People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Abdelhamid Ibn Badis University

Faculty of foreign languages
Department of English

Suggested Course in "Fundamental Concepts of Discourse Analysis"

For M1 Language Sciences Students

Dr. Aoumeur Hayat

2022-2023

Preface

The Aims of This Course

The primary goal of this course is to provide the essential study material for the course "Major Concepts in Discourse Analysis" (Concepts fondamentaux en analyse du discours) for first-year master's students specialising in language sciences at the Department of English. It might, however, be used in any other course on discourse analysis because it provides fundamental theoretical and empirical knowledge on the subject. The following are the course's broad objectives:

- Introduce students to major discourse analysis theories, concepts, notions and methods.
- Prepare students for more advanced courses (e.g., critical discourse analysis).
- Introduce students to various techniques, analytical units, tactics, and functions.

There are also certain objectives that are stated at the start of each unit.

Content of this Course

Because discourse analysis is such a broad field, it would be impossible to cover all related research in a work of such limited scope as this course. Nonetheless, I have chosen resources (concepts, theories, and techniques) that are particularly pertinent and have been often discussed in academic publications and journals. The topics chosen also correspond to the educational objectives outlined on the canvas.

Content Organization

The course is divided into 7 units. Each unit has both theoretical and empirical components. All of them are presented by providing their specific objectives, followed by the theoretical development of the topic in question (major ideas and concepts). The coursebook concludes with research questions. Finally, there is an extensive bibliography at the end.

Master's Programme in Language Sciences

This two-year programme is designed to broaden and improve students' understanding in language-related subjects. The first-year master's programme in language sciences includes classes in discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, traditional sociolinguistics, phonetics, phonology, and major linguistic theories. The master's program's second year includes courses in feminist critical discourse analysis, language policy, and planning.

Prior knowledge and skills of learners were taken into account when designing the courses. The first year licence linguistics course covers topics such as language origins, language design features, approaches to language study, and pre-Saussurean linguistics. In the second year, students are introduced to linguistic subfields, with a special emphasis on functional linguistics. The third-year linguistics course introduces students to structural linguistics, Chomskyan mentalism, and Austin and Searle's theory of the speech act (theories of form, meaning, and knowledge), as well as contextual linguistics topics such as discourse, language variation, language and culture, language planning, and language policy.

Because in-class time is limited to 90 minutes per week, it is critical that teachers focus on the main points of each unit (depending on the circumstances) and that students do their assigned readings and take notes on key points prior to each class so that they can participate in class discussions. Some topics demand more room in terms of content length because they cover many concepts and include numerous examples. It is up to the teacher, however, to establish a balance by emphasising on pertinent points for each unit.

Course Outcomes

- ✓ Students will have exposure to a wide range of concepts and theories in discourse analysis.
- ✓ Students will be able to understand the working of language by relating the word to the wider social context.
- ✓ Students will learn how to use linguistic, cultural and social resources and make inferences to understand and interpret verbal and written texts.
- ✓ Students will be prepared for more advanced courses in linguistics.

Table of Contents

UNIT 1

INTRODUCING DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Discourse analytical approaches take as their starting point the claim of structuralist and poststructuralist linguistic philosophy that our access to reality is always through language. With language, we create representations of reality that are never mere reflections of a pre-existing reality but contribute to constructing reality. That does not mean that reality itself does not exist. Meanings and representations are real. Physical objects also exist, but they only gain meaning through discourse.

<div align="right">(Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, pp. 8-9)</div>

MAIN OBJECTIVES

➢ Trace the development of the discipline across time.

➢ Define the scope and purposes of the discipline.

➢ Explain the discipline's interdisciplinary nature.

➢ Define the terms "text," "discourse," and "genre."

1.1. Discourse Analysis: Its Origins and Development

Discourse analysis examines the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used. It examines both written, visual and spoken texts, ranging from conversation to highly institutionalized forms of speech. In the 1960s and early 1970s, various disciplines, including linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology, and sociology, contributed to its development.

At a time when linguistics focused mostly on the analysis of individual phrases, Zellig Harris wrote a paper titled "Discourse Analysis" (1952). Harris was interested in the distribution of linguistic elements in lengthy texts as well as the connections between the text and its social context, but this study is very different from the discourse analysis we are accustomed to today. In the early years, the rise of semiotics and the French structuralist approach to the study of narrative were also significant. In the 1960s, Dell Hymes gave a sociological perspective by analyzing speech in its social context (e.g. Hymes 1964). Austin (1962), Searle (1969), and Grice (1975) were also significant in the study of language as social action, as evidenced by speech-act theory and the elaboration of conversational maxims, as well as the emergence of pragmatics, the study of meaning in context (e;g Levinson 1983; Leech 1983). Halliday's functional approach to language (e.g., Halliday 1973) has ties to the Prague School of Linguistics, which had a significant impact on British discourse analysis. The framework developed by Halliday emphasizes the social roles of language as well as the thematic and informational organization of speech and writing.

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) at the University of Birmingham established a model for the description of teacher-student dialogue based on a hierarchical organization of discourse units. Other similar work has dealt with doctor-patient interaction, service encounters, interviews, debates and business negotiations, as well as monologues. Novel work in the British tradition has also been done on intonation in discourse. The British work has principally followed structural-linguistic criteria, on the basis of the isolation of units, and sets of rules defining well-formed sequences of discourse. Also relevant to the development of discourse analysis as a whole is the work of text grammarians, working mostly with the written language.

Text grammarians see texts as language elements strung together in relationships with one another that can be defined. Linguists such as Van Dijk (1972), De Beaugrande (1980), Halliday and Hasan (1976) have made a significant impact in this area. The Prague School of linguists, with their interest in the structuring of information in discourse, has also been influential. Its most important contribution has been to show the links between grammar and discourse.

Discourse Analysis has evolved into a vast and diversified field whose commonality lies in the description of language above the sentence level and an interest in the circumstances and cultural forces that influence language usage. It is also increasingly serving as a backdrop for studies in Applied Linguistics, particularly second language learning and instruction.

1.2. Why Discourse Analysis?

Yule, in his book "The Study of Language" (2006), begins chapter 12 on "Discourse Analysis" with the following example from "Seinfeld" (1993) to introduce the notion of "discourse."

> There are two types of favors, the big favor and the small favor .You
> can measure the size of the favor by the pause that a person takes after
> they ask you to" Do me a favor." Small favor - small pause. "Can you
> do me a favor, hand me that pencil " No pause at all. Big favors are,
> "Could you do me a favor, .." Eight seconds go by. "Yeah? What?" ". .
> . well " The longer it takes them to get to it, the bigger the pain it's
> going to be. Humans are the only species that do favors. Animals don't
> do favors. A lizard doesn't go up to a cockroach and say, "Could you
> do me a favor and hold still, I'd like to eat you alive," That's a big
> favor even with no pause.

<div align="right">(Jerry Seinfeld, 1993. Cited in Yule, 2006, p. 124)</div>

According to Yule (2006), in the study of language, some of the most interesting questions arise in connection with the way language is "used" rather than what its components are. When we are interested in investigating:

- How it is that language-users interpret what other language-users intend to convey.
- How it is that we, as language users , make sense of what we read in texts, understand what speakers mean despite what they say, recognize connected vs jumbled or incoherent discourse, and successfully take part in that complex activity called conversation

Then, we are conducting what is known as discourse analysis. Therefore, DA is a method for understanding what is going on (Yule, 2006).

1.3. The Multidisciplinary Nature of DA

Discourse studies also have the significant feature of being fundamentally multidisciplinary, which allows them to extend beyond linguistic boundaries into a wide range of fields. Discourse analysis incorporates linguistics, poetry, semiotics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, and communication study, as noted by Van Dijk (2002). Moreover, he contends that, due to discourse's complexity, we must take into account its textual, cognitive, social, political, and historical components. Researchers therefore give equal or greater attention to language use in relation to social, political, and cultural dimensions when examining discourse rather than just "purely" linguistic data. Because of this, discourse is a topic that fascinates a wide range of academics in addition to linguists, including communication scientists, literary critics, philosophers, sociologists, anthropologists, social psychologists, political scientists, and many more. It can be difficult to distinguish between functionalism, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, text linguistics, and discourse analysis because they all share common denominators. As a result, when conducting DA, researchers may also engage in functional grammar, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, or cognitivism, as these domains are interrelated and share fundamental principles.

1.4. What is Discourse?

The term "discourse" has a long history of association with diverse sociolinguistic research traditions and has come to be employed by many academics, as well as in various academic movements, to denote a variety of different meanings. To understand each meaning, one must look at the ways in which it is used. According to Kress (1989), discourse reaches into all major areas of social life. It "colonizes the social world

imperialistically" (p. 7), as it organizes and gives structure to the manner in which a topic, object, or process is to be talked about. "It provides descriptions, rules, permissions, and prohibitions for social and individual actions" (p. 7). A narrow definition of discourse might refer only to spoken or written language. However, discourse analysis more often draws on a broader definition to include the shared ways in which people make sense of things within a given culture or context.

1.4.1. Discourse vs. Text

Is it possible to use the terms discourse and text interchangeably? In some contexts and by some researchers and analysts, the answer is yes. In the following examples, they refer to the same thing. Salki (1995) « A text, or discourse, is a stretch of language that may be longer than one sentence. Thus, text and discourse analysis is about how sentences combine to form texts. However, the word "text" is often referred to as the product of discourse. It is normally used to describe a linguistic record of a communicative event. The following passage (from Oxford University Press, www.oup.com/elt) provides an example of how text and discourse are different from one another.

> We may go even further and assert that the meaning of a text
> does not come into being until it is actively employed in a
> context of use. This process of activation of a text by relating it
> to a context of use is what we call discourse to put it differently,
> this contextualization of a text is actually the reader's (and in the
> case of spoken text, the hearer's) reconstruction of the writer's
> (or speaker's) intended message, that is his or her
> communicative act or discourse.

De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) use a broader perspective. According to them, a text is a kind of communication that must meet seven criteria:

1. **Cohesion**, which has to do with the relationship between text and syntax. Phenomena such as conjunction, ellipsis, anaphora, cataphora, or recurrence are basic for cohesion.

2. **Coherence**, which has to do with the meaning of the text. Here we may refer to elements of knowledge or to cognitive structures that do not have a linguistic realization but are implied by the language used and thus influence the reception of the message by the interlocutor.

3. **Intentionality**, which relates to the attitude and purpose of the speaker or writer.

4. **Acceptability**, which has to do with how ready the listener or reader is to judge the usefulness or importance of a given text.

5. **Informativity**, which refers to the quantity and quality of new or expected information.

6. **Situationality**, which means that the situation in which the text is made is very important to how it is made and how it is understood.

7. **Intertextuality** refers to two main things: a) a text is always related to a discourse that came before it or happened at the same time as it; and b) texts are always linked to each other and grouped in particular text varieties or genres (e.g., narrative, argumentative, descriptive, etc.) by formal criteria.

According to certain authors, like Halliday, text is the only thing that has any significance in a given circumstance: "By text, then, we understand a continuous process of semantic choice" (1978, p. 137). Schiffrin (1994) argues that the term 'text' can be used to distinguish linguistic content (such as what is said, assuming a verbal channel) from the environment in which "sayings" (or other linguistic products) occur (context). In terms of utterances, "text" is the linguistic content: the fixed semantic meanings of words, phrases, and sentences, but not the inferences available to hearers based on the situations in which words, expressions, and sentences are used. For Schiffrin (1994), context is therefore a world filled with people who produce utterances: individuals with social, cultural, and personal identities, knowledge, ideas, aspirations, and desires, who interact with one another in diverse socially and culturally determined settings.

To conclude, "text" and "discourse" have come to be used to mean different things in recent discourse studies. Seidlhofer and Widdowson's definitions of both terms illustrate better the difference between them. Text, according to them, is "the linguistic product of a discourse process," whereas discourse is "the process of conceptual formulation whereby we draw on our linguistic resources to make sense of reality" (1999: 206).

1.4.2. Discourse Types/ Genres

Foucault (1972), points out that the universe of discourse is broad as it denotes many things.

> In the most general and vaguest way, it denoted a group of verbal performances; and by discourse, then I meant that which was produced (perhaps all that was produced) by the groups of science, but also meant a group of acts of formulation, a series of sentences or propositions. Lastly, discourse is constituted by a group of sequences of signs, in so far as they are statements, that is, in so far as they can be assigned particular modalities of existence.
>
> (Foucault, 1972 in Coupland, Sarangi and Candlin, 2001:49).

11

Sarangi (2001) stresses the importance of the third definition of discourse proposed by Foucault. He says that it is in this sense that we can speak of different discourses: clinical discourse, psychiatric discourse, educational discourse, economic discourse, etc. According to Lakoff (1998), the differentiation between discourse kinds should be evaluated in terms of function or purpose. For her, a spectrum can be divided in a variety of ways: oral/written, formal/informal, spontaneous/nonspontaneous, reciprocal / non reciprocal, public/private, and so on.

Bakhtin applies the term "genre" to the entirety of human linguistic production when referring to the various varieties of discourse. He observes that each field has its own patterns and, as a result, genres are context-dependent, stable, and diversified. It should be observed, however, that no discourse belongs to a singular and exclusive category. Since there are no absolute distinctions between the various discourse types, it is more accurate to speak of a continuum of discourse types as opposed to discrete and distinct categories. For instance, a conversation between a professor and a student at the end of class may be situated somewhere between the formal and informal ranges: there is a certain level of formality because of the distance and power differences between the professor and the student, but the particular situation does not require high levels of formality, so the analyst will undoubtedly find certain characteristics of informal speech in their conversation. Hodge and Kress (2001) state that genres only exist to the extent that a social group defines and enforces the rules that define them. Consequently, a given social group can construct, recognize, and name a certain type of social event, and the activities of the participants at this occasion are governed by the unique set of practices outlined for it. These writings have a form that codifies this set of practices, and this form comes together as a semiotic category and is therefore known as a specific genre.

Research Questions

- ❖ Within linguistics, the view of discourse is not only diverse; it even has an anti-discourse beginning. Explain

- ❖ For many, the interest in discourse goes beyond language use to language use relative to social, political, and cultural formations.

- ❖ Discuss in your own words the emergence of a number of analysts who not only study language use "beyond the sentence boundary," but also prefer to analyze "naturally occurring" language use and not invented examples.

- ❖ DA objective is to perceive language use as social practice. The users of language do not function in isolation, but in a set of cultural, social and psychological frameworks. Discuss

- ❖ While mainstream linguistics limited its borders to studying language in and for itself, new disciplines (Pragmatics and Discourse analysis) emerged to broaden the scope of language research by studying the situation in which a discursive event occurs and the role of the interactants who create the true meaning of that situation. What does discourse analysis have to offer?

- ❖ Why the adverb 'ironically' is used in the quote below?
  « Ironically, it was a sentence linguist who both coined the term 'Discourse Analysis' and initiated a search for language rules which would explain how sentences were connected within a text by a kind of extended grammar » (Cook, 1989, p. 13)

- ❖ How did Hymes (1966), Labov & Fanshel (1977) and Burmingham School contribute to the development of DA?

- ❖ Discuss the definition of the terms 'text' and 'discourse 'with some of your classmates. Write a short summary of the discussion in your own words.

- ❖ According to Yule (2006), in the study of language, some of the most interesting questions arise in connection with the way language is "used" rather than what its components are. Discuss

- ❖ Discourse studies also have the significant feature of being fundamentally multidisciplinary, which allows them to extend beyond linguistic boundaries into a wide range of fields. Discuss

- ❖ What are the seven criteria that any text should meet according to De Beaugrande and Dresseler (1981)?

- ❖ Hodge and Kress (2001) state that genres only exist to the extent that a social group defines and enforces the rules that define them. Explain

Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. (eds.) (2001). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Massachusetts & Oxford: Blackwell.

Introduction

DEBORAH SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH TANNEN, AND HEIDI E. HAMILTON

What Is Discourse Analysis?

Discourse analysis is a rapidly growing and evolving field. Current research in this field now flows from numerous academic disciplines that are very different from one another. Included, of course, are the disciplines in which models for understanding, and methods for analyzing, discourse first developed, such as linguistics, anthropology, and philosophy. But also included are disciplines that have applied – and thus often extended – such models and methods to problems within their own academic domains, such as communication, cognitive psychology, social psychology, and artificial intelligence.

Given this disciplinary diversity, it is no surprise that the terms "discourse" and "discourse analysis" have different meanings to scholars in different fields. For many, particularly linguists, "discourse" has generally been defined as anything "beyond the sentence." For others (for example Fasold 1990: 65), the study of discourse is the study of language use. These definitions have in common a focus on specific instances or spates of language. But critical theorists and those influenced by them can speak, for example, of "discourse of power" and "discourses of racism," where the term "discourses" not only becomes a count noun, but further refers to a broad conglomeration of linguistic and nonlinguistic social practices and ideological assumptions that together construct power or racism.

So abundant are definitions of discourse that many linguistics books on the subject now open with a survey of definitions. In their collection of classic papers in discourse analysis, for example, Jaworski and Coupland (1999: 1–3) include ten definitions from a wide range of sources. They all, however, fall into the three main categories noted above: (1) anything beyond the sentence, (2) language use, and (3) a broader range of social practice that includes nonlinguistic and nonspecific instances of language.

The definitional issues associated with discourse and discourse analysis are by no means unique. In his two-volume reference book on semantics, for example, Lyons (1997) illustrates ten different uses of the word *mean*, and thus an equal number of possible domains of the field of semantics. In his introductory chapter on pragmatics,

Levinson (1983) discusses twelve definitions of the field of pragmatics (including some which could easily cover either discourse analysis or sociolinguistics). Since semantics, pragmatics, and discourse all concern language, communication, meaning, and context it is perhaps not surprising that these three fields of linguistics are those whose definitions seem to be most variable.

The variety of papers in this *Handbook* reflects the full range of variation in definitions of – and approaches to – discourse analysis. The different understandings of discourse represented in this volume reflect the rising popularity of the field. Although it is not our intent to explain how or why discourse has gained so powerful an appeal for so wide a range of analytical imaginations (see Jaworski and Coupland 1999: 3–5; van Dijk 1997), our own intellectual/academic histories – all in linguistics – reveal some of the different paths that have led us to an interest in discourse. Since each of our paths is different, we here speak in our own voices – in the order in which we arrived at Georgetown University, where we all now teach.

Deborah Tannen

When I decided to pursue a PhD in linguistics, I held a BA and MA in English literature and had for several years been teaching remedial writing and freshman composition at Lehman College, the City University of New York. Restless to do something new, I attended the 1973 Linguistic Institute sponsored by the Linguistic Society of America at the University of Michigan. That summer I fell in love with linguistics, unaware that "language in context," the topic of that Institute, did not typify the field. Inspired by A. L. Becker's introductory course and by Robin Lakoff's course on politeness theory and communicative strategies, as well as by Emanuel Schegloff's public lecture on the closings of telephone conversations, I headed for the University of California, Berkeley, to pursue a PhD. There I discovered, along with Robin Lakoff, Charles Fillmore (then interested in frame semantics), Wallace Chafe (then interested in scripts theory and the comparison of speaking and writing), and John Gumperz (then developing his theory of conversational inference). Not for a moment did I think I was doing anything but linguistics. The word "discourse" was not a major category with which I identified. There were no journals with the word "discourse" in their titles. The only journal that specialized in language in context was *Language in Society*, which had a strongly anthropological orientation. I vividly recall the sense of excitement and possibility I felt when a fellow graduate student mentioned, as we stood in the halls outside the linguistics department, that another journal was about to be launched: *Discourse Processes*, edited by psychologist Roy Freedle at Educational Testing Service in Princeton.

When I joined the faculty of the sociolinguistics program at Georgetown University in 1979, I briefly redefined myself as a sociolinguist. That year I submitted an abstract to the annual LSA meeting and checked the box "sociolinguistics" to aid the committee in placing my paper on the program. But when I delivered the paper, I found myself odd man out as the lone presenter analyzing transcripts of conversation among a panel of Labovians displaying charts and graphs of phonological variation. I promptly redefined what I was doing as discourse analysis – the name I also gave to courses I

Unit 2

INTERPRETATION / INFERENCE

One of the pervasive illusions, which persists in the analysis of language, is that we understand the meaning of a linguistic message solely on the basis of the words and structure of the sentence(s) used to convey that message. We certainly rely on the syntactic structure and lexical items used in a linguistic message to arrive at an interpretation, but it is a mistake to think that we operate only with this literal input to our understanding.

(Brown and Yule, 1983, p. 223)

MAIN OBJECTIVES

➢ Deal with inference and interpretation as part of making sense of texts.

➢ Identify the role of context in interpreting discourse.

➢ Identify the types of discourse

➢ Explain the role of coherence in the interpretation of discourse.

➢ Explain the role of background knowledge in constructing mental representations.

➢ Present the main lexical and grammatical aspects of cohesion.

➢ Introduce some key concepts such as "script," "schema," "scenario," "implicature,"

etc.

2.1. Interpreting Discourse

According to Yule (2006), when describing a language, we can simply refer to an accurate description of the forms and structures utilized in that language. But we can—as native language users, we can do more than discriminate between correct and bad form and structure.

- We can deal with fragments like "Trains collide, two die," a newspaper headline (we can recognize that the two phrases have a causal relationship).
- We can also understand notices like "No shoes, no service" on shop windows in the summer by understanding that the two phrases have a conditional relationship (if you are not wearing shoes, you will not receive service)

(Yule, 2006, p. 142).

Yule (2006) illustrates his idea with an excerpt from an essay written by a Saudi Arabian student learning English. The essay contains numerous "errors," but it is understandable.

> My Town
>
> My natal was in a small town, very close to Riyadh capital of Saudi Arabia. The distant between my town and Riyadh 7 miles exactly. The name of this Almasani that means in English Factories. It takes this name from the people's carrer . In my childhood I remmeber the people live. It was very simple, most the people was farmer.

(Yule, 2006, p. 142)

This and other examples demonstrate how we interact with language (use it, react to it, perceive it, etc.) and how we react to texts that contain ungrammatical forms. We can make sense of texts rather than simply rejecting them. We can decipher them. How is such an interpretation possible? This is a critical topic in discourse analysis. We rely on language form and structure to interpret and make our discourse interpretable. However, as language users, we know more than that.

2.1.1. The Role of the Context in Interpreting Discourse

When studying political, literary, or historical works, Van Dijk (2008) highlights the significance of context. He attributes this attention to the establishment of new academic disciplines in the late 1960s. New disciplines like pragmatics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and ethnography of speaking shed light on the cognitive and, in particular, the social and cultural "contexts" of language and language usage. Many studies of "context," both in linguistics and other formal methodologies, have limited the concept of "context" to the "verbal context" of preceding (and possibly later) words, sentences, propositions, utterances, or turns of speech, according to Van Dijk (2008). Discourse structures began to be explored more systematically in their social, historical, and cultural settings between the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s.

Discourse analysts place a premium on context. While the majority of approaches necessitate a micro-level examination of texts, methodologies range in terms of the "breadth of contexts in which utterances are considered" (Gordon, 2009, p. 192). Is the context limiting? What is the definition of context? Is it limited to local utterances? Or does it extend to the world outside the text or conversation? When undertaking discourse analysis, how should context be considered? The study of these and other concerns has resulted in numerous debates, conferences, publications, theories, and methodologies.

Context research has been linked not just to every area of language studies but also to a number of inter-disciplinary fields such as semantics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis. Numerous approaches, such as comparative linguistics, structural linguistics, and transformational-generative linguistics, have helped in the development of context theories. The application of context theories to discourse analysis requires that, in addition to the speech itself, the context in which the conversation happens be examined. Fillmore (1977, p. 119) states "The task is to determine what we can know about the meaning and context of an utterance given only the knowledge that the utterance has occurred," writes ."I find that whenever I notice some sentence in context, I immediately find myself asking what the effect would have been if the context had been slightly different," Fillmore (1977, p. 119) observes.

Linguists have defined "context" in a variety of ways. Widdowson (2000) defines "context" as "those aspects of the circumstance of actual language use that are taken as relevant to meaning" in his research on the meaning of language (P. 126). In other words, he believes that context is a schematic construct and that establishing pragmatic meaning necessitates matching the linguistic components of the code to the schematic characteristics of the context. According to Cook (1999), "context" is just a type of knowledge. It relates to the understanding of variables other than the text under evaluation. "In the broad sense, it refers to knowledge of these factors and of other parts of the text under consideration, sometimes referred to as co-text" (Cook, 1999, p. 24). Yule (2000) also considered "context," which for him is "the physical environment in which a word is used" (p. 128). All of these definitions agree that the environment (also known as circumstances or elements) in which a discourse takes place is one of the most significant aspects of context.

2.1.2. Context Types

Numerous linguists have classified "context" into two, three, or even six groups. Song (2010) examines "context" from three perspectives:

2.1.2.1. Linguistic Context

The relationship between words, phrases, sentences, and even paragraphs is referred to as context. It can be investigated from three perspectives: deictic, co-textual, and collocational. Participants in a language event must be aware of their spatial and temporal position, and these features are directly related to the deictic context, which refers to deictic terms such as "now," "then," etc., "here," "there," etc., and "I," "you," etc. Deictic expressions help in the establishment of deictic roles, which emerge from the speaker addressing his utterance to another individual in regular language action.

2.1.2.2. Situational Context

It is also referred to as "the context of situation," which relates to the environment, time, and location of the diqcourse, as well as the interaction between the participants. The concept of "register," which clarifies the relationship between language and context by categorizing it under three key headings: field, tenor, and mode, is the classic approach to this theory.

Field of discourse: It pertains to the ongoing activity. We might argue that field is the linguistic reflection of the purposeful role of the language user in the context of the text.

Tenor It refers to the type of social interaction enacted by the discourse or within it. Therefore, the concept of tone emphasizes how linguistic choices are affected not just by the

topic or subject of communication, but also by the type of social interaction within which communication occurs.

Mode It is the linguistic manifestation of the user's relationship to the medium of transmission. The primary contrast between modes of communication is between those that need immediate interaction and those that allow for delayed contact between participants.

2.1.2.3. Cultural Context

The culture, customs, and history of a specific historical period in the linguistic community where the speakers live are referred to as cultural context. Language is a social phenomena that is inextricably linked to society's social structure and values. As a result, language cannot avoid being influenced by factors such as social role, social status, gender, age, and so on.

Social roles are cultural functions that are institutionalized and recognized in a society. The term "social status" refers to an individual's social standing. Each participant in the language event must be aware of or make assumptions about his or her standing in relation to the other, and status will frequently play a role in selecting who should commence the conversation. Gender and age frequently define or interact with social rank. The terms of address used by one gender while speaking to an elderly person may differ from those used by someone of the same gender or age in analogous settings.

2.1.3. The Role of the Context

According to Song (2010), the context can help address the following:

2.1.3.1. Eliminating Ambiguity

An ambiguous term, phrase, sentence, or set of sentences has numerous possible interpretations or meanings. There are two kinds of ambiguity: lexical ambiguities and structural ambiguities. The basic causes of lexical ambiguity are homomonymy and polysemy. For example, the terms right, rite, write, and wright are all pronounced [rait], but they have completely distinct meanings. Ambiguous sentences may become clearer or less perplexing as a function of their usage circumstances. Context can illuminate the meaning of words. The grammatical analysis of a sentence or phrase results in structural ambiguity. For example, the phrase "young men and women" might be interpreted as "young men and women" (i.e., both are young) or "young men and women" (i.e., both are young) (i.e., only the men are young).

2.1.3.2. Indicating Referents

To avoid repetition, we usually use words like "I," "you," "he," "this," "that," and so on to replace some noun phrases; "do," "can," "should," and so on to replace verb phrases; and "then," "there," and so on to replace time and place adverbial phrases. Therefore, context is of great importance in understanding the referents of such words. The following dialogue is written by the well-known linguist, Firth:

- Do you think he will?
- I don't know. He might.
- I suppose he ought to, but perhaps he feels he can't.
- Well, his brothers have. They perhaps think he needn't.
- Perhaps eventually he will. I think he should, and I very much hope he will. (Zhang Yunfei, 2000, p. 245)

Too many auxiliary verbs and modal verbs, such as will, might, have, can't, etc. are used in the dialogue, making it difficult to deduce what the speakers are discussing without context.

2.1.3.3. Detecting Conversational Implicature

Grice uses the term "conversational implicature" to characterize what a speaker can infer, suggest, or mean rather than what the speaker says directly. It is generated from the conversational meaning of words and the context, and it is directed by the cooperative principle and its four maxims, namely quantity, quality, relation, and manner. Grice also discovered that when people communicate, they do not always follow the four maxims. In addition to the literal meaning of his comment, a violation of a maxim may result in the speaker transmitting an additional meaning, known as conversational implicature.

Example:
- CAROL: Are you coming to the party tonight?
- LARA: I've got an exam tomorrow.
  (Yule, 2006, p. 148)

According to Yule (2006), Lara's statement does not appear to be an answer to Carol's question. Lara doesn't answer yes or no. Nevertheless, Carol will perceive the statement as "no" or "probably not." How can we explain this ability to comprehend one meaning from a language that, in a literal sense, conveys another? It appears to depend, at the very least, on the assumption that Lara is being relevant and informative, following the relationship and quantity maxims. Given that Lara's initial response contains pertinent information, Carol can deduce that "exam tomorrow" typically involves "studying now" and that "studying tonight" prohibits "partying." Consequently, Lara's response is not merely a statement about tomorrow's activities; it also

contains an implicature (a secondary meaning transmitted) regarding tonight's events (Yule, 2006).

When the analysis of a statement's intended meaning goes beyond its literal interpretation, a number of concerns must be addressed. Conversational implicature is pragmatic and largely derived from the conversational or literal meaning of an utterance produced in a particular context shared by the speaker and the hearer, and is contingent on their recognition of the cooperative principle and its maxims in discourse analysis.

2.3. Cohesion & Coherence

Coherence refers to the knowledge or cognitive structures inferred by the language used and contributing to the overall meaning of a given discourse, whereas cohesion refers to the relationships between text and grammar. Cohesion and coherence are semantic concepts that are components of the system of a language. According to Seidlhofer and Widdowson (1999), cohesion is related with the concept of text, whereas coherence is associated with the concept of discourse. Consequently, coherence is a textual characteristic for these scholars, and it relates to the textualization of contextual links. In contrast, coherence is a discursive characteristic that acts as the discourse function of establishing these links.

2.3.1. The Role of Coherence in the Interpretation of Discourse

Typically, a mental representation of a text (how we perceive it) does not exist in its whole in the mind of the hearer or reader. Rather, it is developed in stages through trial and error. In the initial steps, the listener or reader provides a provisional representation of the text. Then, as the conversation continues, they amplify and modify that representation to ensure that each piece of information is accommodated in an appropriate manner (Yule, 2006). This indicates that the coherence of the text is gradually developed.

Yule (2006, p. 126) defines the concept of "coherence" as "everything fitting together well." According to him, coherence is not something that exists in words or structures but something "that exists in people." People try to make sense of what they read or hear according to what they perceive and experience in the world.

*Yule's (2006, P.127) adaptation of Widdowson's example (1978) is as follows:

'Her: That's the telephone.
Him: I'm in the bath.
Her: O.K.'

(Yule, 2006, P.127)

23

There are no cohesion devices present within this discourse. How does each person understand what the other is saying? They do use the information in the expressed sentences, but the interpretation must also add something more. The speakers are referring to conventional knowledge:

- She asks him to take action by making a request.
- He explains why he is unable to comply with the request.
- She commits to taking action.

Yule points out that such an analysis would indicate that language users must also hold a vast array of information. In fact, many academics are especially interested in the knowledge needed to process conversation. According to Widdowson (2007), the reader might refer to the text (the co-text) to comprehend or gain an understanding of the author's purpose. Coherent devices may assist readers and listeners in developing meaning that is contextually significant to them. Cohesive devices are effective "to the extent that the text's cohesion permits them to construct a coherent discourse from it" (2007, p. 49). Texts can be cohesive without being coherent.

*Widdowson's (Widdowson, 2007, P. 51) example:

> We spent our holidays in Romania. This is a country where grapes are grown. They are a kind of fruit. So are bananas. Fruit contains vitamins, and these are essential for a healthy life. So is regular exercise. Jogging is good for you. We do it every day...

Each cohesive device in the passage serves a specific function (they (refer to grapes), so is (serves as anaphoric reference of 'kind of fruit,' 'essential for healthy life') jogging (semantic relationship with exercise)..... However, the reader is unable to "make any coherent sense of it." According to Widdowson (2007), the text is not coherent because of the "shift of the frame of reference," and other texts might not seem coherent because the reader or listener is not familiar with the frame of reference (Widdowson, 2007). Frames, as defined by Lakoff (2004), are "mental structures that shape the way we see the world" (p. xv). They are part of the unconscious mind and operate automatically to help us make sense of the world.

Example:

- The words (ball, bat) are used in different frames by (Cricket players / baseball players). Framing is our way (window) of viewing the world.

Johnson-Laird (1983, p. 356) asked three questions that Dooley and Levinsohn (2000, p. 10) use to start their chapter on coherence.

1. What does it mean for a discourse to be coherent?
2. "What is discourse?"
3. "What is it that makes a sequence of sentences into a coherent whole as opposed to a chaotic assemblage?"

Johnson-Laird (1983) provides two examples to address these questions.

(A)

It was the Christmas party at Heighton that was one of the turning points in Perkins' life. The duchess had sent him a three-page wire in the hyperbolic style of her class, conveying a vague impression that she and the Duke had arranged to commit suicide together if Perkins didn't 'chuck' any previous engagement he had made. And Perkins had felt in a slipshod sort of way—for at that period he was incapable of ordered thought—he might as well be at Heighton as anywhere ...

(B)

The baying of the hounds and the screaming of the chickens echoed below me, as I quickly scanned the tracks leading towards the hole—this was going to be a hectic breakfast. I thought I'd better eat a full meal because of the task ahead and the difficulties I might encounter. But it was only when I had cooked myself a steak, and that piece of shark meat that had been ignored by everyone, that I discovered that I could only pick at these tidbits, having, as I now recalled, breakfasted, lunched and dined to repletion already. Rather than throw the food away, I rang up my husband at work and asked him to bring home some colleagues to dine with us.

Dooley and Levinsohn (2000, p. 10) present the following explanation regarding the concept of coherence based on these texts.

If the reader is a typical text interpreter, He/she might recognize that (A) deals with a coherent cluster of concepts, despite the fact that it is a fragment of text and you may have never experienced what it represents.

The reader's mental representation of (A) might include such things as the following:

- A place called Heighton (otherwise unknown to you?)

- A Christmas party (and your expectations of what that might involve)

- A male (probably adult) named Perkins

- A duchess (and your expectations about nobility) who knows Perkins and expresses herself somewhat flamboyantly

- An invitation from the duchess to Perkins to come to the party, etc.

By constructing a mental representation that included such elements, the reader probably came to accept (A) as a fragment of a coherent text. The reader may have initially assumed that he/she would also be able to construct a mental representation for B. As the reader tried to follow it, however, his/her idea of what it was talking about probably became difficult to maintain: what kind of home could have below it "the baying of the hounds and the screaming of the chickens"? Was the meal intended to be eaten for breakfast or later in the day?, and so on. So, at some point, the reader probably gave up constructing a mental representation for (B) with any confidence. At that point, (B) ceased to be coherent for the reader (Dooley and Levinsohn, 2000).

A text carries the presumption of coherence; that is, if a speaker presents anything as a text, the hearer may expect that it will provide a coherent interpretation and direct his or her efforts accordingly (Brown & Yule 1983, p. 199; Halliday & Hasan 1976, p. 54). If the reader believed that (A) made sense and attempted to believe that (B) made sense, he or she acted on this assumption, which is the foundation of effective communication. A fully developed mental representation of a text does not typically appear in the mind of the hearer. Rather, it is formed in stages through trial and error. In the earliest phases of reading a text, the listener formulates a provisional interpretation of it. Then, he or she augments and alters this representation, changing it as the dialogue progresses to fit each piece of information in a believable manner.

2.3.1.1. Coherence and the Processing of Discourse
2.3.1.1.1. Using Background Knowledge

Sanford & Garrod (1981). Provide a good example to illustrate the processes involved in making inferences by using background knowledge :

- John was on his way to school last Friday.
- He was really worried about the math lesson.

Yule (2006, p. 132) begins by listing a number of plausible interpretations and inferences. He, for example, points out that most people who are asked to read these sentences believe John is a schoolboy. This information must be inferred because it is not stated clearly in the text. Other readings are available; for certain readers, they may include the fact that "John is walking or on a bus." Yule (2006) contends that these conclusions are clearly derived from our cultural awareness of "going to school," and that no reader has ever claimed that John is swimming or on a boat, despite the fact that both are physically plausible, if unlikely, interpretations.

26

- Last week he had been unable to control   the class.

When confronted with this sentence, most readers conclude that John is, in fact, a teacher who is unhappy. Many people believe he drives himself to school.

- It was unfair of the math teacher to leave him in charge.

Suddenly, John reverts to being a schoolboy, and the teacher's conclusion is dropped. This text's final sentence contains a surprise:

- After all, it is not a normal part of a janitor's duties.

According to Yule (2006), conducting such analyses allows us to discover how we "construct" interpretations of what we read by employing far more information than what is actually on the page. That is, we really produce the text depending on our expectations of what should happen. According to Yule, many researchers use the concept of a "schema" to characterize this occurrence.

According to Yule, "schema" is a broad term for a typical knowledge structure that occurs in memory. People have a variety of schemas that they use to interpret their experiences, as well as what they hear or read. To use Yule's example, if we hear someone tell what happened one day in the grocery, we don't need to be told what is generally found in a supermarket. We already have a "supermarket" schema in place (food displayed on shelves, arranged in aisles, shopping carts and baskets, a check-out counter, and other conventional features).

There are a number of pieces of evidence indicating the mind does, in fact, apply knowledge schema in the interpretation of discourse, according to Cook (1989, p. 70). One piece of evidence is that when asked about a text or asked to recall it, people commonly fill in details that they were not given but that a schema created for them. What did the witness consume? She did not inform us, is the answer. She informed us she had made toast but not that she had eaten it. We are likely to form an assumption after reading this short passage: that when someone makes breakfast, it gets consumed. We assume that the speaker ate the breakfast herself because no one else is mentioned. However, this is not stated.

A "script" is a specific type of schema. A script is simply a dynamic schema: it is made up of a series of predefined actions. You have a script for going to the dentist or the cinema. We all have versions of the "Eating in a Restaurant" script that we can use to make sense of discourse like this:

> Trying not to be out of the office for
> long, Suzy went into the nearest place,
> sat down and ordered a sandwich. It was
> quite crowded, but the service was fast,
> so she left a good tip when she had to
> rush back.

We would be able to state a number of things about the situation and events briefly portrayed in this short text based on our "Restaurant" script. Although the text does not state it, we can presume that Suzy entered the restaurant by a door, that there were tables available, that she ate the sandwich, then paid for it, and so on. The fact that this type of information might appear in people's attempts to memorize the text demonstrates the existence of scripts. It is also an evidence that our knowledge of what we read is derived not directly from the words and sentences on the page, but rather from the interpretation we construct in our brains of what we read.

2.3.1.1.2. Using Knowledge of the World

When discussing the relationship between words and the world, we pose the following question: how can we understand discourse by including world knowledge in addition to literal interpretation (words on the page)?

As a response to this question, numerous academics working within the framework of discourse analysis have categorized our text comprehension into the following categories:

Bottom-up processing: We determine the meanings of the words and structure of a phrase in order to construct its composite meaning.

Top-down processing: At the same time, based on the context and the combined meaning of the sentences we have already processed we make a prediction about what the following sentence will most likely imply.

According to Brown and Yule (1983, p. 234- 235), artificial intelligence (AI) would propose that the second line of the following text be interpreted in a "ungrammatical" or "inappropriate" manner if AI had fully operational English sentence grammar:

Slim is beautiful

> Many reasons are there for people to want a slim
> body. All Become very lighter but it's very difficult
> to held a Normally weight. Nowadays, in our country,
> Sweden, there is so well of all sort of eating that man
> light come to big overweight. What to doing? (Brown
> and Yule, 1983, p. 234-235)

In the view of Brown and Yule (1983) human processors are not like machines; they do not reject ungrammatical text, they try to interpret it. What enables the human processor to do this?

- We try to build some composite meaning for the three- word string (its structure, meaning of the lexical items) **(bottom-up)**
- The reader is also operating a **top-down** interpretive strategy to create expectations about what is likely to come in the text.(a title, for instance, is a good start)
- It is the predictive power of **top-down** processing that enables the human reader to encounter, via his bottom-up processing, ungrammatical or mis-spelt elements in the text and to
- Determine what was the most likely intended message.

Bottom-up processing operates with rules (syntax, lexical semantics). Top-down processing is based on:

- The discourse context which creates expectations about the content of the discourse.
- The Other (similar) texts that we have already processed and which help the reader predict.
- The previous experiences and background knowledge.

In top-down processing we activate only a small part of this background knowledge at a time and is a piece of evidence that this knowledge is stored and organised in a way that makes it accessible. So, representing how background knowledge is stored is worth considering.

2.3.1.1.3. Representing Background Knowledge.

The dilemma posed by Brown & Yule (1983, p. 234) is how to organize all of this knowledge so that we can only use a small portion of it at a time. What is a representation of knowledge?

For instance, data from research testing theories concerning the impact of coherence on cognitive processing and representations is gathered by psychologists and psycholinguists.

2.3.1.1.3.1. Frames

Minsky's frame-theory offers one method of representing knowledge. According to Minsky, our knowledge is stored in memory in data-structures that he refers to as "frames." When a new circumstance (or a significant change in one's perception of the current issue) arises, one chooses from memory a structure known as a Frame. This is a memorized structure that may be modified with the appropriate specifics to meet reality (Minsky, 1975). Although Minsky's theory focuses mostly on visual perception and memory, it is actually about a method of encoding knowledge in general, and language is one type of knowledge.

Brown & Yule (1983, p. 239) use the example of a house to explain the concept of "framing." There will be "slots" in a frame that represents a normal "home" with the labels "kitchen," "bathroom," "address," and so on (they can also be frames). The home frame can be used to depict a specific house that already exists in the real world or is described in a text by filling the slots with the specific characteristics of that particular house. A frame is a fixed representation of knowledge about the world in this meaning Brown and Yule (1983).

2.3.1.3.1.2. Scripts

A script, as opposed to a frame, is more programmatic in that it comprises (Yule and Brown 1983:243) a typical sequence of events that characterizes a situation. Bower et al. (1979) discovered that when individuals were asked to recall texts describing ordinary activities (e.g., going to a restaurant, grocery shopping, or visiting a doctor), they tended to mix acts mentioned in the text with behaviors indicated by the "script." They also discovered that when individuals were shown jumbled texts with script actions that were out of predicted sequence, they remembered the texts with script actions in their canonical order.

2.3.1.3.1.3. Scenarios

The term "scenario" is used by Sanford and Garrod (1981) to define the expanded area of reference used in analyzing written texts. A text describing 'going to a restaurant,' for example, automatically inserts a 'waiter' position into the depiction. Sanford and Garrod demonstrate that significant changes in reading speeds for target sentences are recorded in the following two situations as evidence that distinct 'role' slots are activated in scenarios:

a.   Title: In court

Fred was being questioned.

He had been accused of murder.

     Target: The lawyer was trying to prove his innocence.

b.   Title: Telling a lie.

Fred was being questioned.

He couldn't tell the truth

Target: The lawyer was trying to prove his innocence. (Brown and Yule, 1983, p. 246)

Reading speeds for the target sentence including 'The lawyer' were much faster in condition a, with the 'In court scenario' enabled, than in condition b, with a non-specific scenario set. Texts based on cohesive scenarios, according to Sanford and Garrod, can be comprehended quickly and readily.

The term "schemata" is more commonly used in studies on the representation of knowledge. Is there a distinction between the terms "scenario" and "schemata"? Scenarios are situational knowledge representations (for example, in a restaurant), whereas schemata are much more generic sorts of knowledge representations.

2.3.1.3.1.4. Schemata

The core notion of schemata theory is that, when prompted by key words or phrases in a discourse or by the context, the mind activates existing knowledge schemata and makes sense of new information by linking it to previously stored information. Researchers go on to discuss "deterministic" schemata, which individuals employ when dealing with particular sorts of discourse. Example:

-      A: Would you like to watch the debate?
-      B: No, I already know what they're going to say.

Schemata can vary based on cultural context. According to Anderson et al. (1977), people's interests, histories, gender, etc., contribute to the formation of "higher-level schemata" that influence how they "see" messages in certain ways (p. 377). As with frames, scripts, and scenarios, schemata are a technique of capturing the underlying knowledge that we all employ while producing and interpreting discourse.

2.3.2. Cohesion

The coherence of a text is the ability of the hearer or reader to interpret the content and form an internal representation of it. Even though coherence is a conceptual phenomenon, language devices are not irrelevant to it. To assist the reader or listener in forming a coherent mental image of the text, the speaker or author employs linguistic cues. Cohesion can therefore be defined as the use of linguistic tools to signal coherence (Grimes 1975; Halliday & Hasan 1976; de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981; Brown & Yule 1983). These linguistic cues, also known as cohesive devices, indicate how the various sections of a text are conceptually related. Examples of those cohesive ties can be identified in the following text:

> My father once bought a Lincoln convertible. He
> did it by saving   every penny he could. That car
> would be-worth a fortune nowadays. However, he
> sold it to help pay for my college education.
> Sometimes I think I'd rather have the convertible.
> (Yule, 2017 P.402)

According to Yule (2017), in this passage, there are devices in the use of pronouns that are employed to preserve reference (via anaphora) to the same individuals and things: father, he, he, my, my, I, Lincoln, it. There are lexical connections, such as "a Lincoln convertible" and "that car," as well as more general connections formed by a number of terms that share a common element of meaning: (for example, "money") bought - saving - penny - worth a fortune sold pay; (for example, "time") once - nowadays - occasionally. The connector "however" indicates the relationship between what comes next and what came before. The verbs in the first part are in the past, indicating a connection between the events, and the use of the present simple in the last sentence indicates a shift in time framing.

The presence of cohesive ties within a text can provide insight into how writers structure what they intend to convey, and they can be important in determining whether something is structured or not. In the view of Yule (2017), cohesion alone would not be sufficient to allow us to make sense of what we read. With the example below, he shows that some texts can make a lot of sense but still be hard to understand.

- Yule's Example

> My father bought a Lincoln convertible. The car
> driven by the police was red. That color doesn't
> suit her. She consists   of three letters. However, a
> letter isn't as fast as a telephone call. (Yule, 2017,
> p.403)

This illustrates that the "connectedness" we see in our comprehension of common texts is not just based on word relationships. An additional aspect helps us differentiate between related sentences that make sense and those that do not. This characteristic is typically referred to as coherence (Yule, 2017).

2.3.2.1. Aspects of Cohesion
(1) Reference – Cohesion

Reference contributes to cohesion

It refers to" the relation between an element of the text and something else it points to with reference to which it is interpreted" (Halliday and Hasan 1976:30)

- **Anaphoric reference**

A word in a text refers back to words, expressions, ideas in the text for its meaning (E.g. I, we, you, he, she, they, one, it.)

Example: **Ann** is stressed out about her assignment; **she** is talking about it on Facebook. (She is an anaphoric reference)

- **Demonstrative reference**

Words used to indicate which entities are being referred to (E.g. the, this, that, these, those, here, there, now, then)

- **Cataphoric reference**

It refers forward in the text.

Example: When **she** arrived, **Ann** was surprised to find her apartment door open. (She is a cataphoric reference)

"The reference is within the sentence and is determined by the structure of the sentence» (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, P.56).

(2) Substitution – Cohesion

It refers to the replacement of one item by another. This contributes to cohesion. The (E.g. one, do, so)

Example: "Which ice-cream would you like?" – "I would like the pink **one**" where "one" is used instead of repeating "ice-cream."

(3) Ellipsis-Cohesion

It refers to the omission of certain words. The structure can help us know what was left unsaid.

"An elliptical item is one that leaves specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976. P.143).

A conversational example:

A: Where are you going?

B: To town. Instead of "I am going to town".

(4) Conjunction-Cohesion

It represents semantic links between the components of a text. Conjunctions are used to enact different types of relationships between ideas. (E.g. Then, however, in fact, consequently…)

(5) Lexical-Cohesion

It is achieved through the selection of vocabulary items.

*****Word Repetition**

Repetition creates cohesion and coherence. Certain content words (not function words like: a, the, to) are mentioned several times within the same text to create patterns of meaning. If these words were not repeated, the text would not have an overall sense. (Salkie, 1995, P.3)

*Halliday's example

'Algy met a bear. The bear was bulgy'

(Halliday, 1985, P. 310)

According to Halliday the lexical item which contributes to cohesion the word 'bear' (not Algy and bulgy!).

*Synonyms

Synonyms are used to avoid repetition. Some words are not replaced by their exact synonyms. According to Salkie (1995, P.9), "Though the words 'boss' and 'employer' do not have the same exact meaning, they can be considered as synonyms as they refer to the same person."

*Halliday & Matthiessen's example

(2014: 645

'He was just wondering which road to take when he was startled by a noise from behind him. It was the noise of trotting horses. ... He dismounted and led his horse as quickly as he could along the right-hand road. The sound of the cavalry grew rapidly nearer…'

(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, P. 645)

The examples of synonymy given by Halliday & Matthiessen, in this short passage are the related words 'sound'/'noise' and 'cavalry'/'horses'.

 *Superordinates and Generals

A different way of linking words and creating coherence is the use of 'superordinate terms'

Salki's example

'Brazil, with her two-crop economy, was even more severely hit by the Depression than other Latin American states and the country was on the verge of complete collapse'

<div align="right">(Salkie, 1995, P.15)</div>

According to Salkie, the Link is between Brazil (specific) and country (general/ superordinate). The more specific one is called a 'Hyponym' that can also have its hyponym (and so on). 'A hyponym ha a fuller, richer meaning than its superordinate'. Brazil' 'tells the reader more than the 'country', So Brazil comes first.

*Opposites

Using opposites also contributes to making the text cohesive and coherent.

*Salkie's example

'At least 125 people died of AIDS in Bulawayo between April and June this year, according to City Health authorities...out of the 125, 71 were males while 54 were females.'

<div align="right">(Salkie, 1995, P.23)</div>

The contrast between males / females, in this example, is achieved through the use of 'while'. According to Salkie, the reader, after 'while' expects 'the opposite of 'males'. "By creating this expectation and then satisfying it, the writer helps readers to navigate through the text… which is what cohesion is all about"(Salkie, 1995, P. 23).

*Collocation

Collocation is "the habitual co-occurrence of individual lexical items" (Crystal 1997:69), Halliday defines collocation as the tendency of certain lexical items to co-occur.

*Halliday's example

'A little fat man of Bombay
Was smoking one very hot day.
But a bird called a snipe
Flew away with his pipe,
which vexed the fat man of Bombay.'

<div align="right">(Halliday, 1985, P. 312)</div>

Halliday explains that there is "a strong collocational bond between smoke and pipe" in the poem, making the occurrence of "pipe" in the fourth line cohesive. According to Nunan (1993: 30), lexical cohesion is, in many ways, the most interesting of all the cohesive categories. The background knowledge of the reader or listener plays a more obvious role in the perception of lexical relationships than in the perception of other types of cohesion.

Research Questions

❖ Typically, a mental representation of a text (how we perceive it) does not exist in its whole in the mind of the hearer or reader. Rather, it is developed in stages through trial and error. Explain

❖ "We may go even further and assert that the meaning of a text does not come into being until it is actively employed in a context of use. This process of activation of a text by relating it to a context of use is what we call discourse." Elaborate more on this quote.

❖ To what extent are co-text/ context of situation significant in the interpretation of texts?

❖ The linguistic signals are planted in text as clues to assist the hearers/readers in coming up with an adequate mental representation. Explain and illustrate with examples.

❖ Language has a magical property: when we speak or write we craft what we have to say to fit the situation or context in which we are communicating. But, at the same time, how we speak or write creates that very situation or context. (Gee, 1999 , P.11)

❖ According to Cook (1989:70) "There are a number of pieces of evidence that the mind does in fact employ knowledge schemata in the interpretation of discourse. One piece of evidence is the fact that people…" Which piece of evidence does he propose?

❖ Yule (2006, p. 126) defines the concept of "coherence" as "everything fitting together well." Explain

❖ In the view of Brown and Yule (1983), human processors are not like machines; they do not reject ungrammatical text, they try to interpret it. Explain

❖ Cohesive devices are effective "to the extent that the text's cohesion permits them to construct a coherent discourse from it" (Widdowson, 2007, p. 49). Explain

❖ To what extent is the context significant in the interpretation of texts ?

❖ Cohesion and coherence are terms used in discourse analysis to describe the properties of texts. Explain and illustrate with examples.

❖ According to Yule, "schema" is a broad term for a typical knowledge structure that occurs in memory. Explain

❖ Define the following items: scenarios, scripts, frames.

❖ What does Nunan (1993, p. 30) mean when he says that lexical cohesion is, in many ways, the most interesting of all the cohesive categories?

suggest that we do the same, and that their expectation-based analysis presents 'a viable theory of how humans process natural language' (1978: 290).

Criticism of the claims of Schank and his co-authors could be made in similar terms to those against Minsky, noted earlier. That is, if scripts are stereotypic event-sequences, then would a stereotypic car crash be described at all, since we already have the information in our scripts? The problem of idiosyncratic scripts – e.g. Schank's daughter asking if he was going to get a new key chain to go with his new car (Schank & Abelson, 1977: 68) – is touched on, but not considered at length. It may be, of course, that we all have more idiosyncratic scripts than stereotypic ones.

One very specific and serious criticism of Schank's conceptual-dependency theory has been made by Dresher & Hornstein, (1976). Schank states the following condition on the well-formed-ness of conceptualisations:

A C-diagram that contains only the sententially realised information will not be well-formed conceptually. That is, a conceptualisation is not complete until all the conceptual cases required by the act have been explicated.

(1972: 569)

Dresher & Hornstein quite justifiably point out that such a condition is a recipe for endless conceptualisations. If we bring *John's mouth* into the conceptualisation of sentence (28), quoted earlier in this chapter, do we not also bring in *John's hand, his fingers, his arm muscles, his thought processes*, and so on, to arrive at a *complete* conceptualisation? This is a serious criticism and raises a problem which exists for virtually every attempt to incorporate world-knowledge in the understanding of discourse. We can see how *some* extra-linguistic knowledge is involved in our understanding, or our conceptualisation, of sentences and we can propose ways of incorporating that knowledge in our analysis. What we have difficulty with is restricting that knowledge to only the relevant details required in the understanding of particular sentences on particular occasions. The outstanding problem for Schank's theory (and for Minsky, too, as we noted earlier) is to find a *principled* means of limiting the number of conceptualisations required for the understanding of a sentence. In more general

terms, we require a principled way of constraining the expansion of any analysis which incorporates extra-linguistic knowledge in its account of the understanding of linguistic data.

Despite this general criticism of the theoretical principles involved in using 'scripts', some empirical research has shown that treating scripts as 'action stereotypes' (Bower et al., 1979) for people's knowledge of routine activities can produce experimental results to support the views of Schank and his collaborators. Bower et al. (1979) found that when they asked subjects to recall texts involving routine activities (e.g. Going to a Restaurant, Grocery Shopping, Visiting a Doctor), their subjects tended to confuse in memory actions that were stated in the text with actions implied by the 'script'. They also found that, when presented with scrambled texts which caused script-actions to be out of predictable sequence, subjects recalled the texts with script-actions in their canonical order. There is, then, some evidence that the script-concept may have some psychological validity, over and above its function as an organisational device in computer data storage. Further evidence is provided by Sanford & Garrod (1981) who base their notion of *scenario* very much on Schank's script concept.

7.6.3 Scenarios

Sanford & Garrod (1981) choose the term *scenario* to describe the 'extended domain of reference' which is used in interpreting written texts, 'since one can think of knowledge of settings and situations as constituting the interpretative scenario behind a text'. Their aim is to 'establish the validity of the scenario account as a psychological theory' (1981: 110) in opposition to the proposition-based theory of Kintsch (1974) which we described earlier in Chapter 3. According to the proposition-based approach, the existence of *a waiter*, for example, in the mental representation which a reader has after reading a text about *Going to a Restaurant*, depends entirely on whether a waiter was explicitly mentioned in the text. According to the scenario account, a text about *Going to a Restaurant* automatically brings *a waiter* slot into the representation. As evidence that certain 'role' slots are activated in scenarios, Sanford & Garrod show that substantial differences are recorded in the reading times for the target sentences in the following two conditions:

(32) a. *Title: In court*
Fred was being questioned.
He had been accused of murder.

Target: The lawyer was trying to prove his innocence.

b. *Title: Telling a lie*
Fred was being questioned.
He couldn't tell the truth.

Target: The lawyer was trying to prove his innocence.

In condition *a*, with the *In court* scenario activated, reading times for the target sentence containing *The lawyer* were substantially faster than in the *b* condition where a non-specific scenario had been activated.

Sanford & Garrod emphasise that the success of scenario-based comprehension is dependent on the text-producer's effectiveness in activating appropriate scenarios. They point out that 'in order to elicit a scenario, a piece of text must constitute a specific *partial description* of an element of the scenario itself' (1981: 129). These points and the structure of the examples in (32) lend support to our view, expressed already in Chapter 4, that effective staging, particularly thematisation, facilitates the processing of text. One function of thematisation at the text level may be to activate a particular scenario representation for the reader.

We should emphasise that Sanford & Garrod's claims relate to the ease or speed with which texts based on a coherent scenario can be processed. They do not suggest that texts for which a single scenario structure is not immediately available cannot be processed. Their scenario-based approach would encounter just as many problems as the frame-based approach if applied to the 'Pope meets Archbishop' text presented as (27) in Chapter 7. Their suggestion would no doubt be that such texts take longer to process.

Most of the textual material discussed by Sanford & Garrod is in the form of very brief constructed text which is designed for use in the controlled studies of the experimental psychology laboratory. In fact, this is a general feature of the 'texts' which appear in the work of psychologists investigating knowledge representation. Although Sanford & Garrod prefer the term 'scenario', they indicate that their notion of text-processing involving pre-existing knowledge representations has much in common with other studies

in which the term *schemata* is more generally used. If there is a difference between the use of these two terms, it appears to be that scenarios are situation-specific (At the Cinema; In a Restaurant), whereas schemata are much more general types of knowledge representations.

7.6.4 *Schemata*

We have already discussed one area of discourse studies, that related to story-grammars (cf. section 3.9), in which appeal was made to the existence of a particular type of *schema*. For the proponents of story-grammars, there exists a socio-culturally determined story-schema, which has a fixed conventional structure containing a fixed set of elements. One of these elements is the 'setting' and an initial sentence of a simple story (e.g. *All was quiet at the 701 Squadron base at Little Baxton*) can instantiate the setting element. It should be pointed out that, although a simple story may instantiate many elements in the story-schema, it is not suggested that the story has the schema. Rather, it is people who have schemata which they use to produce and comprehend simple stories, among many other things (e.g. place-descriptions in Brewer & Treyens (1981)).

Schemata are said to be 'higher-level complex (and even conventional or habitual) knowledge structures' (van Dijk, 1981: 141), which function as 'ideational scaffolding' (Anderson, 1977) in the organisation and interpretation of experience. In the strong view, schemata are considered to be deterministic, to predispose the experiencer to interpret his experience in a fixed way. We can think of racial prejudice, for example, as the manifestation of some fixed way of thinking about newly encountered individuals who are assigned undesirable attributes and motives on the basis of an existing schema for members of the race. There may also be deterministic schemata which we use when we are about to encounter certain types of discourse, as evidenced in the following conversational fragment.

(33) A: There's a party political broadcast coming on – do you want to watch it?
B: No – switch it off – I know what they're going to say already.

However, the general view taken of schemata in the analysis of

UNIT 3

PRAGMATICS

One of the central questions of philosophy is how we interpret our world and our lives as being 'meaningful', or, more generally, how we generate meaning in the general sense of 'significance'. One of the most important tools we use to do this is language. And one of the most fascinating fields in linguistics is to study how speakers use their language to generate specific meanings in specific contexts. This is the interface where philosophy meets semantics and pragmatics.

(Senft, 2014, p. 11)

MAIN OBJECTIVES

> Introduce the scope and aims of pragmatics.

> Familiarize students with Grice's Theory of Implicature and the Speech-Act Theory.

> Introduce some important concepts, including reference, deixis, and presumption.

3.1. A Pragmatic Approach to DA

It is important to note that all study areas within discourse analysis are interconnected, making it often difficult to discern between them. Different traditions or schools have been identified with the express purpose of systematizing the study of discourse and differentiating various approaches to problem-solving within the subject. Among the most prominent schools are perhaps pragmatics, interactional sociolinguistics, the ethnography of communication, conversation analysis, and the variationist method.

In the view of Senft (2014), the rise of pragmatics and its increasing popularity and influence since the 1970s are viewed by scholars as a reaction to the development of American structural linguistics, which culminated in Chomsky's proclamation of the "ideal speaker/listener in a completely homogeneous speech community" (Chomsky 1965, p. 3). The more influential the Chomskyan paradigm became in linguistics, the more linguists realised that this paradigm's general abstractions ignored the fact that language is realised in speech produced by speakers in various social, cultural, and political contexts with varying goals and intentions. In fact, language is much more than a grammatical algorithm and vocabulary; it is a tool for social interaction and communication between speakers (Senft, 2014).

Linguistic pragmatics is the study of how speakers use their language(s) in various situations and contexts: what they do and why they do it. Pragmatics focuses on actual language users, their communicative behaviour, their world, and their perspectives (Senft, 2014).

Discourse analysis relies on pragmatics as an indispensable source of information. It is impossible to examine any speech without a firm foundational understanding of pragmatic phenomena and how they operate and interact. Gricean pragmatics is regarded as one of the most important contributions to linguistics, since H. P. Grice's (1975) concepts regarding speaker meaning and the cooperative principle have been and continue to be the most influential in the field.

3.2. Grice's Cooperative Principle and Theory of Implicature

The cooperative principle of Grice is a set of conversational norms. We must adhere to four maxims in order to be cooperative and understood. Below is a description of it according to Grice (1975).

- The Cooperative principle

Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

A. The Maxim of Quantity

- Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
- Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

B. The Maxim of Quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:

- Do not say what you believe to be false.
- Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

C. The Maxim of Relation
- Be relevant.

D. The Maxim of Manner

Be perspicuous, and specifically:

- Avoid obscurity of expression.
- Avoid ambiguity.
- Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
- Be orderly.   (p.45-6)

    Grice notes that people do not always adhere to these norms precisely, which is when conversational implicatures come into play. When a speaker breaks or "flouts" one of the maxims, the listener assumes the speaker is still attempting to cooperate and searches for a deeper meaning. This results in an inference, namely a conversational implicature.

According to Grice, the hearer will consider the following factors when determining if a conversational implicature exists:

- The usual meaning of the words employed, along with the identity of any potential allusions.
- The Cooperative Principle and its guiding principles.
- The utterance's context, whether verbal or otherwise.
- Additional background information.
- The fact (or claimed fact) that both participants have access to all pertinent information covered by the aforementioned headings and both participants are aware of or believe this to be the case (1975: 50).

3.3. Speech acts

    Austin disagreed with the neopositivist theory that language can only be used to explain, confirm, and report physical truths or happenings. Using Wittgenstein's views, who proposed the maxim "Don't ask for the meaning, ask for the use," he argued for the active/performative side of language, illustrating language as a new means of social interaction (Bach, 1998). According to him, language is constative, descriptive, active, and performative. In this regard, he suggests making a distinction between constative claims, which have a truth value, and performative claims, which are connected to an action in the real world. His entire theory focuses on how language and meaning are connected to one

42

another. Austin's theories grew out of the fundamental conviction that language is a tool for carrying out actions. The *William James Lectures* at Harvard, which Austin delivered between 1955 and 1962, were collected in a book titled How to Do Things with Words. This was the beginning of what is now known as the "speech act theory." Austin defines meaning as a link between the linguistic conventions attached to words and phrases, the situation in which the speaker actually conveys information to the listener, and the speaker's underlying intentions.

Austin asserts that some utterances that seem to be statements lack the truth value that is thought to be a necessary component of statements. The act of making the assertion is, or is a component of, the act of doing anything, even though they don't "describe" or "report" anything. Austin refers to these as "performatives," contrasting them with "constatives," which are statements whose validity or untruth can be ascertained (Austin in Schiffirin, 1994:53).

The speech act idea has inspired numerous scholars in numerous fields. This theory mtivated Judith Butler to construct the notion of gender performativity within the field of gender studies. She believed that gender identity is socially produced and enacted, since it is the result of performative acts and behaviours. According to Butler, gender is not something we possess but rather something we act.

3.3.1.The Three types of speech acts
According to Austin, there are three different acts a person may execute by saying something:

3.3.1.1.Locutionary act
The act of stating something 'It's me again' (surface meaning)

It includes three sub-levels: the phonetic act (verbal), which is the act of producing sounds, the phatic act (syntactic), which consists in producing sound characterized as words of a particular language organized according to the grammar of that language, and the rhetic act (semantic), which is the level of semantics, since it consists in producing statements with meaning and reference.

3.3.1.2.Illocutionary act
The act performed by saying something 'It's me again,' (speaker's purpose to apologize). The illocutionary act relates to what is accomplished by saying something, or what the speaker intends to accomplish by saying something. Consider the following scenario: The speaker intended to give an instruction when he said "Close the door, please," and he intended to communicate a sentiment when he said "What a hot day, my God!" and so on.

3.3.1.3. Perlocutionary Act

The impact of the statement on the listener. 'It's me again' (the effect of it is difficult to foresee or guess. In this case, the statement may make the addressee angry)

By saying "The company may not be able to pay the employees this month", whose illocutionary force is to give a piece of information, the speaker may cause the hearer to become worried.

3.3.2. Classification of Acts

Many philosophers believe Austin and his colleague Searle held opposing views on speech acts; whereas Austin emphasized a conventional interpretation of speech acts (illocutionary forces derive from a customary system of social interaction), Searle emphasized a psychological explanation (based on meaning, beliefs, etc.). In fact, Searle expressly connected the study of speech acts with the study of language, including its production, interpretation, and meaning (both speaker and linguistic meaning). Several analytic relationships exist between the concept of "speech acts," what the speaker wants, what the hearer understands, and the rules governing the linguistic elements. Therefore, Searle (1975) extended and refined Austin's theory by suggesting classifications limited to illocutionary acts. Therefore, there are at least five distinct types of illocutionary speaking acts, according to Searle.

Assertives: a statement that expresses the speaker's belief about a fact of the world. Assertives are expressed through statements that bind the speaker to the truth of the statement. For example, reciting a creed.

Directives: refer to the speech acts that are intended to elicit a specific response from the listener, such as requests, instructions, and recommendations.

Directives express commands, orders, etc., which cause the hearer to act in a way or other. In this case, the world will adapt to the language.

Commissives: refer to the speaker's commitment to something in the future, such as a promise. It is necessary to take action in order for the promise to make sense.

Expressives: correspond to the speaker's feelings and emotions, such as thanking or congratulating someone.

Declarations: Baptisms, judicial pronouncements (pronouncing someone guilty, or pronouncing someone husband and wife) are examples of acts that transform the world based on the content of the statement.

3.3.3. The notion of Indirectness

Through indirect speech acts, the speaker communicates to the hearer more than S/he actually says by relying on their mutually shared linguistic and non-linguistic background knowledge, as well as the hearer's general powers of rationality and deduction. Such an act will need an analysis of mutually shared background information about the covaersation, as well as logic and linguistic rules.

Indirectness is a typical conversation strategy. People useindirect speech acts for a variety of reasons and circumstances. Indirect speech acts are frequently associated with piliteness as a means of dealing with unwelcome messages (Leech, 1983). Instead of making a direct request (open the window), the speaker in the following example prefers to first justify the action.

- E.g., it's hot in here.

In regard to indirect speech acts, Searle (1975) offers the categories of "primary" and "secondary" illocutionary acts. Primarily, the indirect illocutionary act is illocutionary. The primary illocutionary act is the literal uttering of the statement. "In indirect speech acts the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and nonlinguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer" (Searle, 1975,p.60).

In linguistic literature, the following example is frequently used to illustrate the notion of indirectness.

- Speaker X: "We should leave for the show or else we'll be late."
- Speaker Y: "I am not ready yet."

In the above example, the primary illocutionary act is Y's rejection of X's suggestion, and the secondary illocutionary act is Y's remark that she/he is not ready to leave.

Searle seeks to explain how humans can simultaneously grasp two meanings from a single utterance and respond to the correct meaning. Speaker and listener exchange information regarding how to identify and classify an utterance as a certain sort of act and as a linguistic unit that is formed and interpreted according to constitutive rules.

To conclude, there are a limited amount of things we can achieve with language. We tell others how things are, try to persuade them to do things, commit to doing things, convey our sentiments and attitudes, and use our words to influence the world around us. At any particular moment, a speech may serve numerous purposes. Some utterances have dual roles because one action can be carried out through another.

3.4. Reference

Numerous terms and expressions used in discourse serve as referents. They identify an entity within the text or the context of a sentence. Referents are frequently introduced into conversation using both indefinite and explicit terms (e.g., a man I met yesterday) and definite and inexplicit terms (e.g., he). Definiteness refers to the speaker's expectation that the hearer will be able to identify the particular, distinct entity to which he or she is referring. Explicitness refers to the transmission of information that actually enables the accurate recognition of a referent (Schiffrin, 1994).

According to Salkie (1995, p. 65), there are two ways to work out the full meaning of a reference word in a text. One is to look at the surrounding text. "The other is to look outside the text in the real world." Salkie (1995) illustrates with the example of "we" that it can refer to a group of people, including the writer or the speaker. So we need to know who the writer or speaker is and which other people are included (the writer may include everyone in the world or can be more specific and refer to a smaller group). In this respect, Schiffrin (1994) believes that scholars typically see the process of referring to entities in the universe of discourse as pragmatic due to the fact that it involves speakers, their intentions, actions, and knowledge. In practice, certain forms of reference require mutual knowledge. Referring to an entity with the idea that the hearer will be able to identify it similarly depends on shared knowledge, beliefs, and assumptions. Thus, referring to an entity is not strictly semantic or truth-conditional but pragmatic as well.

3.5. Deixis

This term is defined by Fillmore (1982) as follows:

> Deixis is the name given to uses of items and categories of lexicon and grammar that are controlled by certain details of the interactional situation in which the utterances are produced. These details include especially the identity of the participants in the communicating situation, their locations and orientation in space, whatever on-going indexing acts the participants may be performing, and the time at which the utterance containing the items is produced.   (1982, p. 35)

The phenomena of deixis makes it easy to see how language and context interact. Deictic linguistic items are those that are closely related to the context of an utterance, such as

demonstratives, pronouns, tense, place, and time adverbs like now and here, some verbs like bring and take, and others. These words have also been referred to as shifters or indexical expressions since their referential meaning changes with each new speaker or context of use. They signify or point to other entities inside the text or context of an utterance.

Deixis, according to Levinson (1983), describes the way that languages encode or grammaticalize aspects of the context of an utterance or speech occurrence, and how this affects how utterances are understood. Therefore, the pronoun "this" does not always name or refer to a specific entity; rather, it serves as a placeholder or variable for a specific entity that is indicated by the context (for example, through a gesture) (Levinson, 1983).

Deixis has traditionally been broken down into three basic categories: time, place, and person (Levinson, 1983). In person deixis, the participants in the speech event in which the utterance in question is delivered are coded according to their roles. Usually, the first, second, and third person pronouns are used to encode this function. The encoding of spatial places in relation to the locations of the participants in the speech event is known as place deixis. The basic language manifestations of this form of deixis are demonstratives (such as the English this or that) and deictic adverbs of place (such as here or there in English). That and there are cases of distal (or nonproximal to the speaker) place deixis, whereas this and here are examples of proximal (or close to the speaker) place deixis. The encoding of temporal points and spans in relation to the time at which an utterance is pronounced is known as time deixis. Time deixis is mostly encoded in English via tenses and a few time adverbs, such as now and then, yesterday, tomorrow, and last year.

We must also include discourse (or text) deixis and social deixis when discussing deixis. Discourse deixis refers to the use of terms within an utterance to refer to a segment of the discourse containing the utterance. Discourse-deictic terms consist of both time and place deictic terms that refer to an upcoming or prior section of the discourse. It is crucial to distinguish between discourse, deixis, and anaphora in this instance. Anaphora typically involves using a pronoun to refer to the same referent previously mentioned., as in:

- The boy opened the door. He was late.

where "the boy" and "he" are said to be co-referential because they share the same referent. Deixis in discourse usually involves a pronoun or expression that refers to the linguistic expression (or segment of discourse) itself, as in:
- A: Trust me; I adore you.
- B: That's the best compliment I've ever heard!
-
Here "That" refers to A's whole utterance.

When used at the beginning of an utterance, discourse connectors or pragmatic markers like however, besides, also, moreover, well, and anyway are also considered discourse-deictic because they refer to or show a relationship with other parts of the ongoing discourse.

Social deixis marks "social relationships in linguistic expressions [...] with reference to the social status or role of participants in the speech event" (Levinson 2005, 119). According to some linguists, social deixis is a subset of person deixis. The manner in which we organise our utterances is determined by our social rank and that of our addressee, as well as our relationship to the other participants in the speech event. This is represented in the pronominal system of many languages, which distinguishes between formal and informal address with the second personal pronoun. This distinction is known as the T/V distinction, derived from the French terms "tu" and "vous" (Grundy 2000, 26; Mey 2001, 274; Yule 1996, 10).

3.6. **Presupposition**

Presuppositions, like implicatures, are a type of language inference. While implicatures cannot be claimed to be semantic (since they are reliant on contextual assumptions rather than being built into the linguistic structure of the sentences that trigger them), presuppositions are. However, because they are very sensitive to specific contextual elements, they cannot be considered semantic in the limited sense (Levinson, 1983). Presuppositions appear to be linked to specific words or characteristics of the surface structure in general, as seen in the examples below.

Examples:
- Peter no longer drinks tea fiction. (Presupposition: Peter used to drink tea).
- Have you watched Titanic? (Presupposition: Titanic has already been released)
- Have you met Jamie? (Presupposition: Jamie exists).

Yule (2010) stated there are six types of presuppositions.
- **The existential presupposition**

It is the assumption assumed to be committed to the existence of the entities' names by the speaker and assumed to be present in the noun phrase.

Example

My mother's car is blue (my mother exists and that she has a car

- **Factive presupposition**

It is the assumption that is true and can identify by some verbs such as 'know', 'realize', ' regret', 'be', ' aware', 'odd', and ' glad'.

Example

John didn't realize that the car was cheap (The car was cheap)

- **The non-factive presupposition**

It is the contrast of factive presupposition. It is assumed not to be true. Verbs like dream, imagine and pretend are used with the presupposition that what follows is not true.

Example

Clara dreamed that she was rich (Yule, 2010) (Sarah was not rich)

- **Lexical presupposition**

It is the presupposition that use of one word with is asserted meaning is conventionally interpreted with the presupposition that another (non; asserted) meaning is understood.

Other examples involving the lexical presupposition are, 'stop', 'start', 'again'.

Example

She stopped smoking (he used to smoke)

- **Structural Presupposition**

It is the assumption associated with the use of certain words and phrase and assumed to be true,for example, WH question construction in English are conventionally interpreted with the presuppositionthat the information after the WH- form is already known to be case.

 Example

When did he leave? (He left)Where did you buy the bike? (You bought the bike)

- **The counter-factual presupposition**

It is the assumption that what is presupposition is not only untrue, but it is opposite of what is presupposed is not only untrue, but it is opposite of what is true, or contrary to fact. For instance, some conditional structure, generally called counterfactual conditionals presuppose that the information in if clause is not at the time of utterances.

Example

If you were my friend, you would have helped me (>> you are not my friend)

Research Questions

- ❖ In the view of Senft (2014), the rise of pragmatics and its increasing popularity and influence since the 1970s are viewed by scholars as a reaction to Chomsky's (1965) idealistic views about language. Discuss

- ❖ Why is Gricean pragmatics regarded as one of the most important contributions to linguistics?

- ❖ Why did Austin disagree with the neopositivist theory?

- ❖ Provide examples for constative and for performative sentences.

- ❖ Searle (1975) elaborates the classification of speech acts into five classes. Discuss and provide examples

- ❖ According to Salkie (1995, p. 65), there are two ways to work out the full meaning of a reference word in a text. What are they? Provide examples.

- ❖ Deixis makes it easy to see how language and context interact. Explain and provide examples.

- ❖ Apart from the three known types of deixis (time, place, person), what are the other types?

- ❖ Presuppositions are context sensitive. Explain and provide examples.

- ❖ What are the six types of presuppositions proposed by Yule (2010)?

<div style="text-align:center">

5

</div>

Pragmatics and sociology

Everyday social interaction

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the 1960s and 1970s the research of three North American sociologists had a strong impact on the understanding of human everyday face-to-face interaction in general and on the understanding of communicative behaviour and language use in particular – especially in conversation.

The first part of this chapter features Erving Goffman's (1922–1982) insights in, and ideas about, social interaction.

The second part of this chapter deals with Harold Garfinkel's (1917–2011) ethnomethodological studies on social order, his understanding of everyday 'common sense' knowledge and his ideas about how we make sense of our social world.

Influenced by Garfinkel, but also by Goffman, Harvey Sacks (1935–1975) developed the field of 'Conversation Analysis' (CA) to research how conversation is ordered and structurally organized. The third part of this chapter presents central aspects and research results of the CA approach and recent developments within this field.

5.2 ERVING GOFFMAN'S INTERACTION ORDER

Erving Goffman's research focused on social interaction that is guided and regulated by normative rights and obligations. He understood the study of face-to-face interactions as a subdiscipline of sociology. In his 1983 (undelivered) presidential address to the American Sociological Association Goffman proposed to call this subarea of his discipline 'the interaction order'. Kendon notes that American sociologists before Goffman had studied interaction as 'a means to an end':

> [Their] approaches took the view that the phenomena of usual concern to sociology and social psychology – leadership, social stratification, organization of authority, and the like – must be grounded in the patterning of specific acts of interaction between society's members. Such acts were to form the basic data upon which the investigation of such phenomena was to be based. However, the acts of interaction were not themselves studied. Only an aspect of them was seized upon as a means toward studying something else. Goffman recognized this and made it clear that what he was concerned with was different: it was to raise the question as how interaction is possible in the first place.
>
> (Kendon 1988c: 19)

Goffman (1967: 2) made it clear that for him 'the proper study of interaction is not the individual and his psychology, but rather the syntactical relations among the acts of different persons mutually present to one another'.[1] Based on the Aristotelian insight that human beings are social animals who spend most of their daily life 'in the immediate presence of others', he pointed out that all their 'doings are likely to be ... *socially situated*' (Goffman 1983a: 2). Face-to-face interactions occur in social situations in which persons are 'co-present with one another' and where 'they must sense that they are close enough to be perceived in whatever they are doing, including their experiencing of others and close enough to be perceived in this sensing of being perceived' (Goffman 1963: 17). This concept of the social situation is central for Goffman's research. He refers to a social situation in which 'people effectively agree to sustain for a time a single focus of cognitive and visual attention, as in a conversation', as a 'focused gathering' or an 'encounter'; and he differentiates such an encounter from 'unfocused interaction' which 'consists of those interpersonal communications that result solely by virtue of persons being in one another's presence', like, for example people walking along in a city or town street (Goffman 1961: 8). In Goffman's interaction order:

> the engrossment and involvement of the participants – if only their attention – is critical ... Emotion, mood, cognition, bodily orientation, and muscular effort are intrinsically involved, introducing an inevitable psychobiological element. Ease and uneasiness, unselfconsciousness and wariness are central.
>
> (Goffman 1983a: 3)

Thus, even in unfocused forms of interaction like walking in a street, people mutually coordinate their behaviour. Goffman describes this behaviour as a minimal interactive ritual which he calls 'civil inattention'. In this situation people who pass each other may 'glance at one another but mutually agree not to let their eyes meet, and do so in a way that lets each know that the other is not scared, hostile or that he regards the other as an automaton' (Kendon 1988c: 25). Focused gatherings, however, are much more complex. Goffman points out that:

> [o]nce individuals – for whatever reason – come into one another's immediate presence, a fundamental condition of social life becomes enormously pronounced, namely its promissory, evidential character. It is not only that our appearance and manner provide evidence of our statuses and relationships. It is also that the line of our visual regard, the intensity of our involvement, and the shape of our initial actions, allow others to glean our immediate intent and purpose, and all this whether or not we are engaged in talk with them at the time. Correspondingly, we are constantly in a position to facilitate this revealment, or block it, or even misdirect our viewers. The gleaned character of these observations is itself facilitated and complicated by a general process yet to be systematically studied – social ritualization – that is, the standardization of bodily and vocal behavior through socialization, affording such behavior – such gestures, if you will – a specialized communicative function in the stream of behavior.
>
> (Goffman 1983a: 3)

UNIT 4

INTERACTIONAL SOCIOLINGUISTICS

Interactional sociolinguistics developed at the crossroads of several disciplines extracting its roots from even more diverse areas of scholarly research, such as: ethnography, dialectology, pragmatics and conversation analysis, areas to which it is closely related.

(Irimiea, 2018, p. 62)

MAIN OBJECTIVES

➢ Define the scope and aims of interactional sociolinguistics.

➢ Introduce the foundational theories and concepts of interactional sociolinguistics.

➢ Highlight Gumperz and Goffman's contribution to interactional sociolinguistics.

➢ Identify the methods of research in interactional sociolinguistics.

➢ Outline the main concepts and tenets of the Theory of Politeness.

4.1. Interactional Sociolinguistics

Interactional sociolinguistics is an interdisciplinary approach to discourse analysis. It is based on anthropology, sociology, and linguistics and is concerned with the study of the links between language, culture, and society. Interactional sociolinguists regard discourse as a social interaction in which the use of language facilitates the emergent production and negotiation of meaning; consequently, they constantly rely on naturally occurring interactions as a source of data. They regard situated behaviour as the site where societal and interactive forces collide, and they concentrate on how such interaction is dependent on culturally informed but situated inferential processes, which play a role in the speakers' interpretative constructions of the type of activity they are engaged in.

Bailey (2008) identifies the value of interactional sociolinguistics as "analyzing how social knowledge and linguistic knowledge intersect in creating meaning in talk," to which he adds another dimension, the "cultural nature of communicative action" (p. 2317). Consequently,

interactional sociolinguistics can be regarded as a broad, multidisciplinary approach that resides at the junction of multiple disciplines and borrows some of their methodologies. It also shows how linguistic and cultural factors work together with social factors to create meaning in speech.

Interactional sociolinguistics grew out of Gumperz and Hymes' seminal 1972 book Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. Several questions were raised in this seminal work that underlined the major challenges for interactional sociolinguistics. Gumperz and Hymes' first notable concern was the search for a theory that could address language as an important aspect of social and cultural processes, as well as the necessity to establish methodologies and applicable technical concepts. Their determination to delve further into the relationship between language and society happened amid a period of political upheaval marked by decolonization, civil rights movements, educational difficulties, and so on. Their desire to describe models of language-social interaction arose from their realisation that there must be a method that connects the disciplines (Hymes, 1972). Indeed, this was an early and clear acknowledgement of the interdisciplinarity of interactional sociolinguistics' and its ability to attract research issues from linguistics, anthropology, sociology, and psychology.

4.2. John Gumperz's contribution to Interactional Sociolinguistics

John Gumperz provides an interpretative sociolinguistic approach to the examination of real-time processes in face-to-face conversations in his 1982 essay titled "Discourse Strategies." Gumperz emphasizes the influence of social and cultural forces on cognition and language. Gumperz argues that we must comprehend and study the influences of culture and society on language (1982).

The contextualization cue is a key concept in interactional sociolinguistics. According to Gumperz (1999), a contextualization cue is any verbal sign that, when processed in conjunction with symbolic grammatical and lexical signs, creates the contextual foundation for situated interpretations and thus influences how constituent messages are understood. Intensity or any prosodic choices, conversational code-switching, lexical or syntactic choices, style switching, and facial and gestural cues are a few examples of contextualization cues.

Gumperz approached social interactions micro-analytically. He was asked in a 1979 interview by John Twitchin why he was interested in micro-analyses rather than macro-level analyses of social processes in a multi-racial society where racial discrimination and economic disadvantages dominated the British political, economic, and cultural scene. Gumperz responded to this argument by saying that there is no doubting that political and economic

factors have a significant role in race relations and that, ultimately, redressing the balance of discrimination is a matter of power. However, communication is a powerful tool. Gumperz was successful in unravelling and analysing segments of audio and video recordings of located interactions, contributing to the creation of a fundamental process for examining social interactions. Gumperz's micro-analyses of recorded conversations addressed the political issues of race, discrimination, class stratification, and gender relations.

4.3. Erving Goffman's Contribution to Interactional Sociolinguistics

Goffman has undoubtedly been one of the most influential authors in the study of interactional sociolinguistics. He used the term "interaction orders" to refer to the shared standards and expectations that members of a group employ to govern their daily social interactions and sense-making, which take the form of location- and circumstance-specific behaviours that are taken for granted.

Although Goffman views talk as the fundamental medium of interactions, he also places great emphasis on co-presence, which draws attention to the body, its posture, and its presentation. As Schiffrin (1994) notes, Goffman contends that the self is a social construction, and one way to view the self as a social, interactive construction is through the concept of "face," the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact (Goffman, 1967, p. 5). Face maintenance is one of the requirements of interaction. In order to interact face-to-face or to retain face, individuals are required to conduct themselves in a manner compatible with this picture. Both avoidance and presentational interpersonal rituals contribute to the maintenance of the face.

Frame is another significant notion in Goffman's description of interaction. Goffman examines how social actors organise their experience in terms of recognisable activities (e.g., a business meeting, a lecture, or a game of chess), which are the frames through which individuals form their experience. Thus, framing organisational activity is socially situated. Goffman's frame analysis demonstrates how individuals can deal with various, interrelated realities, thus revealing the intricacy of everyday social interactions.

4.4. Research Methods

Interactional sociolinguists use audio or video recordings of conversations or other interactions as research methodologies. Language can be analysed in a variety of ways, depending on the methodology of discourse analysis used to isolate instances of interactional sociolinguistics. Despite the fact that Gumperz pioneered his framework several decades ago, anthropologists continue to utilise it in their studies today.

Researchers frequently focus on certain linguistic components. Some concentrate on specialised word usage, such as connotation and indexicality. Schiffrin, who isolated 12 terms to analyse in her research of Jewish communities and their use of speech in Philadelphia, is an example of an anthropologist who used this type of methodology in her work (Schiffrin, 1987). Linguistic analysis tools, such as evaluating linguistic structures and the roles they play within conversational discourse, take a significant part in establishing relational frameworks employing discourse analysis (Schiffrin, 1987). Analysis focuses not only on linguistic structures like words, sentences, syntax, phonology, and so on, but also on subtle clues like prosody and register that communicate contextual presuppositions.

Linguistic analysis is not the sole component that may be used to identify instances of interactional sociolinguistics. Understanding this phenomenon is also influenced by culture. Many linguistic anthropologists have come to realise that language and culture are not different things, but rather processes that coexist. These contextualization cues vary by culture and are frequently unconscious. Linguistic anthropology assists in making explicit implicit cultural aspects that are frequently unknown to the speaker. When conversation participants come from different cultural backgrounds, they may miss these subtle signs in one another's speech, resulting in misunderstanding (Gumperz, 1982).

Gumperz's framework of interactional sociolinguistics has been used extensively to investigate the concepts of misunderstanding, contextualization, and culture. Gumperz's paradigm is frequently employed in the context of jokes and how, when, and why they are used in conversation by a certain culture. Catherine Evans Davies is one anthropologist who has used interactional sociolinguistics methodology in her research. She employs it in her ethnographic research to better understand how language learners begin to make sense of social interaction in that language by conversing with native speakers using jokes (Davis, 2003). She analyses the utility of Gumperz's theory in her technique, which emphasises conversational analysis for the goal of interpreting distinct linguistic practises, in this case humour and joking, in her work. Interactional sociolinguistic discourse analysis is useful in more than just jokes and humour. It is a viable and productive study approach for anyone interested in the interactions of language,

culture, and meaning. Karen Grainger used it in her study of caregiver-elderly relationships. Karen Grainger uses interactional sociolinguistics in her paper "Reality Orientation in Institutions for the Elderly: The Perspective from Interactional Sociolinguistics" to argue against a procedure of elder therapy known as "Reality Orientation" (Grainger, 1998). In this work, Grainger employs discourse analysis to investigate some of the therapists' scripts and patterns of speaking. Using Gumperz's paradigm in this way demonstrated that this type of therapy may be widening the gap between patients and staff. Grainger employs interactional sociolinguistics in this case to understand how power hierarchies are constructed and maintained, whether purposefully or accidentally.

4.5. Politeness

In the 1970s, Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson established an important subfield of pragmatics known as politeness theory. The idea mainly relies on Erving Goffman's concept of face theory and has advanced this concept by focusing on how and why we are polite to others.

4.5.1.Leech's Approach to Politeness

Leech (1983) asserts that the cooperative principle and the politeness principle do not act independently. His model of politeness is founded on interpersonal rhetoric and views politeness as conflict avoidance. He (1983) maintains that the function of the politeness principle is "to maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly relations that enable us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative in the first place" (p. 82). Leech (1983, p. 132) came up with a set of maxims called "The Politeness Principle" to explain how politeness works in conversations.

Leech's Maxims

- Tact maxim (in directives [or impositives] and commissives): minimize cost to other; [maximize benefit to other]
- Generosity maxim (in directives and commissives): minimize benefit to self; [maximize cost to self]
- Approbation maxim (in expressives and representatives [assertives]): minimize dispraise of other; [maximize praise of other]
- Modesty maxim (in expressives and representatives): minimize praise of self; [maximize dispraise of self]
- Agreement maxim (in representatives): minimize disagreement between self and other; [maximize agreement between self and other]
- Sympathy maxim (in representatives): minimize antipathy between self and other; [maximize sympathy between self and other]

The distinction between "relative politeness" and "absolute politeness" is made by Leech. The former refers to politeness in regard to a certain situation, whereas the later refers to the degree of politeness inherent to particular speaker acts. Consequently, some illocutions (such as orders) are inherently impolite, whilst others (such as offers) are naturally polite. Negative civility, according to Leech, involves limiting the impoliteness of impolite illocutions, whereas positive politeness involves increasing the politeness of polite illocutions.

4.5.2. Robin Lakoff's approach to politeness

According to Lakoff (1990), politeness is "a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange" (1990: 34). Lakoff attempts to come up with pragmatic rules to go along with syntactic and semantic rules for Grice's cooperative principle, which she renames "rules of conversation." The search for pragmatic rules would have to be rooted in the notion of pragmatic competence (Watts, 2003). When people converse, they generally adhere to cultural norms, showing that they are competent speakers. Conversation rules include overarching pragmatic competence rules and subrules, such as "be clear" and "be polite."

Rule one (Be clear) is the Grecian CP. This maxim is dominated by the rules of politeness. CP simply means that when people engage in a conversation, they will say something appropriate at that point in the conversation. Rule two (Be Polite) consists of a subset of three rules: (1) Don't impose, (2) give options, and (3) make A feel good—be friendly.

4.5.3. Brown and Levinson's Theory of Politeness

In their model, politeness is defined as redressive action taken to counterbalance the disruptive effect of face-threatening acts (FTAs). The basic notion of their model is "face." This is defined as "the public self-image that every member of society wants to claim for himself." In their framework, face consists of two related aspects. One is negative face, or the rights to territories, freedom of action, and freedom from imposition—wanting your actions not to be constrained or inhibited by others. The other is positive face—the positive, consistent self-image that people have and their desire to be appreciated and approved of by at least some other people.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) politeness is the sum of rational actions people take to maintain both types of faces, for themselves and those with whom they interact. Brown and Levinson also argue that in human communication, whether spoken or written; people tend to keep one another's faces. In everyday conversation, we adapt our utterances to different situations. Among friends, we take liberties or say things that would seem discourteous to

strangers. In both situations, we try to avoid making the listener feel embarrassed or uncomfortable.

Consider the following examples:

- I want some lemonade.
- Is it okay if I have a lemoande?
- Is it possible for me to have some lemonade?
- It's so hot. It makes you really thirsty.

Brown and Levinson divide human politeness into four groups: bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-the-record-indirect strategy. The bald on-record strategy does nothing to reduce threats to the listener's "face" (I want some lemonade). The positive politeness strategy demonstrates that you recognize your listener has a face that must be respected. It also confirms that the relationship is friendly and expresses group reciprocity. (Is it possible for me to have some lemonade?) The negative politeness strategy recognizes the hearer's face, but it also admits that you are in some way imposing on him/her. (I don't want to bother you, but would it be possible for me to have a lemonade?) Off-record indirect strategies take some of the pressure off. You are trying to avoid the direct FTA of asking for a beer. You would rather it be offered to you once your hearer sees that you want one. (It is so hot, it makes you really thirsty.)

Research Questions

❖ Interactional sociolinguists regard discourse as a social interaction in which the use of language facilitates the emergent production and negotiation of meaning. Discuss

❖ Bailey (2008) identifies the value of interactional sociolinguistics as "analyzing how social knowledge and linguistic knowledge intersect in creating meaning in talk." Explain

❖ How did Gumperz and Goffman contribute to interactional sociolinguistics?

❖ What are the main research methods in interactional sociolinguistics?

❖ Leech (1983) asserts that the cooperative principle and the politeness principle do not act independently. How so.

❖ Leech (1983, p. 132) proposed a set of maxims called "The Politeness Principle" to explain how politeness works in conversations. What are they?

❖ Discuss with some of your classmates Robin Lakoff's approach to politeness. Write a summary of the discussion in your own words.

❖ What are the main ideas in Brown and Levinson's Theory of Politeness?

arch/). The chapter concludes by discussing the strengths and limitations of applying interactional sociolinguistics in these ways and outlines what this approach might uniquely contribute to the future study of healthcare communication.

2 Interactional Sociolinguistics as a Methodological Approach

2.1 Origins and Theoretical Positioning

The term 'interactional sociolinguistics' originally referred to a specific approach to intercultural communication and miscommunication developed by linguistic anthropologist John Gumperz and colleagues in the 1970s as an evolution from the ethnography of communication. Since then the scope of interactional sociolinguistics has widened considerably, and nowadays the term is used more generally to refer to the broadly sociolinguistic analysis of spoken discourse, especially in professional and workplace settings. In this later guise, interactional sociolinguistics often incorporates elements from other linguistic and social science methodologies which share a focus on naturally occurring talk; this increasingly includes applied or 'institutional' conversation analysis (Ten Have 2007).

Before moving on to describing the key features of this approach, it is worth briefly considering the main theoretical perspectives within which sociolinguistic research on institutional communication has been framed. Classical pragmatics, politeness theory and sociolinguistics are based on structuralist theories within linguistics. These approaches are typically associated with linear transmission ('sender-receiver') or psychological ('encoding-decoding') models of language and communication which assume that words or other signs unproblematically represent the concepts, feelings or intentions referred to by a speaker according to a predetermined set of rules or implicatures (Trenholm 2010) and that social categories including sex and social status can be seen as independent variables.

By contrast, and in common with other social constructionist and discursive approaches such as conversation analysis (Barnes and van der Scheer, this volume), interactional sociolinguists question the idea that social categories and linguistic/pragmatic forms and functions are predetermined. Rather, local context is viewed as being interdependent with social actions (Cicourel 1992), and spoken interaction is seen as a dynamic collaborative process where meanings, intentions and actions are jointly and progressively negotiated between the individuals involved. From this perspective, social identities and categories are co-produced, constantly changing and developing 'through the boot-strapping processes of contextualization, shifts in footing, and adaptation by interlocutors to each other's actions' (Erickson 2011: 160). Many interactional sociolinguists also apply an explicitly critical lens to the co-construction of institutional discourse, characterized by a meta-analytic interest in agency and power relations in a given communicative context and how these relate to wider societal discourses (Gee 2014).

2.2   Overview of Methodology

Interactional sociolinguistics has been described as an approach to discourse analysis which attempts to 'bridge the gap' between top-down theoretical approaches to discourse that privilege 'macro-societal conditions' in accounting for communicative practices and those such as conversation analysis which aim to provide a bottom-up micro-analytic social constructivist account (Gumperz 1999: 453). Interactional sociolinguists share the interest of conversation analysts in the 'interaction order' (Goffman 1974), namely the structural characteristics of talk-in-interaction as enacted via the machinery of turn-taking, sequential structures and preference organization (see Barnes and van der Scheer, this volume). The primary focus of interactional sociolinguistics is therefore on the detailed analysis of recorded talk-in-interaction. Participants in interactions are observed to make situated inferences about one another's communicative intentions and goals based on a wide array of verbal and non-verbal cues or resources that form part of sociocultural repertoires for creating meaning. These indexical 'contextualization cues' (Gumperz

UNIT 5

CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

What then makes us one species? Anything? Just our anatomy and physiology? Is everything else the product of the Tower of Babel, for better or for worse? Is there nothing which transcends the heterogeneities of culture, language, ethnicity, race, gender, class, nationality, and so on? Is it not, in the end, the formal organizations of interactional practice - conversation preeminent among them - which provide that armature of sociality which undergirds our common humanity?

(Schegloff, 1999, p. 427)

MAIN OBJECTIVES

➢ Define the scope and aims of conversation analysis.

➢ Introduce some foundational concepts in CA such as turn taking, adjacency pairs, preference organization, overall organization, etc.

➢ Familiarize students with some transcription techniques.

5.1. Conversation Analysis: Overview

Conversation analysis (CA) is a type of social interaction research that empirically investigates the mechanisms by which people establish mutual understanding (Flick, 2009). CA originated in the middle to late 1960s as a result of the collaboration of sociologists Harvey Sacks and Emmanuel Schegloff and a number of their students. In their initial investigations, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson devised a rigorous framework for the empirical study of talk-in-interaction; hence, their findings have proven to be robust and cumulative (Sidnell, 2010). Their pioneering investigations laid the groundwork for subsequent study, so that we now have a substantial body of findings about key aspects of human social interaction, such as turn-taking, action sequencing, and repair.

According to Sidnell (2010), within linguistics, conversation analysis is frequently confused with pragmatics or discourse analysis. However, CA differs fundamentally from these methods in that interactional activity rather than language itself is the major object of study. Due to the essential role of language in human social interaction, the ultimate objective of CA is to identify and explain interactional structure, not linguistic structure. Interactions are in fact intricately organised and, as such, accessible to formal analysis, which is a fundamental discovery of CA.

CA began with a focus on casual conversation, but its methods were later modified to include more task- and institution-centered interactions, such as those occurring in doctors' offices, courts, law enforcement, helplines, educational settings, and the mass media, and to emphasize multimodal and nonverbal activity in interaction, such as gaze, body movement, and gesture. As a result, the word "conversation analysis" has evolved into somewhat of a misnomer, although it continues to be used to refer to a separate and effective method for analyzing interactions. Sometimes, CA and ethnomethodology are considered a single field and referred to as "EMCA."

5.2. Methods and central concepts of CA

Conversation analysis presents a model that can be used to comprehend interactions, as well as a variety of descriptive notions. It is primarily considered as a collection of turns of speech; faults or misconceptions in speech are handled through repairs, and turns may be distinguished by the delay between them or other linguistic characteristics.

5.2.1. Overall Structural Organization

According to Sidnell (2010), there is an organisation pertaining to situations or encounters as a whole; this is referred to as "overall structural organization" or, simply, "overall organization." There are specific places within a given occasion where particular actions are performed. The right time to exchange greetings is at the beginning of a meeting, not at the end. Similarly, introductions between strangers are crucial at the beginning of a conversation, according to Sidnell (2010).

- **An example of an opening from a conversation between two close friends.** (Sidnell, 2015, p. 174)

Hyla & Nancy
01   ((ring))
02 Nancy: H'llo:?
03 Hyla: Hi:,
04 Nancy: ↑ HI::.
05 Hyla: Hwaryuhh=
06 Nancy: =↓ Fi:ne how'r you,
07 Hyla: Oka:[y,
08 Nancy: [Goo:d,
09   (0.4)
10 Hyla: mkhhh[hhh
11 Nancy: [What's doin,
12   (·)
13 Hyla: ->   aAh:,   noth[i : n :,]
14 Nancy: ->   [Y'didn't g]o meet Grahame?=

The explanation provided by Sidnell (2015) is that in this example, Hyla has called Nancy. A reciprocal exchange of personal state queries concludes with Nancy's "good" rating at line 8. The participants have reached "anchor position" at this point; however, instead of the caller introducing the initial topic, lines 09–10 include silence and audible breathing from Hyla. This prompted Nancy's "What are you doing?" at line 11, asking Hyla (the caller) to bring up the first issue and indicates that this is the place to do so. After Hyla says, "Oh, nothing," Nancy follows a specific subject by asking, "Why didn't you go meet Grahame?"

5.2.2. Turn taking

The description of a model in a publication titled *The Simplest Systematics* (Sacks et al., 1974), which was very important for the area of conversation analysis and one of the most cited journal articles published in Language, was the starting point for the analysis of turn-taking. (Sacks et al., 1974)

The concept is intended to explain that when individuals engage in conversation, they do not always speak at the same moment, but often, one person speaks at a time, and then another can follow. A speaker's contribution of this nature to a discourse is referred to as a "turn."

Turn construction units (TCUs) are certain forms or units that listeners can recognize and count on to create a turn. Speakers and listeners will know that such forms can be a word or a clause and use this knowledge to predict when a speaker is finished speaking so that others can speak, thereby minimizing overlap and silence. A listener will look for transition relevant places (TRPs), or spots where they can begin speaking, based on how the units appear over time. Turn construction units can be formed or identified in four different ways (Ford et al. 1996).

- Grammatical methods, i.e., morph syntactic structures

- Prosodic methods, e.g., pitch, speed, and changes in pronunciation

- Pragmatic methods: Turns do things, and a turn can be pragmatically over when the listeners have heard and learned enough.

- Visual cues such as gesture, gaze, and body movement are also used to indicate the end of a turn. For example, a person speaking looks at the next speaker when their turn is about to end.

Each time a turn is over, speakers also have to decide who can talk next, and this is called turn allocation. The rules for turn allocation are commonly formulated in this way:

1 a. If the current speaker selects a next speaker to speak at the end of the current TCU (by name, gaze, or contextual aspects of what is said), the selected speaker has the right and obligation to speak next.

b. If the current speaker does not choose a replacement, other potential speakers have the option to self-select (the first starter has the first turn).

c. If options 1a and 1b have not been implemented, the current speaker may continue with another TCU.

2. At the end of that TCU, the option system applies again.

Based on the way people take turns, there are three different types of silence:

- Pause: A period of silence within a speaker's TCU, that is, during a speaker's turn when a sentence is incomplete.

- Gap: A period of silence between turns, such as when a question is posed but not answered.

- Lapse: A period of silence during which no sequence or other structured action is occurring: the current speaker stops speaking, no next speaker is selected, and no one self-selects. Even if the pauses are short, people usually look away or do something else to stop paying attention.

Some sorts of turns may necessitate additional effort before they can be executed correctly. Speakers desiring a lengthy turn, for example, to tell a story or report significant news, must first demonstrate that others will not intrude throughout the telling through some type of introduction and listener consent. The preamble and its accompanying authorization constitute a pre-sequence (Schegloff, 2007). Conversations cannot be terminated by "just stopping," but require a specific ending sequence. (Schegloff,et al,1973).

5.2.3. Action and Sequence Organization

In discussion, actions frequently occur in pairs, and a first action such as a complaint, request, or invitation makes a subsequent response action pertinent (or a delimited range of responses). Participants may perceive that action as absent if it is not carried out. Schegloff (1968) referred to this relationship as "conditional relevance" and the unit as an "adjacency pair." Participants' interactions mirror the normative nature of the adjacency pair. As the principle of conditional relevance suggests, when a question goes unanswered, questioners consider the answer to be "noticeably" lacking. The direction of a questioner toward a missing response can be observed in three frequent forms of subsequent behaviour: pursuit, inference, and report (Sidnell, 2015).

- **Example; A mother asks the child, Roger, what time it is. (Drew, 1981, p. 249)**

01 Mom: What's the time- by the clock?
02 Roger: Uh
03 Mom: What's the time?
04   (3.0)
05 Mom: (Now) what number's that?
06 Roger: Number two
07 Mom: No it's not
08   What is it?
09 Roger: It's a one and a nought

The explanation provided by Sidnell (2015) is that after Roger fails to provide a response in line 2, Mother repeats the inquiry in line 3. Here, the absence of a response motivates the pursuit of one. After three seconds of silence in response to the second query, Mother changes the question to, "What number's that?" Observe that the first inquiry, "What's the time?" involves a complex, multi-step process for the child: He must first identify the numbers to which the hands are pointing and then use those figures to calculate the time. In response to the child's inability to answer this question, Mother breaks down this complex task into its component parts. Thus, the mother's following behaviour suggests that the child did not respond because he was unable to do so. Although this is not the case, questioners may describe an absence of response by using phrases such as "you are not answering my question," "he did not answer the question," "she did not respond," etc. In public inquiries, for instance, attorneys frequently assert that the witness is not answering the question posed (Sidnell 2010).

5.2.4. Repair Organization

When people talk together, they have trouble with speaking, hearing, and/or understanding. Even the most eloquent among us occasionally make blunders as speakers. Sometimes, the environments with which we interact are characterised by ambient noise. It is possible for recipients to be distracted or to have hearing loss. A recipient may be unfamiliar with a word, or it may fail to uniquely recognise a referent. There may be ambiguity in a lexical statement or grammatical formulation. These elements and others contribute to the ubiquity of problems.

Sidnell (2015) notes that what is referred to, as "repair" is an organised set of practices through which interaction participants can address and potentially overcome such problems. The repair process is organised in three fundamental ways.

- First, it distinguishes between repair initiation and repair execution.
- Second, it is organised according to position (in relation to the source of trouble: same turn, transition space between turns, next turn, and third position).
- Thirdly, a division between self (i.e., the person responsible for the source of the problem) and others.

The fundamental structure of repair may be described, as Sidnell (2015) argues, by virtue of the turn-taking system, which grants the current speaker the authority to generate a single TCU through to its earliest potential point of completion, the speaker of the source of the problem has the first opportunity to start and perform repair.

Example (Sidnell, 2015, p. 178) from Deb and Dick.

In the second unit here, Deb produces a minor hitch over the word after "everybody" (possibly going for "stayed") and self-repairs with "still here."

- Deb and Dick

07 Deb: [.h Oh: just grea:t,<everybody:st- still here.

Research Questions

- ❖ How did the sociologists Harvey Sacks and Emmanuel Schegloff contribute to the development of the discipline of conversation analysis?

- ❖ How does conversation analysis differ from pragmatics and discourse analysis?

- ❖ How can CA contribute to research in educational settings?

- ❖ Provide examples to explain the term 'Overall Structural Organization'

- ❖ What is the term 'turn taking' mean in CA?

- ❖ What do 'turn construction units' refer to?

- ❖ What is action sequencing in conversations?

- ❖ What does adjacency pair mean?

- ❖ What is the structure of 'repair?'

She makes a request of him to perform action.
He states reason why he cannot comply with request.
She undertakes to perform action.

If this is a reasonable analysis of what took place in the conversation, then it is clear that language-users must have a lot of knowledge of how conversation works that is not simply "linguistic" knowledge.

Speech events

In exploring what it is we know about taking part in conversation, or any other speech event (e.g. debate, interview, various types of discussions), we quickly realize that there is enormous variation in what people say and do in different circumstances. In order to begin to describe the sources of that variation, we would have to take account of a number of criteria. For example, we would have to specify the roles of speaker and hearer (or hearers) and their relationship(s), whether they were friends, strangers, men, women, young, old, of equal or unequal status, and many other factors. All of these factors will have an influence on what is said and how it is said. We would have to describe what the topic of conversation was and in what setting it took place. Some of the effects of these factors on the way language is used are explored in greater detail in Chapters 19 and 20. Yet, even when we have described all these factors, we will still not have analyzed the actual structure of the conversation itself. As language-users, in a particular culture, we clearly have quite sophisticated knowledge of how conversation works.

Conversation analysis

In simple terms, English conversation can be described as an activity in which, for the most part, two or more people take **turns** at speaking. Typically, only one person speaks at a time and there tends to be an avoidance of silence between speaking turns. (This is not true in all situations or societies.) If more than one participant tries to talk at the same time, one of them usually stops, as in the following example, where A stops until B has finished.

A: *Didn't you [know wh-*
B: *[But he must've been there by two*
A: *Yes but you knew where he was going*

(A small square bracket [is conventionally used to indicate a place where simultaneous or overlapping speech occurs.)

For the most part, participants wait until one speaker indicates that he or she has finished, usually by signaling a **completion point**. Speakers can mark their turns as complete in a number of ways: by asking a question, for example, or by pausing at the end of a completed syntactic structure like a phrase or sentence. Other participants can indicate that they want to take the speaking turn, also in a number of ways. They can start to make short sounds, usually repeated, while the speaker is talking, and often use body shifts or facial expressions to signal that they have something to say.

Turn-taking

There are different expectations of conversational style and different strategies of participation in conversation. Some of these strategies seem to be the source of what is sometimes described by participants as "rudeness" (if one speaker cuts in on another speaker) or "shyness" (if one speaker keeps waiting for an opportunity to take a turn and none seems to occur). The participants characterized as "rude" or "shy" in this way may simply be adhering to slightly different conventions of **turn-taking**.

One strategy, which may be overused by "long-winded" speakers or those who are used to "holding the floor," is designed to avoid having normal completion points occur. We all use this strategy to some extent, usually in situations where we have to work out what we are trying to say while actually saying it. If the normal expectation is that completion points are marked by the end of a sentence and a pause, then one way to "keep the turn" is to avoid having those two markers occur together. That is, don't pause at the end of sentences; make your sentences run on by using connectors like *and, and then, so, but*; place your pauses at points where the message is clearly incomplete; and preferably "fill" the pause with a hesitation marker such as *er, em, uh, ah*.

In the following example, note how the pauses (marked by …) are placed before and after verbs rather than at the end of sentences, making it difficult to get a clear sense of what this person is saying until we hear the part after each pause.

A: *that's their favorite restaurant because they … enjoy French food and when they were … in France they couldn't believe it that … you know that they had … that they had had better meals back home*

In the next example, speaker X produces **filled pauses** (with *em, er, you know*) after having almost lost the turn at his first brief hesitation.

X: *well that film really was … [wasn't what he was good at*
Y: *[when di-*

UNIT 6

THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNICATION

Hymes repeatedly emphasizes that what language is cannot be separated from how and why it is used, and that considerations of use are often prerequisite to recognition and understanding of much of linguistic form. While recognizing the necessity to analyze the code itself and the cognitive processes of its speakers and hearers, the ethnography of communication takes language first and foremost as a socially situated cultural form, which is indeed constitutive of much of culture itself. To accept a lesser scope for linguistic description is to risk reducing it to triviality, and to deny any possibility of understanding how language lives in the minds and on the tongues of its users.

(Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 3)

MAIN OBJECTIVES

➢ Define the scope and aims of conversation analysis.

➢ to highlight Hymes's contribution to the field.

➢ Introduce the concept of "Communicative Competence".

➢ Introduce the main notions and concepts of the approach.

6.1.Historical Background

The ethnographic approach to DA is founded on linguistics and anthropology. Despite having distinct objectives and methodologies, these two fields have an interest in communication. The way in which humans communicate is part of their cultural repertoire for making sense of the world and interacting with it. Culture is a system of ideas that underlies and lends significance to societal behavior (Schiffrin, 1994). General objectives of this qualitative research method include the ability to determine which communication acts and/or codes are significant to different groups, what types of meanings groups assign to different communication events, and how group members acquire these codes in order to provide insight into specific communities. This additional knowledge can be used, among other things, to improve communication with group members, make sense of group members' decisions, and differentiate groups from one another.

To provide support for his concept of communicative competence, which was a reaction to Noam Chomsky's distinction between linguistic competence and linguistic performance, Hymes proposed the ethnography of communication as an approach for analyzing patterns of language use within speech communities (Hymes, Dell 1976). The term was Originally coined "ethnography of speaking" in Dell Hymes' eponymous 1962 paper, it was redefined in his 1964 paper, Introduction: Toward Ethnographies of Communication, to accommodate for the non-vocal and non-verbal characteristics of communication; however, most EOC researchers still tend to focus on speaking as it is generally regarded as " a prominent, even primordial, means of communication." (Lindolf & Taylor, 2002)

The term "ethnography of communication" is intended to describe the features that an anthropological approach to language must possess. According to Dell Hymes, it must 1) examine directly the use of language in contexts of circumstances in order to discover speech activity patterns and 2) use as context a community, researching its communicative habits as a whole.In other words, the analysis of a culture's or community's communication, linguistic and otherwise, must take into account the sociocultural context of its use and the functions of the imparted meanings, rather than separating linguistic form from its function. According to Cameron (2001), " If you are mainly concerned with the way a certain speech event fits into a whole network of cultural beliefs and practices, you will spend more time describing things that are external to the talk itself: who the speakers are, where they are, and what beliefs and customs are important in their lives. " (Cameron, 2001).

6.2.Significance

While the primary objectives of ethnography are descriptive, knowledge regarding varied "ways of speaking" is a fundamental contribution. Indeed, the potential value of ethnography of communication extends much beyond a simple compilation of facts about communicative behaviour (Saville-Troike, 2003).

In terms of significance, Saville-Troike (2003, pp. 6–7) points out that ethnography as a way of speaking contributes to many other disciplines:

- For anthropology, the ethnography of communication adds to the study of how cultures stay the same or change, especially acculturation processes in contact situations, and may reveal important cultural and historical clues.
- For psycholinguistics, the ethnography of communication means that studies of language acquisition must now account not just for children's natural ability to learn to speak, but also for the distinctive ways speaking capacities develop in specific communities as a result of socialisation.
- For sociolinguistic research, the approach is used to evaluate the social significance of Recorded data.
- In the field of applied linguistics, ethnography of communication can be used to determine what a second language learner needs to know in order to communicate appropriately in various contexts in that language, as well as what the consequences are for any violations or omissions. There are also significant applications for comparing entire communicative systems in cross-cultural contact and translation, as well as recognising and analysing communicative misconceptions.
- For theoretical linguistics, the ethnography of communication can contribute significantly to the study of universals in language form and use, as well as to language-specific and comparative fields of description and analysis. Its research methods and results are very important for making an appropriate theory of language and linguistic competence.

6.3. Dell Hymes' Communicative Competence

In response to Chomsky's abstract notion of competence, Hymes (1972) asserts that when a child acquires his or her native language, He/she t acquires not only grammatical but also contextual "knowledge of sentences." He or she becomes competent in knowing when to speak, when not to say, and what to discuss with whom, when, where, and how. Sociolinguistic competency is what he terms the ability to employ grammatical rules that make sense in a given

social circumstance. This is how the concept of a diverse speech community and diverse speaker originated.

Chomsky's conceptions of a fully homogeneous speech community and an ideal, homogeneous speaker and listener are sharply contrasted by Hymes' sociolinguistic competence. According to Hymes, effective communication necessitates knowledge of structural components of language, such as grammar rules, as well as socio-linguistic ability. This socio-linguistic competence refers to the capacity to utilize language in specific social circumstances in an acceptable and efficient manner. "In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishment by others." "This competence is also integral with attitudes, values, and motivations concerning language, its features and uses, as well as with competence for and attitudes toward the interrelationship of language with the other code of communicative conduct" (Hymes, 1972, p. 277). According to Swain and Canale (1980), communicative competence is defined as the combination of a fundamental system of knowledge and skill required for communication. In this context, knowledge refers to an individual's (conscious or unconscious) knowledge of language and other aspects of language use, whereas skill refers to the individual's use of this knowledge in real-world communication.

Zoltan & Thurrell (1991) point out that Swain and Canale define communicative competence in terms of four components: 1/Grammatical competence includes knowledge of phonology, orthography, vocabulary, word formation, and sentence formation. 2/ Sociolinguistic competence includes understanding of sociocultural usage rules. 3/ Discourse competence is related to learners' mastery of text comprehension and production in listening, speaking, reading, and writing modes. It deals with cohesion and coherence in different types of texts. 4/ Strategic competence refers to compensatory strategies used in response to grammatical, sociolinguistic, or discourse difficulties, such as the use of reference sources, grammatical and lexical paraphrase, requests for repetition or clarification, slower speech, or difficulties addressing strangers when unsure of their social status or locating the appropriate cohesion devices.

6.4. Main Concepts and Notions in Ethnographic Research
Several concepts, primarily based on Dell Hymes' early work, have been created to help in the development of a systematic approach to communication ethnography.

- "Ways of speaking" is a broad term that refers to the idea that communicative behaviour within a society involves predictable patterns of speech activity. Individuals' communication skill includes knowledge about such patterns.

- "Fluent speaker" emphasizes ability differences as well as the necessity to define normative ideas of ability. Distinct groups may have different values for different statuses, responsibilities, and situations when it comes to speaking (for example, they may be based on memorisation, improvisation, or voice quality).

- "Speech community" refers to the unit of description as a social rather than linguistic entity. Instead of beginning with a "language," one begins with a social group and then considers the full arrangement of linguistic tools inside it.

- "Speech situation" refers to acts that are connected or integral in some way. They may have both verbal and nonverbal components. They may appear as contexts in declarations of speech rules (for example, as a component of setting), but they are not governed by such rules throughout.

- "Speech event" refers to actions that are directly governed by rules or norms governing the use of speech, with the speech act serving as the most basic term in the set. A party (speech circumstance), a chat during the party (speech event), and a joke within the discourse, for example (speech act).

- "rules ofspeeking" refers to the fact that changes in any component of speaking can indicate the presence of a rule, a structured relation (e.g., from normal tone to whisper, from formal English to slang, from correction to praise, embarrassment to withdrawal, evaluative responses). Differences in component hierarchy are an important feature of the taxonomy of sociolinguistic systems.

- "Functions of speech" can be defined as relationships between components (e.g., in a given period or society, poetic function may require a particular relationship between choice of code, choice of topic, and message form).

6.5. The SPEAKING Grid

Hymes (1974) also stated that these speech events contain components that must be considered in order to generate a sufficient description of any given speech event. He proposes the SPEAKING grid as a heuristic for the different aspects he considers important ("setting," "participants," "ends," "act sequences," "keys," "instrumentalities," and "genre"). This combination of components is known as the "speaking grid," and its goal is to assist analysts in organizing their analysis.

- The letter "S" stands for "setting and scene." Setting refers to the time and place of speech, which are the real physical circumstances in which it occurs. The abstract psychological environment or cultural concept of the occasion is referred to as the scene. A specific piece of speech may serve to define a scene, whilst another piece of speech may be regarded improper in certain circumstances. Participants are able to change scenes within a specific setting as they modify the amount of formality or the type of activity in which they are involved.

- "P" stands for Participants. It includes numerous speaker-listener, addressor-addressee, and sender-receiver combinations. They typically play particular socially defined roles. A two-person discussion consists of a speaker and a listener whose roles alternate.

- "E" for ends: It refers to the traditionally acknowledged and anticipated outcomes of an exchange, as well as the personal objectives that participants strive to achieve on specific occasions. A courtroom trial has a discernible social purpose, but the individual participants, including the judge, jury, prosecution, defense, accused, and witnesses, have diverse personal objectives.

- "A" for Act Sequence relates to the actual form and content of what is said: the exact words used, how they are used, and their link to the matter at hand.

- In the process of social contact, participants provide one another with hints regarding how to perceive the message content. It refers to the tone, manner, or attitude with which a specific message is communicated: serious, precise, mocking, etc. Nonverbal conduct, gestures, or postures may also serve as a nonverbal indicator of the key.

- "I" stands for instruments: It relates to the choice of channel, such as oral, written, or telegraphic, and the actual type of speech used, such as the chosen language, dialect, code, or register. Formal, written legal language, for instance, is one instrument; code-switching between English and French is another, etc. During the course of a lengthy verbal discussion, one may use a variety of linguistic instrumentalities.

- The letter "N" stands for "norms of interaction," and according to Hymes, it is the researcher's job to deduce these norms from systematic observation and documentation of spontaneous verbal interaction. It refers to the specific features and behaviors that go along with speaking as well as how those features and behaviors may appear to someone who does not share them, including loudness, silence, gaze return, and other such behaviors.

Research Questions

❖ What are the general objectives of the field?

❖ Communicative competence was a reaction to Chomsky's distinction between

linguistic competence and linguistic performance. Discuss

❖ Who coined the term "ethnography of speaking?"

❖ How does ethnography contribute to other disciplines?

❖ What is communicative competence, according to Hymes (1972)?

❖ What is communicative competence, according to Swain and Canale (1980)?

❖ Make a list of the key concepts of ethnography of communication.

❖ For a full description of any given speech event, Hymes proposes the SPEAKING

grid. What does each letter stand for?

Communicative Competence

Hymes (1966a) observed that speakers who could produce any and all of the grammatical sentences of a language (per Chomsky's 1965 definition of *linguistic competence*) would be institutionalized if they indiscriminately went about trying to do so without consideration of the appropriate contexts of use. *Communicative competence* involves knowing not only the language code but also what to say to whom, and how to say it appropriately in any given situation. Further, it involves the social and cultural knowledge speakers are presumed to have which enables them to use and interpret linguistic forms. Hymes (1974, 1987) augmented Chomsky's notion of linguistic competence (knowledge of systematic potential, or whether or not an utterance is a possible grammatical structure in a language) with knowledge of appropriateness (whether and to what extent something is suitable), occurrence (whether and to what extent something is done), and feasibility (whether and to what extent something is possible under particular circumstances). The concept of communicative competence (and its encompassing congener, social competence) is one of the most powerful organizing tools to emerge in the social sciences in recent years.

Communicative competence extends to both knowledge and expectation of who may or may not speak in certain settings, when to speak and when to remain silent, to whom one may speak, how one may talk to persons of different statuses and roles, what nonverbal behaviors are appropriate in various contexts, what the routines for turn-taking are in conversation, how to ask for and give information, how to request, how to offer or decline assistance or cooperation, how to give commands, how to enforce discipline, and the like – in short, everything involving the use of language and other communicative modalities in particular social settings.

Clear cross-cultural differences can and do produce conflicts or inhibit communication. For example, certain American Indian groups are accustomed to waiting several minutes in silence before responding to a question or taking a turn in conversation, while the native English speakers they may be talking to have very short time frames for responses or conversational turn-taking, and find long silences embarrassing. Conversely, Abrahams (1973) has pointed out that among African Americans conversations may involve several persons talking at the same time, a practice which would violate White middle-class rules of interaction. And as mentioned earlier, even such matters as voice level differ cross-culturally, and speaker intent may be misconstrued because of different expectation patterns for interpretation.

The concept of communicative competence must be embedded in the notion of cultural competence, or the total set of knowledge and skills which speakers bring into a situation. This view is consonant with a semiotic

approach which defines culture as meaning, and views all ethnographers (not just ethnographers of communication) as dealing with symbols (e.g. Douglas 1970; Geertz 1973). The systems of culture are patterns of symbols, and language is only one of the symbolic systems in this network. Interpreting the meaning of linguistic behavior requires knowing the meaning in which it is embedded.

Ultimately all aspects of culture are relevant to communication, but those that have the most direct bearing on communicative forms and processes are the social and institutional structure, the values and attitudes held about language and ways of speaking, the network of conceptual categories which results from experiences, and the ways knowledge and skills (including language) are transmitted from one generation to the next and to new members of the group. Shared cultural knowledge is essential to explain the shared presuppositions and judgments of truth value which are the essential undergirdings of language structures, as well as of contextually appropriate usage and interpretation.

While referential meaning may be ascribed to many of the elements in the linguistic code in a static manner, situated meaning must be accounted for as an emergent and dynamic process. Interaction requires the perception, selection, and interpretation of salient features of the code used in actual communicative situations, integrating these with other cultural knowledge and skills, and implementing appropriate strategies for achieving communicative goals.

The phonology, grammar, and lexicon which are the target of traditional linguistic description constitute only a part of the elements in the code used for communication. Also included are the paralinguistic and nonverbal phenomena which have conventional meaning in each speech community, and knowledge of the full range of variants in all elements which are available for transmitting social, as well as referential, information. Ability to discriminate between those variants which serve as markers of social categories or carry other meaning and those which are insignificant, and knowledge of what the meaning of a variant is in a particular situation, are all components of communicative competence.

The verbal code may be transmitted on oral, written, or manual (signed) channels. The relative load carried on each channel depends on its functional distribution in a particular speech community, and thus they are of differential importance in the linguistic repertoire of any individual or society. Full participation in a deaf speech community requires ability to interpret language on the manual channel but not the oral, for instance; a speech community with a primarily oral tradition may not require interpretation of writing; and a speech community which relegates much information flow to the written channel will require literacy skills for full participation. Thus, the traditional linguistic description which focuses only on the oral channel

will be too narrow to account for communicative competence in most so-
cieties. Although it may cause some terminological confusion, references to
ways of speaking and *ethnography of speaking* should be understood as usually
including a much broader range of communicative behavior than merely
speech.

The typical descriptive focus on oral production has tended to treat
language as a unidirectional phenomenon. In considering the nature and
scope of communicative competence, it is useful to distinguish between
receptive and *productive* dimensions (Troike 1970); only shared receptive com-
petence is necessary for successful communication. Knowledge of rules
for appropriate communicative behavior entails understanding a wide range
of language forms, for instance, but not necessarily the ability to produce
them. Members of the same community may understand varieties of a
language which differ according to the social class, region, sex, age, and
occupation of the speaker, but only a few talented mimics will be able to
speak them all. In multilingual speech communities, members often share
receptive competence in more than one language but vary greatly in their
relative ability to speak one or the other.

The following outline summarizes the broad range of shared knowledge
that is involved in appropriate communication. From the ethnographer's
perspective, this inventory also indicates the range of linguistic, interactional,
and cultural phenomena which must ultimately be accounted for in an ad-
equate description and explanation of communicative competence (see also
Gumperz 1984; Hymes 1987; Duranti 1988).

1   Linguistic knowledge
    (a)   Verbal elements
    (b)   Nonverbal elements
    (c)   Patterns of elements in particular speech events
    (d)   Range of possible variants (in all elements and their organization)
    (e)   Meaning of variants in particular situations
2   Interaction skills
    (a)   Perception of salient features in communicative situations
    (b)   Selection and interpretation of forms appropriate to specific situ-
          ations, roles, and relationships (rules for the use of speech)
    (c)   Discourse organization and processes
    (d)   Norms of interaction and interpretation
    (e)   Strategies for achieving goals
3   Cultural knowledge
    (a)   Social structure (status, power, speaking rights)
    (b)   Values and attitudes
    (c)   Cognitive maps/schemata
    (d)   Enculturation processes (transmission of knowledge and skills)

UNIT 7

VARIATIONIST SOCIOLINGUISTICS

The evolution of two basic premises in 20th-Century structural linguistics created the conditions for the emergence of variationist sociolinguistics as an interdisciplinary field. These premises are cultural relativism and orderly linguistic heterogeneity. Cultural relativism is an anthropological tradition inherited by linguistics, according to which no culture or language of a speech community is classified as inferior or underdeveloped irrespective of the level of Western technology that the speech community has achieved.

(Bortoni-Ricardo, 1997, p. 59)

MAIN OBJECTIVES

➢ Define the scope and aims of the variationist approach.

➢ Introduce students to Labov's framework for story analysis.

➢ gain knowledge about data collection techniques

7.1. Variationist Approach

It is a methodological and analytical approach to understanding the relationship between language and its context of use. The fundamental tenet of variationists is that there are linguistic patterns that change depending on the social context and that these patterns can only be discovered by researching a specific speech community. The diversity and changes in language that can be seen across various speech communities are the focus of variation analysis. Prototypical variation analyses were first restricted to the study of semantically similar variants, i.e., the many terms used to refer to the same thing depending on a person's location or social standing. These analyses have, however, been expanded to include texts.

The field of variationist sociolinguistics was thought to have been founded by Labov. He has been described as "an enormously original and influential figure who has created much of the methodology" of sociolinguistics (Trask, 1997, p. 124).

Labov noticed the variation of speech among New Yorkers. Given that it is surrounded by other dialects of US English, New York City (NYC) is traditionally recognized to be a dialect pocket on the east coast of the US, making it an important fieldwork location. Labov looked for more diverse variables. Some of these, like the (r) variable, were ones that speakers were consciously aware of. On the other hand, some were ones that speakers were less aware of and could only be found by a trained linguist. Labov used a number of techniques to gather his information about "r." Triangulation is the term for this, and it is a key concept in scientific research. Scientists typically favour using a variety of techniques in order to produce accurate results.

For his research, Labov (1966) conducted in-person interviews with a selection of residents of New York City's Lower East Side. The sociolinguistic interviews had four logical sections. Interviewee was requested to

- read a list of minimum pairs (word pairs with various meanings but just one sound different);
- read a list of words with and without the variables being researched, some of which are not connected to one another;
- read aloud a short tale that was carefully crafted to incorporate the variables in as many unique ways as possible;
- Discuss your life, some of your beliefs, and your experiences with the interviewer.

Labov also conducted anonymous surveys as a means of examining variations. One of the most well-known sociolinguistics research is thought to be his 1966 study in New York City on the realization of (r) at three department stores.

Change or variation in language can be studied not only at the level of words that mean the same thing, but also at the phonological, syntactic, or even textual level, as Labov himself has shown through his study of narrative. He notes:

> "It is common for a language to have many alternate ways of saying the same thing. Some words like car and automobile seem to have the same referents; others have two pronunciations, like working and workin'. There are syntactic options such as Who is he talking to? vs. To whom is he talking? Or It's easy for him to talk vs. For him to talk is easy." (1972b, p. 188)

7.2. The Framework of Narrative Analysis

Labov defines narrative as "one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred" (1972b: 359-60). The function of narrative is to helps the people to express the facts of life events and hence provides the freedom of expression by making appropriate changes to the event while describing it.

Labov and Waletzky (1967) provided a framework on the basis of which we can analyse the narrative. For the identification of basic underlying structure, they have divided the clauses according to their function in the narrative.

(1) And so we was doing the 50-yard dash

(2) There was about eight or ten of us, you know,

(3) Going down, coming back

(4) And, going down the third time, I caught cramps

(5) And I started yelling „Help!"

(6) But the fellows didn"t believe me, you know,

(7) They thought I was just trying to catch up

(8) Because I was going on or slowing down

(9) So all of them kept going

(10) They leave me

(11) And so I started going down

(12) Scoutmaster was up there

(13) He was watching me

(14) But he didn"t pay me any attention either

(Labov and Waletzky, 1967: 31)

Free clauses typically provide the information for the narrative, including an explanation of the scene, action, situation, location, time, etc., according to Labov and Waletzky. Lines 1-3 of the excerpt above include free clauses. Narrative clauses are those clauses that set the stage for the narrative by serving as its foundation. Lines 4-5 of the excerpt above contain narrative clauses. As in lines 6 and 7 in the aforementioned extract, the coordinate clause and narrative sequence can have complex relations. As in lines 13–14, the restricted clauses are less fixed than the narrative clauses but more fixed than the free clauses.

These clauses' functions change as their placement in the narrative is altered. "Temporal sequence," the distinctive arrangement of the clauses in the narrative, was defined by Labov (1972). There are instances where narrative clauses with a temporal junction are complete narratives. It's due to the fact that they have a "beginning, middle, and end." Labov has provided a model of the structure of narrative clauses that consists of six components since some elements of the narrative structure cannot be "fully formed narratives" (Labov, 1972, p. 227).

1. **The abstract** is the first section of the narrative. The abstract is the initial section of the text. This section of the story serves to clarify why the narrative is being told and to grab the audience's attention.

2. **Orientation:** It provides information about the "time, place, persons, and their activity or situation." (Labov, 1972:229)

3. **Complicating action:** Complicating actions are the real happenings of the story that advance the narrative and keep the audience engaged.

4. **Evaluation:** It explains why the audience should be interested in the topic. It described the narrative's odd or intriguing events. Its purpose is to clarify the story's message.

5. **Result or resolution:** The result or resolution alleviates the tension and reveals what ultimately transpired. It helps figure out how the end result was reached throughout the story, but especially right before the end or resolution.

6. **Coda:** It is defined by Labov as "a free clause to be found at the end of the narrative." The function of the coda is to show that the narrative has ended. (Labov, 1972, p. 227)

7.3. Collecting Data

Almost any corpus of language in use (audio/video recorded, transcribed, or written) can be evaluated through the variationist sociolinguistic lens, including handwritten letters, text messages, and emails. In variationist sociolinguistics, the sociolinguistic interview is the most common method of data gathering. The sociolinguistic interview differs from what we normally assume to be an interview (i.e., a set of questions posed to an interviewee with the purpose of

obtaining information or getting a deeper understanding of a topic through the interviewee's personal experience and perspective). Initially, the sociolinguistic interview consisted of a variety of activities, including Minimal Pairs, Reading Passage, and Casual Speech.

Research Questions

❖ Who is the founding father of variationist sociolinguistics?

❖ Labov introduced much of the methodology of this field. Explain

❖ One of the most well-known sociolinguistics research is his 1966 study in New York City on the realization of (r). Provide more details

❖ Why is it important to study the diversity and changes in language?

❖ Labov and Waletzky (1967) provided a framework on the basis of which we can analyse the narrative. Provide a short description

❖ Labov (1972) provided a model of the structure of narrative clauses that consists of six components. What are they?

❖ Make a list of the most important methods of collecting data.

15 The Variationist Approach toward Discourse Structural Effects and Socio-interactional Dynamics

SYLVIE DUBOIS AND DAVID SANKOFF

0 Introduction

Sociolinguists tend to focus on spontaneous speech used in ordinary conversational situations. The variationist approach to sociolinguistics involves open-ended procedures to obtain representative and comparable data, which contrasts with principles of control and predictability in other experimental-evaluative approaches (see Sankoff 1989 for more details). The variationist method relies on quantitative analysis to validate interpretations of the data. The purpose of the quantitative method is to highlight the sociocultural meaning of linguistic variation and the nature of the relationships among the linguistic aspects in probabilistic terms. The use of quantitative analysis is not a minor methodological detail. It provides a more accurate understanding of the usage and the frequency of the forms within the community as well as a way of detecting linguistic change. The frequency of forms and speakers' preferences give a more realistic overview of the usage of linguistic structures. More importantly, statistical tools allow us to pinpoint the social and linguistic conditioning as well as the tendencies and regularities within the linguistic system. Being a more objective and accurate basis of analysis than intuitions and judgments of value, the quantitative method is a powerful and efficient tool.

Sociolinguists view discourse as the product of a specific verbal interaction resulting from a set of choices vis-à-vis the set of all the potential choices within a language. Discursive competence implies the knowledge of linguistic forms, the context within which they might be used, and the sociolinguistic circumstances which permit them to be realized; these circumstances include the conceptual universe of the speakers, their sociocultural characteristics, and the interactional strategies between speakers.

Several analysts (Labov 1978; Lavandera 1978; Dines 1980; Romaine 1981; Thibault 1982; Weiner and Labov 1983; Vincent 1983, 1986; Horvath 1985; Dubois 1992) have identified five characteristics of variation analysis within discourse. First, discourse

variables involve a finite number of discrete variants, independent and autonomous, which do not form part of a continuum of surface realizations, but are related to each other only by their identical function. Second, it is not feasible to contrast the presence of a discourse form to its absence as is done in phonological studies. The linguistic context where the form will appear cannot be anticipated even though it is possible to characterize some linguistic contexts that favor its usage. Third, substitutions among the different manifestations of most discourse processes have consequences at several linguistic levels (pragmatic, interactional, etc.). Fourth, we cannot delimit and define in advance the set of different discourse functions. In addition, discourse forms are structurally diverse and can occur at distinct levels of analysis; they can be complex processes (narration, description, argument), large units (repetition, rhetorical questions, reported speech), or more circumscribed forms (markers and particles). Fifth, the discourse variable has in general a large number of variants (different forms) and, in consequence, requires a more complex quantitative treatment than the usual variable rule method elaborated for binomial variants (Dubois and Sankoff 1997).

Sociolinguists argue that the only way to access the multidimensional scoop of discourse structure is: (1) to adopt a quantitative procedure which respects the principle of accountability; (2) to recognize the various levels of analysis and to integrate them into the observation and analysis of the distribution of a discourse form; (3) to focus the analysis on the conditioning that holds among the multiple linguistic levels (structural, referential, pragmatic, interactional, social, etc.) that form the canvas of discourse process; and (4) to highlight the polyvalent associations (the co-occurrences) between the components of a discourse structure at its various linguistic levels.

0.1   The holistic understanding of the discourse system

The goal of the variationist approach is to highlight the "potential of signification of discourse" (term used by Halliday 1978), that is, the different levels of meaning which are intertwined to create discourse. Four general principles are representative of this framework:

1   *The specific conditions of oral speech:* The segmentation of oral speech based on the concept of the sentence as it is formulated for written speech is inappropriate (Blanche-Benveniste and Jeanjean 1987: 89). The identification of a discourse process must take into account the specific conditions of formation of oral speech.
2   *The type of corpus:* Factors taken into account in the study of a discourse structure within a specific corpus might not be applicable or relevant to or significant in another type of corpus. Consequently, the selection and the nature of the factors or linguistic levels, which may influence the occurence of a discourse structure, are constrained and valid to a single corpus.
3   *The identification of the significant levels conditioning a discourse process:* There are many levels on which discourse is organized. The important point is that the number and the type of levels are not fixed: they vary according to the object of study, the corpus, the type of linguistic data (political speech, interaction among friends, reporter-type interview) and the observed material (written or oral discourse).

The division into two or more is a conceptual distinction,[1] which presupposes that all the levels participate in the creation of a discourse process, and are dependent on each other.

4   *The dynamic nature of discourse:* In examining the discourse system, sociolinguists aim at understanding the dynamic interaction between the different levels of signification constituting the discourse system. All levels are intertwined and interact with each other, but they all can be theoretically classified into categories. The conceptual division aims at identifying where, when, and how each level participates in the organization of a discourse form.

The variationist approach is not without difficulties. The definition and the delimitation of a discourse object – that is, the distinction of what is inherent in this object (the definition) and what constitutes the strategies of support or the variable environment of this object (the groups of factors) – itself represents a difficult task. The analyst must deal with numerous and extremely varied groups of factors. Their study requires different scientific competences; spotting all of them is not evident and is a tedious task. More importantly, their study requires linguistic intuition and good comprehension of discourse organization. Moreover, the systematic analysis of all the relations between groups of factors and the verification of the associations detected oblige the researcher to manipulate a lot of data and evaluate the significance of many statistical quantities, which requires care, energy, and critical judgment.

Nevertheless, the solid scientific basis of the empirical procedure as well as the quantitative method transcend these difficulties. The representation of a given discourse process in its multidimensional aspects, rather than as an inventory of its forms, allows us to unveil the network of associations between different factors which influence the construction of such a process.

The rest of this chapter is divided into two parts. In the following section, we set out the formal criteria and discourse roles that characterize the enumerative process in the spoken language. These provide the operational basis for the collection of data on several thousand tokens of enumeration. We present a variety of structural factors – the number of components; their syntactic nature; the use of coordinating markers and of the processes of repetition, reduction and expansion – which are among the most salient aspects of variation within the structure of enumeration. We intend to show that these processes do not, however, vary completely independently, but in a patterned way, and this patterning should reveal much about functional constraints on the construction of enumerative expressions by speakers.

The second part of the chapter deals with the stylistic dimension that accounts for the considerable variation among speakers in the overall use of enumeration. Stylistic factors are not as regularly employed as sociodemographic factors in quantitative studies, partly because stylistic distinctions are not directly accessible to objective approaches, and because variation along the stylistic dimension generally seems to parallel that along some social parameter. However, there has recently been much debate over the direction and extent of variation due to stylistic or interactional parameters in general versus the analogous effects of age, sex, and class.[2] Rickford and McNair-Knox (1994) emphasize the importance of empirical testing of hypotheses and the predictions of certain models of stylistic variation, such as the audience design

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, R.C., Spiro, R.J., & Montague, W.E. (1977). *Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge* (Eds.). Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum.

Bailey, B. (2005). "Interactional sociolinguistics" International Encyclopedia of Communication. http://works.bepress.com/benjamin_bailey/59/ Copyright 1999

Bortoni-Ricardo, S.M. (1997). Variationist Sociolinguistics. In: Hornberger, N.H., Corson, D. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Encyclopedia of Language and Education,* vol 8. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-4535-0_6

Bower, G. H., Black, J. B., & Turner, T. J. (1979). Scripts in memory for text. *Cognitive Psychology*, 11(2), 177–220. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(79)90009-4

Brown, G. and George, Y. (1993). *Discourse analysis*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis.* Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. & S.C. Levinson (1987). *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733109

Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980) Approaches to Communicative Competence. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Centre.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christiansen, Morten H.; Chater, Nick (2016). "The Now-or-Never bottleneck: A fundamental constraint on language". Behavioral and Brain Sciences. 39: e62. doi:10.1017/S0140525X1500031X

Cook G. (1999). *Discourse and literature*. Shanghai, Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Cook, G. (1996). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse.* Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, C. E. (2003). "How English-learners joke with native speakers: an interactional sociolinguistic perspective on humor as collaborative discourse across cultures". *Journal of Pragmatics*. 35 (9): 1361–1385. doi:10.1016/s0378-2166(02)00181-9

De Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. London & New York: Longman.

Dooley, R., Levinsohn, S.E. (2001). *Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts.* Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Fillmore, Ch. (1982). Frame Semantics. In Linguistics in the Morning Calm: Selected Papers from SICOL-1981 (p. 111). Seoul: Hanshin Pub. Co.

http://brenocon.com/Fillmore%201982_2up.pdf

Fillmore, C. J. (1977). Topics in lexical semantics in (ed.) R.W. Cole, *Current Issues in in Linguistic Theory*. Bloomington: Indianan University Press.

Flick, Uwe (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Ford, C. E., Thompson, S.A. (1996). "Interactional units in conversation: syntactic,

intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns". *Interaction and*

Grammar. pp. 134–184. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511620874.003

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.

Goffman, E. (1967). On face work. In E. Goffman (ed.), *Interaction Ritual*. New York:

Anchor Books, 5-46.

Gordon, C. (2009). *Making meanings, creating family: Intertextuality and framing in family*

interaction. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grainger, Karen (March 1998). "Reality orientation in institutions for the elderly: The

perspective from interactional sociolinguistics". *Journal of Aging Studies*. 12 (1): 39–

56. doi:10.1016/s0890-4065(98)90019-6

Grimes, J. E. (1975). *The Thread of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110886474

Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Gumperz, John J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics* 1.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional*

Grammar (4th Ed.). Oxon Routledge.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward

Arnold

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman group Ltd.

Harris, Z. S. (1952) 'Discourse Analysis' in Language, V. 28, 1-30

Hymes, D. (1962). The Ethnography of Speaking. Gladwin & Sturtevant (Eds.).

Washington, D.C.: Anthropological Society of Washington, 15-83.

Hymes, D. (1964). *Language in Culture and Society*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Hymes, D. (1964). Toward ethnographies of communication: The analysis of communicative

events. In P. Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and Social Contex*t. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Books.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.),

Sociolinguistics (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hymes, D. (1974b). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: an Ethnographic Approach*.

 Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hymes, Dell (1976). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach* (8th ed.).

Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Irimiea, S.B. (2018).The Survival of Interactional Sociolinguistics in the 21st Century.

European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 3(4), 61-69.

https://doi.org/10.26417/ejms.v3i4.p61-69

Johnson Laird, P. N. (1983). *Mental Models: Towards a Cognitive Science of   Language,*

Interference, and Consciousness. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University   Press.

Kress, G. (1989). *Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Labov, W. (1972a). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Labov, W. (1972b) (Ed.). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In

 Language in the Inner City. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 354- 405.

Labov, E. & J. Waletzky, (1967). Narrative analysis. In J. Helm (ed.), *Essays on the   Verbal*

and Visual Arts. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 12-44.

Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington DC:

Center for Applied Linguistics.

Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't Think of an Elephant! Know your Values and Frame the Debate.*

White River Junction, Vt.: Chelsea Green.

Lakoff, R. (1990a). The Talking cure. Talking Power: The Politics of Language. New York: Basic Books, 59-83.

Lakoff, R. (1990b). Life and language in court. Talking Power: The Politics of Language. New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, R. (1998). *Personal communication in her Discourse class*. Georgetown University.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Singapore: Longman.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lindlof, Thomas R.; Taylor, Bryan C. (2002). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Minsky, M. (1975). A framework for representing knowledge. In P. Winston (ed.), *the Psychology of Computer Vision*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 211-77.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nunan D. (1993). *Discourse analysis*. London: Penguin.

Palmer, F.R. (1988). *The English Verb*. London: Routledge.

Sacks, H. (1971). *Quoted in Levinson*, 1983: 313.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on Methodology. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 21-27.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., and Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language.* 50 (4): 696–735. Doi: 10.2307/412243. hdl:11858/00-001M-0000-002C-4337-3

Salkie, R. (1995). *Text and discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Sanford, A. J., & Garrod, S. C. (1998). The role of scenario mapping in text comprehension. *Discourse Processes*, 26(2-3), 159–190. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638539809545043

Saville-Troike M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication : an introduction* (3rd ed.). Blackwell Pub. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470758373

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: a primer in conversation analysis.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511791208

Schegloff, E. A.; Sacks, H. (1973). *Opening up Closings*. Semiotica. 8 (4). doi:10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289. S2CID 144411011

Schegloff., E. A. (1999). Discourse, pragmatics, conversation, analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 1(4), 405–435. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24046433

Schegloff, E. (1972). Sequencing in conversational openings. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.). *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 346-80.

Schegloff, E. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden and D. Zimmerman (eds.), *Talk and Social Structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schegloff, E. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? In *Discourse & Society* 8 (2): 165- 87.

Schegloff, E. (1999a). 'Schegloff's texts' as Billig's data: a critical reply. In *Discourse & Society*, 10: 558-72.

Schegloff, E. (1999b). Naivete vs. sophistication or discipline vs. self-indulgence: a rejoinder to Billig. In *Discourse & Society*, 10: 577-82.

Schegloff, E. & H. Sacks (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 7 (3/4): 289-327.

Schiffrin, D. (1981). Tense variation in narrative. *Language* 57, 45-62.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers. Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/cbo9780511611841. ISBN 9780511611841.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Schiffrin, D. (1996). Narrative as self-portrait. *Language in Society* 25/2, 167-204.

Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. (eds.) (2001). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* Massachusetts & Oxford: Blackwell.

Scollon, R. (1998). *Mediated Discourse as Social Interaction: A Study of News Discourse.* London: Longman.

Scollon, R. (2001). *Mediated Discourse: The Nexus of Practice*. London: Routledge.

Scollon, R. (2005). *Multiple Methods*. At:

www.aptalaska.net/~ron/FOOD%2005/mda/method.htm

Scollon, R. & S.B.K. Scollon (1981). *Narrative, Literacy and Face in Interethnic Communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Scollon, R. & S. W. Scollon (2003). *Discourses in Place: Language in the Material World.* London & New York: Routledge.

Scollon, R. & S.W. Scollon (2004). *Nexus Analysis: Discourse and the Emerging Internet.* London: Routledge.

Scollon, S. (1998). Methodological Assumptions in Intercultural Communication. In B.L. Hoffer and J. H. Koo (eds.), *Cross-cultural Communication. East and West in the 90s.* Trinity University, San Antonio, TX: Institute for Cross-Cultural Research, 104-109.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1975). Indirect Speech Acts. In: P. Cole (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3*. New York: Academic Press, 59-82.

Searle, J. (1979a). *A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts. Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1979b). *On the logical status of fictional discourse. Expression and Meaning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Senft, G. (2014). *Understanding Pragmatics* (1st ed.). Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203776476

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction.* Chichester, UK: WileyBlackwell.

Sidnell, J. (2015). Conversation Analysis: An Introduction. In H. Narrog, (Ed.), *the Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis.* OUP Oxford

Sinclair, McH. and R. M. Coulthard. Towards an analysis of discourse. London: Oxford University Press, 1975. *Language in Society*, 6(2), 296-299. doi:10.1017/S0047404500007363

Song, L. (2010). The Role of Context in Discourse Analysis. *Journal of language teaching and Research.* 1, (6), pp.doi:10.4304/jltr.1.6.876-879

Trask, L. (1997). *A Student's Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315832531

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Power*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-07299-3

Van Dijk, T. A. (2002) Political discourse and political cognition. In P. Chilton & Ch. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (pp.203–238). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 10.1075/dapsac.4.11dij https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.4.11dij [Google Scholar]

Widdowson, H.G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis.* Oxford: University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. (2000). *Linguistics* shanghai shanghai (Shanghai Foreign Language Education

Widdowson, H. G. (2000). Critical Practices: On Representations and the Interpretation of Text. In S. Sarangi, & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Discourse and Social Life* (pp. 155-169). London: Longman.Press).

Widdowson, H. G. (1996*). Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication.* Oxford: Oxford

    University Press.

Yule, G. (2017). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Yule G. (2010). *The study of language* (4th Ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Yule, G. (2006). *The Study of Language*. 3rd edition. Cambridge University Press.

Yule G. (2000). *Pragmatics.* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Zoltán, D., Thurrell, S. (1991). Strategic competence and how to teach it. ELT *Journal*, 45

    (1): 16–23.