Syrian Arab Republic
Damascus University Publications
Open - Learning Center
The Department Of Translation

Introduction to DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

WRITTEN BY
OLA HAFEZ

Revised by
M.M.ENANI

Damascus University

CONTENTS

Unit 1 DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: WRITTEN & SPOKEN LANGUAGE

Objectives

By the end of this unit, students should be able to:

1-Define the following:

- discourse.
- discourse analysis.
- text linguistics.
- conversation analysis.

2-Explain the difference between a sentence and an utterance.

3-Tell the difference between written and spoken language.

Language is usually defined as a system of symbols used for human communication. This system is easy to see in phonetics, morphology, syntax and semantics. As you probably remember, **phonetics** studies the sounds and how they are produced. **Morphology** (تحليل التشكل) analyses word parts, how words inflect for tense, number, etc. and how words can be derived from others by adding certain prefixes and/or suffixes. As for **syntax** (تركيب الجملة), it comprises the study of how words combine to form phrases and how phrases combine to form sentences. **Semantics** (دلالة الألفاظ) studies word meaning and sentence meaning. However, the search for system at **discourse** level, i.e. beyond the sentence, is still evolving. **Discourse** (الحوار / الحديث) **analysis** is the study of the language of communication, its function and organization (both in its written and spoken forms).

what's difference between -- ?

Written language has always been regarded as a source of permanence of linguistic excellence and as a permanent record of facts to keep or scan. It has also been regarded as a form of authority following rules of prescriptive grammar. It can also be composed, edited and read at one's own pace, repeatedly if the need arises, allowing repeated reading and analysis. It is usually physically distant and more formal. It was traditionally regarded as the only respectable representation of language, with spoken language occupying a secondary position. However, speech can be argued to be primary to writing in many senses. In one sense, speech is historically prior to writing, having emerged thousands of years before writing systems were developed. In another sense, speech develops more naturally in children as they pick it up from family and peers before they go to school to study reading and writing. It is the primary medium of communication among all people, comprising more than 60% of our daily activity. Its role further contrasts with written language as some languages (e.g. some Central African and Amazon tribes) have never been written down.

Parallel to the distinction between written and spoken language is that between a sentence and an utterance. It is also basic to the study of discourse analysis. A sentence is an abstract string of words put together according to grammar rules. It is grammatically complete, including a finite verb to be grammatically well formed. An utterance, in contrast, may be a sentence, a series of sentences, or an incomplete sentence e.g. "Sorry". It is defined as a stretch of talk by one person, before and after which there is a pause. It is used as a physical event, defined in terms of its time of utterance, place of utterance and accent of the speaker. It is the unit of spoken language; thus it may be loud or soft, slow or fast. If one sentence is uttered twice, it comprises two utterances. However, to produce different sentences, one needs to use different words or a different word order.

Many of the utterances we use do not consist of full sentences, and yet are entirely understandable in context. E.g.

"Coffee?"

"Sure!"

Two sentences may have exactly the same meaning but ~~cannot say they are one utterance. Each~~ utterance is a unique event created at a particular point in time for a particular purpose. Thus, the same sentence "It's cold in here" could mean different things in different contexts. If said by a Prince to his servant, it would mean, "Close the window". If said by a husband to his wife who had asked him whether to have dinner in the garden, it could mean "No, let's eat indoors". Thus, two utterances using the same underlying sentence may have different interpretations in different contexts.

Discourse is a continuous [illegible] language in use (i.e. in context) larger than a sentence. [illegible] set of utterances which constitute any recognizable speech event e.g. a conversation, a joke, a sermon, an interview. Traditional linguistics has recently witnessed an increasing interest in **discourse analysis**, i.e. -- how sentences work in sequence to produce coherent stretches of language. It studies features of language that bind sentences when used in sequence. It studies all language units with a definable communicative function, whether spoken or written. It involves discovering linguistic regularities in discourses -- e.g.

cohesion and discourse markers -- with emphasis on permissible units in both spoken and written texts, and function or purpose of the discourse.

النصوص اللغوية

To study written language, **text linguistics** views a text as the language unit with a definable communicative function, characterized by such principles as cohesion, coherence, and informativeness. It provides a formal definition of what constitutes their identifying textuality. It also views language as interaction between speaker and listener, and/or writer – reader.

تحليل المحادثة

On the other hand, **conversation Analysis** is a method of studying sequential structure and organization of spoken language. Using ethnomethodology, this approach studies recordings of real conversations to establish what properties are used in a systematic way when people interact. Conversation analysis is basically empirical and inductive, studying the structure of naturally occurring spoken language (e.g. conversations, interviews, commentaries, and speeches). Upon analysis, conversation has proved to be a highly structured activity with basic conventions.

Main Ideas:

كبير/ذو اهمية

1- There are significant differences between written and spoken language.

لغة مختصرة (summary)

2- A sentence is an abstract string of words put together according to grammar rules.

مجموعة/تسلسل

الكلام 3- An utterance may be a sentence, a series of sentences, or

غير كاملة an incomplete sentence. (Sorry! - Silent - Coffee!)

مجموعة تشكل

الحوار 4- Discourse is a set of utterances which constitute any recognizable speech event. (e.g. an interview).

5-Discourse analysis is interested in how sentences work in sequence to produce coherent stretches of language.

6-A text is the language unit with a definable communicative function.

7-Conversation analysis is a method of studying sequential structure and organization of spoken language.

[?]

EXERCISES:

1. Distinguish between an utterance and a sentence.
2. Compare written and spoken language.
3. Define conversation analysis and text linguistics.

Unit 2 COHESION

Objectives:

By the end of this unit, students should be able to:

1- Give the definition of "cohesion".

2- Explain the major types of cohesive ties: reference, subestitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical.

3-Tell the difference between cataphoric and anaphoric references.

4-Give a short account of deictic markers: person, palace a space, temporal discourse, and social deixis.

A **text** is defined as a physical product, a written monologue, and a communicative occurrence which meets seven standards or conditions of **textuality**. In this unit we study one of these, namely cohesion. **Cohesion,** according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), links different parts of sentences or larger units of text, e.g. the cross-referencing function of pronouns, articles, and some adverbs (as in "The boy visited a new shop. However, he couldn't find any of the items on his shopping list.") It concerns the ways in which the components of the surface text i.e. the actual words we hear or see are connected to each other within a sequence. There are five major types of cohesive ties: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical ties.

1. REFERENCE

The use of referring expressions links different parts of a text. To establish reference, we use lexical items as well as pronouns, demonstratives, and comparatives.

a. Pronouns:

Most pronouns are used to link certain nouns in the text. Pronouns can be either anaphoric, referring backwards to a previously mentioned noun, or cataphoric referring forward to a noun that follows. For example, in the sentence "Mary asked *him* to tell *her* a story, and so Tom did", while "her" is anaphoric, used to refer backwards to "Mary", "him" is cataphoric, referring to "Tom".

b. Demonstratives:

The demonstrative pronouns "this", "that", "these", "those" are also used as cohesive ties and are also either anaphoric or cataphoric. In a sentence like "*This* is why I like ice cream", we assume that the reason was mentioned earlier, and so the tie is anaphoric. However, in a sentence like "If you are applying for a new job, you should remember *this*: punctuality and a strong sense of commitment are the key to job keeping", the demonstrative "this" refers forward to a large chunk, namely "punctuality ... job keeping", and so it is cataphoric.

c. Comparatives:

The comparative form of adjectives can also link to a referent. For example, "I have seen nicer places" implies comparison with the place being referred to. Also, in the sentence "We are the best" includes comparison with other people, mentioned previously

The use of referring expressions also includes the use of **"deictic markers"**, i.e. expressions that point or refer to parts of the discourse. These are of five types: person, place, time, discourse, and social.

Person deixis: grammatical markers of participant roles, with first person referring to speaker, second person to addressee(s), and third person to others who are neither speaker nor addressee. Shifting person reference can lead to confusion because the referent being pointed to each time should be the same person.

Place / spacial deixis: Spatial or space deixis refers to show the location of participants, distinguishing between "proximal" (i.e. close to the speaker) and "distal" (far from the speaker). This distinction is shown in demonstratives (this vs. that), adverbs (here vs. there), verbs (come vs. go, bring vs. take), or phrases (in front, at our place, back home, down river, uphill, downhill). An interesting example here is how Egyptians say "I'm going *up* to the cemetery" because it is usually on an elevation, while they say "I'm going *down* to Alexandria" which is downriver.

Temporal deixis: refers to time relative to the time of speaking, as in "now", "then", "yesterday", "today", "tomorrow", "next week", "in a fortnight" To interpret these would be impossible without a clue to what day it is at the moment of speaking. We usually time frame our stories e.g. "once upon a time".

Discourse deixis: Discourse deixis keeps track of reference in the unfolding discourse such as "in the following chapter", "this/ that", thus attending to distance. Distance is also a matter of alignment and focus so that if we closely identify with an idea, it is "close" and we are likely to refer to it as "this", and vice versa.

Social deixis: codes social relationships between speakers and addressees or audience. Absolute deictics are uniformly added to a social role (e.g. titles like "your Honour", "Mr. President") while relational deictics locate persons in relation to the speaker by means of lexical items (e.g. "my husband", "our cousin", "my boss") or pronouns (*tu, vous*, انت , حضرتك , the royal "we", the pronoun "we" in announcements by companies e.g. "We are happy to inform you of our new ...").

2. SUBSTITUTION

The second major type of cohesive ties is substitution. This involves the use of one item to replace a class of items rather than a specific one as with reference. They can be made for nominals, verb groups and clauses, tying the marker and the group together.

a. **Nominal**: "Would you like an ice cream?" "No thanks, I just had <u>*one*</u>." ("One" here substitutes for "ice cream".) "I love these garments; I think I'll take the blue <u>*one*</u>." (Here, "one" substitutes for "garments".)

b. **Verbal**: "Did you eat?" "Yes I <u>*did*</u>." ("Did" here substitutes for "ate".)

c. **Clausal**: "My teacher advised me to work on my style and <u>*so I did*</u>." ("So I did" substitutes for "I worked on my style".)

3. ELLIPSIS

The third major type of cohesion is ellisis, which involves naming the referent, then omitting or deleting it the second time it is referred to. Like substitution, ellipsis can be nominal, verbal or clausal.

a. **Nominal**: "Would you like to see another magazine? I have many ^." (The deleted noun is "magazines".)

b. **Verbal**: "Were you sleeping?" "No, I wasn't ^." (The deleted verb is "sleeping".)

c. **Clausal**: "I don't know how to use this vacuum cleaner. I'll have to learn ^ soon." (The deleted clause is "how to use this vacuum cleaner".)

4. CONJUNCTION

The fourth type of cohesive ties is conjunctions. These are words that join sentences and help interpret the relation between the clauses. They are of different forms including logical sequence (thus, therefore, then, so, consequently); contrast (however, in contrast, conversely), doubt/ certainty (probably, possibly, certainly, indubitably); similarity (similarly, likewise); expansion (for example, in particular). Such conjunctions can function in additive, adversative, causal and temporal relations.

a. **Additive**: "We studied the English lessons <u>*and*</u> solved the math problems."

b. **Adversative**: "She looked for a certain file all day in vain. <u>*Yet*</u>, when she returned to the office, she found the missing file under the desk."

c. **Causal**: "She finally found the file, *so* she sent it to the manager."

d. **Temporal**: "*Then*, she hurried to a meeting."

5. LEXICAL TIES

The fifth type of cohesive ties is lexical cohesion. Lexical ties can be either short (across short pieces of discourse) or long (across large pieces of discourse). Sometimes, the same word or synonym is used and repeated throughout the text. Other times, related words are used, and this repetition of the same concept strengthens the text cohesion.

a. **Repetition**: "They all enjoyed seeing the *film*. Actually, the *film* had won three Oscars."

b. **Synonym**: "He served in the *army* for three years. The *military* service provided him with excellent training in computer skills."

c. **Superordinate**: "She got a bouquet of *jasmines, daisies and sunflowers*. These *flowers* filled the room with a sweet smell."

d. **Collocation**: This means the habitual co-occurrence of individual lexical items which are predictable due to the context. E.g. "On examining the *flower*, he saw that its *petals, leaves and stem* were all withered." Another example is "I couldn't *correct* anything, my *red pencil* was dull."

The five major types of cohesion – reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical ties – are all effective in showing explicit links between parts of the text, and keeping it unified. They are easy to locate in any text.

Main Ideas:

Major Types of Cohesive Ties

- **Reference**
  - Pronouns
  - demonstratives
  - Comparatives
  - deictic markers
- **Substitution**
  - nominal
  - verbal
  - clausal
- **Ellipsis**
  - nominal
  - verbal
  - clausal
- **Conjunction**
  - Additive
  - adversative
  - Causal
  - temporal
- **Lexical**
  - Repetition
  - synonym
  - Superordinate
  - Collocation

Reference
Substitution
Ellipsis
conju
Lex

[?]

EXERCISES:

1. Read the following and identify all cohesive ties:

In Memory of Grandfather

The person I want to introduce to you, died two years ago but he still lives in my memory. Perhaps all grandfathers of the world are remembered by their own children, but that one is mine.

He wasn't like old people with round shoulders complaining all the time about the sadness of life. He just thought that his mind was always young and he whistled all day. The training in the army gave him a straight posture which he was very proud of. You couldn't ask him about the war. He became serious looking far away, then he would say that he forgot it all. Like a bee, he never really stopped working.

After he retired, his favourite pastime was to feed the birds. One shining morning, I was sleeping when I heard him calling me softly from the kitchen. I couldn't believe what I saw: sparrows in the house! They were eating on the carpet near the kitchen door. I thought I was dreaming so I rubbed my eyes and clapped; then the birds flew away! Another day, my sister and I asked him about death. He said when he dies, we shouldn't forget to feed the birds, especially in wintertime.

A few weeks before he left, he told us he was worried about leaving grandmother alone. He also told us we shouldn't be sorry for him when he goes. However, he often visits me in dreams and he still whistles!

2. In the following article, identify the social deictic terms that refer to Ms. Velten.

Pudding Poisoner Gets Life Sentences

A 68-year-old mother of six received three life prison sentences and an additional 15 years for poisoning two husbands, a lover, her father, and an aunt because they were a nuisance.

Maria Velten admitted killing her second and third husbands and her lover between 1976 and 1982 by feeding them blueberry puddings laced with a herbicide.

The judge said Velten killed the three men because she felt they were a nuisance. Greed was an additional motive in the case of her third husband, who left her money, they said.

- Why did the author use deictic terms rather than names?
- How many men were killed? How many husbands did Ms. Velten have?
- Who is the "they" in the final line?

Unit 3 TEXTUALITY

Objectives:

By the end of this unit, students should be able to:

1- Tell the seven standards used to classify texts: cohesion, coherence, intentionality, accept ability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality.

2-Explain how each of the seven standards is achieved in a text and how it functions.

Cohesion is only one of the features characterizing a written text. A text, i.e. a language unit with a definable communicative function, characterized by such principles as cohesion, coherence and informativeness. A distinction is made here between a written text and spoken discourse. A text is a finished written product while discourse is a dynamic process of spoken expression. Also a text is a written monologue while discourse comprises of spoken interaction. The study of texts, their organization and characteristics constitutes the core of De Beaugrande & Dressler's (1981) work on textuality and text linguistics. Texts can be classified into text types e.g. road signs, news reports, poems, conversations, etc. on the basis of seven standards of textuality. These are the standards of cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality.

1. COHESION

Cohesion relates the parts of a text together through the use of explicit, surface-structure ties, as seen in the previous unit. It functions through the use of syntactic and semantic connectivity of linguistic forms at a surface-structure level of analysis. Within the discourse, cohesive ties or deictic markers function as linguistic signals to promote cohesion at the local level.

2. COHERENCE

This is the second standard or condition of a text. Underlying coherence accounts for the underlying functional connectedness or identity of a piece of language. It involves the study of such factors as the language users' knowledge of the world, the inferences they make. Coherence usually depends on the use of patterns / templates from scripts (i.e. certain goal-directed context-dependent sets of actions, e.g. grocery shopping, or classroom interaction), evident in clause selection and syntactic markers. In script theory, once the grocery shopping script, for example, has been established, it activates such lexical items as canned goods, checkout counters, dairy products, shopping list, as part of the script. The script is a mental construct that covers many instances in the text, thus predicting an overall form of discourse.

A concept is activated in the mind, and relations link between the concepts which appear together, each link bearing a designation of the concept it connects to. For example, in the road sign: "SLOW ROAD WORKS AHEAD", "road" is understood as location, "works" as an action, and "slow" as action required of drivers rather than an adjective describing the quantity of motion. Although such relations are not made explicit in the text, they are activated by the readers as they make sense out of the text.

Coherence relations are different types of causality, concerning the ways in which one situation affects another. In the sentence "John fell down and broke his legs", "falling down" is the **cause** of "breaking". In "Adel could read and write because he went to school", being able to read and write is not caused by going to school, but is a reasonable outcome. This relation is one of **reason** where an action follows as a rational response to some previous event. However, cause and reason are different from the relation in the next sentence. In the sentence "Sandra made some sandwiches *and* Dina ate them", Sandra's action created the sufficient but not necessary conditions for Dina's action, and thus made it possible; this relation is called **enablement**. Thus, Sandra's making the sandwiches enabled Dina to eat them, but did not cause her to eat them! Cause, reason and enablement, however, are not involved in the sentence "The child went to the fridge *to* get a bottle of milk". The relation here is one of **purpose** as it is an event or situation that is planned to become possible via a previous event or situation. One more relation between events or situations is arrangement in **time**, which may move forwards or backwards. The sentence "The child went to the fridge to get a bottle of milk" shows forward directionality as going to the fridge is followed by getting the bottle of milk. In contrast, the sentence "When they arrived at the cinema, the film had already started" includes backward directionality with the film starting first before their getting to the cinema. Coherence is thus the outcome of recovering relations within a text by adding one's knowledge to bring a textual world together through inferencing. Text-presented knowledge interacts with people's stored knowledge of the world.

3. INTENTIONALITY

While cohesion and coherence are relations related to the text and its organization, intentionality is a user / reader-centred feature of texts. The text producer / writer's attitude and intention in producing a text should be evident to both producer / writer and receivers / readers. Cohesive ties and coherence related inferences enable the receivers / readers to perceive the producer's / writer's intentionality. Such intention could be seen to inform, to entertain, to persuade, etc. receivers / readers would tolerate errors in production as long as they perceive the producer's / writer's intention. Jokes about a sleepy employee with a pillow on his desk, for example, are used to entertain readers, but can also be used to persuade people of the inefficiency of the public sector bureaucracy, for instance.

4. ACCEPTABILITY

Another feature of textuality is acceptability, concerning the text receiver's / reader's attitude. The reader's expectation is that the language used is a cohesive, coherent text with some use or relevance for the receiver. For example, the reader may want to learn some knowledge or cooperate in a plan. This relates to the text type: whether the text is a poem requiring appreciation of its beauty, a washing machine manual providing information on how to operate the machine, or the charter informing citizens of their rights and obligations. Such acceptability also depends on the social and cultural setting, determining what is culturally acceptable (especially in the domains of politics and religion), and how it is to be understood with such norms.

5. INFOMATIVITY

Another essential feature of textuality is "informativity", i.e. to what extent the text is expected or unexpected, known or unknown. For example, in the telephone company announcement,

Call us before you dig. You may not be able to afterwards.

what the company means is for clients to call before they dig as they might dig through an underground cable which may get broken, cutting the phone service and giving them a severe electric shock, so they won't be able to call. This implicit meaning needs some inference on the part of the readers to process it. The more demanding this processing of information, the more interesting the text is. However, caution is usually taken not to overload the text to the point of hindering communication. On the other hand, a text should be informative to a certain extent. The assertion that "The sea is water", for example, when made to scientists, makes the text very marginal because it is very uninformative. However, this uninformative piece may be acceptable as a starting point for more informative chunks. The text might continue like this "The sea is water in the sense that water is the dominant substance; in fact it is a solution of gases and salts as well as a vast number of living organisms." This continuation upgrades the informative content of the text.

6. SITUATIONALITY

The sixth standard of textuality is "situationality" concerning how relevant the text is to the situation or context in which it occurs. For example, the road sign "SLOW ROAD WORKS AHEAD" discussed above can be interpreted in different ways. It can be read with "slow" describing the road works as going on quite slowly, or instructing the drivers as to the speed of driving. It is due to the context, or location where a certain class of readers (car drivers) are likely to be asked for a particular action, that all readers will only infer the second interpretation (i.e. to drive slowly). Thus, the sense of the text is decided via the situation. The above mentioned road sign text is also preferred to a longer version explaining the same instruction. This economical version is more appropriate due to the situation where drivers have limited time and attention to read, understand and act upon the instruction.

7. INTERTEXTUALITY

The seventh standard of textuality is intertextuality. This concerns how one text is dependent upon the knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts. The road sign RESUME SPEED, for example, can only be understood in relation to a previous instruction to reduce speed. A clown making fun of some public figures and caricaturing them can only be appreciated by an audience familiar with the behaviour and sayings of those persons. Certain genres of writing are based on intertextuality; these include parodies, critical reviews, and reports, where the text writer consults a prior text continually and text readers need some familiarity with that prior text to appreciate the parody, review, report, etc.

A written text, thus, can be judged as an effective text when it is characterized by the above-mentioned seven standards of textuality. These are obligatory characteristics, and a text failing to be cohesive, coherent, acceptable, etc. fails to be a text.

Main Ideas:

There are seven features which are used to classify texts:

1- **Cohesion:**

It relates the parts of a text together through the use of syntactic and semantic forms.

2- **Coherence:**

It is the underliyng functional connectedness of the text. Coherence relations may be cause and result, purpose, time, etc.

3- **Intentionality:**

This is the intention of the writer: the previous features should lead the reader to perceive the writer's intentions.

4- **Acceptability:**

It refers to how far the reader accepts the text content.

5- **Informativity:**

It refers to how much information is included in the text.

6- **Situationality:**

It refers to how relevant the text is to the situation or con text in which it occurs.

7- **Intertextuality:**

This concerns how one text is dependent upon the knowledge of one or more previous ones.

[?]

EXERCISES:

1. Analyze the first paragraph in this chapter in terms of the seven standards of textuality.
2. Choose a magazine or newspaper advertisement and analyze it in terms of the seven standards of textuality.
3. Choose a magazine or newspaper article and analyze it in terms of the seven standards of textuality.
4. In your opinion, which of the above standards of textuality is most important in the study of poetry?

Unit 4 THE COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE & IMPLICATURE

Objectives:

By the end of this unit, students should be able to:

1-Explain the four maxims which feature a successful conversation.

2- Recognize them in a conversation.

3- Explain how and why maxims can be violated, giving examples.

4-Define implicature and give examples of conversational and conventional ones.

While written language is organized through cohesion, and other standards of textuality, conversation has its own organizational standards. The success of a conversation depends not only on what speakers say but also on their whole approach to the interaction. We assume that in a conversation the participants will cooperate with each other when making their contributions. People adopt a "cooperative principle" when they communicate: they try to get along with each other by following certain conversational "maxims" that underlie the efficient use of language. Four basic maxims have been proposed by Grice (1975).

- The Maxim of **Quality:**

Do not say what you believe to be false.

Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

- The Maxim of **Quantity:**

  Make your contribution sufficiently informative for the purposes of the conversation.

  Do not make your contribution more informative or less informative than necessary.

- The Maxim of **Relevance:**

  Make sure that whatever you say is relevant to the conversation.

- The Maxim of **Manner:**

  Do not make your contribution obscure, ambiguous, or difficult to understand.

According to Grice (1975), speakers cooperate with each other when communicating, attempting to be informative, truthful, relevant and clear (maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner). Listeners will normally assume that a speaker is following these criteria.

However, speakers may **violate** the Cooperative Principle or one of its maxims. Violation is not obvious at the time of the utterance, as the hearer will not understand that the speaker has deliberately lied, supplied insufficient information, been ambiguous, or irrelevant. Such violations hamper communication and do not lead to implicature. E.g

A. I need a drink.

B. Try the Bell.

If B is adhering to the Cooperative Principle, several implicatures arise out of this dialogue: e.g. the Bell must be a place that sells drinks; it must be open (as far as B knows); it must be nearby. If B is not being cooperative (e.g. if he knows that the Bell is closed, or is the name of a greengrocer's), he is violating the maxims of quality and relevance. Deliberate violation of this kind is uncommon and only occurs in special cases as sarcasm, joking, or deliberate unpleasantness.

More likely is the **inadvertent violation** of conversational maxims -- as would happen if B genuinely did not know that the Bell was closed, and accidentally sent A to the wrong place. In everyday conversation, misunderstandings often take place as speakers make assumptions about what their listeners know, or need to know, which turn out to be wrong. At such points the conversation can break down and may need to be repaired with the participants questioning, clarifying, and cross checking. The repairs are quickly made in the following example through the use of such pointers as "I told you" and "sorry".

a. Have you got the time?

b. No, I told you, I lost my watch.

a. Oh, sorry, I forgot.

But it is quite common for participants not to realize that there has been a breakdown, and to continue conversing at cross-purposes. However, the maxims can be **deliberately violated** for certain effects; speakers may violate the maxim of quality "for pretend" as in the following example.

c. Mommy?

m. mhmm.

c. How old are you for pretend?

m. oh. (1) I'm about 12 years for pretend.

c. ah. You're older

Such violation does not lead to implicature but just enables participants to suspend the maxims for a while, and so is the case in teasing, joking, and child play.

In contrast, speakers often lead to certain inferences, or **implicature,** when they break (or **'flout'**) these maxims; for example they may be sarcastic, try to be different, or clever, etc. Listeners may then draw inferences from what speakers have said (the literal meaning of the utterance) concerning what they have not said (conversational implicature). When S flouts a maxim, it is obvious to H at the time of the utterance that S has deliberately and quite openly failed to observe one or more of the maxims. This is often done because the maxims clash.

X. What time is it?

Y. Some time between ten and eleven.

In this example, to give sufficient information (observing Maxim of Quantity) would entail telling something S does not have adequate evidence for (violating the Maxim of Quality). For a different response, see the following example.

B. What time is it?

C. It's 10.44 and 35 seconds.

B here flouts the Maxim of Quantity by providing too much information, implying that he is bored, that they are late, or that they are early, depending on the context. In the next example,

A. How are you?

B. I'm dead!

B flouts the Maxim of Quality to imply that he or she is extremely tired. Similarly, speaker B flouts another maxim in the following example.

A. What happened to your flowers?

B. A dog got into the garden.

B flouts the maxim of Relevance to imply that the dog **probably** ruined the flowers. Similarly, in the next husband-wife conversation,

a. I'll take the children out.

b. I veto i-c-e-c-r-e-a-m.

The wife spells out "ice-cream", thus flouting the Maxim of Manner to prevent the children from figuring out what she is saying. Similarly, the following service encounter exchange flouts the maxim of Relevance.

X. Do you do buttonholes?

Y. She'll be back in an hour.

Assuming Y's response is relevant, we infer that the person who does buttonholes will be back shortly.

Implicature, thus, refers to inferences or implications deduced from the utterance, on basis of the Cooperative Principle which governs efficiency and acceptability of conversations. For example, "there's some torn paper on the floor" could mean "you ought to pick it up" depending on the context. Implicatures have been classified into **conversational** implicatures which are inferences calculated on the basis of the maxims and requiring a particular context, and **conventional** ones (not restricted to a particular context, and not derived from these principles, but simply attached by convention to particular expressions like "therefore" as in "He's old, therefore he's wise"). Consider the following examples of conventional implicature.

a. Do you want some cake?

b. I am on a diet. (i.e. No.)

a. Did you like the party?

b. Don't ask. (i.e. No.)

Such responses flout the maxims of relevance and quantity respectively, but the implied answer - no- is easy to infer, regardless of the context in which such utterances occurred. However, in some cases the implicature is not so easy to infer regardless of the context and shared background knowledge is needed to arrive at S's intended meaning. Consider the following examples.

A. Do you like my new hat?

B. It's pink!

A. Did you like the party?

B. They served ice cream.

A. Coffee?

B. It'd keep me awake all night.

Most people will understand the B responses as implying "no" as an answer. However, if both A and B know that pink is B's favourite colour, that B loves ice-cream, and that B has to stay up all night to study for an exam, the implicature then would be "yes". Such conversational implicature is not fixed, but rather based on a considerable amount of shared knowledge between speaker and hearer.

Main Ideas:

A successful conversation depends on the participants' cooperation with each other.

1-When people communicate, they follow certain conversational maxims.

a. Quality (truthfulness)

b. Quantity (information adequacy)

c. Relevance

d. Manner (clarity)

2-Violation of these maxims hampers communication.

3-Violation of the maxims may be either inadvertent or deliberate.

4-Implicature refers to inferences or implications deduced from the utterance. Types of implicature are: conversational and conventional.

EXERCISES:

[?]

Which maxim has not been observed? Decide whether it has been flouted or violated? What implicature(s) might be drawn?

a. I really liked that dinner.

b. I'm a vegetarian.

a. We're going to the movies.

b. I've got an exam tomorrow.

a. Did you get the milk and the eggs?

b. I got the milk.

a. Is he nice?

b. She seems to like him.

a. Do you know someone kind, honest and generous called Catherine?

b. I know someone called Catherine.

Bill. Tom, Susan just loves your book! Don't you, darling?

Susan. More soup anybody?

a. Do you want an umbrella?

b. No, I really want to stand out here in this soaking rain to get wet!

Strangers on a train:

A. What do you do?

B. I'm a teacher.

A. Where do you teach?

B. In Alaska!

A. Sorry I asked!

A. George, I'm afraid you failed philosophy.

B. What great news!

X. Do you think Mary will come?

Y. Either she will come or she won't.

A. When will you do your homework?

B. There's a football match on.

A. Did you have a good weekend?

B. With exams on next week?

A. I like novel and drama.

B. I like drama too.

A. I hope the children don't mess up during the party.

B. Children are children.

A. What do you think of Bill?

B. I think he's a snake!

Unit 5 SPEECH ACTS

Objectives:

By the end of this unit, students should be able to:

1-Describe how an utterance can perform actions.

2-Recognize direct and indirect speech acts.

3-Explain the difference between performative and constative utterances.

4-Explain the meaning of locution, illocution and perlocution.

5-Tell the different types of speech acts, giving examples.

6-Give examples to show the different felicity conditions in conversation.

Several actions can be performed by either speaking or physical gesture. For instance, people may congratulate by saying "congratulations", by giving someone a pat on the back, or the thumbs up sign. Similarly, you can forbid someone to enter the room by saying, "I forbid you to enter the room", "Don't come in now", putting on a "No Entry" sign, or wagging your finger at the person. Try to think of other actions that can be performed by either speaking or physical gesture.

Thus, words can perform actions as well as simply describe a state of affairs. The speaker who utters "There's a spider in your hair" does not just wish to inform the hearer of the existence of the spider, but also to warn H to remove it, and/ or mock H who cannot feel the spider. Similarly, the utterance "Someone's eaten all the ice-cream" could be heard as a complaint expressing annoyance, requesting repair by getting some ice cream, as an inquiry asking who ate it, or as an accusation to the H of having used it without involving the S. Also, the utterance "He's got a gun" can be heard as a warning not to provoke the person being referred to. It has been seen, thus, that assertion of the state of affairs is not the only function of such declarative sentences. Rather, these are used to perform various actions such as warning, complaining, accusing, inquiring, etc.

Speech acts and sentence types:

Utterances may consist of different types of sentences. These may be declarative sentences such as the above (e.g. I have a dream), interrogative sentences (e.g. Are you following? Why didn't you answer the phone?), or imperative ones (e.g. Open the door. Let's go. Have a seat.) Regardless of the sentence type, utterances can be used not only to describe a state of affairs, but also to do things, performing various speech acts. Consider the sentence type of the following utterances.

1. I would like the salt.
2. You can pass the salt.
3. Have you got the salt?
4. Why don't you pass the salt?
5. Pass the salt, please.
6. Get me the salt.

Although these sentences vary, including declarative (1,2), interrogative (3,4) and imperative ones (5,6), they can all be used by S to perform the same speech act, namely requesting, though with varying degrees of politeness.

It is also worth mentioning that sentence types and speech acts do not necessarily correspond. For example, to ask for information, we can typically use an interrogative (Who took my ice cream? / Did you take my ice cream?) but also declaratives (I wonder where my ice cream has gone! / I left an ice cream here!), or imperatives (Tell me what happened to my ice cream! Inquire for me about my ice cream.) Similarly, to make an invitation, we can also use declaratives (we're having dinner and would love to have you come over), interrogatives (Would you like to come over tomorrow evening for dinner?), or imperatives (Come over and have dinner with us tomorrow at seven).

Performative Utterances:

Austin (1962) was the first to draw attention to the many functions performed by utterances as part of interpersonal communication; a theory which analyses the role of utterances in relation to the behaviour of speaker and hearer in interpersonal communication. In particular, he pointed out that many utterances do not communicate information, but are equivalent to actions. When someone says, "I promise...", "I apologize...", "I will" (at a wedding), "I name this ship...", the utterance immediately conveys a new psychological or social reality. An apology takes place when someone apologizes, and not before. A ship is named only when the act of naming is complete. In such cases to say is to perform. Austin, thus, called these **performative utterances** (i.e. utterances where action is performed by virtue of the utterance having been uttered (i apologize, I baptize you, I promise). Such expressions of activity are not analyzable in terms of truth-value terms. (They are different from **constative utterances**, i.e. descriptive statements that solely convey information, and that can be true or false. In particular, performative utterances are not true or false. (If A says "I name this ship...", B cannot then say "that's not true".) Such performative utterances not only perform a speech act but simultaneously describe the speech act itself. A performative utterance includes a performative verb that explicitly describes the intended speech act. Examples of these are the following.

I promise I'll be there.

I warn you this gun is loaded.

I apologize.

I thank you.

I order you to sit down.

I admit I was a fool.

In non-performative utterances, in contrast, the H is left to infer the S's intention as in the following examples. Non-performative utterances can also be used to perform an illocution but unlike performative ones, they do not explicitly name the intended illocutionary act and are often called indirect speech acts.

I'll be there.

This gun is loaded.

I'm sorry.

Thank you.

You must sit down.

I was a fool.

The main difference between performative and non-performative utterances is that performative utterances use verbs indicating the speech act intended by the speaker. What makes a verb performative is that it can be performed by speaking (as in such verbs as apologize, thank, warn, name, announce, admit e.g. I admit I was wrong", vs. "I think / know I was wrong"), it is under the control of the S i.e. locutionary rather than a perlocutionary effect (e.g. "I apologize to you", vs. "I amuse you", or "I bore you"), and is in the present tense first person (I or we) e.g. "We promise to visit you soon" as opposed to "He admits that he was silly" which is a mere report, or "I warned you several times to stop" which is also a report that can be true or false.

Locution, Illocution, Perlocution:

In speech act analysis, we study the effect of utterances on the behaviour of speaker and hearer, using a threefold distinction.

1. First, we recognize that a communicative act of saying takes place (**locutionary** act). The locution is the actual form of words uttered by S and their semantic meaning
2. Second, we look at the **illocutionary force** or act that is performed as a result of the speaker producing an utterance, where saying is the same as doing as in apologizing, betting, promising, welcoming, warning, defined with reference to the intentions of speakers while speaking. It has been seen how different locutions can

have the same illocutionary force (see the pass-the-salt examples above). It is also worth noting how the same location can have different illocutionary forces depending on the context. For example, "It's hot in here" could be a request to open the window or an offer to open it oneself.

3. Thirdly, we look at the **perlocutionary** effect that the S's utterance has on H who may feel amused, persuaded, warned as a consequence. This refers to the actual result of the locution. It may or may not be what the S wants to happen but it is caused by the locution and defined by H's reaction. In other words, the illocutionary act and the perlocutionary effect may not coincide. If I warn you against a particular course of action, you may or may not heed my warning, you may get scared, or laugh at my silly warning.

Types of Speech Acts:

Several attempts have been made to classify speech acts into a small number of speech act types. The most recognized of these is Searle's approach, recognizing five basic types:

1. **Directives**: S tries to get H to do something e.g. begging, pleading, commanding, demanding, requesting, asking, challenging, ordering, suggesting, warning

2. **Commissives**: S commits himself or herself (in varying degrees) to a certain future course of action e.g. promising, guaranteeing, pledging, swearing, vowing, offering, threatening

3. **Representatives**: S conveys belief about/ commitment to the truth of a proposition (with varying degrees) e.g.

stating, describing, asserting, hypothesizing, affirming, admitting, concluding, denying, reporting

4. **Expressives:** S expresses an attitude or feeling about a state of affairs e.g. thanking, apologizing, welcoming, sympathizing, deploring, congratulating, condoling.

5. **Declarations:** S's utterance brings about a new external status or condition of an object or situation solely by making an utterance. Such utterances only count if the speaker has the appropriate authority to perform these acts. e.g. christening, marrying, resigning, baptizing, declaring, sentencing, firing, divorcing

Felicity conditions:

Speech acts are successful only if they satisfy certain conditions / criteria. For example, a threat should involve an action that is undesirable to the H rather than to the S; otherwise the threat would be "infelicitous", i.e. unsuccessful. Thus, "If you don't clean up, I won't give you pocket money" is a felicitous threat, while "If you don't give me pocket money, I won't eat" is not. Austin postulates a number of conditions for the felicity or success of various speech acts. First, the "**preparatory**" conditions have to be right: the person performing the speech act has to have the authority to do so. This is hardly an issue with such acts as apologizing, promising, or thanking, but it is an important constraint on the use of such acts as fining (by a traffic patrol), baptizing (by a priest), arresting (by a policeman), sentencing (by a judge), and declaring war (by a political leader) where only certain people are qualified to use these utterances. It should also be about something that would not ordinarily happen,

-- as in I promise to take you out as opposed to *I promise to breathe. -- and that the act promised would be beneficial to H. e.g. *I promise that I'll punch you / that tomorrow is Friday

Then, the speech act has to be executed in the correct manner: in certain cases there is a procedure to be followed **exactly and completely**: e.g. in baptizing. In others certain expectations have to be met (one can only welcome with a pleasant attitude).

Additionally, "**sincerity**" conditions have to be met. The speech act must be performed in a sincere manner. Apologizing, guaranteeing, and vowing are effective only if speakers mean what they say. Affirm and insist are valid only if the speakers are not lying. S must genuinely intend to carry out the act he promises e.g. *I promise that I'll jump over the pyramid if I pass my exams is impossible except for superman.

Also, content conditions have to do with the meaning of a promise, an apology, etc. For a promise, it has to be a future act; it also has to be about an act that will be performed by the S e.g. *I promise that I started the dishwasher / *I promise that you'll make a wonderful dessert.

Ordinary people automatically accept these conditions when they communicate and only depart from them for very special reasons. e.g. "Will you shut the door?" is appropriate only if a) the door is open; b) the speaker has a reason for making a request; c) the hearer is in a position to perform the action. If any of these conditions does not obtain, a special interpretation of the speech act has to apply. It may be intended as a joke, or sarcasm. Alternatively, there may be doubt about the speaker's visual ability or even sanity

Direct and indirect speech acts:

Direct interpretation comes from linguistic features of an utterance e.g. most likely expression. For instance, interrogative structure is most typical of directives; imperative structure of directives; and declarative structure of expressives, commissives, representatives and declarations. Direct speech acts relate directly between their linguistic structure and the work they are doing. In indirect speech acts, the speech act is performed indirectly through the performance of another speech act.

See the following indirect speech acts, specifically directives:

How many times do I have to tell you?

We need this photocopied for the 4 o'clock meeting.

I'd like some coffee, please.

Let's give Sarah a call now.

Could you do the dishes?

Where are the matches?

What happened to the salt?

Is Mona there?

How would it look if you were to arrive late?

Directives thus can be performed not only through imperatives, but also by stating a personal need or desire, asking for permission, and asking about ability or need or whereabouts of a requested object.

Main Ideas:

1-Words can perform actions (e.g. warn).

2-Sentence type and speech acts do not necessarily correspond.

3-Utterances can perform many functions as part of interpersonal communication.

4-Performative utterances refer to the situation where to say is to perform.

5-Constative utterances are descriptive statements.

6-In speech analysis we consider:

a- the locutionary act.

(the actual words uttered by the speaker and their semantic meaning).

b- The illocutionary force act

(the act performed as a result of the utterance).

c- The perlocutionary effect

(the effect that the utterance has on the receiver).

7-Types of speech acts:

* directives
* commissives.
* representatives
* expressives.
* declarations.

8-Speech acts are successful if they satisfy the following felicity conditions:

a- The person performing the speech act has to have the authority to do so.

(preparatory)

b- The speech act has to be performed in the correct manner.

c- Sincerity conditions have to be met.

d- Content conditions have to be met.

9- There are direct and indirect speech acts.

Direct speech acts (they relate directly between the linguistic structure and the work they are doing.)

Indirect speech acts (they don't relate directly between the linguistic structure and the work they are doing.)

EXERCISES:

1. Think of at least five acts that you can perform by using either words or gestures. Can you think of any acts that can only be performed by using words?
2. Give as many different illocutions as you can for the following locutions: "I'm sorry" and "This gun is loaded". Describe the context in which each one would apply.
3. Choose a particular illocutionary force (e.g. thanking, apology, request, threat) and give at least five different locutions which could express that force.)
4. Give three possible perlocutions for the locution: "I love tea."

5. Decide whether the following utterances are performative or not. Explain why.

   a) You congratulate me.

   b) I apologize.

   c) I envy you.

   d) I warned you not to go.

   e) Switch off the TV.

   f) We convince everyone with our arguments.

   g) I command you to leave immediately.

6. In each of the following dialogues, decide whether B's utterance is a commissive, a directive, an expressive or a representative.

   a) A. I have a fever and a stomachache.

   B: We'll take you to the doctor in the afternoon.

   b) A. What's the weather like in Alexandria?

   B: It's raining cats and dogs.

   c) A. My room is messy.

   B. Clean it up!

   d) A. You've thrown away my favourite toy.

   B. I'm terribly sorry.

7. Mention the conditions in which the following declarations would be felicitous:

a) I now pronounce you husband and wife.

b) I name this ship "Normandy II".

c) I sentence you to 10 years in prison.

d) I divorce you. / You are divorced.

e) I resign.

8. Think of a possible context for each of the following utterances and provide an appropriate response:

   a) Let's put the typewriter over there (gesture).

   b) Oh, the sugar is all gone.

   c) It is cold in here.

   d) What are these shoes doing here?

   e) These exams need to be graded.

   f) What happened to the milk?

9. The following are infelicitous speech acts. For each of them, decide what speech act it looks like, and what makes it infelicitous:

   a) I promise that the weather will improve tomorrow.

   b) I'm sorry to hear about your success.

   c) Thank you for breaking my typewriter.

   d) Where did I hide the chocolate from you?

Unit 6 SPEECH EVENTS

Objectives:

By the end of this unit, students should be able to analyze the following speech events into their components:

a-Compliments.

b-Complaints.

c-Advice.

Linguists have looked not only at speech acts, but at the larger communicative event and the larger discourse structure. This is because, to perform one speech act, sometimes the introduction is much more important than the utterance including the speech act. For example, in the speech event of introducing a speaker to the audience, the one-utterance speech act of introducing is usually limited to mentioning the name of the person. However, the event usually consists of more than just that, the audience hope to learn something about the speaker's background, explaining why he or she is worth listening to, and the topic of his or her talk. Optionally, there are components that can put both speaker and audience at ease or establish a link between the speaker and presenter. Moreover, formulaic phrases like "it gives me pleasure", "our speaker today", and "join me in welcoming" are also attached to introduction speech events. Speech events may be carried out in either written or oral modes. For example, the "I do" and "I will" promises in marriage ceremonies – the "I do" and "I will" statements – are oral contracts given before witnesses, family, friends and the entire congregation in some communities.

Promises to purchase a house, however, are written contracts where the buyer and seller may never even meet each other in person. In this unit, we will focus on three speech events related to three speech acts: compliments, complaints, and advice.

Compliments are expressive speech acts. The speech event includes not only the speech act utterance but also the entire compliment interaction. As for their place, they occur between the opening and the first topic of conversation, or before the closing section. They function as a bonding device to smooth the interaction. They help establish rapport and smooth transition from greeting to the first topic of conversation. They also reinforce and encourage good performance as in "great work" to a student encouraging him or her to keep up the good work. They also relate to thanks when offered to someone who did something especially for us as in "wonderful food" by guest to hostess. They also help soften criticism, curving the intonation to show that a "but" criticism is coming shortly like "Good idea, but let's think about its implications in the long run". The structure of the compliment speech event can be described as follows, with the items in parentheses being optional ones.

(Elicitation) Compliment (Thanks) Acknowledgment (agree/ deny/ redirect focus) Bridge

It is possible that a compliment is elicited if we expect something to be noticed but it isn't, examples are "I'm not sure I like my new haircut" or "I'm so excited about my new bag". This should result in a noticing compliment. Such elicitation is optional. Once a compliment like "What a lovely haircut!" or "[illegible]" has been produced, it can be responded to in various ways. It can be acknowledged with appreciation ("thanks") and agreement ("it is, isn't it?). In acknowledging a compliment, it is possible to deny any personal responsibility (e.g. A friend gave it to me as a present) thus shifting the credit to someone else. It is also possible to accept but downgrade the compliment (as in "Thanks but it's just a little thing"), or shift the focus of the compliment elsewhere (as in "I was really lucky to get it at the sale for half price"). Once the compliment has been responded to, the recipient of such compliment is expected to move on (bridge) to another topic. Compliment speech ~~events~~ thus ~~have a definite~~ structure ~~with~~ optional and obligatory parts, all aiming at smoothing conversation and maximizing bonding, depending on where they come in a conversation.

Complaint speech events also consist of more than just the complaint speech act. Because they are face-threatening acts, speakers can choose whether to complain or not, and if so whether to complain directly or indirectly, softening the complaint with hedges, or impersonalization of the complaint source. Most people avoid complaints because they find it difficult to complain and still maintain and give face; therefore, they usually address them to people, who are not responsible for the offense, by griping. Friends are often invited to share troubles either to obtain advice (producing a genuine advice speech event) or just expecting the listener to share rather than give advice, which shows in many complainers disagreeing with the advice offered to them. Complainers usually accompany their **complaint** (e.g. Do you realize how loud this music is?") with **self-justification** for making the complaint ("you may not realize it but this is really bothering me. I have to get up real early to go to work at 5 am). If the complainer does not see any remedy coming up, he or she may escalate the complaint using a **threat** (e.g. "If you do not turn down this music right away, I'll have to report it to the police"). Interestingly, the complaint speech event is negotiated by complainer and complainee. The complainee may **accept** the complaint and **apologize**. They can save face by providing an **explanation** why they did what they did (e.g. "we had a party here and the loudspeakers had to be placed in opposite corners to reach all parts of the apartment"), or **promise forbearance** ("Won't happen again.") Either party may suggest a **remedy** and they may negotiate it to reach some **compromise**. In worse scenarios, the complainee may **deny** the problem altogether ("Why are you getting so upset? It's lovely music.") or refuse responsibility ("It's not my fault you can't sleep"). They may also refer to their personal relationship ("I thought you were my friend"). As can be seen, the speech event is the result of the interaction and cooperation of both parties.

Another speech event is that of giving **advice**. Advice seeking and giving is common to both radio and television call-in shows, and advice columns in newspapers and magazines. To start with, radio / television call-in show advice speech-event usually consists of many of the following components:

Opening participant identification problem statement symptom negotiation diagnosis advice advice negotiation advice acceptance / thanks pre-closing closing.

After the opening, greeting the expert and identifying himself or herself, the caller usually poses a question that reveals the problem to be solved by the expert. If such statement does not come readily, the expert often asks, "What is your question?", which is then responded to by problem identification. E.g.

a. I have about four trees in the house when I moved in and they're doing pretty well, but I'm not real experienced at pruning and I was wondering if there's a good book with good illustrations that shows you exactly how to do it.

Before advice is given, the caller is usually asked about the symptoms of the problem. . the problem is then diagnosed, and advice is usually negotiated. For example,

b. so water deeply using one of those soaking hoses.

a. But won't that use up a lot of water?

b. Not as much as you think. You only need to do this maybe twice this summer, but DEEP watering is the key.

Once advice has been negotiated, it is then accepted, sometimes reluctantly, "Well, thanks". The pre-closing follows, including a compliment to the expert,

a. Thanks a lot. I really like your show.

b. Thank you, that's very nice to hear. Call back and let me know how it works out.

a. I will. Thanks again.

b. Thank you for your call.

Then the expert usually closes off the call and offers another closing, preaching the audience on more general issues. Such structural components of the advice-seeking and giving are common to personal, medical, and household expert programs. It is also interesting in all such advice-giving events, how the advice-giver tries not to threaten the caller's face, by not blaming the caller or showing off superiority.

Main Ideas:

1-A speech event takes place according to certain discourse structures.

2-Such structures include optional and obligatory parts.

3-Compliments, as speech events, include not only the speech act utterance but also the entire compliment interaction. In this case, acknowledgment is obligatory, while elicitation and thanks are optional parts.

4- There are predictable structures for complaint and advice speech events.

(Refer to the text.)

EXERCISES: [?]

* Record one advice call-in show in English or Arabic. Transcribe it (i.e. write down the conversation word for word as you hear it, specifying who said what). Then identify its components and compare it to the items listed in your lessons. Which items were missing? Any new items?

- Record one call-in show that constitutes one speech event. Transcribe the conversation. Then, identify its components.
- Your neighbours are making a very loud noise at 3.00 a.m. and you have an exam tomorrow morning. Compose a dialogue between you and them complaining about the situation. If the situation is not resolved, write a letter of complaint to their father who is working abroad. Compare the dialogue and the letter in terms of the different components of the speech event of complaining.

Unit 7 POLITENESS

Objectives:

By the end of this unit, students should be able to:

1-Recognize the different levels of politeness in an utterance.

2-Explain Leech's maxims and how they function.

When communicating, we usually choose to imply rather than assert an idea; or choose an indirect directive like "Well, I really must get on with my work now" rather than a direct directive as "Go home". Consider the following imperative structures all functioning as directives.

Clean up the bathroom floor.

Peel these onions.

Pass the salt.

Take a look at this.

Have a seat.

Have some more cake.

Notice how these have been arranged from least polite to most polite, with the first requesting some action from H for the benefit of S, while the last two involve benefit to H, so that they are interpreted as offers rather than requests. Leech (1983) proposed a **TACT maxim** reflecting this tendency: **"Minimize the cost to other; maximize the benefit to other."** Hence, the use of **minimizers** to reduce the implied cost to H (e.g. "*Just* pop upstairs and visit us" or "Hang on a *second*") as opposed to, imposing and directness when the utterance involves benefit to H as in "Have a chocolate". Moreover, by being less direct when making a request like "would you mind helping me with the shopping?" rather than "Help me with the shopping", S sounds like he is asking permission and giving H the freedom to comply or refuse. Requests, thus, become more polite as they become more indirect. In accepting offers, Ss also minimize cost to H as in the following dialogue.

A. Do you want a lift?

B. Well, *<u>if you're going near the campus</u>*, yes please.

Thus, B tries to minimize A's going out of her way by making acceptance conditional on her not taking her out of her way so as to minimize cost for her.

Politeness is also at issue when offering praise or dispraise. The **APPROBATION maxim** goes like this: **"Minimize dispraise of other; maximize praise of other"**. When responding to a question like "Do you like the cake?", it is more polite to praise, saying "yes I do" than to dispraise, saying "not really". However, if H wants to dispraise, he or she is expected to minimize such dispraise by following an indirect route, saying something like "Did you make it yourself?" or "Is it a sponge cake?" thus withholding praise and still avoiding explicit dispraise. Similarly, consider the following example.

A. I've dyed my hair blonde.

B. You look beautiful. (praise = most polite)

You look different. (Implied dispraise)

You look awful. (Dispraise = least polite)

Indirectly implying dispraise is thus more polite than outright dispraise. Also compare the possible responses to this praise.

X. Her performance was outstanding!

Y. Yes wasn't it!

Compare this with agreement to self-praise, which would be very impolite.

A. Your performance was outstanding!

B. *Yes wasn't it!

It can be seen that other praise is much more polite than self-praise. It also shows in reluctance to dispraise others as in "You could have been more careful"; "Her performance was not as good as we'd expected".

A. Do you like these apricots?

B. I've tasted better.

Additionally, Leech proposes a **GENEROSITY** maxim which encourages speakers to "**Minimize benefit to self; maximize cost to self**". This usually applies to offers and requests. Examples of this are "I can lend you my car" as opposed to "*You can lend me your car"; and "You must come and have dinner with us" as more polite than "*we must come and have dinner with you". Also, compare the generous request "I wouldn't mind / could use a cup of tea" with the less polite "Can I have another cup of tea?" There is a tendency to suppress references to S in offers as in "You could borrow my car" as more polite than "*I can lend you my car."

Another speaker-oriented politeness maxim is the **MODESTY** maxim encouraging speakers to "**Minimize praise**

of self; maximize dispraise of self". It is definitely more polite to say "How stupid of me!" than "*How clever of me!". Also, when offering a gift people politely say "Please accept this small gift" rather than "*this large gift".

Another maxim is the AGREEMENT maxim, i.e. **"Minimize disagreement between self and other and maximize agreement between self and the other"**. When agreeing, this is usually exaggerated as in the following example:

a. This was an interesting film, wasn't it?

b. Yes, definitely.

However, when disagreeing, participants usually try to hedge or minimize such disagreement

c. English is difficult to learn.

d. Yes, but the grammar is easy.

The form "yes, but" is quite useful in hedging disagreement.

Finally, the SYMPATHY maxim postulates that speakers **"Minimize antipathy and maximize sympathy between self and other"**. It is frequently used in congratulations and condolences. That is why we would hear "I'm sorry to hear about your cat!" as condoling on some misfortune like the cat's death, but "I'm delighted to hear about your cat!" as congratulating on a fortunate event.

Several factors determine how polite we should be during communication with others. These include distance, power and urgency. Such factors are relevant to another work that touches upon politeness, namely Brown and Levinson (1987). They rank politeness strategies on a scale from bald-on-record, through positive politeness, negative politeness, to off-record strategies. The choice of which type of strategy to employ is based on speakers' assessment of three factors: 1) speaker-hearer relative status/ power, 2) their social distance, and 3) the weightiness of the imposition in a particular culture.

Main Ideas:

1-To produce more polite utterances, we usually imply rather than assert an idea. We also use indirect directives rather than direct one.

2-Leech (1983) proposed the following maxims:

a- Minimize the cost to other, maximize the benefit to other.

(the TACT maxim)

b- Minimize dispraise of other; maximize praise of other

(the APPROBATION maxim)

c- Minimize benefit to self; maximize cost to self;

(the Generisity maxim)

d- Minimize praise of self; maximize dispraise of self.

(The Modesty maxim)

e- Minimize disagreement between self and other;

Maximize agreement between self and other.

(the Agreement maxim)

f- Minimize antipathy and maximize sympathy between self and other.

(the Sympathy maxim)

3-Several factors determine how polite we should be during conversation with others. Namely.

a- Distance.

b- Power.

c- Urgency.

EXERCISES:

[?]

1. Arrange the following utterances from most polite to least polite and indicate which of leech's politeness maxims applies here.

a) Could I possibly ask you to close the window?

b) Close the window.

c) Can you close the window?

a) Would you like some juice?

b) Have some juice.

c) Could I possibly ask you to have some juice?

What do you think of my new haircut?

a) Did you cut it yourself ?

b) Your hair looks terrible!

c) I think you should change your hairdresser.

d) The old haircut suits you better.

Your cake tastes wonderful!

a) It's a simple recipe.

b) Everybody likes my cooking.

c) Have another slice.

2. Complete the following:

a- Some of the factors which determine politeness are ……, …… and ……

b- How stupid of me ! is an example of the …… Maxim.

c- You can berrow my car:

is an example of the …… maxim.

d- Would you mind helping me with the shopping ? is an example of the … maxim.

Unit 8 TURN TAKING

Objectives:

By the end of this unit, students should be able to:

1- Explain how turn – taking can be signaled in conversation.

2- Tell how the listener may signal that he wants to talk.

3- Explain:

a- turn units.

b- competitive interruption.

c- culture and turn – taking.

We have already looked at cooperation and politeness in spoken discourse. In this and the next units, we will have a chance to examine conversational structure, where conversation consists of a sequence of turns. The contribution of each participant is seen as part of a co-ordinated and rule-governed behavioural interaction. The most widely recognized conversational convention is that speakers take turns at talk; but how do speakers know that it is their turn to speak? How do they avoid overlapping and interrupting on regular basis?' In many formal situations, such as committee meetings, police interrogations, job interviews, and classroom interaction, there are many explicit markers showing that a speaker is about to yield the floor, and indicating who should speak next. E.g. "I think Mr Smith will know the answer to this question." This can happen in informal situations too e.g. "What do you think, John?" But there, the turn-taking cues are usually more subtle.

Conversation is characterized by turn-taking: one participant, A, talks, stops; another, B, starts, talks, stops; and so we obtain an A-B-A-B-A-B distribution of talk across two participants. But as soon as close attention is paid to this phenomenon, how such a distribution is actually achieved becomes quite problematic. First, there are the surprising facts that (considerably) less than 5% of the speech stream is delivered in overlap (two speakers speaking simultaneously), yet gaps between one person speaking and another are quite rare and short (frequently measurable in just a few micro-seconds and they average amounts measured in a few tenths of a second). How is this orderly transition from one speaker to another achieved with such precise timing and so little overlap? A second puzzle is that, whatever the mechanism responsible, it must be capable of operating in quite different circumstances: the number of parties from two to twenty or more; persons may enter and exit the pool of participants; turns at speaking can vary from minimal utterances to many minutes of continuous talk; and if there are more than two parties then provision is made for all parties to speak without there being any specified order or queue of speakers. In addition, the same system seems to operate equally well both in face-to-face interaction and in the absence of visual monitoring, as on the phone.

In everyday conversation, people do not simply stop talking when they are ready to yield the floor. Speakers have a variety of signals to project the end of a turn. The signals cue the next speaker to begin a turn. Since speakers wish to achieve smooth turn transfer with minimum overlap, they must be able to recognize the signals that show that the previous speaker is ending a turn.

Body movement and eye contact are especially important. While speaking, we look at and away from our listener in about equal proportions; but as we approach the end of a turn, we look at the listener more steadily. Similarly, when talking to a group of people, we often look more steadily at a particular person, to indicate that in our view this should be the next speaker. Additionally, slowing of tempo, vowel elongation, and falling intonation all help to signal the end of a turn, a place for an exchange in turns, sometimes called a transition-relevance place, or TRP. Although turns are usually nicely timed, overlaps do happen. In fact, overlaps (not interruptions) are thought to show alignment between the communication partners. Syntactic completion can also signal a TRP. For example, assume that the speaker says, "If you try to use that program, you'll run into trouble." The speaker has a slight pause after "program", and the listener may give some backchannel signal (e.g. umhmmm). The speaker has projected the end of the turn with the use of "if". Until the "then-clause" is finished, the next speaker won't normally try to take a turn. Nonverbal signals too may serve this function. A change in gaze direction (at or away from the listener) can indicate the end of a turn. Or, if the speaker begins to raise his arms at a possible transition place, listeners can project when the turn will end. Again, the next speaker won't normally try to take a turn until the speaker's arms are lowered.

Listeners are not passive in all of this. Here too there are several ways of signaling that someone wants to talk next. Most obviously, the first person in a group to start speaking, after the completion of a turn, will usually be allowed to hold the floor. More subtly, we can signal that we want to speak next by an observable increase in body tension – by leaning forward, or producing an audible intake of breath. Less subtly, we can simply interrupt – a strategy which may be tolerated, if the purpose is to clarify what the speaker is saying, but which more usually leads to social sanctions, like being regarded as rude or aggressive.

Well-aligned speakers may, however, complete turns in a collaborative fashion. Overlaps that show collaboration are "good" overlaps showing alignment between conversational partners. (See examples 1-3 above.) These usually occur most frequently in the conversations of family and close friends, where overlaps signal encouragement, where there are lots of collaborative completions. As long as the message does not become garbled, overlaps help create a great deal of camaraderie, letting the speaker know that he or she is not talking to the wall.

Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974) suggest that the mechanism that governs turn-taking, and accounts for the properties noted, is a set of rules with ordered options which operates on a turn-by-turn basis, and can thus be termed a local management system. One way of looking at the rules is as a sharing device. Such an allocational system will require minimal units over which it will operate, such units being the units from which the turns at talk are constructed. These units are determined by various features of linguistic surface structure: they are syntactic units (sentences, clauses, noun phrases, etc.) identified as turn units in part by intonation. A speaker will be assigned initially just one of these turn units (although the length of the unit is largely under the speaker's control due to the flexibility of syntax). The end of such a unit constitutes a point at which speakers may change; i.e. TRP. At such points, the rules that govern the transition of speakers then come into play, which does not mean that speakers *have* to change at such points, they *may* only do so. Such points must be predictable, which explains the minimal overlap and the split-second speaker transition.

Another feature of turn-taking is the possibility of indicating within a turn-unit that at its end some particular other party is invited to speak next. Techniques for selecting next speakers include such straightforward devices as the following: a question (offer, request, etc.) plus an address term; various hearing and understanding checks (who?, you did what?, pardon?, you mean tomorrow?, etc.) which select prior speaker as next.

Based on the identification of turn-units, the following rules apply (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974): (C = current speaker; N = next speaker; TRP = "transition relevance point", i.e. predicted end of a turn-unit).

a. If C selects N in current turn, C must stop speaking and N must speak next immediately after the next TRP.

b. If C does not select N, then any party may self-select and start at a TRP, and then C must leave the floor.

c. If neither of the above rules applies, C may but does not have to continue.

Such rules apply at the end of every turn-unit. And once a speaker has taken the floor, other parties are expected to listen through the turn-unit at the end of which turn transfer becomes relevant again.

Such rules account for a number of observations of conversational behaviour. First, only one speaker generally speaks at any one time in a single conversation. Where overlaps do occur, they tend to be precisely placed. That is to say, they occur as N tries to get the turn at the same time as another party as in example #1 below. Alternatively, overlaps may occur where TRPs have been mis-predicted e.g. where a tag or address form has been produced after a pause as in example #2 below. The rules thus allow to distinguish between unintended overlap (as in examples #1 and #2) and competitive interruption as in example #3.

1. <u>Unintended Overlap:</u>

A. I thought he got twenty pounds a day at that job.

B. ┌ amazing, isn't it?

C. └ they offered twenty but he insisted on twenty five.

2. <u>Unintended Overlap:</u>

X. I think you know him ┌ don't you?

Y. └ yeah.

3. <u>Competitive Interruption:</u>

O. I told you before I cannot ac- ┌ cept any of this trash.

P. └ I completely disagree and think you must think rationally before you do anything so stupid.

The rules also predict that **silence** – i.e. absence of talk -- can be assigned differently. It may be a) a **gap** before the sequence of rules a-c apply again, b) a pause within a turn or before a selected next-speaker has taken the floor, such silence being assigned to him as he is expected to speak then, as in example #4

4. Attributable pause

A. Is anything bothering you?

(2.5)

A. Yes or no?

(2)

A. Eh?

B. No.

The turn-taking system in conversation is locally managed, operating on a turn-by-turn basis, organizing just the transition from current speaker to next. The local management of conversation, thus, provides a strong motivation for participants to listen carefully to what is being said so as to manage a smooth turn-transition at a TRP without overlap or silence.

Despite these rules, overlapping talk does occur, though not very often. When it does occur, one speaker generally drops out rapidly. Then, when one of the two overlapping speakers emerges in the clear, he usually recycles the art of the turn obscured by the overlap. However, if neither party drops out immediately, one of them competes for the floor by upgrading to win the floor. Such upgrading usually involves louder volume, slower tempo, and lengthened vowels, signalled in the following examples by capital letters

5. Competitive Overlap

A. Someone must have done it.

B. But this ┌ person that DID IT IS GOT TO BE:: taken care of

C. └ If I see the person

Luckily for participants in a conversation, in addition to the rules mentioned above, there are other signals that both speakers and hearers attend to for the smooth management of turn-taking. A current speaker usually signals when he intends to hand over the floor, a practice similar to the "over" signal given on radio transmitters. The most noticeable such signal is gaze: a speaker usually breaks mutual gaze while speaking, returning gaze to the addressee upon turn completion. However, this cannot be the case in the absence of visual cues, as in telephone conversation. This gaze-signal system is assisted by intonational cues. Speakers usually rely heavily on a system of intonational signals that show when an utterance has reached a point of possible completion, using terminal pitch. Depending on both visual and intonational cues conversational participants orient to points of possible completion to achieve smooth turn transfer with minimal gap or overlap.

It is difficult to generalize, though, about "normal" or polite conversational practice due to cultural variations. For example in English, silence in conversation can be very embarrassing except for a reason like moments of grief. Otherwise, speakers often interpret overlong pauses before a turn as a signal of lack of understanding, lack of interest, unwillingness to continue the topic of conversation, or even lack of desire to interact In some other cultures, like Apache. it is normal for conversational participants to become silent as who speaks when depends on social status of the participants. Thus, participants of lower status are expected to stay silent if their seniors wish to speak. It would be worthwhile to observe cultural differences in the turn-taking system for a better understanding of such cultural differences.

Main Ideas:

1- Conversation consists of a sequence of turns.

2-Informal situation, there are markers which show that the speaker is about to yield the floor, and indicate who should speak next.

3-In everyday conversation, distribution of talk works according to a system (the local management system). That system requires syntactic units (turn units). Using that system and the other rules, a speaker can indicate the end of his turn and the listener can signal his desire to speak.

4-The rules help us distinguish between unintended overlaps and competitive interruption. They also predict silence in conversation – both gaps and pauses. (transition- relevance places)

5-Overlaps may occur where TRPs , have been mis - predicted.

6-Cultural differences should be observed in the turn -- taking system (e.g. silence may have different interpretati s).

EXERCISES:

1. How can a speaker signal that his current turn is coming to an end?
2. How does a hearer signal that he has something to say?
3. Distinguish two causes of overlap and explain how each is usually resolved.
4. What is a TRP? What are the options available for speakers there?
5. What is meant by local management system?
6. Record a conversation, transcribe it and find an example of a TRP, a pause, a gap, overlap, interruption, and current speaker selecting next.

Unit 9 ADJACENCY PAIRS & SEQUENCE STRUCTURE

Objectives:

By the end of this unit, students should be able to:

1-Define adjacency pairs and their role in conversation.

2-Tell the conditions on the use of adjacency pairs.

3-Tell why insertion sequences are used.

4-Identify pre-sequences in adjacency pairs.

5-Describe preference organization.

6-Explain how the opening and closing sections of a conversation are related to culture.

7- Describe the pattern of organization common to most informal phone calls.

Another source of conversational organization is the use of adjacency pairs, i.e. pairs of utterances consisting of an initiating utterance followed by an appropriate response, like question-answer, greeting-greeting, offer-acceptance, and apology-minimization.

I. What's the time?

R. Two o'clock.

Adjacency pairs are closely related to the turn-taking system as they are techniques for selecting a next speaker, especially when an address term is included to specify who should be speaking next. There are certain conditions on the use of adjacency pairs. These conditions include a) that they should be adjacent, one coming after the other; b) they should be produced by different speakers; c) they should come in the same order as a first part and a second part; d) the first part requires a particular second part, e.g. greeting-greeting, invitation-acceptance, etc. Having produced a first part of some pair, current speaker must stop speaking, and next speaker must produce at that point a second part to the same pair. An adjacency pair, thus, constitutes a fundamental unit of conversational organization. It plays an essential role in initiating, maintaining and closing conversations, as in greetings, leave-taking, and topic-changing.

Because conversational discourse varies so much in length and complexity, analysis generally by breaking an interaction into the smallest possible units, then examining the way these units are used in sequences. The units have been called "exchanges" and in their minimal form consist simply of an initiating utterance followed by a response. Three part exchanges are also important, where the response is followed by an element of feedback. Such reactions are especially found in teaching situations:

I. Where were the arrows kept?

R. In a special kind of box.

F. Yes, that's right, in a box.

This teacher feedback sequence would be inappropriate in many everyday situations.

However, strict adjacency does not apply all the time. There are frequently **insertion sequences** like the following example in which one question-answer pair is embedded or inserted within another, where Q1 is the first question, and A1 its answer, and so on.

A. Can I have 100 grams of ground pepper, please? Q1

B. Black or white? Q2 insertion

C. White. A2 sequence

A. OK. A1

C. Can I go to the movies?

D. Have you finished your homework? insertion

E. Not yet. sequence

C. No, then.

As can be seen, insertion sequences are usually restricted in content to necessary clarification and specification. However, theoretically, numerous levels of embedding could result in a question whose answer is many turns ahead as in (Q1(Q2(Q3(Q4-A4)A3)A2)A1). Adjacency is, thus, suspended and replaced by "conditional relevance", meaning that once a first part of a pair has been produced, a second part is immediately relevant and strongly expected, and can be delayed only until more urgent business has been taken care of.

Another related concept is that of **preference organization.** Some adjacency pairs take more than one possible second part like offer - acceptance / rejection, and request - acceptance / rejection. It can be noticed that not all the potential second parts to a first part of an adjacency pair are of equal standing; one response is preferred and the other "dispreferred". In the above mentioned exchanges, acceptance is usually preferred to rejection. See this example of a preferred second part.

A. Why don't you come and see me some time?

B. I'd like to.

However, when a speaker is about to produce a dispreferred second part of an adjacency pair, this is usually preceded by a) some delay or silence; b) some preface like the particle "well"; c) some account of why the preferred second part cannot be performed as in the following examples.

C. Um I was wondering if there's any chance of seeing you tomorrow morning or after the meeting?
(1.0)

D. Um (.) I doubt it. The reason is I'm seeing the manager before the meeting and have to go immediately after it to a lunch appointment.

A. Why don't you come up and visit me tonight?

B. Well, [preface] that's very sweet of you [appreciation], but I don't think [mitigation] I can make it tonight [refusal]. I've called the electrician to come and fix the washing machine and am expecting him anytime [account explaining why do the dispreferred act].

This preference organization also applies to statement-agreement / disagreement. Other examples of first part – second part (preferred / dispreferred) include Request – Acceptance / Refusal; Offer – Acceptance / Refusal; Question – Expected answer / Unexpected answer / Non-answer; Invitation – Acceptance / Rejection; and Blame – Denial / Admission.

Another type of conversational sequence is usually called a **pre-sequence** as it occurs before a sequence to check whether the conditions required for its success obtain. Examples of pre-sequences are pre-invitations, pre-requests and pre-announcements. See how in the following examples pre-sequences help avoid a dispreferred response to the main sequence (i.e. the invitation, the request, and the announcement).

Pre-invitation (preferred)

A. What are you doing?

B. Nothing. Why?

A. Would you like to come to the cafeteria for a drink?

B. Oh, I'd love to.

Pre-invitation (dispreferred)

A. What are you doing this afternoon?

B. Well, we're going out. Why?

A. Oh, I was just going to say come over here and let's all have a drink, but maybe some other time.

Pre-request:

A. Do you have chocolate ice cream?

B. Uhumm

A. Can I have a chocolate cone with whipped cream?

B. Sure. (Leaves to get.)

Pre-announcement:

A. Guess what?

B. What?

A. Dr. Dallie is leaving on a sabbatical next year.

B. But he hasn't really been six years around here, has he?

Pre-announcement:

A. I forgot to tell you the best thing that happened to me today.

B. Super! What is it?

A. I got a B+ on my math test.

B. Oh, that's great! I'm so happy for you.

In all these pre-sequences, 1) A produces a first part checking whether a pre-condition obtains (that A has the time and is interested, and 2) B answers indicating whether the precondition holds and requests A to proceed to the sequence proper. In 3) A performs the action conditional on the go ahead in #2, and in 4) B responds to the action in #3. Thus, pre-sequences prefigure an upcoming action to invite collaboration in the action or the avoidance of it before it is performed if it is bound to be rejected, thus avoiding a dispreferred second part.

OPENINGS & CLOSINGS

Another type of sequence is that of the opening and closing sections of a conversational interaction. Openings usually signal and establish for the participants the kind of activity about to take place. They orient them to the nature of the interaction as in the following openings: "Can I help you?" in service encounters, and "Can I speak to Mr. Donald please?" in business phone calls. Similarly, casual conversations have recognizable beginnings (greetings) followed by exchanges that establish and/or confirm social relations. These are usually formulaic and phatic utterances that vary from culture to culture. For example, the Chinese would open a conversation by inquiring where the person is going, and whether he/ she has eaten. In Britain, "How do you do?" is enough. As for the Polish, they usual make health inquiries, and statements of pleasure at meeting each other, commenting on the elapsed time since their last encounter. Americans, in contrast, usually use short opening greetings. As for Arabs, they use lengthy openings asking about the health of family members, probably never met before. Due to such cultural differences, openings should be made cautiously because if they are abrupt, we may be thought rude or angry; and if they are extended, then we may be thought of as long-winded, boring or self-centered, demanding of undue attention. For this reason, openings must be for appropriate length, bearing in mind such cultural differences in cross-cultural interaction.

In analyzing telephone conversations, linguists have discovered a certain pattern of organization common to most informal phone calls. They all start with an opening section and end with a closing section, with each section following systematic organization. The opening section usually consists of a number of adjacency pairs including summons-answer, identification sequence, greeting sequence, how-are-you sequence, before the first topic is introduced, which may or may not be the reason for the call. The ringing of the phone represents a summons, and the answer to this summons may be a simple "hello" or station identification (e.g. "Cairo Bank" or "Dr Hafez's clinic") marking the call as a business phone call. In informal phone calls, an identification sequence follows, where both parties may identify each other, with the caller or answerer saying "hi" inviting a reciprocal identification.; e.g. "Hi mom, it's me." or

A. Hi

B. Hi Susan.

Otherwise, the names of caller and answerer are given.

A. Dr Hafez?

B. Yes speaking.

A. This is Sally.

This is usually followed by an exchange of greetings and "how-are-you" sequences, after which parties usually proceed to topical conversation.

As for **Closings,** these have a specific structure. When parties to a conversation have finished what they wanted to say, they do not just say "good bye" and leave; rather, they signal the close of the conversation, which has to be cooperatively accomplished to avoid being considered too hasty or over slow. Closings usually consist of future arrangements, pre-closing items and the closing sequence. Once either party has reached this stage of wanting to close the conversation, he or she uses the discourse marker "anyway" in hinting at his or her wish to close the conversation. Speakers may start this sequence by hinting at their obligation to end the conversation and attend to other business, by saying something like "Sorry but I really have to go now", "Well I must go back to work", or "I mustn't keep you". Then, **future arrangements** are made or recycled as in "So I'll see you tomorrow". These are usually followed by **pre-closing** items, coordinating the closing and providing a slot for deferred topics that the other speaker might like to mention before closing the conversation. These usually consist of an exchange of "Okay" and/or "All right". They are potential initiations of closings, inviting collaboration in closing. If either party has something more to say, this is the last opportunity to do so: "Oh, just a minute" / "Oops, I forgot to ..." after which, there is another round of "Okay"s or other pre-closing items. Once pre-closings have been exchanged, it is very difficult to interrupt them. These are, then, followed by **closing** greetings "bye – bye".

Main Ideas:

1- Adjacency pairs are pairs of utterances consisting of an initiating utterance followed by an appropriate response.
   (e.g. question – answer).
2- There are certain conditions on the use of adjacency pairs.
   (e.g. the first part requires a particular second part)
3- They play an essential role in initiating, maintaining and closing conversation.
4- There may be many possible sequences for adjacency pairs.
   (consider preference organization).

5- A pre-sequence may come before a sequence to check whether the conditions required for its success are adequate.

6- Openings of a conversation usually signal and establish the kind of activity about to take place.

7- Telephone conversation have a pattern of organization common to most informal calls.

8- There are definable structures for closing a conversation.

EXERCISES:

Answer the following questions:

1- What are adjacency pairs ?

2- What are the conditions on their use ?

3- Give examples of the different sequence patterns of adjacency pairs.

4- How can the speaker reject an offer ?

5- What are pre-sequences?

Give examples.

6- How do openings and closings of conversations reflect the culture of the participants?

7- Analyze short conversations reflecting the different sequences of adjacency pairs from the plays or novels you have studied.

8- Study the following conversations and identify the adjacency pairs and their functions.

(1)

A : What would you like?

B : A roll, I think.

A : Chicken ?

B : Yes, please

(2)

A : Would you like something to drink?

B : Yes, hot chocolate, what about you?

A : Nothing, thanks.

(3)

A : What's wrong?

B : I can't see the tree from here!

A : I think you should see an optician.

(4)

A : Could I borrow these tow books?

B : Have you got your card?

A : Yes, here you are.

Unit 10 DISCOURSE MARKERS

Objectives:

By the end of this unit, students should be able to:

1- Define discourse markers.

2- Describe the functions of discourse markers.

3- Explain the functions of:

a- OK.

b- Well.

c- I think.

d- You know.

One verbal device that has gained considerable attention recently is the discourse marker, i.e. a device whose main function is to link, and signal a transition across structural boundaries. Examples of discourse markers are such elements as "OK", "well", "oh", "you know", "I mean", "of course", "and", "but", etc. The term "discourse markers" was defined by Schiffrin (1988, 31) as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk". In other words, discourse markers highlight the boundaries of speech acts and link them. These verbal devices may be lexical (e.g. well, but), or clausal (e.g. I mean, you see). They could be adverbs (e.g. now, then), conjunctions (e.g. and, but, so) or intensifiers (e.g. of course). What they have in common is the discourse role as distinct from interjections like "oops" or "Gosh" in that they are sequentially dependent. In other words, they do not communicate a full message on their own. Markers can be used to signal boundaries in discourse indicating the completion of an on-going discourse topic or phrase (okay, good) or the opening of a next discourse topic or phrase (well now, by the way). They are discourse deictic expressions in that they indicate a relationship between the utterance that they form part of, and previous discourse.

Additionally, markers only signal a structural, logical or pragmatic relationship between discourse units. They do not create the relationship. The speaker selects a marker to signal the type of relationship he or she intends to convey between units of discourse (e.g. X <u>and</u> Y, X <u>but</u> Y, X <u>so</u> Y). The actual relationship, though, already exists. It follows, therefore, that markers are marginal elements that do not interfere with the structure or meaning of the utterance they come in. This allows them to be deleted without distorting the grammar or content meaning of a stretch of discourse. What discourse markers do is specify how the surrounding parts relate to one another. In this way, they contribute to conversational coherence as both speaker and hearer build toward logically related discourse.

Discourse markers have a number of functions: as connectives connecting the parts of the discourse, as politeness markers strengthening or softening the perlocutionary effect of the utterance, and as fillers filling in silence. First, they can be considered **connectives** which maintain the continuity of discourse and signal the sequential relationship between the current basic message and the previous discourse e.g. "and", "so", "but", "anyway", "now", "the main point is", "I have something to add", "what I really mean is". They can also help speakers structure their presentation of topic like "generally", "to begin with", "ordinarily", "obviously", etc. Additionally, discourse markers can **reinforce** the discourse and emphasize what is previously said (e.g. "really", "indeed", "obviously", "as a matter of fact", "in other words"). On the other hand, discourse markers can also function as hedges that soften the discourse **softening** the speaker's attitude towards the hearer or the conversational situation as in "I think", "you know", "you see", "I mean", "sort of", "kind of", "a little bit", "just", "well", "but er". Finally, they can also be used as **fillers** helping the speaker to fill in the silence while planning what to say next or thinking of an appropriate word or expression. Examples of these include "well", "you see", "I think", "you know", "I mean".

In addition, discourse markers play a role as boundary markers signalling sequences such as side sequences and closings. They could function as misplacement markers as "by the way" for something occurring out of sequence; "well" marking shifts in topic; and "now" and "right" identifying frames as boundary markers especially in the classroom. The discourse marker "anyway" is often used in introducing the closing section in conversations and phone calls. It marks a shift to a section of more general interest. Consider the following example taken from the closing of a phone call.

A. Anyway, you can call me anytime if you have any questions.

B. Ok

A. Ok, good to talk to you.

B. Same here. Thanks for calling.

A. Ok. Bye

B. Bye

Discourse markers tend to have a very high frequency of occurrence in spoken languages. The most frequent of these are "OK", "well", "I think", and "you know".

- **"OK":**

"OK" is used in goal-directed decision-making sequences. It appears to have two major functions. The first one is to signify acceptance or confirmation of another participant's proposal. When used in responses to requests for action, it can indicate S's approval and intention to comply with the request of the other party. The second function is to mark a transition at significant structural boundaries at three different points: a) at the beginning of the discourse, marking "topical" organization; b) after a digression (e.g. a joking sequence) and back to a new decision-making sequence, and c) at juncture points between each decision taken. It is common to find "OK" marking the beginning of the entire discourse, the transition from one sequence to the next. This function is common to both service encounters and classroom interaction. "OK" is, thus, used as a cohesive device at transitional junctures.

- **"Well":**

"Well" occurs typically in a number of structures. First, it occurs in question-answer sequences, a) introducing a response that does not fit the questioner's expectations (i.e. dispreferred response) either because the speaker is not sure of the answer, the answer is too complicated, or the question presupposes an inaccurate assumption, and b) marking introductory phrases before the main point of the answer. Second, "well" precedes requests when the relevance of the request is not very clear,

a) when the request is repeated, showing that the previous response was not satisfactory, b) when the respondent is reluctant to comply with the request, and c) when the request asks for further clarification. In short, "well" helps relate apparently unrelated elements to prior discourse, or introduce a dispreferred response.

- **"I think":**

The functions of "I think" depend on the intonation accompanying it. When produced at the beginning of the utterance with fall-rise intonation, it usually indicates the speaker's uncertainty of the truth of what he or she is saying. When produced with level intonation at the beginning of the utterance, it has a boosting effect, emphasizing speaker confidence. When occurring at the end of the utterance with falling intonation, however, it could indicate uncertainty or soften a directive speech act.

- **"you know":**

Similarly, "you know" could show either speaker certainty or uncertainty. It may stress speaker certainty expressing confidence that the hearer already knows what the speaker is saying or is familiar with it, or show speaker's confidence in the truth of the information he or she is presenting. On the other hand, "you know" can also stress speaker's uncertainty eliciting reassurance from the hearer when presenting private information, or as an excuse for linguistic imprecision.

One concludes from the contexts given for each marker that markers do contribute to the understanding of interactional coherence in conversation. Markers have been used for turn-taking purposes, for politeness purposes and for cooperation.

They have also been used for marking textual boundaries, for regulating adjacency pairs and sequences, and for negotiating the degree of certainty about the truth of speakers' propositions. They are an essential organizational tool in conversational interaction.

Main Ideas:

Discourse markers are sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk. (They do not communicate full messages on their own).

1- They may be:

a- lexical (e.g. well)

b- clausal (e.g. I mean)

c- adverbs (e.g. now)

d- conjunctions (e.g. so)

e- intensifiers (e.g. of course)

2- Discourse markers have many functions, (e.g. as politeness markers).

3- " OK " as a marker, has two major functions:

a- to signify acceptance or confirmation

b- to make a transition (as a cohesive device).

4- " Well " occurs in these structures:

a- question – answer – sequences

b- preceding requests (e.g. when there is a problem with compliance).

5- " I think " may be used to express uncertainty, confidence, etc. The intonation accompanying it indicates the function.

6- " you know " could show the speaker's certainty or uncertainty.

EXERCISES:

[?]

Answer the following question:

1- What are discourse markers?

2- What are their functions. Give examples

3- What are the functions of " OK " in a goal – oriented. Decision-making sequence?

4- Complete the following:

a- " Well " is used to ……..

b- The functions of " I think " depend on……….

c- " You know " could mean either ……. or …….

5- Study this dialog and identify the discourse markers and their functions :

A : Why don't we go and see that new film at the Metro ?

B : Well, actually I saw it last week. It's great, but I don't really want to see it again.

A : Well, let's go to the theatre then.

B : yes, I'd love to.

A : OK, if I get tickets, I'll see you at seven o'clock.

Unit 11 CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Objectives:

By the end of this unit, students should be able to:

1- Define the objectives of critical discourse analysis (CDA)

2- Give examples of the areas of CDA.

3- Explain the use of certain language choices when the participants do not have the same power.

4- Give a short account of:

a- mystification.

b- political CDA.

c- racist discourse.

d- gender inequality & language choices.

e- inequalities in institutional interaction.

f- news interviews.

Discourse has studied continuous stretches of language (beyond the sentence level) constituting a speech event such as a conversation, a sermon, a joke, or an interview. Such events have usually been analyzed in terms of such contextual factors as Speaker, Hearer, subject matter, sequentiality, etc. Discourse Analysis came as a revolution against traditional and Chomskyan linguistics, both of which focussed on idealized competence rather than degenerate performance, and analyzed grammatically well-formed sentences produced by an ideal speaker-hearer and isolated [illegible] of language from context. Trying to [illegible] discourse analysts such as Austin and Searle studied utterances and conversational norms. In categorizing such utterances as "Foul" and "I now pronounce you man/ husband and wife," they hinted at the authority or power of the speaker.

Critical Discourse Analysis (or CDA) emerged to reveal hidden power relations and ideological processes at work in spoken and written discourse alike, and to explore the relationship between discourse events and socio-political / cultural factors. Its role is to uncover "linguistic manipulation" i.e. the use of language to mask social oppression, as manifest in obscuring information, deception, distortion and acquiring greater or lesser power conversationally. Going beyond the limited scope of semantics that focuses on the sense relations of words and sentences, CDA sees any writing as a selection and an interpretation, which is primarily intertextual because it is interpreted against a background of other statements. In this way, it reflects the interplay of such forces as power and control, stance and ideology, and power abuse and manipulation. It is the task of CDA to see how such language use confirms, reproduces, or challenges existing (albeit hidden) power relations of individuals and institutions alike.

Linguistic preambles to CDA:

CDA derives concepts from such varied areas as rhetoric, ethnography, content analysis, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis and conversation analysis. Most of these disciplines make sporadic comments on the interplay of language and power. Three works will be cited here that make reference to language as a site of power negotiation. The first one is the study of rules of address which can be a locale for social struggle:

'What's your name, boy?' the policeman asked...

'Dr. Poussaint. I'm a physician...'

'What's your first name, boy?...'

'Alvin.'

In this example, the black doctor is repeatedly humiliated by the policeman who denies his social status/ power in addressing him as 'boy', not acknowledging his title + last name, and insisting on a first name as well as insisting on calling him 'boy' even after he is told he is a doctor.

The second example of analysis of the power-discourse interplay prior to CDA is the study of pronouns of address (T/V) like "*tu*" and "*vous*" or حضرتك أو سيادتك along the power-solidarity scales. Power, here, is defined in terms of such factors as wealth, age, sex, physical strength, and institutional role (in state, army or the family). Linguists argue that unequal strangers display power inequality. They also discuss the powerful speakers' right to initiate reciprocal T terms (you or انت) with strangers.

A third work that touches upon the power-discourse relationship prior to the rise of CDA is Brown and Levinson's work on politeness. They rank politeness strategies on a scale from bald-on-record, through positive politeness, negative politeness, to off-record strategies. The choice of which type of strategy to employ is based on speakers' evaluation of three factors. 1) speaker-hearer relative status/ power, 2) their social distance. and 3) the weightiness of the imposition in a particular culture.

This emerging awareness of power and its role in making linguistic choices as well as the effect of linguistic choices on

'What's your name, boy?' the policeman asked...

'Dr. Poussaint. I'm a physician...'

'What's your first name, boy?...'

'Alvin.'

In this example, the black doctor is repeatedly humiliated by the policeman who denies his social status/ power in addressing him as 'boy', not acknowledging his title + last name, and insisting on a first name as well as insisting on calling him 'boy' even after he is told he is a doctor.

The second example of analysis of the power-discourse interplay prior to CDA is the study of pronouns of address (T/V) like "*tu*" and "*vous*" or حضرتك أو سيادتك along the power-solidarity scales. Power, here, is defined in terms of such factors as wealth, age, sex, physical strength, and institutional role (in state, army or the family). Linguists argue that unequal strangers display power inequality. They also discuss the powerful speakers' right to initiate reciprocal T terms (you or انت) with strangers.

A third work that touches upon the power-discourse relationship prior to the rise of CDA is Brown and Levinson's work on politeness. They rank politeness strategies on a scale from bald-on-record, through positive politeness, negative politeness, to off-record strategies. The choice of which type of strategy to employ is based on speakers' evaluation of three factors. 1) speaker-hearer relative status/ power, 2) their social distance. and 3) the weightiness of the imposition in a particular culture.

This emerging awareness of power and its role in making linguistic choices as well as the effect of linguistic choices on speaker-hearer power has prepared the way for CDA. The tools analyzed in these works are drawn upon later in studies of CDA.

Critical Linguistics:

Fowler et al. (1979) construct a framework of linguistic ploys inherent in the veiling of involvement and responsibility of certain parties for certain actions. One such ploy is modality as evident in the use of personal pronouns, among other things. The pronoun "we" in "We made this decision for the good of the nation" uttered by a party leader, is ambiguous as to whether "we" is used inclusively (referring to speaker as well as other members of the party) or exclusively (i.e. to speaker only, as a representative of an institution.) Another ploy of mystification is the use of nominalization and passivization to omit agent and tense, thus obscuring agency and responsibility, and topicalizing another noun phrase in subject position. Compare the following three alternatives:

X negotiated with Y, which Z criticized.

The negotiations were criticized by Z.

There was much criticism of the negotiations.

Both of the last two sentences obscure the agent (i.e. the doer), and do not allow the reader to determine who criticized whom, or who had negotiated with whom. A third ploy of mystification is the use of "lexicalization" to include both "relexicalization", i.e. inventing new expressions to work out new (or problematized) concepts, and "overlexicalization", namely the provision of a large number of synonyms or near-synonyms to cover an area of intense preoccupation and manage to repeat a concept in different words.

(Mis)representation of the powerless:

One of the objectives of CDA has been to expose misrepresentation of and discrimination against the powerless, be they women, minorities, immigrants, people of the Third World, political enemies, etc. As such powerless groups rarely have access to power positions, they are often objects of others' actions. Such powerless groups or individuals are usually misrepresented, if not excluded altogether from the different domains of discourse. This is reflected in their being objects rather than subjects of action verbs showing how they are often objects of others' definition. Coupled with this is the use of opinionated language, especially by the socially superior speakers who can exert influence through their ability to win attention and support, yet evade and conceal. Such misrepresentation has been studied in such domains of discourse as the media, politics, racism, and gender discourse, as will be seen below.

As any representation is mediated, it is thus moulded by the value systems that are embedded in the language. In the analysis of the US **media** coverage of politics, it was found that political neutrality in news reports is impossible, and that by definition all political news have some bias. Many of these studies mark how political speech is reported: with unnamed sources, questionable quotes, and attitudinal verbs reporting speech (compare the impulsive "blast", the suspicious "brag" or "claim", and the detached "report"). Linguists give an example of how the news of a black robber killed by the police can be skewed according to the reporter's stance so as to portray the robber either as a victim of the social system that kept him poor, led him to rob, and invited the racial police to shoot him, or alternatively blame the robber's poverty on his laziness and failure to go to school or find himself a decent job, preferring to get easy money criminally. News reports embedding such assumptions are not a reflection of objective reality but rather a re-presentation shaped by political, economic and cultural forces. Many analysts mark the use of biased lexical choices such as euphemisms for negative actions by dominant parties,. agency deletion through passivization or nominalization, and generic stereotypes.

Another major trend in **political** CDA is the one commonly called "Orwellian linguistics" which focuses on biases inherent in all political language. Orwell focuses on the use of **euphemisms** such as the term "pacification program" used to refer to bombarding villages, where the dictionary definition of "pacify" is to "calm, subdue, or reduce to a state of peace" rather than to "kill civilians." He elaborates on the use of euphemisms in political language in order to name things without calling up mental images of them. Other linguists focus on the uses of the pronouns **"I"/"we"** to distance the speaker and shift responsibility for certain actions.

Most CDA has focused on **racism** in representing ethnic minorities, like immigrants and refugees e.g. blacks, Latinos, Asians and native Americans in the US, and Turks in Germany. Prejudice is expressed through the use of derogative terms, mention of color, polarization through contrast, lexical terms of difference, and demonstratives of distance. Another feature of racist discourse is the reproduction of stereotyping and overgeneralizations against ethnic minorities; these include intellectual inferiority, crime, violence, and involvement with drugs in the case of Blacks (added to prior oppression, i.e. slavery and segregation). **Stereotyping** is common in different types of discursive practice, describing Asians as hardworking and thus a threat, Latinos as lazy, and Arabs as violent (involved in fundamentalist terrorism), sensuous (with reference to belly dancing and the harem), exotic (with genies and enslaved maidens), and undeservedly wealthy. In addition to stereotyping, one should notice the contradictions between apparently egalitarian lexis referring to native Americans as "co-citizens" on the one hand, and the exclusive pronouns (using the third person "them" vs. the exclusive "us" referring to the dominant group). Add to this the use of overt **racist slurs** like "nigger" as a form of intimidation to repress black opposition to racial injustice. Such slurs wound and hit those already marginalized so that they would feel even more powerless due to lack of a similar weapon.

Another area of power inequality realized through language is that of language about women and language of women, usually labelled **gender inequality**, including a number of assumptions that arise due to this inequality, yet reinforce it. One of these is the use of male-oriented terms like "chairman", "salesman" and even "layman", to refer to men and women alike, demonstrating an assumption that all people are male unless proven female. Another is the assumption that woman is defined through her relationship to man, as illustrated in "Mrs. John Scott" or the phrase "lords and their ladies, and soldiers and their women" so that a woman's status (lady / woman) is defined by that of her husband. Still another assumption is that after marriage a man remains a man, while a woman becomes a wife; they are pronounced "man and wife" at the ceremony; and if unmarried, the man remains a "bachelor", a neutral term, while a woman becomes a "spinster" -- a term with negative connotations.

Another arena of gender inequality is that of the language spoken by and to women. Analyzing the authority of men's style -- with more interruptions, fewer questions, and more assertions--, Tannen (1990) explains male (conversational) dominance and female oppression in terms of difference in conversational style. Whereas men are more detached and power oriented, women are more oriented to involvement and solidarity. While Tannen pleads for understanding style differences, most feminists call for reform of sexist language and of women's discourse to resist such power inequalities.

Since the 1970's, discourse analysts have investigated inequalities in **institutional** interaction in different domains and pointed out some interesting similarities. Whether it is doctor-patient, teacher-student, interviewer-interviewee, examiner-witness, or any kind of professional-client interaction, certain patterns of dominance and control have been observed. One of these is the professional's right to control the participation of the client through questions that specify what kind of contribution is appropriate. Another is the right to change or even ignore the client's topic without proper prefacing. Still another right is that of interrupting the client if the professionals find what is forthcoming inconvenient to their conversational needs. They also have the right to evaluate the participation of the client, by reformulating the topics or summarizing the contributions of others. The dominated client can only respond to the questions without necessarily being aware of the purposes behind the professional's hidden agenda.

For example, in the **courtroom**, as a witness is asked questions, such questions are compelling and require an answer. A witness's response is acceptable only if it is responsive to the question. The examiner, on the other hand, holds the right to demand responsive answers from the witness, to employ unwarranted, unprefaced topic shifts (aiming to catch the witness in a lie), and to manipulate the question form by producing leading or non-leading questions. Witnesses are thus manipulated into compliance, both linguistically and legally.

Another site of power conflict that has been subjected to investigation is **news interviews**, observing subtle bias in favor of employers in interviews with employees, such bias residing in who is interviewed how, in which location, and with what camera angle. Studies examine question design and conclude that it is never neutral with respect to the issue handled or to the interviewee's stance towards it. Questions set agendas for responses, establishing topical domains, embodying certain presuppositions, and preferring particular responses over others, especially after **leading questions** of the type "Isn't X?", "That means Y, doesn't it?", "Do you seriously believe that Z?", and "Don't you think ...?" Questions can also sanction the interviewee by formulating him/ her as evasive.

Though only two decades old, the emerging field of CDA has mushroomed very fast with a diversity of topics and genres covered. The main objective has been the same throughout, namely, showing how discourse reflects power and simultaneously asserts it. Language is thus viewed as not merely a medium of expressing power relations, but also an instrument reinforcing extant asymmetries. The goals of such analysis -- namely the defamiliarization of power-laden discursive practices, and demystification of (c)overt power inequalities -- have been achieved with varying degrees of success in different fields. Still more CDA needs to be practised and extended to still other areas for the purposes of consciousness raising and resistance of inequalities.

Main Ideas:

1- Critical discourse analysis emerged to reveal hidden power relations and ideological processes at work in spoken and written discourse.

2- It derives concepts from a wide variety of areas e.g. rhetoric and content analysis.

3- Three studies had been conducted before CDA:

a- the study of the rules of address.

b- the study of the pronouns of address

c- the study of politeness strategies.

4- Some of the studies in CDA are:

a. plays of mystification.

b. misrepresentation and discrimination against the powerless.

c. biases in all political language (Orwellian Linguistics).

d. racism.

e. gender inequality.

f. inequalities in institutional interaction.

g. news interviews.

5. The ultimate aim of CDA is to raise consciousness of such inequalities and resist them

Exercises:

1. What is the aim of CDA?
2. What are the sources of CDA?
3. Give examples to show language as a site of power negotiation.
4. How could responsibility for certain actions be veiled?
5. What is meant by "Orwellian Linguistics"?
6. How is prejudice against ethnic minorities expressed?
7. How is gender inequality expressed?
8. Explain how news interviews represent power conflict.
9. Write short notes on:

   Courtroom language

   Prejudice in the media

مركز
جامعة القاهرة
للتعليم المفتوح

تم الطبع بمطبعة
مركز
جامعة القاهرة
للتعليم المفتوح