**Summary.** The article is devoted to the linguistic study of communicative roles of the participants of interaction in the discourse of interrogation at the stage of pre-trial investigation. The purpose of the article is to identify, study, analyse and classify communicative roles of the participants of interrogation: an investigator and an interrogee. The institutional nature of the discourse of interrogation and its communicative organization in the form of dialogic speech determine the taxonomy and hierarchy of communicative roles. Based on the analysis made, we have identified such role types as status-institutional, status-category, categorical and operational roles. We single out in the interrogation discourse the category of status-institutional roles, which allows to limit a broad concept of status by the criteria of institutionality.
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**The problem under discussion.** The problem of the taxonomy of communicative roles still remains unresolved in modern linguistics. In other words, there are numerous classifications of roles based on different criteria according to the research priorities of those areas of pragmatics and discourse analysis, in the format of which such criteria were developed.

**Recent research and publications.** According to the traditional classification, roles are differentiated into status, positional and situational. The first group of roles characterizes the status of a communicant “from birth” by criteria of sex, nationality, religion. Positional roles correspond to professional and social statuses, determining a person’s place in society (doctor, lawyer, mother). Situational roles are variable and situation-dependent (buyer, seller, friend, etc.).

**Previously unsolved issues of the general problem.** According to Ukrainian researchers Kravchenko N. [1; 2] and Pasternak T. [3; 4] a certain imperfection of the classification is to allocate a separate category of status roles, as any role can be considered as a status one: the role is a dynamic aspect of social status, aimed at fulfilling the rights and obligations: there are no roles without a status and there is no status without roles. Besides, any individual is the bearer of several statuses, some times opposite due to the fact that he is a member of various groups, institutions, in which he holds certain positions [2, p. 74, 79].

Thus, in view of such considerations, in this study we single out as one of the members of the classification of communicative roles in the interrogation discourse the category of status-institutional roles, which allows to limit a broad concept of status by the criteria of institutionality. According to the bases of the critical discourse analysis, it allows to predict the asymmetry of the rights of speakers depending on their own powers in the format of the
institution of investigation. Among other classifications of roles that are alternative to traditional and which we use to build a taxonomy of communicative roles in the discourse of interrogation, we should mention the typology of communicative identities introduced by H. Sachs [5; 6], who proposed categorical identities / roles (democrat, acquaintance, teacher, doctor, patient), operational identities / roles (caring mother, real housewife) and relational or family identities / roles (mother – daughter, husband – wife, etc.). H. Sachs does not propose criteria for differentiating roles, because the main thing in his conversational-analytical concept is to substantiate how the orientation of participants to use roles determines their speech moves and conversation in general. That is, the distribution of roles is important in order to answer a number of important questions:

1) in what role category communicators are distributed during the interaction;
2) what are the conventional expectations regarding the "normal" behavior of those who are divided into a role category;
3) how the deviation from the expected behavior is marked and corrected in the interaction;
4) how the role categories are related [2, p. 80].

If we compare the traditional classification of roles and the typology of communicative identities of H. Sachs, the status and positional roles will correlate with categorical identities, and situational with operational.

Other classifications of communicative roles that can be used to build a role taxonomy given the specifics of the material are the division into roles: normalized and non-normalized (by the criterion of fixed role structure); sanctioned and unauthorized by society (criterion of compliance with social and ethical norms); standard and non-standard (on the basis of typicality for a certain society) [7, p. 5–18].

Quite interesting and correlated with the specifics of institutional discourse, is the classification of communicative roles proposed in the monographic study of T.A. Pasternak [4] on the material of the discourse of "job interview". In particular, the researcher proposes the differentiation of roles into status (which is the conceptual equivalent of institutional roles), status-category, category and operational.

The purpose of the article is to identify study, analyse and classify communicative roles of the participants of interrogation in the pre-trial investigation.

The object of the study is the discourse of interrogation at the stage of pre-trial investigation.

The subject of the study is communicative roles of a police officer and an interrogated person in the interrogation discourse.

Results and discussions. In the projection on the material of our study, the status role of the investigator realizes the global institutionally determined interactive goal of pre-trial investigation of criminal offenses in order to investigate the truth, reveal the crime and identify those guilty of its commission. Therefore, we consider it appropriate to clarify the name of such a role as a status-institutional.

The status-institutional role of the respondent is also determined by the global institutional goal: to state everything that they know in the case or from its individual circumstances.

Summarizing the above classifications of communicative roles, we divide the roles of communicators in the discourse of pre-trial investigation into status-institutional, status-category, categorical and operational.

Status-institutional roles belong to the standardized, established roles that are determined by the global goal of the interrogation discourse and are associated with the envisaged (institutionally normalized) scenarios of communicative behaviour of an investigator and an interrogated person.

Status-categorical roles are variants of realization of status-institutional roles and are defined by researchers as "a set of stereotypical, institutionally sanctioned, standardized role variants limited by a status role" [3, p. 72].

Categorical roles have double subordination: on the one hand, they are derived from status-category roles, as they implement the purpose and strategies of the interrogation discourse. On the other hand, categorical roles connect an investigator or an interrogee with certain social groups "outside" legal institutional communication. For example, the roles of "good / bad cop" can be played in various communicative situations during the teacher's communication with the student in pedagogical discourse, examination of the patient by doctors, in everyday communication, and so on. Categorical roles can be positioned in the format of socio-cultural scenarios in the narratives of the respondents.

![Figure 1. The taxonomy of the communicative roles of an investigator and an interrogee](image-url)
Finally, operational roles are variable implementations of both status-category and categorical roles according to the needs of communicators to adapt to the flow of interaction in the discourse of interrogation. Thus, they correlate with local tasks or with the tactics of an investigator / an interrogee.

The status-institutional roles of an investigator and an interrogee form an asymmetric role pair with the communicative dominance of the investigator as a representative of the institution, indexed in his speech by the exclusive right of communicative initiative, as well as the use of directive speech acts of information request. The asymmetry of the status roles of "an investigator-an interrogee" is revealed:

- in the duty of an interrogee to support the communicative initiative of an investigator and to answer their questions;
- in initiating the beginning and end of the conversation by an investigator;
- in the explicitly declared right of an investigator to ask questions ("I ask questions here, Mr. Smith") [1], including direct unmitigated questions ("How long have you resided at that address?" [1]);
- in the right to change the subject in order to cover the details of the case;
- in the application of "face-threatening" acts to an interrogee by expressing a negative assessment of their actions ("You are a liar"), distrust of the veracity of their testimony ("And it would not surprise you either, that there have been quite a number of defections, people who formerly worked for the KGB?" [1]);
- in the directive motivation to admit or convince the wrong position;
- in the right to control the correctness of the respondent's answer ("Are you saying that it's not true?" [1]), etc.

Discursive realization of status-institutional communicative roles are status-category roles, which are defined by researchers as "a set of stereotypical, institutionally sanctioned, normalized role variants limited by the status role" [3, p. 72], which are specific in the perspective of our research for the institute of pre-trial investigation and regulated interrogation situations.

In particular, the investigator consciously or unconsciously performs the status-categorical roles of "investigator" ("interested in finding out all the facts and circumstances of the case") [1], "defender of the rights of interrogees" ("Your interests must be protected") [1], "defender of the law", "impartial" ("that is being done with your permission and approval. Is that correct?" [1]), "accuser": "I am establishing quite clearly your dishonesty in this particular point. Firstly, you said that you received a misdirected phone call. Then you tell me that your wife answered a telephone to a man... who asked for you by name, and you are telling me that it was a misdirected call" [1].

**Conclusion.** The institutional nature of the discourse of interrogation and, at the same time, its communicative organization in the form of dialogic speech determines the taxonomy and hierarchy of communicative roles specific to this type of discursive pattern. We have identified such role types as status-institutional, status-category, categorical and operational roles. Peculiarities of status-institutional roles are conditioned by the institutional purpose of pre-trial investigation: for an investigator it is to reveal the crime and identify the perpetrators, for an interrogee it is to state everything they know on the case. The status-institutional pair of roles "investigator – Interrogated" is marked by asymmetric relations with the communicative dominance of an investigator as a representative of the institution, which is indexed by their exclusive right of communicative initiative. Role variants of status-institutional roles are status-category roles. Operational roles correspond to the tactics of the interlocutors in local interactive moves, and, to some extent, manifest the identity of an investigator and an interrogee based on psychological and other personal specific features.

**References:**

1. Kravchenko N.K. (2012) Prakticheskaya diskursoslogiya: shkoly, metody, metodiki sovremennogo diskurs-analiza. Prakticheskoye posobiye [Practical discourse: schools, methods, techniques of modern discourse analysis. A practical guide]. Lut'k: Volin'poligraf, 251 p.
2. Kravchenko N.K. (2017) Diskurs i diskurs-analiz: kratkaya entsiklopediya [Discourse and Discourse Analysis: A Brief Encyclopedia]. Kyiv: «Interservis», 286 p.
3. Pasternak T.A. (2012) Prahmalinhvistychni kharakterystyky dyskursu «spivbesida pry pryymoni na robotu» (na materiali anholomovnykh navchal'nykh tekstiv) [Pragmatic and linguistic characteristics of the discourse “job interview” (based on the English language texts); Dys. ... kand. filol. n.: 10.02.04. Odessa. nats. un-t im. I.I. Mechnikova. Odessa, 194 p.
4. Pasternak T.A. (2017) Prahmatyka institutsiynoho dyskursu «spivbesida»: linhvokomunikatyvniy aspekt [Pragmatics of the institutional discourse "job interview": linguistic and communicative aspect]; monohrifiya. Kyiv: NUBiP, 206 p.
5. Sacks H.A., Schegloff E., Jefferson G. (1974) Simplest systems for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation. Language, no. 50, pp. 696–735.
6. Sacks H. (1987) On the Preferences for Agreement and Contiguity in Sequences in Conversation, in G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds). Talk and Social Organization. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters, pp. 54–69.
7. Tarasov Ye.F. (1990) Rechevoye vozdeystviye: metodologiya i teoriya. Optimizatsiya rechevogo vozdeystviya [Speech impact: methodology and theory. Optimization of speech impact]. Moskva: Nauka.

**Illustrative material:**

1. Smith M.J. Police interviews. Available at: http://Cryptome.org/smith-inter.zip