

1.1 Introduction

Linguistics is concerned with the study of language, including theories of language as discussed in Chapman's *Thinking about Language: Theories of English (TL:TE)* and the ways in which a language is structured and patterned as in Jeffries' *Discovering Language: Describing English (DL:DE)*. 'Language' in this general sense can be theorised and described in a general and abstract way, or we can be concerned with the categorisation and description of a particular language, such as English. However, when we come to consider how any language such as English is actually used in everyday life, then it becomes clear that far from being spoken and written in exactly the same way by everybody, language is in fact tremendously varied. This chapter considers different spoken varieties of English, and the extent to which the society and communities in which we live affect the ways in which we speak and write.

1.2 begins with definitions of **language, dialect, accent, variety** and **standard English**, and a consideration of the attitudes people have towards variation in language use. 1.3 outlines the history of the standardisation of English in England in order to illustrate why dialectal variation persists in this region and throughout the United Kingdom as a whole. This section also traces the origins of prejudicial attitudes towards variation that continue to this day. By contrast, a consideration of the linguistic history of the USA shows how the processes of standardisation have been very different from those in England. This contrast explains why there is not the same degree of variation to be found in the USA as in the UK, nor the same degree of prejudice towards non-standard varieties. These two examples show how, although standardisation follows identifiable processes, the way in which these processes are enacted in the case of individual language varieties varies a great deal and depends upon a unique combination of social, economic, political, geographic and historical variables.

1.4 discusses research undertaken into variation based upon two different methodological approaches: firstly, focus upon the **linguistic variable**; secondly, focus upon **the social variable** and **social networks**. Studies into linguistic variation of phonology, morphology and syntax are the focus of traditional dialectology such as the regionally based studies undertaken by *The Survey of English Dialects* (1962) and Kortmann and Schneider's two-volume *A Handbook of Varieties of English* (2004). Studies into the social variable are the focus of sociolinguistic dialectology, which also focuses upon the linguistic variable, but also takes into account social issues such as race, class and gender in relation to linguistic variation, such as those of Labov (1966, 1972, 1979) and Trudgill (1974, 1978). More recently, Milroy (1987) and Milroy and Gordon (2003) have based their sociolinguistic studies upon the notion of **social networks**, arguing that in addition to linguistic and social variables, attention should also be paid to the communities and contexts within which speech occurs. 1.5 provides students with guidance and advice on undertaking their own studies into variation and change, whilst section 1.6 provides suggestions for further reading.

1.2 Language, dialect, accent and variety

1.2.1 Language

Let us consider the meaning of the term **language** and to what it refers. In *DL:DE* Jeffries makes a distinction between language as a system and language use. A language system refers to an idealised form of the language which is separate from how a language is actually used, and *DL:DE* concentrates upon describing language as a system. In *TL:TE* Chapman considers 'language' from different theoretical perspectives: as a type of behaviour, as a state of mind and as a form of communication. A sociolinguistic approach to the study of language considers language as behaviour, particularly in taking account of the regional and social situations in which language occurs, and the social as well as linguistic factors that affect how speakers relate to one another. Consequently, a sociolinguistic approach to language behaviour, rather than being concerned with language in a more general or abstract way, asks questions such as: 'what is a language?' and 'what is language *for*?' Language is not just about communication, but also about identity, a factor which is paramount in sociolinguistics.

Deciding which criteria to adopt for defining a language, however, is far from straightforward. Take the example of the language called 'English'. Who are the speakers of English? Are they the people living in a particular country, England, where the language is spoken? One popular way of deciding the boundary of a language and boundaries between languages is to consider their geography. We generally assume that people living in a particular geographically defined country speak the language associated with it: French in France, German in Germany and so on. 'English' by this definition is the language spoken by people living in England, Great Britain (England, Scotland and Wales) and the United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland). However, it is not always the case that people living in a geographically defined area all speak the same language, or that one language is the exclusive 'property' of a particular country. This is certainly not the case with 'English', which is spoken not only in countries that make up the UK, but is also widely used across many countries around the globe, including the United States. Another factor which has to be taken into account is that English today is widely used in many countries across the globe as the language of business, diplomacy, medicine and the internet.

We should also take account of the fact that there are many countries in the world which are not monolingual: that is, they have not one nationally recognised language, but several. For example, in Switzerland, there are three major languages: German, French and Italian. Switzerland recognises itself as multi-lingual society whereas most of us would agree that Britain (with the exception of Wales) unlike Switzerland, is a monolingual society in that 'everyone speaks English'. The same could also be said of other countries across the globe, such as the USA, where English is the language of official communication, used in educational contexts, the law, government, the media and so on. However, if we look at the actual languages spoken in areas such as the UK, USA or Australia today, then they include many others besides English. Far from being monolingual, these countries, including those that make up the UK, are actually multilingual, with many inhabitants speaking languages other than English. So although the UK has an official language, 'English', its inhabitants actually come from a vast range of language backgrounds, making the UK linguistically diverse.

This is further complicated by the fact that one of the countries which makes up Great Britain and the UK, the principality of Wales, has two officially recognised languages, Welsh as well as English, and all its inhabitants are taught to be bilingual. This situation is similar to the one in

Canada, where people are taught to be bilingual in French and English. In the United States of America, there is no officially recognised national language, and legislating to impose one is forbidden by its constitution, although to all intents and purposes English functions as a national language through its use in public institutions such as education, business and the law. What these examples all illustrate is that what counts as a language then, is not only dependent upon geography, but also upon history, politics and economics.

The association between language and nation or nationality is a very strong and powerful one. The association between language and identity of all kinds, regional and social as well as national, is also very powerful. The language, languages or varieties of a language that we speak form an integral part of who we are, and attempts at imposing one language or variety of a language on the population of a nation are often bound up with issues of power and ideology. The reasons why one language or one variety of a language becomes associated with a particular nation are many and varied, resulting from a combination of historical and social changes. Throughout history, one of the first things an invading force of another country imposes upon the conquered people is its language, particularly in terms of political, economic and educational institutions and suchlike. For example, The Norman Conquest of 1066, the Roman invasion of the first century BC and the altering of country boundaries in Eastern Europe post 1945 to form the United Soviet States of Russia. What counts as the language of a country at any particular moment in time, therefore, is not as simple and straightforward as it might at first seem. The term 'language' is also a very difficult, if not impossible, one to define linguistically, as the example in the following section illustrates.

1.2.2 The Ebonics Debate

In December 1996 the Oakland School District Board in the American State of California passed a resolution which gave official recognition to **Ebonics**, a separate language and distinct from English. Ebonics is a compound word made up of from the two words 'Ebony' meaning black and 'phonics' meaning sound, As a consequence, schools in the Oakland District were required to recognise and accept Black pupil's speech in the classroom as part of a bilingual education program, so that pupils would be taught both in their primary language, Ebonics, and in English. The impetus for adopting such a resolution came from the persistently low educational achievements obtained by black students in the district, who made up over fifty percent of the school population. Although a local issue, the passing of this resolution quickly became national news and precipitated a fierce debate across all the American States. Amongst the issues raised by the Oakland resolution on Ebonics was whether or not black English could be shown to be linguistically a separate language. The very raising of this issue immediately brought to the fore another one, namely, the wider, more politically sensitive one of the nature of the relationship between language and ethnicity, and between African-Americans and Anglo-Americans in contemporary American society. At the heart of the debate was not, as it tended to be presented in the press, whether one was for or against Ebonics, but the far wider issue of equality: of equal access to education for all American citizens regardless of ethnicity and through it, right of access to a full participating status in American life regardless of class, ethnicity and gender (Clark 2001:237-252).

Tatalovich makes the point that whenever an opportunity arises in America such as that

provided by the Oakland Resolution to debate matters of language, 'ordinary people rise to defend the English language against those who speak other tongues' (1995:1). He points out that the Oakland Resolution, in common with similar episodes throughout the history of the United States, 'is symptomatic of the debate over whether the United States should reflect a dominant English-speaking majoritarianism or encourage a multilingual culture' (1995:2). Consequently, for Tatalovich, controversies over language such as those sparked by the Ebonics debate become not only linguistic conflicts but also moral ones. Such controversy is further compounded by the fact that, although English is by far the most common language spoken and used in most areas of American public life, it has no official recognition as the national language of all American states, nor indeed does any other language. Furthermore, unlike many other major English speaking countries in the world, the US Federal government has not been able to assert the dominance of English or legislate any kind of national language policy through the education system, since neither language nor education are enshrined in its constitution. One of the ways in which the United States gets around this is by the importance it places on immigrants into the United States taking a test in citizenship, which is in English.

Not surprisingly, the Ebonics debate found its way onto the agenda of the Linguistics Society of America. In 1997, the society passed a resolution calling for the recognition of Ebonics, alongside African-American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Vernacular Black English, to be recognised as systematic and governed by linguistic rules. However, the society refused to be drawn upon the issue of classification, on the grounds that the distinction between 'languages' and 'dialects' or 'varieties' is usually made more on social and political grounds than purely linguistic ones. It argued that what was important from a linguistic and educational perspective was not whether Ebonics or AAVE is called a 'language' but that they, in common with other speech varieties, be recognised as systematic and governed by linguistic rules. At the heart of the debate then, according to the Society, was not the linguistic issue of what counts as a language, but more the social and political ones which surround the establishment and maintenance of language hierarchies.

If linguistics does not help us in defining the term 'language', then maybe another way of defining language is in terms of sub-divisions or as a collection of mutually intelligible **dialects**. In this way, we can talk about the southwest dialect of France, the Black Country dialect of English, the Bavarian dialect of German and so on. So, for example, English as a language includes not only its standardised form known as **standard English** (see 1.3 below), but all other dialects which exist within the geographical boundaries of England and elsewhere. However, mutual intelligibility as a criterion is not very helpful, since different languages as well as dialects can be mutually intelligible. For example, Norwegian, Swedish and Danish, though accepted as different languages, can each be understood by the speakers of the other languages. Other factors concerning intelligibility also have to be taken into account, such as the individual's degree of exposure to a language, her/his educational background and a willingness to understand.

1.2.3 Dialect, accent and variety

One way of defining a language is as a group of dialects and accents which have a certain number of forms and structures in common. Put simply, **dialect** refers to words and syntactic structure, whereas **accent** refers to the sounds that speakers produce and the intonation and pitch which accompanies sound. If a dialect describes the words and syntactic structures used by one person or a group of speakers, then accent is the word used to describe pronunciation, and the two often go hand in hand. For example, if someone speaks in a regional dialect of English such as Scouse in the North West or Black Country in the Midlands, then her/his pronunciation will also be particular to that area. If you were to walk north from Land's End in Cornwall to John O'Groats at the very north of Scotland, you would hear different accents and dialects of English – Geordie in the North East, West Country in the South West and Cornish. This is known as a **dialect continuum** or a chain of mutual intelligibility; that is, there is no distinct or complete break from one dialect and accent to another, and speakers of geographically adjacent dialects can understand one another. However, the cumulative effect of linguistic differences is such that the greater the geographical separation, the greater the difficulty of understanding what people say. Europe has many dialect continua, an example of which is Romance, stretching across the Iberian peninsula through France and parts of Belgium down to the southern tip of Italy.

In addition to a purely linguistically descriptive dimension to accents and dialects, there is also a social one. Chambers and Trudgill (1980:3) point out that dialects are commonly viewed as:

...substandard, low status, often rustic forms of language, generally associated with the peasantry, the working class, or other groups lacking in prestige. DIALECT is also a term which is often applied to other forms of language, particularly those spoken in more isolated parts of the world, which have no written form. And dialects are often regarded as some kind of (often erroneous) deviation from a norm – as aberrations of a correct or standard form of language.

Trudgill and Chambers found that people speaking with rural accents such as those of Devon and Cornwall in South West England, for example, are typified as dim-witted but trusting, whereas people speaking with urban ones such as Cockney in London are typified as quick-witted but untrustworthy. By contrast, speakers of **standard English** with a **Received Pronunciation** accent (see 1.3.1 below) are generally thought to be more intelligent than speakers of other dialects and also superior morally as well as socially.

Because of such negative connotations, linguists have come to prefer to use the term **variety** when describing variation in language. This has none of the negative connotations associated with the terms dialect and accent, and fits in with the idea of **descriptive linguistics**: that is, basing descriptions of language upon actual use. It can also be applied across a wider range of language features than the terms dialect and accent. For example, we can talk of linguistic variation, historical variation, social variation, geographic variation, stylistic variation and so on.

The main reason why there is so much geographical variation in English throughout the United Kingdom and England especially, and throughout Europe in general, is historical. Language operates across two dimensions simultaneously: the horizontal dimension of space, also called the **diachronic axis**, and the vertical dimension of time, called the **synchronic axis**. In addition, there is also a third, social dimension to be considered, which accounts for variation between social classes and cuts across both. The reason why, for example, there is so much variation in England today and so little in the USA is historical. Similarly, the negative and prejudicial attitudes commonly held towards linguistic variation, particularly in the UK, have their roots in history. Consequently, in order to comprehend variation in English and attitudes held towards it, it is important to consider the social history of English.

1.3 Standards of English

1.3.1 What is standard English?

The term standard English (SE) is the one most commonly used to label the language 'English'. It is the variety of English used in public life in England and other English speaking countries, for example: in education, law, medicine and government. Nowadays, it has no geographical boundary, and is used across the whole of England and other English speaking countries. In England, it also has an accent associated with it, known as Received Pronunciation: RP for short. Because of their origins and history, SE and RP are closely associated with the language of the middle and upper classes in English society, known variously as 'the Queen's English' or 'BBC English'. The concept of RP is a peculiarly English one, having no equivalent in any other part of the English speaking world. For example, there is no US equivalent of RP. Some linguists have argued that SE is best defined as the written form of English, on the grounds that standard English is not a matter of pronunciation and is thus not tied to any particular accent (See: Crystal 1995 and Trudgill 1999). Rather, it is a matter of grammar, vocabulary and orthography, that is, spelling and print face, and not of pronunciation. Nevertheless, linguists such as Stubbs (1986) argue that accent *is* involved in notions of standardness, since people have an idea of what is and is not 'standard' in pronunciation. That is, the accent RP is widely regarded as the 'standard' accent of British English, just as 'standard English' is widely regarded as the standard written form of English, as used in education and other public institutions such as the law and government.

Indeed, there is much disagreement amongst linguists as to whether or not SE can be classed as dialect at all. Some, such as Trudgill and Chambers (1980) and Milroy (1987) argue that it is, pointing out that all speakers speak at least one dialect, and that standard English is as much a dialect as any other form of English. Consequently, some speakers may have no other variety than SE, whilst others may have either a regional variety and/or SE. Other linguists disagree, on the grounds that standard English differs from other dialects in a number of ways, especially in the fact that it has its own writing system. Because of this, they argue that dialects and the study of dialect should concentrate upon speech. This position, however, ignores the fact that many non-standard English dialects in England such as that found in the Black Country in the

English West Midlands or Geordie in the North East of England have an established tradition of writing. Also, if standard English is not a dialect, then it is difficult to see what else it could be.

As has already been mentioned, whilst regional accents and dialects go hand in hand, standard English can be spoken with any accent. So, although it is possible (but not very likely) that someone may speak the Geordie dialect with an RP accent, it is both possible and probable that someone may speak standard English with a Geordie accent. Indeed, the BBC, once an important gatekeeper in the maintenance of standard English and RP, has in recent years adopted a much more liberal policy towards the use of regional accents amongst its presenters. When the BBC was founded in the 1930s, all broadcasters spoke standard English with a uniform RP accent. Nowadays, no such training is given, and presenters can be heard speaking standard English in a variety of different regional accents. Indeed, attitudes towards the use of regional dialects and accents in public life has altered so significantly since the 1930s that in 2005, the BBC launched a national campaign celebrating and promoting regional English linguistic diversity called *Voices*. This campaign, in addition to television and radio programmes, has used the internet and phone-ins to undertake a national dialect survey on the use of regional dialects in England today. Working together with dialectologists at the universities of Leeds and Cardiff, this initiative aims to produce a comprehensive survey of contemporary English dialects and accents. This BBC sponsored project takes issue with the correlation between RP and BBC English, and is fighting hard to disassociate the BBC from any 'gate-keeping' role in language use. It argues that the fact that BBC news broadcasters spoke RP in the early days was more the product of a restricted group from which BBC employees were drawn rather than as part of any deliberate policy. Even so, employees outside that group, at the time, were given elocution lessons to ensure use of RP. The project also questions the role of the BBC in championing a particular accent and thus potentially holding back the tide of language change. It also takes issue with the fact that some linguists have relabelled RP as BBC English, and called it such in pronunciation dictionaries for foreign learners. However, if you call the accent normally used in BBC news broadcasts BBC English, and that it is an example of RP, then by definition, the people the BBC employs as news broadcasters are therefore RP speakers. This circularity in defining BBC English in relation to RP and RP in relation to BBC English renders both concepts meaningless. It is also ironic that this is happening at a time when the relationship between RP and so-called BBC English is more logically viewed as a thing of the past.

Nevertheless, initiatives such as *Voices* aside, there is still a strong correlation in Britain between dialect, accent and social class. The social dialect of SE is bound not by geographical region, but by social class.

Fig 1: The triangle or pyramid model of the relationship between status and accent (Trudgill 1983:29-30)

As figure 1 illustrates, there still exists a sliding scale of hierarchy in English dialects and accents, with that of standard English and RP held to be the most prestigious, and those of large urban conurbations cities such as Birmingham the least. Speakers of the most marked form of RP appear at the apex of the triangle and tend to be accorded the

highest status, whereas speakers of marked regional pronunciation are accorded the lowest. Even though London is the historical centre of standard English, nevertheless geographically bound local London accents and dialects such as those associated with the East End of London (Cockney) and Essex (Estuary English) are generally thought of as less prestigious and open to ridicule. No wonder then, that the playwright George Bernard Shaw wrote in 1916 that: '...it is impossible for an Englishman to open his mouth without making some other Englishman despise him.' Such prejudices have deep historical roots going back to at least the eighteenth century and the period when the 'English' we have today began its processes of standardisation. In order to understand current issues and debates surrounding accents and dialects, we have to consider the ways in which English was standardised, and the social attitudes and prejudices upon which standardisation was based.

1.3.2 A brief history of the standardisation of English in England

On any day of any week, we can open an English newspaper and find either articles on, or letters about, the degeneration and corruption of the English language. In case we might be tempted to think of such concerns as symptomatic of modern times, then it is worth pointing out that they date back to at least the fifteenth century and a time when English was beginning to be standardised. The concept of a standard, unified form of a language is a relatively new one in historical terms. Very briefly, the need for a unified form of a language arose during the late middle ages and the Renaissance period in history for two main reasons: political and economic. Communication over greater areas of land than before became a political necessity for governments, and an economic necessity for trade. It was during this period that the concept of a national language began to be linked to notions of national identity, as the nation states of modern day Europe began to be formed.

Haugen (1996:97-111) identifies the process of standardisation as a four-stage one:

Stage one: **Selection** – an existing dialect is chosen as the one to be standardised. In the case of English, this was the Middle English dialect of the East Midlands.

Stage 2: **Elaboration** – the chosen dialect is expanded and elaborated so that it can fulfil the variety of different functions it is intended to serve. That is, the dialect is added to by adding vocabulary and/or elaborating grammatical structures. In the case of English, the East Midlands dialect was elaborated by the importation of words from French and Latin and its grammatical structures elaborated by the adoption of Latinate constructions.

Stage 3: **Codification** – the vocabulary and grammar is made explicit and written down. Once codified in writing, then language becomes an object of consciousness in the material world, in that it can be seen as well as heard, and thus 'fixed' or 'pinned down'. Changes to the language are thus more open to regulation and control by its community of users, especially by the more powerful sections of society.

Stage 4: **Implementation** – the chosen variety is implemented throughout a community, usually by becoming the language of instruction in education and being adopted by public institutions

such as the law, government and the media.

The reason why various regional dialects and accents exist in England today dates back to the late Middle Ages and beyond. The reason why prejudices against their use persist is due to the theory of language upon which the processes of standardisation was based. This was a **prescriptive** theory, based upon an idealised form of language and how it *ought* to be used, rather than upon **descriptive** theory, and how it actually *is* used. Prescriptive theories of language immediately give rise to value judgements. From the late Middle Ages onwards, judgements on the selection of a dialect were based upon notions of ‘correctness’, ‘the best’ and the ‘pure’, which linked language with morality, and by appealing to an idealised form of usage. In making the case for the standardisation of *English*, it was argued that the ‘best’ language was that spoken by the ‘best’ people and any other form was deemed ‘corrupt’ and spoken by ‘corrupt’ people.

The history of the English language can be divided into four periods: Old English (400ad to 1100 ad); Middle English (c.1100 ad to 1500 ad); Early Modern English (c.1500ad to 1800 ad) and Modern English (from 1800). By the end of the Middle English period (1100 ad -1500 ad), England had five main dialects, each with its own earlier history. The Old English dialect of Northumbrian developed into Scots and Northern English, north of a line from the Humber to the Lake District. The Mercian dialect of Old English became the West Midlands and East Midlands dialects. Below the Rivers Thames and Severn the Southern dialect was spoken, while Kentish remained in the far south east.

Fig 2: Middle English dialect map

At this time, all dialects of English were bound geographically. People of all social backgrounds from the richest to the poorest living in these areas spoke and used the dialect of the region, which included writing in it. Medieval authors lacked any notion of a standard or prestige form of English, as one did simply not exist, and so they wrote in the language of their birthplace. During the Middle Ages then, all English dialects had a written equivalent. Questions of ‘dialect versus standard’, ‘regional versus social dialects’ which create so much debate today were simply not an issue then, because the economic and political landscape was very different. Even after English was standardised and its written form codified, local people continued to speak and indeed write in their local dialect. Consequently, many regional dialects of today’s English, such as that of the Black Country in the West Midlands, for example, can trace their history back to Middle English dialects and continue to use syntactic forms, vocabulary and pronunciation that remain little altered since that time, particularly syntactically and phonologically.

By the end of the Middle English period, English did not yet have an official, standard form, in the sense of fixed or uniform, yet many Renaissance writers refer time and time again to a variety of English they describe as the ‘common dialecte’ or ‘common language’. Common, that is, in the sense of the most usual, meaning a shared language of usage and understanding. It is the identifying, elaborating, and codifying of this common language which preoccupied much of the Early Modern English period, c1500 – c1800. By the beginning of this time and not without contestation, the East Midlands

dialect had been selected as the one for elaboration and codification into the standard form of English. The East Midlands region of England had come to exert tremendous power – intellectually, economically and politically – in the processes which shaped the emerging cultural identity of the English nation. However, unlike other European modern nation states being formed around the same time, the selection of a dialect as the standard form of a language did not happen in any planned, systematic or uniform way. Whilst the Tudors, along with other reigning monarchies in Europe sought to standardise language in the interest of national unity they did not, unlike in France for example, establish an Academy to plan and regulate the processes of standardisation. During the Renaissance period, from 1400-1700, two important factors affected the process of standardisation: firstly, the invention of printing and secondly, increased mobility amongst the aristocracy, both of which helped to promote one dialect over others. In addition, two other noticeable features of change occurred in the English language. The first was the borrowing of many words from Latin and Greek as well as Italian and Spanish. This came about as a result of the emphasis on classical learning which spread across Europe from the Italian States, with Latin and Greek becoming the languages of the ‘civilised’ and ‘educated’ person. Between 1500 and 1650 over 10,000 new words were incorporated into the emerging standard language, generally through the medium of writing with newly coined and invented words, for example *allurement*, *allusion*, *atmosphere*, adding to those borrowed from other languages such as *bombast*, *chocolate*, *genteel*, and *shock*.

The second change was in pronunciation, which shifted the pronunciation of vowels to sounds that we more or less recognise today, known as the **great vowel shift**. Chaucer’s pronunciation of ‘name’ - /(((/ became Shakespeare’s /(((/ and /(((/ in today’s RP accent. No one knows precisely why such a shift in pronunciation happened, but one of the reasons given for it is the speakers’ sense of their own prestige (see for example, Baugh and Cable (2002)). At a time of growing urbanisation in London and the forming of the modern class system, sensitivity had been growing to accents which betrayed people’s origins. During the sixteenth century, people from East Anglia and the Midlands moving towards London did not want to sound like ‘country bumpkins’ and so altered their accent to emulate or sound like others. As often happens, when people consciously adjust their pronunciation to emulate the speech of others, they **hypercorrected** their pronunciation, That is, in being consciously aware of their accent in a way which requires imitation of another, a person often over-emphasises the sound they wish to make for example, putting an ‘h’ in before vowels as in *whonder* and *whay*.. However, these hypercorrected accents gradually became an indicator of the rising wealthy merchants and would themselves be copied or emulated by others. Thus, what was originally an accidental innovation became prestigious and spread, although such a vowel shift did not occur in all regional dialects, and accounts for some of the variation that continues to this day.

This new variety of English, standard English, though originally geographically rooted in the Middle English area and dialect of East Midlands, rapidly became dissociated from its regional origins. Indeed, the emerging form of standard English was viewed more in terms of a foreign language, designed to function as a lingua franca (that is, a language which is used internationally in trade or business), in the same way as Ancient Greek and Latin, the languages which became its blueprint. The underlying theory of prescriptivism upon which the standardisation of English was based, really took hold during this period, especially in deriving a grammatical structure. This was

based on the notion that the description of a language should abide by a set of rules prescribed for it, rather than, as is the case with modern grammar, be derived from a description of how it actually works. In England then, from the very beginning, the codification of English was marked by the theoretical foundations of prescription which inextricably linked language, social class and moral value (see *TL:DE* Part 1 4.1). Throughout Renaissance Europe, 'questions of language' were tied to questions of literary language, and linguistics – as it existed then – was the study of language in general, particularly focused upon the study of poetic language. In Europe, standardisation of language distinguished between literary, including poetic, language, and the form of language used for transactional purposes. In England, by contrast, writing about literary language doubled as a contemporary theory of English usage, as though the two styles of language were, or should be, the same. It was the written, literary form of standard English rather than any other that formed the basis for its codification. This entrenched even further the link between standard English and social class, since its use demanded a degree of literacy which was not available to the vast majority of the working population. Education thus played an important role in the standardisation process, a role which continues to be important in its reproduction and maintenance.

Having been selected and elaborated, standard English then began to be codified in dictionaries and grammars. As social institutions such as the law and printing came to use English, so the first dictionaries and grammars of English were written, with the purpose of identifying and disseminating the 'best' forms of English. The idea that the 'best' English was that spoken by the 'best' people as defined by the nobility gave rise to the notion that therefore, anything else was not only linguistically but also morally and socially inferior. As a result of standardisation, all other dialects, Northern, Southern and Western, were treated as second class and ignored, unless written as poetry. As living dialects however, they did not fossilise, but continued to be used by the inhabitants of those areas. Towards the end of the Early Modern English period, arguments about the establishment of an Academy in England of the kind established in France (1635) and Italy (1582) continued. This idea found little public sympathy, since observers noticed that the French still changed their language despite having an Academy. In England, language was perceived as an embodiment of the spirit of individual liberty, and of resistance to central regulation.

Nevertheless, this did not stop people from trying to pin down the language through the means of dictionaries and grammars, which were first written with the prime aim of 'fixing' the language once and for all. In 1755, Samuel Johnson published his *Dictionary* with the aim of making 'a dictionary by which the pronunciation of our language may be fixed and its attainment facilitated; by which its purity may be preserved, its use ascertained and its duration lengthened'. It may seem odd to us now that there was ever a time when words did not have a standard spelling, but before Johnson published his dictionary, this was the case. Words were spelt in several different ways without much thought or anxiety attached to such practice as is to be found today; Shakespeare, for example, signed his own name with five different spellings over the course of his lifetime.

Johnson's dictionary was by no means exhaustive, and he made no apology for its selective nature, leaving out as it does any terms to do with manufacturing, law, medicine and the physical sciences on the grounds that: 'I could not visit caverns to learn the miner's language, nor take a

voyage to perfect my skill in the dialect of navigation, nor visit the warehouses of merchants, and shops of artificers, to gain the names of wares, tools and operations, of which no mention is found in books'. Johnson's principal source of both orthography (spelling) and definition for the words he included in his dictionary was from written, literary texts.

By the beginning of the Modern English era, from 1800 onwards, England was a linguistically divided nation. It was divided geographically by regional dialect and accent, and socially by the growing rise and influence of standard English as a national language, becoming the language not only of government and administration, but also of a cultural elite. Paradoxically, as standard English became removed from its regional origins, it served to increase rather than to decrease class differentiation. During the nineteenth century, the use of standard English spread throughout the country and all social classes, especially after 1870 when compulsory education was introduced in England (1872 in Scotland). Learning to read and to write standard English was an important part of the state school curriculum. Spoken as well as written standard English was held up as a model of refinement and, with the expansion of the British Empire, a carrier of political power world-wide.

During the nineteenth century, language, as much as science or any other discipline, came to be an object of study among others. For Max Muller, the first professor of Philology at Oxford, the object of such study was 'language' in general rather than any specific one. This made it possible to study language as a science, abstracted from the contexts of its use, a study that was eventually called linguistics. Attitudes towards language use were validated by claims to scientificness, fostering the notion that any variation from standard English as a norm was deviant, and therefore improper and incorrect. Such deviance was a manifestation not only of improper speech, but improper behaviour. Thus, to speak the 'superior', 'refined' language demonstrated that one belonged to a 'superior' class, and that speaking a 'vulgar' language correspondingly meant that one belonged to a 'vulgar' one. Smith writes that:

The study of universal grammar at that time stipulated that languages were fundamentally alike in that they represented the mind, and fundamentally different in the quality of mind and civilisation that they represented...By dividing the population into two extremes, ideas about language firmly distinguished those who were within the civilised world from those who were entirely outside it
Smith (1984:2-3)

The grammar and dictionaries of English which came to be written and used in schools during the first half of the twentieth century continued to be based upon a prescriptive description of the grammar and vocabulary of Standard English. Grammar continued to be thought of as a unified, universal concept that described any language, and the degree to which a language fitted grammatical prescription was a marker of its superiority over all others, which were therefore deemed 'imperfect' and full of errors.

This concept remained unchallenged until the 1950s when the first modern grammars of English came to be written, based upon *description* rather than *prescription*, a seismic shift in linguistic grammatical theory that broke with long-standing tradition.

In 1927 the influential phonetician Wyld argued that RP 'is superior, from the character of its vowel sounds, to any other form of English, in beauty and clarity' (Wyld 1927:606). Appealing to aesthetics, however, is hardly a scientific basis upon which to argue grounds for superiority. Wyld tried to prove scientifically that there was a hierarchy of pronunciation, with RP at the top as the most superior accent. His ideas were very influential in the curriculum for English in elementary schools and the training of teachers and still persist to this day. For example, when a national curriculum was re-introduced into English schools in the late 1980s, and revised shortly after in the early 1990s, and one of the most controversial issues was around the teaching of standard English and RP as part of the speaking and listening curriculum (see; Clark 2001).

Although RP is not exclusive to any social class, through its history it has social associations with upper and upper-middle classes, whilst lower-middle and working classes have tended to be associated with regional accents. In evaluations of speakers whose speech differed solely in terms of accent, RP always comes out as having more prestige, being more pleasant sounding, its speakers are viewed as more ambitious, competent and better suited for higher status jobs than speakers with regional accents. Some earlier studies though, rated RP speakers as less attractive: less sincere, trustworthy, friendly, generous, kind, than speakers of other accents. The prestige associated with RP is thus a social, not a linguistic, phenomenon and can change.

A further important point to note here is one that Aitchison (1981 & 2001) has made, namely that change in language is neither degenerative nor progressive: it simply happens and no amount of 'fixing' can stop this occurring. The fact that English is not stable across history is because it is a living language, and change is a necessary aspect of this. Such a view has huge implications for the ways in which language variation and change have previously been studied, and especially for the methods used to reconstruct our linguistic past. Similarly, there is no way of predicting what the English language will sound like in another five centuries, other than it will be different from what we have today.

Far from dying out, dialects and accents continue to survive, and also to change, as do our attitudes towards their use. Although it could be said that accents and dialects in particular, are far more convergent and mutually intelligible than they were say two centuries ago, there is still a great deal of variation. The processes of change governing dialects, but more particularly accents, are difficult to determine, but, like the great vowel shift, are more often than not a result of social change of some kind rather than through any pattern of linguistic regularity (see 1.4 below) .

The brief outline of the social history of English in England above illustrates how the processes of standardization were enacted in that language variety, and explains why regional varieties in England persist to this day and where notions such as 'correctness'

and 'purity' of language come from. The next section considers the processes of standardization in a different context, and illustrates how although the processes may be the same, their realisation is very different.

1.3.3 A brief history of the standardisation of English in the USA

American English now dominates the world. It is often standard American English which is taught to foreign learners around the globe, and it is not unusual to find people from the Pacific, the Far East and even Europe speaking English with an American accent and using American idioms. Since the Second World War and from the 1940s onwards, American English has consolidated its position through its dominance of the entertainment industry and in recent decades, through its dominance of information technology and the internet. American English, like that of British standard English, owes a great deal to its social and cultural history.

The main feature of American English in contrast with standard British English is in lexical variation and variation in pronunciation. There is very little, if any, syntactic variation. Many words, such as *moccasin*, *jazz*, *zucchini*, *bagel*, and *kosher*, have been borrowed from the languages of non-English speaking immigrants, as well as from the indigenous peoples. Some recognisably British words have developed variant meanings such as *mad* meaning *angry*; *are you through?* meaning *are you finished?* and *bad* or *wicked* meaning *good*. There is also a good deal of cross-over between the two varieties, American English and British English, in that American technical innovation has imported into British English words such as *program*, *telephone* and *typewriter*. Other words express a culture and environment different from the British with words such as *lynch*, *blizzard*, *joy-ride*, *bayou*, *levy* and *prairie*. So, in British English, you drive a *car*, fill up with *petrol*, wipe your *windscreen*, check your *bonnet* and *boot* are shut and drive down the *road*, *dual carriage way* or *motorway* overtaking *lorries*. In American English, you drive an *automobile*, fill up with *gas*, wipe your *windshield*, check your *hood* and *trunk* are shut, and drive down the *freeway*, *expressway* or *divided highway*, overtaking *trucks*. In England people *queue*, whilst in America they stand *in line*. Phonetic variation does exist across the USA as well, but given its relative youth as a country, this is shown not so much by regional variation of the kind that exists in England. Rather, phonological variation exists on divisions between urban and rural areas and between different ethnic groups.

The origins of American English date back to the seventeenth century and the colonization by several disparate European nations of the 'New World'. In 1620 the first English colonists landed at Plymouth rock, fleeing religious persecution in England. By this time in England, standard English had begun to emerge and these initial inhabitants of America adopted its use. Thus, it was standard English which was selected at the first stage of the process of standardisation, rather than any other variety. As American English developed, and as grammars of English came to be written, its syntactic structure adopted that of British Standard English. The association between linguistic variation and social class so prevalent in British English is therefore missing from American English. In terms of the processes of standardisation then, American English followed a very different course from that which occurred in England. Differences between British English and American English are to be found more in its subsequent elaboration and codification than in the processes of selection and implementation. The initial pilgrim settlers, in order to survive, enlisted the aid of the native Indians, and, realising the importance of local Indian knowledge for

this survival, acquired Indian terminology which they then incorporated into their own vocabulary. During this time, words such as *moose*, *wigwam* and *naiack*, meaning a point or corner from which comes the expression '*that neck of the woods*' derives, were part of an emerging vocabulary. Dillard (1976) estimates that of these initial Indian borrowings, some 17,000 survive within American English to this day.

The English settlers were not the only recent inhabitants on the new continent; the Dutch had landed at the same time as the first pilgrims. They established colonies along the Hudson Valley, near to present day New York, and the Germans also formed their own colonies near Philadelphia. As time went on, the colonists expanded their horizons beyond the East coast and pioneers penetrated further West and then South into the mainland, encountering colonies of French and Spanish settlers as they went. As new and unfamiliar terrain and wildlife were encountered, terms were needed to name them. The French settlers had already named most of the geography and natural flora and fauna around the Saint Lawrence and Mississippi rivers, which the English speakers absorbed into their own lexicon, incorporating such words as *chowder*, *bayou*, *voyager*, *apache* and *brave*. The Spanish, who had occupied the Caribbean islands, South and Central America, moved north through the Gulf of Mexico, also named the geography and natural flora and fauna around these areas, and words such as *alfalfa*, *pumpkin*, *canyon*, *chaparral*, *corral*, *fiesta* and *stampede* were similarly absorbed.

In 1804 two explorers, Lewis and Clark, embarked on a journey across America with the ambitious aim of mapping and defining the inner territories, which involved labelling everything that passed before them. Consequently, a new vocabulary distinct from that in Britain was formed to meet with the demands of a new and different terrain and culture that Americans now inhabited. Although numerous languages existed in America throughout the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and despite the anti-British sentiments expressed during the war of Independence (1775-83), English became the medium used to unite speakers of different languages. In Jefferson's *Declaration of Independence*, no official language was named as American, since this was seen as contrary to the prevailing spirit of freedom and pluralism of the time and also in direct confrontation with a constitution which advocated egalitarianism. To establish a national language was seen as redolent of the monarchical policies which the New World had left behind. The American constitution prevents prescription in two important aspects in the transmission of national of culture and identity; in language, and in education. Nevertheless, although English has never been or can be recognised as the official language of the USA, in practice, as the language of public life, including government, the media and education, its use as the national language prevails.

The alternative to a national language, it seemed, was a distinctive form of English that would serve the functional aspects of communication, but at the same time represent American cultural and national identity. Noah Webster proposed such an alternative, and he was arguably one of the most important men in the development of the American language. As part of its elaboration, American English had absorbed words and phrases from the many different cultures inhabiting the continent. Webster proposed to codify the language through the writing of an American dictionary. Webster was well aware of the need for a culturally independent society, not one that was still influenced by Britain. The printed word was the most powerful medium of communication at the time, and Webster was conscious of the fact that to disseminate and

propagate a new national culture, a new national book trade was needed (Simpson 1986:58). He feared America's dependence on foreign nations for the development of their manners and felt that new American citizens should show their affiliations by buying American literature to stimulate a national book trade, and to enhance American morality, politics, culture and fashion. As Webster, quoted in Mencken (1921:12), says: 'Let us seize the present moment and establish a national language as well as a national government. As an independent nation our honor requires us to have a system of our own, in language as well as in government.'

Webster resolved to make cultural distinctions between America and Britain, initially by devising his own system of spellings, which he later changed to a modification rather than a whole-scale change, realising the impossibility of implementing such a revision. He deplored the foreign-influenced pronunciations and spellings evident in written English of the time, believing that the British system of spelling was class-ridden and created divisions in society, since it demanded a level of educated orthographic knowledge of the language and was thus inaccessible not only to the lower classes, but also to foreign nationals. As a consequence of his disaffection with the English aristocracy and its abstruse orthography, Webster resolved to introduce a system of modified spellings that was more uniform in its sounds than those proposed by Johnson. For example, he excised the 'u' in the British English '-our' structure, so that words such as *honour* became *honor*; changed the final spelling of -re to -er in words such as *theater*, *center*, the 'c' before 'e' to an 's' in words such as *defense*, the suffix -ise to -ize; dropped the doubling of consonants in words such as *travelling* and *programme*, and lost the silent 'e' in words such as *program*.

Webster's modifications do not appear very radical, but by simplifying spelling he claimed to have made it easier for a primarily agrarian population to learn to write and thus assist in the development of an American culture and manner that would distance it from Europe. It would also be easier for newcomers to learn. The modifications, by their very existence, challenged British assumptions that the language 'belonged' to them and that its development or change was exclusively their province.

By the mid nineteenth century, cultural divergence and isolation, coupled with Webster's influence, had created a form of English sufficiently different from that used in Britain. However, arguments continued on both sides of the Atlantic about the nature and purpose of this new form of English. In Britain particularly, 'Americanism' became a pejorative term, so much so that in 1842, Charles Dickens wrote in his *American Notes* that he was at a loss when asked by a waiter if he wanted his food 'right away': 'I need not tell you that the prevailing grammar (in America) is more than doubtful, and that the oddest idioms are received idioms.' However, what were generally thought of as 'aberrations' were sometimes forms of English that had become outdated or old fashioned in British use but had continued to be used in America. Americans, as colonists, had continued using the standard English of the seventeenth century pilgrims and still used words whose form or meanings had altered in British English. For example, the word *sick* used by Americans to mean somebody who is *ill* in British use was widely used in Shakespeare's time; the past participle *gotten* used in America had been in use in Elizabethan times. Other terms, common in Elizabethan England, were: *fall* for *autumn*; *progress* as a verb; *mean* for *unpleasant*; and *deck of cards* for *pack of cards*.

By the end of the nineteenth century, American English, in addition to its verbal form, was also establishing a literary canon, centred upon the works of writers such as James Fennimore Cooper and Mark Twain who encapsulated the essence of frontier America. Ralph Emerson had declared that now America was free from the literary constraints of English romantic poetry, a new national American poet should come to the fore to represent the nation's poetic aspirations. Walt Whitman established himself as this poet with works such as *Leaves of Grass* (1855). Literary prominence may seem insignificant when considering the development of a language, but the establishment of a literary canon is indicative of linguistic recognition.

Throughout the twentieth century, the influence of American English upon the world, through the influence of firstly the media and more recently information technology, has, transformed it into a global language, used for economic and communicative purposes around the globe. This has created a kind of reverse linguistic colonisation and a two-way traffic between the two different varieties of English. British people today, particularly in speech, use a host of American terms such as *okay*, *goodbye* (from the pilgrim's abbreviation of 'God be with you') and *hi*. Other items of American English adopted by the British are:

Lexis

french-fries	truck	movie
snoop	bar(pub)	has been(adjective)
teenager	fan(sports)	burger
soap opera	parking ticket	download
commute	gameshow	phoney
babysitter	downsize	gimmick
gridlock	hospitalize	hopefully

idioms

fly off the handle
give me the bottom line
pass the buck
it's a walk in the park
it comes with the territory
take the bull by the horns
let the cat out of the bag

Numerous analyses have been undertaken into the lexical differences between the two varieties, spawning a large dictionary industry. If there are any distinct characteristics that differentiate American English from British English at present, then it has been in the formation of new vocabulary in two areas: **back formation** and **word blends**. One of the consequences of these processes is known as **tall talk**.

Back formation is a process in morphology whereby new terms are created by the removal of affixes from an existing word. Most of these new creations are verbs. American English already had many terms formed with the noun suffix *-ion*. Where verbs did not exist, they were created by deleting the suffix *-ion* and adding an 'e', thereby verbalising nouns. The first noted example of this process was the formation of *locate* from *location* in 1652, *donate* from *donation* (1795) *commute* from *commutation* (1865) and *electrocute* from *electrocution* (1889). This process, though as a zero derivation process, continues with recent additions such as *housekeep*, *burgle*, *shoplift* and *babysit*.

Word blends refers to the blending of existing words. This process has always added to the word stock of a language where previously a term did not exist, but is especially prevalent in American English. Word blends are the merging of phonological elements from two or more words (see *DL:DE* 4.2.3), such as:

<i>Cablegram</i>	from cable and telegram
<i>Travelog</i>	from travel and monologue
<i>Newscast</i>	from news and broadcast
<i>Telecast</i>	from television and broadcast
<i>Motel</i>	from motor and hotel
<i>Brunch</i>	from breakfast and lunch

Although American in origin, most of these terms have now been assimilated into British English.

Tall talk refers to the imagery and vivid expression which has been central to American linguistic development, created through the use of, for example, back formation and word blending. During frontier times, the nation was a ‘rough and ready’ one, but frontiersmen, desiring to make the ordinary seem grander than it actually was, elaborated and exaggerated their descriptions in a form of vocabulary. spawning a host of bizarre creations in lexical terms as in *ripsnitious*, *absquatulate*, *flusticated*, *elegantiferously* and *teetotacuiously*. Even so, ‘tall talk’ prevails in contemporary American English, such as the lexical terms *discombobulating*, *rambunctious*, *fantabulous* and *bodacious*.

By far the greatest degree of variation between British English and American English is in the phonological distinctions of accent. Although American accents are more homogenous than British ones, nevertheless differences in accent are evident. Labov (1997), identifies eight distinct American dialects across the whole of the United States. Consequently, it is no wonder that American accents are distinctly more uniform than the ones to be found in Britain, and is one of the reasons why American English is so much more appealing to foreign learners than that of British English. The greatest difference in the range of accents is in the number of vowel phonemes realised in British English and American English. Both have the same number of consonant phonemes, which is 24, whereas RP has 20 vowel phonemes, and General American (GA) has 16. This is probably due to the fact that many American English accents are rhotic (see 1.4 and 2.3.4 DL:DE). This means that the phoneme /r/ is pronounced after vowels, where a British accent may omit an orthographic ‘r’. Another distinctive area, among others, is realised in intervocalicity, where the alveolar plosives /t/ and /d/ are, through a process of voicing, seemingly merged together and consequently words such as *ladder* and *latter* sound identical.

Although in the United States, unlike in the United Kingdom, the majority of regional dialects are largely free from social stigma and prejudice, there is one notable exception, that of African American English. The term African American English (AAE) is an umbrella term for various descriptions known as African American Vernacular English AAVE, Black English BE, Inner City English ICE and Ebonics (see 1.2.1). It is spoken by a large population of Americans of African descent, as the historical discrimination against African Americans has created social isolation which has intensified its isolation from other American varieties. There are critics of the variety who equate its use with inferior genetic intelligence and cultural deprivation, on the grounds that AAVE is a deficient, or incomplete language, or who believe that different races speak differently

inherently. Such views have no linguistic foundation and it is as unscientific a view in reference to AAVE as to standard American English, Russian or Chinese. Equally, a child's race plays no part in the language a child learns to speak, since a white child raised in an AAVE environment will learn to speak AAVE just as a black child raised in a white middle-class American family will speak standard American English. Nevertheless, the position of AAVE and its speakers in the United States, as with, to a less intensified degree the speakers of regional dialects and accents in the UK, illustrate in two different ways just how deeply entrenched attitudes and prejudices towards language use are and the part that social and cultural history plays in the formation of such attitudes and prejudices.

1.4. Studies in variation and change

1.4.1 Linguistic variation

Early twentieth century research into dialects and accents tended to concentrate upon descriptions of linguistic variation, particularly lexis and phonology, compiling linguistic atlases to show the different distributions of different dialect forms. The aim of such research was to counter a mainstream view in historical linguistics held at the time that all sound change was regular and had no exceptions. Dialectologists aimed to show that linguistic change, far from being regular, was in fact irregular and did not affect all sounds and/or words equally.. Early dialectologists were particularly interested in lexical variation, and how different words were used to refer to the same thing in different places. They did this by going out and collecting examples of speech (known as **data**) from people in the regions in which they were interested, a process known as **fieldwork**. The people who were interviewed are known as **informants** (see also 1.5.2 below).

One such study undertaken in England was the *Survey of English Dialects* (1962) by Stan Ellis and Harold Orton, later edited by Harold Orton. The impetus for Orton's survey, in addition to the reasons cited above, was his fear that as an agricultural way of life was fast becoming mechanized, then lexical items associated with rural life would die out, and he wanted to capture them before they did so. The fieldwork for the project was undertaken during the 1950s and 1960s in over 300 rural communities throughout England, and interviewed about a 1000 men. The criteria for selection was that at the time of the survey they were aged 60 or above, with little or no formal education, still lived in the area where they had been born and had not travelled much. This section of the population was most likely to be speaking in dialects which had escaped the processes of standardisation and thus still bore a resemblance to the Middle English dialects as described in 1.3.2 above. Orton's survey was thus intended as a resource for linguistic historians, who could investigate the phonology, lexis and syntax of Medieval English. The survey has since been used to reconstruct spoken English in the times of Shakespeare, Chaucer and even earlier and is still used a resource to this day.

However, the ways in which data was collected for the survey began to be severely criticised from the 1960s onwards, both in terms of its methods and its **sampling**: that is, the range of factors such as age, social class, geographical location such as urban and rural, gender and ethnicity of the informants from which data was gathered. The main method used was a long questionnaire, usually with one word answers to questions such

as *You sweeten your tea with...?*, which were then transcribed phonetically by the survey worker. Critics argued that one word answers were too divorced from everyday use to provide an accurate account of how people actually used language. They also took issue with the sampling, arguing that dialectology should not restrict itself to such a small segment of the population who were old, rural and male, but should also be concerned with young men and women, and urban as well as rural areas. As a result, traditional dialectologists have made changes both to their methods and to their sampling of informants. The invention firstly of sound recording and portable tape recorders and more recently video recorders, digitisation and computer technology have revolutionised research into dialectology. Most books now published in the field are accompanied by a CD or reference to websites and electronic databases. Consequently, dialectologists have developed more interactive techniques of data gathering such as those undertaken by the *Survey of Regional English* based at the University of Leeds, also used as part of a large-scale web-based project called *Voices*, sponsored by the BBC (see also 1.3.1 above). For example, data collected as part of the *Voices* project has identified at least ten alternative words or phrases for the verb 'to play truant'. These are: *skive, bunk off, wag, skip, mitch, dog, hookey, twag, sag* and *nick off*. Although most of these phrases can be found across the United Kingdom, *twag* is specific to Hull and Doncaster, towns in the North East of England, *cap* to Derby and Nottingham, cities in the Midlands area of England, and *skidge* to Paisley in Northern Ireland.

Traditional dialectologists have also extended their sampling to include men and women of all ages and social backgrounds within particular geographical areas, and urban areas as well as rural ones. They are much more careful these days to ensure that they have a representative sample taken from categories of age, gender and social background from a particular region in selecting their informants from whom they gather data and subsequently analyse. Consequently, the kinds of surveys exemplified by the SED, far from dying out, are still being compiled around the world. In addition to lexical variation, traditional dialectologists have also been concerned with phonological variation. The methods of data collection and sampling used here are the same as for lexical variation, but the focus of analysis is upon sound rather than word. The basic conceptual tool here is that of the **linguistic variable**, a term used to mean a linguistic item that has identifiable variants. There are at least two basically different kinds of variation. The first is in clearly distinct variation. For example, words such as *laughing* and *going* can be pronounced as *laughin'* and *goin'*. The final sound of these two words is the linguistic variable (ng) with its two variants [l] in *laughin'* and [n] in *goin'*. Another example of a linguistic variable is in words like *car* and *farm*, which can be given r-less pronunciations: *cah* and *fahm*. Here, there is the linguistic variable (r) with two variants [r] in *car* and (pronounced zero) as in *fahm* (see also 1.4.2 below). The second kind of variation is the quantity of nasalisation, for example in a word such as *bend*. The vowel 'e' in this word is sometimes nasalized and sometimes not, and the amount or degree of nasalization can be noticeably different. Here, we have the linguistic variable (e) and a number of variants (see also 1.5 and *DL:DE* Chapter 3).

Linguists who have studied variation in this way have focused on a number of linguistic variables, such as those outlined above. Studies of variation employing the linguistic

variable have also been used in studying grammatical variation in addition to phonological. For example, the presence or absence of (s) in the third person singular: *she goes* or *she go*; the form of the verb *be* in sentences such as *she's glad*, *she be glad* and *she glad* and multiple negation, such as *he don't mean to hurt nobody* and *I ay done nothing* (see .1.4.3. below).

Within sociolinguistic research that focuses upon phonology, one sound is selected as a linguistic variable and used as the **dependent** variable: that is, a sound against which to measure other sounds. Other factors such as social class, age, gender, region and ethnic group are varied, and the **independent** variable: that is, the variant, is compared for each of these variables. In this way, the speech of older informants can be compared with that of younger ones, and that of men to women, lower class to upper class, and so on.

Sound recording has also made it possible to investigate patterns of stress and tone in addition to those of sound when studying speech, known as **prosodic features**. English accents vary tremendously in this respect. Wells (1999) points out that many Northern dialects of English tend not to reduce vowels in unstressed Latinate prefixes (eg *con-*, *ex-*) as much as do RP and other Southern-based varieties. Although relatively little work has so far been done on dialect intonation, Wells (1999: 91) points out that certain British accents – including Birmingham, Liverpool, Newcastle and Glasgow – appear to have some tendency to use rising tones where most other accents have falling tones. Such tendencies are noted, for example, by Biddulph (1986: 3), who suggests that West Midland speech characteristically has a “peculiar” intonation involving terminal raising in statements, as well as negative verbs (such as <wor> *wasn't/weren't*) taking a markedly “high” tone. Wells (1999: 93) also points out that the working-class accents of the West Midlands (as well as Liverpool and some New York) characteristically have a **velarised** voice quality (that is, with the centre of gravity of the tongue further back and higher than for other accents).

1.4.2 Social variation

In addition to descriptions based upon the linguistic variable which continue, throughout the later half of the twentieth century, linguists began to turn their attention to the relationship between language and social class, particularly in relation to accent variation. One of the first of these was the American linguist William Labov. In order to investigate differences between accents, Labov (1966), undertook research based upon the notion of the linguistic variable. For example, one very noticeable linguistic variable in accents of the English language is rhoticity. This refers to the pronunciation /r/ when it occurs after a vowel (as in *bar*, *sort*, *churn*) and is usually known as ‘post-vocalic r’. How [r] is pronounced after vowels differs across the English speaking world. For example, RP is ‘r-less’ or non-rhotic, whilst Scots English or Cornish is ‘r-ful’ or rhotic. In the British Isles, rhoticity differentiates Scottish, Irish, Cornish, West Country, rural East Anglian and Northumbrian accents from most Midland and southern accents. It is also, in Britain, regarded as a low-prestige feature, associated with ‘backward’ rural areas. By contrast, in most of the USA, rhoticity is prestigious and its absence stigmatised.

Labov's influential study, based in New York City, showed that if speakers are ranked according to social class, then they can also be ranked in the same order by differences in the use of certain linguistic variables. One of the most notable of these is the variable (*r*) after vowels in words such as *lark* and *bar*. Labov wanted to demonstrate that patterns of variation existed in New York centred upon the use of the postvocalic /r/. Before undertaking a large-scale survey, Labov did a pilot study; that is, a small-scale survey to check and test the research methods used to ensure their reliability before embarking upon a large-scale survey. For this pilot survey Labov chose three sites, three department stores in Manhattan. His hypothesis was that sales assistants' accents in each of the three stores would largely reflect that of their typical customers, which in turn he believed would exemplify patterns of variation across the City. The three stores were Saks's Fifth Avenue, a high-status store, Macy's, regarded as middle-class and middle-priced, and Klein's, which sold cheaper items catering for poorer customers. Labov pretended to be a customer, but first he checked what items were for sale on the fourth floor of each store. He then asked sales people on different floors in each of the three department stores the whereabouts of items he knew to be on the fourth floor. He chose this particular floor because 'fourth floor' is a phrase that contains two tokens of postvocalic [r]. Having asked his question, such as 'Excuse me, where are the women's shoes?', Labov pretended to be hard of hearing and followed listening to the answer with a further 'Excuse me?'. In this way, he obtained two more tokens given in a careful, stressed way as the sales person repeated 'fourth floor'. He then repeated the exercise on the fourth floor itself, Labov asked sales assistants, 'Excuse me, which floor is this?'

Once Labov had received his answers, he would move out of sight as quickly as he could, and write down the pronunciation and details such as the gender, race and approximate age of the assistant. All three department stores are very large, and in this way Labov was able to gather data from 264 unsuspecting subjects. Multiplied by four tokens per informant, this gave a collected total of over 1,000 tokens of the variable (*r*), taken over six and a half hours in total. Analysis of the data confirmed Labov's hypothesis, and showed patterns of variation in the use of postvocalic /r/ according to the speech style, social class and linguistic context associated with each store. Of all the employees, 62 percent at Saks, 51 per cent at Macy's and 20 per cent at Klein's used [r] in at least one of the four tokens. All groups showed an increase in the use of [r] in the more deliberate repetition, and interestingly it was employees of Macy's the middle-status store, who showed the greatest increase. This seemed to indicate, as Labov later commented (1972: 52): 'It would seem that *r*-pronunciation is the norm at which a majority of Macy's employees aim, yet not the one they use most often'. On the quieter and often more expensive upper floors of Saks, the highest-ranking store, the percentage of [r] was also much greater than on the much busier ground floor.

Labov's pilot study showed that /r/ could be studied systematically. In the full scale survey that followed, a more representative sample of informants was used, by undertaking sampling procedures similar to those employed by sociological surveys. He divided his informants into six different groups, principally on basis of age and socio-economic class, and his findings confirmed those of his pilot study, in that his upper-class informants pronounced non-prevocalic /r/ most consistently, whereas by contrast, lower-

class informants pronounced it the least. In New York City postvocalic /r/ was associated with high status and prestige. He argued that his research showed language change in process, in that pronunciation of the postvocalic /r/ was spreading. Like other researchers into pronunciation, Labov found that it was lower class women who were responsible for the diffusion of /r/ pronunciation in the community, on the basis that they were particularly conscious of its prestige value.

Like the sales assistants in middle-class Macy's, Labov's full-scale study also discovered that lower middle class speakers, in more formal speaking styles, showed a greater increase in the use of [r], a phenomenon known as hypercorrection (see 1.3.2). These speakers' vocalisation of [r] went beyond that of the highest status group, in their tendency to use a pronunciation considered to be appropriate for formal styles. This use can be attributed to the position of the lower middle class in the class hierarchy, where its members wish to distance themselves from the working class and to become more like the upper class.

Trudgill (1974) replicated Labov's methodology in undertaking a study of non-standard variants in the city of Norwich in the East of England. Like Labov, Trudgill aimed to describe the norms of a whole city by detailed interviews with a sample of its population, in this case fifty adults and ten schoolchildren. He analysed several linguistic variables of grammar and accent. For example, in Norwich, as in other parts of England, there are two alternative forms for the third person singular present tense: *she runs, walks, skips* and so on and the local dialect form without the -s inflection: *she run, walk, skip* and so on. Trudgill found that there was a correlation between social class and use of this variable. His findings across all variables confirmed those of Labov, in that members of the lower working class used them the most often and that the lower middle class produce relatively more of the prestigious forms than do members of the social group immediately above them on the social scale.

Like Labov, Trudgill distinguished between **overt** and **covert prestige**. The issue of prestige is generally an important but complicated one in sociolinguistics. **Overt prestige** refers to the positive or negative assessment of a variant or a speech variety in accordance with the dominant norms of educational institutions, public media and upper middle-class speech. In Labov's New York City study, informants who made the highest use of stigmatised forms showed the greatest tendency to stigmatise others for their use of the same form. However, working class informants did not adopt middle class norms and the stability of working class norms calls for other explanations than those associated with prestige. **Covert prestige** refers to this set of opposing values implicit in lower and working class lifestyles that do not appear in conventional subject-reaction tests. Working class speech is thus seen as a mechanism for signalling participation in local norms and values, whereas middle class speech reveals a concern for social status and is thus a mechanism for solidarity. However, in his study, Trudgill also correlated gender as well as age and social class, and found that gender played a significant part in the use of variant forms. He found that within each social group, his female informants consistently used less of the non-standard variation than men. They also had a tendency to over-report their use of prestige forms whilst male informants were more likely to under-report them. Women in Norwich seemed more responsive to the overt prestige of the standard variety, while men seemed more responsive to the covert prestige of localised

Norwich speech. Thus, whilst Labov's study showed clear social stratification by status in New York City over the variable (r), Trudgill's study emphasises the difference gender makes in terms of solidarity with a local variant norm. The covert prestige of the vernacular is thus a counterbalancing force to the overt prestige of the standard variety. Account has to be taken of the fact, however, that Trudgill wrongly characterised women by their husband's social class, for which he has been criticised. He concluded that differences in attitude between the two countries reflects differences in class consciousness at the time, particularly the lack of any militant class-consciousness in the USA as compared with that of the UK, and the relative lack of 'embourgeoisement' of the British working class.

1.4.3 Variation and social networks

By the late twentieth century, studies undertaken into urban dialectology by linguists such as Labov and Trudgill were challenged by work undertaken by the Milroys (L.Milroy 1987; J. Milroy 1992). They took issue with the notion of the linguistic variable and variation theory in general. A study undertaken in Belfast led to the conclusion that the relationship between linguistic and social structures is not necessarily best examined by an exclusive exploration of social variables such as age and class. Instead, they based their research upon the notion of **social networks**. Rather than grouping speakers into predetermined categories such as social class, the social network situates an individual within the sum of his or her relationships, both formal and informal; with other people, such as family, friends, work colleagues; neighbourhood and relations based upon ethnicity. They found that particular kinds of networks will either inhibit or advance linguistic variation in a community.

For example, men in the Ballymacarett district of Belfast who worked in local shipyard with dense social networks bound by strong ties were more likely to enforce the prevailing linguistic norms and less likely to tolerate or encourage change. This differed from the women who, by contrast, often travelled outside the area to work and had fewer local ties. This points to their conclusion that dense, multiplex networks act as brakes on linguistic innovation, whilst weak ties between individuals seem to make the spread of linguistic innovation, such as new pronunciation or new words from network to network, easier. The Milroys argue that peripheral members of a community who have ties with other communities (through work, study or friends) effectively conduct or carry innovation into a community. Their conclusions complement Labov's arguments about change in progress, but provide far more information about the site and possible explanations of change.

Virtually all of the work undertaken in social and urban dialectology until this point had concentrated upon variation in phonology. Milroy and Milroy (1993) sought to redress this balance. The aim of their book was to raise the status of English regional dialects and to draw attention to their syntactic and morphological characteristics. To give a morphological example, in standard English, the past tense forms of *break* and *know* have been codified as *broke* and *know*. Verb forms such as *breaked* and *knowed*, have been part of the English language for centuries and still exist in regional dialects, but since they were not chosen as the past tense forms for standard English, are no longer used in writing or 'educated speech'. A syntactic example is that of multiple negation: *she never said nothing*. This pattern was outlawed by nineteenth century prescriptive grammarians, but was common in the middle English of Chaucer's time, used by Shakespeare and continues to be used by native speakers of English today as it remains a

grammatical feature of some dialects.

For example, in some English dialects *thee*, *thy* and *thou* are still to be heard instead of *you*. Other dialects retain forms of the verb *be* which is different from that of standard English, such as the Black Country dialect in England, centring upon the Midlands towns of Wolverhampton, Dudley and Walsall. For example, in the affirmative present tense:

<i>I am(am)</i>	I am (am)
You/Thou am (Y'am)	you are
S/he is	s/he is
We am	we are
You am (Y'am)	you are

Such variation, because of its high degree of dissimilarity and variation from standard English grammar, has been interpreted as an indication of ignorance, lack of intelligence and as a bastardised form of English. Such attitudes can be traced back to the ways in which English was standardised in England, summarized in 1.3.2 above. However, the Black Country dialect, far from being a bastardised form of English, has a history and pedigree dating back to the Middle English dialect of the West Midlands. The Black Country dialect is also noted for its highly contracted negative modal forms such as *ain't* (*am not/isn't/aren't, hasn't/haven't*) and *doe/doh/dow* (*doesn't/don't*).

(adapted from Clark 2004:261)

On-going investigations into the Black Country variety (Clark, forthcoming) have shown that syntactic forms discussed above are all still being widely used by men and women from all kinds of social backgrounds and different ages, particularly in social networks that are informal and localised, such as talking to friends and relatives. This is the case even where speakers have been educated to a level that includes higher education. On the whole, consistent use of most or all Black Country grammatical forms listed above is most prevalent amongst older speakers of the fifty plus generation. Younger speakers, especially adolescents and those of the twenty to thirty age group, tend to use them less, mostly the verb 'be' in its various tenses and its negative form. The use of dialect amongst adolescents has been the focus of recent studies, particular Eckert (1988 & 1989) and Kerswill & Williams 2000 & 2002). Eckert in her studies involving American adolescents, suggests that they are linguistically the most innovative of all generations and, through their peer groups, establish new norms that may diffuse to the wider community.

Kerswill and Williams investigated the role of adolescents in **dialect levelling** in three English towns: two in the south, Reading and Milton Keynes, and one in the north, Hull. Dialect levelling is a term used to describe changes in dialects that make them considerably more like standard English in phonology, grammar and vocabulary.

Kerswill and Williams examined phonological and grammatical variables and compared of teenage and elderly subjects, across middle and working classes and males and females. Their study showed, for phonological features, convergence between the two southern towns, whereas

convergence between the southern towns and the northern one was limited to some consonantal features (see also 1.4.1 above). Kerwill and Williams also tested Milroy's claim (L. Milroy 1987 & J. Milroy 1992) that network characteristics rather than class which account for the more levelled, standard speech of the middle classes than the working class. They found that, whilst the Milton Keynes working class speakers were more linguistically levelled than their Reading counterparts, they remained strongly non-standard and non-RP in grammar and pronunciation. They ascribed this to a lack of social, as opposed to geographical, mobility and to the maintenance of class-based cultural differences surrounding relationships with schools, literacy, authorities and employers.

In the same study, Kerwill and Williams also investigated adolescents' attitudes to language and social groups. They found that when discussing aspects of teenage culture, language issues evoked the strongest response. They expressed strong allegiance with their own peer group, framed in terms of in-group and out-group labels, and usually with reference to a hierarchical class structure. They also found that adolescents' self-identifications and their linguistic use did not stand in a one-to-one relationship: that is, what adolescents said about the way they spoke and how they actually spoke themselves did not always match. This led them to conclude that adolescents are partly, but not fully aware, of language change processes. However, they found a uniformity of attitudes towards language issues in both northern and southern schools, suggesting that part of the mechanism of levelling lies in these subjective parameters.

What all the studies summarised in this section show is that both linguistic variation in language use and processes of language change are inextricably bound up with issues of class, gender, age and culture. The study of variation and change, then, involves not only linguistic description, but also consideration of social and cultural issues in accounting for variation and processes of change.

1.5 Studying variation in English

The earlier sections in this chapter introduce issues in studying variation and change in English. As they have shown, the focus of research in linguistic variation is upon identifying differences in the actual production of language in one or more of the three areas of pronunciation or accent, vocabulary and grammar. The focus of research into language change has normally been across different generations. A further associated area of research is into attitudes towards variation.

A purely linguistic description of variation in itself does not explain *why* variation occurs. For such an account to take place, notice has to be taken of non-linguistic variables which derive from the social context or networks within which linguistic variation takes place.

What we mean by a **variable** is a feature which has a number of possible 'values', or in the case of linguistic variables, we might say that they have a number of potential 'realisations'. Thus, the phoneme /t/ can be said to have a number of possible variants (or allophones), including at least [t], [t̪], [t̚] and [ʔ] (glottal stop). See chapter 2 of DLDE for further information on phonological variation. Any investigation of the variable 't', therefore, would be looking to collect examples of possible /t/ phonemes, and see whether there is any patterning in the occurrence of different variants, perhaps in relation to syllable structure, word structure, or in the case of glottal stop, issues of formality of

setting or class of the speaker. In the case of non-linguistic or social variables, the variants will be the different social classes informants may belong to, their age, their geographical origins and so on. Thus, the variable itself would be known by its generic name, such as 'social class' and the variants would be lower-middle class, upper-working class etc. Much of the discussion and advice that follows will refer to linguistic and non-linguistic variables in the sense just defined.

1.5.1 Selecting a topic for research

The first thing to decide is the specific question you wish to address. For example, you may wish to investigate variation:

- > in a particular geographical area;
- > in a particular ethnic group;
- > between two neighbouring areas;
- > across different age groups;
- > across different social classes;
- > across different ethnic groups;
- > the same person in different social settings
- > attitudes towards variation.

The second thing to decide when undertaking your own research is its focus:

- Investigating variation in a particular geographical area will involve you in selecting the area upon which you wish to concentrate, deciding upon the linguistic variables you wish to investigate and selecting the nonlinguistic variables for your sample of informants (see 1.5.2 below).
- Investigating variation between two neighbouring areas is similar to the first example above, but two regions are chosen instead of one. For example, you may wish to investigate two neighbouring villages rather than one town or city, or two neighbouring conurbations of a city.
- Investigating variation in a particular ethnic group will involve you in selecting the ethnic group you wish to investigate. If you want to add a social dimension to your study, then you will need to consider the settings within which you wish to undertake the investigation, for example, a domestic setting or in a workplace and the impact this has upon language use.
- Investigating variation across different age groups, genders, social classes and ethnic groups will involve you in identifying the ages, social classes and/or ethnic groups you wish to investigate and how you intend to restrict these non-linguistic variables to make the project manageable and the results clear. Investigating variation across different age groups, particularly if you include the oldest generation through to children in your study, lends itself to investigating language change over the time span of half a century or more.
- Investigating attitudes towards variation should not be confused with investigations of the linguistic variation itself, since how people *think* they speak and how they *actually* speak can be very different. This kind of topic is usually best undertaken by a questionnaire, and one which includes dialect recognition as part of its design, or as a separate element (see 1.4.3 above and 1.5.3 below).

For all of the examples above except for the last, and for any study into linguistic variation, once you have decided upon its focus and scope, you then need to decide on the specific linguistic variable(s) you wish to investigate and any non-linguistic variables too.

If you choose to investigate phonological or grammatical variation, then you will have to decide whether you are going to choose specific variables to focus on, or whether you are going to let any potential linguistic variable emerge from your data. Investigating lexical variation will involve discussing situations where lexical variation is most likely to occur, for example, topics relating to food and drink, or discussing word lists of some kind.

Non-linguistic variables include factors such as geographical origin, age, gender, social class, ethnicity and so on. The decisions to be made here involve selecting specific non-linguistic variables and the extent to which you control each one. For example, choosing informants who are all of a similar age, geographical location or gender means that instead of investigating differences between informants with different backgrounds, you will have provided a control for those variables which are therefore invariant. However, the extent to which you control each of these non-linguistic variables will depend upon the aim of your study. For example, a study looking at one age group ironically finds out least about what is specific to that age group, because it has nothing to compare its results with. This is why a study which considers linguistic variation in relation to age is best undertaken from informants of different ages. From a practical point of view, though, it is not sensible to investigate variation across different age groups if you do not know many people from different age groups. If your study relates to geographical area, which it most likely will, then you need to decide on the extent of that area and its boundaries. Your access to it is also important. Equally, if you select gender as one of your non-linguistic variables, then you must be sure that you know enough people of either gender who would be willing to act as informants. Undertaking fieldwork is fraught with enough pitfalls without the added complication of setting yourself unrealistic or overambitious parameters of non-linguistic variation (see discussion on **sampling** in 1.5.2 below). For this reason, and also to avoid having to carry out overly complex statistical testing, the suggested list of topics below confines itself to one or two non-linguistic variables.

Once you have selected a topic and the focus for your research, then you are in a position to design your project and collect the data required for your investigation.

1.5.2 Project design

Your project should be carefully designed to reflect your research question, and will usually fall under the general heading of a quantitative or a qualitative study. The former aims to quantify the number of variants of a linguistic variable, and sometimes also to plot these results against non-linguistic variables. The latter considers the nature of linguistic features in context, and normally explores a text or set of texts in more depth, often considering a range of variables, rather than restricting the study to a narrow selection.

So, for example, a quantitative study may involve the investigation of h-dropping in different generations of Londoners, and would need to obtain data from a roughly equal number of different informants within a set of pre-determined age-ranges such as the following:

	18-27	35-44	52- 60	70+	
Number of					
informants:	20	18	22	16	

We will look a little later at the issues involved in analysing data arising from a project like this one. For now, let us consider a typical qualitative research project, in order for the distinction to be clear. Whilst the h-dropping project focuses on a single variable, in this case the pronunciation (or dropping) of the glottal fricative, /h/, a qualitative project might wish to look more broadly at the phonology of a particular speaker or speakers who share a similar background, such as geographical or ethnic origin. This would probably involve a longer recording of individual speakers, rather than focussed data which aims to elicit the particular variable, as in the case of the h-dropping study.

The precise nature of the data you collect is not entirely determined by whether your study is quantitative or qualitative, though there are tendencies to use different methods of data collection to produce either statistical or contextual results. We will consider both the different kinds of data collection and also their correspondence to categories of research type in the next section. Before we do so, however, we will introduce some very important principles of how to choose the informants that you use for research into language variation, particularly, and most vitally, where you are planning to carry out a statistical or quantitative study.

The way in which you choose informants or the principles of selection are known as **sampling**. Sampling can be of three different kinds: **Random**, **structured** and **opportunistic**. If you wish to establish the patterning of linguistic usage in a particular group, for example, the English morphology of New Yorkers, you may decide to use **random sampling** to acquire your set of informants. This use of the term ‘random’ is a very precise and technical one, and does not relate to the colloquial use of the word which may indicate an accidental set of occurrences or items. The random sample in this more technical sense refers to set of informants (for our purposes) who have been chosen from a well-defined population by the use of random number tables or computer-generated random numbers. For the above project, then, the population would be the whole of the population of New York city, and in order to be sure that your sample was representative, you would need to choose people from the electoral register or phone book, or some other comprehensive listing, using random numbers based on the total population, to make sure that everyone has an equal chance of being picked in the sample. You will appreciate that this is not an easy route to take, and you also have to build in certain factors, such as the reluctance of some people to take part in surveys and interviews. However, it is possible to imagine a much smaller population – such as the whole first year of a University course, and still use the random sampling technique, to make sure that you are not skewing the results in favour of, for example, people who you know, because it is likely that they will not be representative of the whole population.

Although random sampling is the most reliable method of getting a representative sample, there is another kind of sampling technique which suits many research projects on variation, particularly where you wish to compare the linguistic usage of informants with different ages, social classes or ethnic or geographical origins. This is known as **structured sampling**, and reflects the desire to

create a balanced sample, using non-linguistic variables to define the different groups of informants. Thus, we may decide that we wish to study dialect words for small, individual portions of bread, baked as a separate unit (i.e. not a slice of bread). The very many possibilities in British English include *bap*, *roll*, *breadcake*, *teacake* and *barmcake*, and these are the variants that the research would be investigating. In order to establish whether there are regional differences, we may decide to take a sample of people in cities in the South West, South East, East and West Midlands and the North East and North West regions of England – say, Bristol, London, Leicester, Wolverhampton, Newcastle and Manchester. These six samples will be made up of those informants that we are able to get hold of and who are willing to be part of the project. Whilst in an ideal world, they might also be chosen from those populations by random sampling, the enormity of the task would probably preclude this. The important issue for structured sampling, to make sure that the different categories of informant are able to be compared, is to make sure that there are a minimum of 5, and preferably more, in each group. So, to return to the h-dropping project discussed earlier, we have a minimum of 16 in the categories, and their results are therefore comparable. If we were to add another social variable, for example, gender, to see whether this linguistic feature is more marked in men or women, we would immediately double the number of informants needed:

	18-27	35-44	52- 60	70+
Number of male informants	20	18	22	16
Number of female informants	22	16	20	18

The other issue that arises when more than one social variable is introduced as well as the linguistic variable is the difficulty of analysing the results. For quantitative projects, you would need to perform some fairly sophisticated (multivariate) statistical tests on data of this kind, and before you do so, it is recommended that you read up on some of the basic statistical principles (see section 1.6 for suggestions and Woods, Fletcher, Hughes & Anderson 1986).

Apart from random and structured sampling, the other form of sampling is opportunistic, and as long as you are not trying to make great generalised claims for your findings, and are thus probably carrying out qualitative research, then this is fine. Opportunistic sets of data will be collected from friends, family and others with whom you are in contact.

1.5.3 Methods of data collection

A very common form of quantitative data collection is to use questionnaires or surveys. This is because the same questionnaire or survey can be sent out to a large number of people to gather information from as many informants as possible. Sound recordings of interviews and transcriptions based upon dependant or pre-given variables can also be used as a quantitative method, particularly if you are investigating phonological variables. For example, in Kerswill & Williams's 2002 study summarised in 1.5.3 above, 100 adolescent participants were tape recorded across the three towns drawn from two secondary schools in each area., totalling about ninety hours of tape recording. This data was compared with recordings taken from four to six elderly

participants in each area from a working class background and who had lived in the area since birth, plus data from the SED (see 1.4.2 above).

Qualitative methods of data collection are used in studies where more in-depth study is required, normally gathered from a small sample. The most usual form of data collection here is interviews, usually taped.. In Clark's 2004 study of the phonology of the English West Midlands, five informants were tape recorded totalling two hours of tape recording, and the data was compared with previously published findings such as Wells(1999) and Biddulph (1986). Comparison of this kind thus adds a limited quantitative dimension to a study. Whereas questionnaires can be sent out to a large number of people, interviews by their very nature are time-consuming, and most research studies do not have the time or the resources to conduct large numbers of interviews. Talking to people face to face also allows for flexibility in a way which is not possible with questionnaires. It is important to remember that a method of data collection is not of itself either quantitative or qualitative. Rather, the terms refer to the ways in which you use the methods and to the size of your sample. For example, you could design a questionnaire to send to ten informants, and then follow up the questionnaire with interviews, interviewing five of the ten informants. Both methods of questionnaire and interview would be used in a qualitative way. Similarly, you could design a questionnaire to send to five hundred informants, in which case you would be using the method in a quantitative way. The difference between the two is not only one of data collection, but also of aim. If your aim is to investigate variation across two or three different regions, such as phonological variation in three towns such as Kerswill (2004) or across the British Isles such as Widdowson & Upton (2006) or grammatical variation across the British Isles as in Cheshire (1993), then quantitative methods are probably best. Equally, if your study involves attitudes towards variation, then the more people who give you that information the better, and questionnaires are also appropriate here. For example, a student of mine undertook a study into attitudes towards local accents by employers. The focus of her study was call centres, and she sent questionnaires to the Personnel departments of ten different national call centres, to find out what account was taken of regional accents in determining employability.

If your aim is undertake an in-depth study of linguistic variation in a specific geographical location, then qualitative methods can be the most appropriate. Thus, although Kortmann & Schneider's (2004) two volume publication investigates linguistic variation across the world, each chapter investigates a specific locality and the methods used in most cases were qualitative ones. For example, a local brewery requested that research be undertaken into lexical variation for words to do with beer and drinking which they could use in an advertising campaign, which was targeted at men. They wanted to make sure that the dialect words and phrases they used were not only authentic but also conformed to dialect spelling. This project involved students employing qualitative methods of interviewing and recording, talking to men in local pubs about their drinking habits.

The main methods of data collection you choose then, will depend upon your research question and the focus of your study.

Structured sampling can also be used in qualitative studies, although the size and range of the sample will not be sufficient for any worthwhile statistical analysis to be undertaken. For example, the following table shows the distribution of informants for one qualitative study:

	British Asian	British White
Male	1	1
Female	1	2

The topic under investigation here is phonological variation between different ethnic groups across both genders in a specific geographical location. The number of informants is five in total, which is normally a minimum *in each category* for the purposes of comparison, and the number of non-linguistic variables is two; gender and ethnicity. It is sensible to restrict non-linguistic variables in a qualitative study of this kind to a maximum of two, since this makes the focus of your study clear. Too many non-linguistic variables in such a small range of informants could mean that it is difficult to draw any worthwhile conclusions.

Whether or not your sample is random or structured, it is important to bear in mind that five long interviews or less are not really sufficient to provide you with enough data upon which to draw general conclusions about social variability. Any conclusions that are drawn would have to be provisional upon a larger study in order for them to be worthwhile. Thus, for the study into dialect words and phrases for beer and drinking mentioned earlier, students interviewed informants in pairs, and each pair of students interviewed five informants. The data they gathered provided information on lexis, grammar and pronunciation, but the data gathered by each pair of students was not sufficient to draw conclusions about how such information linked to social networks or social class. However, the data gathered in this way by ten pairs of students produced data from ten different interviews and fifty informants over a period of two weeks. In this case, sufficient data has been produced for analysis and conclusions about social variability to be drawn. In another study, a doctoral research student investigating variation of register in which social variation was also a factor, recorded forty children aged between eight and twelve over a period of eighteen months in six different primary schools. Data for a study involving social variability can thus be gathered by various researchers interviewing informants at the same time, or by one researcher interviewing and/or recording informants over a period of time, of about a year to eighteen months.

The biographical information of your informants is a crucial source for providing the contextual information within which your study is located. Consequently, it is important that you obtain biographical details of each of your informants. This information will include not only standard items such as name, age and address but also factors which may have a bearing on language use such as level of education, length of time spent in the locality and the birth place of parents or even grandparents. The best way of obtaining this information is to design a biographical sheet with all the categories on it you wish informants to fill in, and ask them to complete it either at the start or at the end of your interview. The advantage of this is that you have an easily available written record to which you can refer. Alternatively, you could ask for the information as questions at the start of an interview by way of an ice-breaker, although this will involve you in additional form filling or transcription after the event.

Once you have established your variables and your sample, then you need to collect your data. The main methods used for this purpose are questionnaires and/or recording of some kind.

Questionnaires

If the main method of your data collection is a questionnaire, then you will need to issue sufficient questionnaires to ensure a return that is going to be of any use. As a rough guide, expect a fifty percent return. People do not return questionnaires they are sent for a number of reasons, including lack of time or lack of interest. This means that to obtain ten completed questionnaires, you will need to send out twenty.

A written questionnaire may be used as a main source of data collection when investigating grammar, lexis or attitudes towards language use, though it is worth considering the more formal nature of the written language if you are trying to obtain information on spoken grammar or informal lexis. It is important when designing a questionnaire that you are clear about the kinds of questions you want to ask. **Closed** questions are ones which require a yes/no answer, semi-open or **multiple choice** questions are ones which invite informants to choose from a restricted list of options and **open** questions invite informants to give their own answers. For example, an investigation into grammatical variation may include a question such as: *Do you ever say 'I don't know nothing'?* This question invites the answer *yes* or *no*, and is thus a closed question. A 'yes' answer will give you information on informants who use this expression, but a 'no' answer does not allow for identification of any other non-standard negative constructions such as *'I ay know nothing'*. It is thus not a very useful tool for discovering the usage in this area. A semi-open question would be one which says: *tick the following expressions you are most likely to use* followed by a list of negative constructions, and including a final category of 'other' which captures anything you have not included. An open question would be one which invites informants to give their own categories and descriptions such as: *How do you say 'no' to something?* It is also important to avoid leading questions: that is, questions which invite a specific response. For example, a question such as 'Do you think the Queen speaks good English?' is more likely than not lead to the answer 'yes'. Note that non-standard grammatical constructions may not be acknowledged by speakers anxious to be on their 'best' linguistic behaviour, so more indirect methods of discovering this information are useful. These would include, for example, recordings of informants speaking in relatively informal surroundings.

To return to questionnaires, it is a good idea to have a mixture of all three kinds of questions, since it is very difficult if not impossible to predict all possible answers to a closed or multiple-choice question. The amount of time it takes to process a questionnaire, however, should also be taken into account. Although closed questions limit the number of possible answers, they are the quickest to process since all they require is an adding up of the responses to each option. Open questions require more time, since there is potential here for every answer to be different.

Once you have designed your questionnaire, then you will need to pilot it before distributing it. That is, you need to try it out on a few people to make sure the questions you ask are clear and will get you the information you want. Piloting your questionnaire will allow you judge how successful your design has been, and to make any subsequent changes or adjustments thrown up by the pilot. For example, a questionnaire whose questions were regularly misunderstood by informants in the pilot study, or where the questions turn out to be leading the informants more than expected, should be redesigned and piloted again.

Recordings

If you are trying to obtain more natural spoken language, and a questionnaire does not suit your project, you may need to record informants as your main source of data. This choice, unless you have a great deal of money and many research assistants to help, will push your project in the qualitative direction. However, it would in theory be possible to record a large number of informants in the way described below, if resources were available.

To collect recordings which will generate sufficient data for analysis, you need to record informants for interviews for up to one hour, depending upon the focus of your research. Recordings of spoken data can be of different kinds. Different types of spoken data are:

- > reading word lists or passages aloud;
- > interviews between you and the informant(s);
- > conversation between informants;
- > conversation or interview about a written questionnaire or other form of written data such as a spidergram (see 1.5.3 below).

Reading aloud involves selecting material which all informants will read. This method of data collection restricts you to identifying phonological variables, although the more formal nature of writing may affect more naturally occurring speech. Even so, reading a passage could test, for example, the pronunciation of /t/ in different contexts, including, for instance, syllable-final glottal stops, and comparing this with the reading of a word list, which is more formal still, can give an idea of the variation according to social context. Usually, where reading aloud is used as a form of data collection, then it is accompanied by another form of data collection which produces more naturally occurring data, such as interviews.

Interviews involve you in preparing questions in advance which you then ask of all your informants. Interview questions usually fall into one of three categories: **structured**, **semi-structured** and **unstructured** or open. **Structured** interview questions are ones where all the questions asked of informants are the same, asked in the same order, with no room for any additional or supplementary questions. **Semi-structured** interview questions are ones where most of the questions are the same and asked in the same order, but with additional or supplementary questions added. **Unstructured** interviews are ones where no questions are determined in advance and conversation, rather than an interview, is left to take any direction. For example, a **structured** interview will have, say, five questions which every informant is asked and has to be asked, in the same order. For example, in the study students undertook on behalf of a local brewery, then a structured interview was undertaken, asking all informants the questions: *Is this your local? What beer do you drink? How does x beer compare with others? What words or phrases do you associate with drinking beer? With drinking x?* The advantage of this kind of interview is that it makes comparison across the questions for the purposes of analysis straightforward, particularly if you are interviewing large numbers of informants. The disadvantage is that it does not allow for any interesting answers to be developed or pursued.

A **semi-structured** interview will have say, three main questions with supplementary questions added designed to draw out further information and scope for digression within the framework of the main questions, should it occur. For example, main questions can centre upon recent events such as: *Do you go to the cinema often? What was the last film you saw? What is your favourite film?* Each of these questions could have additional ones such as: *do you go locally or elsewhere?*

Do you enjoy films by that director and so on. The advantage of this kind of interview is that it does allow for discussion to develop, but may make comparison of data other than the answers for the main questions more time-consuming.

An **unstructured** interview has no pre-determined questions. The advantage is that discussion can be more free-flowing and not tied to answering particular questions; the disadvantages are that should the interview dry up, then the interviewer is thrown back on her/his own resources and the data generated might not have sufficiently similar items or topics to make comparison possible.

For the purposes of sociolinguistic research, and depending upon your own specific research question, the questions you prepare for interview will normally be semi-structured. This is so that you can make sure any variables you wish to investigate, particularly phonological ones, are covered by the answers to the questions you ask, which can then be compared with one another for the purposes of identifying variation. Questions are there to help the flow of conversation and keep it going, and semi-structured interviews allow for the addition of supplementary questions to the main questions asked. They are intended to cover ground that the speaker does not volunteer, and to ensure that all informants discuss roughly the same topic. For this reason, semi-structured interviews are ones which will have the greatest degree of success in capturing the data you wish to collect. Semi-structured interviews also allow for lines of conversation that develop during the course of your conversation to be included in ways in which structured interviews do not. Alternatively, depending upon your research focus, you may choose to conduct unstructured interviews which are likely to resemble conversation more than undertaking an interview. Here, the speech you capture may sound more natural than that of reading passages or interviews. By their very nature, unstructured interviews are unpredictable, and you will need to be prepared to cope with occasions such as conversation drying up or where one person dominates the conversation to the exclusion of others. For occasions of this kind, it is a good idea to have some questions ready such as *when did you last go on holiday?* in case you need them. The important thing to remember above all else is to choose methods of data collection that are going to give you the data that will best answer the research question you have chosen to investigate. The choice of data collection for any study should always be justified in the write-up.

Recording and talking about speech make people more aware and conscious of it, and gives rise to a phenomenon identified by Labov (1966) called **the observer's paradox**. This refers to the fact that it is impossible to observe someone 'behaving naturally' without affecting what they do or how they do it. This paradox can affect informants' speech in two main ways. An interview situation brings with it a certain degree of formality which affects speakers' use of language. Added to this, if the topic of conversation is the informants' speech itself then this too makes speakers more aware of what they are saying and even more likely to formalise their speech. For this reason you need to think very carefully about the questions you are going to ask. Questions which take the focus of attention away from speech onto other topics is always a good idea, such as Labov's (1972) 'danger of death' hypothesis: *Were you ever in a situation where you thought you were in serious danger?*

You may get better results and minimise the observer's paradox by interviewing people about their views on a particular topic where the emphasis is upon something other than informants' speech. Another decision to be made is whether you interview your informants one at a time, or

in pairs. Interviewing them in pairs can take the focus of attention away from you as the interviewer and allow for more varied dialogue and thus also minimise the observer's paradox.

Investigating attitudes towards language use is particularly problematic area to study, not least because people's perceptions of how they or others speak are often at odds with actual use (see Kerswill & Williams 2002). It is difficult to assess the reliability of a person's judgement of this without recourse to other evidence, such as a dialect recognition experiment (Kerswill & Williams 2002). This involves playing taped extracts of samples of speech and asking informants to identify their own community dialect. An experiment of this kind could also be written instead of spoken. A study into attitudes works best if it has a focus, rather than the vague notion of attitudes, such as attitudes towards employability as in the example given above. For the purposes of reliability, **triangulation** is often employed in data collection: that is, more than one method of data collection is used to cross-reference results across different methods. Thus, the usage reported by informants could be compared with naturally occurring conversation (perhaps in response to the 'danger of death' question), so that the accuracy of self-reporting can be checked.

One final set of issues you need to consider before you begin to collect your data, especially taped recordings, are those to do with **ethics**. These include issues about the ways in which you collect your data, and how you obtain the informants' consent. If your main method of data collection involves questionnaires, then completing and particularly returning a questionnaire means that the informant is happy for you to use the information provided. Ethical issues are more complex when it comes to recording. The ways in which you are going to collect your data may be done in an **overt** or **covert** way. An **overt** way is where the use of the recorder is obvious and your informants are in no doubt that they are being recorded. They are also fully aware of the reasons why they are being recorded and that the topic of the interview or conversation is the one which is being researched. A **covert** way of recording is where you either collect your recording without informants' realising that you are doing so, or, you give a reason other than the real one as to why you are collecting data.

Undertaking data collection in an overt way involves obtaining informants' permission to undertake recording before the recording itself takes place. If no permission is given, then no recording takes place. Undertaking it in a covert way is more problematic. If you record informants without their knowledge, then you need to obtain their permission after the event before you can use the data. One way to get around the paradox is to give a reason other than the real one to obtain that permission. For example, you wish to record informants' speech to study phonological variation and its relation to social class or regional identity, but you tell your informants that you are conducting a survey into eating habits. Making the focus of the interview and recording something other than the informants' own use of language gives you more chance of obtaining more naturally occurring data than would otherwise be the case. However, if the informant is kept ignorant of the real reason why they are being recorded then this remains an ethical consideration. A way of getting around this, is to tell the informant after the recording has been completed the real reason why they have been recorded, and, in the light of this new information, ask for their permission again.

1.5.4 Sound and video recording

Central to the data you collect will be your informants' speech. The medium you use to record this can be chosen from a wide range that includes an MP3 player, camcorder, laptop or digital audio tape (DAT) in addition to the standard audio cassette and cassette recorder. For the purposes of researching variation in English, and especially accent, sound recording is by far the most reliable source of data, since this captures sound as it is actually used. Video recording has allowed an extra dimension in data analysis, since it captures the context in which naturally occurring language is used. However, because the focus of research into variation is usually the language itself, and not, for example, body language or facial expression, then it is still usual to use a sound recorder such as an audio cassette, or (increasingly) minidisk, as the main method of data collection.

The kind of microphone you use is also important. Many cassette players have built-in microphones, but the sound quality they capture can be very poor, and for this reason it is best to have a separate microphone, and one which is omni-directional: that is, captures sound from multiple directions. Since an interview can last up to an hour, it is best to place the microphone between the informants rather than to hold it, since holding a microphone can be not only obtrusive but also tiring. The best place for the microphone is to set it up so that it is spaced equally between you and the informants, so that you are all speaking across the microphone. The ideal place is on a level close to the informants' mouths, which will allow for speech to be picked up clearly by the microphone. Try not to position the microphone too close to the interviewees' mouths or you will get a distorted sound. Positioning the microphone roughly thirty centimetres from the interviewees and positioning yourself the same distance next to them is best. That way your questions can also be clearly heard. It is also vital that you check how the microphone works and if it works in advance of your recording, and that you are absolutely sure you have it plugged into the correct socket on the tape recorder. Also, you need to be aware of any peripheral noise such as a fridge humming in the background, that might affect your recording.

Some recorders allow you to set a recording level to help with the avoidance of distortion. There will be a meter which shows the level, plus a dial to adjust it. To set the level, ask your informants some simple questions such as: 'What did you have for breakfast?' or 'Where did you go on holiday?' whilst you adjust the setting. Other recorders may offer recording level options such as 'high' or 'low'. Here you can ask your questions and play back to judge which is the right setting.

A further important factor to take into account is the location in which the recording is to take place. The overriding aim of recording is to record speech which is as close to that used by informants when the recorder is not there. You will need to be in a reasonably quiet location, where there will not be too many interruptions, and in a setting where your informants feel comfortable. For this reason, it is important to interview informants in a setting which is familiar, for example a domestic setting such as their own home, or a social setting such as a café, bar or pub, or, if investigating younger children, a playground, either at school or close to home. For example, if you are investigating lexical variation of words to do with beer and drinking, then the most logical setting for such investigation is a pub. However, you need to record at a time when the pub is not too noisy, or arrange with the landlord if you could have exclusive use of a room. Similarly, if you wish to investigate phonological variation between people of different ages, then a family gathering or social occasion such as a birthday party or family gathering is appropriate,

though it would need to be small enough to record individual conversations, but large enough to generate suitable data.

You will also need to decide in advance and let your informants know how long the interview or recording session is going to take. This will involve agreeing a start and end time for the recording session, which allows for an actual hour of recording time.

Depending upon the focus of your study, your recording may centre upon discussion of a written document such as a spidergram, mentioned in 1.x. above. (For more information on this technique, see: www.bbc.co.uk/voices). Here, informants are given a sheet of paper which asks them to list alternative vocabulary items for certain groups of words. The spidergram may be given to informants in advance to complete, with an interview being recorded subsequently to discuss the items listed, or it can be completed as part of the interview. For example, this technique would be a good one to use when interviewing men (and women) about drinking habits and beer.

In order to play back recorded speech, it is important to have a recorder that will do the job you want it to do. One with a built-in counter and speed control is especially useful. The counter will let you pin point sections of tape easily, and a speed control will let you vary the speed of the recording, which is particularly useful when it comes to transcribing. The development of digital recording has allowed electronic resources such as sound files to be developed. Another resource is electronic data bases such as the Newcastle electronic corpus of Tyneside English. This has been developed into a major corpus of Tyneside English, an area of North Eastern England, with orthographic and phonetic transcription, tagging and sound files (see: www.ncl.ac.uk/necte).

Once you are ready to start recording, then note the date, time and location of recording, both on the tape itself and on a sheet of paper. Make sure your questions and/or any other material you may need are to hand, including preparation for follow-up questions and 'drying-up' or the unexpected. Something you will also have to bear in mind is that conversation, and the circumstances in which it takes place, can be unpredictable. You have to be prepared to record more than once and for greater lengths of time than you actually need in order to obtain sufficient data for analysis. It is always far better to have too much than too little.

1.5.5 Transcribing data

Once you have completed your recordings, then your next task is transcription. Transcription is a very time-consuming business, and is best done with a tape recorder that lets you slow down the pace of the speech, so you can transcribe it more easily, or by using a digital recorder.

There are two main types of transcription: **phonetic** and **orthographic**. The kind of transcription you undertake will depend upon your research question. For example, if you are undertaking a phonological study, then you will need to transcribe phonetically using the IPA (see *DL:DE Chapter 1*). The reason for using the IPA is because it allows for the notation of more sounds than the alphabet allows, and can be used consistently to represent the same sounds whilst the alphabet is not consistent in relation to sound.

There are two general types of **phonetic transcription: narrow transcription** and

broad transcription. **Narrow transcription** gives precise details of sound, encoding information about the phonetic variations of the specific **allophones** in the utterance. **Broad transcription** gives a basic idea of the sound and is usually a transcription of the **phonemes** of an utterance. In dialectology, broad transcription is generally used. For example:

Erm in about (.) erm twenty seven weeks I go away to cuba

(:ʔ (ʔ (vʔ (:ʔ ??????? ????ʔ ??:?? (?((??? ?(?v:ʔ(

for two weeks er 'nd four days in Havana and ten days in a holiday

?(?v: ??:?? (:ʔʔ ?(: ???? (? ?(ʔ(ʔ(?? ??? ???? (? (?(????):

Resort erm its cost about two thousand pounds for the two of us (.)

????(:ʔ (:ʔ ??? ?(ʔʔ (?vʔ ?v: (?ʔ(ʔʔ ??(??? ?((? ?v: (? (?

This transcription is taken from a recording of an informant speaking in a regional English accent, that of the Black Country. One of the characteristics of this accent is use of the diphthongs, such as that of [ɪ] previously identified by both Mathison (1999: 109-10) and Clark (2004:262), whilst Wells (1982:539) points out that there is quite a degree of phonetic variation. These findings are illustrated in the transcript above, where (appears in (?vʔ, ??? ??? ?????????? a(in (?ʔ(ʔʔ and ??(???.

It is important that you listen to a passage several times before beginning your transcription. This is so that you can be absolutely sure that you know exactly what a speaker has said in order to transcribe it faithfully since you cannot, as in a written text, rely upon a variety of interpretations.

Orthographic transcription uses the standard alphabet, in writing down verbatim what is said (also see 2.8.3). This is usually set out like a play script, with speakers' identified in the left hand margin and the text of what they say next to their name. It is conventional not to use capital letters or other punctuation in such transcription. It is also important that you transcribe what you *hear*, including utterances not normally found in writing such as 'um', 'er', and so on, and resist the temptation to modify what you write into written, grammatical and punctuated standard English. For example, the following extract has been transcribed both phonetically and orthographically:

Once you have decided which form of transcription you are going to use, then if this is relevant to your study, you need to select the parts you wish to transcribe, Bearing in mind that phonetic transcription takes longer than orthographic transcription, as a rule of thumb it takes between seven to ten hours to transcribe one hour of recording, so you can see why it is so important to select sections of recording for transcription, rather than to transcribe whole recordings.

The criteria you use for selecting sections for transcription will depend upon the focus of your study. The focus will to a large extent determine the criteria, and it is a good idea to have a list of those criteria when you listen to the recordings and make your selection. For example, if you are

intending to analyse differences in accent of a particular geographical area, then you need to select the sections where your informants are most at ease, which is most likely to be once your interview or conversation has become established, which would be after about ten minutes into your recording. Depending upon the focal point of the study, you might decide to use a broader or narrower transcription system (see: *DLDE* Chapter 1). If the focus of your study is lexis and/or grammar, then may be less need to transcribe or to transcribe in short sections where the relevant structures or lexical items are used.

1.5.6 Analysing data

Once you have transcribed your recordings, then you are in a position to analyse them. The focus of your analysis will depend upon the focus of your study, but will almost certainly concentrate upon identifying regular patterns of difference in accent, vocabulary or grammar. Depending again upon the focus of your study, and especially if you have chosen to investigate grammar, vocabulary or attitudes towards language use, then you may have other data to analyse, such as questionnaires.

Identifying patterns of linguistic variation can be achieved by comparing your data with standard English and RP. This will involve you in not only identifying patterns of difference in the speech itself, but also taking account of the non-linguistic variables you have included in your study, such as age, gender, social class and ethnicity which may account for the variation. Any conclusion you may draw here as of necessity to be tentative, since you may not easily be able to tell which variable is responsible for the linguistic variation unless you are in a position to perform statistical tests on large amounts of quantitative data.

The first thing you need to do is to identify patterns of difference or variation in your data. For example, the following transcript is taken from a study of the Walsall dialect in the West Midlands area of England. The dialect of this area is known as the Black Country dialect. From interviews of five white British informants aged between forty and fifty, of whom three were female and two male and all of whom left school aged fifteen or sixteen with no formal qualifications, the following features of non-standard grammar were identified:

1. J: yeah, he got me a job ‘cos I **wor**...well, I was working, but I changed jobs ‘cos it was nearer, **worn** it?
2. K: and **her** came back Sunday
3. M: that’s got to be our jodhpurs **wot** we make
4. K: and then **her come** back Sunday
5. K: **them** chickens
6. J: **Never** touched it
7. K: and the zip was **broke** so he says
8. K: was that one **yorn**?

Once you have completed this first level of analysis, then you can undertake a second level, which is to identify the grammatical forms and present them in a table, given below. Column A describes the feature in grammatical terms, column B gives an example, and column C gives the first occurrence of each feature from five transcripts, with subsequent occurrences listed.

A Feature	B Example	C script and line
1. Dialect use of preterite <to be> <was> affirmative <were> negative	<was> <worn>	1.3, 1.4
2. Non-standard use of <her> would be <she> in SE	<her>	3.2, 3.3
3. <wot> for SE <that> (relative pronoun)	<what>	2.7
4. Preterite identical to present tense	<come>	3.3, 5.5
5. <them> for demonstrative <those>	<them>	4.1
6. <never> as past tense negator	<never>	5.10, 5.12
7. (adjectival) past participle identical to preterite: <broke> for SE <broken>	<broke>	2.6 (2.8)
8. <yorn> for SE <yours> (2nd person possessive pronoun)	<yorn>	2.9

A third level of analysis would involve identifying grammatical features which are specific to a particular dialect, and those which are a more general feature of non-standard dialects. For example, from the data given above, then dialect use of the 2nd person possessive pronoun as in the last example **yorn** is a distinctive feature of the Black Country dialect, identified in previous studies. **Never** in example 6 as a past tense indicator or past participles being identical to preterites such as **broke** in example 7 are features to be found in several non-standard dialects.

Having analysed your own data, then a comparison can be drawn with studies previously published to draw conclusions and to see whether or not your data affirms or contradicts that previously undertaken.

If your study involves researching attitudes towards language use, then your analysis will centre upon identifying what these attitudes actually are and possibly, in addition, where these attitudes come from. As 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 above has explained, attitudes people have towards language use, including any prejudices, can be traced back to a period when people held very different beliefs about language to the ones linguists hold today, but which still persist. Your study may also wish to investigate the extent to which individuals choose a variety of language not only to express ideas but also their own identity and to distinguish themselves from other groups of people.

Analysis of any questionnaire data will, in many cases, produce numerical results, particularly where closed or multiple choice questions have been used. Note that there are some simple statistical tests, such as the χ^2 test, which can quite quickly indicate whether raw scores and/or percentage scores are significantly different from each other.

1.5.7 Writing up your study

The overall structure of your study will be different from that of a conventional essay. Generally it will include the following elements:

- **Presentation of your hypothesis or hypotheses.** This will include: a description of the issue(s) at stake; the questions to be addressed; what is your hypothesis, and why it matters; what type of data will be used (phonological, lexical, syntactic or people's opinions); if appropriate, which variable (s) you will use, if any, and their possible variants; description of the speech community to be examined in your project; what type of analysis will be conducted and briefly, what conclusions you expect to draw. You should also locate this discussion within the context of other studies already undertaken. This will allow you to set your own hypothesis against the work of others, and provide a context for your own hypothesis.
- **Description of your methodology.** Your methodology will normally be drawn from certain methodological and analytical frameworks, and in applying them the researcher is making assumptions about theoretical issues. Description of your methodology and methods should be detailed enough so that someone else could replicate your study, and include information about: the informants and investigators, and how many there were of each; an explanation of the methods used to locate possible informants and agreeing their participation; any criteria used for sampling; how the data was collected, including how it was recorded and transcribed, and by what method; how many questions or items were elicited, and when and where; how the results were analysed and if any statistical analysis was involved. Your write-up should include a copy of any research instruments you used, such as interview questions you asked, questionnaires, dialect recognition experiments and completed biographical data sheets,
- **Presentation of your data.** This is the place to describe the variant(s) or the attitudes you are investigating. You will need to define the degree or envelope of variation for the dependent linguistic variable(s) you are investigating. There are also other types of variables that may affect the dependent variable you are investigating. These can be grouped into three different kinds: social, such as age, gender and ethnicity; stylistic, such as a casual conversation compared to a reading passage or linguistic, for example, the position (of a variable) in a clause, the height of vowel. You will also need to define and discuss each of the social factors relevant to your project, and provide a table or list that summarises all the relevant linguistic variables and their possible variants, with examples from your data, or a summary of your questionnaire responses. Your write-up should include a copy of the transcript from which you have taken your examples or a copy of the questionnaire. As mentioned in 1.x above, quantitative studies, even though they cannot rely on percentages, must use statistical testing for significance. ,
- **Discussion of what you found.** This is the place to analyse your data (see also 1.5.5 above) and discuss any patterns you found, and how they correspond to your hypothesis. What did you find out? Discuss each independent variable individually, commenting upon how it correlates to each/the dependent variable, or each question of your questionnaire and commenting upon what each one reveals.
- **Your results.** This is the place to comment upon your analysis and what you have found out. This section addresses questions such as: Do your results support your hypothesis? If not, why not? Make sure you respond to everything you raised in the introduction. Were there any surprises? How do your findings compare with any others? How might your

study have been improved? What did this investigation suggest for future research?

1.5.8 Sample projects

a) An Analysis of the Accent of (place).

Choose a geographical area and undertake an analysis of its accent in relation to your own choice of dependable linguistic variable(s) and two non-linguistic variables. In undertaking this study, you should choose a sample of at five least informants.

Methods of data collection here would normally be taped interviews or conversations. You will also need to choose your linguistic variable to act as your dependable variable. As suggested in 1.5.6 above, you would then need to outline the scope of your study, why you chose this particular one and justify the research methods used in your write-up. You will also need to give an overview of biographical information and transcribe selections of your recordings into IPA, using a narrow or broad system of transcription. Your analysis of the transcription would then identify the dependable variable(s) and the scope, presented in tabular form. A comparison can then be made with other published studies on the locality, to see whether or not they confirm what has already been found or show something different in drawing your conclusions. Your transcripts would form an appendix to your write-up, which would cross-refer to it.

b) Lexical change in (place) circa 1950 to the present day.

Undertake a study across three generations of the same family, all living in the same area where they were all born. You should choose a sample of at least three informants, one of whom can be yourself, to determine the extent of any lexical change and the reasons for it.

Methods of data collection here would normally be taped interviews based upon a written questionnaire of some kind or a spidergram. You would then need to outline the scope of your study, why you chose this particular one and justify the research methods used in your write-up. The biographical information you collect will be an important part of your study, particularly as it relates to education, since it may allow you to draw conclusions as to the reason for any change. You may not need to transcribe selections of your recordings into IPA, but orthographically instead. As in sample project a), a comparison can then be made with other published studies on the locality, or with data from electronic resources, to see whether or not they confirm what has already been found or show something different in drawing your conclusions. Your transcripts would form an appendix to your write-up, which would cross-refer to it.

c) Grammatical variation in (place).

Methods of data collection here would be questionnaires, or contemporary writing in the local dialect such as newspaper articles, poems and short stories. This would allow you to collect more data more quickly than interviews upon which to base your analysis. In a project of this kind then like b), you would not need to undertake a transcription, but pick out instances of grammatical variation in orthographic notation. As in sample project a), a comparison can then be made with other published studies on the locality, or with data from electronic resources, to see whether or not they confirm what has already been

found or show something different in drawing your conclusions.

d) Undertake a study of attitudes towards variation in your peer group.

Methods of data collection here would be questionnaires, possibly followed up by interviews and the use of dialect recognition experiments. The success of your project will depend very much upon the design of your questionnaire, and the kinds of questions you ask in the dialect recognition experiment. You will need to make the questions general enough in your questionnaire, or with sufficient options to allow for the spectrum of possible views, but also narrow enough or specifically focused to get at the reasons why people hold the views that they do. For this reason, biographical information of your informants is as important in this kind of study as for any of the others listed above. Similarly the questions you ask as part of your dialect recognition experiment should allow for possible options, rather than a closed 'yes' or 'no'.

1.6 Where to find out more

Leith (1997) and Beal (2006) are good places to start for socio-historical accounts of English. Views on standardisation, grammaticality and correctness can be found in Clark (2001), Crowley (1991 and 2001), Honey (1983) and Milroy and Milroy (1991). Labov (1978) and Wolfram & Schilling-Estes (2006) cover social and geographical variation in English in the USA and Milroy (1987) in the UK, whilst Wells (1992), Hughes, Trudgill and Watts (2005) and Widdowson & Upton (2006) give an account of geographical variation in English in the UK and Kortmann and Closs Traugot (2004) across the whole world. Trudgill (2002) and Kerswill & Williams (2002) cover aspects of sociolinguistic variation and change. Montgomery (1995) and Wardhaugh (2006) are good introductory books on sociolinguistics in general. Woods, Fletcher, Hughes & Anderson (1986) provide an overview of linguistic statistical analysis.

Chapter 2: Pragmatics and Discourse

2.1 Introduction

This chapter examines issues and debates in the field of pragmatics and discourse: that is, it examines how interaction shapes linguistic structures and the ways in which communication involves more than the words which are actually spoken. Traditionally, linguists have concentrated upon the formal structure and properties of what we hear as sound or see as words on a page, that is the *visible* or *aural* aspect of language. Language and word structure have been described in terms of syntax, morphology, phonology and the meaning of individual words as semantics (for more about this, see: *DL:DE*). Variation in language use, discussed in Chapter 1, has also traditionally concentrated upon variation of these features, especially phonology. In addition, linguists have been concerned with the history of these structures and their change. However, there is another aspect or dimension to the study of language, which views language as communication or language in the context of its use between people in everyday settings: that is, language as it is actually used in communication. Recognition of this, and a desire to formulate or generate rules of how *communication*, as opposed to *language*, works, has led to new areas of linguistics being developed.

Discourse Analysis (DA) and **Conversation Analysis** (CA) are concerned with the structure and management of discourse and conversation whilst 'Pragmatics' is also concerned with unspoken or implicit meanings in language. A further area, interactional sociolinguistics, focuses upon the importance of cultural variations in the ways people use and interpret discourse. However, the concerns of each of these areas overlap and have much in common, particularly as all of them study the context in which speech occurs, how it is made meaningful and its purpose or function. These aspects of language analysis go beyond studying the linguistic structure of utterances to look more closely at, for example: how conversation *structure* can be as meaningful as its content; the social force of what is said and how the assumptions and world-view of speakers is encoded, or embedded in speech - in what they say, or do not say. As Bonvillian (1993:85) puts it: 'Understanding meaning is necessarily contextual, situating speech in interpersonal and cultural contexts. All cultures provide rules for appropriate communicative interaction, defining behaviours that *should* occur, that *may* occur and that *should not* occur in given contexts.'

In formal linguistics, the term 'structure' applies or refers to the ways in which words combine, the grammatical relations between them, and how they function within a sentence, the sentence usually being the largest unit of analysis. In investigating communication, pragmatics, Discourse analysis, conversation analysis and interactional sociolinguistics are all concerned with structures beyond the level of a sentence up to the longer stretches of often complete texts. This is because, when we communicate, we rarely do so through single sentences alone, but usually communicate through a series of exchanges between two or more people. Indeed, work undertaken in discourse analysis and more recently in the grammar of speech such as that of Carter & McCarthy (2006), has found that applying the term 'sentence' to speech is something of a misnomer, since

the ways in which we structure speech differs significantly from the ways in which we structure writing (see 2.7.1 below). The preferred term in pragmatics for a segment of continuous speech is thus 'utterance' or 'speech event'.

2.2 Language, meaning and communication

As children growing up in families and/or communities, and as part of our socialisation, we acquire the rules for appropriate communicative interaction. This is done both informally at home and in our communities and formally at school or other public settings. As children, learning to behave is often not only communicated *through* language, but also includes how to use language itself. We are told how to act and what to say - or not - in particular places and times or to particular people: for example, we learn to say *thank you* when offered something, even if we do not particularly want to accept what is offered: *Would you like a biscuit? Say thank you to Aunty.* We are also told how to modify aspects of our behaviour: *Don't shout/point it's rude! You mustn't tell your sister she looks fat in that dress, even if you think she does!* Much of what we learn though, is not so much through such direct modifying of our verbal behaviour, but comes from our own observations of people around us: family, peers, our neighbours or strangers on the bus, so that we learn the interactional norms appropriate to the society - or groups within society - in which we live. Consequently, much of what we learn is implicit: that is, not much is ever spelt out or explained as to why we are told to behave in the way that we do, but absorbed as part and parcel of growing up in a particular community, culture and society.

Sometimes we can also find ourselves living within two or maybe more communities or cultures which require different cultural norms, or growing up in one then moving to another. For example, if we happen to be the first generation of children born to immigrant parents or have spent the majority of our childhood in an institutional setting, such as a children's home or a setting different from that into which we were born, such as foster care, then we have to learn to acquire and understand the implicit norms of spoken interaction within both sets of communities. Similarly, if you move to another country at any time in your life, then you will also find that part of acclimatization, even if the same language is spoken, it involves acquisition and understanding of implicit norms for successful communication to take place. If you happen to have experience of such different settings, then you're probably more aware than most of the unspoken interactional norms which govern verbal behaviour. Underlying and unstated rules of interaction which we normally use without thinking are most usually brought to the surface either when they are violated when someone speaks inappropriately or when we have experience of an unstated or underlying rule being appropriate in one cultural setting but not another.

For example, in English culture it is part of the underlying 'rules' of conversation that we learn to listen to one another and to take our turn in conversation, that it is rude to interrupt, and that when we are interrupted because somebody cannot wait to speak, then we stop speaking. In other cultures, such as those of the Indian sub-continent, this rule does not exist and it is acceptable for people to talk at the same time and/or to interrupt one another whilst speaking. As communication across the world increases,

through increased global business, travel, economic and social mobility and increased use of the internet, we may find ourselves more frequently in situations where norms differ from the ones in which we grew up (see 2.6 below for more on this).

2.3 Language in context

Some sociolinguists have argued that in order to find out what are the relevant features of different contexts or situational variation, speech behaviour needs to be studied and analysed in its widest social and cultural context. The work of Gumperz, 1982a & 1982b, Hymes (1972 & 1974) and Gumperz and Hymes (1986) has been very influential in this area. Drawing upon research in sociology and anthropology, Gumperz and Hymes proposed an ethnography of communication. Ethnography is primarily a research method associated with sociology and anthropology, concerned with the study of human behaviour in its ordinary day to day settings. An ethnography of communication extends this notion to include verbal behaviour, language, on the grounds that no verbal activity has any meaning unless it is viewed in the context of its situation. For Hymes (1974), the communicative conduct of a community is the starting point for ethnographic analysis. He identified several components of communication that require description of which the most important are:

1. setting or context
2. participants, minimally speaker and addressee
3. topics and attitudes
4. goals.

Each of these different aspects can be studied independently of one another. However, sociolinguists like Gumperz argue that a speech event is likely to include all of them if it is to count as a speech event at all, so all of the components are interdependent and therefore need to be studied. The extent to which any one aspect or component dominates more than another depends upon a speaker's assessment of the whole situation which they are in and their judgement on how things are likely to turn out. For example, speech events in formal contexts - such as a law court or lecture hall or seminar room - often take place in specified settings amongst expected participants and concern relatively fixed topics. At other times, all four aspects may take a more equal share, especially in more informal settings. Consider the following example of how the different factors interconnect, from a court of law:

1. A trial setting: Trials or hearings are communicative events that occur in particular settings, namely courtrooms. The courtroom itself has a structural design separating seating areas for various categories of participants and orienting them in relation to one another.
2. Participants: Participants include judges, lawyers, defendants (and plaintiffs), witnesses, jurors, spectators, and court officials. Each participant's behaviour, including verbal behaviour is conditioned by his/her role. The judge is singled out by his/her seating position in front, usually on a raised platform, of the courtroom and special attire.

The judge clearly controls communicative behaviour of other participants, each of whom has certain obligations to speak or not to speak. In fact, failure to speak when so directed or failure to be silent otherwise are legally punishable offences ('contempt of court'). Only judges, lawyers, and witnesses may speak publicly. Other participants (jurors, officers, spectators) must remain silent. Specific discourse patterns are expected of each type of participant. Lawyers may make introductory and concluding statements or ask questions. Witnesses answer questions. Judges have greater latitude in the kinds of speech appropriate for them; they can make statements, ask questions, and issue commands and rulings.

3. Topics: Topics of discussion are rather rigidly defined. The communicative event is about 'something' and all speech behaviour must be relevant to that issue. Rights of participants to introduce changes of topic are narrowly limited and permission to incorporate extraneous speech must be asked of the judge (and granted). In lawyer's questioning of witnesses, it must be clear that questions are relevant to the central issue or are a logical argument from it. Similarly, witnesses' answers must be relevant to the topic and relate directly to their own experience. Judges have some flexibility in topic choice, but they too are limited by the overall focus.

4. Goals: Goals of participants vary according to their role in the proceedings. Individual communicative behaviour is oriented toward achieving specific goals. Speakers choose words, tone of voice, facial expression, gesture, and so on, to accomplish their purpose: for example, the judge must appear impartial, lawyers speak and act aggressively, defendants portray themselves as innocent, witnesses appear honest and reliable, and jurors remain silent but convey interest in the speech and behaviour of others.

Adapted from Bonvillian (1993:85-6)

A trial in a court of law is probably at the most formal end of the scale of human interaction. At the other end, though, even the most informal of settings are constrained by cultural norms of ways of speaking and rights to speak. Take the following example from an English family's table at an everyday dinner:

1. Setting: family meals are communicative events that occur in particular settings, although these may vary: at a table, in front of the TV or on one's knee. At a family table, the structural design is centred upon the table and its arrangement of seats.

2. Participants: participants are the members of the family and occasional guests. Each participant's behaviour is conditioned by his/her role, including verbal behaviour. Although the setting is not as formal as a courtroom, nevertheless family members will have usual seats at the table, with the mother, father and/or any other adult in parental authority occupying at least one of the seats at the end of the table. The parent(s), step-parent(s) or adult with parental responsibility will control the communicative behaviour of other family members, encouraging talk or discouraging it as the case may be.

3. Topics: Topics of discussion are potentially limitless and can be introduced by anybody. Most typically, they relate to the family member's own daily experience - events at work, school, or discussion of other extended family members and friends - to discussion of TV programmes, computers and games or to current affairs that have grabbed news headlines - a national election or a world disaster, for example. The

speech event is about 'something' but not all speech behaviour must be relevant to the issue. Rights of participants to introduce changes of topic are not limited and no permission needs usually to be asked. Topics may range over a number of issues with all members taking part in no particular order, but the overall pace and direction of the conversation may be controlled by a dominant adult.

4. Goals: The goals of all the participants may vary; for teenagers, the goal may be to eat the meal as quickly as possible and limit participation to a minimum in order to get back to the TV or computer. For adults, it is a time to catch up with the day's events and maybe plan the next day's activities. Above all, family meals are a social occasion where members catch up with one another's news.

Ethnographers of communication thus claim that by observing the variation that exists in speaking styles and verbal behaviour, we can uncover and make evident underlying and unstated rules of interaction. One of the problems of such an approach is that it tries to do far too much all at once (see DL:DE section 1.0). It takes into account the full complexity of grammar, personality, social structure and cultural patterns and treats them as integral to the speech activity itself. Although not many sociolinguists would disagree with this as an aim, there is simply too much to take into account if one considers all aspects of human behaviour - social, cultural and linguistic - all together and all at the same time. In addition, because such study is so context specific, and given the apparent endless possibilities of situations, it is difficult to generalise rules across a variety of contexts even in similar settings, unless for the most formal of settings such as the law court example above. Such an approach lends itself well to the understanding of how communication occurs in *particular* contexts, and might well lead to discovering underlying and unstated rules of interaction for a particular situation, but it is doubtful how far such a discovery could then be transferred to other situations or made into a methodology itself. Some sociolinguists argue that an ethnography of communication is *too* context bound for it to be of much use linguistically. Nevertheless, the approach remains important because it highlights the central place context plays in communication. (see also: TL:TE Part II Chapter 5).

Focusing upon the verbal aspect of a speech activity and uncovering the underlying or unstated and implicit rules which govern communication at all levels, is what pragmatics and discourse analysis are concerned with. In the example given above of the court of law, communication in this context is made as explicit as possible with little opportunity for ambiguity, misinterpretation or misunderstanding. Consequently, uncovering implicit rules is much more straightforward than in less formal situations where the topics and goals of the participants are not as orientated or explicit, and where there is greater potential for misunderstanding and misinterpretation. The question those concerned with pragmatics frequently ask themselves is: 'what patterns of unquestioned meaning emerge from verbal communication?'

Consider also the following examples:

Example 1:

Urszula: What's the road number where we turn left?

John: Oh, we've got ages to go yet.

(conversation on 7 August 2004 between the author and her partner driving to a party)

This conversation is between two people who live together and know one another well. Urszula has asked a specific question, wanting to be prepared in good time for turning left, but rather than answering the question, John interprets it as indicating anxiety and so does not answer the question, but instead offers words to soothe this perceived anxiety.

Example 2:

A mother and her young son are out shopping, and the mother needs to use the toilet. She takes her son with her into the Ladies, and uses a stall but discovers it has no paper. She calls out to her son:

Jonny, go and see if the men's toilets have any toilet paper. He goes, comes back and says: Yes, Mummy!

(True story told as a joke at a conference by Lesley Jeffries, July 04) .

In this case, the child has taken the mother's request literally, and not worked out the illocutionary intent (see 2.4.2. below) of her sentence *and if there is some get it for me* which the mother had left out. This issue of interpretation, of explaining the unspoken or implied, is a central concern in pragmatics. As the examples above illustrate, often the meaning of particular utterances or exchanges between people depends as much upon the context of the speech and the purpose of the speakers as on the literal meanings given by the utterances themselves. Trying to account for, the underlying rules is an important aspect of pragmatics, where the focus is upon how utterances mean what they say and the possibilities of interpretation within a given context.

For example, consider the phrase: *'How're things going?'* The meaning potential of this phrase is in theory open to any number of replies, but the potential is limited by the situation, the speaker of the question and the relationship between the two participants. For example, a standard opening between two acquaintances who accidentally meet in the street and have not seen one another for a long time, especially when one of them cannot quite remember when they last talked to the other, is *'How're things going.'* Given the situation, the meaning potential of this utterance is limited. It cannot be interpreted as a request to walk the dog, to leap into bed or to go on holiday. In the particular context of this occasion with its clear social constraints on the sorts of questions that could appropriately be asked, it would not be reasonable to go into the minute details of relationship or health problems and so on. Even excluding improbable interpretations, there still remain a number of options open. One is, to take the question as a purely phatic greeting, say *'OK thanks'* and move on, or take it as a question about a job, or a general enquiry about family. However, if one changes the context in which the question is asked, for example at a relationship guidance counselling session between a counsellor and a couple, or in a doctor's surgery between a doctor and a patient, then the

question takes on a very different meaning. Both speaker and hearer develop topics from a range of possible utterance meanings and speaker meanings which are appropriate to the circumstances and congenial to all participants.

It is also the case that people do not always or even usually say what they mean. For example, in saying '*It's warm in here*' what the speaker may mean is '*Can you open a window?*' People can mean something quite different from what their words say, or even just the opposite. For example, if asked a friend's opinion on her new hair cut I might say *It suits you* when actually I think the opposite, that it does not suit her at all, but I don't wish to hurt her feelings by telling her what I really think. Sections 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 below describe key theories and methods that have emerged within the field of pragmatics and discourse analysis, before going on to consider issues raised by interactional sociolinguistics in more detail.

2.4 Language as action

Our understanding of underlying or unstated rules which govern communication owes a great deal to a particular theory of language, known as **speech act theory** (for more about this, see TL:TE Part II Chapter 5). Prior to the nineteen seventies, it was presumed that spoken interaction was a relatively haphazard, chaotic way of using language which was not subject to the same kind of linguistic norms or rules as writing was. Far from being unstructured, conversation and spoken language does, indeed, have a unique structure of its own. In addition to having underlying structures and rules, speech can also function in a performative way; that is, speaking may not only be a way of verbalising but also of performing actions. For example, 'Close the door' verbalises a wish to have a door closed, and also functions as a request to a second party who is then expected to perform the action of closing the door.

Speech act theory began with the work of the philosopher John Austin (1962) whose ideas were expanded by John Searle (1969) and developed by H.P. Grice (1975). This theory is based upon the belief that language is often used to perform actions and on how meaning and action relate to language. As Austin (1962:100) says: 'the words used are to some extent to be explained by the 'context' in which they are designed to be or have actually been spoken in a linguistic interchange'. It is this emphasis upon context which underpins speech act theory, and which has made it far more suitable as a theory upon which to base linguistic method and practice, rather than the all-encompassing ethnographic theories taken from anthropology and sociology outlined above, which attempt to cover every aspect of behaviour and interaction.. The section below gives a brief summary of speech act theory. (For a more detailed explication, see Part II Chapter 5 of TL:TE.)

2.4.1 Speech Act Theory

Austin wished to move away from traditional approaches to the study of meaning in philosophy, and particularly from the notion that the meaning of a sentence could be analysed in terms of 'truth' or 'falsity' (see: *DL:DE ii.6*). As humans we communicate verbally and non-verbally. Where communication is performed by words, Austin called the act a 'speech act', and argued that speech acts performed three different acts at once: the **locutionary** act, the **perlocutionary**

act, and the illocutionary act.

- The **locutionary** act corresponds to the act **of** saying something. It involves uttering certain noises in a particular grammatical construction with a more or less definite sense of reference.
- The **perlocutionary** act is the act performed **by** saying something. It involves the effect that the speaker has on her/his listener in uttering the sentence. These effects might be upon the feelings, thoughts or actions of the hearer, even if the effect is not intended. Examples of perlocutionary acts are such things as convincing, persuading, annoying, amusing and so on.
- The **illocutionary** act is the act performed **in** saying something. It reflects the speaker's intent in uttering a sentence, and it is the **illocutionary force** of an utterance which determines what illocutionary act is performed.

Austin argued that linguists should not limit themselves to the study of the literal meanings of utterances (the locutionary act) but should also concern themselves with what communicative act was intended (perlocutionary act) or accomplished (illocutionary act). We know what the sentence *I promise to be there at nine o'clock exactly* means, but how is it to be taken? As a promise? As a threat? A teacher who says to a noisy disruptive class: *I'll keep you in after the lesson*, is simultaneously producing three acts:

-locutionary: involving saying the sentence which means *I'll make you stay in school later than usual*.

-illocutionary: threat.

-perlocutionary: silencing the students (or causing a revolt!).

For Austin, the illocutionary force is not part of the literal and linguistic meaning of what a speaker says. Statements might in fact also act, for example, as requests. *It's cold in here* may either function as a statement or be interpreted as a request to turn on some heating (see also Thomas 1995:1 and 28-54). Sometimes, it is not possible to tell what is meant simply from the form of words being used. Speakers, recognise illocutionary acts and/or the illocutionary force behind them from, for example, our own previous experience (both linguistic and non-linguistic), our knowledge of the speaker and from the context itself. However, we can also get it wrong, since we do not always interpret illocutionary acts correctly. What is important to remember is that there is no one-to-one relationship between the syntactic structure of an utterance and a particular speech act. An illocutionary act of warning could involve a declarative sentence, a statement, a command, a question or any other linguistic structure, given the right context. For example:

Your t-shirt is on fire.

Watch out! Your t-shirt's on fire.

Did you know *your t-shirt's on fire?*

Why is your t-shirt on fire?

After Austin's death, his work was pursued by Searle. Like Austin, he saw the importance of recognising that when we say something to someone, very often we are not only saying words but also inviting or performing action of some kind, which in some cases can be legally binding. Searle picked up from where Austin had left off, focusing on trying to explain how speakers intend a particular illocutionary act, and how hearers recognise such acts. He proposed that some illocutionary acts can be performed by a speaker if, and only if they fulfil the following conditions:

- > some linguistic item (word, phrase, clause) is uttered
- > which has some determinate characteristic (word order, stress, intonation, for example),
- > and the speaker's utterance constitutes the relevant act
- > because of some set of specific conditions which have to be satisfied on the occasion of the utterance.

So, for example, we can do things like promising, warning, and so on by using certain particular forms of words in particular circumstances. In addition to speech acts, Searle also identified the phenomenon of **indirect speech acts**. For example, an utterance such as *Can you pass the salt please?* is syntactically a question with the illocutionary force of a request. Interpreting indirect speech acts correctly is a complex phenomenon, that includes not only the identification of a set of conditions but also other factors such as the participants' own linguistic habits, cultural practices and present situation.

Following on from the work of Austin and Searle, the linguistic philosopher H.P Grice took the theory of utterances one step further, by identifying underlying rules which govern our management of conversation.

2.4.2 The co-operative principle

A major contribution to our understanding of how conversation is managed has been Grice's theory of conversational implicature. As a linguistic philosopher, Grice was concerned with the relationship between logic and conversation. He made a distinction between the logical meaning of given words and underlying broader interpretations which he labelled 'implicatures', and which arise out of the rules and principles of conversation (see *DLDE:ii.6*). The over-riding principle of all conversation according to Grice (1975), is the principle of co-operation or **co-operative principle** (CP). The CP assumes a tacit understanding between speakers to co-operate in conversation in a meaningful way. The CP is formulated in Grice's own words as:

[...] a rough general principle which participants will be expected (*ceteris paribus*) to observe, namely: make your conversational contribution such as it is required at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. Grice (1975:45)

This 'rough general principle' suggests that when we engage in verbal interaction, we work on the assumption that this interaction operates according to a certain set of expectations. Grice suggests that there are four categories (Grice, 1975: 45-46) which people tacitly assume to be the norm in conversation, which he calls 'maxims of conversation': that is, intuitive principles which are supposed to guide our conversational interaction.

The four maxims or sub-principles of the CP are:

1. The maxim of **quantity**. This relates to the amount of information to be provided:

a) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange).

b) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

2. The maxim of **quality**. This relates to the truth of the contribution:

a) Do not say what you believe to be false.

b) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3. The maxim of **relation** relates to the relevance of the contribution:

a) be relevant.

4. The maxim of **manner**, relates to the manner in which the contribution is made:

a) be perspicuous, i.e.

i. Avoid obscurity.

ii Avoid ambiguity.

iii Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).

iv Be orderly.

According to Grice then, we have a tacit, unspoken, general assumption or expectation that our interlocutors when speaking (or writing) to us will, all other things being equal, give us the degree of information required and no more or no less, tell us the truth, be

relevant to what has been said and say what they say in a clear, understandable manner or way which is not antagonistic, ambiguous and so on, and that we will do the same by return. Grice proposed that adherence to these maxims is the expected 'norm' of conversationalists, and much of our day to day conversation follows these maxims. Take the following example, given in Thomas 1995:

Husband: where are the car keys?

Wife: They're on the table in the hall.

Here, the wife has given the right amount of information (quantity), truthfully (quality), directly answered the question (relation) and clearly (manner). She has said exactly what she meant to say, no more and no less, and with no implicature: that is, there is no additional level of meaning, and there is no distinction between what she said and what she meant. However, much conversation does in fact flout these norms, giving rise to 'conventional' or 'standard' conversational implicatures. A crucial feature of implicatures is that they must be capable of being calculated by a hearer. Schiffrin (1994:195) sums up Grice's description of the process as follows:

To work out that a particular conversational implicature is present, the hearer will rely on the following data:

- (1) the conventional meanings of the words used, together with the identity of any references that may be involved
- (2) the CP and its maxims
- (3) the context, linguistic or otherwise, of the utterance
- (4) other items of background knowledge
- (5) the fact (or supposed fact) that all relevant items falling under the previous headings are available to both participants and both participants know or assume this to be the case.

Given this basic process, implicatures are created by the speaker deliberately flouting one or more of the maxims, and the hearer being aware of this violation of the CP. For example, political language makes use of a great deal of implicature, making it harder for the listener or reader to explicitly identify – and thus to challenge – the basis of their policies. Hoardings carrying advertising for the Conservative and Labour Parties for the 2005 General Election centred around a set of slogans, some of which flouted the maxim of quantity by giving less information than would strictly be required. For the Conservative Party, there was:

Are you thinking what we're thinking?

For the Labour Party it was:

Are you remembering what we're remembering?

The Conservative slogan depends on the flouting of the maxim of quantity. It is not made explicit from the text what exactly it is that the Conservatives are thinking, but the force of the slogan is to imply that the country is united, and in this case, the reader is expected to share background knowledge that this unity is based on distrust of or disappointment with the Labour government. Note that the convenience of this flouting of quantity is that it enables readers to identify with the slogan, even if their own thoughts on Labour are different from those identified in the last sentence. The gap in information, therefore, may be 'filled in' in the reader's mind, by thoughts of how the Labour government is ineffectual, lazy, arrogant, or whatever the particular voter thinks. The disadvantage, for the Conservatives, is that the critical or resistant reader may choose to 'fill in' the gap with their own views, and have a mental response such as 'I don't know – are you also thinking how good and socially just the Labour government has been then?'

The Labour slogan imitates the Conservative one by parallelism, using the same direct address and phrasing as a question, and relying on intertextual referencing (see 3.7) to build another implicature upon the earlier flouting, again depending on a lack of information and thus flouting the maxim of quantity. In this case, the text itself does not explain what it is that the Labour party is remembering, but background knowledge of recent British political history would indicate that it is the years of Tory rule, including those under Margaret Thatcher, and the sleaze of John Major's years in office, that are being implied here. Again, a resistant reader may choose to sidestep the implicature and think of what they considered to be good about the years of Conservative government, but this is at odds with the intended, and compliant reading of the text.

Flouting the maxim of quality can be achieved in several ways. One way is to say something that obviously does not represent what the speaker thinks. For example, if an employer tells a prospective employee that they'd be happier elsewhere, it is a polite and face-saving way of saying that they do not wish to employ them. Another way to flout the maxim of quality is by exaggeration. 'I could eat a horse' or 'I'm starving' or by metaphors or euphemisms. For example, 'She's such a wet blanket' or 'I'm just going to wash my hands' as a euphemism for 'I'm going to urinate'. The maxim can also be flouted by irony and banter. Irony expresses a positive statement whilst implying a negative one, whilst banter does the opposite: expresses a negative statement whilst implying a positive one. An example of irony would be 'I love burnt toast in the mornings' but implying the opposite. The danger with both irony and banter is that it can offend if hearers do not recognise the conversational implicature, and as a result take the words literally.

Flouting the maxim of relation involves uttering statements which appear to have no connection with one another, or expecting hearers to be able to work out for themselves what the utterance does *not* say, and make the connection between the utterance they hear and the one preceding it. For example:

John: So what did you think of Ashley?

Mary: His sister's a good laugh.

(author's data)

By not mentioning Ashley in her reply and apparently saying something irrelevant, Lucy implies that she is not impressed by him. In technical (stylistic) terms, we can argue that flouting the maxim of relation is often achieved by a lack of cohesion in the text. This topic is covered in section 7.2 of DLDE and in chapter 3 in the current book. Note here, however, that the maxims often overlap. John's question is not only responded to irrelevantly, but also fails to be answered, which is a flouting of the maxim of quality too

Flouting the maxim of manner concerns not *what* is said, but *how* it is said. Thus, the intonation, modality, lexical connotation or other aspects of the style of a text, as well as the level of detail, ordering of content and use of obscure language, may result in a clash between the context-appropriate style, and that actually used. Thus the use of overly formal or complex language in talking to students or trainees, may well amount to a flouting of the maxim of manner, and could be interpreted variously as an attempt to demonstrate how ignorant the hearers are in comparison with their lecturer or trainer, or in a more friendly environment, and with the right intonation and body language, it could be interpreted as humorous. An example of this sort, used to impress first year language students with no previous linguistic knowledge, might include:

In order to explicate the precise mechanism for the articulation of utterances, we must consider the egressive pulmonary airstream mechanism and the modification of the egressive airstream as it encounters the articulatory features of the oral and nasal cavities.

Though some of the technical terms used here might indeed be introduced to students, they would normally be glossed or explained and would not be surrounded by unnecessarily formal and long-winded (prolix) language that is seen here.

Grice's theory of conversational implicature has been criticised on a number of counts. One issue is with whether or not the CP should be interpreted as a system of social, 'goal-sharing' cooperation (see, for example, Pratt, 1977, Kiefer 1979, Watts 2003,) or linguistic cooperation (Thomas 1995 and Leech and Thomas 1990). However, Grice's own writings (1975:48) clearly indicate that he does not intend the CP to be viewed as social cooperation, since there are too many types of exchange (such as quarrelling, for example) where issues of social cooperation and the CP do not match or coincide. Linguistic, as opposed to social, goal sharing assumes that the only goal of a given communication is the transmission of information, and that the CP operates solely to allow for interlocutors to understand what is said or implied. It makes no claims about the intentions of the speaker, good or otherwise, but to do with using language in such a way that interlocutors understand what is said, presupposed or implied.

Another criticism of Grice's model is that it applies to how conversation in Anglo-American English is managed, and thus is open to criticism on the grounds that it does

not take account of different cultures, countries and communities who have different ways of observing and expressing maxims for particular situations. For example, in Britain if we say to someone: 'I'll come and see you tomorrow' then we expect the appointment to be kept and if we then do not turn up, this would be considered a violation of the maxim of quality. In some cultures however, this is quite a normal way of indicating lack of interest.

Nevertheless, although investigating conversation in cross-cultural contexts shows that different conversational norms or conventions operate or apply in different cultural contexts, the fact that norms can be identified at all points to the fact that they generally need to be adhered to for effective or successful communication to happen. Conversational norms such as the ones identified by Grice and others show how various sentence meanings combine into discourse meaning and are integrated with context, in much the same way that rules of sentence grammar allow word meanings to be combined into sentence meaning.

A further criticism of the theories put forward by Austin, Searle and Grice by some linguists is that, as linguistic philosophers, the research methods they used to arrive at their conclusions involved solely introspection. In other words, their work was based upon examining and theorizing ideas about the nature of interaction but without referring to any actual 'real' language use, or using 'real' language data to inform their ideas (see: DL:DE 1.2). Even so, despite this limitation, the theoretical work undertaken by Austin, Searle, Grice and others on the nature of conversation has provided linguists with a theoretical foundation upon which to investigate the linguistic structure of naturally occurring language. Refinements, correctives, elaborations or replacements of the CP continue to be published (for example, Hawley, 2002 and Spencer-Oatey and Jiang 2003). Far from being unstructured and improvised, it is clear from speech act theory and the CP that what appears at first to be so commonplace and trivial is on closer inspection far more complex. Speech has a performative function, and our ability to take part successfully in verbal exchanges of any kind depends upon knowing how to manage and behave in conversation.

2.5 Discourse analysis

Discourse analysis (DA) is both an umbrella term used to discuss any form of discourse analysis and also the term given to a specific method of analysis. As a specific method of analysis and in its narrowest sense, it is the term given to discovering and specifying rules that are relevant for the production of coherent discourse, now also called exchange structure (Cutting 2002:24-7). It is concerned with how speakers combine utterances into broader speech units. This method of analysis was first devised by the British linguists Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and the Birmingham School of Discourse Analysis. Drawing upon speech act theory (see 2.2. above) Sinclair and Coulthard proposed a descriptive system to handle the structure of discourse within a particular setting, that of the classroom.

2.5.1 The structure of talk

The conversational situation on which Sinclair and Coulthard based their work was the formal, hierarchical setting of classroom talk between teachers and pupils. Their work

showed that a lesson, like any other example of talk, can be analysed sequentially, as a series of turns or **exchanges**. During the course of a transaction the teacher would direct pupils to perform a particular task, elicit some verbal contribution from the pupils to which the pupils would respond and to which the teacher would make a further response. From their data, Sinclair and Coulthard identified four main types of exchange: **Directive** (for example: *teacher: the first quiz is this*); **Check** (for example: *teacher: Finished Joan?*) **Informative** (for example *teacher: here are some of the symbols used*) and **Elicitation** (for example: *teacher; read us what you've written Joan*).

The structure or composition of any of the four exchanges is determined by the function the exchange performs. In the case of the informative exchange, the sequence only requires the teacher's contribution. In the case of directives and checks, however, pupil response is an obligatory element. In the case of elicitations, the structure allows for follow-up turns. Consequently, the structure of the exchange can be described in terms of component **moves**, of which there are three: **initiating** (I), **responding** (R) and **follow-up** (F).

Moves themselves can also be divided according to function. For example, in asking a question of a whole class, the teacher might restrict the answer to one pupil by naming them; follow-up moves can be segmented into accepting the response as relevant (*That's right*), evaluating the response (*that's a good answer*) or commenting upon it (*that's interesting*). These various functional components of the moves of an exchange are called **acts**.

For example:

Move	Act
1. Teacher: Initiating (I): <i>Read us what you've written Joan</i>	(elicit)
2. Pupil: Responding (R): <i>The cat sat on the rug</i>	(reply)
3. Teacher: Follow up (F): <i>yes, that's right</i>	(accept
Pupil: <i>I changed the last word</i>	(comment)

The Sinclair and Coulthard model of discourse analysis can be applied successfully to formal exchanges which take place in a classroom, but it does not easily transfer to other situations, particularly informal ones. A major criticism of the model is that it applies to a hierarchical, formal and ritualistic form of discourse, with one person in a position of power over others, and therefore ignores the underlying structures of social relationships that sustain power, authority and hierarchy. Nevertheless, this structural approach is important because it was the first to show that there is indeed an underlying, systematic, organisational structure to conversation which can be categorised, and that there are ways of describing it.

When applied to conversation which does not involve hierarchy, such as a conversation between

two friends, then an even greater degree of interpretation and judgement is required than that provided for by the Sinclair and Coulthard model. It also says nothing about the perlocutionary force of language and the way language is used to convey humour, irony, threats and so on. It also assumes that utterances have a single function when they may in fact have more than one. The categorisation of moves also limits the length of an exchange to the three categories of I, R and F, or subsequent variations such as R/I and F/I. Even so, the model as one of classroom transactions still has limitations, not least because it applies best when the transactions are going according to plan and does not easily allow for disruption. It is also centred very much on the teacher, in which the teacher dominates with long turns and the students take short turns in response but do not interrupt. Although such a style of interaction may still occur, there are other kinds of classroom interaction such as where pupils work in pairs and groups, and exchanges between teachers and pupils are generally more interactive.

Francis and Hunston (1992) presented a revised version of the Sinclair and Coulthard model, which aimed to be more flexible and adaptable, and thus able to cope with a wide variety of discourse situations. The data Francis and Hunston used was based upon telephone conversations. This was chosen because of the lack of paralinguistic features such as gesture, eye-gaze and so on, and because the interaction came complete with rituals of greeting and leave-taking. In their model, the one to one correspondence between exchange and move is called an **exchange structure** (e.s), and the range of moves is extended from four to eight:

1. Framing: to mark boundaries in a conversation
2. Opening: to initiate, including greeting, or to close conversation, or any attempt to impose structure upon the conversation in some way
3. Answering: indicating a willingness to take part in conversation
4. Eliciting: to inquire, prompt, clarify, elicit information
5. Informing; to offer information, concur, confirm or qualify
6. Acknowledging: to provide positive or negative follow-up
7. Directing: to request an immediate or future action
8. Behaving: to supply or defy a direction.

For example:

	Move	e.s	exchange
B: Why I-it's not floating at all	eliciting	I	1

A: No, it's lying on the floor

Like any old balloon informing R

B: It's a bit strange you know acknowledging/ F

Informing I 2

A: Yeah interesting acknowledging R

A very useful exercise in beginning to understand the nature of conversation is to undertake an analysis of your own, applying either or both of the discourse models outlined above, especially the exchange structures, to see how far they are applicable, what they reveal about the structure of the conversation and what their limitations are (see 2.8.5 below).

Although the Francis and Hunston model of exchange structure allows for some degree of flexibility, it still remains very structural, focusing as it does upon the nature of the exchanges and developing categories which can be applied to them. Consequently, it has fallen out of vogue as attention has shifted more towards pragmatics and conversation analysis. In recent years, however, the study of the structure of institutional discourse has shifted its focus onto studying the relationship between language and power which has developed into new areas of study such as Critical Discourse Analysis (see Chapter 4) and language and the law or forensic linguistics. Nevertheless, exchange structure remains an important linguistic tool in discourse analysis.

Some discourse analysts such as Brown and Yule (1983), Hoey (1983) and Burton (1980) as well as analysing conversations, have examined written texts. Burton has applied descriptive frameworks developed for analysing exchanges in conversation to dramatic dialogue, and has produced a model showing the ways that some types of modernist dramatic dialogue violates or goes against discursive norms. Consequently, discourse analysis today has widened its field of inquiry from a focus on exchange structure within a narrowly defined context such as that of the classroom to discovering underlying structures of organisation across a whole spectrum of texts, both spoken and written. Generally, however, the field of pragmatics and discourse is largely concerned with speech, whilst that of stylistics, discussed in the next chapter, is predominantly concerned with the writing, and especially, though not exclusively, literary writing.

2.6 Conversation analysis

Discourse analysis as outlined above is concerned with the structure of conversation and how utterances fit together to constitute a discourse, providing a method for its analysis. Conversation analysis is concerned with the management of conversation and how communication is achieved, thereby providing a method of analysis for spoken interaction. Whereas discourse analysis comes from a British tradition of linguistics, conversation analysis comes from an American tradition of sociology.

Conversation analysis also differs in its concept of conversation: discourse analysis starts with a

linguistically based theory based upon a patterning of units and fits conversation to the model, thus viewing conversation as a product. Conversation analysis starts with the conversation itself and lets the data determine its own categories of structure. Methods of conversation analysis description and analysis are commonly applied to everyday conversation, although they have also been used to study interaction in institutions and workplaces: medical interaction, business settings, broadcast news and so on.

Cutting (2002:28) defines conversation as follows: 'Conversation is discourse mutually constructed and negotiated in time between speakers; it is usually informal and unplanned'. Cook (1989:51) defines it as follows:

1. It is not primarily necessitated by a practical task
2. Any unequal power of participants is partially suspended
3. The number of participants is small
4. Turns are quite short
5. Talk is primarily for the participants not for an outside audience

Many linguists would disagree with the first item listed above, 'it is not primarily necessitated by a practical task,' citing the fact that even the most casual of conversations has an interactional function, such as ascertaining at a party if future social interaction with a stranger is desirable, or establishing contact between old friends and planning future events. Other linguists, such as Fairclough (1989:12) would contest the second item, 'any unequal power of participants is partially suspended' on the grounds that there is unequal power, in varying degrees, in all exchanges (see also Chapter 4). However, although conversation analysis assumes that utterances have a contextual relevance to one another, not all aspects of contexts are taken as equally relevant. In practice, much of the work undertaken in conversation analysis has been concerned with identifying structural features thrown up by conversation, concentrating upon a particular methodology for discovering how social relations are achieved by participants. CA focuses upon the conversation as the basis for the existence of patterns, distributions and formation of rules which can then be applied to subsequent stretches of discourse. The overall pattern or structure of face to face conversation varies a great deal, depending upon a host of factors such as where the conversation takes place, the social relationship between the participants and the topic of conversation. Nevertheless, conversational analysts point out that speakers are constructing and negotiating their conversation in time, and as they do, certain stretches of utterances or turns emerge which shape and structure the conversation.

2.6.1 Turn-taking

Just as in discourse analysis, in conversation analysis, turn-taking is central to the structure and management of conversation. It is the lynch-pin of analysis, and categories associated with it have been identified which make it more applicable to analysing

informal conversation. In Anglo-American English, next speakers cannot be sure when a current speaker is going to finish speaking, but will wait until the end of an utterance as an indication that the turn may be complete. Stenström (1994:68) has identified that the turn-taking system involves three basic strategies on the part of the speaker: taking the turn, holding the turn and yielding the turn. A point in a conversation where a turn of place is possible is called a transition relevance place or TRP. Although as listeners we can never be sure when a speaker has finished talking, we learn to identify clues to indicate the end of an utterance to indicate that the speaker is willing to yield their turn. For example, in British English these are phonological features such as low falling tones and syntactic ones such as the end of a main clause. When speakers do not want to wait until a TRP, then this is an interruption, whereas if listeners anticipate a turn being completed, miscue their entry and come in before the end, then this is an overlap.

In the following extract, between a mother and her teenage son, an interruption is marked with // and an overlap with =.

Mum: I want you to put // your dirty clothes in the washing basket

Harry: // I know what you're going to say. Alright =

Mum = then why don't you do it then?

Another aspect of turn-taking is the acceptable length of a pause between two turns. Each culture seems to have an unspoken agreement about the acceptable length of a pause between two turns, and as participants in a conversation we cannot but help to attribute meaning to a pause longer (or shorter) than this norm. Consequently, analysts categorise pauses that carry meaning as 'attributable silence'. Consider the following exchange:

Lucy: Did you remember to buy the cheese?

John: (3) No

Lucy: Did you forget?

John: Afraid I did. Sorry

(author's data)

John pauses for three seconds before answering Lucy's question, and she attributes this silence to him trying to remember whether or not he did remember to buy the cheese. As participants in a conversation, we do not usually feel comfortable when there is a pause or lull in a conversation; which if it extends beyond about ten seconds, speakers tend to utter fillers such as *um* or *well then* to get the conversation going again or to break the silence.

2.6.2 Adjacency pairs

Turn-taking provides a basic framework for the organisation of conversation since it allows for its

participants to interact with one another rather than simply speaking individually in a haphazard and uncoordinated way. However, turn-taking on its own is not sufficient to guarantee that there is purposeful and meaningful interaction. Take, for example, the quote from the play *Equus* used earlier:

Dysart: Won't you sit down?

Is this your full name? Alan Strang?

And you're seventeen. Is that right? Seventeen..Well?

Alan: Double your pleasure

Double your fun

With Doublemint, Doublemint

Doublemint gum

Dysart: Now, let's see. You work in an electrical shop during the week. You live with your parents and your father's a printer. What sort of things does he print?

Alan: Double your pleasure

Double your fun

With Doublemint, Doublemint

Doublemint gum.

(*Equus* 1973. 1:3)

In this imagined exchange, the two parties have no problem coordinating an orderly exchange of turns. However, the *content* of each turn is not cohesive with what went before. Alan's responses do not answer Dysart's questions. His manner of speaking is intended to portray madness and he fails to provide a meaningful answer to the question he has been asked. Flouting needs to be intentional and with an intentional effect. Mental illness leads to a suspension of the norms. As Cameron (2001:95) points out: 'CA places great emphasis on the idea that conversation is 'one thing after another': it is an activity that unfolds in time, and what I say now must inevitably constrain what you can meaningfully say next.' It also looks for patterns in data – so in this case, conversation analysts might collect data from real situations with people in mental health settings, to see whether Shaffer has got the patterning of the turns 'right': whatever 'right' means in a creative context. In the example above, Dysart's questions are a request for information. Alan's answers make the information requested sound straightforwardly appropriate.

Thus, although turn-taking involves the participants in a conversation taking turns to speak, the turn-taking itself is structured around utterances which occur one after the other, and in which the second utterance is functionally dependant upon the first. This phenomenon uses the label **adjacency pairs** to refer to a sequence of two utterances, adjacent to one another, produced by different speakers and ordered as a first part and second part. The most obvious adjacency pairing is that of question-answer. When we ask a question, we usually expect a response, known as a **preferred response**. A question, therefore expects an answer, but can also be answered by a question, which is a **dispreferred response**. Adjacency pairs are numerous, but the following is an indicative list of the major cases:

a question	has the preferred response of	an answer
an offer		an acceptance
an invitation		an acceptance
an assessment		an agreement
a proposal		an agreement
a greeting		a greeting
a complaint		an apology
a blame		a denial

(taken from Cutting 2002:30)

Dispreferred responses tend to be refusals and disagreements which can be interpreted as either meaningful or rude. For example, in offering the greeting 'How are you?' the response is 'Go away!', then this would be a dispreferred response. Whether or not it is meaningful or rude would depend upon the circumstances and context in which the exchange took place.

Consider the following exchange:

1. *John: have you finished that yet?*
 2. Paul: no, I've just got to get an email off to John Harrap.
 1. John: oh good, well, when you've done, would you give me a hand?
 2. Paul: (.) doing what?
 1. John: something I have to get done for Monday. It'd be great if you took a look at it.
 2. Paul: (.) Ok. Give me five minutes.
- (author's data)

In the first adjacency pair, John asks Paul a question, to which he replies (preferred response). John then asks Paul a second question, who stall his reply by answering a question with a question to find out what it is John wants (dispreferred response). John then phrases his request as a type of proposal, to which Paul agrees. In CA terms, this preference system refers to the patterning of responses, and not to the more usual meaning of 'preference', where something is considered more desirable than something else. Preferred responses are prompt and short whereas dispreferred ones tend to be more hesitant and elaborate. Acceptances and agreements are typically structured one way, and refusals and disagreements in another.

In conversation analysis, analysis of turn-taking has also established the idea of **sequence** in conversation, of which four have been identified: opening and closing, pre-sequences and insertions. Take the following example of a consultation between a doctor and a patient:

(Doctor leads patient into the consultation room, talking as he does so).

D: that's only the clutter in the (.) background

(.)

P: yeah

D:no problem

(.)

5

so (.) take your coat off

P: sure

(4.0) ((Doctor helps patient remove his coat))

Thanks

10

D:don't think Philip's got any clothes pegs in here so uh (1.5) ((Doctor hangs up coat))

I don't usually use thi- sit down

P: fine

D:I don't usually use this room its erm (.)

15

Philip's

(1.0)

P: yes, of course

D: anyway (.) going through the whole thing

(2.0)

20

you've changed your job(.) in effect

(.)

P: well (.) additional responsibility

(taken from Montgomery 1995:205-6)

In lines 1 to 10, the doctor and patient are engaging in an **opening sequence** centred upon getting settled into the consultation room. From line 12 onwards, **insertions** centre upon the doctor checking the patient's file. Since consultations are time specific, then the exchange ends with a **closing sequence**. Cutting (2002) notes that British and North Americans preface closings with a pre-closing sequence which can be long and drawn out. Rather than simply saying *goodbye* or *tarrah*, markers are usually given to signal that a conversation is about to end, such as *anyway*, *I've got to go*, *it's been nice talking to you*' and so on.

Turn-taking strategies as described above appear to form an orderly system where one person speaks at a time whilst another waits their turn. However, ordinary conversation does not always work like this, since the person waiting to speak may decide not to wait their turn and butt in, or lose concentration and/or interest and fail to respond, or speakers may lose their thread and so on. In the normal course of events, as Montgomery (1995:194) points out, we expect our conversations to proceed without such difficulties, because of the underlying patterns we have absorbed that give rise to such expectations.

Even so, there is a growing body of research, which has questioned the universality of turn-taking, and especially the 'one person speaks at a time' principle upon which it is founded. This is especially so in relation to the way men and women behave in conversation. Jennifer Coates, for example, argues that the way turn-taking functions between women and between men is different, based upon her analysis of a large corpus of informal talk between British women friends. She found that turns were more usually jointly or co-constructed between these speakers than singly. She views this kind of talk as highly cooperative, and concludes that it is more common amongst groups of all female speakers than all male. A similar corpus of informal talk among men (Coates 1997), confirmed this conclusion, as she found that patterns corresponded more closely to the 'one person at a time' notion of turn-taking. Whilst Cameron (1997) supports Coates' findings in an analysis of the talk of young men friends.

Whilst Coates' and Cameron's studies have concentrated upon informal talk, Edelsky (1981) provides evidence that supportive simultaneous speech can also happen in institutional contexts. In an analysis of talk at business meetings, she distinguishes between two types of floor, 'F1' and 'F2'. F1 refers to the 'one speaker speaks at a time' model of turn-taking, whereas F2 involves more simultaneous speech which, according to Edelsky, enabled women to take the floor more than was the case with F1. It seems then, that in both talk among friends and in some kinds of institutional talk, it is possible for turn-taking to be organised other than on the 'one speaker speaks at a time' principle. As Cameron (2000:93) points out, the 'one at a time' model is presented as both normal and fundamental, and there is no obvious place within it for simultaneous speech which is neither a violation nor a mistake, whereas it may be in fact, that it is a normal feature of certain kinds of conversation, such as informal ones. Studies undertaken in interactional sociolinguistics and intercultural communication also show how norms associated with turn-taking are cultural, rather than a linguistic, and different cultures have different turn-taking norms (see 2.6 below).

In another study, Shaw (2000) examined the speech behaviour of male and female members of the British Parliament in debates in the House of Commons. The House of Commons has arcane rules which are highly codified regulating who may speak, when, and about what. One of these rules is that in a debate, contributions can only be made by the MP who is standing up, and contributions from the floor are not allowed and are 'illegal', although in practice many MPs make such contributions, and the Speaker (effectively the 'chair') rarely censures them unless called upon to do so by the MP holding the floor. The Speaker is the person responsible for ensuring that this rule, among others, is observed. In an analysis of five debates, Shaw found that male MPs were far more likely than women to make 'illegal' interventions in other people's speeches, not because the latter were reluctant to intervene, but because they wished to avoid 'illegal' interruptions. By playing by the rules of the game more often than men, Shaw found that women MPs were less likely to influence a debate than men, who were more inclined to exploit rules. Shaw concludes from this that in this particular context, by being more inclined to play by the rules, women MPs are disempowered by comparison with men.

When it comes to topic changes in informal talk, in their 1988 study of 'conversational shift work', West and Garcia, investigating talk between men and women, found that men tended to initiate 'unilateral topic changes' in the course of women's turns-in-progress: that is, they would change a topic completely whilst women were still talking about a previous one. These topic shifts occurred most often when women were talking about affective (emotional) experiences.

Thomas (1995) argues that, whereas in other areas of linguistics such as grammar the linguist is striving to make rules, pragmatics is concerned with probability rather than certainty. However, there is a growing body of research which suggests that men and women acquire different norms of turn-taking in both informal and institutional settings which, particularly in settings that involve both men and women, see the balance of power and influence in men's speech behaviour rather than women's. This issue is explored in more detail in Chapter 4. Conversation analysis also takes nothing as predetermined, and views the turn-taking system and the relevance of particular actions as always being governed by *contingency*. Contingency and probability is what conversation analysis is all about. Coates notwithstanding, much conversation analysis research has addressed overlap, interruption, collaborative completion, choral responses and the like. All of these practices, rather than constituting evidence against the conversation analysis account of turn taking, demonstrate instead the exploitation of the ways that turns at talk allow for the projection of trajectories.

2.6.3 Presupposition

One important aspect of conversation is the amount of implicit background information and common ground shared by the participants in a conversation. For example, take this extract of conversation between two friends walking their dogs:

Lucy: How's Lawrence?

Pamela: He's OK thanks. Still hobbling but getting better slowly.

Lucy: When's he back at school?

Pamela: Oh, next week some time

(author's data)

If Lucy were to clarify in completely linguistic terms what she means by *How's Lawrence?* then it might go something like this:

Assuming, Pamela, that you have normal hearing capabilities and a workable knowledge of English, to understand me, I am addressing you. I guess that you, like me, do not want to undertake this walk in silence but that we both want to interact socially by means of a conversation. Since I know that your son has been in hospital recently for an operation on his knee, it seems reasonable for me to start a conversation by enquiring about his progress. So I am asking you 'How's Lawrence?' And I would appreciate it if you could say something in reply to the question.

No matter how elaborate this attempt is, it still leaves much that is implicit. It could be for example, that Lucy's enquiry is asking for a more general update on Lawrence's health and well-being beyond the operation. Complete explicitness is thus impossible in what we say and write, and language provides numerous conventionalized carriers of implicit meaning, tools for linking explicit content to relevant aspects of background information. One important tool is presupposition - that is, aspects of meaning that are presupposed, understood or taken for granted for an utterance to make sense. *How's Lawrence?* for

example, presupposes that both Lucy and Pamela know the Lawrence being referred to, and furthermore that he is Pamela's son. This pragmatic presupposition cannot be derived from the semantic base of the utterance; that is, the meaning of the words. Rather, it resides in the shared conventions of language use rather than in the more formal patterns of its logical structure. One concept of presupposition is that of **entailment**. Entailment is the most 'literal' component of the meaning of a sentence, which remains the same or stable in whatever context it occurs. Take, for example, the sentence:

The cat sat on the mat

This sentence entails a basic proposition *p*. indicated in italics:

P: the cat sat on the mat

The concept of entailment also extends to sentences or utterances which contain more than one basic proposition. For example, the sentence:

Susan ate an apple and Peter ate a pear

Entails two propositions, expressed as *p* and *q*:

P: Susan ate an apple

q: Peter ate a pear

Assuming that the sentence expresses true claims, (that Susan did eat an apple and Peter a pear), then it follows that *p* and *q* must also be true (see also 2.3.1 above and TL:TE Part II 2.1) Entailment, then, can be defined more rigorously as:

A sentence *S* entails a proposition *p* if and only if in every possible circumstance where *S* is true, *p* is true (Simpson 1993:123).

If someone says to you that *the cat sat on the mat* or *Susan ate an apple and Peter ate a pear*, then you would expect the person to be committed to the truth of the entailment. However, as Simpson (1993:123) points out, the concept of 'truth' is a complex and abstract one, the definition of which has exercised linguists and philosophers (see TL:TE Part II 2.2). A great deal of effort has gone into explaining the conditions under which a particular sentence maybe true or false. These 'truth-conditions' form the foundation of semantic description by specifying the components of meaning that give a sentence its overall truth-value.

However, the concept of entailment, although an important aspect of sentence meaning, does not provide a complete description of what utterances mean in a real situation of use. Take the following example (from Simpson 1993:124):

Well darling ...the dog has ...erm...stopped sleeping in its kennel.

Literally, this sentence means something like: *the dog does not sleep in its kennel*. If the utterance as a whole expresses a true claim, then the entailment must also be true.. Presuppositions usually fall into one of two types: **existential** and **logical**. **Existential** presuppositions are ones which state the existence of referents in the utterance, and are triggered by definite noun phrases, in this case *the dog*. **Logical** presuppositions are triggered by a number of possible features, including most commonly change of state verbs such as *stop*, factive verbs such as *regret* or *realise* whose complement is presupposed to be true, iterative adverbs such as *again* or *still*, which presuppose that the process has happened before, cleft constructions such as *it was John that let the dog out*, where the whole subordinate clause is presupposed to be true and comparators, where the quality asserted is assumed to imply also, in some measure, to the referent, as in *This cake is richer than the last one*, where the entailment is that the first cake is rich, and the presupposition is that the second one was also rich in some degree. If the dog has stopped sleeping in its kennel, then the logical presupposition arising from the change of state verb, *stop*, is that it had previously been sleeping in the kennel.

Grammatical constructions that trigger a logical presupposition are known as **triggers**, of which factive verbs is one. Others are: **cleft sentences**, such as: *It was Ben who stole the meat*, which presupposes someone stole the meat; **iteratives**, such as: *you can't buy music cassettes any more*, which presupposes that once you could and **comparators**, such as: *Peter is as sexist as Paul*, which presupposes that Paul is sexist.

To return to the example of: *well, darling...the dog has...erm...stopped sleeping in its kennel*. The additional elements of *well darling* and *erm* give additional meaning to the sentence. Use of an endearment marker such as *darling* usually indicates some relationship of intimacy between the speaker and addressee. This information is not relevant to its truth conditions, but forms part of the overall message. The particles *well* and *erm* also lie outside truth conditions, but have an important function as **hedges**, softening the impact of the message upon the addressee. Consider also the context in which the utterance occurred, which was as part of an exchange between A and B:

A; What are all those hairs doing on the sofa?

B: Well, darling...the dog has ...erm...stopped sleeping in its kennel.

This contextualization of B's utterance alters its meaning from the literal one of the dog has stopped sleeping in its kennel to the inferred one that the dog is responsible for the hairs on the sofa. Such a process of inferencing is triggered by the indirectness of B's answer to A's question. The meaning which the exchange as a whole generates is a combination of B's indirectness and A's inferencing work, a process known as **conversational implicature** (see also 2.3.2 above).

The impossibility of being fully explicit in language lends itself to strategic exploitation. For example, if asked why you did not make it on time for a meeting, you could answer /

didn't manage to get away. You may not have tried to get away, but by using the word 'manage' gives the impression that you did, a logical presupposition based on the factive verb manage, which presupposes trying. You have not actually *said* that you tried to get away, so no one can accuse you of lying. This is called 'presuppositional lying'.

2.6.4 Politeness

Politeness in conversation refers to the choices people make in linguistic expressions that show a friendly attitude towards speakers and listeners, including giving them space. It lies not in the words and expressions themselves, but in their intended social meaning and function. Brown and Levinson (1987) in their analysis of politeness, point to the key aspect of **face** in social relationships. Face refers to self-image, and it is a universal characteristic across all cultures that speakers' should take account of their listeners' feelings, respect each others' expectations regarding self-image and avoid **face-threatening acts** (FTAs). Where FTAs are unavoidable, Brown and Levinson suggest that the threat can be lessened through **negative politeness**. Negative politeness respects the hearer's negative face, which is recognising the need to be independent, not to be imposed upon by others, to have freedom of action and generally to minimise imposition. Alternatively, speakers can address the FTA by **positive politeness**. Positive politeness attends to hearer's interests, wants and needs. It respects the hearer's positive face, the need to be liked by others, to be treated as a member of a group and so on.

One way of dealing with FTAs is to do them **off record** or **on record**. For example, if you are in a supermarket looking for a particular produce and no assistant is to be found. You would like some help, but do not wish to approach any other shopper directly since you do not wish to interrupt their shopping and place yourself in a potential FTA. You could ask for help indirectly, by saying in a voice loud enough for other shoppers to hear: *Where have they moved the breakfast cereals to?* In this instance, you would be speaking off record and using an indirect speech act (see 2.4 above) in the hope that a fellow shopper will hear your question and respond to your request for help. The illocutionary force will probably be understood by hearers, but they can choose to ignore it without anyone losing face. Avoidance of FTA is also achieved by flouting the maxim of quantity (see 2.4.2), since you are not saying openly that you need help and thus not making your contribution as informative as possible. Indirect speech acts and flouting maxims of quantity in this way allows speakers to make requests, offers, invitations and so on without addressing them to anyone in particular and thus avoiding any potential FTA.

Alternatively, you have the option of approaching someone directly by going up to them and saying: *Excuse me, you couldn't tell me where they've moved the breakfast cereals to could you?* This person then has to reply unless they want to be rude. Making a request in such a direct way is called doing an FTA **on record**. On record FTAs are direct speech acts. In this example, the speech act is phrased as a question as a mitigating device, thereby giving the listener the option of saying *no* or of giving you the help you need. Had you said to a fellow shopper *tell me where the breakfast cereal is* then this would be a **bald on record** communicative act, with no mitigating devices, and

leaving the hearer with no option to answer or otherwise be thought of as uncooperative. Consequently, this is the most face-threatening mode of action. It is also possible, however, to orientate bald-on-record events to save the hearer's face. For example, if you say to someone at the meal table *have another helping*, then there is little risk of the hearer feeling imposed upon. The degree to which such directness is face-threatening depends upon how socially close we are to our hearers. The closer we are, then the more direct we are likely to be; the more distant, then the more face-threatening such directness will be.

Generally, speakers perform FTAs on record in ways which take account of face by 'face-management'. This can be done on record and using either negative or positive politeness.

Negative politeness strategies, as defined above, pay attention to negative face. Speakers use them to avoid intruding upon hearer's territory and also give the hearer options. For example, *you couldn't tell me where the breakfast cereals are, could you?* Uses negative politeness by using a question in this way gives the opportunity to say no. Other strategies commonly used in negative politeness include apology and hesitation.

Positive politeness strategies aim to save positive face, by appealing to friendship and demonstrating solidarity. Asking where the breakfast cereals are with on-record positive politeness, for example, would mean approaching a shopper and saying something like: *excuse me, I'd appreciate it if you could tell me whereabouts in the store you got that packet of breakfast cereal.* One of the main types of positive politeness strategy identified by Brown and Levinson (1987) is claiming common ground. Speakers can do this by attending to hearers' wants, needs and interests. For example *I know you don't like loud music, but this concert will be fun. Oh, Mark and Chris'll be there and we haven't seen them for ages.* This example uses many solidarity strategies, such as nicknames, knowledge of personal information and seeking agreement.

Take the following example, which is an extract from a telephone conversation between a boyfriend and girlfriend:

1. Mary: I (.) sometimes I do: think: I I suppose I have (.) I (.) I have felt that maybe you
2. James: were cross with me
3. Mary: cross with you darling
4. James: yeah: I I had =I had
5. Mary: =I wasn't cross with you darling
6. James: mmm
7. Mary: well (.) cross with you about what darling
8. James: but you know I I kind of (0.1) but you know what I'm like sort of thinking that:

=i'm always
9:Mary: =right
10. Mary: thinking that I've offended: and that: oh! No! I mean (.) I'm not! I think (.) erm

(author's data)

Mary performs an on record FTA in turn 1, in that she is voicing a concern about James' behaviour which he may find potentially threatening. By turn 6 she has still failed to provide an answer to the James' question 'cross with you about what'. In her responses, Mary not only flouts the Gricean maxims of quantity, manner and relation, but she also employs negative politeness and another politeness strategy, that of extensive hedging: 'but you know I I kind of' 'I think (.) erm'. Both Cameron (2001: 211-2) and Brown (1980: 117) suggest that women may rate FTAs more severely than men. Mary's behaviour in the extract above bears this out, evidenced by her difficulty throughout to tell James of his tendency to think that he is always right.

2.6.5 Context

Much is said within pragmatics and discourse analysis about the importance of studying verbal behaviour not only as action and its management but also its context (see 2.2.above and TL:TE Part II Chapter 5). Take the following example of two undergraduate students, Claire and Peter, talking about a visit Peter had planned to visit Claire at her parents' house which had not turned out at all well:

Claire: hello, what happened to you?

Peter: (2) well, I got the train as far as Birmingham but then there was this massive delay=

Claire:= what did you do? was there another train?

Peter: I had to go back to Leicester because it was impossible to go on. So then I thought I'd get the coach, but when I got to Leamington I didn't have your address.

Claire: oh no! why didn't you phone me?

Peter: my phone was out of battery, and I'd hurt my ankle when I ran for the coach. Look, its swollen like this.

Claire: poor you! so what did you do?

Peter: (1) um I got the train back to Leicester.

Claire: wait until I tell Debbie!

(author's data)

As with presupposition, there is a great deal of knowledge which the two students share regarding the context of this situation. Presuppositions, though, are not really the shared

background, but an *assumption* of shared background, which may not in fact be shared. Typically these are contexts of:

- > situation – what the speakers know about their physical and geographical surroundings;
- > background knowledge – what the speakers know about one another and the world;
- > co-textual – what the speakers know about what they have been saying.

The situational context in the example above, is Claire's study bedroom at university halls in Leicester. When Peter mentions his hurt ankle, he points to it and refers to it as 'this'. This referential quality of words such as 'this' is known as **deixis** or **deictic expressions**. Words which signal the use of deixis include personal pronouns (I, you, we, they etc), demonstrative pronouns (this, that, these, those) and the article or determiner *the* and adverbs of time and place. The more bound to a situation a conversation is, then normally the more deictic expressions are used. (see 3.x for a fuller discussion of deixis and TL:TE Part II 5.2).

Referring expressions and **referent(s)** are terms used to describe the identification of something or someone and identifying the entity being referred to. For example, in the words '*I* shared a car with *Frank* and *Michael*', the first person singular pronoun 'I' is a referring expression that refers to the person speaking, who is known as the referent. In the same way, 'Frank' and 'Michael' are referring expressions which refer to two people named Frank and Michael, who are the referents.

The background knowledge speakers bring to a conversation is generally of two kinds: cultural and interpersonal. In the conversation above, Claire and Peter share a cultural knowledge of the geographical locations of particular English cities and towns and the difficulties of traveling between the particular ones mentioned by public transport. Claire is not overly surprised that Peter had difficulties traveling by train, because he undertook his journey on a Saturday when trains are notoriously subject to delay and cancellation without notice because of engineering works. The reference to a mobile phone battery being dead is also another instance of shared knowledge, since Peter does not have to explain what this means or why it meant he could not communicate with Claire. Talk assuming shared knowledge of cultural context often presupposes or shows an assumption of shared attitudes towards it. As 2.5.4 above discusses, speakers often modify their expressions to accommodate those of other speakers in order to be accepted and be seen as belonging to the same group.

Consideration of the situational context and shared knowledge is a central concern of another aspect of pragmatics and discourse, namely interactional sociolinguistics, which is discussed in more detail in 2.6 below.

Interpersonal knowledge refers to knowledge that has been acquired through previous exchanges or activities and experiences, and can include personal, privileged knowledge

about a speaker. In the example above, both Claire and Peter know who 'Debbie' is. Peter's interpersonal knowledge of Claire, however, does not extend to having previously visited her at her parents and the situational context of the exchange leads one to conclude that they are contemporaries at the University and their relationship dates from them meeting at University rather than at some earlier time.

Finally, the co-textual context looks at both the context and the content of the text itself: that is, the actual words spoken, and the ways in which the text uses lexical and grammatical cohesion to express its meaning. This aspect of context is dealt with more fully in section 3.4 of the next chapter.

The categories of turn-taking, adjacency pairs, presupposition, politeness and consideration of context are all major methods of analysis not only in conversation analysis but also in pragmatics in general. Although a useful tool for analysis, both discourse analysis and conversation analysis have been criticised on the grounds that their categories of description such as turn-taking and adjacency pairs described above are not exhaustive, or how, in conversation analysis, TRPs (2.3.1 above) might be recognised. As a method of analysis, both are qualitative in nature; that is, they analyse a finite set of segments of conversation in detail, and do not lend themselves easily to quantitative analysis, that is, analysis of a large number of conversations. In conversation analysis, methods of analysis derive categories from conversation itself, aiming to provide descriptions of how conversation works. Since its description and analysis applies to real-time activity, then there is a sense in which any attempt at description or categorisation within any framework, conversation analysis or otherwise, can never be exhaustive or claim to be so since it has to allow for the unpredictability of real-time activity, and its capacity to generate new or different ways of interacting. Whilst the categories of analysis within discourse analysis are finite, it has been criticized for its hierarchical structure and for the fact that they derive from institutional settings which, it is argued, make them less applicable to all naturally occurring communication. However, there is a sense in which the ideological relations underlying all discourse means that all discourse is inevitably hierarchical, and has led to the development of critical discourse analysis, discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

2.7 Language, action and interaction

One further approach to discourse analysis is known as interactional sociolinguistics, which focuses upon the importance of small and subtle variations in the ways people use and interpret discourse. The work of Gumperz (1982b) has been particularly influential in this area. Practitioners of discourse analysis and conversation analysis have tended to criticize interactional linguistics for being both too broad and too context specific as 2.2 above has discussed. However, although the main goal of interactional sociolinguistics is not to describe the structure of discourse, which is the main goal of both discourse analysis and conversation analysis, the two approaches are beginning to come together. Sociolinguistics of the kind described in Chapter 1 centres upon the notion of the linguistic variable in speakers' grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation in identifying different ways of saying the same thing (see 1.1. and 1.3). Interactional sociolinguistics goes one step further, and takes the view that aspects of interaction such as rules of turn-

taking, conventions for signaling agreement and acknowledgement and the marking of utterances as particular kinds of speech acts are also 'variables' in that they are used differently in different contexts or by different kinds of speakers. As discourse analysis and conversation analysis have developed categories of description and analysis over recent decades, this has enabled interactional sociolinguists to take into account both the pragmatic and sociolinguistic aspects of interaction, which also includes consideration of aspects of discourse and conversation analysis such as turn-taking, adjacency pairs and sequences.

In addition, interactional sociolinguistics places importance upon the way in which language is situated in particular circumstances in social life. It brings the situational context and shared knowledge described in 2.5.5 above, and particularly about speakers, their histories and their purpose in speaking, to the forefront. It also looks at grammar, social structure and cultural patterns. Several studies have documented the complex interplay of factors shaping turns and sequences in spoken interaction in a variety of languages, showing how interactional features contribute to achieving particular linguistic and communicative outcomes. This is particularly so with analysts who consider the relationship between grammar and social interaction within the larger sphere of human conduct and the organization of human life (e.g. Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson 1996).

Like practitioners of discourse analysis and conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguists draw upon naturally occurring interactions for their data. Whilst discourse analysis and conversation analysis have traditionally focused upon native Anglo-American speakers, many interactional sociolinguists follow in a tradition initiated by Gumperz in focusing upon speakers from different cultural backgrounds. This has led to a field of inquiry known as 'intercultural communication', sometimes also known as 'cross-cultural communication', which tends to centre upon interaction in institutional settings such as schools and businesses. Key features of such communication – or, as is more often the case *miscommunication*, are contextualization cues, 'crosstalk' and 'uptalk'.

Contextualization cues are signals which convey to the listener some quite complex information about how we intend them to treat the message, conveyed through: prosody (intonation, pitch and stress contrasts); paralinguistic clues (hesitation, pausing, contrasts of speed and volume, simultaneous speech); or switching to a different language, dialect style or register to signal an utterance as having particular significance. For example, in Anglo-American English, the signaling of a question can come from rising intonation at the end of a word. Just the word 'Gravy?' spoken with a rising intonation indicates that the speaker is asking whether or not a person wants gravy, presumably on their meal. Gumperz (1982b) cites the example of a workplace in which white workers ate their lunch in a canteen staffed by Asian workers. A customer was asked if he wanted gravy on a meal which included meat by uttering the word 'gravy', not with a rising intonation but a falling one, which made it sound more like a statement: 'this is gravy' or like an assertion: 'I'm giving you gravy' which was perceived as rude. But, in Indian varieties of English, falling intonation has the same meaning as rising intonation in Anglo-British varieties. Since neither group was explicitly aware of these differences, then

misunderstandings can occur.

Crosstalk refers to the assumptions we all make about the norms and conventions of particular speech events, which may differ culturally. For example, in an interview extract cited in Roberts et al (1992:131), a White interviewer and Asian interviewee have the following exchange:

A: *What have you been doing since you were made redundant?*

B: Nothing

The interviewer's question is a veiled invitation for the interviewee to reassure the selectors that he has in fact been doing something since the redundancy since in the culture to which the interviewer belongs, unemployment is seen as not only a misfortune but also a moral failing. However, speaker B does not pick up on this hidden message, and answers factually and truthfully, qualities considered interview-appropriate in *his* culture. Such miscommunication can have potentially serious and damaging consequences as, in this example, the interviewee could fail the interview due to failing to pick up on hidden messages or agendas.

Uptalk refers to the intonation pattern thought to originate in Australian English, but found in American English and increasingly in British English, especially among young people, where intonation rises at the end of declarative sentences. For example, 'I went shopping today?' Since rising intonation in Anglo-American English is associated with questions, then this pattern can irritate and puzzle other speakers, especially older people. However, an example given by Cameron (2001:113) is that of a study undertaken amongst young women who used uptalk. The focus of the study was to test the assumptions that firstly, there is likely to be variation in the use of a socially and linguistically meaningful feature: uptalk speakers would not use rising intonation on every declarative sentence and secondly, that the pattern of variation would be structured. The pattern uncovered by the study was to do with the status of the *information* being relayed in an utterance: when the information given was new information considered important by the speaker they would make it with rising intonation.

2.7.1 Grammar and interaction

Much of the work undertaken in pragmatics and discourse analysis discussed so far in this chapter has centred upon identifying categories and structures of the way in which speech is structured and managed, and has not been as concerned with the linguistic structure of the utterances themselves. However, just as it was once assumed that speech was unstructured and without pattern, so too the assumption that spoken speech follows the grammatical rules of written language has been challenged. Grammars of written English almost invariably use constructed sentences to illustrate their points. However, once one moves away from constructed sentences to 'real' language data, especially that of speech and particularly conversation, then it becomes clear that the categories designed to describe written speech do not transfer across very easily. Features such as false starts, hesitations and reformulations are common in speech, but grammars designed to describe written English prove inadequate to describe them.

Carter and McCarthy (1995 and 2006) and Douglas Biber et al (1999) for example, have shown that the grammar of speech has many characteristics that are different from those found in writing. Their studies have been made possible by the application of computational techniques which allow for the processing of natural language data. Computers are able to store large numbers of texts, and these collections are known as **corpora** (the singular form is **corpus**) which can then be processed by using specialist software. This has given rise to a whole new area in linguistic study, that of **corpus linguistics**. Corpus analysis has allowed researchers to look in detail at recurring patterns of use within corpora and how they relate to the context in which they is used (see also 3.x).

Carter and McCarthy's (1995) discuss the spoken data taken from a mini-corpus which is part of a much larger one. This consisted of two and a half hours of transcribed talk from a variety of male and female speakers of different ages and from different backgrounds in a variety of different contexts: service encounters such as shopping, talking to a bank manager; narratives such as retelling stories; casual conversation and 'language in action'; that is, the talk which accompanies tasks such as preparing a meal, moving furniture and so on. They isolated four grammatical features that were common across all types of speech: **Ellipsis; left dislocation and topical information; reinforcement** and **indirect speech**.

Ellipsis is the leaving out or omission of parts which would otherwise be required in a structure – was found to be a common feature across the corpus. For example:

[At a dry-cleaner's. <02> is leaving a pair of trousers for cleaning]
<01> Wednesday at four be okay
<02> Er yeah that's fine...just check the pockets a minute

In this example, the initial *will* or *would* is missing from <01> and *I'll* is missing from the second clause in <02>. Carter and McCarthy found that ellipsis was a feature of service encounters, casual conversation and 'language in action', but was noticeably absent from narratives. This is because the participants and processes of the story are normally separated in time and place from the moment of telling.

Left dislocation refers to the phenomenon where '... items semantically co-referential with the subject or object of the clause are positioned before the subject. For example:

<01> Well Sharon, where I'm living, *a friend of mine*, *she's* got her railcard and....

In this example, *a friend of mine* is repeated as the subject pronoun *she*. Carter and McCarthy argue that left-placed or fronted items of this kind are perfectly normal in conversation, and especially in narratives: 'It is apparent that speakers use the available slot to flag a variety of items of information that will be helpful to the listener in identifying participants, in linking current topics to already mentioned ones, in reactivating old topics, and generally anchoring the discourse...' (1995:143) Carter and McCarthy term

the slot at the front of a clause used to carry topic-prominent items as 'topic'.

Just as there is an available slot at the front of the clause called 'topic', so too, is there a final slot, when all other core clause constituents have been exhausted, which speakers often fill with different types of information. Tags often occupy this slot (such as: you're daft, *you are*) as do other noun phrases. For example:

<01> It's lovely

<02> Good winter wine *that*

and:

<01> it's very nice *that road up through Skipton to the Dales* [<02> Yeah] I can't remember the names of the places.

Indirect speech is usually described as 'X said that Y' where the reporting verb (for example *tell*) is in the simple past tense. However, in Carter and McCarthy's corpus, examples of indirect speech had the reporting clause in past continuous. For example:

<01> Tom *was saying* they should have the heating on by about Wednesday.

Carter and McCarthy suggest that the past continuous seems to report the *event* of the uttering, whereas the past simple gives more authority to the words uttered. The use of the past continuous form of a reporting verb was found in every context except for the narrative one, which may indicate that what someone said *and* what words they used are considered equally important. In casual conversation, past continuous *saying* and *telling* emphasise message content over its form, and to summarise or report entire conversations rather than individual utterances.

The work of Biber et al (1999) has concentrated more upon types of structure characteristic of speech than distinguishing different contexts at a finer level of detail. They distinguish between the body of a speaker's message which carries the main content, and optional preceding elements, or 'prefaces' and following elements or tags'. For example:

Preface: North and south London

Body: they're two different worlds

Tags: aren't they? In a way

Prefaces function as conversational launching devices which Biber et al call **utterance launchers** and signal the beginning of a turn or an utterance. They include **fronting, noun phrase prefaces, discourse markers** and **overtures**.

Fronting is a device used for the management of information, where word order is capitalized upon to give prominence to one element in the immediate context. The grammatical structure of a clause commonly follows the SVO/P/A word order of English (see DL:DE xx and 3.x), which is the same for speech as for writing (disregarding ellipsis). The ordering of O/P/A S is known as topicalisation or fronting found in a

restrictive set of conditions. It gives prominence to one element in an immediate context, and its use is thus restricted and not very common. For example:

A: *You always remember numbers. Don't you? Car numbers and telephone numbers and...*

B: **Car numbers** I remember more by the letters than the numbers.

Noun phrase prefaces occur in speech more frequently, dividing clause frames into two chunks, where a pronoun co-refers to a prefaced noun phrase as in the following examples:

This little shop – *it's lovely*

Those Marks and Spencer's bags, *can you see them all?*

You know, **the vase**, *did you see it?*

In sentence grammar, such utterances would more usually be expressed as a single clause with no co-referential pronoun, for example, 'This little shop is lovely'.

Discourse markers are single words or phrases which signal that something is about to be said and to gain the listener's attention. They are a particular feature of the grammar of speech and are not normally found in writing. Words such as **right, erm, well, oh, okay, so** and phrases such as **so anyway, you see, look here**, or in combination **okay, you see** or **well, so anyway**.

Overtures are expressions which are longer than discourse markers and a more explicit way of signaling a new direction in conversation, and the list is more open-ended. For example: *I would have thought* has the pragmatic force of signalling a point of disagreement; *there again* of adding a contrasting point to an argument and *going back* to signalling a return to an earlier topic.

Whilst prefaces describe what comes before the main body of an utterance, **tags** describe 'afterthoughts' or qualify what has already been said. Biber et al identify four different types of tags: **retrospective comment clause, retrospective vagueness hedges, question tags** and **noun phrase tags**.

Retrospective comment clauses refers to the speaker adding a comment which modifies the preceding clause. For example, *'Mm I wouldn't go into Amanda Close I don't think* whereas **retrospective vagueness hedges** signal that the speaker has some doubt about what has just been said: For example, *'North and South London they're two different worlds aren't they? In a way.'* **Question tags** have the **pragmatic force of** turning a statement retrospectively into a question and an interactive function of wishing to elicit a response. For example: *'You had a nice trip though yeah?'*

Finally, **noun phrase tags** repeat and elaborate a preceding noun phrase, most commonly with the aim of clarifying what might not at first have been clear. For example: *'He's had a blind up-a special blind that leads straight across the fanlight'*. They are also the opposite of noun phrase tags, where a noun phrase links to a preceding pronoun, for example: *Oh, I reckon they're lovely. I really do whippets.'* Biber et al

conclude that the main motivation for this device is the need to clarify retrospectively. In speech, the use of a personal pronoun is most common, which the speaker then adds a clausal unit with a clarifying noun phrase to make the reference clear.

Carter and McCarthy's *Cambridge Grammar of English* (2006) draws upon extensive corpus research in arriving at its descriptions and categories and identify nine basic forms of spoken grammar. Like Biber, they too recognize the category of fronting, which they call **heads**, and Biber's retrospective comment clauses are called **tails**. They also recognise the category of **discourse markers**, and **ellipsis**, identified in their 1995 study. They add further categories of: **deixis** (*could we just move **that** into this corner **here***); **modal expressions** (*I suppose it **must be sort of** difficult to phone **or whatever***); **adverbials** (*you know which one I mean **probably***); and **spoken clause structure** which includes the previous 1995 categories of topical information and reinforcement and **vague language** (<SO1> *do you think it is affected by your faith, like you were saying you [**<SO2> mm**] have kind of moral standards or not, like hooliganising and things I mean...*). (See DL:DE for explanation of grammatical terms).

Studies of the kind undertaken by Biber et al, Carter and McCarthy and others show that not only does speech have its own grammar which is distinct in many ways from that of writing, but that it can also be described and categorized into grammatical categories.

2.8 Studying speech

The earlier sections in this chapter outline and introduce issues in studying pragmatics and discourse. As they have shown, the focus of research in pragmatics and discourse is upon: a) identifying linguistic patterns in verbal behaviour; b) the management of conversation and c) the nature of interaction as it occurs in everyday speech, taking account of the contexts within which it occurs. Conversation analysis, and indeed pragmatics in general, studies the order, organization and orderliness of social action, and particularly as it is located in everyday interaction. Above all, it is concerned with structures and ways in which order happens. The aim of research in pragmatics and discourse then, is to provide analytic descriptions of the organization of spoken interaction, to apply them to everyday speech and to analyse its implications on the linguistic system itself.

2.8.1 Selecting a topic for research

The first thing to decide when undertaking your own research into pragmatics and discourse is the focus of your study. For example, you may wish to:

- > replicate previous studies by taking new data and performing the same analysis;
- > compare talk in particular settings, such as an institutional one and/or an informal one;
- > compare different kinds of talk, such as between men and women, among women or men of a similar age or of different ages;
- > describe something new, such as interactive or live TV or internet chat rooms;
- > compare talk amongst people of different cultural backgrounds.

Replicating a previous study is perhaps the simplest kind of research project. It involves you asking the same research question or questions and using the same methods as the study you are going to replicate, but you collect your own data to analyse, to find out if your analysis confirms the same results as the original study. Replication of study is in fact an important aspect of research in pragmatics and discourse, since by nature this kind of study tends to be qualitative and small scale with a large number of variables that make it difficult to draw conclusions from any one study. Reliable generalizations about the point at issue can only be made when similar results have been obtained across a range of studies. Even if you replicate a study, there will still be differences between your own and the original study. The informants (the term used to describe participants you record, as in Chapter 1) in your study will almost certainly be different people from those in the original study, even though they may share similar characteristics of age, gender, ethnicity, class and so on.

One way in which you can usefully or consciously vary replication of a study is to ask the same questions and use the same methods, but change one or more of the nonlinguistic variables. For example, the women who took part in Coates's 1996 study of women friends' talk were predominantly middle-class. This study could be replicated using working class women as informants, and the results of the two studies compared. The question here would be to see whether patterns of friendly talk identified by Coates apply to women from a different social background.

Comparing talk in different settings is another common type of research project. Whereas projects that replicate earlier work share largely the same research focus as the original study, for this kind of study, you would need to be clear about this for yourself and decide (in advance) on your own focus or research question. For example, in addition to those given above you could:

- compare soap opera dialogue with spontaneous informal conversation, to see how far soap opera dialogue resembles spontaneous speech;
- compare the speech of one person in their work setting as opposed to a more informal and casual one, to see if the context of speech makes a difference.

Comparing different types of talk is also another common type of research project. As with investigating talk in different settings, you would need to be clear what the focus or research question you are investigating is going to be. For example, in addition to those given above the you could:

- compare a group of elderly men or women with a group of young men or women from similar social backgrounds to see if patterns of conversation vary with age;
- compare a mother talking with a daughter or son, or a father talking with a daughter or son, to see if patterns of conversation vary according to gender. .

Describing something new is also a possible area for research. Technological advances in TV broadcasting and the internet have both produced new interactive media genres, and it would be interesting to see whether such genres observe patterns of use previously identified or give rise to new ones.

Once you have chosen the focus of your research project, then it is important that you read any relevant works which may help you to orientate your study within the body of published research undertaken, in both books and journal articles. By reading around you form a better picture of the field of enquiry in which you wish to locate your project, such as what the arguments are about and what the questions are. Knowing this will help you to formulate your own question more clearly and give you a picture of what findings you might expect, and what would be unexpected. Another important aspect of reading around your topic is that it gives you ideas and information regarding data collection. Most studies will usually have a 'methods' section where the author details the procedures used in the study, such as how many informants, how long the recording was for, and maybe even pitfalls to avoid!

It is important to take notice of the date of publication of any work, since that which is most recent will be most up to date in developments in the field, and most likely refer back to older references still being cited by researchers, which gives an idea of their importance. The key to reading for the purposes of writing a research project, or indeed any essay, is not the amount of reading that you do, but developing the ability to perceive which reading is important to your own research question.

2.8.2 Choosing and collecting data

As with researching variation and change in English, the data you collect will usually be that of naturally occurring speech. Research in pragmatics, as has been mentioned previously, is qualitative in nature; that is, the methods it uses involve more time collecting and analysing data from a small range of informants. This allows for a more detailed analysis than quantitative methods using more standardized instruments such as questionnaires allow (see also 1.4.2).

In researching variation in spoken English, Chapter 1 described how interviews form a main source of spoken data collection. However, for the purposes of research into discourse and pragmatics, the aim of collecting data is different, in that it is to find out how some aspect(s) of talk itself works in different contexts and settings. Interviews of any kind are generally structured around interviewers asking questions on a predetermined topic with informants responding. Consequently, the researcher ends up with a certain kind of talk to analyse, which may be suitable for the purposes of analysing variation, but not for analysing naturally occurring speech. The researcher is more likely to obtain data for the purposes of pragmatics analysis by taking the role of an observer or eavesdropper rather than that of the interviewer. This sounds simple, since people are talking all around us all the time; however, to capture that speech requires the use of a recording device, and many of the circumstances in which we find ourselves day to day do not lend themselves easily to recording. Since all talk is shaped by the context in which it occurs, then where it is being observed and recorded is an important part of that context. Opting for a more recording-friendly physical setting almost inevitably loses or contaminates the influence of more common or usual contexts.

Recording natural conversation, particularly in domestic and social settings, is a different kind of activity from recording interviews. Rather than preparing an interview, you could ask your informants to discuss a particular topic, such as their views on something which is topical in the news, or ask to record when a meal is taking place or a social event of some kind. With this latter

kind of activity, you need to be aware of noise levels and make sure that the event does not involve loud background music. Recording talk in a more institutional setting can be easier from the point of view of people talking, as speech is usually structured around a particular activity, such as, in a school a lesson, in a university, a seminar or tutorial, in a doctor's surgery the greetings of patients at Reception and the doctor-patient interview or in a sales situation between a salesperson and the potential buyer.

Although the purposes and contexts of recording data for researching pragmatics and discourse are different from those for researching variation, the actual mechanics of the recording situation are very similar, and discussed in 1.4.2. Briefly, these are: being aware of the observer's paradox, obtaining consent and the recording itself.

The observer's paradox refers to how a researcher's presence may affect other people's behaviour, which is a problem, since ideally, we would wish to observe how people behave when they are not observed. One obvious way to get around this would be not to let people know that they are being recorded, or let them know afterwards, but this raises ethical issues of truth and honesty. Coates in her book *Women Talk* (1996) describes how she secretly recorded her friends talking at gatherings at each other's houses for over a year. Eventually, she told them what she had been doing, and to her surprise they felt angry, exploited and betrayed, not because she had recorded them, but because she had not told them. We may think recording people closest to us would be a relatively easy thing to do, but the reactions you encounter to such a request may be surprising. Informing people after you have recorded them may be an option, but one you need to think about carefully, and to be aware of any potential consequences such as Coates' experience should you choose to do this.

The current ethical guidance is that it is not acceptable to fail to ask permission to record people's voices, but this raises the issue of exactly how much to tell them about the purpose of your recording. As 1.4.2 pointed out, if you tell people that you wish to record their accent, then this has the effect of making people more conscious and aware of it and results in them altering their normal speech behaviour. One way to avoid this is to offer a secondary reason for recording, such as gathering opinion on a particular issue or as part of a project into a topic of some kind. However you decide to obtain consent, a straightforward issue is that of making them aware about the overall purpose of your research. Not everyone is familiar with the conventions of academic research and thus need to be made aware of the implications of consenting to be recorded. The most important implication here is when or if you are recording private conversations. By analysing the data and writing it up as an academic piece of work, you are effectively making that conversation available in a much more public arena. Professional researchers aim to get their studies published in books or journals which reach a wide audience, and your own work, although not so publicly available, will still be read by tutors and external examiners. For this reason, it is an academic convention that pseudonyms are used in the transcript and analytic comment. Your informants might also feel more comfortable in taking part in recording if they know that this will be the case. It is also worth noting that professionals are often interested in seeing results, and the offer to give them a copy of the recording - or indeed the written up research project - can often help in obtaining consent.

When it comes to recording itself, then the less obtrusive video, tape, or micro recorder you use

the better. Section 1.4.3 explains the mechanics of recording in more detail. One thing you will also have to bear in mind is that conversation, and the circumstances in which it takes place, can be unpredictable. You need to be prepared to record more than once and for greater lengths of time than you originally think you need to. If you are one of the participants in the recording, then you will have to take account of the observer's paradox.

Once you have recorded your conversation, then you will need to select the part which you will use in your analysis. This will usually be a stretch of dialogue lasting anything from about two to five minutes, giving two to five pages of transcription. Depending upon the length of the conversation, it is not usually necessary to transcribe all of it, since this is very time-consuming and not necessary for the purposes of your analysis. The selections you make will be guided by the research focus of your study. For example, if you wish to investigate FTAs in relation to conversation between a male and a female, then it makes sense to choose extracts which feature FTAs. Once you have made your selections, then you need to transcribe them.

2.8.3 Conventions of transcription

Because analysing discourse is concerned with the management and order of conversation and the contexts within which it occurs, then transcribing speech uses ordinary orthographic script rather than the phonetic fonts of the IPA (see 1.5.4 and *DL:DE* chapter 3). It is important that you transcribe what you hear, including utterances not normally found in writing such as *um*, *er*, and so on, and resist the temptation to modify what you write into written, grammatical and punctuated English. It also helps if you line number your transcription down the right hand side, for ease of reference. There is no one single set of transcription symbols which are used uniformly, but a consensus of use has emerged. It is usual to set out the transcript like a play script; that is, with the speaker's name or initial in the margin and then the utterance after it. It is also usual to leave out punctuation and use the method of indicating pauses described below. Capital letters are normally either not used at all, or confined to proper nouns. They are not usually used to mark the beginning of sentences, since spoken conversation is not subject to the same rules and conventions of written language. Punctuation marks generally are used for intonation rather than for grammar. Analysing discourse is a relatively new activity, and there is no standard system for transcribing talk of the kind there is for transcribing accent such as the IPA. Even so, certain conventions of transcription have become established. The list below gives the most commonly used transcription notation:

Transcription notation.

(.)	just noticeable pause
(0.3) (2.3)	examples of exactly timed pauses, in seconds
.hh hh	speakers' in-breath and out-breath respectively
wo(h)rd	'laughter' within a word
end.	full stop (period) denotes falling, ending intonation
word?	question mark depicts rising, questioning intonation
£word£	pound signs enclose talk said in a "smile voice"
cu-	a sharp cut-off of a prior word or sound
lo:ng	stretching of a preceding sound

(word)	transcriber's guess at an unclear part of the tape
()	unclear talk.
(- - -)	unclear talk with each syllable represented as a dash
A: word=	equal sign shows no discernible pause between two speakers
B: =word	turns or, if between two sounds within a single speaker's turn, shows that they run together
word	underlined sounds are louder
WORD	capitals are louder still
>word word <	inward arrows indicate faster speech, outward arrows slower
<word word>	
[overlap]	

Transcribing accurately and faithfully is a time-consuming and lengthy business, since you will be concerned not only with the words that are spoken, but also with representing any speech markers which occur such as 'oh', 'um', 'er'; identifying the length of pauses; identifying amounts of overlap and so on. Anyone coming new to transcription invariably underestimates the amount of time an accurate transcription takes. Even if you have undertaken transcription activities associated with sociolinguistics of the kind described in Chapter 1, the kind of transcription you do for analysis here will be very different, since it seeks to capture all aspects of conversation as it occurs in real time, rather than with the identification of whole, identifiable words.

One way of preparing you to realise what exactly is involved in transcription is to undertake a small-scale activity with another person. Record between 10 and 15 minutes of conversation, where you and your partner may or may not be one of the participants, in an informal setting such as at home, or the communal space of a shared house or flat, (making sure you have permission to record before you start). Once you have recorded, you and your partner need to listen to the tape right through, select and agree the sections you are going to transcribe, which amount to between 2-3 minutes in total. This should give you between 3-5 pages of transcription which should be sufficient for the purposes of future analysis. Agree the transcription conventions you are going to use, and any additional ones that may be needed, then, independently write out your transcriptions. Once you have made your transcript, compare it with that of your partner. Points of comparison would be: whether or not either of you have included anything apart from words; whether or not your transcripts are identical, and if not, where they are different. It is also worth taking some time to think about features of talk that were hard to capture and why.

2.8.4 Analysing data

If you have prepared yourself well when deciding your research topic in reading the background studies that pertain to your work, and identified a clear focus for what it is you wish to interrogate your data for, then the task of analysing your data will be straightforward. For example, if you have chosen to replicate a study, or changed a variant in the study, then the categories of analysis will be the same as those used in the original piece of research. If you are designing your study around any other of the topics of the kind listed in 2.7.1, you may decide to concentrate your analysis upon the categories of the kind described in this chapter, such as Gricean pragmatics outlined in 2.3; discourse analysis in 2.4; conversation analysis in 2.5 or interactional sociolinguistics in 2.6. The preparatory reading you will have done will help you decide, since reading previous studies on your chosen topic should give you an idea of which methods of

analysis best suit the transcription data you have collected and transcribed.

Students can be worried by the fact that the analysis they present with their transcription can be the least time-consuming aspect of the project, whilst collecting, choosing and transcribing data is very time consuming for an end result of three to four pages of transcription. The fact of the matter is, that you cannot do your analysis without the transcription, and without it there would be no project.

The aim of your analysis will usually be:

- > to discover how far the model or categories of analysis you are applying can be identified in your data;
- > to what degree this has been successful;
- > how far your own findings accord with published studies in the field.

Once you have analysed your results, then you will need to interpret them. That is, you will need to consider your results in the light of your analysis and draw conclusions about any insights your analysis and comparison of it with other published research have given you.

2.8.5 Sample projects

a) Choose a study to replicate such as Cameron (1997) or Coates 1997 discussed in 2.6 above.

This will involve you firstly: in recording and transcribing parts of conversation between participants of a similar age, gender and background to the ones used in the original study. Your own work may not involve such extensive recording as the original study, but should be sufficiently long enough for comparison to take place. As a rough guide, half an hour of conversation with transcription of sections totaling about five minutes should be sufficient. Secondly, you will need to analyse your transcription according to the categories used in the original study and thirdly, compare your analysis with that of the original which involves interpreting it, drawing conclusions from it which may or may not confirm those of the original study.

b) Compare talk in a particular setting, such as an institutional one and/or an informal one, and analyse it according to either DA or CA categories of description.

This will involve you firstly: in recording conversation which takes part in your chosen setting, probably about half an hour, and transcribing parts of it which total about five minutes. Secondly, choose either DA or CA categories of analysis and apply them to your transcription. Thirdly, discuss what your analysis reveals, and draw conclusions from it, referring your conclusions to research already undertaken in this area. Since the focus of this study is upon the setting, then your discussion will centre upon how aspects of that setting affect verbal behaviour. You should also include an explanation as to why you have chosen either DA or CA.

c) Compare and analyse different kinds of talk, such as; i) between men and women, ii) among women or iii) men of a similar age or of different ages.

This study is very similar to b) above, and will follow the same process, except that the focus will be more on the participants' verbal behaviour and less on the effect of the setting.

d) Describe interaction in live TV or internet chat rooms.

This study will involve you in either: i. recording data from TV or ii. printing off material from chat rooms. Recording data from TV does not take as long to set up or to execute as 'live' recording, so you could record one or two programmes, depending upon their length. Chatroom material needs to be long enough to select extracts, but not so long as to make the data unwieldy. For a short study, 15-20 pages should be sufficient. You then need to select extracts which you can analyse in detail, according to the methods and categories of analysis you have chosen. Finally, you need to consider your data in terms of what it reveals about the interaction and whether or not any conclusions can be drawn as to how the context affects interaction.

e) Undertake an analysis of spoken grammar.

This study will involve you in analysing and transcribing conversation as for a), b) and c) above. Instead of applying categories associated with either DA or CA, you will need to analyse your data according to grammatical categories of spoken English. This will involve you in explaining what these categories are, where they are found in your data and how they affect the process of interaction.

2.9 Where to find out more

For other works on pragmatics and discourse, see Brown and Levinson (1987), Hewings and Hewings (2005); Cutting (2002); Cameron (2001); Hutchby and Woofitt (1998); Thomas (1995), Schiffrin (1994) Leech (1983) and Watts (2003). Chapters on pragmatics and discourse also feature in general books on Applied Linguistics, such as that edited by Davies and Elder (2004) and Schmidt (2002).

Chapter 3 Stylistics

3.1 Introduction

The first two chapters of this book have been concerned with spoken language. By contrast, stylistics is concerned primarily with the linguistic analysis of written texts, especially, but not exclusively, literary ones. In its earlier form, linguistics had been concerned with spoken language, its history, acquisition and so on. Where it had concerned itself with the written form of English, this was often through a consideration of its formal features as expressed through vocabulary and grammar and not with literary features of style. In a seminal and often quoted paper, Roman Jakobson (1960:377) wrote that: '... a linguist deaf to the poetic function of language and a literary scholar indifferent to linguistic problems and unacquainted with linguistic methods are equally flagrant anachronisms'. That is, just as a linguist should take account of the creativity and literariness of language, then a literary scholar should take account of the linguistic structures through which that creativity and literariness is realised.

At the time, Jakobson's statement provided a landmark for the field of stylistics. Since that time, many specifically linguistic investigations into literary texts have been undertaken, often using categories of descriptive linguistics as their structuring mechanism. In addition, aspects of phonology, especially metrics and sound patterning, have been applied to poetic texts. Linguistic analysis of literature, however, involves not only the identification of linguistic features, but also a consideration of how these are interpreted, and the relationship between linguistic structures and their mental processing. Consequently, in addition to more formal properties of style, there has also been a parallel interest in the psychological and cognitive properties of style, particularly in how readers respond to texts.

Many books or chapters on stylistics are organised around investigating the language of particular textual genres, and especially the language of poetry, prose and plays. This chapter takes a different approach, in that it is organised around key concepts or linguistic categories in stylistics and organising principles of language as discourse. This allows for consideration of stretches of text at the level of discourse and discussion of stylistic 'tools' across a variety of different text types and genres. 3.2 and 3.3 provide a background and overview to the study of stylistics. 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 discuss some major

aspects of textual organisation and patterning across stretches of text. 3.7 explores a major organising principle of textual organisation, that of narrative, whilst 3.8 considers representations of speech and thought in narrative and 3.9 the use of dialogue in drama. These sections are by no means exhaustive of all methods and approaches to stylistics, but cover a few in sufficient detail to give you a flavour of what is involved and to get you started in your own analysis. 3.10 provides students with guidance and advice on undertaking their own research into stylistics, whilst 3.11 provides suggestions for further reading.

3.2 What is stylistics?

At its broadest, stylistics can be defined as the study of style of written -- predominantly literary -- texts, as opposed to the investigation of the ideas that it may contain, which is the focus of literary criticism. This is not to say that stylistics ignores ideas. Stylistics looks mostly into HOW texts mean, whereas literary criticism focuses on WHAT they convey. As Wales (2001:373) says: 'The goal of most stylistics is not simply to describe the formal features of texts for their own sake, but in order to show their functional significance for the interpretation of text; or in order to relate literary effects to linguistic 'causes' where these are felt to be relevant...'

Although intuition and interpretative skills are important, stylistic analysis aims to avoid vague and impressionistic judgements about the way formal features are used and manipulated in texts. For their part, some literary critics take issue with what they think of as an 'objective' approach to the interpretation of literary texts. However, this 'objectivity' is an important feature of stylistics, since its methods of analysis aim to be, in Wales' words: '...methodical, systematic, empirical, analytical, coherent, accessible, retrievable and consensual.' Thus, stylistics is concerned both with identifying and examining the linguistic organisation of a text, how that organisation interacts with its interpretation to support a particular view or reading of the work under examination.

In addition to linguistics and literary criticism, in recent years stylistics has also been influenced by cultural theory, which questions the assumption that interpretation or a particular view of a text is fixed, stable, and the same for all readers. From the 1980s onwards, the work of linguists such as Fowler (1986) and more recently Fairclough (1989 onwards) and van Dijk (1988) have added a further dimension of interpretation, which is that interpretation does not happen in a vacuum or as a solely individual activity but interacts with social and cultural experiences. Consequently, stylistics can be said to be made up of three distinct but interrelated strands of inquiry, any of which can independently form the primary focus of study, or lend themselves to viable combination with either or both alternatives. These strands are: the formal, the cognitive and the sociocultural.

A **formal** approach to the study of stylistics is concerned with the formal properties of a text. It takes on board the analysis of words and other structures from a linguistic perspective. This includes analysis of sounds, vocabulary, syntax of phrases and clauses, and the textual organization of discourse. Within stylistics, analysing the formal features of a text has the most developed conceptual vocabulary and frames of reference. In the stylistics classroom, a common language or **metalanguage** has evolved: that is, a set of linguistically derived terms for describing stylistic concepts. These terms centre around the metaphorical concept of the stylistician's 'toolbox', and includes the use of 'checklists' of the kind offered by writers of textbooks in stylistics such as Short (1988; 1996), McRae (1997), some of which are discussed more fully in 3.3 and 3.4 below.

A **cognitive** approach takes account of the points of contact between a text, other texts and readers, including consideration of the function of a text, drawing upon literary, cultural theory and psychological theory in addition to linguistic theory. In recent years, stylistics has begun to draw upon work in cognitive psychology in attempting to understand the point of contact between a text, other texts and readers. Thanks to research in the field of pragmatics described in chapter 2, linguists have come to realise that meaning is not stable and absolute, but often depends as much upon the processes of interpretation undertaken by a reader or listener, as upon the actual linguistic structures that are used. Stylistics can also consider the point of contact between the text and the reader as an interactive, communicative act. It includes considerations such as the ways in which writers draw attention to other texts, and studies how readers track texts during the act of processing, discussed in 3.4.1 and 3.5. Consequently, those working in the field of stylistics are increasingly coming to recognise the interactive nature of roles played by the reader and the text in the activity of analysis and the construction of an interpretation. The aim for stylisticians then, as well as for literary critics, is to understand the reception of a text.

A **sociocultural** approach is concerned not only with the interaction between the text and its readers, but also the socio-cultural contexts within which reading and writing take place. Texts and their readers do not exist in isolation, but function within a wider social and cultural context. This has led to account being taken of contextual factors such as the cultural background of the reader, the circumstances in which the particular text is read, and so on. Rather than concerning themselves exclusively with finding out 'what a text means', stylisticians undertaking such an approach to analysis are more interested in the systematic ways language is used to create texts which are similar or different from one another, and link choices in texts to social and cultural contexts. The particular concerns, experiences and political views which the reader brings to bear on the text will obviously play a huge role in colouring her/his search for meaning in a text, and it is essential that this influence is acknowledged when applying the objective criteria that are deployed through the checklists of linguistic features contained within a text. Such a view shifts the point of focus away from a static view of the text which exists in its own world as a self-sufficient entity, towards one which is much more dynamic, cognitive, intertextual and interpersonal. This third aspect of stylistic analysis can also include taking account of unequal relationships in society and how texts mediate authority,

power and control. Viewed in this way, stylistic analysis can become embedded within a framework of critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis (CDA), where explorations of authority, power and inequality form a central motivation for the analysis. This approach pays attention both to the formal features of the text and also to its reception within a reading community in relation to ideology. This critical aspect or dimension of textual analysis is discussed fully in chapter 4, whilst the current chapter concentrates its discussion on the formal and cognitive approaches to textual analysis and interpretation.

A further issue in stylistics has been the range of texts which should be considered for analysis. Stylistics was originally intended as a method of analysis for literary texts, but as the whole notion of 'literary language', texts and textuality has become open to question and become more fluid, then the range of texts open to stylistic analysis has also broadened. Consequently, analysis extended beyond exclusively literary texts to include, for example, newspaper articles, advertisements, and so on. Rather than focusing on and identifying instances or features of literary language, it is more appropriate to consider the concept of 'literariness', first coined by the Russian Formalists in the early twentieth century. Literariness is a property of texts and contexts which focuses upon and considers patterns of language in use, irrespective of their acknowledged genres. The examples used in this chapter then, come from a wide range of texts, rather than being confined to exclusively literary ones.

3.3 Stylistics, levels of language and grammar

Any utterance or written piece of language is organised on several distinct levels of language, each of which has an associated area of linguistic study. (see *DL:DE* Chapter 1 section 1.1 and chapters 4 and 5). Traditionally, the largest unit of grammatical analysis has been that of the sentence. Texts are essentially made up of grammatical units of analysis are ordered in a rank scale according to their size, from the largest down to the smallest:

Sentence or clause complex

Clause

Phrase or group

Word

Morpheme

Phoneme

These levels of language from the phoneme through to the clause can be identified and discussed individually in the stylistic analysis of any text. However, it is central to stylistics and to our understanding of language and style that these levels are

interconnected. They depend upon each other and work together, representing 'multiple and simultaneous linguistic operations in the planning and production of an utterance' (Simpson 2004:5). Stylistic analysis of texts then, at this formal level, considers each of these levels and their interdependence upon one another, an interdependence which is often most vividly apparent in poetry. Many textbooks on stylistics explain this interdependence in detail (see, for example: Wright & Hope 1996; Short 1996).

Phonemes, the smallest meaning-changing units of sound (see: *DL:DE* 3.1), are often exploited in poetry and advertising slogans, especially for their **alliteration**, **repetition**, **assonance** and **rhyme**. Take the following example, from Old English poetry:

*Over breaking billows, with belly sail,
And foamy beak, like a flying bird
The ship sped on.*

B is used alliteratively throughout the poem: **breaking billows**, **belly**, **beak**, **bird**; as is *s* in **sail** and **sped** and *f* in **foamy** and **flying**. Alliterative syllables are usually strongly stressed ones, so that they relate to the rhythmic pattern of the rhyme as in the following example, taken from the medieval poem *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*:

The snaw snitered ful snart, that snayped the wilde
(The snow came shivering down very bitterly, so that it nipped the wild animals)

Assonance is where a vowel sound is repeated in a word with different final consonants. e.g. *Break! Break! Break! On the cold grey stones, O Sea!* For example, repetition of *o* in 'cold' and 'stones' again as the single word 'O', stresses the poet's anguish. Another example of assonance is the advertising slogan: *beans means Heinz*. This repeats the vowel sounds /ea/ which is then echoed in the assonance of /ei/.

The morpheme is the smallest unit in grammar often also said to be the smallest unit of meaning in written language (see: *DL:DE* 4.0 and 4.1), whereas the phoneme is commonly described as the smallest unit of meaning-changing sound. Certain morphemes, called **root** morphemes, are individual words in their own right, whereas others, such as prefixes and suffixes known as **bound** morphemes since they depend on their meaning by being joined onto bound morphemes. For example, the word *teapots* has three constituents: two root morphemes *tea* and *pot* plus the suffix or plural morpheme *s*. One way in which morphemes can add to vocabulary is by creating newly invented words. A common way of doing this is through **compounds**: that is, joining two root morphemes together, such as *teapot* or *mobile phone*. Another way is to invent completely new words, of which a famous examples of this is Lewis Carroll's poem *Jabberwocky* from the novel *Through the Looking Glass*:

Twas brillig and the slithy tothes,

Did gyre and gimble in the wabe;

All mimsy were the borogroves,

And the mome raths outgrabe.

"Beware the Jabberwock, my son,

The jaws that bite and claws that scratch

Beware the jubjub bird

And shun the frumious bandersnatch"

Here, English speakers can readily interpret invented words such as *brillig gyre* and *gimble* as root morphemes, whilst *tothes*, *borogroves* and *mome raths* are shown by their syntactic position to be bound by the plural –s, and *slth-y* has two morphemes, the final –y being an adjectival one.

Morphemes combine into words which combine into **phrases**. These can be one word on its own or a group of words, such as a **noun phrase**, **verb phrase**, **adjective phrase** and **adverb phrase**. To this can be added the category of **prepositional phrase** which is a noun phrase with a preposition in front. (see: DL:DE 5.3). For example, *The cat* is a noun phrase made up of the determiner *the* and the noun *cat*. *Jumped* is a verb phrase comprising the past participle of the verb *jump*, whilst *has jumped* is a verb phrase made up of two words, the auxiliary *has* and the verb *jumped*. *Over the fence* is a prepositional phrase, formed by the preposition *over* plus a noun phrase *the fence*, itself made up of a determiner and noun. Phrases combine elements of information into **clauses**. The main difference between a phrase and a clause is that a clause contains a verb phrase in addition to other phrases (see: DL:DE 5.3 for a more detailed explanation).

For the purposes of stylistic analysis, the clause is particularly important because it has to include a verb, thus fulfilling several important functions of language such as providing information on tense and grammatical 'mood': that is, whether a clause is interrogative, imperative or declarative. In addition to the grammatical forms summarised above, clauses can also be categorised according to their semantic functions. The various phrase classes outlined above combine into five basic elements of clause structure. These are:

subject (S),

predicator or verb (P),

object (O),

complement (C)

adverbial (A)

(see also DL:DE Chapter 5, , especially 5.4 for a fuller explanation).

In English, it is normal for the theme of the sentence, and the process, namely the subject and the verb, to appear at the start of a sentence. Take, for example, this sentence from F. Scott Fitzgerald's novel *The Great Gatsby* 1926&2000:8):

My family have been prominent, well-to-do people in this Middle-Western city of three generations.

A SPOCA analysis of this sentence reveals the following:

Subject **Predicator**

My family have been

Complement

prominent, well-to-do people

Adverbial

in this Middle-Western city

Adverbial

for three generations

This sentence is comprised of five phrases:

my family (noun phrase);

have been (verb phrase);

prominent, well-to-do people (adjective phrase)

in this Middle-Western city (prepositional phrase).

for three generations (prepositional phrase).

The noun phrase *my family* functions as the subject of the sentence, whilst the adjective phrase *prominent, well-to-do people* functions as a complement after the verb phrase *have been*, which functions as a predicator. The predicator is the only place in a clause where form and function have a one-to-one correspondence. Complements occur after certain intensive verbs, of which *be* is the most common.

Not all clauses or sentences, however, fit such a standard pattern, particularly in poetry, and this may have the effect of interrupting our expectations or bringing to the fore, and

therefore emphasising, information which would usually come later or, delaying information we would normally expect at the beginning to the end. Another important aspect of an analysis of this kind is the number of clauses that a sentence contains, and whether they are independent, co-ordinate or dominant and dependent. In the example above, there is one independent clause, but in the following extract from Wordsworth's poem *Michael* (1800, lines 10-114), we see the clause and sentence structures being manipulated to serve the meaning of the poem:

Down from the ceiling, by the chimney's edge,

That in our ancient uncouth country style

With huge and black projection overbrowed

Large space beneath, as duly as the light

Of day grew dim the Housewife hung a lamp.

This sentence has two clauses: *as duly as the light of day grew dim* and *the Housewife hung a lamp*. Both of these are preceded by a series of prepositional phrases which function as adverbials. The main clause is the last one, *the Housewife hung a lamp*. The subject of this clause is *the housewife*, who is also the main subject of the sentence. Placing the main clause of a sentence at the end in this way delays the delivery of information vital to the understanding of the sentence, making the reader aware of the detail which comes before it in ways which we might not do if it came after the main clause. The adverbials of the first part of the sentence work as a kind of camera, a filmic panning which introduces the scene, moving from the wider perspective of the gloomy, rustic country room to the housewife, who illuminates that gloom with a lamp. We may also feel some sense of frustration, awaiting the main verb, which parallels the waiting of those in the cottage as they anticipate the light illuminating their room (see; Jeffries 1993:68).

The examples above show how undertaking a clausal analysis of texts of this kind can tell us a great deal not only about how the information given in them is ordered, but also about the effect of such ordering. Traditionally, syntactic or grammatical analysis has stopped with the clause as the largest element. However, patterns of language can be identified across stretches of text that have extended the unit of analysis beyond that of the clause or sentence. Any piece of writing, if it is to make sense at all, makes connections within itself through the kinds of vocabulary and the syntactic structures it uses to bond or connect its sentences together. Just as a random selection of words does not in itself make a sentence, so too a random selection of sentences does not of itself create a coherent text. Modern stylistics recognises that texts work as discourse, that is, discourse in the linguistic sense of a stretch of language above the level of the sentence.

3.4 Stylistic methods and categories of analysis

Analysing texts beyond the level of the sentence has been made possible by developments in systemic-functional grammar. Within this grammar, patterns of syntactic structure have been identified which go beyond the clause or sentence across sentences in stretches of text and beyond the text, making direct links with the situational context of the speaker or writer. Two of the most developed descriptions of such structures are those concerned with **cohesion and deixis** (see also: *DL:DE*, chapter 7, especially 7.1 & 7.3 and, for deixis *TL:TE* Part II 5.2) **Cohesion** refers to the ways in which syntactic, lexical and phonological features connect within and across sentences in a text. **Deixis** refers to the ways in which some words and phrases shift their reference, depending upon the speaker's position in space and time and who says or writes them. Cohesion thus performs a textual function, making explicit connections between the sentences of a text, whilst deixis, though textually based, makes direct links with the situational context of the speaker or writer. Cohesion and deixis then, exemplify ways in which the text and the reader interact. Throughout 3.4 and 3.5, then, attention is therefore paid to both formal and cognitive aspects of textual features.

3.4.1 Cohesion

In addition to subject matter, vocabulary and the syntactic structure of individual sentences, a writer will normally use signals to make connections in and between sentences. These include the ways in which sentences are sequenced, how one thing leads to another, how certain feelings or events are implied and so on. These signals act as markers of **cohesion** or **cohesive ties** in a text: that is, writing is held together not only because of relationships between the ideas or action represented through lexis, semantics or syntactic structure, but also through connecting forms in the lexis and syntactic structure within and across the sentences themselves. Jeffries (2006) divides cohesion into six different kinds: **reference**, **substitution**, **ellipsis**, **conjunction** and **lexical cohesion** (see *DL:DE* Chapter 7 for further explanation of these terms). A category also relevant to writing such as poetry and adverts is that of **phonological cohesion**.

Take the following example:

When I first entered heaven, I thought everyone saw what I saw. That in everyone's heaven there were soccer goalposts in the distance and lumbering women throwing shot put and javelin.

Alice Sebold *Lovely Bones* (2002:3).

References can be divided into two main categories: **exophoric reference** and **endophoric reference**. Exophoric reference refers to the immediate situational context in which the discourse is taking place. Examples of exophoric reference in the example above are *heaven*, *everyone*, *soccer*, *goalposts*, *women (who were lumbering)*.

Endophoric references can be sub-divided into **anaphoric** and **cataphoric reference**. **Anaphoric reference** refers backwards to somebody or something that has already been mentioned, usually by the use of personal or possessive pronouns. Once a referent

has been established, that is, the person or thing being referred to, then it is usually replaced by a pronoun the next time it appears, unless using a pronoun makes the sense unclear and ambiguous. The most common use of anaphora is where the pronoun refers to a noun already mentioned in the same or preceding sentence. Take the following examples:

*Connie always had a foreboding of the hopelessness of her affair with Mick, as people called **him**(1). Yet other men meant nothing to **her** (2). **She** was attached to Clifford(3) . **He** wanted a good deal of **her** life and she gave it to **him**(4).*

Lady Chatterley's Lover D.H.Lawrence (1928& 2006:132)

The two characters Connie and Mick are named in the first sentence. Thereafter, anaphoric referencing of *him* in sentence 1 and *he* and *him* in sentence 4 refer back to *Mick*, whilst that of *her* in sentence 2, *she* in sentence 3 and *her* in sentence 4 refer back to Connie..

Anaphoric referencing can also have the effect of implying a previous existence for the characters in a text. Its use plunges us immediately into the world of the text, assuming that we are familiar with the person for whom a pronoun stands when this could not possibly be the case unless we were re-reading the text. For example, the following extract, taken from the beginning of the first chapter of William Golding's novel *The Inheritors* (1955), uses anaphora in this way:

***He** was struggling in every direction, **he** was the centre of the writhing and kicking knot of **his** own body...*

Since this is the beginning of the novel, we do not know who *he* refers to other than that he is a male, but by using the anaphoric reference instead of a noun, we are immediately drawn into the middle of a narrative, instead of being led gently into it, and expect to learn who *he* is in good time.

Cataphoric referencing is the opposite to anaphoric referencing, in that it refers forward. Saying that something appears 'below' in a text, for example, direct the reader to something that is to be encountered, such as 'in the next chapter, we will examine *this* theory in more detail'. Cataphoric references delay more precise information, and are important in creating an element of suspense. In the following example, cataphoric referencing gradually reveals information about a particular woman, before naming her:

*And slowly down the steps in **her** magnificent ballgown comes **the young woman** of the moment we have all been waiting for, **Princess Diana herself**.*
(BBC News 6 June 1986)

In this example, a pronoun *her* is used first, followed by a noun phrase, *the young woman*, followed by the proper noun *Princess Diana* which is then followed, for added emphasis, by a reflexive pronoun *herself*. Anaphoric referencing of this kind is commonly used to build up suspense in, for example, thrillers and detective fiction.

The following lines taken from the beginning of Mark Twain's novel *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (1910 & 1986:1) show different kinds of referencing at work:

*"What's gone with **that** boy, I wonder? **You** Tom!"*

*The old lady pulled **her** spectacles down and looked over them about the room; then **she** put **them** up and looked out under **them**. She looked perplexed a moment and said, not fiercely, but still loud enough for the furniture to hear, " Well, if I get hold of you, I'll..."*

Before we even know his name or what is being referred to, the cataphoric reference *that* signals that a person or thing is about to be mentioned; this is followed immediately by the noun *boy*, followed by the pronoun *you*. It is not until we get to the end of the second utterance that we get the proper noun *Tom*. Just as in the Princess Diana example above, the cataphoric references delay precise information about the boy that the woman is wondering about. These words are spoken by a woman who is not given a name, but the exophoric reference *the old lady*. Since this is the opening of the novel, there is nothing we can refer back to, to establish who she actually is. Similarly, we have nothing to refer back to *the room*. Which old lady? Which room? After the first clause mentions *The old lady*, she is referenced anaphorically as *her* and *she*, and *her spectacles* as *them*. The use of anaphoric and cataphoric referencing in this extract link the world of the text to the shared reality of the reader, drawing upon our experiences of what we already know about the world, in this old ladies, rooms and young boys. In this way, coherence is established between what is being described and the expectations and shared knowledge which we, as readers, bring to a text.

In addition to using pronouns to refer outwards, backwards and forwards to something or someone, referencing can also include repeating the noun or noun phrase that has been used instead of replacing it with a pronoun at the beginning of clauses, phrases or sentences.

Repetition re-reinforces description and emotional effects in narrative; in public speeches and adverts it can be used to hammer home a point or a product, as in the following examples:

Example 1.

The rain fell heavily on the roof, and pattered to the ground....*The rain fell, heavily*, drearily. It was a night of tears.

(Little Dorrit, Charles Dickens Ch 17)

Example 2:

We are fighting for the rights of the little man... *We are fighting*, as we have always fought, for the weak as well as the strong. *We are fighting* for great and good causes...
(Mrs Thatcher. Guardian 13Oct 1984)

In the examples above, repetition of *the rain fell heavily* in example 1 reinforces the weight of the rain and its metaphorical association with tears, whilst the repetition of *we are fighting* in example 2 emphasises the point that the Conservative politician is on the side of the underdog and meeting resistance from other political parties.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, a common feature of cohesion in spoken utterances is **ellipsis**, the name given to leaving out part of an utterance or a grammatical structure which the listener or reader is assumed to readily understand from its context. For example, predicators and sometimes also the following clause elements which have already been used are often repeated in condensed, substituted forms (generally as a form of the verb *do* or by the word *so*), or are left out altogether.

For example:

All trains go to the station. At least, most do.

The second sentence leaves out the unstated, obvious predicator *go* and adverbial *the station* of the first sentence to avoid unnecessary repetition.

He didn't fail. He might have done, if he'd gone later.

This sentence leaves the main verb (*failed*) out of the verb phrase in the second sentence, again to avoid repetition.

Because it leaves out information already given, ellipsis can help the listener or reader to focus on new or important information. It is often used where economy of words is needed, such as note-taking and personal newspaper adverts (*Wanted: Mother's Help. Three children, 2, 4 and 7. Must drive*) Omitting grammatical words such as determiners and auxiliaries is also common in representing interior monologue in narratives, suggesting a quick succession of thoughts or images as the following extract from James Joyce's novel *Ulysses* (1922) illustrates:

...raised his eyes and met the stare of a bilious clock. Two. Pub clock five minutes fast. Time going on. Hands moving. Two. Not yet.

In this example, Joyce uses ellipsis in a **telegraphic** way, omitting all words except for the essential *two* rather than *It was two o'clock* or *It said two o'clock*, and omitting *the* and *was* from the next sentence. The extract uses no referencing beyond *his*. Instead, cohesion is achieved by cryptically describing the thoughts of one person from which we, as the reader, have to infer far more than we are accustomed to make sense of the

text.

Where ellipsis is used to avoid unnecessary and tedious repetition, its use is typically anaphoric. It is extremely common in everyday conversation which is far more context-dependent than writing. One of the most striking differences between natural, spontaneous conversation and written dialogue which aims to represent it is the use of ellipsis. Dramatic dialogue tends to be far less elliptical than natural conversation, since it lacks the degree of context dependence of ordinary speech (see 3.9 below). In written texts which have to be explicit, such as legal contracts and advertising, there is far more repetition and explicit referencing and subsequently far less ellipsis than in other types of text.

Ellipsis can also be used in narratives and plays not only as grammatical omission or substitution but also to signify passing of time, speeding up the action or pace of a narrative by leaving out events assumed to have happened but not described or enacted, either by leaving them out altogether or explicitly marking that they have happened.

Substitution works in a similar way to ellipsis, only rather than working by omission, one word, most commonly a pronoun, is substituted for another word, phrase or clause. Other items commonly used for substitution are:

One: I offered her a seat. She didn't want one.

Do: Did Frank take that letter? He might have done.

So/not: Do you need a lift? If so, wait for me; if not, I'll see you there.

Same: He chose the roast duck, I'll have the same.

Like ellipsis, substitution assumes much that is left out within the context in which it is used, and, also like ellipsis, is a much more common feature of speech than writing. In writing, its use is mainly in the writing of dialogue which aims to represent spontaneous speech although again, like ellipsis, its use depends upon the context having been made explicit so that its use can be understood by a listener or viewer.

Conjunctions (words like *and*, *because*, *but*) work in a way which is different from reference, ellipsis and substitution, in that they do not search backwards or forwards for their referent; rather they signal a relation between segments of a clause or phrase. Conjunctions join clauses within a sentence which can lead to ellipsis being possible in co-ordinating sentences. For example, *Mary walked to the car and got in (to the car)* They also indicate that what follows in a sentence bears some relation to what has already been said as well as grammatically joining the sentences together.

Within a text, conjunctions signal different types of relation between sentences. In the example above, *and* connects the two parts of the sentence, and marks the way that the second clause follows the first, and how the text as a whole is moving forward. Other conjunctions which also perform such a function are *so*, *therefore* or *hence* Jeffries in *DL:DE 7.1.4* notes that the signposting conjunctions provide falls into four semantic sets:

Additive: adding more information as in the example above, or in the following one: .
*She's intelligent. **And** she's very reliable.*

Adversative: qualifying the information already given. For example, *I've lived here ten years **but** haven't ever heard of that pub.*

Causal: giving a cause as to why something happened. For example, *He caught a cold **because** he fell in the river.*

Continuative: signal further comment, For example: ***Well**, he could be right.*

Take, for example, the following extract, from Thomas Harris's novel *Hannibal* (2000:251):

*Clarice Starling was the last to know that Dr Lecter had killed again. **After** she hung up the phone, she lay still for many minutes in the dark **and** her eyes stung for some reason she did not understand, **but** she did not cry. From her pillow looking up, she could see his face swarming in the dark. It was lecturer's old face, **of course**.*

The first conjunction *after* is a causal one, telling us that Clarice lay still once she had finished the phone call. The second conjunction *and* is additive, giving us more information, whilst the third, *but* qualifies this information by saying that she does not give into the temptation of crying. The fourth conjunction, *of course*, is continuative, adding more comment and information on that given in the preceding sentence. Conjunctions then, play a vital role in cohesion, logically connecting between parts of the text.

Lexical cohesion, as the term implies, describes ways in which items of vocabulary relate to one another across clause and sentence boundaries to make a text coherent. It refers to the part played by certain semantic relations between words to create textuality; in other words, that which distinguishes sentences as a text as opposed to a random sequence of unconnected sentences. The relations between vocabulary items in texts are of two main kinds: **reiteration** and **collocation**.

Reiteration means either repeating the same word in a later section of the discourse or else reasserting its meaning by exploiting **lexical relations**: that is, the stable, semantic relationships that exist between words and which form the basis for descriptions or definitions in a dictionary or group of words in a thesaurus (see DL:DE section 6.3). These are of two main kinds: **synonymy** and **hyponymy**. For example, *zucchini* and *courgette*; *bachelor* and *unmarried man* are related by synonymy: they both refer to exactly the same thing or state. *Courgette* and *vegetable*; *mosquito* and *aeroplane* are both related by hyponymy: one is a *superordinate* in the family tree of another.

Consider this example of synonymy:

*The meeting **commenced** at six thirty. But from the moment it **began**, it was clear all was not well.*

In this example, *commence* and *began* co-refer to the same thing in the real world, the meeting. But this is not always the case:

The meeting **commenced** at six thirty; the storm **began** at eight.

In this second example, *commence* and *began* refer to separate events, although the semantic relation of synonymy between them is being exploited stylistically here to create humour or irony.

Now consider this example of hyponymy:

There was a fine old **rocking chair** that his father used to sit in, a **desk** where he wrote his letters, a nest of small **tables** and a dark, imposing **bookcase**. Now all this **furniture** was to be sold, and with it his own past.

Repeating ideas by direct lexical repetition is something we do not commonly do or encounter, other than for a particular effect such as driving a point home. Instead, we tend to vary items, in this case hyponyms of *furniture*, giving variation from sentence to sentence which taken together build a mental picture of the kinds of furniture being described. Such variation can add new dimensions and nuances to meaning, building up an increasingly complex context. Every paraphrase of an earlier word brings with it its own semantic connotations. The following newspaper report uses several types of lexical cohesion:

Police **toughened** up their **anti-protest tactics** at Brightlingsea yesterday and arrested 12 demonstrators who had defied their warnings against trying to block the continuing export of **live animals** from the port in Essex.

Around 400 demonstrators, a lower turnout than the 1,000 anticipated by the organisers, failed in their attempt to turn back three **lorries** containing around 1,500 sheep. Following a clear police warning that arrests would be made if the paths of **vehicles** were blocked, the **lorries** containing the **sheep** began the final 400 yards of their journey to the quayside at Brightlingsea. A line of police riot **vans** protected the convoy, as they have through the months of protest.

Independent. 19th April 1995. p1 col 6

In the first line, *arrested* is being used as a hyponym of *anti-protest tactics*, or synonymous with its; *live animals* is reiterated as the superordinate *sheep* which is also repeated, making it clear that it is this particular live animal which is being discussed in the article. *Lorries* and *convoy* are also used synonymously whilst the *vans* used by the police is a reiteration to distinguish them from the *vehicles* used to transport the sheep. *Demonstrators* is repeated; a more sensationalist style of reporting might have used more lurid synonyms such as *antivivisectionists* or extended noun phrases such as: *extremist animal rights protestors*.

Collocation describes the way in which certain words commonly (or uncommonly) associate with one another in a semantic way over and above their syntactic ordering (see DL:DE section 6.4.1). Some adjectives, for example, are used with some nouns

and not with others. The adjective *beautiful* collocates with the noun *day* more often than with *night*, as do other adjectives such as *sunny*, *warm* and *bright*. The phrase *a sunny night* is syntactically accurate but semantically rather suspect unless used in an ironic way, since *pretty* and *man* do not normally collocate. Similarly, we would expect to see the adjective *shabby* applied to the nouns *clothes* and *treatment* rather than to *water* or to a *baby*. Some verbs regularly collocate with particular nouns, particularly ones associated with animal and insects: bees *buzz*, dogs *bark* and geese *quack*; or transport: *drive* a car and *ride* a bike. The reasons why some words have particular associations is not all that clear. We do know that some words are more likely to combine with specific items to form natural sounding combinations while others do not, even though they are possible or understandable. For example, we call milk that has gone off *sour*, whereas butter which has gone off is *rancid* and eggs *rotten*. All these adjectives describe foodstuffs yet they are not interchangeable; we would think it odd for someone to describe milk as *rancid* or butter as *sour*, yet these words essentially describe the same process. Collocation can be exploited stylistically by collocating words that do not normally go together, particularly in poetry. For example, the following two lines from T.S. Eliot's poem *Morning at the window*:

I am aware of the damp souls of housemaids
Sprouting despondently at area gates

We do not normally collocate the adjective *damp* and verb *sprouting* with the noun *soul*, or think of such an action as a *despondent* one. *Damp* and *sprouting* are terms more normally collocated with the weather and/or gardening, rather than with spirituality, which might lead us to think of a soul's growth in terms of gardening. *Despondently* also more normally describes an emotion, thereby endowing souls with feeling.

In addition to the grammatical and lexical aspects of cohesion outlined above, there is also **phonological cohesion**: that is, cohesion arising from sound. Sound patterns are particularly important when it comes to writing verse of any kind. For example, in languages where stress falls on the first syllable of every word, alliteration, where the first letter of two or more words is the same, is often favoured as a poetic device.

Phonology can be a source of cohesion in a text, particularly through alliteration, assonance and rhyme, all of which involve textual patterning created by the repetition of same or similar sounds. Alliteration, assonance and rhyme are among the most obvious and easiest ways a poem can be made phonologically cohesive and are often, therefore, very superficial (see, for example, Short 1998; Jeffries 1993). Where these phonological aspects form the overriding criteria for the structure of a poem, such as the use of rhyme in commercial cards for birthdays, Christmas and other seasonal events, then its meaning is often banal. A more complex kind of cohesion is that which is created through the interaction of phonological patterns with semantic ones. Even though sounds in themselves have no meaning (see Jeffries 1998 chapter 2), and the associations between sounds and meanings in language are arbitrary and conventional, there are ways of using sound so that it complements meaning. Take for example, the following

passage from Alexander Pope's *Essay on Criticism* which was written in the eighteenth century. The use of italics in the poem is an eighteenth century convention for emphasis, shown in bold below, and nouns were also capitalised then.

*True Ease in Writing comes from Art, not Chance,
As those move easiest who have learn'd to dance.
'Tis not enough no harshness gives Offence,
The **Sound** must seem an **Eccho** to the **Sense**.
Soft is the Strain when **Zephyr** gently blows,
And the **smooth Stream** in **smoother Numbers** flows;
But when loud Surges lash the sounding Shore,
The **hoarse, rough Verse** shou'd like the **Torrent** roar.
When **Ajax** strives, some **Rock's** vast **Weight** to throw,
The Line too **labours**, and the **Words** move **slow**;
Not so, when swift **Camilla** scours the Plain,
Flies o'er th'unbending Corn, and skims along the Main.*

Pope's key advice here is that 'sound must seem an echo to the sense.' The sound, according to this advice, supports, rather than creates, meaning by triggering sound-symbolism associations, with the syntax contributing further to the total effect. For example, the word *smooth* in line 3 associates through alliteration with the *str* of *stream*, like the everflowing, stable rhythm of a stream itself. In line 7, the word /(((/ cues us in to the significance of low vowels, especially the diphthong /(/, intended to echo the roaring of the waves. Such a phenomenon is stylistically known as **iconicity**, which explores the nature of the relationship between meaning and sound.

One further form of phonological patterning is that of **metre**. Metre in this sense refers to patterns of stress in lines of verse. Stress is a feature of language which we internalise as we learn to speak it; metre is something which is imposed on language, where stress patterns are made to fit a particular metre (see: DL:DE sections 2.5.3 and 3.3.1). Using metre imposes a constraint upon language which we do not normally use in everyday speech, particularly in a language such as English which is time-stressed (see: DL:DE: Chapter 1). Many books on stylistics and the language of poetry (see for example, Hobsbaum 1996), give thorough accounts of metrical stress in English, of which the following is a summary.

The most common metrical types in English are the Iamb, the Trochee, the Anapest and the Dactyl. An iambic foot has two syllables, of which the first is stressed less heavily than the second, (as in 'te-tum') Pope's poem above is written using the iambic pentameter, which is the most common metrical line in English poetry. This metre arranges words in lines which make up five feet or ten syllables in alternating patterns of unstressed or weak (w) syllables and stressed or strong (s) syllables:

The sound | must seem | an ec | cho to | the Sense
w s w s w s w s w s

The Trochee reverses the unstressed/stressed or weak/strong pattern to form a stressed/unstressed strong/weak one:

And be| fore the |Sum mer | end ed
s w s w s w s w

Stood the | maize in | all its |beau ty
s w s w s w s w

The Anapest has three feet, made up of two unstressed or weak syllables followed by a stressed or strong.

Not a sound | hath es caped |to thy ser | vants,
w w s w w s w w s w
of prayer | nor of praise
w s w w s

The Dactyl reverses the Anapaest, with one stressed or strong syllable followed by two unstressed or weak ones:

Lulled by the | coil of his |cry stall ine | streams.
s s w s s w s s w s

As the last example illustrates, the actual number of feet or stresses in a line of poetry does not always fall precisely into ten syllables in the iambic pentameter or two strong and one weak in the Dactyl. In fact, the iambic pentameter, especially as used by Shakespeare, can be anything from four to six iambic feet, eight to twelve syllables.

Using strict metre produces rhythm in a text, but a text does not have to be metric to be rhythmic. Free verse and prose are both discourse types which by definition do not use a fixed metrical scheme, but in both rhythm is often a source of cohesion and sound-sense connections. Virginia Woolf, for example, is a writer whose prose is often very rhythmic as the following extract from her novel *Mrs Dalloway* (1923& 1999: 2) shows:

What a lark! What a plunge! For it had always seemed to her, when, with a little squeak of the hinges, which she could hear now, she had burst open the French windows and plunged at Bourton into the open air. How fresh, how calm, stiller than this of course, the air was in the early morning; like the flap of a wave; the kiss of a wave; chill and sharp and yet (for a girl of eighteen as she then was) solemn, feeling as she did, standing there at the open window, that something awful was about to happen....

Much of the rhythm in this passage comes from the repetition of similar stress patterns either within a phrase or between two consecutive phrases. The first two sentences

What a lark! What a plunge! introduce repetition, the phrases being identical in their syntax, syllable structure and stress and following the pattern of the Anapest; two weak syllables followed by a strong one:

What a lark! What a plunge!
w w s w w s

The fourth sentence contains two pairs of parallel phrases: *How fresh, how calm...;* and *like the flap of a wave, the kiss of a wave*, in which the similarity of stress pattern accompanies virtually identical syntactic and syllabic structure. Although this is not verse, some phrases within the prose partially use the iambic pentameter; for example: ... *and plunged at Bourton into the open air* and : *that something awful was about to happen*. These alternate rhythmic patterns and mirror images of phrases strongly associate with one of the novel's main themes: life as an alteration between a joyous 'lark' and a 'plunge' into despair, and the search for an equilibrium between the two.

Taken together, these various cohesive elements create what is often called the **texture** of a text: that is, the property of visibly holding it together as a connected entity, rather than appearing to be a random or accidental sequence of sentences. Different types of texts may use different kinds of cohesion to a greater or lesser extent, creating different types of cohesion and texture. For example, conversations typically draw on material which is shared or taken as given, because it can be retrieved from the immediately surrounding situation and generally use a lot of pronouns and ellipsis. Fiction such as novels and plays depend less upon situational references and tend to use referring expressions to thing(s) which have already been mentioned in the text itself, rather than to anything outside it. Reports will tend to use more co-reference, determiners and conjunctions and less endophoric reference and ellipsis than novels.

For example, the continuation of a quote from Alice Seebold's *Lovely Bones* used earlier;

When I first entered heaven, I thought everyone saw what I saw. That in everyone's heaven there were soccer goalposts in the distance and lumbering women throwing shot put and javelin (1).

[...]

After a few days in heaven, I realised that the javelin-throwers and the shot-putters and the boys who played basketball on the cracked blacktop were all in their own version of heaven(2).Theirs just fit with mine – it didn't duplicate it precisely, but had a lot of the same things going on inside (3).

I met Holly, who became my roommate, on the third day (4). She was sitting on the swing set (5). (I didn't question that a high school had swing sets: that's what made it heaven (6). And no flat-benched swings – only bucket seats made out of hard black rubber that cradled you and that you could bounce in a bit before swinging) (7). Holly sat reading a

book in a weird alphabet that I associated with the pork-fried rice my father brought home from the Hop Fat Kitchen, a place Buckley loved the name of, loved so much he yelled “Hop Fat!” at the top of his lungs (8).

An analysis of the stylistic range of cohesion in this passage would consider use of referencing, both exophoric (*heaven, everyone*) and endophoric: *What I saw* in line 1 points forward to *soccer goalposts in the distance and lumbering women throwing shot put and javelin*. There is repetition of *heaven* and *swings*, emphasising the importance of both. It would also consider how conjunctions such as the temporal conjunction *after* and the additive *and* in sentence 2 are used to logically connect parts of the text. If we look more closely at sentence 8, then we can see that this sentence is made up of six clauses. All of these are short and simple in structure, but are ordered in such a way as to leave the reader with interpretative ‘work’ to do, in order to understand what the narrator is trying to say: instead of being told that Holly is Vietnamese, we are told she is reading a book in a strange alphabet, which is then related to a Chinese takeaway the narrator knew when she was alive, that then leads onto a reminiscence of her brother, Buckley

3.5 Deixis and Fictional Worlds

Deixis refers to the ways in which words make direct links with the situational context of the speaker or writer. (see also TL:TE Part II section 5.2 and DL:DE 7.2.2). Typically, as Chapter 2 has discussed, speech often uses deixis, since we rely on context a great deal in natural conversation. For example,

Come *here* and look at *this* mess.
Go over *there* and look at *that* mess.

These two statements point to two very different scenarios: one, where the mess is physically close to the speaker, and the other one where it is further away, although both are within sight. In plays or prose, as well as within poetry, deixis or deictic expressions help to create and sustain the world of the play or narrative by referring to places, people, times and events that have occurred within it. In writing, the use of deixis links the world of the narrative or the poem with that of the reader. For example, in poetry, deixis can be used to imply that the reader takes part in or watches a scene or events alongside the poet:

That spot with spice-blooms must need be o’erspread
Where such wealth to rot is run;
Blossoms pale and blue and red
There will shine full bright against the sun.
Hillman *The Pearl* (1360&1400 & 1961: lines 25-28)

In this example, through the shifting use of *that* and *there*, the poet is inviting us to share his view,, and to read the poem as if we were standing beside him. This shifting of points of reference, known as **deictic shift**, moves the point or points of focus from one place, time, person or thing to another. In this way, deixis also extends the places, times,

people and things created in a text. Words which signal the use of deixis include personal pronouns (*I, you, we, they* and so on), demonstrative determiners (*this, that, these, those* and so on), the article or determiner *the* and adverbs of time and place. Stockwell (2002:46) points out that understanding deixis involves mental processing that is implied or inferred rather than made explicit by the linguistic structures of the text. Various deictic fields or categories can be identified, including: **perceptual, spatial, temporal,** and **textual.**

Perceptual deixis refers to participants in a text, including personal pronouns *I, me, you, they, it*, demonstrative pronouns *these/those*; definite articles and definite reference such as *the woman* and mental states such as *seeing* and *believing*. Third person pronouns and names are more commonly viewed as part of reference, but Stockwell (2002:46) argues that: 'taking cognition seriously means that reference is to a mental representation is a socially located act and is therefore participatory and deictic.'

Spatial deixis refers to expressions locating the deictic centre in a place, such as adverbs *here, there, nearby, far away*; demonstratives *this, that*; locatives such as *down the hill, out of Africa* and verbs of motion such as *come* and *go*.

Temporal deixis refers to expressions which locate the deictic centre in time, such as temporal adverbs, *today, yesterday, soon* and so on; locatives such as *in my childhood* and *a week from now* and verb tense and aspect which differentiate between the speaker, the story and the receiver.

Textual deixis refers to expressions which foreground textuality, such as chapter headings, titles, and any features which draw attention to the text itself or its production.

For example, take the following two paragraphs from George Elliot's novel *Mill on the Floss* (2002 & 1860). The first is the last paragraph of Volume 1 Chapter 1, and the second is the beginning of the first paragraph of Volume 1 Chapter 2. The ways in which these chapter headings appear is an instance of textual deixis. The novel is framed at the beginning by the musings of an unnamed and unidentified narrator, who is the **deictic centre** of the narrative. The end of Chapter 1 and the beginning of chapter 2 signal a major **deictic shift** from the deictic centre of the narrator to the character of Mr Tulliver:

:

Ah, my arms are really benumbed. I have been pressing my elbows on the arms of my chair and dreaming that I was standing on the bridge in front of Dorlcote Mill as it looked one February afternoon many years ago. Before I dozed off, I was going to tell you what Mr and Mrs Tulliver were talking about as they sat by the bright fire in the left-hand parlour on that very afternoon I have been dreaming of.

'What I want, you know,' said Mr Tulliver, 'what I want, is to give Tom a good eddication: an eddication as'll be a bread to him. This was what I was thinking on when I gave notice for him to leave th' Academy at Ladyday. I mean to put him in a

downright good school at Midsummer.

The deictic shift to Mr Tulliver is preceded by the narrator directly addressing the reader about what s/he is about to tell them. The first part is clearly deictically centred upon the narrator as perceptual deixis, with first and second person pronouns appearing throughout: *I* refers to the narrator and *you* to the reader. Further spatial deixis. Mental states are also indicated in the nouns and verbs *benumbed; pressing; dreaming; dozing*. Spatial relations are indicated by the chair in the room in which the narrator is sitting, and beyond it by the bridge in the narrator's dream and Mr and Mrs Tulliver's parlour. Temporal relations signalled by *I was going to tell you* signal a shift in the deictic centre that occurs at the beginning of chapter 2 which is perceptual; from the narrator to Mr Tulliver, which is temporal, in that the reported events take place at some unspecified point back in time, and spatial, as the narrative moves from the narrator's chair in an unspecified room to Mr Tulliver's left-hand parlour. As the novel progresses, the deictic centre shifts between Mr Tulliver, his wife Mrs Tulliver, their two children Tom and Maggie, and the narrator. Viewed in this way, deixis extends categories of deictic reference from short stretches of text of two or three sentences to complete texts and beyond, providing an account of how we as readers mentally process implied and inferred fictional or **text worlds** we encounter in the texts that we read.

There are currently two textual meaning models based on the concept of **worlds**. The first derives from Werth's text world theory (1999) and is developed in Gavins (2006). This theory aims to account for the conceptual space that links narrative levels by proposing three 'worlds' of discourse. The first is the immediate *discourse world*, inhabited by an author and a reader. Understanding of this world by the reader is dependent upon their knowledge and experience of what is being described in the discourse world, which creates the second level of *text world*, and requires understanding, memory and imagination as well as direct perception. Text worlds are defined deictically and referentially, anchored or fixed to the world depicted in the discourse. For example, take the opening line of David Guttererson's novel *Our Lady of the Forest* (2003):

The girl's errand in the forest that day was to gather chanterelle mushrooms in a bucket to sell in the town at dusk.

Deictic references pick out spatial location (*in*) and temporal location (*that*) whilst referential information identifies entities present in the text world (*the girl; the forest; chanterelle mushrooms; a bucket; a town*).

The third type of conceptual space identified by Werth is a *sub-world*. These occur when a character projects thoughts and reflections, to create another space inside the text world.

The second model of conceptual tracking during the course of reading a narrative is

Emmott's framework of narrative comprehension (1997). This framework aims to account for the ways in which a reader can concentrate on one context in particular, whilst holding on to ones previously encountered. She has identified two processes called *priming* and *binding*. *Priming* refers to the process by which one contextual frame becomes the main focus of attention for the reader, whilst *binding* refers to the way episodic links between people and places are established in a text, and create a context which is then monitored in the mind of the reader. Narrative strands that have been bound into the story but been temporarily left alone by a narrator remain in a fictional place until they are brought back in, or 'bound out'. Text world theories such as these aim to account for or emphasise the mental processing that goes on in the act of reading, rather than upon textual representation. As Simpson (2004:92) points out, finding a balance between the two is important, as a stylistic analysis can go too far in either direction.

3.6 Similes and metaphors

Simile and metaphor, traditionally associated with literary analysis, are ways of identifying patterns in language which are less to do with syntactic patterning and more to do with semantics, by exploiting unusual collocations to achieve a particular effect. Poetry or poetic language is not the only kind of language to exploit words in this way. Much work in stylistics has been undertaken in the area of metaphor in recent years, most of it influenced by social psychology which has informed cognitive linguistics and building upon the seminal work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Traditionally, the study of metaphor has restricted the texts under analysis to literary ones, but the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's book and subsequent work in cognitive linguistics has revolutionised the way we think about metaphor. Lakoff and Johnson and others working in the field of cognitive psychology, have pointed out that far from being restricted to literary and poetic language, metaphor pervades much of our everyday discourse and is thus pervasive in *all* language use, both spoken and written. For a start, we are probably all aware, as students of English or English Language, that meaning is not stable, and can change. To create new ones, we often use existing words metaphorically. As the word gets used more and more, new usages become absorbed into the language as commonplace, traditionally known as 'dead metaphors': for example, *foot of a bed*, *table leg*, *foot of a page*. Much of the terminology we now associate with electronic communication - *net*, *web*, *mouse* - is metaphorical. Their use is so commonplace and, within traditional categories of metaphor, would be considered 'dead'. Lakoff and Johnson argue that far from being 'dead', the reason they are there is because metaphor permeates the whole way in which we think about the world. They argue that metaphor is not simply a conceptual category of one aspect of language, but fundamental to our very thoughts and actions. The concepts that govern our thoughts are not just matters of literal reason, but of allusion and analogy which also govern our everyday functioning down to the most mundane details. Such metaphorical concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities. Since communication is based upon the same conceptual system that we use in thinking and

acting, language is an important source of evidence for what that system is like.

Many everyday expressions appear to share underlying conceptual structures that are understood and shared by groups of people. Grouped together, such common expressions are called **conceptual metaphors** and are normally identified by being written in capitals. Take the following example given by Stockwell (2002:110):

ARGUMENT IS WAR

Your claims are *undefensible*.

He *attacked every weak point* in my argument. His criticisms were *right on target*. *I demolished* his argument.

I've never *won* an argument with him. You disagree, Okay, *shoot!*

If you use that *strategy*, he'll *wipe you out*. *He shot down* all of my arguments.

We do not just talk about arguments in terms of war, we win or lose them. There is no physical battle, but a verbal one, and the structure of an argument: - attack, defence, counterattack, etc - mirrors the movements of war. In this sense, the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor one by which we live in Western culture; it structures the actions we perform in arguing. It is not that arguments are a sub-species of war, but that the two different things - verbal discourse and armed conflict - and different kinds of actions. ARGUMENT are partially structured, understood, performed and talked about in terms of WAR. The concept is metaphorically structured and, consequently, the language is metaphorically structured. Such a way of talking about argument is far from being a 'dead' metaphor, but has become so ingrained in thought and language that it has become the ordinary way of talking about war. Metaphors are possible as linguistic expressions precisely because they are already embedded in a person's conceptual system. Conceptual metaphors such as ARGUMENT IS WAR, LIFE IS A JOURNEY, TIME IS MONEY and so on not only attempt to describe but also to structure a great deal of our everyday discourse, and are thus not confined to literature.

Developments in cognitive stylistics build upon the work of literary critics such as I.A Richards and cognitive theorists such as Lakoff and Johnson in proposing new models for analysing metaphor. Richards (1925) categorised metaphor into three constituent parts: **tenor**, **vehicle** and **ground**. **Tenor** is the subject of the metaphor, **vehicle** is the terms in which the subject is expressed and **ground** is the common properties the other two categories, tenor and vehicle, share. Take the following example from Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*. Juliet is the 'sun'.

Juliet = tenor

sun=vehicle

ground = common properties of warmth, beauty, life-affirming.

A cognitive approach would argue that in this example, we can only make the inference of warmth, beauty and life-affirmation because our conceptual system 'sees' the sun in those terms and makes it possible to assign them to a person. We can thus make sense of the metaphor because of how our perceptions are formed. Consequently, the categories have been re-named to provide a different emphasis. Instead of the category 'ground', in cognitive stylistics it has been re-named **mapping**. 'Ground' is re-defined as a mapping onto the properties between the two spaces or domains that are inferred: warmth, beauty, life-affirming. Similarly, tenor is re-defined as **target** and vehicle as **source**.

'Juliet is the sun' is thus analysed as:

Target= Juliet

Source =sun

Mapping= warmth, beauty, life-affirming.

However, it may be that a 21st century Western conceptual system 'sees' the sun in terms of warmth and life-affirmation, but such a cognitive approach assumes that concepts are universal, or somehow acquired, with little or no reference to social and cultural background, and that the association between the 'sun' and life-affirmation' is a universal one. In Europe, we may well view the sun as warmth and life-affirming, but the inhabitants of the Sahara desert or Australian bush may not. Similarly, in Japan the sun is the symbol of the flag and of nationalism and in seventeenth century France it meant something else yet again, generally political connotations of the divine right of the monarchy, and specifically Louis XIVth. The meaning of the word 'sun' then, or, more accurately, the properties associated with it, change or transfer its meaning from culture to culture and from century to century within any given culture. Thus, the mapping we infer is culturally, as well as cognitively, determined.

Consequently, although such a cognitive approach helps us to understand the metaphoric nature of much of our discourse, and its reliance upon conceptual structures being understood and shared by groups of people, it has not yet found a way of accounting for why particular concepts are formed in particular ways. A cognitive approach to analysis has yet to account for where our concepts come from or how they originate, in ways that take account of shared cultural and social understanding in addition to personal reaction.

3.7 Narrative

One possible basic definition of narrative is 'the choice of a specific linguistic technique or techniques to report (mainly) past events'. At its simplest, a narrative recounts a chain of cause and effect which happens in space and time to a particular set of people. Even the

simplest narrative follows a pattern of development, with the listener or reader being steered through the course of a tale by the teller or author which takes place in the two dimensions of time and space. Generally, we are unaware that we are being guided, and it is only when we begin to look more closely at the way in which language is structured that we begin to realise that we are.

One important aspect of the way in which a narrative develops is not only the interplay of cause and effect between events, but the way in which the story itself is narrated and the way speech and thought are represented within it. Texts which tell a fictional story usually describe the events, characters and setting within them from a particular perspective, which may be the author's, the character's (or characters') or a combination of both. However, providing a detailed and rigorous stylistic model of narrative has proved extremely challenging, and a comprehensive one has yet to be developed. There are, nevertheless, specific aspects of narrative which can inform a stylistic analysis and models have been developed that have given rise to categories of stylistic analysis.

Two basic components of a narrative, stemming from the Russian Formalists (fabula and szujet) are **plot** and **discourse**. **Plot** refers to the abstract story line of a narrative: what you would say if asked to sum up what a narrative was about. **Discourse** refers to the actual way in which or the manner in which the plot is narrated, including the use of flashbacks, repetition and prevision which disrupt the basic chronology of the plot. Plots can be realised through a variety of different media. For example, the novel *Frankenstein* has been made into several film versions, all using material taken from the plot but realised in different ways, and also written as a poem by the poet Liz Lockhead. Similarly the play *Romeo and Juliet* can be performed as a ballet. Narrative discourse is thus not confined to written narrative in poetry and prose, but also extends to other media such as film, ballet, musicals and comic strips. Consequently, we can identify different textual media for the analysis of narrative, which for stylistic analysis, is the written medium. Simpson (2004) identifies five other basic aspects of medium in addition to the textual one: **sociolinguistic code; actions and events, points of view, textual structure and intertextuality**.

Sociolinguistic code locates a narrative in time and place by considering how language reflects sociocultural context. It encompasses, for example, the varieties of dialects and accents used in a narrative. As Chapter 1 has pointed out, it may be generally assumed that standard English is not a dialect at all, but *all* speech and writing is spoken and written in a dialect of some sort, whether it is standard or non-standard, prestigious or low status. Although poetry has often been written in dialect, a common convention in narratives is that the prose is written in standard English and only the character's speech is represented in dialect such as in, for example, the novels of D.H. Lawrence or Elizabeth Gaskell; a model of representation which serves to emphasise the social class divisions between the characters and gives us as readers, a flavour of the kind of society within which the characters live. Although writing in dialect has a long history (see Chapter 1), it has not usually formed part of mainstream writing, other than in poetry. One such famous, contemporary example is the novel *Trainspotting* written by Irvine Welsh, which is written entirely in Scottish dialect (1993:75)

The problem wi Begbie wis ... well, thirs that many problems wi Begbie. One ay the things thit concerned us maist wis the fact thit ye couldnae really relax in his company, especially if he'd had a bevvy. Ah always felt thit a slight shift in the cunt's perception ay ye wid be sufficient tae change yir status fae great mate intae persecuted victim.

Since non-standard dialects are associated with lower social class in England (see Chapter 1), then its use by the narrator reinforces a class distinction between himself and the establishment. Later in the novel, the protagonist appears before a magistrate, and the usual ways in which narrative prose are written is reversed, in that the prose and the narrator's speech and thought is written in dialect, whilst the speech of the magistrate is in standard English:

- *You stole the books from Waterstone's bookshop, with the intention of selling them, he states. Sell fuckin books. Ma fuckin erse.*
- No, ah sais.
- (1993:165)

Actions, events and point of view are ways of considering the intersection of **narrative** and **character**. **Actions and events** are described in Chapter 4 under the heading of transitivity. **Point of view**, as the term implies, is the particular perspective from which a narrative is told. Any written text has an author, known or unknown. Authors of factual texts are usually at pains to separate themselves from what they are writing, whereas in fiction the author can take a more active and positive role in telling the story. The way this is usually done is by having a **narrator**. Much has been written about the stylistics of narrators and narration (see, for example,), the main points of which are summarised below.

The degree to which writers make themselves known to readers as the narrator of the story can vary, according to how much a writer chooses to directly intervene in the telling of the story by choosing to be or create either a **personal** or **impersonal narrator**. Telling the story itself from either narrative perspective involves further choices about whether the narrator knows everything about the characters and events (authorial omniscience) or has a restricted narrative perspective (authorial reportage). Both of these perspectives can be referred to as **authorial voice**, though the narrator might be different from the author. Taken altogether, the ways in which the narrative is told, with either an impersonal or personal narrator, an omniscient or reporting authorial voice, contribute to the particular perspective or point of view from which a story is told.

A **personal narrator** is one who intrudes into the story to address us, the readers, directly, to make comments, pass judgement on or moralise about the characters and events of the narrative, and may even appear as an 'I' outside the story. Such an intrusion was fairly common in earlier novels, such as Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones*. In this novel, Fielding interrupts the telling of the story for whole chapters at a time whilst he

passes comment on the events that have just occurred. A very general characteristic of the development of the novel is that this kind of personal intrusion has become used less and less often within narrative so that when it does reappear in the postmodern novel, such as in John Fowles's novel *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, its appearance is startling and seems something new.

By contrast, an **impersonal narrator** is one who is less intrusive, and simply reports the events of a story, without passing comment on them. They are much more likely to use the third person in telling the story, that is, using characters' names and the personal pronouns *he*, *she* and *they*. Written narratives with an impersonal narrator are least likely to use the second person, *you* or the first person *I* in telling their tale. It is perfectly possible for both types of narrative reporting to be used within the same narrative. For example, the 19th century novelist George Eliot generally writes as an impersonal narrator style in her novels, but occasionally she addresses her readers directly, changing to a personal narrative style. In the extract from *The Mill on the Floss* in 3.5 above, moves from the personal narrator in Chapter 1 to the impersonal narrator in Chapter 2.

First person narratives, such as the example from *Trainspotting* above, tell the story from one character's point of view, who may or may not be the author, as in autobiographical novels such as J.D. Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye* or fictional ones such as *Bridget Jones's Diary*. They are more common than second person narratives, that is, written in the second person 'you', and restrict the point of view made possible within the narrative to that of the 'I' of the story.

Telling a tale also involves a writer in making choices about the extent to which details of characters are to be portrayed. He or she may choose to be authorially omniscient, in which case they deliberately enter their characters' consciousness and are thus able to tell us, the reader, about characters' thoughts as well as their actions. The 19th century writer Thomas Hardy, for example, uses a generally impersonal narrative style but is authorially omniscient, able to reveal his characters' innermost thoughts and feelings. Alternatively, an author may choose to report events which are external to the characters and leave their thoughts alone, as exemplified in many novels by the 20th century writer Graham Greene. In novels of this kind, what characters think or feel is inferred entirely from their speech and actions, rather than through descriptions of both thought and speech, as is the case with authorial omniscience.

In addition to the voice of the author or narrator, a writer may also choose to tell the tale from a particular character or characters' perspective with which we as the reader are invited to identify and who may also be the chief narrator of the tale. This character is usually the first one to whom we are introduced in the book. Usually, narratives are told from the point of view of the main character, and the events of the story are told as they relate to him or her. Examples include novels such as *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Bronte, *Emma* by Jane Austen and *The Passion of New Eve* by Angela Carter. Other characters appear in relation to the protagonist, and our opinion of them tends to be formed by that

of the main character. Novels written in the first person are generally told from one character's point of view: the 'I' who is telling the story.

Even though there may appear to be one main character in a story, a writer may also choose to tell a tale from more than one perspective, moving from one character's perspective to another's. A novel such as *Women in Love* by D.H. Lawrence does just this, moving between a description of the actions, thoughts and feelings of two sisters to those of two men with whom they form relationships using an omniscient authorial voice. Ian McEwan's novel *Enduring Love* moves between a description of the actions thoughts and feelings of two witnesses to a ballooning accident and the man involved in the accident. Telling the tale from more than one character's perspective provides authors with the opportunity to develop different narrative strands or sub-plots within the main one, which may be used to keep the reader guessing, as in detective fiction, or in suspense and thrillers, as well as in fiction more generally, for example in *Little Dorrit* by Charles Dickens or *The Man Who Made Husbands Jealous* by Jilly Cooper.

Textual structure refers to the ways in which narrative units are arranged or combined in a story. Several models of narrative structure exist (see, for example Propp's morphology of the folktale), of which one of the most influential has been William Labov's 1972 framework of natural narrative (1972: 359-60). Labov derived the model from stories told during the course of natural conversation from which he isolated six core and recurrent features or categories. Each one of these has a corresponding hypothetical question that is addressed, a narrative function and linguistic form, summarised below:

1. Abstract: The question here is: What has happened, or what is the story about? the **narrative function is** a signal that the story is about to begin and the **linguistic form** is often a one-sentence summary.

2. Orientation. The question here is: who or what is involved in the story? The narrative function helps the reader to identify, for example, when and where the story takes place and the linguistic form is often sentences describing participants, times and places, most usually characterised by use of the past continuous tense and adjuncts of time, manner and place.

3. Complicating action. The question here is: what happened? The narrative function is to provide the 'what happened?' part of the story and the linguistic form is usually sentences ordered into narrative clauses with a verb in the simple past or present.

4. Resolution. The question here is: and what happened in the end? The narrative function here is to bring the story to an end, and the linguistic form is normally expressed as the last of the narrative clauses that began the complicating action.

5. Evaluation. The question here is: so what? or what else?. The narrative function here

is to make clear the point of the story, and the linguistic form includes evaluative commentary, embedded speech, modal verbs, negatives and so on.

6. **Coda.** The question here is: how does it all end? or how does it relate to the here and now? or supplies a moral or lesson learnt by the teller or protagonist. The narrative function here is to signal the end of the story or to provide a bridge back to the present. The linguistic form is often a generalised, 'timeless' statement.

This model has worked equally well when applied to written narratives. For example, there is currently running on British and American television a drama called *House*, centring upon a cantankerous doctor of the same name. Each episode begins with a prospective patient being admitted to hospital (abstract) for an uncomplicated procedure or unconfirmed diagnosis (orientation). The illness, however, from which the patient is suffering turns out to be far from straightforward and medically baffling (complicating action). House and his team run through a series of options whilst the patient gets closer and closer to death's door (complicating action). House finally discovers the correct diagnosis, usually at the eleventh hour (evaluation). This serves to re-inforce his skill as a doctor (coda) which more than makes up for his boorish and non-cooperative stance with patients. Toolan (1988 &) and Simpson (2004) provide more detailed accounts of stylistic approaches to narrative.

Intertextuality refers to the ways in which writing does not occur in a social and historical vacuum, but echoes or alludes, either implicitly or explicitly, to other works. A novel such as David Lodge's *Nice Work* about a female lecturer specialising in the nineteenth century Industrial novel, begins each chapter with a quotation from one such nineteenth century Industrial novel. Angela Carter's *The Magic Toyshop* makes a stylistic allusion to a line by the Romantic poet Shelley, in the line: *Look upon my works ye mighty and beware* with the original final word *despair* implicit as well as altered.

3.8 Presenting Speech and Thought

One way in which point of view is represented or can lead to a change of perspective within a narrative is by the presentation of speech and thought. Speech and thought in fictional texts are, by definition, imaginary, and although they may follow the 'rules' of natural conversation such as those discussed in chapter 2, there is nothing natural here. Speech and thought in fictional texts are artificial, contrived and interwoven into a wider creative structure where they always do more than just represent talk no matter how 'natural' it may appear to be.

Real time speech is very different to speech that is written down. One immediate and important difference is they each use different mediums of expression: speech uses sound and hearing whereas writing uses graphology and sight as the vehicle for words. Spoken speech is also interactive, usually involving at least two people, which makes it a dialogue and, depending on the situation, there can be no guarantee of topic when

speakers take turns in speaking (See Chapter 2). Where speech requires little or no interaction, such as during a lecture, after dinner speech or parliamentary speech, then it has usually been scripted and rehearsed and is more of the form of a monologue than dialogue. Written dialogue or representation of speech and thought is interactive in a completely different way from spoken speech. The interaction happens on two levels: firstly, between the characters represented and secondly, between the reader and what is read. A writer is also in control of what characters say compared to participants in speech. Consequently, the frameworks or models for analysis that have been developed to analyse written speech are very different from those used to analyse actual speech, as discussed in chapter 2. By far the most influential of these has been the one developed by Leech and Short (1981), Short (1996) and Fludernik (1993).

There are five main ways in which speech or thought can be represented in narrative which vary according to the way in which a character's speech or thought is represented. They are: **Direct**, **Free Direct**, **Indirect**, **Free Indirect** and **Narrative Report**. Consider this example:

'Do you see her much' ' she said, half-concerned.

In this sentence, there are two independent voices at work. One is the quotation which gives the actual words spoken and is bound by speech marks (*Do you see her much?*). The other is the rest of the sentence: a clause which reports information about the quotation, usually who said it, with further information such as how and/or to whom given to us by the narrator, known as a reporting clause: (*she said, half-concernedly*).

Reporting speech in this way is called direct speech (DS), where the actual words spoken by a character are written, usually within a sentence that also gives us information about the words and using punctuation marks to mark the actual words spoken. The reporting verb (the word which tell us what was being done) may well tell us a lot about the purpose, emotions and intentions of the utterance. It may also tell us about the expression on a person's face and their emotional state. For example, notice the difference between:

'Go away!' she screamed.

'Go away,' she said.

Adding an adverb or a prepositional phrase after the reporting verb as the following examples do, are other ways of conveying more information about what is said.

'Most of them were too young,' she replied.

'Most of them were too young,' she replied sorrowfully.

'Most of them were too young,'" she replied with disgust.

The reporting of direct thought (DT), is marked by the use of reporting verbs such as wondered, thought, mused, and so on, as in the following example:

'Does she still like me?' she wondered.

Sometimes, writers may use dashes instead of conventional speech marks, or not use them at all, depending on the particular effect they want to achieve, such as making actual speech appear to be more like free indirect (see below) or to distinguish it from thought. Throughout this century, writers have increasingly experimented with speech representation, such as presenting speech directly without the accompanying punctuation or reporting clause characteristic of direct speech. Such variations from the representation of direct speech and thought are known as free direct (FDS and FDT): For example:

She said 'I want to see the elephants'

' I want to see the elephants'

In the second sentence, the reporting clause is left out, but the punctuation kept in. Representing speech in this way tends to minimise the narrator's role and foreground the character and his or her speech. Consider this example:

She asked him whether he saw her much.

In this example, there is only one voice and one point of view. The narrator is using their own words rather than the words that were actually used by the character and presenting their version of them. There is a reporting clause (*she asked him*) and a reported clause (*whether he saw her much*). The narrator's point of view prevails and so no speech marks are needed. Reporting speech or thought in this way is called indirect speech (IDS or IDT). It usually has the effect of foregrounding the narrator rather than the character who has spoken

Narrative report of speech or thought (NRS or NRT) involves a narrator reporting a character's speech or thought without giving any indication of the actual words used. Unlike the explicit models given above, NRS/T can be used to summarise whole stretches of reported speech and thought.

The different ways in which writers represent speech and thought in writing is summarised in the table below:

SPEECH

THOUGHT

DIRECT

He said, 'I'll come back tomorrow.'

What will they say of me? she wondered.

FREE DIRECT

'Am I too late?'

Was I too late?

INDIRECT

He said that he would return the next day

She wondered what they would say of her.

FREE INDIRECT

He would come back tomorrow

What would they say of her?

NARRATIVE REPORT

She told him about her evening

She wondered about his love for her

Generally, the *narrator's* role or function is to inform the reader of what is going on and/or to evaluate a particular or whole situation for the benefit of the reader. The *character's* role or function is usually to make claims, express doubts and desires, display all sorts of emotions and evaluate themselves and/or others and/or a particular situation from their individual point of view. Take the following example, from Virginia Woolf's novel *Night and Day*:

Denham's one wish was to leave the house as soon as he could; but the elderly ladies had risen, and were proposing to visit Mrs Hilbery in her bedroom, so that any move on his part was impossible (1). At the same time, he wished to say something, but he knew not what, to Katherine alone (2). She took her aunts upstairs, and returned, coming towards him once more with an air of innocence and friendliness that amazed him (3).
(1919&1978:140)

This extract narrates Denham's free indirect thought which places us, as readers, in the privileged position of reading Denham's mind and his reaction to the news he has just heard: that Katherine is to marry William Rodney, which includes comments about the movement of characters to and from the room.

We might consider or ask why have speech represented in narrative at all. It is perfectly possible to recount a tale without using speech at all, but its use has become a common feature of fiction, and part of what we expect writing which tells a story to include. Generally, including speech and thought representation in writing does three things:

1. It interrupts the general flow of the narrative, slowing it down and concentrating attention on a particular character, event, relationship and so on. In the extract above, the flow of the narrative is interrupted to focus upon Denham and his thoughts
2. It develops and brings out relationships between characters; their personalities may be revealed by what they say, their reaction to what is said and/or by what others say about them. In the extract above, aspects of Denham's personality are revealed by his thoughts.
3. It adds to the sense of social as well as physical background through personal interactions which add further details associated with it, such as mannerisms, its concerns, subject matter and so on. In the extract above, the setting, places the extract not only in a particular place but also at a particular time in history and also places Denham in terms of social class and their place in society.

3.9 Dialogue in drama

Most scripted speech, especially dialogue, aims to reproduce spontaneous, natural, everyday speech. However, there are several important differences between actual spoken speech and written speech intended to imitate it, which makes it difficult or

inappropriate to apply models of spoken discourse analysis to it as described in chapter 2:

- someone else has usually written the words that a different person speaks, unlike in normal conversation where the speakers are the authors of their own words;

- we take part as active participants in any conversation with which we are involved, whereas with scripted speech we take the part of onlookers who see and hear but do not engage directly with the speakers, although we may be appealed to in a way which invites response. Scripted speech implies an audience in much the same way as any other form of written language which has implications for the pace at which something is spoken, its phrasing and degree of implied context;

- scripting speech means that it is written in advance of being spoken and can be edited, unlike everyday, ordinary conversation which can't.

- Scripted speech may look like spoken language written down, but if you compare a transcript of a normal conversation with that of scripted speech then you will immediately see many differences. In conversation, we usually take it in turns to speak and this is known as turn-taking (see chapter 2). Often, though, we interrupt before someone has finished their turn, whereas scripted speech normally allows each character to take their turn. Scripted speech cannot assume such a shared understanding on the part of its listeners. For example, in scripts of long running soap operas or series such as *Coronation St*, *Neighbours*, *Friends* or *The Simpsons*, characters nearly always refer to one another by name and explain details of events which in spontaneous conversation would be taken for granted so that viewers new to the programme or who have not watched it for a while can pick up the thread of the story. Scripted speech also tends to be more organised, operating as it does within a narrative structure, usually being about one particular thing, event or person at a time, whereas spontaneous speech can hop about from one topic to another and back again in a seemingly haphazard way. Scripted speech means that characters nearly always finish what they start to say without being interrupted and talk to one person at a time, using hardly any of the normal features of spontaneous conversation such as repetition, restructuring and fillers.

One very important difference between spontaneous and scripted speech is that the content of scripted speech, particularly dialogic speech, is controlled by someone who is not the originator of the words themselves, whereas the originator and controller of content in spontaneous speech is the speakers themselves. You cannot walk away from a script. Even though spoken conversation has an internal structure of its own, control of it is shared in a way that of scripted speech is not.

Writers of scripted speech normally have control over both the content of what they write and over how this is to be spoken. It is then up to the people speaking the words to interpret these by adding tone of voice, expression, gesture etc. rather than to create the

words themselves. Scripted speech, then, can have two different audiences; the actors or people who are to do the talking and the audience for whom they interpret the script.

When a script is written down, the words on the page, including any stage directions and camera angles form part of the script as well as the actual words characters speak. What we see or hear is actors' interpretations of the writer's words and accompanying directions. Scripts, like any other kind of writing, can also be edited and changed. Once a script has been written, the director may then choose to make his or her own alterations. For example, a director may decide to cut certain lines that have been written, encourage actors to improvise on the words present in the text or to change aspects of the location a scene, such as changing it from indoors to out of doors and vice versa.

Scripted dialogue has to convey to its viewer or listener all the things normally described through narration in writing. For example, what characters say has to convey emotion, action and move on the plot as well as the words themselves. We do not have access to the thoughts in character's heads as we do in novels, short stories or poems. All our information about characters' personalities, behaviour and actions comes from the words which they say. An analysis of a script, then, will need to look very closely in ways which the language spoken by characters as well as at that of stage directions gives us clues to characters' personalities and reasons for their actions as well as the actions themselves.

Consequently, although it is not always appropriate to apply pragmatic models to dramatic dialogue, its representation shares a principle common to most models, which is, that naturally occurring speech takes place within a context of use. Much of our everyday conversation relies on a shared understanding of the context within which it is taking place, and the more we have in common with the people we are talking to the more assumptions we make. References to places, times, people and events will also usually include a common understanding and refer to actual places, times, people and events that make up our daily lives. The notion of **context** in drama can be divided into three basic categories: **physical**, **personal**, and **cognitive**, to which can be added the **interactive** and **imaginary** (see also 2.3 and 2.6.5).

Physical context, as the description implies, refers to the actual setting, which in drama takes place usually on a stage of some sort with a set and props, however minimalistic. **Personal context** refers to the social and personal relationships of the participants, including social networks and group networks as well as the social status and distance between participants. **Cognitive context** refers to the shared background knowledge held by the participants, their world view, cultural knowledge and past experiences. These three aspects of context, the physical, personal and cognitive, can be applied to any face to face interaction, dramatic as well as natural. However, because this is drama, there is also an **interactive context**. That is, what we as viewers and listeners of the drama make of the unfolding dialogue, and how far it accords with our worlds views, cultural knowledge and past experiences. There is also what can be called an **imaginary** or **creative** aspect, where the participants on the stage and the audience engage in the creation of a shared world both on the stage and beyond it. This requires

us to suspend our belief of what we see and hear in front of our eyes – a stage with people on it – and become drawn into a world created by the participants which takes us beyond the world of the stage which is entirely imaginary (see DL:DE 7.31 and TL:DE Part II section 5.2). Deixis (see 3.5 above) plays an important part here, since it serves not only as a way of binding the text together but also of extending the world on the stage or set beyond itself to incorporate elements of the represented world beyond that which we actually see. When a dialogue is being written, whether for radio, stage or screen, any reference to a world outside the scene cannot actually exist, but we are invited to believe in it as part of the process of engaging with the scenes that are being acted out. Dialogue in scripts will also refer to places, times, people and events which may happen ‘outside’ the script. As the audience, we are drawn into the scripted world both as it is presented to us through the actual dialogue and its setting as we experience it and by extending beyond it to places, times, people and events which we do not actually experience but which are referred to and which may have a direct bearing on the action played out on stage or set. For example, at the beginning of Shakespeare’s play *Merchant of Venice*, the merchant Antonio talks about the ships he has at sea. His friend, Bassanio, wants to marry Portia, an heiress, but is in debt and needs money to set himself up as a nobleman. Antonio tells Bassanio that his money is tied up at sea, but will borrow money on his behalf. Thus, although we do not actually see the ships (or the sea) on stage, nevertheless their voyage and its success are an integral part of the plot. When it comes to the structure of the dialogue itself, then certain features can be identified, such as **structure** and **strategy**. Like natural conversation, dramatic dialogue is comprised of exchanges. Consequently, a structural analysis of dialogue can be applied, based upon exchanges such as questions and answers, statements and acknowledgements, commands and requests and so on. Burton’s book (1980) is a seminal work on the structure of dialogue. Burton uses a variety of different models in conversation analysis and speech act theory (see Chapter 2) to investigate a number of play texts to uncover patterns of dialogue which serve to delineate character. Through her analysis of Pinter’s play *The Dumb Waiter*, she concludes that the unequal status of characters is reflected in the dialogue. Take the following exchange as an example:

GUS: I want to ask you something.

BEN:[no response]

BEN:What are you doing out there?

GUS: Well I was just –

BEN: What about tea?

GUS: I’m just going to make it

BEN: Well, go on, make it

GUS: Yes, I will

(cited in Burton 1980:161-2)

In saying 'I want to ask you something', Gus attempts to initiate an exchange, letting Gus know through the use of a metastatement, that is, a statement about language, which lets Ben know what Gus is about to ask. The fact that Ben ignores this statement and fails to provide the anticipated second half of the exchange – 'do you?' 'what is it' or suchlike, which immediately places Gus in a subordinate position to Gus. Ben then initiates his own questions to which Ben responds, further reinforcing the inequality between the two characters.

Culpepper's more recent study (2001) applies stylistic and pragmatic models of discourse, focusing particularly on Shakespeare's plays. Culpepper applies models drawn from social psychology supplemented by ideas from cognitive linguistics, in arguing his approach. Far from perceiving characters as if they were real people existing in the real world, Culpepper points out that inferring characters from dialogue, or indeed any text, relies in part on the cognitive structures and inferential mechanisms that the audience or the reader has already developed for real-life people. Consequently, the measure of success in characterisation is not how 'life-like' such characterisation is but how closely the characterisation resembles our own understanding of the particular character being portrayed.

A strategic analysis considers the ways in which speaker's communicative strategies are sensitive to context, employing different types of utterances ranging from 'direct' to 'indirect' and from 'polite' to 'impolite'. Dialogue which consistently violates our understanding of such strategies, such as that to be found in the 'Theatre of the Absurd', for example, often creates dialogue which is deviant, anti-realist or simply absurd, to reinforce its central concern, which is the futility of human existence. In some plays, however, violation is used to provide contrast between the world of the sane and insane. Consider the following exchange, taken from Peter Shaffer's play, *Equus*.

Dysart: *So: did you have a good journey? I hope they gave you lunch at least. Not that there's much to choose between a British Rail meal and one here.*

Won't you sit down?

Is this your full name? Alan Strang?

And you're seventeen. Is that right? Seventeen..Well?

Alan: *Double your pleasure
Double your fun
With Doublemint, Doublemint
Doublemint gum*

(1975 1:3)

Here, Dysart, as the doctor, is talking to Alan who has been brought in for a consultation by his parents. Alan's madness is signalled by his refusal to answer Dysart's questions directly as a well-behaved and sane patient might, flouting the Gricean maxim of relevance (see 2.4.2) and choosing instead to sing advertisement jingles by way of answering Dysart's questions. In the lines which follow the extract, Dysart, by contrast, observes the communicative strategies of consultation, even when Alan persists in singing.

3.10 Studying stylistics

A stylistic approach to textual analysis usually involves consideration of three different things. The first is deciding what it is you want to find out: your research question. The second is the selection of the texts you are going to analyse, the third is selection of the linguistic tools and any specific stylistics framework within which you are going to undertake your analysis. Research in stylistics, just as much as in dialectology and pragmatics, aims to be reliable, replicable and rigorous. Any of the models or frameworks for analysis outlined above can, in theory, be applied to the stylistic analysis of any text. However, there are certain methodologies and methods which apply themselves more readily to some kinds of texts rather than others, summarised in 3.10.1 below.

3.10.1 Selecting a topic for study

The first thing to decide when undertaking your own research into stylistics is the focus of your study. The data used in stylistic analysis, unlike that used in variation in English or pragmatics, is normally that of written texts. It may be that the text selected for analysis will be given to you, as will the focus of your analysis. If, however, you are given the option of choosing your own text or texts to analyse, either for an essay or for an extended piece of work, then your choice of text will depend to a large extent upon what aspects of stylistic analysis you are most interested in investigating or, conversely, choosing a text and then deciding which aspects of it to analyse. It is no good, for example, choosing poetic texts or instruction booklets to undertake an analysis of dramatic dialogue, since you will find relatively few (if any) examples; equally, investigating speech and thought representation is best achieved through an analysis of

prose rather than poetry or drama, again because this is an aspect to be found more often in prose than in any other genre. Some aspects of stylistic analysis such as those concerned with narrative can be found across a variety of written genres, such as newspaper reporting as well as prose fiction and spoken discourse. Consequently, it is possible to choose texts for analysis across more than one genre. The methods of analysis you choose will, to a certain degree, be determined by the type of text(s) you choose, and the specific focus of your investigation. As has been emphasised throughout this chapter, stylistics is eclectic in nature, and draws upon various research methodologies associated with a number of areas of linguistic investigation including: grammatical theory, literary theory, narrative theory, pragmatic theory and social psychological theory. For example, if you look at vocabulary and word structure in texts written for children, then you will draw upon methodologies associated with phonology and grammar. If you wish to investigate differences and similarities of narrative structure in detective fiction or any other kind of genre fiction, then you will draw upon methodologies associated with discourse grammar and narratology. Or, if you wish to investigate the structure of dialogue in drama, then you will draw upon methodologies taken from pragmatics.

Undertaking research in stylistics, like variation and pragmatics, is a very practical activity and the degree of your success rests in demonstrating your understanding of the methodologies and methods it provides, by applying them successfully in your analysis. For example, you may wish to investigate:

- vocabulary and word structure in writing for children;
- aspects of cohesion and coherence in poetry or a prose extract;
- deixis and metaphor in poetry or an extract of prose fiction;
- narrative structure in detective fiction or any other kind of genre fiction;
- point of view and authorial voice in prose fiction;
- the use of free direct and indirect speech and thought in Modernist novels;

- the structure of dialogue in plays.

Once you have chosen the focus of your research project, then it is just as important for stylistics as it is for research into variation or pragmatics that you read any relevant works which may help you to orientate your study within the body of published research undertaken, in both books and journal articles. By reading other works you form a better picture of the field of enquiry in which you wish to locate your project, such as what the arguments are about and what the questions are. Knowing this will help you to formulate your own question more clearly and give you a picture of what findings you might expect, and what would be unexpected. Another important aspect of reading around your topic is that it gives you ideas and information regarding the number of texts you need to choose for your own study and the length of any extracts.

It is important to take notice of the date of publication of any work, since that which is most recent will be most up to date in developments in the field, and most likely refer back to older references still being cited by researchers, which gives an idea of their importance. The key to reading for the purposes of writing a research project, or indeed any essay, is not the amount of reading that you do, but developing the ability to perceive which reading is important to your own research question.

3.10.2 Choosing and collecting data

The data you choose to collect for stylistic analysis are written texts, and the most pressing question here is how many texts to choose and collect and/or how many extracts and of what length. Much work undertaken in stylistics is qualitative; that is, it analyses a few texts in detail to demonstrate how a particular stylistic method works. Consequently, the texts you choose have to be sufficiently lengthy to allow for a detailed analysis, yet not so long that you either cannot complete the analysis or exceed the word limit set on your study in order to complete it.

For example, if you wish to investigate vocabulary and word structure in writing for children for a short study of essay length, then you could choose a complete story of about 200 words, or extracts from two or three different stories of about 75 words each. These extracts could be from stories by the same author or from one or more authors to provide a contrastive dimension to your study. For a longer study, then as a rough guide you would double this number. If you wish to study aspects of cohesion and coherence or deixis and metaphor in poetry or a prose extract, then the lengths and numbers of texts will be different depending upon choosing poetry or prose. Depending upon the length of the poems you choose, then three poems of about 20-30 lines each would be sufficient, or one 100 line poem or extract from a longer one. Your choice of prose extracts will depend upon whether you wish to focus upon one extract from one text, or

one or more extracts from the same text or different ones. As a rough guide, extracts which total about 600-800 words are probably sufficient for a short study of essay length.

If your study focuses upon aspects of narrative such as narrative structure and/ or point of view and authorial voice, then the texts chosen for study here will be longer, and often complete texts. If your study concentrates solely on narrative structure, then you can choose four or five complete novels for an essay length piece of research, though there may be some need for sampling, depending on the detail of your intended analysis. If your study considers narrative structure and point of view and authorial voice, then two novels plus short extracts of anything from 20 to 100 words from each is probably sufficient for an essay length study. For a longer study, then more novels would be necessary and longer or a greater number of extracts. Similarly, if you are investigating the use of free direct and indirect speech and thought in novels of a particular period, then for a short study you might choose one (or part of one if that novel is Joyce's *Ulysses*) and select extracts from it of again between 20 to 100 words or so or, for a longer study, compare two or three novels. Depending upon the range of your data you choose, then from your analysis it should be possible to generalise your findings.

An investigation into the structure of dialogue in plays will again involve you in choosing at least one play for a short study, and, depending upon length, two or more for a longer one. From these, you will need to select extracts for more detailed analysis or for worked examples, with the length depending upon the point you wish to make, but usually between 4-5 lines and 20-25.

Although much stylistic analysis is qualitative, one method of collecting and choosing data which allows for analysis to be more quantitative is the use of corpora, which has led to corpus approaches to stylistics being developed. Stylistic analysis is usually undertaken on a small sample or range of texts, from which generalisations are made and theories or models proposed. A corpus-based approach allows for that range to be extended, by collecting texts into corpora and developing techniques for analysis. It has also allowed for different approaches to stylistic analysis to be developed. Two main approaches to stylistic use of corpus linguistics currently being undertaken are corpus annotation and the analysis of collocation.

Corpus annotation involves investigating a particular linguistic feature by constructing a corpus of texts and conducting a thorough analysis of this feature as it occurs within it. The results of the analysis are normally inserted into the electronic version of the text as tags or annotations. Such an analysis, because it is undertaken over a wide range of texts, is thus arguably a more empirically sound procedure for discovering linguistic

phenomena, than choosing examples from which generalisations are made, and also allows for a statistical analysis of frequency, distribution and so on. A corpus, once annotated, is then available for studies which aim to replicate or further the research. Such an approach, for example, was taken by Semino and Short (2004) in their work on speech representation. This built upon the the system of classification for speech presentation in the novel developed by Leech and Short (1981). A corpus constructed of modern British English narrative texts was categorised, annotated and analysed in order to test the theoretical model against real data. They found that not only did they have to adapt the model in the light of their analysis, but also discovered new categories.

The second approach is to study literary effects in texts by using the evidence of language norms in a reference corpus, an effect most commonly characterised by deviance. A corpus can provide comparative information of what is normal and expected in texts and identify deviations from the norms of language use. For example, if a particular word or phrase is thought to be exclusively literary, then its use can be searched for in a corpus of non-literary texts to test this hypothesis. Following on from the work of Firth and Sinclair, Louw (1993 and 2006) has developed a methodology for analysing literary effects through his study of collocations, as has Zyngier (2005). This is based upon the idea that certain words, phrases or constructions become associated with certain types of meaning because of their regular co-occurrence. For example, Sinclair (1987) discovered that the subjects of the phrasal verb *set in* are usually unpleasant things, such as *rigour mortis has set in; the rain had set in for the day*. This allows for unpleasantness to be evoked without using any other evaluative words or phrases other than the phrasal verb. Louw argues that such a phenomena can only be revealed computationally and is not generally accessible to our intuition. Only collocation, he argues, can reveal the covert meanings of literary worlds and the feelings and attitudes of those who create and inhabit them and unfettered by any condition related to levels of language as outlined in 3.3 above.

Hoey (2005) has developed applications of collocation into a theory of *lexical priming* which adds a cognitive dimension and also can be used to account for creativity in language. This theory proposes that speakers and hearers associate meanings with words not only because of their intrinsic meaning, but also because of the linguistic contexts in which they are used to speaking and hearing them. In this way, words are *primed* for certain uses and meanings. So, for example, *set in* has an intrinsic or primary meaning of a process having started and continuing, but also a *primed* meaning of unpleasantness. Corpora have made it possible to study the ways in which primings are created, in ways that link corpora and the study of style with cognitive aspects of language.

3.10.3 Analysing data

The methods that you use to analyse your data will depend upon the particular stylistic features you wish to identify in your chosen text. Corpus methods notwithstanding, it is still most common for stylistic analysis to be undertaken on a small, selective sample of texts. For example, if you wish to undertake a stylistic analysis of a poem, then your analysis will most probably be framed by the following investigations:

What can be said about:

1. the general patterns of grammar in the poem? This includes identifying the general clause structure of the poem(s).
2. foregrounded patterns of grammar in the poem(s)? This includes identifying sequences which are different from the basic grammatical pattern.
3. sound and rhythm in the poem(s)? This includes identifying any dominant metrical pattern, or the use of free verse.
4. the way the poem(s) is/are set out on the page? This looks at the way in which the words are set out on the page and any impact this may have upon other levels of language.
5. vocabulary and word structure? This considers if there are any words or word structures that are foregrounded; whether they deviate from the norm, and if so, the ways in which they intersect with other levels of language such as sound and metre.
6. simile, metaphor? This considers identifying any similes and metaphors used, and the effect of such a use of language, including the use of cognitive metaphors.

For example, for a short study, you could choose two poems by the same poet such as

Roald Dahl's *Revolting Rhymes* or two poems, each by a different author, and apply each of the methods above to each poem, to discover what, if anything, is similar or different about them. Alternatively, you could contrast a poem from an earlier historical period such as the seventeenth or eighteenth century with a late twentieth/early twenty first one in order to draw some conclusions about any changes in structure and form that may have occurred between the two. For a longer study, you would choose a greater number of poems, say four or five of 100 to 150 lines.

If your study is concerned with prose fiction or narrative reporting, then your analysis will most probably be framed by the following investigations:

1. What is the authorial voice? This involves considering in which person is the narrative written, whether or not this changes, what kind of narration is used – omniscient or otherwise.
2. aspects of cohesion and deixis? This involves considering, for example, how deixis and other aspects of cohesion are used in the text, the ways in which it coheres, including the use of any imagery such as similes and metaphors, and how they contribute to the creation of the fictional world of the text.
3. point of view? This involves considering the perspective or perspectives from which the narrative is written and the ways in which characters are presented.
4. representation of speech and thought? This involves investigating the ways in which speech and thought are used in the narrative and their part in constructing characters and furthering narrative action.
5. narrative structure? This involves identifying aspects of a model of narrative structure to see how far the narrative you are analysing accords or differs from what is expected.

For example, for a short study you might wish to restrict your analysis to anything from

one to three of the aspects listed above as applied to two novels or examples of narrative reporting, either by the same author or two different ones. For a longer study, you could either broaden your analysis to include all five aspects, or widen your choice of novels or narrative reporting to include more. If your study is concerned with dramatic texts, then your analysis will most probably be framed by the following investigations:

In a dramatic text, what can be said about:

1. the context? – physical, personal, cognitive, interactive and imaginary?
How is deixis used?
2. structure? – what is the pattern of dialogue, and how is it structured in terms of exchanges?
3. strategy? – what conversational strategies are employed or violated?
4. characterisation? – how do context, structure and strategy interrelate or interweave to produce characterisation?

Again, the number of plays you choose and the length of extracts will depend upon the length of your study. For a short study, extracts from one or two plays, either by the same playwright or different ones would be sufficient, and you might wish to restrict your analysis to anything from one to three of the aspects listed above. For a longer study, you could either broaden your analysis to include all four aspects, or widen your choice of plays to include more.

3.10.4 Sample projects

a) Undertake a stylistic analysis of a poem, in terms of: its clause structure; sound and rhythm; graphology; vocabulary and word structure; cohesion and deixis and use of simile and metaphor. For a longer study, you could compare and contrast two poems from different periods of time, from the same poets or two different poets of the same age

or several poems by the same poet or of a particular period.

b) Undertake a stylistic analysis of a prose extract in terms of, for example: its clause structure; authorial voice; aspects of cohesion and deixis and the use of any similes and metaphors, and how they contribute to the creation of the fictional world of the text; point of view; representation of speech and thought and narrative structure. For a more in-depth or longer study, you could analyse these aspects in relation to a particular genre such as detective or romance fiction, to novels by the same author, in order to identify how any one or more of these categories accounts for the distinctiveness of a particular author's style.

d) Undertake a stylistic analysis of a scene from a play,, paying particular attention to: its creation of contexts; the structure of its dialogue; the conversational strategies involved and how these all interrelate or interweave to produce characterisation. For a longer or more in-depth study, you could analyse more than one scene taken from one play, or scenes from different plays by the same playwright.

e) For a more corpus-based approach, you could test the application of a stylistic model against real data, such as the deictic categories outlined in 3.x above in a corpus of prose texts.

3.11 Where to find out more

For other works on stylistics, see: Carter and Nash (1990); Short (1996); Jeffries (1993); Werth (1999); Wales (2001); Semino & Culpepper (2002) Simpson (1993 and 2004); Stockwell (2004); Semino and Short (2004) and Watson and Zyngier (2006). Chapters on stylistics also feature in general books on and encyclopedias of Applied Linguistics, such as the one by Clark & McRae in Davies and Elder eds (2004)

Chapter 4 Critical Discourse Analysis

4.1 Introduction

So far, the approaches taken in the preceding chapters have been concerned with analysing different aspects of spoken and written English. Chapters 1 and 2 have outlined various issues and debates concerning spoken English; Chapter 1 concentrated upon linguistic variation in spoken English and Chapter 2 upon the interactive nature of speech, its context and the ways in which communication involves more than the words which are actually spoken. Chapter 3 considered the application of linguistic approaches to the analysis of written language, and literary language in particular. This chapter considers a different approach to the study of language, that of **Critical Discourse Analysis** (CDA). CDA is concerned with structures of power and equality that underlie all acts of speech and writing, and is thus concerned with the politics of language. It concentrates upon analysing the ways acts of speaking and writing and the practices associated with them construct and shape reality and the world in which we live. It is 'critical' in the sense that it encourages readers to question assumptions and not take anything for granted, analysing social issues as they are constructed in discourse and also how discourse contributes to the construction of society. Its methods of analysis draw upon sociological and critical theory in addition to linguistic theory in taking account of relations of equality and power, including those of gender, ethnicity and social class. CDA also differs from other aspects of applied linguistics discussed in this book, in that its approaches and methods of analysis allow for the study of both spoken and written language across all genres.

The question of what exactly *is* the nature of the relationship between language and reality is a matter of much debate, and is discussed in more detail in TL:TE I.4 and II.2. That the two are closely intertwined and in many ways inseparable is undeniable, but how they intersect and act upon one another is unclear. Throughout the twentieth century, work undertaken in several different disciplines: by linguists, most notably the French linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1916), the Russian linguist Mikail Bakhtin (1981), by anthropologists such as the Americans Edward Sapir (1921) and Benjamin Whorf (1956), by philosophers such as the German philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein (1951) and cultural theorists such as the French theorist Michel Foucault (1972), have all shown that language plays an important part not only in structuring but also creating reality (If you want to read more about this, see: *TL:TE I.4 and II.2*). If it is indeed the case that language structures and creates, rather than reflects, reality, then the source of power and control, of who has the authority to determine what is said, when and by whom, shifts in a seismic way. The authority to construct 'reality' shifts from some external God-like authority who exists outside of and independently of society, to a community of language users instead. Linguistic structures, as well as being susceptible to description and analysis, can thus be studied in ways which attempt to account for underlying structures of authority and control, ideology and power. It is this dimension of linguistic analysis which CDA adds to the study of language in action.

This chapter provides a background and overview of CDA. Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 discuss

major studies in the relationship between language, power, and ideology that have influenced its development. Section 5 explains the major linguistic tools developed within a critical linguistic methodology, namely those of transitivity and nominalisation. Section 6 moves on to an explanation of CDA as it is mainly understood today, which purports to be both a theory and a methodology for research and analysis. Section 7 provides students with guidance and advice on undertaking their own research into stylistics, whilst section 8 provides suggestions for further reading.

4.2 Language, society and ideology

Ideology is commonly defined as a set of fundamental beliefs and ideas: that is, the values and attitudes held by any given society or community which govern behaviour and social interaction. Much of our understanding of ideology comes from the work of sociological theory. In sociology, there are two related uses of the term 'ideology'. The first is taken from the work of the German writers Karl Marx and Frederik Engels known as Marxism, and the second from neo-Marxists such as Louis Althusser. Both related uses of the word see ideology as a system of beliefs, ideas, speech and cultural practices of a particular social group. This system of beliefs, ideas and practices disguise or distort the social, economic and political relations between dominated and dominant classes. Marxism stresses fundamental differences of interest between social groups that give rise to conflict, thereby making conflict a common and persistent feature of society, rather than a temporary disorder after which things go back to 'normal'. Marx (1976) claimed that the basis of all human organisation is economic, organised in two levels: the base (or infrastructure) and a superstructure. The base in turn has two aspects to it: the forces of production and the social relations of production. The forces of production include the raw materials, technology and people of a particular society; and the social relations of production refers to the social relations people enter into to produce goods, such as manager, worker, and models of ownership, private and public, of the means of production. The superstructure is made up of political, legal and educational institutions, which are not independent of the base but are shaped by it. 'Ideology' within Marxist theory thus refers to the set of dominant ideas which emanate from the ruling classes who control the institutions of the superstructure. Such ideas serve ultimately to justify the power and privilege of the ruling class, and to hide from all members of society the ways in which they are exploited and oppressed.

A clear example of this comes from the feudal age in Europe when the dominant concepts were those of honour and loyalty, which appeared as the natural order, celebrated in literature and implicit in superstructural institutions like law courts and education. Similarly, in the capitalist age exploitation is disguised by the ideology of equality and freedom, which appear to be desirable and natural concepts. Marxists argue that this conceals the reality or fact that capitalism involves fundamentally unequal

relationships since workers have to work in order to survive, and all they can do is exchange one form of wage subordination for another. Marx believed that many modern societies contain basic contradictions which stop them from being sustainable. These contradictions are based upon the exploitation of one group by another, for example, the exploitations of serfs or peasants in feudal times, that have to be resolved, since a social system containing such contradictions cannot survive without changing.

For Marxists, ideology is part of the superstructure rather than the economic base. Neo-Marxists such as Louis Althusser, whilst agreeing with Marxists on what constitutes ideology, nevertheless see it as something more fundamental. Althusser (1971) put forward the view that ideology works by putting people into 'subject positions', in that all social relations, including those of what Marx called the base or infrastructure are subject or subordinate to some power (for example, *the Queen's subjects*). Ideological processes take place within various organisations which he calls ideological state apparatuses such as the church, the legal system, the family and most of all, the education system. Nicos Poulantzas (1976) went further in dividing the state system into firstly, an ideological apparatus of church, political parties, unions, schools, mass media and the family, concerned with the promotion and naturalisation of certain values and beliefs and secondly, a repressive apparatus of army, police, tribunals and sometimes even a government and its administration to enforce values and beliefs.

Sociological theories of the kind described above have concerned themselves with the ways in which society is structured, and particularly in how social inequalities are structured and maintained. What none of these theorists take into account, however, is the part language, or discourse, plays in the construction of ideology.

4.3 Language, linguistics and ideology

A major influence upon the way the relationship between language and society is perceived has been the shift in theories of how language functions in society, and particularly how the meaning of words is determined. This shift is discussed in detail in TL:TE I.4.4.3 and II 3, 4 and 5. Very briefly, prior to the twentieth century, it was assumed that the meanings of words were stable and fixed. Such a view has a long history, dating back to the work of Ancient Greek philosopher Plato, and continued into the writings of the Bible. In chapter 2 of the Book of Genesis, once God had created all living creatures, he brought them to Adam for him to give names to 'all the cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast in the field'. Names then, are treated as vocables, that is, sounds, standing in a certain relationship to the things (persons, beasts, plants and so on) of which they are names. Such a view assumes that the meaning of a word exists independently and outside of the thing which it names.

4.3.1 Words and meaning

The relationship between words and their meaning has preoccupied various philosophers, initially by calling into question how a word e.g. *gold* related to the object it named, that is, its **referent** 'gold'. They considered questions such as: the relationship between a word and what it stands for; whether or not the relationship depended upon a natural connection of some kind; as something which exists independently in the world, or as an idea in the mind. As linguistics came into being as a discipline, linguists joined philosophers in subscribing to such a view of language. Neither philosophers nor linguists, though, questioned the underlying assumption of the relationship between words and their meaning, which was that the two existed independently of one another. Under such a view, it is assumed that the individual words of a language name objects, and sentences are combinations of such names. This picture of language assumes that every word has a meaning, and that the meaning correlates to the referent or the word. Such a notion of language and its relationship with meaning came to be increasingly challenged throughout the twentieth century, most notably by Saussure (see also *DL:DE 1.4. and TL:TE:II.3*). He took issue with the notion that a language, reduced to its essentials, is a nomenclature: that is, a list of terms corresponding to a list of things: a 'picture-dictionary'. He thought that asking what was the relationship between words and objects was irrelevant, because the question itself assumes that ideas exist independently of the words. Furthermore, such a view of the nature of meaning did not make clear whether the name given to an object is a vocal (that is, made up of the sounds we hear) or a mental (that is, something we imagine) entity. Saussure argued that it was both. Together, the vocal and mental entity made up the linguistic sign. Consequently, a linguistic *sign* is not a link between a thing and a name, but between a concept: that which is *signified*; and a sound pattern; that which is the *signifier*. (See also: *TL:TE I.4.3 and II 3.3. and also DLDE 1.4.3 and 7.7.3*)

Saussure explained that the relationship between the signifier and signified was not, as had been traditionally thought, a logical or necessary one, but one which is arbitrary (see *DL DE section 1.2.1*). That is, the concept 'tree' and the sounds /(((/ are not logically bound in any way, but are a matter of convention. Saussure's theory of signs, known as semiotics, has revolutionised the way we perceive the relationship between words and meaning. This is because such a view of the relationship between words and meaning shifts the allocation of meaning from an external, Godlike figure outside humanity to humanity itself, and it becomes the result of social negotiation. In practice meaning in language then, is not natural but conventional. The relationship between a sound or symbol and what it represents is fundamentally arbitrary, in that any sound or letter can be used to represent any concept. Meaning results from shared common understanding amongst a community of users as much as from anything else.

Take, for example, the ways in which dictionaries construct their definitions. Chapter 1 discussed how Samuel Johnson, in writing the first dictionary of English, was explicit about the assumptions and prejudices upon which he based his selections and definitions (see 1.3). Since that time, lexicographers (dictionary compilers) have endeavoured to make the process of definition much more objective and neutral. However, given that dictionary definitions are based upon examples of actual language usage, there is a sense in which dictionaries, no matter how 'neutral' they try to be, inevitably not only reflect bias but also help to perpetuate it. For example, Hoey (1996:150-165) analysed definitions of *man* and *woman* as defined in the *Collins*

COBUILD English Language Dictionary. The definitions for this dictionary were constructed from examples taken from an extensive corpus or database of contemporary English. One of its fundamental principles was that all definitions should be based upon how words were actually used in contemporary English. At the same time, another of its principles was that there should be no reinforcement of sexist attitudes in and towards language. Hoey's analysis of examples and definitions given for the terms *man* and *woman* however, discovered that such reinforcement did in fact appear in the dictionary. Take the following example:

A **man** is ... a human being of either sex (1.2)

Hoey (1996:158)

As Hoey points out, firstly, if this definition were strictly accurate, then there would be no need to specify *of either sex*. Secondly, if the definition were correct, then *man* would be synonymous with *human being*, and it would be possible to reverse the two noun phrases without making them nonsensical, which is not the case:

A human being is a man of either sex.

The definition, then, implies that male human beings are sometimes taken as the only human beings by users of the language, and female human beings are a sub-class of male human beings. Two other definitions given in the dictionary also make the same assumptions (Hoey 1996:158):

The man in the street is an ordinary person who is not especially rich or educated or famous, and who is therefore considered to be a typical representative of public taste and opinion. (2.1)

Modern man, primitive **man**, etc means all modern people, primitive people, and so on considered as a group.

As Hoey says: 'It is worth noting the democratic implications of the phrase **the man in the street** are replaced by sexual ones in the closely parallel phrase **a woman in the street**. It would appear that men can in the English language go about in the street and be regarded as normal, but that women go about the street at the peril of their reputations'(1996:158).

Hoey's analysis shows that, no matter how much lexicographers might aim not to reinforce sexism in language or indeed or any other kind of prejudice or bias, no corpus of real language use is value-free or neutral, but inevitably reflects and embodies bias. The explanation Hoey gives for the bias he found was that the corpus chosen for the COBUILD dictionary was predominantly that of written, published texts, with a

predominance of male over female writers. Consequently, he concluded that the corpus strongly reflected the value-system of the male-orientated establishment.

In addition to redefining the nature of the relationship between words and meaning, Saussure made a further distinction between two different axes of time in linguistic study. The first is the diachronic axis, that is, the time line of the past, present and future, and second is the synchronic axis, that is, language as it is used in the present. The fact that language changes had proved something of a headache to linguists. By distinguishing between the two different axes, Saussure suggested that we could base the description of a language on how it is used at a particular time, thereby making it possible to ignore its history. This had the effect of focusing subsequent linguistic endeavour upon the synchronic, that is, present day, aspects of language and ignoring the diachronic, that is, developmental aspects of language. However, over long periods of time in the history of a society, meaning is determined in a way which suits the needs of that society, usually through serving the 'needs' of the dominant, privileged groups. As Fowler (1986:31) says: 'These dominant groups control the means of legitimating the preferred systems of meanings – schools, libraries, the media. Language thus becomes a part of social practice, a tool for preserving the prevailing order. It does this not only through propaganda, but also by inertia, the settlement towards stability and resistance to change...' An example of legitimating preferred systems of meaning has been the change in recent years in the meaning of the word 'gay'. Until the 1960s, this word was synonymous with 'happy' or 'glad'. It began to be applied to homosexual men as a derogatory term, but as sexual liberation became a dominant theme in Anglo-American society from the mid nineteen sixties onwards, the homosexual community appropriated the term for itself, thereby legitimating its use as their own status in mainstream society altered. Nowadays, the term 'gay' is rarely used to mean 'happy', and then most likely by the older generation. It is most commonly used as a synonym for homosexuality with none of the derogatory overtones its use implied until very recently. Consequently, language becomes not only a tool for preserving social order but also a means of acknowledging change within it.

4.3.2 Language and reality

A further influence which has contributed to the altering of linguistic thinking about the nature of the relationship between language and society is the work of the American anthropologist Edward Sapir (1884-1939), and his student Benjamin Whorf (1897-1941), known as the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis (see: *DL:DE 1.4.5*). This hypothesis, and the theories of linguistic relativity and linguistic determinism arising from it, resulted from the work Sapir and Whorf undertook in making a record of American Indian languages, particularly Hopi. They compared the grammatical features of American Indian languages with that of standard average European (SAE) languages, including English, French, German and other related ones. One of these comparisons was with the American Indian language of Hopi and published by Whorf (1939). In his study, Whorf focused on verb tenses, from which he concluded that the ways in which the Hopi Indian used tenses was radically different from that of SAE, particularly the ways in which concepts of time and

space were talked about. Further more, he also argued that ways in which grammar was expressed by Hopis related to Hopi culture, just as that of SAE related to European culture. Take the example of talking about time. In western culture, we mark our verbs to show whether we are talking about the past, present or future: for example, *I wrote this chapter, I write or am writing this chapter or I will write this chapter*. Time then is basically ordered into three separate periods which progress linearly from the past through the present onto the future, as represented, for example, in historical time lines. In Hopi culture, time is expressed very differently; rather than linear stages, it is viewed as cyclical. Time is expressed through the stages of the human life cycle which goes from birth, through childhood, adolescence, adulthood to maturity then death. Although each of these stages are defined, they flow into one another rather than being markedly defined as *yesterday, today and tomorrow* are. At each point, an individual is the same person, although aspects of that individual may have changed, such as appearance and certain characteristics. Consequently, in Hopi, an expression such as *next week* or *seven days* which reflects a belief that each day is different, is not possible in Hopi, where: 'return of the day [is] felt as the return of the same person, a little older but with all the impresses of yesterday' (Whorf in Carroll 1956:156). The Hopi language has no tenses like European languages do, a difference which comes essentially from the different world-views of the two types of culture.

Since the two types of culture, European and American Indian, have evolved in different circumstances and with different influences, (such as the geographic and historic), then so too, their experience of reality has been different. This worldview informs all cultural aspects in addition to the linguistic, since, in Whorf's conclusions to his study, language, culture and behaviour are constantly influencing one another. Sapir (in Lucy, 1992), claimed that once the language habits of a group have been fixed, then its speakers are at their mercy, in the sense that we cannot but help acquire these habits as part of acquiring language. This has been taken to mean that we are passive victims of our language, and that the language we speak determines our worldview; a kind of linguistic determinism. In other words, our worldview is so encoded that we cannot think beyond it. However, what the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis in fact claims is that perceptions and concepts are encoded in language systems and reinforced by constant and unquestioned use by their speakers, which does not necessarily mean that no questioning or alternative to that system is ever possible. Sapir himself said that as our awareness of language grows, so too must our questioning of it and how it is used. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis suggests that language use is not only determined by socio-cultural factors, but also, and more importantly, determines our very ways of thinking. This hypothesis has led to the theory of **linguistic relativism**, and is one which underlies CDA.

4.4 Language as discourse

The term **discourse** has several meanings in linguistics. In traditional descriptive linguistics, **discourse** is used to describe manifestations of speech and **text** to describe manifestations of writing. In discourse analysis it has been used to describe the physical,

aural and visual manifestation of speech and writing, and the study of its management in relation to structure and grammar, taking account of the interactive nature of speech and writing between speaker and listener and writer and reader, as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. There is, however, a further meaning of the word derived from social and cultural theory, particularly from the work of theorists such as the French social theorist and philosopher Michel Foucault. Here, the use of the term 'discourse' applies to what is said and written, but it also applies to the invisible structures and forces through which the ideas - the ideology - of a society are shaped. These ideas are also subject to change, and alter across time.

Discourse in this sense has two dimensions: the first is the **visible** aspect; that is, speech and writing which is produced from within the structures of language we have at our disposal. The second is the **invisible** one of the underlying assumptions and practices which govern our production of language. Any discourse at any given moment in time is structured as much by the assumptions about what constitutes it as a discourse as well as the boundaries of language itself. As an example, Foucault cites institutional practices associated with education. He points out that: 'Every educational system is a political means of maintaining or modifying the appropriateness of discourses with the knowledge and power they bring with them' (Foucault 1972 : 46).

For Foucault, discourses are to do with the ways sets of statements are systematically organised in order to give expression to the meanings and values of an institution or a society. Discourses in this sense thus define and delimit what it is possible to say or do and not possible to say or do with respect to the concerns of particular institutions and societies. To take an example cited in O' Halloran (2003:12), 'different religions have their own discourses which delimit explanation of natural behaviour. Catholicism now accepts that the universe began with the 'Big Bang' (scientific discourse) but believes that the Christian God initiated it (a mixture of scientific and religious discourse)'.

Drawing upon social and cultural theories of discourse such as those of Foucault has given rise in linguistics, and especially within CDA, to different ways of interpreting the terms **discourse** and **text**. So far, the term **discourse** has been used to describe either the manifestation of speech and its organisation (discourse and conversation analysis), or as invisible structures that shape what is said (social and cultural theory). A **text** is then anything which is actually produced by language, both spoken and written. In cultural and social theory this notion is taken even further, and the term *text* is used to describe any manifestation of human communication. As the cultural theorist Fornas (1995) describes them, *texts* are:

... signifying practices (that) combine meaningful signs into complexly structured and ordered symbolic units. These are referred to as *texts*, whether they consist of spoken or written words, images, sculptural or architectural forms, musical sounds, body movements or any combination of these or other symbolic entities.

Fornas (1995:149).

Consequently, the term *text* may be extended beyond the written word to include any

visual manifestation in the material world - images, the way we furnish our houses, the clothes we wear, even our bodies, can all be read as *texts*. As CDA is primarily concerned with linguistic analysis, then the *texts* with which it is concerned are those produced by speech and writing. Unlike traditional discourse analysis however, in CDA the use of the term does not differentiate between speech and writing, calling manifestations of both *texts*. Within CDA then, *discourse* (or discursive practices) refer to the underlying structures that shape what is said: pedagogic discourse, religious discourse, political discourse and so on, and *text* to a manifestation or realization of that discourse: a lesson, a sermon, a speech and so on.

These uses of the term *text* and *discourse* have been applied to the analysis of language by two different recent linguistic traditions: firstly, the work of critical linguists undertaken during the 1970s by Fowler (1979) and Hodge and Kress (1979). From the 1980s onwards this work has been subsumed and developed by critical discourse analysts, most notably Norman Fairclough (1989), a collection edited by Rosa Carmen Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard (1996) Fairclough and Wodak (1997), Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1999), and van Dijk (2001).

4.5 Critical linguistics

Critical linguistics resulted from the publication of two seminal books both published in 1979: *Language and Control* (R Fowler, R Hodge, G. Kress and T Trew) and *Language as Ideology* (G. Kress and R. Hodge). Drawing upon sociological and critical theory as outlined in section 3 above, critical linguists took issue with a purely 'objective' model of linguistic criticism which claimed that the meaning and value of a text can be derived solely from its linguistic construction; that is, the words on a page or the sounds made by speech. They argued that although linguistic structures are themselves objective: 'their significances in discourse cannot be read off automatically from the text: a semiotic assessment in relation to cultural factors is required' (Fowler 1986:169). That is, that communication results not only from what is said or heard, or written and read, but also from understanding or 'reading' cultural and social norms associated with the acts of speaking, listening, reading and writing (see also Chapter 2). Consequently, Fowler describes the central concerns of critical linguistics as '...the ordering of experience and with the mediation of social relationships and values'(1991:70). Critical linguistics draws upon cultural theory outlined above to extend the concept of 'text' to include every kind of writing; newspapers, adverts, leaflets and so on, as well as novels, plays and poetry, and also extends to spoken speech. Unlike pragmatics then, which focuses mainly upon spoken speech used in context, or stylistics which focuses mainly upon written, specifically literary texts, critical linguistics, and CDA, include the whole spectrum of texts that speech and writing make possible. Such an activity requires a specific model of linguistics, which for critical linguistics is drawn from systemic-functional linguistics (see: Halliday 1971&1973). Systemic functional linguistics is concerned with how language is used in real life, and with how linguistic structure is related to communicative function and social value. At its heart is the notion of **function**, a concept used in a general, global sense. All language performs three functions at the same time: the **ideational**,

the **interpersonal** and the **textual** (see also *DL:DE 7.3.2*).

The **ideational** function is concerned with the content of language, as it is used to express our experience of the external world the inner world of our own consciousness.

The **interpersonal** function is concerned with language as the mediator of role, as it is used to express our personalities and personal feelings and our interaction with other participants in communication. The **textual** function has the enabling one of creating text, and is concerned with language in operation as opposed to or as distinct from strings of words or isolated sentences and clauses: 'It is this component that enables the speaker to organise what he is saying in such a way that makes sense in the context and fulfils its function as a message (Halliday: 1973:66).

As Halliday (1978) makes clear in a later work, the *ideational*, *interpersonal* and *textual* functions are sets of social options, constrained by social and cultural practices, rather than areas of voluntary or privileged personal choice. The three functions provide a way of classifying linguistic structures according to their communicative roles. Consequently, linguistic details of syntax, vocabulary and so on are conceived of functionally. That is, they are considered not only as formally different kinds of structure, but also as the kinds of structure they are based upon the particular jobs or functions they perform. Approaching the analysis of language in a systemic-functional way has given rise to a set of linguistic tools that go beyond those normally associated with grammatical analysis, and include transitivity, syntactic transformations of the clause, lexical structure and modality. These tools have been described in various works (e.g. Fowler (1991; Simpson 1993). It is worth, however, explaining transitivity and modality in more detail, since they exemplify the concept of functionality in language.

4.5.1 Transitivity

The ideational function of language, that is, the content of what is said or written and the writer's or speaker's experience that content embodies, is best illustrated by ways of semantically categorising clauses that reveal speakers' or writers' experience or point of view. A clause is essentially a basic unit of syntax which determines the position and sequence of elements (words and phrases), rather than being concerned with propositional meanings and functions. Nevertheless, meanings are encoded in clauses because of the way different types of processes are represented in language. There are three key components of processes:

1. The **process** itself, typically realised grammatically as the verb phrase. For example: *hit, sees, broke*.
2. The **participant(s)** associated with the process, typically realised grammatically by the noun phrase. For example: *John, she, the vase*.
3. The **circumstances** associated with the process, typically realised grammatically by the prepositional and adverb phrases, for example, *in the room, at breakfast, over the*

	Behavior	Process	Circumstance
(7)	<i>Joan</i>	<i>laughed</i>	<i>at the clown.</i>

	Behavior	Process	Circumstance
(8)	<i>The dog</i>	<i>barked..</i>	

Behavior	Process
-----------------	----------------

4. **Verbal processes** are processes of saying. The participant roles associated with this process are the Sayer, who is the producer of speech, the Receiver, who is the entity to which the speech is addressed, and the Verbiage, which is what gets said. For example:

(9)	<i>John</i>	<i>told</i>	<i>the joke</i>	<i>to his friends</i>
-----	-------------	-------------	-----------------	-----------------------

Sayer	Process	Verbiage	Receiver(s).
--------------	----------------	-----------------	---------------------

(10)	<i>The Judge</i>	<i>announced</i>	<i>the sentence</i>	<i>to the court.</i>
------	------------------	------------------	---------------------	----------------------

Sayer	Process	Verbiage	Receiver.
--------------	----------------	-----------------	------------------

Within this category, the verbiage can apply to the content of what is said, as *the joke* in example (9) above, or the name of what is said, such as *the sentence* in (10).

5. **Relational processes** are those which are to do with 'being', in the specific sense of establishing a relationship between two entities. The process is almost always taken from forms of the verb *be* (or a very small number of similar verbs such as *seem* or *become*), and the participant roles those of the Identifier and identified. For example,

(11)	<i>The show</i>	<i>is</i>	<i>on all evening.</i>
------	-----------------	-----------	------------------------

Identified	Process	Identifier
-------------------	----------------	-------------------

(12)	<i>Catherine's car</i>	<i>is</i>	<i>a Volvo.</i>
------	------------------------	-----------	-----------------

Identified	Process	Identifier
-------------------	----------------	-------------------

(13)	<i>Harry's dog</i>	<i>was</i>	<i>in the park.</i>
------	--------------------	------------	---------------------

Identified	Process	Identifier
-------------------	----------------	-------------------

6. Finally, **existential processes** assert that something exists or happens. Typically,

they include the word *there* as a dummy subject, as in *There has been a theft* or *Has there been a fight?* They normally contain only one participant role, realised in the examples as *a theft* and *a fight*. Existential processes take us back to material ones, in that both can answer a question such as *what happened?* In a material process, an actor and a goal would be identified, with the participant role replaced by a process. So, *There has been a theft* would be something like *John stole*. In the existential version, the actor and goal disappear, to be replaced by the Existential which is filled by a nominalised element.

Applying the transitivity model to written texts, especially when analyzing media language such as newspaper headlines and articles, can be very revealing of ideology. For example, Trew's seminal article on media language (1979) analyses the news coverage of a civil disorder event in pre-independent Zimbabwe. The headlines and opening texts of two British newspapers of 2 June 1975 read:

a) POLICE SHOOT 11 DEAD IN SALIBURY RIOT

Riot police shot and killed 11 African demonstrators.

(The Guardian, p.1)

b) RIOTING BLACKS SHOT DEAD BY POLICE

Eleven Africans were shot dead and 15 wounded when Rhodesian police opened fire on a rioting crowd.

(The Times, p1)

In example a), the *Guardian* headline and first line uses an active construction, a standard SVO pattern, making the ACTOR, the police, the first element in the clause with the GOAL, the 11 dead or African demonstrators, appearing at the end and the PROCESS, *shoot, shot and killed*. This places considerable emphasis upon the agents involved in the process. By contrast, the *Times* employs a passive construction, inverting subject and object, actor and goal, thereby placing the GOAL, *rioting blacks, 11 Africans*, at the start of each construction, and thus in a position of prominence. The ACTOR element, by contrast, is placed in a less prominent position at the end. Furthermore, in the *Times*' first sentence, agency is actually deleted from the first clause - *Eleven Africans were shot dead and wounded* - , and can only be identified by inference from the second. Trew contends that the effects of the passivity and agency deletion in the *Times* are to shift attention away from who did the shooting onto the victims. In other words, the two messages, whilst reporting 'the truth', are slanted in crucially different directions. This slanting can be said to correspond with the political orientation of the two newspapers; *The Guardian* reflecting the political left and *The Times* the political right. An analysis and interpretation of this kind, based upon extrapolating from textual analysis to questions of political bias, essentially summarises the critical linguistic method.

Take a further example, which was the shooting of a suspected terrorist following the July 2005 terrorist bombings in London, reported by the BBC and the Guardian. The BBC purports to take a politically neutral stance and the Guardian is associated with the political left.

The first is:

a) POLICE SHOT BRAZILIAN EIGHT TIMES

The man mistaken for a suicide bomber by police was shot eight times, an inquest into his death has heard. (BBC News On-Line 25 July 2005).

The second is:

b) SHOT MAN WAS NOT BOMBER – POLICE

The man shot dead in Stockwell tube station yesterday was not connected to the attempted bombings of London on July 21, police said tonight.

(The Guardian On-Line 23 July 2005).

The lexical choices of the two texts are different and clearly significant: the 'Brazilian' of the BBC becomes 'Shot Man' in The Guardian. These lexical differences are accompanied by differences in the transitivity structures of the two reports:

POLICE SHOT BRAZILIAN EIGHT TIMES

Actor Process Goal

The man mistaken for a suicide bomber by police was shot eight times,

Goal Actor Process

an inquest into his death has heard.

Receiver Verbiage process.

Although the headline uses an active SVO construction, the lexical choice and foregrounding of the dead man's nationality as one which is 'not British' is offered as something of an explanation for the shooting. The London bombers were assumed at first to be foreign terrorists, and marking the shot man as 'foreign' can thus be interpreted as some kind of justification for the shooting. However, the statement of the exact number of times the man was shot emphasises or implies a literal overkill, since it does not usually take that number of bullets to kill someone. The headline is followed by a

passive construction, inverting subject and object, actor and goal, thereby placing the GOAL, which is further elaborated as 'the man mistaken for a suicide bomber' in a prominent position. The fact that he was shot eight times is repeated, again reinforcing that excessive force was used. The reporting is from accounts made a day after the shooting, when it became evident that the man shot by police was not a suicide bomber as had first been reported. Placing the first clause construction of GOAL ACTOR PROCESS before the reporting clause emphasises the fact that not only did the police use excessive force, but that such use was unjustified by the outcome, since the man was not after all a suicide bomber as had first been thought.

The Guardian's headline does not mention nationality, instead focusing on the shooting:

SHOT MAN WAS NOT BOMBER – POLICE

Verbiage

Sayer

The man shot dead in Stockwell tube station yesterday was not connected to the attempted bombings of London on July 21, police said tonight.

Verbiage

Sayer

The Guardian's headline and accompanying first line summarises and quotes the admission made by the police that they had made a mistake. Actual admission of the mistake is implied, not stated. The Guardian headline does not offer the excuse of mistaken nationality as does the BBC example, focusing instead upon the fact that the shooting was an error and a result of at best, over reaction, and at worst, panic. Both, however, are unequivocal in their condemnation of the action itself. The Guardian report allows the words of the police to speak for themselves in condemnation of the attack, whereas that of the BBC presents a more ambivalent stance, highlighting or offering 'foreignness' as a possible excuse for the shooting, but immediately condemning the excessive use of bullets.

4.5.2 Modality

Whereas transitivity serves an ideational function, modality serves an interpersonal one: that is, it expresses comments, attitudes and evaluations. Modality is the way in which speakers and writers use language to comment or express attitudes and beliefs and present their own point of view. It is a grammar of explicit comment, and it signals the varying degrees of certainty we have about what we say or write, and the sorts of, or degree of, commitment and obligation we express. The way in which modality functions grammatically is realised most commonly through modal auxiliary verbs, though lexical verbs, adverbs, adjectives, intonation and even body language can also be modal.

Fowler (1986) identified four different aspects of modality: truth, obligation, desirability

and permission. Truth indicates or implies a commitment to the truth of any proposition uttered, or a prediction of the likelihood of an event taking place. Modality appears where the speaker or writer is expressing an opinion on what will, might, could or should happen. Truth modality varies from a scale of absolute confidence signalled by 'will' to degrees of lesser certainty signalled by 'could'. It can also be indicated by adverbs such as 'certainly' and modal adjectives such as 'likely' or 'unlikely'. An example of absolute confidence is:

Strikes end but airport misery *will* last for days.

The Times, 13 August 2005

An example of lesser confidence is:

He said the issue *could* only be resolved by the courts and he predicated that passengers *would* bring a case against BA.

The Times, 13 August 2005

Obligation is where speakers and writers express an opinion on what ought to happen, expressed by 'ought', 'should' and 'ought to', as in the following example:

Although the frustrated holiday makers marooned west of London *will* find it difficult to do so, there *should* be sympathy with the workers' cause.

The Guardian, 13 August 2005

It is important to note that English, unlike other languages which have future tenses, has only a modal way of talking about the future, that is, with *will*. This means that all future statements are modal, whilst statements about present or past can be categorical. In the future then, there is no choice about the modality.

Desirability is where the speaker or writer shows approval or disapproval of the state of affairs that is communicated. This use of modality is widely used in the Press, particularly in editorials and especially in tabloids and broadsheets with right wing tendencies. Modality of this kind may be expressed through a range of evaluative adjectives and adverbs as well as some lexical verbs (e.g. wish, want). For example,

To be sacked by megaphone is *callous*, even for a part of the service sector well known for low pay, insecure job tenure and poor career prospects.

The Guardian, 13 August 2005

Permission is where the speaker or writer gives permission to do something, signalled by *may*, *can* and *shall*. Here, the auxiliaries *may* and *can* indicate a degree of cautiousness or hedging, as opposed to *shall* which is more definite, as can be illustrated by the fairy godmother's utterance to Cinderella that: *You **shall** go to the ball!*

Modality is also an important feature in the study of narrative, where Simpson (2004) in his work on point of view in fiction points out that the degree of modality expressed by the writer or reader can be categorised as degrees of shading, from **positive**, through **neutral** to **negative**.

Positive shading is where the writer, narrator or speaker tell you what s/he thinks and believes by foregrounding expressions, beliefs, opinions and obligations. Modality which expresses desire and obligation is known as **deontic modality**: for example, *I **ought** to visit my Gran* or *I **need** a drink*. This is the most common use of modality, which underpins many first and third person narratives. It also underpins the writing of newspaper Editorials and comment and analysis columns.

Negative shading is where the writer or narrator is uncertain about events and other characters' motivations and is often expressed through structures based upon perception: *as if*, *it seemed*, *it appeared to be* and so on. This kind of shading is marked by **epistemic modality**. This foregrounds a narrator's, writer's or speaker's efforts to interpret and make sense of what is read or heard, and is often characteristic of Gothic or existentialist styles of narrative fiction. For example, ***Maybe** the sound came from...*, or *his horse **must have** thrown her off...*

Neutral shading is where the writer or narrator gives no evaluation or interpretation and thus there is a complete absence of either **deontic or epistemic modality**. Rather, it is typified by categorical assertions with the speaker or writer making no evaluative or interpretive statements. For example, *My name is Bill* or *Bus hits 10 cyclists*. This kind of modality is rare in narrative, but is often to be found in news reporting which aims to be factual and neutral.

The linguistic tools derived from critical linguistics such as transitivity and modality described above show how linguistic structures encode both ideational and interpersonal functions. Tools such as these, together with those which perform a textual function such as the pragmatic categories of discourse and conversation analysis (see 2.x) and stylistic ones such as cohesion and deixis (see 3.x) are all ones upon which CDA draws in its methods of describing and interpreting both spoken and written texts. Where CDA differs from other methods or frameworks for the analysis of spoken and written discourse, it is in its emphasis upon the underlying ideologies of the social and cultural context within which description and interpretation occur, and which, it is argued, also shape that description and interpretation.

4.6 A Framework for Critical Discourse Analysis

Taking account of sociological and cultural theory (4.2), changes in theories of language (4.3 and 4.4) and developments in functional grammar (4.5 above), have combined to allow insights into the ways in which language functions in society. They show how points of view, world views and beliefs are not only socially constructed but also grammatically encoded in language, in ways which often reveal unequal relationships based upon authority and power. Critical linguistics and the grammatical tools associated with it (see 4.5 above) have added to the analysis of spoken and written texts as outlined in chapters 2 and 3 and also extended the range of text studied to non-literary ones such as newspaper articles and adverts. They also take account of the social element of how language represents the world. In CDA, this aspect of analysis is taken further. It is argued that language, as well as playing a part in constructing (or misrepresenting) reality, is also the primary medium of social control and power, and is therefore fundamentally ideological. For practitioners of CDA, ideology is all-pervasive in language, and consequently it is with revealing the ideological nature of language with which they are most concerned.

CDA integrates linguistic analysis of the kind described above and in other chapters of this book, with social and cultural theories in order to expose the ideological assumptions and relations at play in language, which are essentially to do with power. Although critical linguistics recognises that texts are essentially a form of social practice, the methods of analysis associated with it remain grounded in the text, as the section above has shown. Critical discourse analysis takes matters one step further, arguing that the text is itself part of wider discourse practice within which it is situated. This discourse practice is, in turn, located within wider socio-cultural practices. Consequently, interaction between all three layers – text, discourse practice and socio-cultural practice - that is, between all aspects of the social use of language, becomes the subject of analysis. CDA then, acts as both a theory and a method of analysis. As Fairclough argues:

It is not uncommon for textbooks on language to have sections on the relationship ‘between’ language and society, as if these were two independent entities which just happen to come into contact occasionally. My view is that there is not an external relationship ‘between’ language and society, but an internal and dialectical relationship. Language is a part of society; linguistic phenomena *are* social phenomena of a special sort, and social phenomena *are* (in part) linguistic phenomena.

Fairclough: (2001:19)

Figure 4.1 below shows this three-layered model of discourse, which presents discourse as involving three dimensions at the same time:

Fig 4.1 A three-dimensional model of discourse (from Fairclough 2001:21).

Corresponding to the three dimensions of discourse, Fairclough distinguishes three dimensions, or stages, of CDA:

1. **Description** is the stage which is concerned with formal properties of the text.
2. **Interpretation** is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction - with seeing the text as the product of a process of production, and as a resource in the process of interpretation; notice that I use the term *interpretation* for both the interactional process and a stage of analysis.
3. **Explanation** is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context - with the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation, and their social effects.

(Fairclough2001:21)

Linguists interested in CDA consider language an important tool in the production, maintenance and change of social relations of power. Their aim is to increase language users' consciousness of how language contributes to the domination and control of some people by others. It is a means of: 'helping people to see the extent to which their language does rest upon common-sense assumptions and the ways in which these common sense assumptions can be ideologically shaped by relations of power.' (Fairclough:1989:). For the dimensions of **description** and **interpretation**, CDA draws upon linguistic tools that have already been developed as part of other traditions, such as those of pragmatics and discourse analysis outlined in chapter 2, those associated with stylistics as outlined in chapter 3 and those of critical linguistics such as transitivity and modality summarised in 5.5 above. Where CDA differs from these traditions is not only the linking but embedding of the **descriptive** and **interpretative dimensions** within the **evaluative** one. It is this interface between linguistic interaction, the social contexts within which it occurs and underlying ideologies of those contexts which is the most controversial aspect of CDA (see: Widdowson 2004).

For example, common sense assumptions are evident in the conventions for a traditional type of consultation between doctors and patients where authority and hierarchy are treated as natural, and such assumptions are thus embedded in the forms of language used. Another example is in the relationship between the police and witnesses. Take the following example, which is part of an interview in a police station involving a witness to a burglary and a policeman. The policeman is filling out a form and his questions follow the order on which they appear on the form:

P: *You say you saw them as they left the shop?*

W: Yeah, I saw their faces. There were two of them. I think they were...

P: What age would you say they were ?

W: Dunno. One was younger than the other. Twenties I guess. Mid twenties. The other...Fortyish? I think one of them was carrying ...

P: Height?

W: medium, I'd say. About six foot, maybe less. One was slightly shorter than the other...

P: Six foot. Five foot ten. Did you notice the colour of their hair?

W: I think the shorter one had fair hair. Look, how long's this going to take? I've got to ...

P: Not much longer, no. What about the other one?

W: Can't say, I'm sorry.

P: Short? long?

W: Short.

P: What about their clothes?

W: One was wearing a dark, heavy jacket...

P: Like a donkey jacket?

W: Yeah.

(author's data)

A discourse or conversation analysis of this exchange would emphasise the verbal utterances that make up the utterances and the structure of the interaction. Focusing upon, for example, turn-taking, adjacency pairs, presupposition and politeness (see: 2.5).

A critical discourse analysis of this exchange emphasises what the conversation reveals about the relationship between the participants and the social conditions which determine the properties of the discourse. The interviewer, who is the policeman, is in control of the way the interview develops, and reduced questions such as *height?* are typical of someone filling out a form. The witness is forthcoming with information, but the policeman will only deal with each bit as it is determined by the order on the form, not in the order given by the witness. The witness signals her frustration by asking: *how long's this going to take?* The policeman, though, has his task to perform and the witness, as a law-abiding citizen, complies with the requirement of that task even if it means being late for a previous engagement. It could also be argued that the sensitive nature of the situation is also contained or framed by the norms of form-filling. Filling in the form structures the questions the policeman asks, who ignores any information volunteered by the witness if it is not relevant to the particular question on the form, even if it is relevant to the incident as a whole.

In analysing this conversation in this way, it can be seen that the relationship between the police interviewer and the witness is unequal. The way in which the interview is carried out follows social conventions based upon the nature of the relationship between the police and members of the public in our society. In this way, it can be said that social conditions determine the properties of the discourse. When looking beyond the text itself we can look at the way we produce and interpret texts and see how these processes are socially shaped and relative to social conventions. For example, there is complete absence of any acknowledgement by the policeman when the witness gives information. In a conversation between friends this would not be acceptable, whereas in this case it generally is.

In terms of the three-dimensional model shown in fig 4.1 above, consider further the example of the interaction between the policeman and a witness given above:

Text: this involves a linguistic analysis of the actual speech exchange and its characteristics in terms of conversational properties, politeness phenomena, narrative or argument structure, characteristics of grammar and accent and so on.

Processes of production and interpretation: this involves considering the type of discourse produced in the interaction: argument, small talk, political discussion and so on. Identification of the ways the exchange fits in with 'genres' or speech events.

Social conditions of production and interpretation: this involves consideration of how the exchange derives from, reinforces or challenges expected relations between the police and the public and law enforcement as an institution.

As has already been mentioned, linguistic analysis of actual speech exchanges or written texts within a CDA framework draws upon ones established in other areas of linguistic activity. It has concentrated more upon developing frameworks or categories for the remaining two dimensions: processes of production and reception and the social conditions within which they occur.

5.6.1 Schema theory and members' resources

Processes of production and especially of interpretation have been the focus of much recent linguistic study (see also Chapter 3). Interpretation is generally arrived at through a combination of what is in any given text and what is 'in' the interpreter. One influential theory in trying to account for the relationship between the two is **schema theory**, derived from cognitive linguistic theory, as proposed by Schank and Abelson (1977) and developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986). Schema, (or in the plural schemata), is a mental representation of a particular type of activity, representing models of social behaviour. Frames represent the entities that occur in the natural and social world. A frame is a representation of whatever can count as the topic, subject matter or referent within an activity. Scripts refer to chunks or bits of knowledge which describe 'a predetermined, stereotyped sequence of actions that defines a well-known situation' (Schank and Abelson 1977:41). Although scripts refer to what we already know, they are also subject to modification and change as our range of experience of situations, well-known or otherwise, grows. A script-based framework of the kind proposed by schema theory is a way of accounting for how we can understand texts without having everything within them made explicit linguistically.

Going back to the example of the policeman and witness, applying schema theory makes the schema being enacted here that of police activity, and the frame is the questioning of a witness. Scripts represent the subjects who are involved in this activity, the policeman and the witness, and their relationship with one another. Scripts typify the ways in which specific classes of subjects behave in particular situations, and explains why the witness accepts the absence of acknowledgement in this schema but not in another; s/he is behaving according to the script we set out for ourselves on how a police interview should be conducted, based on our previous experience – real, imagined or hearsay.

Fairclough (2001) absorbs and expands upon schema theory in his notion of **members' resources** or **MR**. . Like schemas, MR are the interpretative procedures in which any

of us engage in any communicative act. MR are essentially interpretative procedures which help to generate interpretation: '.....from the point of view of the interpreter of a text, formal features are 'cues' which activate elements of interpreters' MR, and ... interpretations are generated through the dialectical interplay of cues and MR' (2001:118). That is, interpretation results from interaction between the structural content of any given text and the ways in which this structure activates the reader's or listener's store of interpretative procedures. Fairclough shies away from using the term 'background knowledge' to describe MR, on the grounds that the term is too restrictive, and misses the point that many of the assumptions we make in interpretation are ideological, thus making *knowledge* a misleading term. MR refers to the representation each one of us has stored in our long-term memory of, for example, shapes of words, grammatical forms of sentences, typical narrative structures, the expected sequence of events in a particular situation and so on. We draw on this MR to both produce and interpret texts. MR are cognitive in the sense that they are in people's heads but they are also social in that they have social origins, being dependent upon social relations and struggles out of which they were generated. Fairclough (2001: 119-20) identifies four levels of textual interpretation: **surface of utterance, meaning of utterance, local coherence** and **text structure and 'point'**.

Surface of utterance refers to the processes by which we convert strings of sound or marks on a page into recognizable words, phrases, sentences and utterances. The aspect of MR upon which we draw in doing this is commonly known as 'knowledge of the language'; that is, its phonology, vocabulary and grammar.

Meaning of utterance refers to that aspect of MR concerned with semantic aspects such as the representation of the meaning of words, including implicit ones. It also includes drawing upon pragmatic conventions associated with speech acts.

Local coherence refers to the ways in which MR infer connections or cohesive relations between utterances within a particular part of a text. This is possible even where formal cohesive cues are absent, where we make implicit assumptions which are often of an ideological nature.

Text structure and **'point'** is to do with working out how a whole text hangs together. Text structure '... involves matching the text with one of a repertoire of *schemata* or representations of characteristic patterns of organization associated with different types of discourse' (2001:120). For example, once we have worked out that we are taking part in a telephone conversation, then we can expect the conversation to follow a particular structure of greeting, establishing a topic, changing a topic, closing off the conversation and saying goodbye. The 'point' of a text is the overall interpretation of the text as a whole. For example, a telephone conversation may have included an exchange of conversation on the participants' well-being, recent activities and so on, but the overall 'point' of the telephone conversation was a request to go out. It is this overall 'point' which is stored in long term memory and available for recall.

Fairclough's categorization of MR is more specific than that of schema theory, taking into account or incorporating linguistic processing as part of the process of interpretation, in

addition to the levels of pragmatic and schematic processing. To return to the example of the policeman and witness, the two participants interpret what is actually being said in terms of phonology and semantics, surface and meaning of utterance, make sense of what is implied by local coherence and how to manage the exchange through text structure and 'point'. This is all in addition to interpreting aspects of the context within which the exchange is taking place.

In addition to the four levels of interpretation, Fairclough also includes *contextual* as well as *textual* aspects of interpretation, which he identifies as 'situational context' and 'intertextual context'. Situational context refers to both the physical cues in which an exchange takes place - its situation, what has previously been said and so on - and to the ways in which MR interpret these cues: 'How participants interpret the situation determines which discourse types are drawn upon, and this in turn affects the nature of the interpretative procedures which are drawn upon in textual interpretation' (2001:121). Intertextual context refers to the ways in which participants in any given exchange make assumptions about it based upon their experience of previous exchanges to which the one in which they are engaged is connected, similar to scripts in schema theory. These assumptions then determine what can be given and does not need to be re-stated as part of common experience, what can be alluded to, what disagreed with and so on. Situational and intertextual contexts thus correspond more closely with the schemas, frames and scripts of schema theory, whilst the four levels of textual interpretation add a further dimension. For interpretation to take place, all six levels of the interpretative process interact with one another in what are clearly complex, as well as dynamic, ways.

Fairclough offers a further diagrammatic example of how interpreters arrive at interpretations of the situational context, and the way in which this determines decisions about which discourse type is the appropriate one to draw upon.

Fig 4.2 Situational context and discourse type (Fairclough 2001:122)

In the lower half of the diagram, on the left hand side, are four questions which relate to four dimensions of the situation: what is going on, who is involved, what the relationships are and what the role of language is in the situation. On the right hand side are the four dimensions of discourse type, in the CDA sense of a set of underlying conventions belonging to some particular order of discourse. If we take again the example of the policeman and a witness given above, then we can ask these questions:

1. *What's going on?* The activity type here is interviewing a witness, and the overriding purpose is the elicitation of information and accounts of the alleged crime, including its documentation.

2. *Who's involved?* Subject positions are multi-dimensional and alter according to situation; in this case, as it is an interview, the subject positions are that of interviewer and interviewee. A second dimension is that the institution ascribes social identities to the subjects who function within it, here 'a policeman' and a 'member of the public' who is also 'a witness' and a likely victim. A third dimension is that different situations have different speaking and listening positions associated with them – speaker, addressee, hearer, spokesperson and so on. In this example, speaker and addressee roles alternate between the policeman and the witness.
3. *In what relations?* Subject positions here are looked at more dynamically, in terms of power, social distance and so on. In this case, the focus is on the nature of the relationship between the police and the public, with the policeman anxious to get his form completed, and the member of the public wanting to get away and back to schedule.
4. *What's the role of language?* Language here is being used in an instrumental way as part of a wider institutional and bureaucratic objective. Language here determines genre – that of an interview – and its channel as spoken or written. Here, the form is being filled out by the policeman, complicated by an interview and is indicative of the degree of control which the police exercise over all aspects of the case. The information given by the witness is mediated and checked by the police; only then is it valid.

The first three discourse types listed on the right hand column of the figure are conventionally associated with a particular type of situation. The fourth dimension, *connections*, includes the ways in which texts connect and are tied to situational contexts and also ways in which connections are made between parts of a text, both of which can vary between discourse types. In making judgements about these connections, we draw upon elements of MR particular to a discourse type. A CDA approach to analysis involves consideration of social conditions of production and interpretation which is again related to three different levels: the level of the social situation (the immediate environment), the level of the social institution, and the level of society as a whole. Fairclough suggests that these social conditions shape the MR we bring to production and interpretation which shape the way in which texts are produced and interpreted. The determination of social order in terms of society and institution is also a matter of interpretation. Observable features of the physical situation, and the text which has already occurred, that is, the interview between the policeman and the witness, do not, of themselves, determine the situational context. They are clues which help the interpreter to interpret it, read in the light of and in conjunction with the interpreter's MR.

In CDA, the notion of language as discourse means analysing the relationship between all three levels or dimensions of texts, processes and their social conditions, both the immediate conditions of situational context and more remote conditions of institutional and social structures, as shown in the example above. It also proposes that discourses are hierarchical, and that there are thus different orders of discourse. By looking at the way in which actual discourse is determined by underlying conventions, it is claimed that these conventions cluster in sets which are called orders of discourse, because they are more general than a specific type of discourse. For example, in the example given above between a policeman and a witness, the discourse type given in figure 4.x is an element

in the order of discourse associating policing as a social institution. It contrasts with others, such as the discourses of making an arrest, charging a suspect and so on. It also contrasts with others in the discourse of interviewing a witness such as questioning aimed at teasing out a story. It is the prerogative of the powerful participant to determine which discourse type is appropriate. In the example above, the choice positions the witness in a determinate place in the order of discourse and the social order of police work. It positions the policeman and witness in terms of one of a number of procedures for dealing with cases that are constituted by a series of discourse types in determinate orders: for example, information gathering is usually followed by interrogation followed by perhaps a charge being laid and so on.

The way in which orders of discourse are structured and the ideologies embedded within them are determined by relationships of power in particular institutions and in society as a whole. Consequently, it is social structures that determine discourse, and as such discourse has an effect upon social structures and contributes to the achievement of social continuity and social change. Take, for example, 'subject' positions in schools. In school there exists a set of situations where discourse occurs (for example, class, assembly, playtime, meetings), a set of recognized 'social roles' in which people participate in discourse (headteacher, teacher, pupil, friend, peer) and a set of approved purposes for discourse associated with, for example, learning and teaching, examining, maintaining social control, and a set of discourse types. Within CDA, occupying a 'subject' position is a matter of doing certain things. Teachers and pupils each know (or learn) what they are allowed to say or not to say within particular discourse types, and occupying particular subject positions also reproduces conventions. Discourse thus determines and reproduces social structure. Such reproduction can be conservative, in the sense of sustaining continuity by replication, or transformative, in effecting change. Since much of this behaviour goes unquestioned and is implicit in our relations with one another, then the overall aim of CDA is for people to become conscious of the power relations that exist within and through discourse. By raising self-consciousness, it is argued that effecting change becomes possible.

4.6.2 CDA, written discourse analysis and stylistics

As the sections in this chapter have explained, CDA is a complex and wide-ranging theory and method which attempts to analyse texts, both spoken and written, within its three-dimensional framework of text, interaction between text and its processors and the social and institutional contexts within which both text and interaction occur. Its corresponding categories of description, evaluation and interpretation attempt to provide frameworks within which categories of analysis can be generated and replicated. As a theory, it draws upon sociological and cultural theory as well as linguistic theory, in ways which have yet to be fully developed, especially in providing a theory and method for the ways in which all three aspects of its framework interrelate. Its attraction as a theory and method is its focus upon exposing the underlying ideologies of a text, be it spoken or written, and its underlying assumption that discourse is structurally unequal and that every discourse is based upon internal relations of language and power. Consequently,

such a critical approach can also be adopted within stylistics when analysing written texts to discover underlying ideological assumptions by drawing upon, for example, models of transitivity, modality and point of view (see: Simpson 1993; Clark & Zyngier 1998). In particular a transitivity analysis can reveal much about the various roles portrayed by the characters and the relationships between them. For example, a transitivity analysis of passages taken from novels written in the romance genre or fairy tales will usually reveal that women and girls are more 'acted upon' than 'acting', with men or boys more often than not in charge of the action. Van Leeuwen (1996:32-70) has investigated agency and the ways in which the representation of social actors, in this case in a newspaper article on immigration, are represented and positioned.

CDA has also provided a framework for stylistic analysis undertaken from a feminist perspective, as proposed by Sara Mills (1995:199-202), of which the following is an adaptation:

- 1. Context (CDA dimension of explanation):** This involves asking questions such as: what sort of text is it, and to which genre does it belong (novel, advert, newspaper article and so on)? Is there a tendency for women or men to be associated with this type of text? What is its status, history, and your reason for analysing it?
- 2. Gender, reading and writing (CDA dimension of interpretation):** This involves asking questions such as: what assumptions do you have to make about the voice of the author, and whether it is female or male? Does knowing this serve any purpose? Does the text address you as male or female, or a universal audience? Does the text address you directly in other ways? Is background knowledge drawing upon stereotypical assumptions about men and women?
- 3. Gender vocabulary, the clause and discourse (CDA dimension of description):** This involves asking questions such as: how are males and females named and/or referred to in the text? Do any of the terms used have sexual connotations, or taboos associated with them? Is 'he' used as a generic pronoun? Who acts in the text? Why is the text using humour? What are the transitivity choices, and are they the same for men and for women? From whose point of view does the text emanate? What elements are associated with male and female?

For example, the text of this advertisement for a car which appeared in *The Times Magazine* 29.04.06, and the analysis which follows it. The text that appears below is given in the bottom half of a lefthand page, whilst a picture of the car appears on the opposite righthand page.

THE TOPLESS MODEL YOU CAN TAKE SERIOUSLY.

CHRYSLER

Inspiration comes as standard

The New PT Cruiser Cabrio.

Context: This is a magazine advert for a car, which appears in a recent *The Times* magazine supplement. Although the magazine, aims to appeal to both men and women, with a mixture of gender-specific and general articles, this particular car advert is aimed at men. The purposes of analysis is to demonstrate the underlying ideological assumption about male purchasing power and stereotypical portrayal of females in car advertising that persist into the twentyfirst century.

Gender, reading and writing: The voice of the author is male, aimed at male readers. Positioning the text on the left-hand page and the picture on the right means that attention is drawn to the left-hand side and the text first. A female reading the advert is positioned not as a prospective purchaser of the car, but as **a topless model**. Although the pronoun *you* here is generic, in this instance it addresses men, not women. Background knowledge draws upon stereotypical assumptions about men and women, particularly in the reference to women as strippers, men as their voyeuristic audience and also the underlying assumption that men, not women, buy cars.

Gender vocabulary, the clause and discourse: the most strikingly obvious naming in the text from the point of view of gender is *the topless model*, used as a pun on the phrase *open-topped* and on the personalities of women who work as topless models, perceived by men as of great attraction but minimal intelligence. The transitivity process of the sentence *the topless model you can take seriously* is a verbal one, with some unknown male addressing his male reader through the deictic use of *you*. The modal *can* is an example of truth modality and a positive shading, thereby portraying topless models in a positive light which, by association implies an alternative negative shading. The large typeface of this sentence attracts attention, whilst the factual information about the car, together with the Chrysler slogan is placed below the head-line grabbing clause.

Sexual connotations of adverts like this to sell cars are nothing new, but what this example illustrates is the ways in which gender stereotyping and sexual inequality is still so ideologically ingrained in sections of Western society, and particularly the car industry, persist in contemporary Western society. When it comes to car advertising, women are still portrayed as sexual objects used to sell cars and men as those who have the purchasing power to buy the car, and, by implication and association, women.

However, discovering underlying ideological assumptions is not the main point of focus for all analysis undertaken in stylistics as it is for CDA, since stylistic analysis also works within and draws from other theories and methods such as the cognitive, descriptive and so on. Stylistics may thus draw upon CDA theory and methodology in undertaking analysis within the third strand identified in 3.1, that is, that which takes account of the sociocultural and historical context of both texts and readers/listeners, including the ways in which texts mediate authority, power and control. Equally, CDA draws upon similar theories and methods as stylistics in the first and second strands identified in 3.1, that is, the structural, formal or descriptive elements, concerned with the recognisably formal and linguistic properties of a text existing as an isolated item in the world, and the psychological: that which refers to the points of contact between a text, other texts and the way readers/listeners process them. Stylistics and CDA may differ in the text they choose as their main focus of analysis, but also with the kinds of texts chosen for analysis, with stylistics

most often and commonly (but not always) analyses literary texts, whilst CDA focuses more on texts such as advertising, natural conversation, political speeches and so on. Nevertheless, Ideology is still encoded and embedded in literary texts just as much as those of any other kind, just as ideology can affect a reader in a literary work as it can in any other.

As both theory and method, CDA has been criticised on a number of counts. Firstly, it has often been criticised for the fact that its data, in focusing upon institutional settings *inevitably* raises issues of power and inequality. Consequently, the range of texts chosen for analysis is generally selected in ways which *inevitably* throw up ideological considerations: for example, newspaper reports and doctor-patient conversations (Widdowson, 1995 and 2004, and Toolan, 1997). However, its practitioners counteract criticism by pointing out that for them, *all* settings, domestic and informal as well as institutional, are underpinned by ideological assumptions. Secondly, CDA has been criticised for the fact that the framework for textual analysis at an ideological level is nowhere near as fully developed as those which deal with its more formal, linguistic levels. Its practitioners would argue that no such claim has been made, that CDA is not a closed field, and that the criticism is not of itself a valid reason for abandoning it. CDA has been the first attempt so far to formalise a methodology which seeks to articulate the relationship between a text, the context in which it is produced and its processes of production, reception and interpretation. One recent development coming from CDA has been the growing areas of forensic linguistics, which examines the relationship between language and the law. This fascinating field of inquiry not only has a theoretical dimension, but also an applied one in working with the police and lawyers on actual cases such as appeals in order to bring a linguistic dimension to them.

4.7 Studying CDA

The aim of any CDA analysis is to expose the ideology embedded in language. Your task then, will always be one which seeks to expose the ways in which inequalities are expressed through language and their effect upon a reader. Exposing inequality between a policeman and a witness is one thing, but showing how a newspaper continually demonises Muslims, for example, may show their relative powerlessness but also, as a reader, might affect my own view of Muslims. The focus of research in CDA is upon the nature of interaction as it occurs in everyday speech and writing, taking account of the contexts within which it occurs and identifying linguistic patterns with the aim of revealing the underlying ideological assumptions at work that underpin the discourse. CDA, like conversation analysis, and indeed pragmatics in general, studies the order, organization and orderliness of social action, particularly as it is located in everyday interaction, but is above all concerned with the ways in which language structures (and conceals) issues of power and equality. The aim of research in CDA then, is to uncover issues of power, authority and control through not only analytic descriptions of the organization of spoken and written interaction but also by analyzing the underlying social, cultural and institutional structures through which the interaction occurs.

4.7.1 Selecting a topic for study

The first thing to decide when undertaking your own research into CDA is the focus of

your study. For example, you may wish to:

- > Compare different newspaper reporting of the same event;
- > analyse a speech or speeches;
- > analyse an advertisement or undertake a contrastive analysis of two advertisements;
- > analyse spoken exchanges in a particular setting, for example, between a teacher and a pupil, a policeman and a witness, or a mother or father and a child.
- > compare spoken exchanges between men and women, among women or men of a similar age or of different ages.

Comparing newspaper reporting of the same event involves you in taking two or three different newspapers for the same day with different political orientations, for example *The Mirror* and *The Daily Telegraph*, or *The Daily Mail* and *The Guardian*, and analysing their coverage of a particular news event. The aim of your analysis here is to apply methods of analysis from within each of the three dimensions associated with CDA, in order to expose underlying ideological assumptions at work within the texts. This also allows you to take account of not only the words used but also any accompanying pictures and/or photographs used.

Analysing speeches involves you in taking a speech, extract from a speech or comparing two speeches in order to expose underlying ideological assumptions at work within the texts, by applying methods of analysis from within each of the three dimensions associated with CDA. For example, a student of mine analysed the speeches given by the founder of scouting, Baden Powell, one given to Girl Guides and one to Boy Scouts. The analysis revealed an extremely gender-biased view of the role Baden Powell envisaged for the different sections of scouting.

Like analysing newspaper articles, analysing an advertisement or advertisements involves you in applying methods of analysis associated with the three dimensions of CDA in order to expose underlying ideological assumptions at work within the texts, again taking account of the words used and accompanying pictures and/or photographs.

Analysing spoken exchanges in a particular setting, for example, between a teacher and a pupil, a policeman and a witness, or a mother or father and a child, or comparing spoken exchanges between men and women, among women or men of a similar age or of different ages, involves you in applying CDA methods of analysis in order to expose underlying ideological assumptions at work within the spoken exchange. The difference here is that the data with which you are concerned is speech, and draws upon methods of analysis associated with pragmatics and discourse within a framework of CDA.

Once you have chosen the focus of your study, then you will need to orientate or locate it within any previously published research. This will help you to form a better picture of the field of enquiry in which you wish to locate your study, giving you ideas and information about, for example, the type of data you may wish to collect for your own study. It will also help you to identify what the arguments are about, what the questions are and which research methods are most commonly used. This will help you to:

formulate your own question more clearly; give you an idea of what findings you might expect, and what would be unexpected.

4.7.2 Choosing and collecting data

Since CDA is concerned with both spoken and written texts, then the data you collect will be either that of naturally occurring speech or of written texts. Research in CDA, as with that in pragmatics, is usually qualitative in nature; that is, the methods it uses involve collecting data from a small range which allows for a more in-depth analysis than that which quantitative methods such as a questionnaire allow (see also 1.4.2). The quantitative dimension in CDA is provided for in much the same way as for pragmatics and discourse, in that like studies can be compared with like, and the more studies that are undertaken in a particular area such as parliamentary speeches, for example, then the larger the research database becomes.

The aim of collecting data for the purposes of studying CDA is to analyse its content to uncover or expose underlying ideological assumptions. Consequently, your choice of data will be determined to a large extent by the topic of your research question. If your research question involves you in analysing coverage of an event in different national newspaper articles for example, then it is wise to choose newspapers published on a day when a story is likely to be covered by most of them, such as a shooting, a large-scale robbery, a political scandal or some other equally newsworthy event. Similarly, if your research question involves you in analysing adverts with a view to exposing ideological assumptions of gender, then you are more likely to be successful if you choose adverts for household appliances or motor cars than, say, for furniture or music.

When it comes to collecting spoken data, then you can choose between collecting your own or obtaining it from transcripts available from sources such as the Internet or by recording television. Transcripts of trials by jury in the USA are available on the internet and television programmes such as *Court TV* broadcasts live trials, or you could record news broadcast reporting of particular events.

How much data to collect will again depend upon the topic of your study. The CDA framework given in 4.6.3 below allows both for a very detailed analysis of the actual texts analysed and the wider textual and social processes within which it occurs. Consequently, a great deal can be written about a small amount of data. For example, if you wish to compare newspaper reporting of the same event, then usually two articles of between 400 – 600 words is sufficient. Analysis of a speech or speeches totalling 600 words is again usually enough. Analysis of an advertisement or a contrastive analysis of two advertisements is more difficult to quantify in terms of word length, but between 50 – 100 words per advert works as a rough guide. 600 words of transcribed spoken data is normally sufficient for an analysis of spoken exchanges. Since the focus of your analysis of spoken data includes categories of analysis from pragmatics and discourse, then it is best to transcribe your data according to the conventions associated with spoken discourse (see 2.x).

4.7.3 Analysing data

Having chosen your text or texts, your analysis will involve applying the three levels or

dimensions of CDA: description, interpretation and evaluation.

1. Description. This involves analysing the text at the level of description by analysing its formal linguistic properties, such as:

- a. subject positioning through transitivity and modality,
- b. the relational values between the subjects (i.e., how pronouns and forms of address are used and the implications of such use),
- c. pragmatic analysis in terms of e.g. turn taking,
- d. negative and positive sentences which indicate a struggle between the producer of a text and its audience, especially evident in political texts such as speeches.

For example, if you are comparing newspaper reporting of the same event or analysing advertisements, then this will involve you in analysis of formal linguistic properties most usually applied to written texts, such as 1a. and 1b. above: subject positioning through transitivity and modality; how pronouns and forms of address are used to draw conclusions about relational values between subject; the use of reported speech or metaphorical language in constructing relations between subjects and so on. If you are analysing a speech or speeches, then you would add consideration of aspects such as 1d. to this analysis: that is, including consideration of positive and negative sentences. If you analyse spoken exchanges of any kind, then applying categories of pragmatic and discourse analysis as in 1c. above would be more relevant. Your ability to undertake such analysis will involve you in engaging with MR, specifically in this instance of spoken exchanges, identifying pragmatic categories such as those associated with turn-taking or exchange structures.

2. Interpretation: This involves assessing the descriptive analysis undertaken in 1. above and interpreting it as a process of production and interpretation, identifying discourse types such as:

- a. Discourse type contents: the type of activity going on, its topic and purpose,
 - b. Discourse type subjects: the subjects involved,
 - c. Discourse type relations: the relations between the subjects,
 - d. Discourse type connections: the role of language in what is going on.
- (see also Fig 4.2 above).

For example, comparing newspaper reporting of the same event, in addition to analysis of the linguistic properties of the actual text studied, would also involve considering it in relation to newspaper reporting as a genre or as whole, in terms of its content, the subjects involved, the relations between them and how language is used in such reporting. How this process of interpretation is arrived at involves drawing upon MR, particularly text structure and 'point'. A newspaper report of a particular case of political corruption, for instance, would involve locating the descriptive analysis undertaken for 1. above within the wider sphere of newspaper reporting in general and the reporting of political events in particular. For example, a newspaper report will usually follow

conventions of newspaper reporting such as headlines and sub-headlines, and possibly even a house style. Reporting of political events will usually assume a great deal of implied knowledge on the part of the reader in ways which reporting of say, a natural disaster in another part of the world does not. It may also use political language, usually in the form of reported speech, within the report and your analysis would discuss the relation between the two and how this affects its interpretation. The extent to which you are able to undertake such analysis and interpretation will depend upon your own experience of discourse types, in this instance newspaper reporting and political language.

Similarly, analysis of a speech made at an inauguration of a society of some kind would involve locating your analysis of its content (the particular inauguration), the subjects involved (usually the speaker and members of the society), the relation between them (between the speaker and the members) and the part played by language in establishing the relation within the wider sphere of speeches in general and inauguration speeches in particular. Again, the extent to which you are able to undertake such analysis and interpretation will depend upon your own experience and knowledge of such speeches.

3. Explanation: This involves analysing discourse in terms of the institutional and social conditions of production and interpretation, and is the least developed in terms of categories of analysis within the CDA framework. It can involve considering:

- a. to which institutional processes does the discourse or discourse types belong, and how are they ideologically determined. For example, identification of the particular institution to which the discourse or discourse types belong, such as the political, educational, social and so on, and identification of underlying institutional ideology, such as conservative, capitalist, liberal, socialist, Marxist and so on,
- b. to which societal processes does the discourse belong, and how is it ideologically determined. For example, identification of any social institution such as the family, marriage, religion to which the discourse or discourse type belong, and identification of underlying social ideology in terms of race, class and gender.

For example, analysing an advertisement would involve identifying the particular discourse type and institutional ideology underlying it. For example, in a car advertisement currently running on British television, two young boys who are neighbours admire the newly purchased car of one of their sets of parents, parked on the driveway of their newly bought, presumably bigger and more expensive, house. This advertisement belongs to an economic discourse with an underlying capitalist ideology. The discourse also belongs to the social institution of family and social class, with an underlying social ideology of equality in terms of race and social class, since one of the boys is white and the other black, with the two families living side by side in a middle class suburban area.

Analysing spoken exchanges such as the one in 4.x above between a policeman and a witness belongs to a social and political discourse of law and order with an underlying ideology of conservatism and capitalism. It also belongs to the social institution of law

enforcement and an underlying social ideology of justice. Also implicit in the exchange is an underlying structure of authority and control which underpins all exchanges between the police and the public. The witness is doing her duty as a law abiding citizen in reporting what she saw of the burglary, within the framework allowed by the policeman. The extent to which you are able to undertake an evaluation of this kind and others will depend upon your own experience and knowledge of discursive practices and ideology.

Undertaking a CDA analysis as described above involves you in identifying and describing linguistic properties of a specific text, and in relating that analysis to the discourse types of which it is a part. In many ways, this is very similar to the kinds of analysis described in the other three chapters of this book. What makes this a *critical* discourse analysis is firstly, the concept of discourse used which does not distinguish between speech and writing, and secondly, in the added dimension of evaluation which relates the analysis to underlying structures of authority and control, ideology and power.

4.7.4 Sample projects

Using a Critical Discourse Analysis approach:

- a) Critically analyse one or more than one recent news report(s) in order to explain how the ideology of the text works. You may choose to concentrate on a newspaper or TV or radio news report or you may contrast reports of a single event from two or more sources.
- b) Critically analyse one or more advertisements in order to explain how the ideology of the text works.
- c) Critically analyse a spoken exchange between i) a teacher and a pupil, ii) a policeman and a witness, or iii) a mother or father and a child, to explain underlying ideologies of the exchange.
- d) Critically analyse a spoken exchange between i) men and women or ii) among women or men of a similar age, identifying and explaining underlying ideologies of the exchange.

4.8 Where to find out more

Fairclough (1995 & 2001), Wodak & Meyer (2002) and edited collections such as Caldas-Coulthard & Coulthard (1996) Van Dijk (1997) and Toolan (2002) give an overview of CDA, whilst collections such as Meinhof & Richardson (1994) investigate particular aspects of social life from a CDA perspective. Widdowson (2004) offers a comprehensive critique of the approach. whilst Wodak and Chilton (2005) chart recent developments. Chilton (2004) gives an account of political discourse and Lazar (2005) edits a collection on feminist approaches to CDA.

References

- Aitchison, J (2001) *Language Change: Progress or Decay?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [1st edn 1981]
- Althusser, L. (1971) Ideology and ideological state apparatuses, *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays* New Left Books
- Austin, J.L. (1962) *How to do Things with Words* Oxford: Oxford University Press Bakhtin, M (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination* Texas: University of Texas Press
- Baugh, Albert C. & Cable, Thomas (2002) 4th edn. *A History of the English Language* Harlow: Pearson [1st edn 1951]
- Beal, Joan (2006) *Language and Region* London: Routledge
- Biddulph, Joseph (1986) *A Short Grammar of Black Country*. Pontypridd: Languages Information Centre.
- Biber, Douglas, Finegan, Edward & Leech, Geoffrey (1999) *The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* Harlow: Pearson
- Bonvillian, Nancy (1993) *Language, Culture and Communication: the meaning of messages* New Jersey:Prentice-Hall Inc
- Brown, Gillian and Yule, George (1983) *Discourse Analysis* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987) *Politeness* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Burrow, J.W (1982) ed *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* London: Penguin [1st publication date unknown]
- Burton, Dierdre (1980) *Dialogue and Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Modern Drama Dialogue and Naturally Occurring Conversation* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Caldas-Coulthard Carmen Rosa & Coulthard, Malcolm (1996) *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* London: Routledge
- Cameron, D. (1997) 'Performing gender: young men's talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity', in Sally Johnson and Ulrike Meinhof (eds), *Language and Masculinity* Oxford: Blackwell. Pp.47-64.
- Cameron, D. (2001) *Working With Spoken Discourse* London: Sage Publications Ltd
- Carter, R & Nash, W (1990) *Seeing Through Language: A Guide to Styles of English Writing* Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Carter, R. & McCarthy M. (2006) *The Cambridge Grammar of English* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Chambers, J.K & Trudgill, Peter (1980) *Dialectology* London: Cambridge University Press
- Chapman, S. (2006) *Thinking about language; Theories of English* Basingstoke: Palgrave

- Cheshire, J. (1993) *Real English: The Grammar of Written Dialects in the British Isles* Harlow: Longman
- Cheshire, J. (1991) (ed) *English Around the World: Sociolinguistic Perspectives* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Chilton, Paul (2004) *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice* London: Routledge
- Chouliaraki Lilie & Fairclough, Norman (1999) *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Clark, Urszula & Zyngier, Sonia (1998) 'Women beware Women: Detective Fiction and Critical Discourse Stylistics' in *Language and Literature*, 1998, vol. 7, no. 2: 141-58.
- Clark, Urszula (2001) *War Words: Language, History and the Disciplining of English* Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd
- Clark, Urszula (2004): The Phonology of the English West Midlands in *A Handbook of Varieties of English Vol 1*, ed. B. Kortmann & Edgar W. Schneider Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter 2005 Pp 260-288
- Clark, Urszula 'Stylistics' (with J. McRae), in *A Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, eds. Alan Davies & Catherine Elder. Oxford: Blackwell 2004
- Coates, J & Cameron, D eds (1986) *Women in Their Speech Communities* Harlow: Longman
- Coates, J. (1996) *Women Talk* Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Coates, J (1997) 'One-at-a-time: the organization of men's talk', in S.Johnson and U.H.Meinhof (eds) *Language and Masculinity* Oxford: Blackwell
- Cook, G. (1989) *Discourse* Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Coulthard, M. (1977) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* London: Longman
- Coulthard, M. and Montgomery M. (eds) (1981) *Studies in Discourse Analysis* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Crowley, T (1991) *Proper English: Readings in Language, History and Cultural Identity* London: Routledge
- Crowley, T (1996) *Language in History: Theories and Texts* London: Routledge
- Cruse, A. (2000) *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics* Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Crystal, David (1995) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of English Language* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Culpepper, Jonathan (2001) *Language and Characterisation* London: Longman
- Cutting, Joan (2002) *Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for students* London: Routledge
- Davies, Alan & Elder, Catherine (2004) *A Handbook of Applied Linguistics* Oxford: Blackwell

- Dickens, Charles (1842 & 2000) *American Notes* London: London: Penguin
- Dickens, Charles (1994) *Little Dorrit* Harmondsworth: Penguin [1st published 1855-1857]
- Dillard J.L. (1976) *American Talk* New York: Random House
- Edelsky, Carole (1981) Who's got the floor? *Language and Society* 10: 383-421
- Eckert, Penelope (1988) Adolescent social structure and the spread of linguistic change *Language in Society* 17: 183-207
- Eckert, Penelope (1989) *Jocks and burnouts: social categories and identity in the High School* New York and London: Teachers College Press
- Eliot, T.S (2002) *Collected Poems: 1909 – 62* London: Faber & Faber
- Elliot, George (2002) *Mill on the Floss* London: Penguin [1st published 1860]
- Emmott, C (1997) *Narrative Comprehension: A Discourse Perspective* Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R (1997) Critical Discourse Analysis in T.van Dijk (ed), *Discourse as Social Interaction* London: Sage
- Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and Power* Harlow: Longman[1st edn 1989]
- Fludernik, Monika (1993) *The Fictions of Language and the Language of Fiction: the Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness* London: Routledge
- Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge* London: Tavistock
- Fornas, J. (1995) *Cultural Theory and Late Modernity* London: Sage Publications
- Fowler, R. (1996) *Linguistic Criticism* Oxford: Oxford University Press[1st edn 1986]
- Fowler, R. (1991) *Language in the News* London: Routledge
- Fowler, R., Hodge, R., Kress, G. & Trew, T (1979) *Language and Control* London: Routledge
- Francis, Gill & Hunston, Susan (1992) Analysing everyday conversation in Malcolm Coulthard (ed) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis* London: Routledge
- Gavins, Jo (2006) *Text World Theory: An Introduction* Edinburgh: Edinburgh Press
- Garfinkel, Harold (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology* Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Golding, William (1955) *The Inheritors* London: Faber
- Grice, Paul (1975) Logic and conversation in P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds) *Speech Acts (Syntax and Semantics Vol 3)* New York: Academic Press, 113-28 Reprinted in Paul Grice (1989) *Studies in the Way of Words* Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 22-40
- Gumperz, J.J. & Hymes, D. (eds) (1986) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* New York and Oxford: Basil Blackwell [1st edn 1972]

- Gumperz, J.J. (ed) (1982a) *Language and Social Identity* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Gumperz, J.J. (ed) (1982b) *Discourse Strategies* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Guterson, David (2003) *Our Lady of the Forest* London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1971) 'Linguistic structures and literary style: an inquiry into the language of William Golding's *The Inheritors*', in S.Chatman (ed) *Literary Style: A Symposium* New York and London; Oxford University Press pp. 332-4 quoted in R Fowler (1991).
- Halliday, M .A. K. (1973) *Explorations in the Function of Language* London: Edward Arnold
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978) *Language as a Social Semiotic: The social Interpretation of Language and Meaning* London: Edward Arnold
- Harris, Thomas (2000) *Hannibal* London: Arrow Books
- Haugen, E (1966) Dialect, language, nation in Pride, J.B. and Holmes, J. (eds) (1972) *Sociolinguistics* pp. 97-111. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Hawley, Patrick (2002) What is said *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 969-991
- Hewings, Ann & Hewings Martin (2005) *Grammar and Context* London: Routledge
- Hillman, Sister Mary Vincent (1961) *The Pearl* Notre Dame, London: University of Notre Dame Press [1st published 1360-1400]
- Hobsbaum Philip (1996) *Metre, Rhythm and Verse Form* London and New York: Routledge
- Hodge, R & Kress, G (1993) *Language as Ideology* London: Routledge [1st edn 1979]
- Hoey, Michael (1983) *On the Surface of Discourse* London: Allen &Unwin
- Hoey, Michael (1996) in Rosa Caldas-Coulthard & Malcolm Coulthard (eds) *Texts and Practices; Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* London: Routledge
- Hoey, Michael (2005) *Lexical Priming: a New Theory of Words and Language* London; Routledge
- Hutchby, Ian & Wooffitt, Robin (1998) *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction* Cambridge: Polity Press
- Hughes, Arthur, Trudgill, Peter & Watt, Dominic (2005) *English Accents and Dialects: An Introduction to Social and Regional Varieties of English in the British Isles* London: Hodder Arnold [1st edn 1979]
- Hymes, D. (1972) Models of the interaction of Language and Social Life in J.J. Hymes, D. (1974) *Foundations in Sociolinguistics* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- Jakobson, R. (1960) 'Linguistics and Poetics' in T. Seboek (ed) *Style in Language* Cambridge, Mass: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press

Jeffries, Lesley (1993) *The Language of Twentieth Century Poetry* Basingstoke: Palgrave

Jeffries, Lesley (1998) *Meaning in English* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Jeffries, Lesley (2006) *Discovering Language: Describing English* Basingstoke: Palgrave

Johnson, Samuel (1755) *A Dictionary of the English Language* London

Joyce, James (1992) *Ulysses* Harmondsworth: Penguin [1st published 1922]

Joyce, P. (1991) in *Language, Self and Society* eds P.Burke and R Porter Cambridge: Polity Press

Kerswill, Paul & Williams, Ann (2000) Creating a new town koine: children and language change in Milton Keynes. *Language in Society* 29 (1) 65-115

Kerswill, Paul & Williams, Ann (2002) Dialect recognition and speech community focusing in new and old towns in England: the effects of dialect levelling, demography and social networks. In Daniel Long & Dennis Preston (eds.) *A Handbook of perceptual dialectology Vol 2* Amsterdam: Benjamins

Kiefer, F (1979) What do the conversational maxims explain? In *Linguisticae Investigationes* 3 (1): 57-74

Kortmann Bernd and Schneider, Edgar W (2004) (eds) . *A Handbook of Varieties of English Vol 1*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Labov, W. (1966) *The Social Stratification of English in New York City* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics

Labov, W. (1972a) *Sociolinguistic Patterns* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Labov, W. (1972b) 'The study of language in its social context', in Pier Paulo Giglioli (ed.), *Language and Social Context* Harmondsworth: Penguin. Pp. 283-307

Labov, W. (1978) ed *Sociolinguistic Patterns* Oxford: Blackwell

Labov, W. (1979) The logic of non-standard English. In '*Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia

Labov, W. and Fanshel, D.(1977) *Therapeutic Discourse* New York: Academic Press

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphor We Live By* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Lawrence, D.H.(2006) *Lady Chatterley's Lover* London: Penguin [1st published 1928]

Lazar M (2005) ed *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power and ideology in Discourse* London: Palgrave

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

Leech, G.N., and Short, M.H. (1981) *Style in Fiction* London: Longman

Leech, Geoffrey, N & Thomas, Jenny (1990) *Language, Meaning and Context: Pragmatics in Collinge (Ed), An Encyclopedia of Language* London: Routledge 173-206

Leith, D. (1997) *A Social History of English* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul [1st edn 1983]

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

Lucy, J.A. (1992) *Language Diversity and Thought; A Reformulation of the Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

McRae, John (1997) *Literature with a Small 'l'*. London: Macmillan/Prentice-Hall. [1st edn 1991]

Marx, K. (1976) *Capital: Vol I* Harmondsworth: Penguin

Mencken, H.L. (1921) 2nd edn *The American Language: An Inquiry into the Development of English in the United States*

Meinhof Ulrike & Richardson, Kay (1994) *text, Discourse and Context: Representations of Poverty in Britain* London and New York; Longman

Mills, Sara (1995) *Feminist Stylistics* London: Routledge

Milroy, L. (1987) *Observing and Analysing Natural Language: A Critical Account of Sociolinguistic Method* Oxford: Blackwell

Milroy, J. (1992) *Linguistic Variation and change* Oxford: Blackwell

Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. (1993) *Real English: The Grammar of English Dialects in the British Isles* London: Longman

Milroy, L. & Gordon, M (2003). *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Montgomery, Martin (1995) *An Introduction to Language and Society* London and New York: Routledge [1st edn 1986]

Muller, Max (1862) *Lectures on the Science of Language* London: Royal Institute of Great Britain

Murray, J. (1888-1928) *A New English Dictionary Based on Historic Principles* Oxford: Clarendon Press

O'Halloran, Kieran (2003) *Critical Discourse Analysis and language Cognition* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Ochs, E., Schegloff E.A and Thompson, S.A. (1996) *Interaction and Grammar* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Orton, H. (1962). *Survey of English Dialects: introduction*. Leeds: Arnold.

Pope, Alexander, Churton Collins John (1896) *Essays on Criticism* London: Macmillan

- Poulantzas, Nicos (1976) *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism* London: New Left Books
- Pratt, M.L. (1977) *Towards a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse* Bloomington: Indiana University Press
- Richards, I.A. (1925) *Principles of Literary Criticism* London: Kegan Paul
- Roberts, Celia, Davies, Evelyn and Jupp, Tom (1992) *Language and Discrimination: A Study of Multiethnic Workplaces* London: Longman
- Sacks, H, Schegloff, E. and Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation' *Language* 50 (4), 696-735
- Sapir, Edward (1921) *Language; An Introduction to the Study of Speech* Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc
- Saussure de, Ferdinand (1916) *Course in general Linguistics* London: Duckworth
- Schank, R. C. & Abelson, R.P (1997) *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Schmidt, Norbert (2002) *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* London: Arnold
- Schiffirin, Deborah (1994) *Approaches to Discourse* Oxford UK & Cambridge USA: Blackwell
- Searle, J.R (1969) *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Sebold, Alice (2003) *Lovely Bones* London; Picador
- Semino, E & Culpepper, J (2002) eds *Cognitive Stylistics: language and Cognition in Text Analysis* Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Semino, E. & Short, M. (2004) *Corpus Stylistics: Speech, Writing and Thought Presentation in a Corpus of English Narratives* London: Routledge
- Shaffer, Peter (1975) *Equus* London: Penguin
- Shaw, Sylvia (2000) Language, gender and floor appointment in political debates, *Discourse & Society* 11 (3): 401-18
- Short, M. (1988) ed. *Reading, Analysing and Teaching Literature*. Harlow: Longman.
- Short, M. (1996) *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose* London: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd
- Short, M. (1995) in Verdonk, Peter and Weber, Jean-Jaques (eds) *Twentieth Century Fiction: From Text to Context* London: Routledge
- Simpson, David (1986) *The Politics of American English 1776-1850* New York and London: Oxford University Press
- Simpson, Paul (1993) *Language, Ideology and Point of View* London: Routledge
- Simpson, Paul (2004) *Stylistics* London: Routledge

- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1975) *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: the English used by Teachers and Pupils* London: Oxford University Press
- Smith, O (1984) *The Politics of Language* Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen and Wenying Jiang (2003) Explaining cross-cultural pragmatic findings: moving from politeness maxims to sociopragmatic interactional principles (SIPs) *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1633-1650
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1995) *Relevance: communication and cognition* Oxford: Blackwell [1st edn 1986]
- Stockwell, P. (2002) *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction* London: Routledge
- Stubbs, M. (1986) *Educational Linguistics* London: Blackwell
- Swift, J. (1712) *Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue* <http://books.mirror.org/gb.swift.html>
- Tatalovitch, R. (1995) *Nativism Reborn?: The Official English Language Movement and the American States* Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press
- Thomas, Jenny (1995) *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics* London: Longman
- Toolan, M (1997) 'What is Critical Discourse Analysis and Why are People Saying Such Terrible Things About It?' *Language and Literature* 6:2, pp. 83-103
- Toolan, M (1998) *Language in Literature: An Introduction to Stylistics* London: Hodder
- Toolan, M (2001) *Narrative; A Critical Linguistic Introduction* London: Routledge [1st edn 1998]
- Toolan, M (2002) *Critical Discourse Analysis: Critical Concepts* London: Routledge
- Trudgill, Peter (1974) *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Trudgill, Peter (ed) (1978) *Sociolinguistic Patterns in British English* London: Edward Arnold
- Trudgill, Peter (1983) *On Dialect: Social and Geographical Perspectives* Oxford: Blackwell
- Trudgill, Peter (1999) 'Standard English; What it isn't' in Bex, T & Watts, R. J. (eds) *Standard English: The Widening Debate* London: Routledge
- Twain, Mark (1986) *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* London; Penguin [1st published 1910]
- Van Dijk, T (2001) 'Critical Discourse Analysis' in D. Shiffrin, D. Tannen & H. Hamilton eds. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*: Oxford: Blackwell
- Verdonk, Peter and Weber, Jean-Jacques (eds) (1995) *Twentieth Century Fiction: From Text to Context* London: Longman
- Van Dijk, T (1997) (ed) *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Vol 1* London: Sage
- Van Leeuwen, Theo (1996) The Representation of Social Actors in Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen-Rosa and Coulthard, Malcolm (eds). *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* London: Routledge pp. 32-70
- Wales, Katie (1990) 2nd edn 2001 *A Dictionary of Stylistics* Harlow: Longman
- Wareing, Shan and Thornborrow, Joanna (1998) *Patterns of Language: Stylistics for Students of*

Language and Literature London: Routledge

Watson, Greg & Zyngier, Sonia (2006) eds *Literary Education: A Critical Reader* Palgrave

Watts, Richard, J. (2003) *Politeness* Cambridge; Cambridge University Press

Wells, John C. (1999) *Accents of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Welsh, (1993) *Trainspotting* London: Vintage

Werth, Paul (1999) *text Worlds; Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse* Harlow: Longman

West, C. and Garcia, A (1988) Conversational Shift-work: A Study of Topical Transitions. *Social Problems*, Y2h 35 (pt. 5), pp. 551-75.

Whorf, B.L. (1939) 'The Relation of Habitual Thought and Behaviour to Language', in J.B. Carroll (1956) (ed.) *Language, Thought and Reality* Massachusetts: MIT Press

Widdowson, J.D.A & Upton, Clive (2006) *An Atlas of English Dialects* London: Routledge

Widdowson, H.G. (1995) 'Discourse Analysis: A Critical View' in *Language & Literature* 4 3 pp 157-72

Widdowson, H.G. (2004) *text, Context, Pretext: Critical issues in Discourse Analysis* Oxford:Blackwell

Witman, Walt (2005) *Leaves of Grass* London: Penguin [1st published 1855]

Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1951) *Philosophical Investigations* Oxford: Blackwell

Wodak R. and Chilton, P (2005) (eds) *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis* Amsterdam: Benjamins

Wodak, Ruth & Meyer, Michael (2002) eds *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* London: Sage

Wolfram Walt & Schilling-Estes (2006) 2nd edn *American English* Malden, MA, USA; Oxford, UK; Victoria, Australia: Blackwell

Woods Anthony, Fletcher Paul, Hughes Arthur & Anderson S.R. (1986) *Statistics in Language Studies* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Woolf, Virginia (1978) *Night and Day* London; Granada Publishing Ltd [1st published 1919]

Woolf, Virginia (1999) *Mrs Dalloway* London: Penguin [1st published 1923]

Wright, Laura & Hope, Jonathan (1996) *Stylistics; A practical coursebook* London: Routledge

Wyld H.C. (1927) 3rd edn *A Short History of English with a Bibliography of Recent Books on the Subject* London: Murray