

How Do We Build and Understand Texts?

In this chapter you will get to know what a text is, what mechanisms are important in the creation and interpretation of texts. You will again meet the necessity of distinguishing between form and function, this time as regards utterances. You will see when communication is successful and when it is not. We will also see in what way conversational rules are universal and in what way culture-specific.

If you want to raise the chance of memorizing these terms and notions you should do the tasks inserted from time to time first on your own and in your own words and then continue reading.

Now that we got to know what words are and how we build sentences with them, we can advance to the next step: sticking sentences together into texts. This is the subject of **text linguistics**, or **discourse analysis**. (The two terms originally referred to written and spoken language respectively, but they are nowadays often used synonymously).

What is a Text?

Task: What is a text? Are the following series of sentences texts or not? Why?

- (1) *The cat chased the mouse. Mark Twain was an American author. The weather was fine.*
- (2) *The cat chased the mouse. The lion is a kind of cat. Tom and Jerry are cat and mouse.*
- (3) *The cat chased the mouse. The rodent had teased the cat. So the cat got mad at it.*
- (4) *The cat chased the mouse. The feline chased the rodent. The cat ran after the mouse.*
- (5) *The cat chased the mouse. If you tease somebody, you have to bear the consequences.*

In (1) each sentence by itself is a syntactically well-formed and semantically reasonable sentence. But the connection of these sentences doesn't seem to make any sense at all. They do not describe one common event or interrelated events. If this shall be considered a text, then it is at least not considered a "good" text. In (2) the three sentences all contain the word *cat* and may therefore seem connected at first sight; but the things they describe have nothing in common. So despite a linguistic connectedness, there is no connection of the things described. If this shall be considered a text, then it is at least not considered a "good" text. In (3), again, all three sentences contain the word *cat*. In addition, the events that the sentences describe are also related in the real world. Both the language of the sentences and the things described by the sentences are interrelated and make the sentences appear as an interconnected whole and thus a text. This connectedness is referred to as **coherence**. In other words: a text is called coherent if you can construct a coherent/interrelated/self-contained representation of that text. In (4) the sentences are linguistically connected through synonyms and hyperonyms, but they all express the same event, i.e. the same event is expressed three times without any visible reason. If this shall be considered a text, then it is at least not considered a "good" text. Linguistic interrelatedness doesn't automatically lead to a "good" text. In (5) the two sentences are not related in any linguistic way and yet it is clear that idea expressed by the second sentence helps to understand the event expressed by the first sentence. This would be considered a coherent text despite the lack of linguistic interrelatedness.

How Do We Create a Text?

Again, there are two basic ways to create coherence: (1) things described are interrelated (which you find out through your encyclopedic knowledge or your knowledge of the things described in earlier passages of a text), (2) the linguistic forms lead to interrelations.

Task: Look at the following joke and say why Eve has produced an incoherent text:
Adam comes home late, Eve starts to shout at him: “You’ve been unfaithful to me!” - Adams looks at her, puzzled: “With whom?”

Eve’s text does not fit with the encyclopedic knowledge which the two in paradise share, namely that Eve is the only woman living there. So this is a violation of the first type of coherence. Let us now move on to the second type of coherence.

This second phenomenon, that linguistic devices create coherence, is called **cohesion**. There are several types of cohesive devices. Let us have a look at Text 3 again:

The₇ cat chased the₇ mouse. The₆ rodent₂ had teased₅ the₆ cat₁. So₄ the₆ cat₁ got mad₃ at it₆.

The cohesive devices marked with 1 are simply repetitions of already used words. The cohesive device marked with 2 is a hyperonym of the preceding *mouse*. Repetitions and hyponyms as well as synonyms are types of lexical cohesion. That the same things are expressed repeatedly with the same words (Type 1) or semantically related words (Type 2) is termed **referential coherence**. There is one more type of lexical cohesion, but not of referential coherence. It is represented by 3: this is a word (*mad*) whose occurrence is semantically relatable to another word (*tease*). Some people call this a form of collocation (not to be mixed up with Firth’s definition). It connects cause and consequence. Such types are termed **relational coherence**. Another example of this is the word marked with 4. It is an adverb that serves as a logical link for two sentences. Some call such a logical linker a conjunction (not to be mixed up with Quirk’s definition), some call this a **connective**. This is already some type of grammatical cohesion. The word marked with 5 we can see that the choice of tenses also leads to coherence, because the use of the so-called past perfect shows that the event described by this sentence happened prior to the one described in the preceding sentence. The words marked with 6 (*the, it*) indicate the following word denotes something already mentioned; it refers back to an already mentioned entity. Thus, this is a type of referential coherence. If the words refers to a preceding word, then we speak of **anaphora**; if it refers to a succeeding word, then we speak of **cataphora**. The *the*’s marked with 7 are different. They do not refer to something mentioned in the text, but to something that is known from outside the text, from the extralinguistic world (e.g. when you are talking about Tom the cat and Jerry the mouse). When the word points outside the text (to the situation or to encyclopedic knowledge), we say that it has **exophoric reference**, while the *the*’s marked with 6 have **endophoric reference**. The technical term **deictic words** is often used in the context of this. Unfortunately, linguists do not use the term unanimously again. For some *deictic word* only refers to words with exophoric reference; for others it covers both words with exophoric reference and words with endophoric reference. **Deixis** not only concerns articles and pronouns. It concerns all words related to determine person, time and location whose reference can only be understood if the context is known (e.g. *I, now, here*).

Task: Explain the misinterpretation in the following joke:
Tom: *Do you know that in California a man is run over every half hour?* -- Jerry: *Really? Poor fellow.*

The answer lies in the interpretation of the indefinite article in *a man*. Tom uses it for generic, encyclopedic reference—*a man* in contrast to *a dog, a cat* etc.—, while Jerry interprets it as a reference to one specific man. In both instances, we have exophoric reference, but in Tom’s use we have reference to encyclopedic knowledge, in Jerry’s interpretation reference to a specific situation.

Task: Now that we have clarified what a coherent text is, we have to come back once again to the single text-elements. What factors may play a role in a speaker's decision for linguistic forms: sounds, words, grammatical forms, grammatical constructions. The following synonymous mini-texts may help you.

- (1) *Hello, Mr. Mouse. How are you doing? I have received the volume for which you placed an order.*
- (2) *Hello, Jerry. How are you doing? I've received the volume you ordered.*
- (3) *Hello, Jerry. How're you doin'? I've gotten the book you ordered.*
- (4) *Hello, Jerry. How're you doin'? I've got the book you ordered.*
- (5) *Hi, Jer. How're things? Got the book you ordered.*
- (6) *Hey, Jer. You ordered that book. Got it now.*

You may have come to the conclusion that the factors that determine a speaker's choice of variants are, among others, speaker's origin, profession, place of living, nationality, education, social class, ethnicity, religion, gender, age—these factors are sometimes called **sociolinguistic variables, or factors**—, but also **situational factors**, for which Dell Hymes has created the formula “SPEAKING”:

Setting,

Participants,

Ends (i.e. objectives),

Act sequence (i.e. form and content of what is said),

Key (i.e. manner, tone, spirit),

Instrumentalities (written or oral, formal or informal),

Norms of interaction and interpretation (i.e. specific behaviors/properties that attach to speaking),

Genre (e.g. sermon, lecture, clerk-customer dialog).

To be able to select the right variant in a specific situation speakers need to have what Hymes called **pragmatic, or communicative, competence**.

The importance that speakers give to the various situational factors decides what linguistic forms or styles (i.e. the set of linguistic forms) are selected. The words that are characteristic set of a certain style is also referred to as **register**. Thus you can choose between more formal and more informal grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation; you can choose between more complex or more simple grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Examples: you may (a) use multiple-clause constructions (**hypotactic syntax**) or (b) add one clause after the other (**paratactic syntax**); you may use (a) “complete” sentences (*I got it*) or (b) “incomplete”, elliptical sentences, where elements are left out (*Got it*); you may use (a) rather nominal style (*to place an order*) or (b) rather verbal style (*to order*); you may use (a) rather passive voice or (b) rather active voice. The elements under (a) are features of what the 1950's psychologist Basil Bernstein called **elaborate code**, those under (b) are features of what he called **restricted code**.

You may even shift between styles within the same text. Concerning style-shifting several additional theories have come up over the decades. Here are a few examples: William Labov's “attention to speech” theory, Howard Giles's “speech accommodation” theory, Alan Bell's “audience design” model, and Nicolas Coupland's “speaker design model”. These communicative models have rather tied utterances to the interlocutors' “separate” intentions and goals. Herbert H. Clark has developed a different model, which he calls “common ground” theory. In this theory communication is seen as the common effort to build understanding. At first, pieces of information that are only known to one interlocutor will be offered by this interlocutor to the other interlocutor. Only when the other interlocutor has shown that s/he has understood the information bits are they part of the common ground.

What is the Function of an Utterance?

Well-known is a model of language established in 1960 by the philologist Roman **Jakobson**. He identified the following six functions of language, originally with respect to poetics:

- expressing the speaker's own feelings (which he called **emotive function**)
- getting the addressee's attention (**conative/appellative function**)
- getting an information across (**referential/contextual/informative function**)
- referring to the linguistic utterance itself (**metalinguistic function**)
- attracting the reader's interest through the choice of linguistic forms (**poetic/aesthetic function**)
- creating a social bond with an addressee (**phatic function**)

One function may be more prominent in one context or one text-type, or **genre**, while it may be of minor relevance in other contexts.

Task: Try to think which of the functions of language according to Jakobson is especially prominent in which contexts or text-types.

You may have come with the following answers: the emotive function is prominent in poems and therapeutical conversations, the conative function in advertising, the referential function in manuals, the metalinguistic function in encyclopedic articles through the use of explanations and examples, the poetic function in poems and headlines, the phatic function in small talk.

Of all the functions, the last one, the phatic function, is the one that clearly involves dialogic communication. We shall therefore have a look at a successful dialog and at some less successful dialogs now.

What are the Mechanisms of Successful Communication?

Task: Why does the following dialog work although question and answer seem to have nothing in common?

Tarzan: "Where is Tom?" -- Jane: "I've just seen Jerry in the basement." -- Tarzan: "Ok, I'll look for him downstairs."

The dialog works because the two interlocutors can infer information although it is not expressed explicitly. Inferences can be context-dependent or context-independent. Context-dependent inferences are called **pragmatic inferences**, or **conversational implicatures**. In this situation, for example, Tarzan will interpret Jane's answer as actually being related to his question. Tarzan maybe knows that Tom and Jerry are often together. Context-independent inferences, which are based on the conventional meaning of words, phrases and sentences, are called **semantic inferences**. Within the type of semantic inferences linguists frequently distinguish between two phenomena. One phenomenon is that information A is true only if information B is true. Example: If (A) Jerry is in the basement, then (B) Jerry is automatically in the house; if Jerry is (A) not in the basement, (B) Jerry may still or may not be in the house. This type of semantic inference is called **semantic implication** [sic!], or **entailment**. The other phenomenon is that information A is true no matter whether information B is true or negated. Example: that (A) there is a Jerry is true no matter whether (B) Jane can see Jerry is true or not. This type of semantic inference is called **conventional implicature**, or **presupposition**.

Let us now look at some less successful dialogs.

Task: Mr. Garasi comes from a small island in the Pacific ocean and, since he is a very sociable as well as a hard-working man, his company sends him to the United States of America to contact a company that his own company may soon work with. He has never been to the USA before and sometimes has the feeling that he simply doesn't understand people at all. Here are three situations, in which he feels that he hasn't said the right thing.

- (1) American woman in the street: "Excuse me, sir, could you tell me time?" - Mr. Garasi: "Yes, I could, just let me know if you need the information." - American woman: "Are you making fun of me? Then go out of my way." - Mr. Garasi: "??? What did I say wrong? She asked for it."
- (2) One of the American business colleagues at a casual evening meeting: "Hello, Mr. Garasi, how was your day?" - Mr. Garasi: "Thanks for asking. In the morning, I had a talk with your boss and he presented important information on your company, which made me reveal that a cooperation between our companies would be very fruitful. At noon, I went to a restaurant and had a marvelous fruit salads. The fruits were very fresh and tasty. Then afterwards I went back to the wonderful hotel that your boss has organized for me, watched some television and took a nap for about half an hour. Then—" - "Excuse me, Mr. Garasi, I have to go and see the person over there. Nice evening." - Mr. Garasi: "??? Did I say anything wrong? He asked for it."
- (3) On the bus, from the hotel to the company, a passenger next to Mr. Garasi: "So, you are also riding on the bus?" - Mr. Garasi: "Well, yes, of course. ??? Why are you asking? Are you making fun of me?"

What went wrong here? Try to generalize your observations.

In all three situations, Mr. Garasi seems to have problems with "question sentences". He doesn't realize that not every sentence that is formed as a question functions as a question. In Situation (1) the woman wants to utter a request and therefore becomes annoyed when Mr. Gurusi doesn't give her sufficient information. In Situation (2) the colleague just wants to utter a friendly greeting formula and therefore becomes annoyed when Mr. Gurusi doesn't just give him a friendly reply, but delves into a lengthy description of his day, thus stealing his time. In Situation (3) the passenger just wants to create some social bond by starting "small talk", while Mr. Gurusi feels mocked at by the passenger's description of an obvious fact.

It is observations like this one that made language philosophers have a more systematic look on language in actual use. Language in use is the subject of **pragmatics**. The father of pragmatics is considered to be John R. **Austin** (1911-1960), whose lectures on this matter were published in the book *How to Do Things With Words* posthumously in 1962. Austin said that beyond the objective, literal meaning of a utterance, which he called the **locutionary act**, the intention of the sender of the message, which he called the **illocutionary act**, and the effect on the hearer, which he called the **perlocutionary act**, must also be taken into account. Example: In the sentence *It is cold in here* the locutionary act as a description of the room temperature, the illocutionary act is a complaint or a request to close the window, the perlocutionary act is, possibly, that the hearer was encouraged or convinced to close the window.

Later on, linguists made a clear distinction between the form of utterances (sentence types) and the function of utterances (speech acts). In English, we can distinguish three sentence types: (a) declarative sentences, (b) interrogative sentences, (c) imperative sentences. The most famous classification for speech acts is the one that John R. **Searle** suggested in 1969. Searle distinguishes between (1) constitutive, (2) obligative or (3) informative speech acts, with subtypes

- (1A) **declarative** (Austin had called them **performative**) ('by describing the action you are performing the action', the use of *hereby* is a good indicator for this speech act),
- (1B) **expressive** ('expression of emotion', e.g. congratulating, thanking, greeting)

- (2A) **commissive** ('expression of offer')
- (2B) **directive** ('expression of order')
- (3) **assertive**, or **representative** ('description', 'statement'; [sometimes listed separately:] 'information question')

Task: Determine the sentence type and the speech act(s) of the utterances in the following situations.

- (a) [lady at ticket office]: I'd like a round trip to Boston, please.
- (b) [chairman]: I hereby declare our linguistics conference open.
- (c) [speaker at a meeting on university politics]: Is it right to reduce funding of society-oriented linguistics?
- (d) [linguistics professor]: Note that Searle was not the first to speak about speech acts.
- (e) [mother to child]: Look at the mess you've made on your desk.

Let us have a look at the solutions:

- (a) sentence type = declarative speech act = directive
- (b) sentence type = declarative speech act = declarative
- (c) sentence type = interrogative speech act = order (if the speaker wants others to raise funding) and/or assertive (if the speaker just wants to say that it is not right to reduce funding) and/or commissive (if the speaker wants to say that he is going to give more money) and/or, maybe, information question (if it is really not a rhetorical question)
- (d) sentence type = imperative speech act = assertive
- (e) sentence type = imperative speech act = expressive and/or assertive and/or order
- You see that more than one speech act may be included in an utterance.

The reactions of the persons in Mr. Garasi's experiences reveal that those who get annoyed obviously see some communicative rules ignored. Some principles for communication exist everywhere, but the concrete customs to meet these rules are culture-specific. In 1975, Herbert Paul **Grice** said that communication is governed by certain universal conversational principles and maxims. He focussed especially on what he called the **cooperative principle** (without denying that other things like politeness and aesthetics are also important). His cooperative principle consists of four **maxims**:

- **relation**, or relevance ("Be relevant.")
- **quality** ("Be truthful." - This refers to the type of content elements of an utterance.)
- **quantity** ("Be informative. Give the appropriate amount of information." - This refers to the amount of content elements of an utterance)
- **manner** ("Be brief, clear and orderly." - This refers to the amount and type of formal elements of an utterance.)

If a maxim is violated, this may have happened unintentionally, but, more often than not, it is done intentionally. The intentional violation of a maxim is also called **flouting**.

Although dealt with in some detail by Robin **Lakoff** and Geoffrey **Leech**, the politeness principle is mostly connected with the thorough and cross-cultural work by Penelope **Brown** and Stephen **Levinson** (1980). They focussed on acts that may threaten the addressee's well-being, so-called **face-threatening acts** (e.g. requesting something from somebody, complaining, offering etc.) and set up a catalog of possible ways to master such situations (with various directness degrees):

- (1) **bald on-record** strategies (very directly, by way of imperative, e.g. "Close the window, please.")

- (2) **positive** politeness (creating a feeling of common wants, e.g. “Shouldn’t we close the window, please.”)
 - (3) **negative** politeness strategies (respecting the other’s autonomy, e.g. “Would it bother you to close the window?”)
 - (4) **off-record** strategies (very indirectly, through hints, e.g. “It’s cold in here.”)
- There are no clear-cut lines though.

The strategy to be used in a certain situation differs from culture to culture. Let us have a look at some more (intercultural) dialogs.

Task: Why did the communicative breakdowns come up?

- (1) At an Oxford company: Jeff, the new employee from Washington, doesn’t understand why his British colleagues think of him as dishonest and impolite. Whenever he passes a colleague, he greets him or her with a friendly “How are you?”. His colleagues, however, wonder why he asks this question if he walks on without even waiting for an answer. John, on the other hand, wonders what kind of answer he should wait for as his British colleagues don’t wait for an answer to their “How do you do?” either.
- (2) Christina, a German student, has just started her year abroad at a French university. Because she’s a very sociable person she makes friends quite easily. After a few weeks Christina is invited by a two French girls from her Literature seminar, Claire and Céline, to their party. Unfortunately, there is also an international evening that Christina wants to participate in. She decides not to go to her French friends’ party. As she meets them the next day, she says without beating around the bush: “Thanks for your invitation, but unfortunately I can’t come”. The French girls can’t understand this reaction and begin to show very reserved behavior.
- (3) Harry and Sally are driving on the freeway. Sally: “Oh look, there’s a McDonald’s at this freeway exit. Won’t you like to have a cup of coffee after this long ride.” -- Harry: “No, I’m fine. Better to be home earlier.” Harry drives on. After a while he asks Sally why she’s so silent all of a sudden, but Sally just grumbles: “Oh, never mind.” Harry: “Well, why don’t you tell me what’s wrong.” Sally: “Because you’re not interested anyway.”
- (4) E-mail from Tom to Jerry: “Hi jerry, back gtom miami and the suntan conference again? think we should meet to discuss the hampton file asap. - tom” -- Reply from Jerry: “What do you mean suntan? This annual conference means nearly 12 hours of work each day.” - “Sorry, you got me wrong. I was just trying to make a joke. I know it is hard work. I was there myself last year. - Tom.”
- (5) The father of a high-school student asks Professor Frank Davis, an American linguist: “Don’t you think that the use of dialects should be forbidden at school so that the kids don’t get sed to bad language.” -- Prof. Davis: “Well, first of all, we can’t say that there is good and bad language. Every dialect consists of its own system with its own variants, even the standard dialect. Standard dialect should of course be especially focussed on at school and it should be illustrated to student why its command is important for the future life, but language also serve as a group-marker, as an expression of identity, and therefore any form of language that is not standard dialect has its right of existence as well. Many studies have shown that the bidialectal model works very well for schools.” -- “No, that’s not what I meant. I don’t think that the students should use any dialect at all, not one, not two—just standard speech.” -- Prof. Davis: “???”.
- (6) An Italian and a Japanese businessman who both work for an American company have a serious business conversation for about half an hour. After the meeting, the Italian tells the American boss: “He was a nice man, but he never said anything.” The Japanese tells the boss: “He was a nice man, but he never gave me a chance to speak.”
- (7) An American working for an international company is supposed to give a 10-minute presentation of the new sales concept in front of an international group of colleagues. Relaxed, he smiles at the audience, takes off his jacket and starts with a short joke. He says what he is going to do, invites the audience to ask questions whenever they want, continues with his presentation using colorful computer animations, looks directly into the eyes of various people and inserts brief summaries now and again. He keeps exactly to the 10 minutes. The reaction of the audience is mixed: some are impressed, some are a bit irritated.

Here are a few comments that may explain what happened: In (1) the misunderstanding can be explained because they illocutionary acts in *How are you?* differ in the two countries: In Britain *How are you?* is more regarded like a real question, which would at least require something like (*Oh, I'm*) *Fine, thanks.* (complementary formula). Many Americans, however, use *How are you?* as a simple greeting phrase that can just be replied by the same *How are you?*--they don't expect and thus don't wait for an answer. Pair-like formula are also termed **adjacency pair**.

The misunderstanding in (2) is triggered by intercultural pragmatic differences: Christina's direct way is interpreted as an offence by the French, who would never express themselves in such an explicit way. The French style is more indirect and has finer stylistic distinctions than the German direct functional style of communication without any stylistic ornaments. If they want to refuse an offer, the French rather say that they will think about it and talk about it again. The polar distinction between **direct style and indirect style** goes back to the anthropologist Edward **Hall**.

In (3), Harry and Sally get angry with each other because of communicative gender differences. Actually, Sally wants to have a cup of coffee and indirectly likes to reach a common decision or compromise—this is called the (female) *cooperative style*. Harry, on the contrast, interprets Sally's utterance as a question about his wants and thus just says directly what he likes—this is called the (male) *competitive, or dominant, style*.

The misunderstanding in (4) occurs because of the different communicative possibilities in the medium. Although in the written medium e-mail we often find an oral concept of language (cf. also the lack of capitalization and the remaining spelling mistakes), there are still aspects that cannot easily be rendered in written texts, for instance non-verbal elements and intonational features. Thus Tom's irony does not come through. One way could have been to use emoticons such as ;-).

Situation (5), is an example of failed expert-layperson communication. Professor Davis doesn't manage to illustrate, first, that linguists think of non-standard speech differently than many non-linguists (this reflects a different conceptualization, or framing, of the world) and, second, that the definition of *dialect* as a technical term differs from the definition in everyday language.

Situation (6) shows you that the rules for **turn-taking** (i.e. how the role of the speaker is turned over to another person) are culture-specific. The Japanese man had probably given the Italian minimal responses like *I see* (such minimal responses are also called **back-channelling**), but he didn't want to have an overlapping of turns, while this was exactly what the Italian colleague was waiting for.

Situation (7), finally, shows you that the “imaginary” **script** for certain communicative settings or for certain text-types may differ considerably from culture to culture. In some cultures, the first usual element, or **slot**, in a business presentation may be a joke, in others not. In some cultures, it is important to give a structure and to insert summaries, in others not. In some cultures, it is important to support a business presentation with graphics, in others it is not. In some cultures you smile at the audience and look at people, in others you don't. These last aspects show that also the **non-verbal** elements in communication (such as gestures, mimics, eye contact, body distance, etc.) transmit messages.

Classroom Activities

Before you start doing the following tasks make sure that you have understood the terms and ideas in bold print and the examples around Tom and Jerry, Mr. Garasi and other persons.

1. Comment on this statement: In administrative language we find long-winded phrases such as

adjacent to instead of *near*, *concerning the matter of* instead of *about*, or *owing to the fact that* instead of *because*. On the other hand, there are also many acronyms such as *FYI* for *For your information*, *ASAP* for *as soon as possible* or *Re* for *with reference to*. Isn't administrative style a constant violation against the maxims of quantity and manner that should be banned?

2. Isn't advertising language, especially slogans, a permanent violation against the cooperative principle and the politeness principle? Shouldn't there be a law that allows companies only to use truthful advertising? Discuss.
3. In general, wouldn't it be more economic if everyone could use bald-on record strategies? Don't indirect politeness strategies slow down the communication process? Discuss.
4. Contrast the pragmatic behavior of English-speaking countries (the US, the UK, Australia, and others). How do politeness rules differ and what implications does this have for teaching English as a foreign language?
5. Try out a few freeware translation programs and see what the problems are. How can you explain these problems with your knowledge of pragmatics.
6. What do our observations mean for communication in information and knowledge societies?
7. What can we learn from our observation for advertising products for the international market?
8. Bernstein developed the notions of elaborate and restricted code when he compared the speeches of lower class children and of middle-class children. He noticed that the children from the lower class, in contrast to those from the middle class, would answer questions like *Where is the pen?* with an "incomplete" *On the table* instead of a "complete" *It is on the table*. This is why Bernstein considered the speech of lower class children as deficient. Discuss this view and also discuss the conclusions that you can draw from your ideas for foreign language teaching.
9. Discuss how the knowledge of pragmatics and discourse analysis can explain manipulative use of language (e.g. in political rhetorics).
10. Discuss how the knowledge of pragmatics and discourse analysis may help improve skills in expert-layperson communication.

Further Reading Recommendation

Articles and books quoted in this section and recommended for further reading are:

Austin, John (1962), *How to Do Things with Words*, Oxford: Clarendon.

Blakemore, Diane (1992), *Understanding Utterances: An Introduction to Pragmatics*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Brown, Penelope / Levinson, Stephen (2002), *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, rev. ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Steven / Attardo, Salvatore (2000), *Understanding Language Structure, Interaction, and Variation: An Introduction to Applied Linguistics and Sociolinguistics for Nonspecialists*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Clark, Herbert H. (1996), *Using Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coates, Jennifer (ed.) (1998), *Language and Gender: A Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Cruse, Alan (2004), *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*, 2nd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cutts, Martin (1996), *The Plain English Guide*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cutts, Martin / Maher, C. (1986), *The Plain English Story*, Stockport: Plain English Campaign.

Goddard, Angela (1998), *The Language of Advertising*, London: Routledge.

Goffman, Erving (1955), "On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction", *Psychiatry* 18: 213-231.

Grice, H. Paul (1975), "Logic and Conversation", Cole, Peter / Morgan, Jerry L. (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, 41-58, New York etc.: Academic Press.

Hall, Edward T. (1976), *Beyond Culture*, Garden City (N.Y.): Doubleday.

Hofstede, Geert (2000), *Culture's Consequences*, rev. and enlarged ed., Beverly Hills (Cal.): Sage.

Hymes, Dell H. (1964), "Toward Ethnographies of Communication: The Analysis of Communicative Events", *American Anthropologist* 66,6,2: 1-34.

- Hymes, Dell H. (1972), "On Communicative Competence", in: Pride, J. B. / Holmes, Janet (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Jakobson, Roman (1960), "Linguistics and Poetics", in: Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.), *Style in Language*, 350-373, New York etc.: Wiley.
- Lakoff, Robin (1973), "The Logic of Politeness, or: Mind Your P's and Q's", in: Corum, Claudia / Smith Stark, T. Cedric / Weiser, Ann (eds.), *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, 292-305, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Leech, Geoffrey (1983), *Principles of Pragmatics*, London: Longman.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1983), *Pragmatics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, Jacob (2001), *Pragmatics: An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Searle, John R. (1969), *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah (1986), *That's Not What I Meant! How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships*, New York: Ballantine.
- Tannen, Deborah (1990), *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*, New York: Random House.
- Tzanne, Angeliki (1999), *Talking at Cross-Purposes: The Dynamics of Miscommunication*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald (1998), *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 3rd ed., Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wierzbicka, Anna (2003), *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*, 2nd ed., Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yule, George (1996), *Pragmatics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.