

# Communicative Silence in Apology Situation

Yuliya Tufanova  
*Irkutsk National Research  
 Technical University  
 Institute of Linguistics and Cross-  
 Cultural Communication,  
 Department of Foreign Languages  
 for Humanities  
 Irkutsk, Russia  
 ttufanova@mail.ru  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3933-6578>*

Tatyana Maklakova  
*Irkutsk State University  
 International Institute of  
 Economics and Linguistics,  
 Department of Linguistics and  
 Liguodidactics  
 Irkutsk, Russia  
 tanya-834@mail.ru  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5631-3220>*

Mariya Chupanovskaya  
*Irkutsk State University  
 Institute of Philology, Foreign  
 Languages and Media  
 Communication, Department of  
 Russian Language and General  
 Linguistics  
 Irkutsk, Russia  
 mariya-chupanovskaya@yandex.ru  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4638-8832>*

**Abstract** — The article considers silence as a nonverbal component of apology situation. The general model of this situation is described and the goals pursued by the participants of the situation are identified. The basic features of the communicative situation of apology as a conflict one are showed. The main functions of communicatively significant silence in apology situation are discussed. As the study indicated, silence performs the communicative (the expression of the addresser or addressee's intentions) and the emotive (the reflection of the psycho-emotional states of communicants) functions in the situation. The silence used by the addressee of apology refers to the courtly strategy of behaviour in conflict situations that is chosen unconsciously and reflects the characteristics of his or her personality. The silence of partners in apology situation is a unit of communication and, depending on the goals and relationships of the interlocutors, can have both cooperative and conflict orientation. In particular, communicatively significant silence in the situation may express both acceptance and nonacceptance of apology. The combination of communicatively significant silence and other nonverbal means of communication may express the addresser's communicative intention (the intention of apology) in the situation directly.

**Keywords** — *silence, apology situation, conflict, nonverbal, communicative.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

In modern linguistics, studies based on formal criteria have been replaced by the desire to take into account human factor, since in order to know linguistic phenomena, it is necessary to turn to a native speaker – a person who speaks, a thinking person. Anthropocentrism of modern linguistics is manifested in addressing various aspects of human communication. "Communication, being a complex socio-psychological process of mutual understanding between people, is carried out through verbal and nonverbal means" [1]. Currently, research on both verbal and nonverbal aspects of communication is one of the priorities in linguistic science. The problem of interrelation of verbal and nonverbal components of human communication seems to be the most urgent.

In this regard, the relevance of the chosen topic is determined by: 1) the focus of modern linguistic science on the study of both verbal and nonverbal speech behaviour problems; 2) the need to expand knowledge of the patterns of interpersonal interaction in a nonverbal way; 3) the significance of the apology situation in various areas of human communication; 4) insufficient development of issues related to nonverbal interaction of partners in apology situation.

The research is based on the following hypothesis: partners' silence in apology situation is a unit of communication and, depending on the goals and attitudes of interlocutors, can have both cooperative and conflict orientation. The scientific novelty of this study is due to the verification of the hypothesis on sufficiently extensive empirical material.

The objective of this work is to identify the functional features of silence in the communicative situation of apology. Achieving the goal of the research involves the following tasks: 1) to clarify the apparatus of the initial concepts necessary for the study; 2) to systematize the results of empirical research relevant to the subject matter of the work; 3) to identify the main functional characteristics of participants' silence in the communicative situation of apology.

To solve these tasks, a complex of empirical and theoretical research methods was used, including the methodology of modeling, observation and interpretation, as well as the functional-semantic analysis. We consider the written text as a representation of the communicative-pragmatic potential of nonverbal means of communication, in particular silence. The research material was data drawn mainly from dictionaries and encyclopedic publications, texts of Internet sites, texts of English-speaking authors' fiction (11,629 pages). Research body was about 1200 examples of dialogical speech.

## II. COMMUNICATIVELY SIGNIFICANT SILENCE

«Communicative interaction is a form of social interaction where individuals use overtly intentional acts, such as utterances, gestures or controlled facial expressions»

[2]. In speech situations, nonverbal components contain intentional, emotional, social, and other components that are layered on the main subject-logical content. «Gestures do provide a significant, moderate benefit to communication» [3]. «They help maintain the conversation as a social system» [4]. They do not have a direct effect on the logical content of the statement, they are superimposed on the meaning of the phrase itself and are the factor of emotional and psychological impact on communicants.

Information transmitted verbally and nonverbally may not be the same. In cases where there is a contradiction between verbal and nonverbal speech behaviour, people usually believe in nonverbal manifestations. Nonverbal speech behaviour reveals the true, often deliberately concealed intentions of a person. Nonverbal communication components may express emotions, streamline, accompany or replace speech.

Being a nonverbal means of communication, silence is one of the essential components of human interaction. It is polysemantic and multifunctional. In modern linguistics, silence is studied in the context of the communicative approach to language. In this case the fact of constant interaction between participants of communication and «the mutual determinism of their communicative behaviour» is taken into account [5]. In this regard, silence is considered as a part of the dialogical interaction of communicants.

Silence is as natural as speech. Silence accompanies people throughout their life and is a prerequisite for communication: when we are silent, we give others the opportunity to speak. It's interesting that silence, opposed to speaking, is seen as one of the achievements of civilization. According to E. Hemingway, a person needs only two years to learn to speak and as much as fifty years to learn to keep silent. In this regard, even the silence rules are developed (similar to the maxims of verbal cooperative behaviour). W. Pisarek advises «to prefer silence: 1) when you doubt whether to say «this» or not to talk about «this»; 2) if you come to the conclusion that in a collective it is you who speak most often, long and loudly; 3) if you are not sure that you can say something really important and interesting for listeners and readers; 4) if you are surrounded by people among whom there is no one who could or would like to admit that you were right; 5) if you are so angry with someone that you cannot notice any of his merits; 6) if you are not able to cope with the consequences of what you want to say for you and other people» [5].

Based on the understanding of silence as a «zero sign» of the communication process, traditionally scientists divide communicative and non-communicative silence. According to N. D. Arutyunova, in the first case it is semiotic, in the second it is symptomatic. Silence as a symptom may be caused by indecision, confusion, etc. In this case, «it is significant as a symptom, but not as a sign» [6]. In other words, communicative silence is the significant interruption of speech chain in the process of communication and is a means of interpersonal interaction. Communicatively significant silence, as one of the nonverbal components of language communication, is able to perform a communicative function, i.e. be a unit of communication.

Communicatively significant silence conveys information from the sender to the addressee. The addressee decodes it

based on knowledge of the context of the situation, presuppositions, and other circumstances of the communication process. Communicative silence may have propositional and intentional content, as well as reflect the psycho-emotional state of the participants of communication. We consider silence as communicatively significant if it is used intentionally and consciously for the purpose of transmitting certain information.

So, communicatively significant silence is tantamount to an act of utterance, since it carries certain information. The addressee, possessing communicative competence, as well as being capable of correlating and comparing fragments of information, perceives the meaning inherent in the act of silence. Communicative silence acquires meaning under the influence of a certain pragmatic situation, speech background, mimic accompaniment, gestures. At the same time, the line between silence and speaking loses clarity, since silence acquires the signs of speaking (loud, eloquent, meaningful, meaningless, etc.) [6].

We assume silence as a definite communicative action since it has a definite goal, intention and motive and is directed to the addressee. The communicative informational nature of silence is primarily due to the fact that silence is a speech behaviour, an act of abstaining from speech, a lack of speech, that under certain conditions is a sign («zero sign»), carrying certain information. Unlike unintentional silence («a natural sign»), intentional silence, aimed at the addressee, is an arbitrary sign, is a communicative behaviour in the strict sense of the term. The main goal of such behaviour is to report certain information, meaning, sense.

### III. COMMUNICATIVE CONFLICT

In this article, we consider silence as a means of interpersonal communication in conflict. The word «conflict» comes from the Latin *conflictus* (a collision) and almost unchanged in many languages (*conflict* – Eng., *konflikt* – Germ., *le conflit* – French). Conflict is an integral part of human communication; it is involved in the development of interpersonal relationships and «a pragmatic orientation to communicative interactions» [7]. At the same time conflict is a form of expression of contradiction, it is the interaction of several persons with mutually exclusive goals. In other words, «the interests of sender and receiver can conflict» [8]. As a phenomenon, the reality of conflict arises only in the case when the contradictions encountered in it are personally significant for each of the participants in the communication. *Homo loquens* is revealed in different ways in various speech situations. Most of all, the individual characteristics of personality are manifested in speech situations, «carrying elements of psychological stress. The situations of this kind include communicative conflict – a verbal collision, which is based on aggression, expressed by linguistic means» [9]. Obviously, the conflict is always accompanied by great psychological stress, emotional discomfort. «Discrete emotions uniquely shape policy preferences in conflict through their unique emotional goals and action tendencies» [10].

The basis of communicative conflict is usually the desire of one (or both) of communicative partners to relieve psychological stress at the expense of the interlocutor. Communicative conflict is preceded by the feeling of frustration – «psychological discomfort that occurs when it is

impossible to achieve any goal. In interpersonal interaction, frustration occurs when (in the opinion of one of the conflicting parties) the communicative partner violates the norms (rules) of behaviour» [9].

Researchers distinguish between conflict and conflict situation. Conflict is a process, which has specific characteristics, includes a beginning and an end. Communicative conflict is a state of relations between interlocutors, «which: 1) is characterized by a clash of intentions, assessments, opinions, attitudes, etc.; 2) as a rule, accompanied by negative emotions; 3) has a formal structure: the beginning of the conflict, the process of conflict and its end». «Conflict is most clearly manifested in an interpersonal communicative situation, which fixes it (the conflict between participants) at a specific time period». We consider such communicative situation a conflict one. «Communicative behaviour of interlocutors in a conflict situation is characterized by confrontation between their opposing intentions, goals, assessments, views or attitudes» [11].

Everyday conflict, as a rule, is the result of dissatisfaction of one of the participants of interpersonal interaction with the behaviour of another. In some situations «such discontent becomes a consequence of communicative misunderstanding, which is based on the difference in the speech strategies of the participants of communication» [9].

#### IV. COMMUNICATIVE SITUATION OF APOLOGY

One of these (conflict) situations is apology situation. The general model of communicative situation of apology is characterized by the presence of the following components: 1) two, at least, communication partners: the addresser (the person who brings an apology) and «the addressee (the person to whom the apology is directed)»; 2) damage (potential/real); 3) the purpose of communication; 4) communicative circumstances; 5) verbal and/or nonverbal expression of communicative intentions of the interlocutors [11].

The highlighted structural components of apology situation are interrelated, mutually influenced and interdependent: 1) the damage (real or possible) affects the actual occurrence of apology situation; 2) the degree of damage affects the addresser and defines the choice of various ways of expressing apology; 3) the severity of the damage affects the addressee as well, determining his or her communicative reaction to the addresser's speech actions; 4) the circumstances of communication affect partners' speech behaviour (the addresser and the addressee) in the situation; 5) the addresser influences the addressee using verbal and/or nonverbal expression of the communicative intention of apology; 6) the addressee responds (verbally and/or nonverbally) to the expression of the communicative intention of apology by the addresser.

The most important components of the situation being studied are the addresser (who apologizes) and the addressee (victim) as linguistic personalities – the bearers of certain knowledge and ideas. In the process of speech communication, interlocutors exchange remarks, so a dialogue occurs between them. At the same time, the roles of communicants are constantly changing: the speaker becomes the listener and vice versa. In this situation, constant

adjustment of speech behaviour with a focus on the recipient is extremely important. The addresser in the communicative situation of apology does not only express the corresponding speech intention but also demonstrates his or her attitude to the interlocutor, to the situation in general, presents itself in a certain light. Therefore, the success of communicative interaction in apology situation depends not only on the ways of expressing apology that the speaker chooses but also on the way how the interlocutors' relations develop in general. Here the mood for a certain vision of the situation plays an important role, since, as psychologists note, everyone hears exactly what he or she wants to hear. In this case «the communicative competence is more important in social interaction» than the linguistic competence [12].

«People take part in a conversation in order to plan, debate, discuss, gossip, and carry out other social processes» [13]. In the situation of interpersonal communication, speech intention is closely related to the purpose of communication. It is believed that in any communicative situation the interlocutors pursue certain nonverbal goals, which, in point of fact, are the mechanism regulating the communication process on the whole. The communicative goal is the main parameter of statement interpretation from the pragmatic point of view. Most studies of the problem of human communication suggest the thesis about the lack of independence of speech as an ontological background, in particular, its subordination to the goals of certain activities.

Traditionally, the exchange of information, as well as the impact on the partner are considered to be the purpose of verbal communication. At the same time it is important that the addressee understands the meaning of the statement and the goals of the speaker and vice versa.

For linguistic analysis, it is not so much the situation itself that is significant, but its interpretation or understanding of it among the participants of communicative interaction. As situations or contexts «are constructs of the participants themselves» [14]. Communication partners should focus on those specific features of the communicative situation that may affect the correct understanding of statement meaning, intentions and goals of the speaker [14].

It is necessary to emphasize that in apology situation the addressee, perceiving the addresser's statement, immediately demonstrates a response, which can be positive or negative, emotional or neutral, etc. The addresser, for his or her part, expects from the addressee not a passive perception of the message, but a verbal or nonverbal response. Thus, the speaker and the addressee, possessing not only linguistic but also communicative competence, in each particular situation of apology choose the necessary verbal and/or nonverbal means for expressing their communicative intentions.

Considering the communicative situation of apology, it should be noted that the primary goals determine the very fact of apology situation emergence, the goals of the second order determine the choice of a verbal/nonverbal variant of the behaviour of communicants. The primary goal of the addresser in the communicative situation of apology is to prevent or resolve the conflict between the interaction partners. All this ultimately leads to the realization of the secondary goal – the preservation of harmonious relations between them. The speaker, using some formulas of apology, has a certain effect on the addressee, expecting to get the

perlocutionary effect. As a result, any real changes in the activity or psycho-emotional state of the addressee in the apology situation are conditioned by the meanings that he extracts from the message of the addresser.

So, in the apology situation the speaker makes a conscious attempt to influence the addressee, namely, to influence his attitude towards the event, his psycho-emotional state. The immediate reaction to the statement, first of all, is emotion. Explicit or implicit meanings are hidden in emotions. If the opinion on the state of things changes, then the emotions change too. The influence on the addressee in apology situation is made increasingly relying on emotions. Apologizing, the speaker wants to affect the addressee, so to bring him to such a psycho-emotional state so that the addressee could forgive/excuse him. However, the rational factor is present here on a par with the emotional one. In this case, the speaker can use different mechanisms of influence. Thus, the use of various intensifiers, repetitions, nonverbal components, in addition to direct formulas of apology, enhances the impact potential of the entire utterance.

#### V. SILENCE IN THE COMMUNICATIVE SITUATION OF APOLOGY

In the process of human interaction, verbal and nonverbal means of communication are closely interrelated. And often the intentions of the interlocutors are expressed in a nonverbal way. Our study notes that the addresser's communicative intention of apology can be expressed in a nonverbal way. The reaction of the addressee can also be expressed nonverbally.

We believe that nonverbal components of communication in apology situation can perform emotive, communicative, appellate and representative functions (I.N. Gorelov's classification). The emotive function of nonverbal means is the reflection of the psycho-emotional state of interlocutors, the communicative one is performing interpersonal interaction (in our case – a nonverbal expression of apology by the addresser and nonverbal reaction by the addressee). Attitude to the subject of speech, expressed nonverbally, is the essence of the representative function [15]. In apology situation, a significant role is played by the extent to which the words of communicants correspond to their nonverbal signals, since they (nonverbal signs), as a rule, carry information about the true psycho-emotional state, real intentions of the interlocutors.

We are primarily interested in silence which is communicatively significant. Obviously, in an apology situation, the speaker and the addressee perform their communicative roles. For the addressee of apology as a listener, silence is, firstly, his or her communicative role, secondly, the addressee's reaction to the speaker's previous remark can be expressed by silence. In such a situation, silence acquires «intentional, emotional, evaluative, etc. content» [16] and can express both acceptance and non-acceptance of apology depending on the situation. For the person who brings apology, silence in combination with other nonverbal means of communication can directly perform the role of apology. For example, head movements, performing «semantic, discourse, and communicative functions» can «convey propositional content» [17].

The collected data of empirical material showed that in apology situation the use of communicatively significant silence by the addressee rather than the addresser is more frequent. The semantics of silence, in this case, is diverse: insult, resentment, misunderstanding, anger, bitterness, etc. Based on this, we can assume that a person, who is silent has the reason and the purpose of his or her silence. The interlocutor does not always have accurate information, but sometimes he or she may know the reason for the addressee's silence. In such communicative situations, often there is a problem of misunderstanding between the interlocutors. This, in turn, can lead to the violation of information transmission. The accuracy of «sending and receiving of nonverbal social information» depends on age, «personal and social adjustment and academic achievements» [18].

The variety of verbal and nonverbal forms of interaction used in conflict communicative situations, K.F. Sedov refers to the three types of speech strategies: invective, courtly, rational-heuristic. As the basis of the typology, the author uses the «feature of affective behaviour that the linguistic personality uses to remove frustration»: 1) the invective strategy of conflict communicative behavior is associated with low signedness: communicative manifestations here reflect emotional and biological reactions and «poured into affective discharge in the form of abuse, swearing, violent language (invectives)»; 2) the courtly strategy of conflict communicative behaviour correlates with increased semiotics, due to the communicator's fixation to etiquette forms of social interaction. «As an extreme form of passion, in this case, the preference is given to crying»; 3) the rational-heuristic strategy of speech behaviour in conflict communicative situation is based on rationality and sanity. This type of discharge manifests itself in the form of laughter, as an affective reaction. Negative emotions in such cases are expressed by implication, indirectly [9].

The silence used by the addressee of apology refers to the courtly strategy of nonverbal behaviour in conflict communicative situation that is chosen unconsciously and reflects the characteristics of his or her personality. For example:

*– I have said all I intend to say. It has been very hard for me to do this – very hard. I regret the necessity. You have my card. Please note the name. I will come any time you suggest, or you can write to me. I will not detain you any longer. I am sorry. I hope you will see fit to say nothing to your husband of my visit – it will be advisable that you should keep your own counsel in the matter. I value his friendship very highly, and I am sincerely sorry.*

*Jennie only stared at the floor. Mr. O'Brien went out into the hall to get his coat [19].*

In the situation above, the addresser first attempts to justify his behaviour and cause pity in the interlocutor by saying *It has been very hard for me to do this – very hard*. Then he tries to apologize using statements with the meaning of regret (*I regret the necessity*), and the etiquette formula, uttered twice (*I am sorry. I am sincerely sorry*). In the second case, the apology formula is accompanied by the intensifier (*sincerely*) to enhance the impact on the addressee. In general, in this situation, the speaker suffers a communicative failure, because, in response to his apologies

and attempts to justify himself, the addressee is silent, realizing thereby the courtly strategy of behaviour in conflict communicative situation (*Jennie only stared at the floor*). The lack of verbal reaction of the addressee indicates, most likely, that she is not satisfied with the apology and, therefore, the conflict is not settled. The addressee's silence is the reflection of her psycho-emotional state. Thus, it is her nonverbal speech behaviour that performs, in addition to the emotive, communicative function, since it is the nonverbal response to the verbal apology of the addressee.

Turn to another example:

– *Where would you think of going if it came to that? – he asked curiously.*

– *Oh, I'd find some place. Do you remember that little town of Sandwood, this side of Kenosha? I have often thought it would be a pleasant place to live.*

– *I don't like to think of this, – he said finally in an outburst of frankness. – It doesn't seem fair. The conditions have all been against this union of ours. I suppose I should have married you in the first place. I'm sorry now that I didn't.*

*Jennie choked in her throat but said nothing.*

– *Anyhow, this won't be the last of it, if I can help it, – he concluded [19].*

In the considered communicative situation, the addresser uses the statement *The conditions have all been against this union of ours*, trying to justify his behaviour. He regrets his inaction (*I suppose I should have married you in the first place*) and then apologizes with the etiquette formula (*I'm sorry now that I didn't*). Using the expression *I don't like to think of this*, the addresser makes it clear that he does not like the current situation. Nevertheless, all attempts of the addresser to mitigate and settle the conflict do not lead to an obvious positive effect, therefore this communicative interaction cannot be called successful. In this case, the addressee unconsciously chooses the courtly strategy of behaviour in a conflict that is highly semiotic. In particular, her reaction is expressed by the silence, which performs the emotive function and indicates the state of psycho-emotional discomfort. At the same time, the silence of the addressee of apology is the nonverbal response to the interlocutor, thus performing the communicative function.

Silence is one or another kind of opposition, it does not always contribute to the harmonization of relations between interlocutors. As a rule, it introduces disharmony, and sometimes hostility in interpersonal relationships. For example:

– *I'm really sorry, Father. I should have been more thoughtful, really.*

*Mr. Kronsky kept silent. Without a word, without a look at Nick, he was sitting in front of the fireplace. Suddenly Nick felt cold and irritation.*

– *Are you mad at me, Father? Do forgive me.*

*No answer. Nick waited a minute...*

– *I repeat, Father. It was a mistake. Anyway, I'm not a schoolboy I used to be ten years ago, no.*

*He left the room, banging the door [20].*

In the example above, the speaker apologizes with the help of combined use of the etiquette formula enhanced by the intensifier (*I'm really sorry*) and the statement confirming his guilt (*I should have been more thoughtful, really*). The addressee chooses the courtly strategy of behaviour in a conflict situation and responds with silence (*Mr. Kronsky kept silent*), does not pay attention to the interlocutor (*Without a word, without a look at Nick, he was sitting in front of the fireplace*). Silence is used in this situation intentionally, consciously and it shows the psycho-emotional state of the addressee of the apology. Then the speaker makes the second attempt to receive forgiveness, uttered more emotionally (*Do forgive me*). However, this time he does not receive an answer again (*No answer*), that indicates the addressee's unwillingness to forgive the speaker. Such an attitude of the addressee has a definite effect on the speaker: he loses his temper (*Suddenly Nick felt cold and irritation*). Trying yet to restore good relations, the speaker explains that he made a mistake (*It was a mistake*). But emotions take over, and instead of an apology, the speaker reproaches the addressee (*Anyway, I'm not a schoolboy I used to be ten years ago, no*). In this case, the addresser suffers a communicative failure. The reaction of the addressee (silence), says that he does not accept the apology. Thus, silence performs the communicative function, as it expresses the addressee's nonverbal reaction to the speaker's apology.

In dialogue, silence can express many emotional and semantic shades: rejection of something, disapproval, self-withdrawal, non-intervention, indifference, embarrassment, fear, etc. However, sometimes silence is the indicator of solidarity with the interlocutor. Our study notes that silence expresses solidarity with the interlocutor (accepting an apology) only with gestures, facial expressions and other nonverbal means of representing speech behaviour.

Consider the following example:

– *Forgive my saying so, but sitting here and being just is much more warping <...>.*

*Mr. Danby smiled [21].*

In this case, the speaker's prospective apology (*Forgive my saying so*) serves to eliminate the potential negative effect of the words he utters (<...> *but sitting here and being just is much more warping*). The addressee of the apology reacts to the speaker's statement using nonverbal means of communication. Here we see the combined use of two nonverbal components of communication – smile and silence (*Mr. Danby smiled*). Such a reaction is positive and suggests that the apology is accepted. In other words, the combination of these nonverbal components of the addressee's behaviour performs, besides the emotive, communicative function, since it contributes to the implementation of the communication process, replacing the addressee's speech.

## VI. CONCLUSION

The analysis suggests the following conclusions. Interpersonal interaction in apology situation relies on both verbal and nonverbal speech behaviour of the interlocutors. It is the reflection of their psycho-emotional states, interpersonal relationships, and also bears the imprint of the

personalities of communication partners. In the apology situation communicatively significant silence is used more frequently by the addressee rather than by the addresser. The silence used by the addressee of apology refers to the courtly strategy of nonverbal behaviour in conflict communicative situation. This behaviour strategy is chosen unconsciously by the addressee and reflects the characteristics of his personality.

Silence as the structural component of apology situation carries the special communicative load and includes all the variety of meanings that can be expressed with the help of language as well, therefore silence in this case is not the absence of speech, but the transfer of information in a certain way. To decode this information correctly, the interlocutor must take into account all the nuances of the specific speech situation, since silence can affect the addressee and the addresser both positively and negatively.

The main functions performed by communicatively significant silence in apology situation are: 1) the emotive function, as silence is the reflection of such psycho-emotional states of communicants as pride, tension, fear, horror, alienation, anger, bewilderment, surprise, excitement, shock, embarrassment, resentment, pride, contempt, remorse, hatred and others; 2) the communicative function, since silence serves as the means of expressing the addressee's reaction — accepting the apology (only in combination with other nonverbal means of communication) or not accepting the apology. The combination of communicatively significant silence and other nonverbal means of communication sometimes expresses the addresser's communicative intention (the intention of apology) in the situation directly.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] T.S. Ryzhkova, "Communicative aspects of verbal and nonverbal representation of *Freundlichkeit*," in *Foreign languages and intercultural communication: the role and place in modern education*, 2014, pp. 47-53. (In Russian).
- [2] W. Reich, "The cooperative nature of communicative acts," in *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 43, issue 5, pp. 1349-1365, 2011.
- [3] A.B. Hostetter, "When Do Gestures Communicate? A Meta-Analysis," in *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 137, issue 2, pp. 297-315, 2011.
- [4] J.B. Bavelas, N. Chovil, D.A. Lawrie, and A.Wade, "Interactive Gestures," in *Discourse Processes*, vol. 15, issue 4, pp. 469-489, 1992.
- [5] M. Kita, "Inexpressible and unexpressed for a native speaker," *Direct and indirect communication*, 2003, pp. 159-177. (In Russian).
- [6] N.D. Arutyunova, "The Phenomenon of Silence," *Language about language*, 2000, pp. 417-436. (In Russian).
- [7] L. Comparini, "The use of justifications in the linguistic construction of agency and social connection in Latina mother-child conflict," in *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 57, pp. 57-67, 2013.
- [8] J.A. Russell, J.A. Bachorowski, and J.M. Fernandez-Dols, "Facial and vocal expressions of emotion," in *Annual review of psychology*, vol. 54, pp. 329-349, 2003.
- [9] K.F. Sedov, "Language personality in the aspect of psycholinguistic conflictology," in *Dialogue*, vol. 21, 2019. URL: <https://www.dialog21.ru/digest/2002/articles/sedov> (date of access: 13.01.2019) (In Russian).
- [10] E. Halperin, and M.R. Tagar, "Emotions in conflicts: understanding emotional processes sheds light on the nature and potential resolution of intractable conflicts," in *Current Opinion in Psychology*, vol. 17, pp. 94-98, 2017.
- [11] Yu.V. Tufanova, "Peculiarities of interlocutors' verbal communicative behavior in apology situation," in *SHS Web of Conferences*, vol. 50, 2018. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185001189> (date of access: 17.03.2019).
- [12] F.H. Felemban, "Building up Learners' Communicative Competence: the Politeness Principle," in *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 46, pp. 70-76, 2012.
- [13] H.H. Clark, and E.F. Schaefer, "Contributing to discourse," in *Cognitive Science*, vol. 13, issue 2, pp. 259-294, 1989.
- [14] T.A. van Dijk, "Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach," *Pompeu Fabra University*, 2008, pp. 1-267.
- [15] I.N. Gorelov, "Nonverbal components of communication," *ComBook*, 2006, pp. 1-112. (In Russian).
- [16] N.I. Formanovskaya, "Speech communication: communicative and pragmatic approach," in *Russian language*, 2002, pp. 1-216. (In Russian).
- [17] E.Z. McClave, "Linguistic functions of head movements in the context of speech," in *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 32, issue 7, pp. 855-878, 2000.
- [18] S. Nowicki, and M.P. Duke, "Individual-differences in the nonverbal-communication of affect-the diagnostic-analysis of nonverbal accuracy scale," in *Journal of nonverbal behavior*, vol. 18, issue 1, pp. 9-35, 1994.
- [19] T. Driser, "Jennie Gerhardt," *Progress Publishers*, 1972, pp. 1-359.
- [20] M. Lerner, "The Doubts of His Heart," *Clouder*, 1995, pp. 1-267.
- [21] J. Galsworthy, "The White Monkey. A Modern Comedy," *Foreign Languages Publishing House*, vol. 1, 1956, pp. 1-328.