preceding sentences which are represented by various types of questions.

The importance of tracing question-answer pairs should be stressed in the study due to the fact that “question–response patterns offer special insights into the ‘glue’ that holds human interaction together—the patterns of expectation, the modulations possible in the wide range of available response types (non-answers/answers, partial/whole answers, direct/indirect answers, etc.) and response formats (partial repetitions, response tokens of various kinds from nods to yes, one word answers, etc.)” (Enfield et al. 2010: 2615).

The objects of study become various question types such as rhetorical, content, “yes/no,” tag and echo questions as well as corresponding expressions of confirmation such as “da” (‘yes’), paraphrasing of a question, and nodding and the repetition of the particle “da” (‘da-da-da’). The repeated usage of “da” (‘yes’) is considered in the work as one type of response production.

Moreover, the research in this work is focused on the detailed description of the types of social identities which are found in the studied talk-in-interaction. Social identities are represented in roles that the participants take during the conversation. In order to examine the
differences in identity, the detailed turn-taking of the present study has been analyzed line-by-line. It seems important to trace the distribution of social roles between individuals in this work because it is relevant for the analysis to show what kind of identity a person must possess to have the right to ask questions and what kind of identity is obliged to reply to the question appropriately.

The concept of identity was not immediately taken into account with the emergence of CA. Initially, a discussion concerning categories took place. This has been mentioned by Harvey Sacks who noted that “fundamental importance of people’s use of categories – of which an ‘identity’ category is a peculiar protean sort – as a practical matter of transacting their business with the world” (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998: 2). Thus, it can be said that an individual can belong to any category which means that they have a certain number of characteristics. However, according to Schegloff (1992), these characteristic features should be taken into account only when they visibly and audibly influence the course of the interaction. Still, conversation is based on ‘adjacency pairs’ such as question-answer and, thus, it represents “a series of invariably relevant parts” which consists of a summons that calls for a response, a question that expects an answer, etc. (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998: 5).

Having a vast variety of such structures available, an individual inevitably takes on a special role in conversation that represents his/her identity, often studied in accordance with the rules of CA.

In the early stages of conducting research, the present author became interested in various response strategies in the Russian language but realized that it was impossible to make an analysis of answers irrespective of preceding questions. During the study, the representation of social identity features was revealed, something which seems important for understanding of the strategic use of question-answer pairs. Thus, the aim of the research is to represent the types of questions and answers in the studied interaction, making an initial description of the social types of identities to be found in it. The research question of the present study is to analyze the conversation in naturally occurring settings and to highlight the strategic use of question-answer pairs in Russian.

2. **Theoretical Background**

Let us have a more detailed look into CA research. What CA is, what its goal is and where it came from have been mentioned above. However, considering our study, it is also important
to mention that talk in interactional settings exists alongside with the different means of collecting data for research.

The hallmark of CA is usually represented as small sequences of talk recorded in the mundane settings of everyday life (Hutchby & Widdicombe 2008: 145). In addition, CA also analyzes so-called institutional talk which presents an interaction in institutional settings such as courtrooms, classrooms, psychiatric interviews and other forms of lay-professional interaction (Hutchby & Widdicombe 2008: 145).

When discussing the development of CA in his book “Doing Conversation Analysis”, Paul ten Have, a researcher of Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis in the Netherlands, states that: “from the early beginning in Sack’s considerations of tapes of suicide calls, CA has developed into a full-blown style of research of its own, which can handle all kinds of talk-in-interaction” (Paul ten Have 1999: 7). It still took time, however, for CA researchers to start paying attention to conversations in institutional settings. It was only in the 1970s that researchers started explaining conversations that take place in courtrooms, interviews, hospitals etc. “The general purpose was to ‘apply’ the acquired knowledge of conversational organization specifically to these institutional interactions in order to show how these institutions were ‘talked into being’” (Paul ten Have 1999: 7).

However, the conversation under study in this work does not quite represent ordinary interaction. On the one hand, the topic of the talk is based on a professional problem requiring a solution. This can be proved by the usage of professional terms during the conversation. On the other hand, the conversation does not take place in any kind of an institution but in the flat of one of the participants and this leads to a friendlier and more relaxed manner of conversation. Both of these factors make this particular interaction unique and interesting for analysis.

The fact that we can see the signs of institutional interaction in the talk referred to above allows the participants to switch turns and produce their opinion in accordance with their belonging to a particular social group such as boss/employee or client/service provider.

The signs of friendlier talk allow us to see such an interesting phenomenon as a power play between boss Sasha and employee Andrej.

While discussing the switch in turns of the participants, it is important to mention that such an action is called turn-taking which may be built by different means, one of them is “adjacency
pairs”. It has been argued that “[i]n pragmatics, the tie between question and answer has been a prototype for larger units in the structure of verbal interaction, and specifically in the theory of adjacency pairs” (Enfield et al. 2010: 2615). It is relevant to remember that conversation is often structured around question-answer pairs. Thus, studies have indicated that interactions are organized in “adjacency pairs” which consist of two actions called the “first pair part” (hereinafter referred to as FPP) and the “second pair part” (hereinafter referred to as SPP) respectively (Whitehead 2011: 103). FPP “initiates a trajectory of action and [SPP] is responsive to the first” (Schegloff, 2007: 13).

The interaction under study may to some extent resemble an interview pattern as it “consists of talk that is organized into a series of questions and answers” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 214). The explanation of the concept of a typical answer in this case has been successfully given by Drew and Heritage (1992: 215) as “sequential objects that have been occasioned by a prior activity – asking a question – and […] their intelligibility as answers is dependent upon their position following a question”.

According to Drew & Heritage (1992: 219) it is important to remember that “[t]he shape or design of a current talk may be organized with respect to the immediately prior turn and the immediately next turn”.

Thus, there is no doubt that questions play an important role in the combination of question-answer as intonation, grammar and function coalesce in the unit of the interrogative sentence (Enfield et al. 2010: 2615). In the present study, adjacency pairs of questions-answers have been made in the context of a home construction scenario. It is reflected in the construction strategy of questions and thereby affects the response strategy. The home atmosphere, on the one hand, creates a friendly and natural conversation between participants. The construction environment, on the other side, leads the discussion in a professional direction.

“While in conversation an answerer’s turn is monitorable as to how a person understood the prior turn, so too may a recipient of the answer have their response monitored for their understanding of the answer” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 219). Not only responses are tied to the questions but also have their own preferred order of occurrence. Enfield et al. state that in English, responses to questions are required, and answers are preferred to non-answer types such as “I don’t remember” (Enfield et al. 2010: 2616). The same situation is seen in Russian as a similar answer can be found in the conversation under study: “And how would I know?”
Moreover, it is important to remember that “speakers commonly select individuals to respond to questions and selected question recipients have greater rights to respond than non-selected question recipients” (Enfield 2010: 2616).

Drew and Heritage (1992) give the following explanation for response strategies to questions: “answers are a resource whereby hearers can monitor a speaker’s apparent understanding of the question” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 215). Thus, depending on the type of question asked, the response strategy varies.

Paukkeri (2006: 21) examines the etymology of the word “da” (‘yes’) and states that “da” (‘yes’) has an Indo-European origin derived from a pronoun. She also maintains that “da” (‘yes’) in the Old Russian language carried the meaning of “pust”, which is equal to the English verb “let.” Further, she writes that “[i]n many Slavic languages “da” (‘yes’) functions as a conjunction or/and particle; in some of the languages it functions as an adverb and interjection” (Paukkeri).

According to the Dictionary of Russian Particles (СРЧ), “da” (‘yes’) in its function as a response to a question carries a meaning of consent, confirmation or affirmation and can be followed by nodding. The dictionary also states that in regard to this meaning other particles such as “aga” and “ugu” can be used instead of “da” (‘yes’). Moreover, according to (ССРЛЯ), the Dictionary of Modern Literary Russian Language, consent and affirmation can also be expressed with the help of repeating “da-da-da” (‘yes-yes-yes’), an action which strengthens their meaning. Repetition of the particle “da” (‘yes’) however, cannot be stronger than a single “da” (‘yes’) followed by a detailed explanation.

3. **Data**

The research material for the present study consists of a conversation recorded in a natural environment. The conversation is recorded on video, and its duration is 80 seconds (1 minute and 20 seconds). The communication is realized mainly by two participants with the occasional production of several sentences by two other participants.

The data was collected in connection with the renovation of a flat at a Russian-speaking individual’s home in Sweden. The personnel of a construction company are also Russian-speaking. The owner of the flat in question was known to the author before the videotaping.
The other participants of the conversation were not known to the author before the recording took place. The conversation occurs in the kitchen.

The participants consented to the recording of their conversation. The video was made in the presence of the author. In the beginning of the video, a couple of moments can be found where some of the participants looked at the camera while communicating with each other. By the end of the conversation, however, it appeared that their focus was on the act of communicating. Further, although it is widely held that free and easy conversation can hardly be achieved during video recording, it can be said that a high degree of concentration by the participants who were searching for the solution to a problem produced a natural conversation in this case. The need for the discussion arose from a problem that occurred in the kitchen of the flat being renovated which required a solution.

Although not all the participants are Russian, some of them came from former Soviet Republics such as Latvia where Russian is still spoken as a mother tongue in many families. The participants have differing levels of education, and they belong to different age groups and social classes. The author has access to such information about all the participants and takes it into account when necessary.

Sasha is a married man in his thirties who was born in Russia. Andrej and Vlad are from Latvia. Andrej is in his middle thirties while Vlad is in his forties. Viktor is the youngest participant. He is in his late twenties and is from Moscow. The relationship status between the individuals named above is not equal. Sasha and both workers, Andrej and Vlad, have the relationship of boss-employee. While Viktor and Sasha have a friendly relationship, Viktor is the client of Sasha’s company which gives him the superior position over Sasha and his employees. Vlad and Andrej are equals.

The choice of the participants was based on the criteria that they are all native speakers of Russian and that they use this language as their main means of communication. In the research, informal speech does not oppose the standard Russian language but is considered as an oral production of speech sounds or as an opposition to written language. It is essential to bear in mind that even if native speakers demonstrate different functional styles of the language, their oral speech would still consist of the patterns typical for the Russian language.
4. **Methodology**

When audio recording became available to researchers, it marked a turning point in studying CA and helped greatly in doing research. Shortly after this, however, video recording became possible. Contrary to some expectations, video recordings did not have as significant an effect as audio recordings did, although researchers have taken the opportunity to analyze not only dialogue itself but the surrounding atmosphere as well: “[I]n most cases the verbal production by the participants is taken as a baseline for the understanding of the interaction, with selected visual details being added to this understanding to make the analysis more completely an analysis of face-to-face interaction. Prominent among these details is the direction of the gaze of the participants, with marked gestures as a good second” (Paul ten Have 1999: 8).

I recorded a video of the interaction and later on made a detailed transcription in both Russian and English which includes not only the conversation between the participants but also all the pauses, intonations, movements and gestures that are relevant for the study. Sometimes the facial expressions could not be seen on the video because the participants often turned their heads to the wall, the site of the problem. On the basis of the transcription, I made an analysis of the interaction.

It is important to study a conversation as a unit consisting of speech and non-verbal communication. That is why video recording is a very significant means in the present study. Prosody, pauses, movements, etc. are considered important in the given transcription and are taken into account while analyzing the conversation.

It is, at any rate, known that a transcription cannot display all the existing signs and shades of a real conversation. The accuracy of the transcription can be identified in accordance with the needs and requirements of each individual study. For the purposes of this particular work, it is considered important to produce an adequate transcription for the careful analysis of response strategies alongside with the turns preceding the responses.

5. **Social identity differences**

As has been mentioned earlier in section 1, the interaction under examination can be classified as an institutional conversation. However, an interesting interplay of social roles between individuals engaged in conversation can be observed. The turn taking and distribution of roles in the interaction under study vary from professional to friendly conditions.
The concept of “identity” has been studied by many linguists, but it is still difficult to find a suitable definition for this concept. There are also many approaches to studying identities in interaction, but in the current work we will consider the one suggested by C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe (1998) in their book “Identities in Talk”. Antaki and Widdicombe (1998) suggest that one “treat identity as an element of context for talk-in-interaction” as “any […] applications of the concept would depend in some way on identity as a contextual element of a given discourse [talk-in-interaction]” (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998: 87).

The reason why the identification differences are important in this study can be found in the work of B. Benwell and E. Stokoe (2006) in their discussion of relational identities. According to them, “speakers can ascribe particular identities to themselves and each other, as well as resist them” (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 78). Thus, in order to examine and explain the response strategies between participants, it is essential to see “how people display their relationships through the occasioning of relationship categories and the duties and obligations that are bound to incumbents of those categories: ‘relational identities’” (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 78).

5.1 Analysis

In the following section, we shall examine closely the rapidly and covertly changing social relationships between the categories of client-representative of a service-providing company, boss-employee, and employee-employee. For this purpose, a line-by-line analysis of each relationship pair of the interaction is conducted.

5.1.1 Schematic drawing of the participants’ positions

Since every interaction occurs under specific conditions such as place, setting, and time, it is important to remember that the analysis of institutional conversations would be incomplete without studying its context.

The notion of “contextualization” was suggested by Gumperz and Hymes (1972) and was developed further by Gumperz (1982) and led to the evoking of such terms as “contextualization cue” which marks aspects of the context that are essential in interpreting what a speaker means. Thus, according to Drew and Heritage, “‘[c]ontextualization cues’ […] offered an important analytic opening to grasp the relationship between language use and speaker’s orientations to context and inference making” (Drew&Heritage 1992: 8). For this reason, it seems necessary to define the circumstances under which the conversation under
study occurs. In the present study, the social context of an interaction includes the body position of each participant in the interaction as well as that of the cameraman, their movement in respect to each other as well as their gestures and gaze direction during the conversation and the position of a part of a cooker hood which is relevant to the discussion.

The position of the participants in the scheme is represented at a moment when everyone is present in the kitchen. In relation to the wall where the problem exists, Sasha stands closer than the other participants of the interaction. While standing alone with Viktor, Sasha is positioned next to the window and a little in front of Viktor. As soon as Andrej enters the kitchen, he steps closer to the wall with the cooker hood and remains standing there until the end of the video. He stands sideward to the wall, with his face turning alternately to Andrej and to the wall. Standing close to the wall gives Sasha the possibility of pointing to the wall during his examination of the problem, and everybody is able to watch his actions.

Andrej immediately stands close to the window and beside Sasha. He stands closer to him than anyone else does. His body position is oriented towards Sasha.

When Vlad comes into the kitchen, he at once takes a place in front of Andrej and positions himself a little further from Sasha than Andrej did.

Before Andrej and Vlad appear in the kitchen, Viktor takes the position a little behind and beside Sasha. He stands in front of the door so that his face is oriented toward the wall with the cooker hood. When Andrej enters the kitchen, he quickly steps away and stands behind the participants, close to the wall which is opposite the one with the problem. His body is out
of the way so that everyone can examine the problem. Vlad’s appearance in the kitchen does not change Viktor’s position. At the beginning of the video, he holds a part of the cooker hood which he then puts away after completing his last turn in the conversation. The position of the part of the cooker hood is also indicated in the schematic drawing. The cameraman stands in a doorway with his camera targeted on the participants. When Andrej comes into the kitchen, the cameraman moves into the kitchen as well and stands behind everyone so that all of the participants can be seen in the video. His position does not change during the video recording.

5.1.2 Client –representative of service-providing company relationships

According to Benwell and Stokoe (2006), there is a ‘standardized relational pair’ of ‘institutional representative’ and ‘client’ which involves such facts as that “the institutional representative normally has the right to ask questions.”

The video starts when Sasha, who is the head of the workers, enters the kitchen of Viktor’s flat. The conversation begins with Viktor’s explanatory words. Sasha has heard of the problem that occurred with the cooker hood during the renovation of the flat, but he has not yet seen it with his own eyes. That is why Viktor is holding a part of the cooker hood and is pointing to the wall with his finger, trying to show and explain the original defect in its construction.

From Viktor’s first words, we can recognize that he is the client, one who is unaware of the industry's terminology and the details of its working processes. We can observe him holding a part of the cooker hood which he calls “thing” and can hear him suggesting “some kind of box” as the solution to a problem.

1. V:  Vot eta vot shtuka ne fstala iznachal’no
       there this there thing NEG fit:IMF:3SG from.beginning
       ‘This thing did not fit from the very beginning’

   S:  ----------------------------------------------- ( gaze at camera )

   V:  ----------------------------------------------- ( holds cooker hood part )
       ----------------------------------------------- ( gazes at cooker hood part )
       ((shifting gaze to S )) >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

2. (0.2)

   S:  >>>>>>> (shifting gaze downward) )<<<<<< (shifting gaze up to camera)

   V:  ----------------------------------------------- (gaze to S)
Viktor, however, also shows his expertise in regard to the origin of the problem that occurred in his flat when stating that “the thing didn’t fit from the beginning”. Viktor displays understanding of the problem because in his hands he holds a part of the cooker hood which shows that he knows that this part is needed for the solution to the problem. He guides Sasha through the problem by pointing to the wall and indicating the location of the problem. By looking at Sasha, Viktor shows that he views Sasha as a professional. Viktor’s actions also show that he tries to inform Sasha of the problem. As we can see, Viktor offers a possible solution to the problem when saying “some kind of box should be there” which shows that he examined the problem and offers an easy solution thus simplifying the job for the company. At the same time, he is not insisting on the solution which shows that he accepts the representatives of company as experts.

Sasha just gives two short glances at the part of the cooker hood which Viktor is holding in his hands, and as soon as Viktor finishes his first sentence, he puts down the part. After receiving no verbal reply from Sasha, Viktor continues to look at the wall and initiates a turn in conversation, again giving Sasha more explanations of the problem. We can hear, however, that it is not easy for him because he stretches the preposition in an attempt to find the right words, changes the structure of the utterance, and fills the pause with mumbling.
6. V: m-m-m nado chtoby ona bli-zhe k sten-e byla
    m-m-m need:PRED that she close-GEN to:ALL wall-DAT is:PST
    'm-m-m it should be so that it is closer to the wall'

V: <<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<< ((lowering his hand))

7. V: m-m eto takoj kostruktivnyj defect↑
    m-m this such constructive defect
    'm-m it is such a constructional defect'

Still, we can hear the description of the problem when Viktor states that “it is such a constructional defect”. We can conclude that Viktor is trying to show his knowledge of the problem to Sasha. At the same time as producing speech, Viktor points to the wall.

Viktor gives up his attempts to get an answer from Sasha upon not receiving a verbal reply after finishing his second turn. We can see that he hesitates a bit which may be the cause of not receiving Sasha’s gaze while he expected his engagement and a reaction to his words. However, he takes a turn in the conversation when Sasha finally starts to speak and produces a question. Viktor overlaps Sasha to suggest an explanatory reply where he puts blame on the original builders. It again shows us Viktor’s expertise in regard to the problem.

9. S: A pochemu ona tak poluchil-as’? ANDRJUX[AAAAAA↑]!
    And:Q why she so happen:PST PROPER NAME
    'And why did it happen like that? ANDRJUX[AAAAAA↑]!'

S: ((turning to camera))<<<<<<
    ((gazes to camera)) ---
    ((shifting gaze downward))<<<<

10. V: tak*- [eto][iznachal’n-o-]
    it from.beginning
    so
    '[*it ]was [from the beginning like that-*]'

V: ((stooping down))>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

We can also watch Viktor’s last act as an owner of a flat in interaction when he steps away to clear the way to the kitchen for Andrej. This behavior can be interpreted as Viktor’s attempt to provide the workers, who know more about the solution to the problem, with all the
conditions for fast and easy access to the troublesome place (line 6). He confirms his role further during the interaction by keeping silent, listening carefully to the conversation between the workers, giving them space and by following Sasha when he moves closer to the wall. During the conversation, he engages in a side activity, looks at the camera, smiling, and giggles with Andrej. All of these activities show that he disengages from seeking a solution as it is not his duty to solve the problem. Thus, he underlines his status as a client. We can also observe that Viktor always stands behind Sasha while speaking to him and later steps back closer to the wall opposite to the one where the problem is to be found. Sasha, in his turn, first stands close to the window and just a little ahead of Viktor and later holds the position closest to the wall with the cooker hood, leaving Viktor far behind him. Viktor’s standing on the periphery in relation to the problem indicates that Viktor regards himself as a non-professional in comparison to the representatives of the service-providing company.

10. V: (stooping down) >>>>>>>>>>>>
15. V: (coming closer to S & A) <<<<<<< (turning to camera, smiling & giggling)
16. V: (gazes at camera, smiling)

Sasha’s role in conversation can also be seen from the very beginning. From the opening moments of the video we can see him standing in the kitchen and looking at the wall while Viktor speaks. We can observe that Sasha acts as a professional. His social role can be proved by his actions. When it is time for Sasha’s turn in conversation, he stares at the wall and does not reply to Viktor verbally. At the same time, however, we can see that Sasha is being a professional as he examines the problem but for some reason chooses not to reply. It can also be seen that while Viktor pays a lot of attention to the part of the cooker hood which he carefully shows to Sasha during his first turn, Sasha only glances at it briefly and then focuses on the wall. Thus, Sasha, as a professional, shows that the part of the cooker hood is irrelevant. Sasha’s action proves his status as the representative of the service-providing company and the professional engaging in conversation with Viktor, a non-professional.

2. (0.2)
   S: (shifting gaze downward) <<<<<< (shifting gaze up to camera)
3. S: (gazes at cooker hood part)
4. S: (gazes at the wall)
8. (0.5)
We can also observe Sasha’s professional behavior after Viktor’s turns. Sasha keeps examining the wall and keeps silent, not looking at Viktor. He looks at the wall thoroughly and thoughtfully, though, which might be a sign that he acknowledges that the problem exists and that he is already involved in the problem.

4. (0.5)

4A. Viktor & Sasha: Looking at the wall

Sasha starts to speak after Viktor gives up on receiving a reply. What we can observe in Sasha’s speech is not a reply to Viktor’s speech but rather a reasonable continuation of Sasha’s examination of the problem. Having his eyes glued to the wall, Sasha thoughtfully asks for an account of how the problem occurred which indicates that he is a professional as his question does not require an answer and is not targeted at Viktor. It can be proved by Sasha’s subsequent interaction – he calls Andrej and turns his head to the kitchen door where the cameraman is located, avoiding looking at Viktor. When he finishes his turn, he turns back to the wall, ignoring Viktor’s attempt to reply to the question he posed.

9. S: A pochemu ona tak poluchil-as’? ANDRJUX[AAAAAA]!
   And:Q why she so happen:PST PROPER NAME
   'And why did it happen like that? ANDRJUX[AAAAAA]!'

   S: ((turning to camera))

   ((gaze at camera))

   ((shifting gaze downward))

In contrast to Viktor, Sasha always stands in front of everyone which is the closest position to the wall where the problem is located. This shows his professional status in the conversation.

5.1.3 Boss – employee relationships

The conversation between Sasha and Andrej represents a typical pattern of institutional talk as their interaction contains “institution-specific goals to accomplish, and the kinds of contributions that can be made are constrained” (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 90).

The relationship between boss and employee can be traced here from line 5 after Sasha calls for Andrej. When calling Andrej, Sasha uses an unofficial and even friendly form of his name which shows us that the relationships between the colleagues are more friendly than hierarchical. The official and neutral form of the name is Andrej. We do not, however, have
examples of the way Andrej addresses his boss. At the same time, we observe proof of Sasha’s superior position over worker Andrej as Sasha as a boss has the right to address Andrej unofficially. Such an action represents one of the characteristic features of institutional talk which is called by Benwell and Stokoe (2006) ‘modes of address’ and relies – is found on “the devices used by participants that display a specific alignment with the institution” (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 94).

9. S: pochemu ona tak poluchil-as’? ANDRJUX[AAAAAA↑]!
   And:Q why she so happen:PST PROPER NAME
   'And why did it happen like that? ANDRJUX[AAAAAA↑]!'
   S:
   ((turning to camera))((((((gazes at camera))))(((shifting gaze downward))))

11. A: [SHTOOOO↑]?
    What
    ' [WHAAAAAT]?'
    V:
    ((taking cooker hood part away))((((((gazes at camera))))(((shifting gaze downward))))
    S:
    ((shifting gaze))((((((gazes at camera))))(((shifting gaze downward))))

The friendliness of the relationships is proved also by Andrej’s reply to Sasha’s summons. He does not hurry to come to the kitchen but prefers to ask a counter question to his boss asking what Sasha wants. With his question, Andrej gives the turn to Sasha, inviting him to continue his thought. Further, it is only when Sasha, indicating his leadership position, directly orders Andrej to enter the kitchen, that he leaves the room. Thus, Andrej manages to understand whether he could answer the question verbally or whether he must come to the kitchen. However, with his social action Andrej shows that he has the right not to show up because he is working in another room. Also, Sasha acts as an individual who has the right to summon workers which indicates his position as a boss.

12. S: sjuda↓ come-SG.IMP here
    'Come here↓’
    S: >>>>>>>>( (stepping aside))
    ------------------ ( (looking down at the floor))
Let us examine more closely Sasha’s actions which represent his identity as boss. We can see that when Sasha calls for Andrej, he calls him as an expert from whom he makes a request for the solution to the problem. Sasha points to the wall, having in his hands a part of the cooker hood, indicating to Andrej that he wants him to look at the wall. By stating the problem and not asking for the solution, Sasha displays boss-like behavior in his actions.

The interaction between Sasha and Andrej produces the pair of summoner-answerer in which Sasha acts as an individual who has the right to summon and Andrej acts as an individual who must answer to Sasha’s call. According to Benwell and Stokoe’s (2006) work, “[t]ese turn-generated categories […] contain an orientation to membership categories regarding the person called” (Benwell & Stokoe 2006: 100). As we can see, Andrej is acting as a member of an ‘employee’ group.

14. S:  
  slusha-j a chjo tut nado↓ - nado shto to pri-dumat’↑
  'Listen and what should be- we should think something of↑'
  A:  >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>( (following Sasha) )
  ------------------------------- ( (gazes at wall) )
  V:  ------------------------------- ( (looking at camera, smiling) )
  (((turning to wall)))<><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><>

15.  
  (0.2)
  A:  --------- (hems)
  >>>>>>( (giggling) )
  V:  >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ( (coming closer to S & A) )
  <<<<<<<<<<<<< ( (turning to camera, smiling & giggling) )

Being the head of employees and getting no response from Andrej, Sasha has to take a turn and pose a question. This time, we can see that he points out that he is speaking to Andrej by turning his head to Andrej. This proves that Sasha has the right to ask and repeat questions if he does not get a response.

16. S:  
  A pochemu tak poluchi-los’?
  And:Q why so happen-ed:3SG:PST
  'And why did it happen like that? '
Now, let us focus on Andrej’s actions which demonstrate the identity of an employee though at the same time indicate his position as an expert. Andrej, in his turn, acts as a subordinate, who works for Sasha, and he acknowledges this by obeying Sasha’s order to come to the kitchen and by following Sasha’s gestures pointing to the wall.

13. A: >>>>>>>>>>>>>((entering the kitchen & following S))

At the same time, however, Andrej does not hurry to reply to Sasha’s formulation of the problem. Instead, he hems and giggles while still having his eyes turned to the wall. Under the same turn, Viktor’s giggling can be heard due to his involvement in a side activity with the cameraman. The cause of Andrej’s giggling remains unknown.

15. (0.2)

A: "--------((hems))" >>>>>>(giggling)

V: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> ((coming closer to S & A))

Andrej takes his turn in the conversation only after Sasha asks him a question. Andrej’s response to Sasha is given in the form of a question. Even though this is the case, we cannot assert that he actually asks something. First of all, his question does not require an answer from anyone. Secondly, it implies the answer “I have no idea” as it is equal to it in meaning. In contrast to the simple answer “I have no idea,” however, the question form tells us that Andrej shows his desire to explain that it was not his fault that the problem occurred. Keeping in mind that Andrej is in a subordinate relationship with Sasha, it is a rare case to see an answer with a counter question because it is usually a sign of impoliteness and sounds a bit rude. Andrej’s reply shows that the question was wrongly addressed as he cannot be held responsible for answering the question because he cannot be held accountable for the problem.

17. A: A jat ot-kuda znaju↓?

And:Q I where.from:ADV know

'And how would I know↓?'

S: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>((turning to the wall))

V: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>((turning to the wall))
Still, we can see that Andrej acts as a typical employee in the middle of the conversation. In line 19, for example, we can see his assertive behavior when he answers directly and clearly the question posed by his boss, supporting his answer with a further explanation “tam prjamo vyhod” (‘there exactly is the entrance’) which consists of paraphrasing Sasha’s question “toka uhodit tuda” (‘only goes exactly there’). Thus, Andrej ties his answer to Sasha’s question, showing his independence as an actor by reformulating Sasha’s words. However, the fact that Andrej changes his answer by reformulating his boss's words shows us that he conceives of himself not only as an employee but as an expert of a certain field as well. Andrej also secures his response by nodding. This interaction represents a very interesting case as it shows us the transformation from an employee identity to the identity of an expert.

18. S: A ta - eta prjamo toka u-hodit tuda na vyjashk-u?

And:Q that - this straight:ADJ only go.away:PRS:3SG there on:ALL cooker hood:ACC

'And that-this only goes exactly there to the cooker hood?'

S: <<<<<<<<<<<<<((raising his hand))

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>(((showing something)))

( (turning to A))>>>>>>

V: ( (stepping away))----------------

V1: ----------------------------------------((entering kitchen))

19. A: Da (.) tam prjamo vy-hod↓=

Yes (.) there straight way.out:SG:M

'Yes (.) there exactly is the entrance↓='

A: X ((nodding))

Later on in the dialogue between Sasha and Andrej, we continue to find proof of Sasha’s position as a boss. Thus, the fact that Sasha poses questions one after another and has the right to accept or reject replies from Andrej supports his leadership position. In his next three turns, for example, Sasha accepts Andrej’s answer and, continuing examination of the problem, presents another, more detailed question to Andrej. We can also see that Sasha treats him as an expert (line 18). For example, when Sasha demands specific information he often turns to Andrej, indicating that he is still speaking with him and needs an exact answer.
In the middle of the interaction between Sasha and Andrej, we can observe a very interesting interplay which emphasizes the differences between the social roles they possess (lines 21-23). The following interaction proves the notion that “an individual’s self-consciousness […] always exists in relationship to an ‘other’ or ‘others’ who serve to validate its existence” (Hall 1998: 51). As a result of such a relationship between ‘self’ and ‘other,’ we can observe a curious interplay.

Line 22 shows us that Andrej does not give Sasha a chance to finish the sentence but by picking up Sasha’s idea he answers him with a re-phrasing of Sasha’s words. At the same time, it needs to be highlighted that Andrej uses a more current popular word nowadays: “unrealistic”. Altogether, to strengthen his own confirmation Andrej shakes his head because he gives a negative answer to a negative question.

All of Andrej’s behavior shows us that he is confident in his answer, and it can be seen that he acts as an expert.

'And to turn it in principle is absolutely for sure impossible'

S: (turning his head to A))

22. A: =nere[al’no ]
unrealistic:ADJ:PRED
'=unre[alistic ]'
A: X ((shakes his head))

Moreover, we can see that Andrej becomes interrupted by Sasha. Sasha hears the first part of Andrej’s word and seize it using this word to start a new turn. In this case, we can see that Sasha understands Andrej’s idea from the first sounds of the word. Thus, we can see that what Sasha does next is produce an echo question. By using an echo question, Sasha ties his sentence to Andrej’s answer and asks for Andrej’s re-confirmation. Such interplay can be interpreted as Sasha treating Andrej as an expert in this kind of work. Also, the fact that further in his turn Sasha asks for re-confirmation of Andrej’s assurance in Andrej’s own words shows that before making the final decision Sasha prefers to listen to the final expert’s position.

23. S: [eto nereal’no?=]
unrealistic:ADJ:PRED
'[it is unrealistic]?=

Andrej meanwhile replies to him with the same word thus once and for all confirming for Sasha that it is “unrealistic,” strengthening his confirmation by shaking his head (line 20A). Eo ipso accepting and confirming his position as an expert given to him by his boss Sasha.

23. S: [eto nereal’no?=]
unrealistic:ADJ:PRED
'[it is unrealistic]?=

24. A: =nerealno
unrealistic:ADJ:PRED
'=unrealistic'
A: X X ((shaking his head))
S: -----(turns his head to wall)
Andrej continues to keep this position by taking the turn himself and starting a new sentence (line 25). He is about to take the role of the one who decides the case but he gets interrupted by Sasha. This situation displays a struggle for authority. Taking back the role of boss in the conversation, Sasha continues sharing his thoughts. His sentence (lines 26–28) ends with asking for expert confirmation from Andrej as he turns to him during the speech.

25. A: No! shto to nado [*de*-]
   But some PRT need:PRD:IMP
   'But! Something has to be [*do*-]'

26. S: [esli by eto byla vysota potolk-a (. tam (.)
   if PRT this is:PST:F height ceiling-GEN
   (. there (.)
   'if the height of the ceiling was (. for example' (.)

V: -----------------------------((steps away))-------------------

27. S: podvesno-va on byl by ni-zhe santimetr-of
   na p'janatsat’
   suspend-ADJ he is:PST:M PRT:COND low-ADJ:GEN centimeter-GEN:PL on fifteen
   'of suspended one it would be lower by fifteen cm'
   S: ------------------((rising his hand))
   >>>>>>>>>>>((lowering his hand))
   <<<<<<<<<<<((turning to A))

28. S: to v printsip-i trub-u esche povernut’
   mozhdin [o da? (rovanyu)]
   then in principle-ADV:INS tube-ACC more:ADV turn:INF
   possible:PRED yes (gregated):PROX:ADJ
   then in principle the tube could then be turned possibly?
   yes? (grega)ted
   S: ((nodding))

This time, Andrej overlaps Sasha. He understands Sasha’s idea as Sasha nods while producing the word “mozhno” (‘possibly’) and pronouncing this word with a rise in voice. Thus, Sasha guides Andrej in regard to the moment he expects Andrej’s confirmation. This forces Andrej to nod back and respond with a set of “yeses,” supplying his verbal answer with nodding and continuous gazing at the wall. Andrej in this case acts as an employee who is guided by the
action boss Sasha. The sequence of "da" repeated three times is similar to the response strategy of “da-da” ('yes-yes’) described by Paukkeri. According to her work, such a response is produced in order to express a high level of politeness and cooperation. Moreover, she states that this kind of response strategy is a common practice in interaction that occurs between individuals of unequal social statuses (Paukkeri 2006: 144). It would thus be typical for an employee to express respect in regard to his or her boss by confirming the position taken by the boss.

However, in this case, Andrej’s “yesses” are pronounced firmly which makes a strong assertion of the speaker’s idea and indicates the expert position of the speaker. We may also presuppose that Andrej’s usage of nodding strengthens the effect of his assertion even though Andrej’s set of “yesses” given as a reply to Sasha’s question indicate his respect for and politeness to the boss.

At the end of conversation, Andrej’s expert position is seen and underlined not only because Sasha treats him as an expert but also because he accepts and initiates this role himself when he tries to seek a solution even when his boss asks for a simple confirmation and after a while gives a final expert conclusion. In line 30, Sasha poses his last confirmation-seeking question to Andrej using Andrej’s word and what he gets is not a direct answer but a new sentence where Andrej reconsiders Sasha’s conditional sentence, correcting him when showing his doubts that fifteen centimeters would be enough to bend the tube. Thus, Andrej shows his expert position in the conversation. We can see that he nods and makes gestures showing how the tube could be turned, imagining the situation.

30. S:  A tak vobsche nikak nereal’no
And now absolutely for sure unrealistic yes↑?= S: ------------------------------------ (gazes at wall)
Again PRT fifteen centimeter-GEN:PL that PRT hundred.twenty-OBJ:ACC:F bend:INF
=But then again, fifteen cm to bend one hundred and twenty
33. A: nu da nu mozhno i (.) vmeste s povarot-am;
PRT yes PRT possible:PRED and (. ) together with turn:INS:M
well yes well possible and (. ) together with the turn;
A: X X((nodding))
( (showing the tube with his hands) )  -------------------
Vl: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>((turning to A))
( (looking at A) )  --------------------------------------
S:  ---------------------------------------------
(gazes at wall) )

Andrej gives his final conclusion as an expert in line 36. The sentence he produces is constructed with direct word order with a stressed syllable and falling intonation at the end which gives the utterance an accomplished form.

36. A: eto nereal’no↓=
it unrealistic:PRED:NEG
this is unrealistic↓=
The final part of the conversation starts when Sasha being a boss by status takes his turn and sets up the goal for the workers to solve the problem somehow, turning to Andrej while uttering these words. Sasha constructs impersonal in its form sentence which is typical for formal relationships. Thus, he indicates his role as a boss again. Andrej as an employee shows skepticism by answering Sasha with a question which represents a single word repeated from Sasha’s sentence.

37. S: =Trebuet-sa reshenie dann-ova
=Demand-REFL solution current-ADJ:SG:INS:M question-SG:GEN:M
=A solution is required to this pro[blem]
S: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>((turning to A))
38. A: [reshenie?] solution
[solution?]
A:

39. (0.2)

A: X (shakes his head)

>>>>>>>>>>>(hems)

With the final question given by Andrej, we can see that he displays his role as an expert in this case. The interrogative form of the reply given by Andrej, in the role of an expert who is aware of what he is doing, indicates his skepticism in regard to the solution seeking process. Andrej’s hem in line 39 strengthens this statement.

After Andrej’s words, the final line of the interaction can be seen.

40. V: ----------------- (coughs)

S, A & V: ----------------- (gazes at wall)

The video stops when silence falls and everyone stands looking at the wall.

5.1.4 Employee-employee relationships

Another interesting interplay between the pair of employee – employee occurs when the second worker, Vlad, takes a turn in the conversation.

Vlad appears in the video for the first time when he enters the kitchen at line 18. At first, his gaze is directed at the wall and the boss who stands in front of everyone, but when Andrej starts speaking about the possibility of bending the tube, Vlad immediately turns to him (line 33).

18. Vl: ---------------------------------------- (entering kitchen)

33. A: nu da nu mozhno i (.) vmeste s povarot-am:
PRT yes PRT possible:PRED and (.) together with turn:INS:M
well yes well possible and (.) together with the turn:
A: X (nodding)

( showing tube with his hands) ---------------------

Vl: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (turning to A)

Even though Vlad comes into the kitchen shortly after Andrej, his first words in the interaction can be observed in line 34 when he decides to take a turn after listening to Andrej’s guess in regard to how much the tube could be bent. What Vlad says turns out to be a proposal of a height that could be suitable for the solution. Vlad’s turn becomes a “first pair
part” (FPP) in the conversation (Whitehead 2011: 103). The "second pair part” (SPP) is produced by Andrej and appears in line 35, overlapping Vlad (Whitehead 2011: 103). Not allowing Vlad to finish his sentence, Andrej replies to his suggestion and confirms Vlad’s idea. Trying to guess the measurement, both Vlad and Andrej suggest the same idea but give different numbers when speaking of the ceiling’s height. As the idea in general is the same, Andrej ends his sentence with a confirmative “yes.”

In this exchange of ideas between workers, we can see that they are equals, but Andrej plays the role of an expert who can easily overlap the boss and another worker and his word will be the ultimate. The second worker, Vlad, shows that he understands the problem as well but as nobody addresses him and his boss, Sasha, did not summon him, he leaves the kitchen and goes into another room. With this action, Vlad shows that he is allowed to leave and get back to work in the other room. Vlad also turns to Andrej and looks at him while speaking. By looking at Andrej, Vlad indicates that he expects Andrej to confirm his guess which shows that Vlad treats Andrej as an expert. Vlad leaves the kitchen right after his turn which shows that he distances himself from seeking a solution and that he treats himself as being irrelevant to the conversation.

33. A:    nu da nu mozhno     i  (. ) vmes te s povarot- am!
          FRT yes PRT possible:PRED and ( . ) together with turn:INS:M
          well yes well possible and ( . ) together with the turn!
          A:     X        X((nodding))
    ( (showing tube with his hands) ) ---------------------------
      Vl:    >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>((turning to A))
    ( (looking at A) ) ----------------------------------------
      S:     ---------------------------------------- ((gazes at wall))
34. Vl:  Eto na  [fse    tri-       na fse trits]
        It  on  all:PL thir:PROX:OBJ on all:PL thirt:PROX:OBJ
        This on [all thir- on all thirt]
      Vl:   ---------------------------------------- ((looks at A))
      A:    ------- (folding his arms and turning to wall))
35. A:  [hh fse dvats’ pjal’] da
        all twenty-five yes
      [hh all twenty-five] yes
While producing the sentence, Vlad uses a self-repair which might mean that he was about to make a mistake or it could be a sign of a slip of the tongue. It also can be claimed that Vlad’s proposal is a reduced sentence made of Sasha’s conditional sentence in line 27. This conclusion can be drawn based on Vlad’s usage of the same construction with the preposition “na” (= engl. “on”). The same preposition was used by Sasha when he said what it would be like if the ceiling was 15 cm lower. Vlad builds his sentence reusing Sasha’s format but corrects the number.

27. S: podvesno-va on byl by ni-zhe santimetr-of na pjatnatsat’
   suspend-ADJ he is:PST:M PRT:COND low-ADJ:GEN centimeter-GEN:PL on fifteen
   'of suspended one it would be lower by fifteen cm'

34. Vl: Eto na [fse tri- na fse trits]
   It on all:PL thir:PROX:OBJ on all:PL thirt:PROX:OBJ
   This on [all thir- on all thirt]

The proof that Andrej poses himself as an expert can be found in his SPP when he confirms the general idea of Vlad’s proposal but gives the exact number of how much the ceiling would have to be lowered for a successful solution.

35. A: [hh fse dvatsat’ pjat’] da
   all twenty-five yes
   [hh all twenty-five] yes

By producing this guess, we can see that Andrej is compromising with his boss and Vlad. He acts as an independent agent and produces the most accurate guess though the exact number is irrelevant for the solution as the ceiling’s height could not be changed anyway. In contrast to Vlad, Andrej stays in the kitchen and continues the discussion.

**5.1.5 Private relationships**

In this, the final part of the section, it is relevant to analyze the participants’ reactions to the video recording process. Before starting the analysis, it is necessary to mention the social relationship between the participants. Viktor is the owner of the flat where the renovation is taking place. Sasha is the boss of the company responsible for the renovation of Viktor’s flat.
and is a good acquaintance of his. Both Viktor and Sasha have friendly relationships with the workers though business relationships are still maintained.

Sasha and Viktor are the first people to appear in the recording. Viktor starts speaking directly to Sasha, having his head turned to him and showing him the part of the cooker hood which he holds in his hands. Sasha, at first staring at the camera and listening to Viktor’s words, changes the direction of his gaze from the camera to the cooker hood and back. Finally, he fixes his gaze on the cooker hood for a small amount of time and changes the direction of his gaze to the wall. From this moment on, he shows that he is fully concentrated on the problem and only glances at the camera again after summoning Andrej when he turns to the same direction where the cameraman is standing.

Viktor, on the contrary, watches the camera for the first time in the video when Andrej is approaching the kitchen. Being uninvolved in the conversation, he puts away the cooker hood part and turns to the camera, smiling. Then, after coming closer to Andrej and Sasha, he giggles together with Andrej and looks at the camera again.

Meanwhile, Sasha and Andrej start their discussion. Vlad appears in the kitchen soon after this point. Viktor suddenly looks at the camera once again in the middle of Sasha and Andrej’s conversation and gives way to the cameraman. Right after stepping aside, he looks out from behind Vlad’s back and tries to watch Sasha’s explanatory gestures. He goes out of the shot immediately after that and stands behind the screen until the end of the video though his presence in the room is proved by his cough. Viktor’s standing behind the shot shows us that he acts as a person who is not experienced in these types of discussions and who thus cannot be involved in the conversation. However, his presence in the kitchen indicates his social role as a client who is interested in seeking a solution and who holds the situation under control by being present for the workers’ discussion.

None of the participants had ever been recorded before for the purpose of language analysis. That is why the fact that some of the participants turned to the camera time to time might be an indicator of awkwardness caused by the presence of camera in the room.

6 Question types

In this paper, different response strategies are under examination. To trace the context of the conversation and the functions of various responses, the study is based on the interaction between four different people. Before starting the detailed analysis of the studied responses,
let us look at the diversity of question types which have been found in this work. As was mentioned above, it is considered important in this work because the diversity of response strategies depends directly on the type of question or utterance preceding the given response.

There may be many types of questions in our daily life. The scientists of different social fields of study have been examining them but still have not reached a common decision about a single typology for question types. “The categorization of question types also differs substantially across academic researchers, which makes it very difficult to interpret findings” (Oxburgh et al. 2009: 50). It is still possible, however, to distinguish some kind of similarity in the topologization. Only types of questions relevant to the study will be named here. Based on the typology research conducted by Gavin Oxburgh et al. (2009: 51-52), in this study we can find: 1) rhetorical questions (questions which do not require an answer), 2) content questions or so-called 5WH questions (those which start from the question words “what?”, “why?”, “when?”, “where?”, “who?”, and sometimes “how?” and ask for specific information), 3) “yes/no” questions (ones which require the answers “yes” or “no” only), 4) tag questions (statements which end with an interrogative fragment and require a yes or no answer); 5) echo questions (replicating the answers).

6.1 A note on Russian grammar

Before analyzing the interaction itself, we will have to look briefly at the grammatical structure of the Russian language because it is quite often possible to meet discrepancies between the Russian and English languages in the translation.

Russian belongs to the Slavic group of languages. It thereby differs greatly in its grammar from English which is a part of the Germanic group. Russian does not have a fixed word order and this represents the largest difference in sentence building between these two languages. Even though Russian has a relatively flexible word order, it should be noted that the words still follow some rules of organization in sentences. Rodionova (2001:1) explains this phenomenon as follows: “The main hypothesis of this thesis [the flexibility of word order] is that there is indeed a correlation between word order and information structure of sentences and that pragmatic considerations are reflected in the syntactic composition of Russian utterances”. Thus, the order of words often depends on what the speaker wants to stress in the utterance.
In the classification part of the analysis, the rules of written Russian will be explained first as most of the works on Russian grammar are done on the basis of written language. Later on, the typical intonation pattern will be revealed on the basis of oral language as the analysis of conversation is represented in the present work.

Russian sentences are recognized by Russian grammarians as belonging to three categories according to the aim of the utterance: narrative, interrogative or imperative.

Narrative sentences are sentences that state facts, describe phenomena, events, etc. They can be both positive and negative in their form. Narrative sentences are the most frequently used ones and can vary in their content and structure greatly. They are normally built without any inversion: S+O+V. The “[S+V+O] order of constituents is posited as basic but not obligatory” pattern in Russian (Rodionova 2001: 2).

Interrogative sentences are those which are aimed at making the participant(s) of interaction produce the idea(s) in which the speaker is interested, i.e., asks a question about. They always end with a question mark in written language.

The grammatical features of interrogative sentences are as follows:

1) The word position. Usually, the keyword of a question is placed at the beginning of the sentence although they do not necessarily take the very first position in the sentence. Ex: “A pochemu tak poluchilos?” (‘And why did it happen like that?’), “A ja otkuda znaju?” (And how would I know?’). In these examples, the words “pochemu” (‘why’) and “ja” (‘I’) represent the keywords of these particular sentences. They take the second position in the sentence while the first position is occupied by the particle “a” (‘and’).

Particles in Russian have different functions which should be analyzed with respect to particular cases of usage. A detailed discussion on the functions of particles in sentences is beyond the scope of this work. However, one of the functions of the particle “a” (‘and’) is discussed in the present study during the analysis of content questions, subsection 6.1.2, example b.

2) When present, particles or question words such as pronouns and adverbs are placed at the very beginning of a sentence as is the particle “a” (‘and’) in the following example: “A pochemu tak poluchilos?” (‘And why did it happen like that?’).
3) Interrogative intonation. In most sentences, we can see an increase in pitch on the stressed syllables of keywords in questions: “A ta-eta prjamo toka uhodit tuda na vy†tjashku?” (‘And this-that only goes exactly there to the cooker hood?’).

As opposed to English, Russian does not have auxiliary verbs. Thus, questions in Russian have a straight word order: Q.w.+Subj.+Verb.

Apart from the classification of questions used by G. Oxburgh (2009: 45-66), Russian grammar traditionally divides interrogative sentences into proper-interrogative, imperative-interrogative, and rhetorical-interrogative (Valgina 2002). In our transcription, we encounter proper-interrogative and rhetorical-interrogative sentences only. For this reason, we will look closely at the description and division of these groups of interrogative sentences. It should be said, however, that imperative-interrogative sentences are those which encompass within themselves a command which is expressed in question form (Valgina 2002).

Proper-interrogative questions are those which presuppose receiving an answer. They can also be positive and negative according to their form. Positive (proper-interrogative) questions require a confirmation of the fact stated in the question, ex: “A ta-eta tuda toka uhodit na vytjazhku?” (‘And this-that only goes exactly there to the cooker hood?’).

Negative (proper-interrogative) questions contain a negation of the fact stated in the question and require confirmation of the fact stated in the question as well, ex: “Eto nereal’no?” (‘It is unrealistic?’). The confirmation of a negative answer can be expressed in both positive and negative forms in Russian.

Rhetorical-interrogative sentences do not require an answer from the addressee. They can be constructed with positive or negative forms. Counter questions can also be referred to as rhetorical-interrogative sentences (Valgina 2000).

Finally, before introducing the analysis of the interrogative sentences, some words should be said about the so-called “wh” questions. Though equivalent in meaning and function to “wh” words, Russian interrogative pronouns do not have the same form and start with different letters comparing to “wh” words in English. Timberlake (2004: 461) defines “content questions” as those which start with “interrogative-indefinite pronouns”.
6.2 Analysis

In the interaction under study, eleven instances of questions could be found which correspond to the classification of the five types of questions that have been discussed above. Let us examine these question forms more closely.

6.2.1 Rhetorical question

a) The first question type that can be found is a rhetorical question which appears in line 5. It should be mentioned that Sasha and Viktor are the only people in the kitchen. Andrej is working in the room next door.

9. S: A pochemu ona tak poluchil-as’? ANDRJUX[AAAAAAA₁]!
   And:Q why she so happen:PST PROPER NAME
   'And why did it happen like that? ANDRJUX[AAAAAAA₁]!'
   S: ((turning to camera))<><><<<
   ((gazes at camera))---</((shifting gaze downward))<><><<<

In the given case, the question form produced by Sasha becomes a rhetorical question after being asked due to several reasons. First of all, Sasha does not gaze at Viktor, showing by this action that he does not expect an answer from him. Thus, the sentence becomes rhetorical for Viktor. As a consequence, we can see that in the given context the sentence does not require an answer from the person present in the kitchen, i.e., Viktor. It becomes clear that he is not the one who should answer this question as it has been discussed in subsection 5.1.2 and Viktor does not play the role of expert in the field of flat renovation. Secondly, when Sasha, the head of the workers, produces his first sentence in the conversation, he does not respond to Viktor’s preceding speech but produces a reasonable continuation of his own examination of the problem on the wall. Thus, Sasha initiates his own sentence which is addressed to everyone present in the flat. It can also be seen in the interaction that Sasha looks at the wall and, leaving no space for an answer, calls in one of the workers. This action proves that the sentence produced by Sasha becomes a rhetorical question in this particular context.

b) Another example of the rhetoric-interrogative form of sentence can be found when Andrej replies to Sasha’s question. The question form is represented by the word “how” and the interrogative intonation.

17. A: A ja₁ ot-kuda znaju₁?
And:Q I where.from:ADV know

'And how would I know?'

S: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>(Turning to the wall)

In Russian, “the interrogative intonation is expressed with a rise in tone in the beginning of a phrase and a drop in tone by the end of the phrase” (Modern Russian Grammar). In the given sentence, we can see exactly the same intonation which is characteristic for an interrogative phrase in Russian. Thus, we can state that the sentence is used as a question. Even though Andrej’s sentence stands in the form of a specific question, we can state that this is a reply which in fact is the statement “I do not know.”

6.2.2 Content questions

a) The next question form which can be found is represented by a set of interrogative pronouns. We can find three examples of specific question forms in lines 11 and 16. The first question form in this set is produced by Andrej, the worker. In fact, he utters this interrogative word as a reply to his boss’s summons. Usually, the word “what” serves as one of the indicators of content questions since in its form it represents the “wh-word” (Oxburgh et al. 2009: 51) or “interrogative-indefinite pronoun” (Timberlake 2004: 461). Even when such a word stands alone, it makes a question which requires specific information in comparison to general questions which can be answered with “yes” or “no” only. The function of this question has been mentioned earlier in subsection 5.1.3 as it serves as an invitation to continue Sasha’s speech so that Andrej manages to understand whether he can give a verbal answer or his presence in the kitchen is needed.

11. A: [SHTOOOOO↑]?

What

'[WHAAAAAT]?'

S: ((shifting gaze))<<<<<<<<<

A: ((Answering from another room. Some noises can be heard.))

Words like [SHTOOOOO↑] are called “go-ahead” words by E. Schegloff (2007: 49). “The go-ahead response is generally articulated with ‘yeah’ or ‘what’, but may also be displayed by redirection of gaze to, or re-orientation of posture, at the summoner, or some other indication that the addressee is aligning as recipient to the summoner” (Schegloff 2007: 49).
b) The second question form in this set is produced by Sasha and functions as a question which requires an answer. As was said earlier, content questions usually start with one of five WH words. In this question, we can see that Sasha uses the word “why,” one of the indicators of content questions.

16. S: A pochemu tak poluchi-los’?
And:Q why so happen-ed:3SG:PST
'And why did it happen like that? ' 
S: ((turning to A))>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

It has a special word order, however, which should be explained further here. The sentence starts with the word “and” which plays the role of particle in the given utterance. In this sentence, we can see that the question produced by Sasha shows that it is placed in the middle of the conversation and refers to the information prior to this question. We can thus state that a particle in the initial position in a question can serve as an indicator of continuous conversation which has been started before the question and is expected to be continued further.

6.2.3 “Yes/No” questions

a) The next interrogative form of sentence, found in lines 18 and 21, is known as the “yes/no” question form. “Yes/no” questions are characterized by the expectation of “yes” or “no” answers to this kind of question. In the Russian and English languages, such questions can be formed in both positive and negative forms. The first “yes/no” question that we meet in the given interaction is structured in the positive form. This question requires a response that contains only one of two possible alternatives: “yes” or “no.”

18. S: A ta - eta prjamo toka u-hodit tuda na vytjashk-u?
And:Q that - this straight:ADJ only go.away:PRS:3SG there on:ALL cooker hood:ACC
'And that-this only goes exactly there to the cooker hood? '
S: <<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<((raising his hand))
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>((showing something))
((turning to A))>>>>>>

There is no need to re-arrange word order to make a general question in Russian. The straight word order (Q.w. + Subj. + Verb) is used together with an interrogative intonation (which
consists of an increase in pitch on the stressed syllables of keywords in questions) explained in section 6.1. Sometimes, a particle is used in the very beginning of a sentence with the S+O+V word order. The function of these particles has been explained previously as indicators of follow up questions which are used as a series of questions produced one shortly after another.

Thus, the utterance produced by Sasha could function grammatically as an affirmative sentence as Sasha, being an expert in the renovation field compared to Viktor, expresses his expertise in regard to the situation. He addresses Andrej, however, whom he treats as an expert in a particular field, and by using an interrogative intonation makes the sentence function as a question.

b) The second question is uttered by Sasha, but it is constructed in the negative form, and as a typical “yes/no” question it requires an answer that is negative in its form.

21. S: I poverynt’ jejo v printsip-i nikak voobsche ne vozmo=

'And to turn it in principle absolutely for sure impossi=’

S: ( (turning his head to A))<<<<<<<<<<<
The question is designed to elicit some kind of an answer. However, a slight opportunity for disconfirmation appears, and we can say that the usage of the given form of question expresses Sasha’s authority as he constructs his question so that his employee can only confirm his idea.

6.2.4 Tag questions

Another question type represented in the given interaction is called a tag question. Tag questions are built in the form of statements with an interrogative fragment at the end. These types of questions are usually used to seek for confirmation.

a) In the first tag question in this study, we can see the interrogative fragment “yes” which follows the positive statement. We can see that with the help of this question, Sasha seeks for confirmation from Andrej.

20. S: =prjamo na vy-hod (.) vot tak da?
straight on:ALL way.out:SG:M (.) that so yes
The word order of the given utterance is direct which is why it is impossible to say that we face the question until the final word “yes” is pronounced with the stress on this word and a rise in intonation. Although, as was previously mentioned, the typical interrogative intonation in Russian goes down at the end of a sentence, this example of a tag question shows that the intonation pattern depends on the type of question being produced. Tag questions are constructed in such a way that the intonation of the whole sentence up to the fragment “da” (‘yes’) is the same as in an affirmative sentence. However, the “da” (‘yes’) fragment is stressed and a rise in pitch occurs which serves as an indicator of an interrogative sentence. This happens because tag questions in Russian are constructed from affirmative sentences and the particle “da” (‘yes’) induces the addressee to confirm the idea expressed (Russian Grammar).

b) We can see the second example of a tag question represented in the interaction in lines 26-28 where Sasha asks for further confirmation from Andrej. This statement is constructed in the form of a conditional sentence which ends with the interrogative ending “yes.” Again, we can see that it is difficult to say whether the sentence will be affirmative or interrogative up until the word “yes.” However, when Sasha produces the keyword “mozhno” (‘possibly’) he raises his voice which becomes the first indicator of the interrogative intonation. At the same time, he nods which serves as an indicator for the addressee that a response is needed. The word “da” (‘yes’) is also pronounced with a rise in intonation which indicates that the speaker has produced a question and expects an answer.
28. S: *to v printsip-i* trub-u esche povernut’
možhno? (rovano)ju

then in principle-ADV:INS tube-ACC more:ADV turn:INF possible:PRED yes (gregated):PROX:ADJ

then in principle the tube could then be turned p;ssibly? yes? (gregated)

S: (nodding) X

C) The last sentence in the form of a tag question can be found in line 30. Again, we can see that Sasha in the role of boss asks for confirmation from his employee. Sasha constructs his sentence in the form of a statement and adds an interrogative tag “yes” which helps to classify this statement as a typical tag question. The addition of “da” (‘yes’) makes a response relevant to this sentence. If the sentence lacks this final “da” (‘yes’) and has a certain keyword, the utterance could be interpreted for example as the final decision from the boss.

30. S: *A tak vobsche nikak nereal’no*
da;?= And:Q so altogether:ADV nowise:ADV:NEG unrealistic:ADJ:PRED yes

And now absolutely for sure unrealistic yes;?= S: ---------------------------------(gazes at wall)

Lastly, the stress on the penultimate syllable of the word “nerealno” (‘unrealistic’) occurs which causes the falling intonation at the end of the word and the incompleteness of the statement.

6.2.5 Echo questions

The last question type which can be found in the interaction under study is the so-called echo question. This type of question is characterized by the replication of a previous statement.

a) The first example of this type of question can be found in line 23 of the given conversation and is produced by Sasha. This question is constructed with the replication of the previous answer and is targeted at seeking additional confirmation from the speaker.

The function of the given echo question in this context functions as a general question as it requires a “yes” or “no” reply from the person who is questioned. It is constructed in subject + adverbal modifier form and is pronounced with the stress on the “nereal’no” (‘unrealistic’). Stressing the word in question (‘unrealistic’) makes it possible for the listener to understand that a question is being produced.
23. S:  
\[\text{[eto nereal’no?] = it unrealistic:ADJ:PRED}\]
\[\text{'[it is unrealistic]?=}'\]

The function of this particular echo question is to express incredulity at Andrej’s previous utterance. Such construction is called “incredulity response construction” (Lambrecht 1990), and it is equivalent in meaning to an exclamation of surprise such as “really?” By using this construction, Sasha demands re-confirmation from Andrej.

b) The second and final example of the echo question type is found in the last turn taken, line 31, and represents a reply to the goal which has been set up by the boss in line 37. Andrej’s reply to Sasha’s words takes the form of an interrogative sentence and is accompanied by hemming. It is pronounced with falling intonation at the end of the word, and this corresponds to typical interrogative intonation in Russian. We can thus state that Andrej’s phrase represents a question, one which consists of a single word repeated from Sasha’s sentence.

37. S:  
\text{=Trebuet-sa reshenie dann-ova vo[prosa]\}
\text{=Demand-REFL solution current-ADJ:INS:M question-SG:GEN:M}\n\text{=A solution is required to this pro[blem]}
S:  
\text{>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>(turning to A)}

38. A:  
\text{[reshenie?] solution [solution?]}
A:  

39. (0.2)
A: X ((shakes his head))

As Andrej’s final question is a repetition of Sasha’s words, we can state that he poses an echo question. The function of the question can be examined from two perspectives as technically it expresses a reconfirmation of Sasha’s words but pragmatically it plays a very different role. As Andrej hems thoughtfully and shakes his head in addition to posing the question, we can see that the problem that has been discussed by them turned out to be quite difficult. In this case, we can speak of Andrej’s question as of a repair initiator which shows skepticism in regard to the set up goal. The pragmatic meaning of the reply can express an impediment to seeking a solution.
7  Confirmative response strategies

In this section, different response strategies will be examined. Most of the responses in the conversation have been given in the form of easily recognizable answers but responses that represent a difficult and at the same time interesting status have also been found.

The following response strategies have been found here: 1) responses of confirmation represented by the particle “da” (‘yes’) given to a positive question form, 2) responses of confirmation as an answer to questions asking for specification, represented silently by nodding, 3) response-repetition given to the echo question type; 4) responses of confirmation represented by the repeated particle “da-da-da” (‘yes-yes-yes’) given to questions asking for specification. It is important to note that the responses represented in the study are tied to the special type of question in the data set of the current research.

7.1 Analysis

To analyze the response strategies used in the conversation under study, let us look more closely at each type of response.

7.1.1  Particle “da”

The most common answer expressing consent in the Russian language is “da” (‘yes’). In our example, Sasha asks a so-called “yes/no” question which causes the production of a “da” answer in this case. In section 6, a reference to the Dictionary of Russian Particles (CPH) was made, and it was highlighted that when “da” (‘yes’) functions as the response to a question, it bears the meaning of affirmation, consent and confirmation. Nodding can also follow the “da” (‘yes’) response in this case, according to the dictionary.

In the given example, Andrej gives a clear and confident answer of agreement which is followed by the more specific explanation and nodding. On the basis of the identity analysis, we find evidence that Andrej possesses the role of an expert in the field which has been proved by Sasha constantly seeking confirmation from him.

18. S:  A  ta - eta prjamo  toka u-hodit  tudo na  vytjashk-u?
       And:Q  that - this straight:ADJ only go.away:FRS:3SG there on:ALL cooker hood:ACC
       'And that-this only goes exactly there to the cooker hood? '
       S:  ((turning to A))>>>>>>
Andrej’s explanation following the “da” response consists of the paraphrasing of Sasha’s words which justifies his confirmation. Andrej’s paraphrasing underlines his role as an employee. At the same time, such a combination of the simple confirmative particle “da” and an extended explanatory sentence makes a stronger confirmation of Andrej’s answer and reveals his expert role.

Moreover, the falling tone at the end of Andrej’s phrase is additional proof that Andrej is confident in his answer. By finishing the phrase with falling intonation, he lets Sasha know that he has explained what Sasha wanted to know and is not going to add anything else. The falling tone and Andrej’s nod allow Sasha take a turn at the same time that Andrej is finishing his speech.

7.1.2 Nodding

The second response type here occurs when Sasha asks Andrej another question. This time, the question form Sasha uses is aimed at requesting specification and is classified as a tag question. Its production is based on the previous answer type. In order to show the strong degree of confidence in the answer, the explanations suggested by Andrej make Sasha ask for more precise information from Andrej. In other words, when Sasha comprehends Andrej’s answer, he seeks confirmation of his understanding from Andrej. When he finishes producing the question, he turns his eyes from Andrej to the wall. Andrej nods almost at the same time that Sasha produces the question. Thus, we can see that Andrej gives a reply before Sasha finishes producing the question. As the interaction in question represents mostly an inseparable sequence of questions and answers, we can guess that Andrej understands Sasha’s intention to ask for a specification from the first word, “prjamo” (‘exactly’), which Sasha repeats from Andrej’s previous response.
The nod remains the only answer to Sasha’s question and is not followed by any verbal answer. As Sasha produces the next question immediately after Andrej’s nod, we may say that he accepts Andrej’s action as a response and continues the interaction.

Whitehead (2011: 104) describes nods in the function of response as a means of producing an affirmative or confirmative response to the FPP which is represented by the question in this example. Thus, the sole nodding gesture in response to the tag question in this example represents a simple act of confirmation.

### 7.1.3 Response-repetition

The next response strategy is built on the power play between Sasha and Andrej and consists of the response-repetition given to the echo question.

In the following example, the question posed to Andrej (line 23) represents the response to the answer produced by Andrej in line 22.

22. A: =nereal’no 
     unrealistic:ADJ:PRED
     ’=unrealistic’
     A: X X ((shakes his head))

23. S: [eto nereal’no?=]
     it unrealistic:ADJ:PRED
     ’[it is unrealistic]?’=

24. A: =nerealno
     unrealistic:ADJ:PRED
     ’=unrealistic’
     A: X X ((shaking his head))

In the given response strategy, the response-repetition takes place. As we can see, Sasha produces an echo question in line 23 in response to Andrej’s assertion in line 22. Sasha picks up Andrej’s word and makes a question out of his statement. Thus, Sasha and Andrej repeat each other’s word. What Andrej does in line 24 confirms his previously given idea once again. Response-repetition in this example is a stronger confirmation than using a single “da” (‘yes’) because it shows exactly where Andrej agrees with Sasha. Andrej’s action of shaking his head functions as a confirmation of his idea that it is “unrealistic” to turn the tube.
7.1.4 Repeated particle “da-da-da”

The last response strategy is one of the most common in the Russian language. It consists of a sequence of a repeated particle, namely “da” (‘yes’), which can usually be found as an answer to a positive question. According to the Dictionary of Modern Literary Russian Language, the repeated particle “da” (‘da’) functions as an indicator of consent and strengthened confirmation.

In the given example, the answer produced belongs to the category of tag questions. As has been analyzed in section 6 on questions, tag questions are constructed in the form of a statement and end with an interrogative fragment. They are usually used to ask for confirmation.

Repeated answers are commonly used by speakers of different languages. According to Stivers (2004: 288), multiple sayings have several characteristic features: “they are done by the same speaker, involve a full unit of talk, have a similar segmental character, and are done immediately in succession and under a single intonation contour”. It is thus important to trace whether these features illustrate the given example. The answer of multiple “yesses” made by the same speaker, Andrej, used to confirm a full sentence produced by Sasha, consists of the same repeated particle, “da” (‘yes’) and is produced at the same time with falling intonation. Thereby, it indeed contains all the features described by T. Stivers.

26. S: [esli by eto byla vysota potolk-a] (.) tam (.)

( ) there ( ( )

if PRT this is:PST:F height ceiling-GEN

example' ( ( )

27. S: podvesno-va on byl by ni-zhe santimetr-of na pjatnatsat’

suspend-ADJ he is:PST:M PRT:COND low-ADJ:GEN centimeter-GEN:PL on fifteen

[of suspended one it would be lower by fifteen cm’

S: --------------------------((rising his hand))

>>>>>>>>>(lowering his hand))

<<<<<<<<<((turning to A))

28. S: to v printsip-i trub-u esche povernut’

možhn [o da? (rovanu]ju)
In this interaction, we can observe another question from Sasha posed to Andrej. Sasha produces a tag question which requires a specification. Before he turns his sentence into a tag question, however, Sasha pronounces the word “mozhno” (‘possibly’) with an interrogative intonation, i.e., with a rise in voice in the beginning of the stressed word “mozhno” (‘possibly’) and nods. This action makes Andrej nod as well before the question is produced. Thus, we can see that Andrej is guided by Sasha in regard to where to produce an answer. It identifies Andrej as an employee and Sasha as a boss.

A verbal response is produced by Andrej at the end of Sasha’s speech. Overlapping Sasha, Andrej produces the sequence of “da” (‘yes’) responses. However, Andrej does not produce three “da” (‘yesses’) at once. After the first “da” (‘yes’) he makes a micro pause and then continues saying the remaining two “da” (‘yesses’) of the sequence. We can thus see that his first “da” (‘yes’) is aimed at confirming Sasha’s tag question as it is uttered at the same time that Sasha nods. The rest serve here as supportive elements for the first confirmation and are used without pauses.

This triple response of “da-da-da” (‘yes-yes-yes’) is also followed by Andrej’s nodding. In the given example, we can see the double strengthening of confirmation produced by Andrej. The repetition of “da” (‘yes’) three times and the subsequent nodding indicates to us the confidence of the speaker in regard to what he has expressed. Moreover, the sequence of “da” (‘yes’) responses serves to express respect and politeness to the speaker’s boss, as has been discussed in the section on identities.
8 Conclusion

The aim of the research was, first of all, to display the types of questions and answers in the interaction under study in interrelation to the initial description of the social types of identities represented in the interaction. Secondly, an additional aim was to explain the choice of response strategies made by participants of the interaction.

The first part of the research was dedicated to describing the distribution of the social roles and the interplay between the participants of the interaction. The following categories were revealed: employee-employee, client-representative of a service providing company, and boss-employee social relationships. In addition, two typical social roles were discovered in the employee-employee relationship pattern: expert and general employee. The position of an expert is characterized by the attention given by the boss for most of the time and the taking of responsibility for suggesting a solution. The general employee position is characterized by simply obeying commands from the boss and fulfilling duties. In the relationship between client and representative of the service providing company, the non-expert role is represented by the layman’s understanding of the problem while the expert role of the service-providing company’s representative is characterized by the ability to distinguish what is relevant to the solution to the problem. Social interaction between boss and employee discloses the typical hierarchical behavior as well as shows proof of a friendly atmosphere existing between the participants. The social role of boss is represented by the abundance of questions posed to the employee, the summons and the impersonal sentence which is typical for formal relationships. Two kinds of roles of employees can be observed: the expert role and the employee who obeys commands. These two role types can be observed in their mutual substitution during the conversation and are characterized by detailed replies with explanation, replies of confirmation to the specification-seeking questions posed by the boss and at the same time by the acceptance of the answerer role which sometimes was guided by the boss.

The second part represented the analysis of the diversity of the question types which can be found in the current research. The analysis was made in accordance with the rules of Russian grammar. The following patterns of questions have been investigated in the work: rhetorical questions, content questions, “yes/no” questions, tag questions and echo questions. The two examples of each question type have been found in the conversation, except the tag questions that have been represented with three examples.
It is important to notice that both examples of rhetorical questions prove that the sentences bear the rhetorical function only in the particular context. In the first example of content questions, we have seen that it has been represented by the so-called “go-ahead” word “what”. The second content question started with the particle that serves as an indicator of continuous speech. The first example of “yes/no” questions showed that while the form of the question remained positive the use of the interrogative intonation made the question function as interrogative sentence. The position of a particle in the beginning of the sentence helped to indicate the question as the so-called “follow up” question. The second example was characterized by its negative form that required a negative in its form answer. The examples of tag questions represented the typical construction of this question type in Russian. It has been found out that the first example of echo question was represented by the “incredulity response construction” (Lambrecht 1990). While the technical function of second example was to ask for reconfirmation, the pragmatic meaning was argued to express an impediment to seeking a solution.

The third part dealt with the response strategies that were found in the interaction. The section followed the discussion of question types due to the fact that the response patterns are tied to the preceding questions. All in all, four response types of confirmation were analyzed: responses represented by the particle “da” (‘yes’) responses represented by nodding, response-repetition, and responses represented by the triple particle “da-da-da” (‘yes-yes-yes’). It was discovered that different response patterns express different degrees of confirmation. The single particle “da” (‘yes’) with a detailed explanation after it represents the strongest degree of confirmation. Response-repetition is thus weaker than the response of “da” (‘yes’) followed by an explanation even when it is accompanied by nodding, but response-repetition is stronger than the repeated particle “da” (‘yes’) followed by nodding. The weakest response of confirmation found is simple nodding. However, the position of nodding and head shaking was taken into consideration and was analyzed in respect to their place in the interaction. Thereby, nodding and head shaking can preshadow the response as it can be produced during the production of a question. Both head shaking and nodding were explained as serving to strengthen responses to questions in both positive and negative form. In the position which precedes the completion of a question, nodding and head shaking are performed based on a guess or guidance from the previous turn. It also was noted that nodding and head shaking take place purposely and in respect to different sentence forms. Thus nodding can occur as a response of confirmation of both positive and negative in their form.
sentences while head shaking as a response of confirmation is used only for the negative in their form sentences.

Thereby, the current study gives the possibility of a deeper understanding of the way Russian is constructed as well as an understanding of the ways people interact in institutional settings and distribute their social categories during naturally occurring conversation. At the same time, the work helps to investigate how the rules governing Russian grammar serve to help the participants to understand each other.

The current research can be used for the purposes of comparing question-answer patterns in Russian with the same pattern in other languages.

It would be very interesting to expand the research in the future in order to look at different kinds of question-answer pairs as well as to trace further the relationship of body engagement to spontaneous naturally occurring conversation in Russian. Additionally, it would be interesting to conduct research made on the basis of informal conversation upon which a comparison of results could be made between the response analyses carried out in institutional and informal settings.
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Appendix A: List of Abbreviations

CA              Conversation Analysis
FPP             First Pair Part
SPP             Second Pair Part
S+O+V           grammatical pattern of sentence construction containing: subject + object + verb
СРЧ             the Dictionary of Russian Particles
ССРЯЯ           the Dictionary of Modern Literary Russian Language
Appendix B: Transcription Notation

The specificity of the research subject has determined the use of the following transcription notation system: Gail Jefferson’s notation system described in, among other works, “Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction” (Jefferson 2004).

The summary of transcription symbols used in this investigation is provided below.

[word] the left-side brackets indicate the starting point of overlap

word] the right-side brackets indicate the ending point of overlap

= equal signs indicate no gap between utterances

(1.0) numbers in parenthesis indicate the timed pause by tenths of seconds

(.) a full stop in parenthesis indicates a brief pause, usually shorter than two tenths of a second

“word” the degree signs indicate that the word or phrase are pronounced softer than the surrounding speech

WORD word in upper case letters indicates that word was pronounced considerably louder than the surrounding speech

word: colon after a vowel or a consonant indicates its prolongation

_underline_ word or syllable indicates that it is accentuated by the speaker

word- dash indicates a cut off word or phrase

.hh an inbreath

(word) words or phrases in parenthesis are dubious

((word)) words or phrases in parenthesis are transcriber’s descriptions

↑ the upper arrow indicates rising pitch

↓ the lower arrow indicates falling pitch

,.? punctuation markers indicate the intonation at the end of a sentence

--- continuous/steady state

>>> movement

X head shake/nod
Appendix C: Transcriptions

The conversation between the workers and the owner of the flat is about the
difficulty they have encountered during the renovation of the flat.
Viktor (V) - the owner of the flat; Sasha (S) - the head of the workers;
Andrej (A) - one of the two workers; Vlad (Vl) - the second worker.

1. V: Vot eta vot shtuka ne fstala iznachal’no
   there this there thing NEG fit:IMF:3SG from.beginning
   'This thing did not fit from the very beginning'

   S: ----------------------------------------------- (gazes at camera)

   V: ----------------------------------------------- (holds cooker hood part)

   ----------------------------------------------- (gazes at cooker hood part)
   ((shifting gaze to S) >>>>>>>>>>>>>>

2. (0.2)

   S: >>>>>>>> (shifting gaze downward) <<<<<< (shifting gaze up to camera)

   V: ----------------------------------------------- (gazes at S)

3. V: ◦tak plavno◦ to est’ kakoj to tam jaschik dolzhen byt’
   so smoothly it is:3SG some PRT there box must:3SG be:INF
   'so smoothly*, so some kind of box should be there.'

   V: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (raising his hand)

   <<<<<<<< (lowering his hand)

   >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (puts down cooker hood part)

   <<<<<<<< (shifting gaze to wall)

   ((shifting gaze downward) >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

   S: ----------------------------------------------- (gazes at cooker hood part)

4. (0.5)

   V: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (straightens up)

   ----------------------------------------------- (shifting gaze to the wall)

   S: ----------------------------------------------- (gazes at the wall)
5. V: Dyrka eta ochen’ blizko k-k-k
    Hole this very close t-t-to:ALL
    ’The hole is very close t-t-to’

    V: >>>>>>(raising his hand)

    ---------------------
    ((pointing to wall))

6. V: m-m-m nado chtoby ona bli-zhe k sten-e byla
    m-m-m need:PRED that she close-GEN to:ALL wall-DAT is:PST
    ’m-m-m it should be so that it was closer to the wall’

    V: <<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<(lowering his hand)

7. V: m-m eto takoj kostruktivnyj defect↑
    m-m this such constructional defect
    ’m-m it is such a constructional defect↑’

8. V & S: --------------------------

9. S: A pochemu ona tak poluchil-as’? ANDRJUX[AAAAAA↑]!
    And:Q why she so happen:PST PROPER NAME
    ’And why did it happen like that? ANDRJUX[AAAAAA↑]!’

    S: ((turning to camera))<<<<<<

    ((gazes at camera))---

    ((shifting gaze downward))<<<<

10. V: tak-—
    [*eto][iznachal’no-]

    it from.beginning

    so

    ’[*it ]was [from the

    beginning like that-’]

    V: ((stooping down))>>>>>>>>>>>>>

11. A: [SHTOOOO↑]?
    What
    ’[WHAAAAAT]?’

    V: ((taking cooker hood part away))>>>>>>>>>>>>>
S:  (shifting gaze)<<<

12. S:  Иди сюда↓
Come-SG.IMP here
'Come here↓'
S:  >>>>>>>>>(stepping aside))

-------------------------------- (looking down at floor)

13. (0.6)
S:  ---------------- (gazes down at floor)

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>(coming closer to wall with problem)
V:  <<<<<<<< (putting away cooker hood part)

>>>>>>>>>(turning around and standing)

------------------------------------------- (gazes at camera)
A:  >>>>>>>>>>>>(entering kitchen & following S)

14. S:  слушай что нужно↑ - нужно↑ что то↑
PRT think.of:INF

'Listen and what should be↑-we should think something of↑'
A:  >>>>>>>>>>>>>>(following Sasha)

-------------------------- (gazes at wall)
V:  --------------------------- (looking at camera, smiling)

((turning to wall))<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<

15. (0.2)
A:  -------(hems)

>>>>>>(giggling)
V:  >>>>>>>>>>>>>(coming closer to S & A)

<<<<<<<<<<((turning to camera, smiling & giggling))

16. S:  А почему так получилось↑?
And:Q why so happen-ed:3SG:PST

'And why did it happen like that? '
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S: ((turning to A))

V: ------------------------((gazes at camera, smiling))

17. A: A ja ot-kuda znaju?

And:Q I where.from:ADV know

'And how would I know?'

S: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>(turning to wall)

V: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>(turning to wall)

18. S: A ta - eta prjamo toka u-hodit tuda na vytjashk-u?

And:Q that - this straight:ADJ only go.away:PRS:3SG there on:ALL cooker hood:ACC

'And that - this only goes exactly there to the cooker hood?'

S: <<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<((raising his hand))

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>((showing something))

((turning to A))

V: ((stepping away))

Vl: ------------------------((entering kitchen))

19. A: Da (. ) tam prjamo vy-hod=

Yes (. ) there straight way.out:SG:M

'Yes (. ) there exactly is the entrance=

A: X ((nodding))

Vl: ------------------------((gazes at wall))

20. S: =prjamo na vy-hod (. ) vot tak da?

straight on:ALL way.out:SG:M (. ) that so yes

'=exactly {to the entrance (. ) right there, yes?'

S: ((turning to wall))

A: X X ((nodding))

21. S: I povernyt’ jejo v printsip-i nikak voobsche ne vozmo=


'And to turn it in principle is absolutely for sure impossi='
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S: (turning his head to A) <<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<

22. A: =nere[al’no ]
unrealistic:ADJ:PRED
'=unre[alistic ]'

A: X ((shakes his head))

23. S: [eto nereal’no?]=
it unrealistic:ADJ:PRED
'[it is unrealistic]?='

24. A: =nerealno
unrealistic:ADJ:PRED
'=unrealistic'

A: X X ((shaking his head))

S: ----- ((turns his head to wall))

25. A: No! shto to nado [◦de◦]
But some PRT need:PRD:IMP
'But! Something has to be [◦do◦]'

26. S: [esli by eto byla vysota potolk-a (. ) tam (. )
if PRT this is:PST:F height ceiling-GEN
(.) there (.)
'[if the height of the ceiling was (. ) for example' (. )

V: -----------------------------((steps away))-------------------

27. S: podvesno-va on byl by ni-zhe santimetr-of na pjetnatsat’
suspend-ADJ he is:PST:M PRT:COND low-ADJ:GEN centimeter-GEN:PL on fifteen
'of suspended one it would be lower by fifteen cm'

S: ----------------------------((rising his hand))

>>>>>>>>>((lowering his hand))

<<<<<<<<<<((turning to A))
28. S: then in principle the tube could then be turned possibly?
yes? (gregated)

A: [da(.) da-da ]

S: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>( (turning to wall) )

unrealistic:ADJ:PRED yes

And now absolutely for sure unrealistic yes!?

31. A: =Opjat’ zhe pjatsat’ santimetrshto by stodvatsat-ku zagnut’

Again PRT fifteen centimeter-GEN:PL that PRT hundred.twenty-OBJ:ACC:F bend:INF

=But then again, fifteen cm to bend one-hundred and twenty

32. (0.2)

33. A: nu da nu mozhno i (. ) vmeste s povarat-am!
PRT yes PRT possible:PRED and (. ) together with turn:INS:M

well yes well possible and (. ) together with the turn:

A: X X ( (nodding) )

( (showing tube with his hands) )---------------------

Vl: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>( (turning to A) )

( (looking at A) )-----------------------------
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S: ------------------------------------------------ (gaze at wall)

34. Vl: Eto na [fse tri- na fse trits]
      It on all:PL thir:PROX:OBJ on all:PL thirt:PROX:OBJ
      This on [all thir- on all thirt]

Vl: ------------------------------------------------ (looks at A)

A: ----- (folding his arms and turning to wall)

35. A: [hh fse dvatsat’ pjat’] da

      all twenty five yes

      [hh all twenty five] yes

Vl: (turning and leaving kitchen) >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

36. A: eto nereal’no;=
      it unrealistic:PRED:NEG
      this is unrealistic;=

37. S: =Trebuet-sa reshenie dann-ova vo[pros-a]
      =Demand-REFL solution current-ADJ:SG:INS:M question-SG:GEN:M
      =A solution is required to this problem

S: >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (turning to A)

38. A: [reshenie?]
      solution

      [solution?]

A:

39. (0.2)

   A: X ((shakes his head))

   >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (hems)

40. V: ------------------- (coughs)

   S, A & V: ------------------- (gazes at wall)