CURRENT APPROACHES TO ANALYSIS IN PRAGMATICS RESEARCH

Akin Odebunmi,

Department of English, University of Ibadan,

Nigeria

Protocols

- The Vice Chancellor, Lagos State University, Ojo

- The Dean of Arts

- The Head, Department of English

- Chairman, Board of Trustees, NPrA

- Chairman, Consultation Board, NPrA

- All NPrA Exco members

- All members and participants

- Members of the public

- Gentle men and ladies of the press

Introduction

✓ This presentation reviews current approaches to analysis in pragmatics research.

✓ It therefore essentially focuses on a complex interplay of methodology, theoretical framework and analytical procedures without necessarily repeating any part of the presentation by Professor Charles Ogbulogo on current methodological issues in pragmatics research.

✓ Its goal is to use the panoramically reviewed approaches as a prelude to the discussions and applications of the principles and procedures in the three groups established for this workshop: starter, intermediate and advanced.

Methodology

- ✓ Review of many key theories of pragmatics to tease out relevant information on approaches to analysis

- ✓ Fairly detailed identification of analytical principles and their applicability to pragmatic analysis

- ✓ Classification, with sourced or constructed examples, of theoretical tenets/analytical principles in line with analytical procedures in pragmatics.

- ✓ Provision of a fairly detailed outline of key considerations in pragmatic analysis.

- ✓ Review of a number of studies in some core pragmatics journals, namely, *Journal of Pragmatics, Pragmatics, Pragmatics and Society, Intercultural Pragmatics* and *Pragmatics and Cognition* to construct generic structure catalogues for pragmatic analysis procedures.

Presentation Organisation

- **Definition and Nature of Pragmatic Analysis**

- **Approaches to Analysis**

- **Types of Pragmatic Analysis**

- **Analytical Mappings in Pragmatics**

- **Operationalising "Current"**

- **Why New/Current Approaches?**

- **Key Considerations in Pragmatic Analysis**

- **Generic Structure of Pragmatic Analysis**

Definition and Nature of Pragmatic Analysis

- Pragmatic analysis refers to a careful examination of communicative resources in which linguistic and logical arsenals are deployed to systematically account for context-driven discursive features through the identification of the entirety of discourse-inherent inferences associated with particular locutions (My enrichment of the definition of Duffy 2008)

This means that pragmatic analysis:

a. depends on linguistic, i.e. theoretic, resources;

b. combines logical resources with theoretic knowledge;

c. works out locutionarily-based inferences from communications or discourses

   (Locution: what is said by verbal or non-verbal means);

a. is a venture in context-restrictive interpretation of whatever is done with language (taken broadly).

Definition and Nature of Pragmatic Analysis

- For Duffy (2008), pragmatic analysis is systematic and can be replicated by other analysts

- In other words, in several cases, the nature of pragmatic analysis, which is largely top-down (details later) allows replications of analyses; for example, same categories of discursive features can be applied to different, but relevant or related data (e.g. categories of speech act theories can be tried out on different data sets across several zones of the world).

- The context-strict nature of pragmatic analysis powers the inferences made: inferences are made on the basis of what the context of language use suggests.

- Pragmatic analysis is a rigorous exercise which takes a qualitative method, sometimes complemented/supplemented with quantitative elements.

- Pragmatics in general encourages analysis of meaning that goes beyond the confines of truth-conditional semantics which emphasises context-free paradigms.

Definition and Nature of Pragmatic Analysis

- Central to pragmatic analysis is language users' intentions, which is a space beyond truth-conditionality;

- Duffy's (2008) example: Do you know what time it is?

a. To provide an answer that is pragmatic, which the analyst is expected to note, the utterer's intention is crucial.

b. To reply with 'Yes I do' will be merely semantic, particularly when the speaker's intention is to find out from the addressee what the time is.

c. Thus, an answer such as 'Yes it is 1:30' will orient more pragmatically to the intention of the speaker.

Definition and Nature of Pragmatic Analysis

- The immediate foregoing represents the difference between sentence meaning and speaker meaning, upgradable as the distinction between compositional/semantic meaning and utterance/pragmatic meaning.

- The Gricean side to intentionality, which, in a way, explains our examples, sees the sentence/speaker meaning distinction as "a consequence of the intentionality of human communication". (Duffy, p. 173)

- For Grice (1975), meaning occurs only under the following conditions:

Definition and Nature of Pragmatic Analysis

- S meant U if and only if:

- S intended U to cause some effect in hearer H; and

- S intended (i) to be achieved simply by H recognising the intention (i)

- The Gricean position on intention has been under intense fire in current pragmatics scholarship(see Haugh 2008; Arundale 2008, 2010; etc) ;

- and the outcome is the evolution of two big schools, first increased to three by Archer and Grundy (2011) and one, within the intercultural pragmatic framework, by Istvan Kecskes (2014): cognitive philosophical school and socio-cultural interactional school.

COGNITIVE-PHILOSOPHICAL PRAGMATICS

- **Cognitive-Philosophical Pragmatics, aka Anglo-American pragmatics**

- Contends that communication always involves speakers' intentions, and hearers' associating such intentions with speakers

- Communication is believed to have occurred/taken place if the hearer's perceived intention matches appropriately with the one the speaker expresses:

Socio-cultural Interactional Pragmatics aka European-Continental Pragmatics

- It takes an equivocal position on intention: not necessarily present in communication. For Verschueren (1999:48), for example, "…it will be … unwise to claim that every type of communicated meaning is dependent on a definable intention on the part of the utterer"

- Theorists of this school largely conceive of intention "as a post facto participant resource that emerges through interaction" (Haugh 2008: 4). In the words of Kecskes (2014: 6): "…[the socio-cultural interactional school] regards intention as a post factum construct that is achieved jointly through the dynamic emergence of meaning in conversation".

Archer and Grundy 2011

- Identified three schools, rather than reconcile the existing schools:

- Cognitive: e.g RT (intention-strict)

- Philosophical: e.g speech acts, implicature (intention-strict)

- Socio-cultural: (intention-optional/relaxed)

Kecskes (2014): Socio-cognitive Approach

- Attempted to reconcile the different schools by identifying only one tradition: the socio-cognitive approach (SCA).

- It "emphasises that there is a dialectical relationship between a priori intention (based on individual prior experience - declarative) and emergent intention (based on actual situational context - procedural) (Kecskes 2014: 7).

Definition and Nature of Pragmatic Analysis

- Pragmatic analysis equally applies to deictic inferences, drawn from changing contextual grounds and orientations. "I", "we", "you", "here", "there", "now", "then", for example, would be interpreted differently as agency and space shift, even when the referents are the same.

- This means that a pragmatic analysis, while relating to deictic centres, is strictly sensitive to contextual affordances:

Definition and Nature of Pragmatic Analysis

- Examples: different deictic centres

a. I am talking about here now: A doctor talking to a patient (reference to the patient's liver, the doctor touching a liver image on his table)

b. I am talking about here now: The same doctor talking to his wife (reference to Nigeria in comparison to the West)

c. Here is always a very dangerous zone: A policeman talking to leaders of a particular neighbourhood (a secluded place on the street)

d. Here is always a very dangerous zone: The same policeman talking to his gatekeeper in his residence (a sharp, pointed part of the gate always thrusting out when the gate is being pushed open)

Approaches to Linguistic/Pragmatic Analysis

- Two key approaches are possible in (data-driven) linguistic analysis: bottom-up and top-down.

- Both are used by pragmaticians/pragmaticists/pragmatists, depending on their sub-disciplinary orientation; e.g. conversation analysis, core pragmatics and societal pragmatics.

- The bottom-up approach is preferred by conversation analysts while the top-down approach is the choice of most core and societal pragmaticians.

Bottom up Approach

- **Bottom-up (inductive) Analysis**

- The bottom-up and top-down analytical approaches have their origins in compiler technology, where they serve as methods to parse the languages of programming.

- "A compiler is a special program that processes statements written in a particular programming language and turns them into machine language or "code" that a computer's processor uses" (Rouse, 2018: not paginated)

Bottom up Approach

- Bottom-up parsing involves two steps:

- The recognition of "objects represented by smaller portions of text, [and identification of] their syntactic classes" (Tseytin nd: not paginated)

- A combination of "results obtained for smaller objects to identify bigger objects composed of those smaller objects; so one proceeds until the whole text (a compilation unit) is recognized as some kind of language entity" (Tseytin nd: not paginated)

Bottom up Approach

- This means that the bottom-up approach does not permit the knowledge of the entire text at the outset;

- rather, it makes the analyst go through the elements/constituents the whole text/discourse is composed of before coming to the bigger picture.

- The analysis starts with smaller elements and moves progressively to bigger ones: for example: morphemes → words → phrases → clauses → sentences → texts.

Bottom up Approach

- It begins with the analysis of the surface level constituents (morphemes and words) after which it comes to the deeper level ones (syntactic elements which provide access to the bigger chunks of the text).

- In the conversation analytic tradition of pragmatics where the bottom-up approach is very popular, particularly where the mixed method is not applied, moment by moment analysis, which builds up to larger, sometimes, categorially-clinched analyses, represents the bottom-up approach.

Bottom up Approach

- The analysis begins with the exhaustive determination of the semantic range of individual lexical entries, irrespective of the frequency of occurrence in texts. This makes the approach somewhat repetitive and boring.

- Meanings are not recognised as primary or secondary; all entries are treated as having equal status (cf Haan 2010).

Bottom up: demonstration

- Considered: lexico-grammar /syntax and interactive sequentiality.

- Lexico-grammar/syntax is exemplified from the lower rungs of the grammatical rank scale and lexical meaning.

- Sequentiality is demonstrated as a conversation analytic resource and exemplified briefly as a moment-by-moment analytical effort.

- Note however that the humongously detailed and characteristically repetitive nature of the analysis make it difficult to apply the approaches to large data in qualitative analyses. Lexico-grammatical/syntactic bottom up is popular approach in corpus linguistics, including corpus pragmatics.

Lexico-grammar/syntax: demonstration

- The name of the new ship is already known to everyone. Its source is a tale told several years back among the Philistines, a group smashed by David, the lad.

a. The: a particulariser.

b. Name: designation of someone/something.

c. The: a particulariser.

d. New: indicating fresh acquisition ; collocates with 'ship'.

e. Ship: referring to 'a large boat for transporting goods and people', etc.

Sequentiality: Example from "Conversation Analysis and the study of bilingual interaction" by Jakob Steensig

1 ESEN: Jeg [har en] ide ,=Vil I ge rne hø :re det .

→ Eng: I [have an] idea,=Would you(PLUR) like to hear it.

2 EROL: [(nʊ ,)]

→ Eng: (now)   com: ((first 4 words spoken enthusiastically))

3 pause: (0.8)

4 ESEN: Altså en ide:.

→ Eng: you know an idea   com: ((distinct, calm voice))

5 pause: (0.3)

6 SELMA: Ne [j vi vil ikk' [hø :re] det,   ]

→ Eng: N [o we will not [hear] it,   ]   N [o we don't want [to hear] it,   ]

7 ASIYE: [Det kommer an [på   ] hva' det] er]

→ Eng: It depends   [on   ] what it] is]

Sequentiality: Jakob Steensig (2004)

- I hear Esen's first utterance in line 1 as an announcement of a proposal, followed by a request to get attention to present the proposal.

- In line 4 Esen restates the announcement.

- In line 6 Selma declines the request

- and in line 7 Asiye accepts it, but in a strongly conditioned fashion

Top down Approach

- In the top-down approach, the analyst first presents the total/whole picture before parsing the lexico-grammatical/syntactic entries.

- In other words, the analyst first does some analysis of the text/discourse before identifying the constituents.

- The top-down approach is a strictly categorial dimension to pragmatic analysis.

Top down: Categoriality

- I have operationally identified two types of categoriality: paradigm-driven and discourse/issue/theme-driven categorialities.

- Paradigm-driven categoriality: The tenets or metalinguistic configurations of chosen theoretical perspectives drive the categorisation.

- Discourse/issue/theme-driven categoriality: The interaction between the tenets or metalinguistic configurations of theories and selected/sampled data produces categories that are reflective of the contents of the data and, sometimes, in addition, the genre to which the data belong(s).

Paradigm-driven Categoriality: demonstration

- The analyst scouts around for the presence of chosen/relevant tenets in the data, characterises their manifestations and exemplifies them from the data:

- **Tense**: present/past: analogical (pass/passed); anomalous (go/went)

- **Modality**: epistemic (might, possible, improbable, etc); deontic (can, may, must, etc)

- **Transitivity in SFG**: mental (think, guess, etc), material (beat, hold, etc), relational (is, seem, etc) processes

- **Speech acts**: representatives, directives, expressive, commissives and declarations

- **Representatives**: informing (tense: present: go, act, redeem, etc)

Discourse/theme/issue-driven Categoriality

- Medical locutions (using speech act theory): **surgical**: "operate", "lap", "sedate"; **consultation**: "clerk", "interview", etc

- Religious locutions (using speech act theory): **religious act/observance**: "ablution", "sinful"; **religious existence**: "life after death", etc

- Culture-driven practs (using pragmatic act/pragmeme theory): **greeting**: "prostrate yourself"; **traditional recreation** (e.g. in Ayo game: "Your father is a big-headed baboon".

- Veiling (using deresponsibilisation theoretic resources): **abbronymisation**: "Give i.m CQ stat"; **bush** (Cafi 2007): "I want to serve you to build a brighter future" (on the poster of a Nigerian politician: Who benefits or builds a brighter future?

Types of Pragmatic Analysis

- Duffy (2008) observes: "A typical top-down approach leads to questions such as —to what linguistic category [domain] does linguistic element X belong?"

- This, according to him, contrasts with the bottom-up approach, which asks questions such as: "What is the semantic range of linguistic element X?

Types of Pragmatic Analysis

Example from Duffy (?), converted to a table by me: The Modal Aux: Must

SN	Top down	Bottom up
Question	Is must an epistemic or evidential modal	What is the semantic range of must
Analytical response	Types of modal verbs: evidential (categoriality)	a. Be obliged to b. expressing an opinion about something that is logically very likely (Online dictionary)

*I have added the analytical columns

Types of Pragmatic Analysis

Example from Duffy (?), converted to a table by me: The Modal Aux: Must

SN	Top down	Bottom up
Question	Is must an epistemic or evidential modal	What is the semantic range of must
Analytical response	Types of modal verbs: evidential (categoriality)	a. Be obliged to b. expressing an opinion about something that is logically very likely (Online dictionary)

*I have added the analytical columns

Types of Pragmatic Analysis

- - Depending on the theoretical or analytical models favoured, top-down and bottom approaches account exhaustively for the features of language (form and function) found in texts and discourses.

- Examples later.

ANALYTICAL MAPPING IN PRAGMATICS: TOP-DOWN APPROACH

- Two types of top-down analytical mapping are available in pragmatics (see Jucker 2013):

- Form to function

- Function to form

- **Form-to-function mapping**: analysis starts from linguistic features which are mapped on to language functions.

- **Function-to-form mapping**: analysis starts from language functions which are linked to the linguistic forms that realise them.

SOURCES OF FORM AND FUNCTION FEATURES

- Form features derive from the following:

a. lexical, syntactic, grammatical, stylistic or discourse paradigms: meaning relations, semantic mapping concept, lexico-grammatical elements (e.g. transitivity in SFG), textuality (coherence/cohesion), discourse tracking, etc.

b. Constituents of some function-based theoretic resources; e.g. locutions in speech act theory; booster markers in appraisal theory, etc.

SOURCES OF FORM AND FUNCTION

- Function derives from the following:

a. pragmatic, discourse and stylistic resources: speech act theory, politeness theories, interactional sociolinguistics, register and genre theories, stance and appraisal, critical discourse analysis, critical pragmatics, etc.

b. **A number of function-based resources also have form features; e.g. speech act theory, aspects register theories, critical pragmatics, etc.

c. **Resources without form elements have to outsource them to situate pragmatic analyses in linguistics **on certain occasions**; e.g. CDA/SFG pair.

ANALYTICAL MAPPING IN PRAGMATICS: TOP-DOWN APPROACH

Demonstration 1: Form to Function

Transitivity in SFG

Type	Text	[1]Context	Function 1: speech act	Function 2: face work	Function 3: stance
Material process	I will crush you if you cross my path	Quarrel	Commissive: threatening	Bald-on-record politeness: threat	Affective stance: anger/hatred
Mental process	I think he is a bit of a funny person (when what is meant is: "strangely stupid")	Disrespect	Expressive: berating	Off-record politeness: degrading	Affective stance: Disregard
Relational process	Adekambi is my hero	Eulogy	Assertive: admiring	Positive politeness: Approbation	Evidential stance: Approval

[1] Context is defined in this section as what we need to know to understand something (cf van Dijk 1977)

Function to Form
Function theory: Pragmeme; form theory: Cognitive Construction Grammar (CCxG)

Categoriality: Pract /	Text	Context	Practal functions/pragmatic acts	Form: CCxG (cognitive construction grammar)
Culture-related Pract	He giggled the old man out of the house eventually	Disrespect	Blaming the third party (maybe for embarrassing an old man)	Ditransitive caused-motion construction
Skills/caution-related Pract	Lions attack at night	Training/tourism	Instructing/counselling (new trainees at a game reserve/tourists)	Deprofiled Object Construction
Ethics-related Pract	It is curious the kind of people who speak here	Impropriety	Demeaning (say the personality of speakers)	Nominal Extraposition Construction
Religion-related Pract	He donated generously to God.	Devotion	Eulogising (say a rich church member)/protecting	Implicit Theme Construction

Pragmeme

- Propounded by Mey (2001), the pragmatic act theory, aka, the theory of a Pragmeme, approaches pragmatic analysis from two theoretic perspectives, following the presentation of "pragmeme" as the representation of possible pragmatic features: activity + (con)textual parts.

- Its distinctive intervention is the pract, and/or the allopract, which defines the situatedness of the speech act version advanced by the theory.

- It sidelines the winding navigation of traditional speech act by combining the two parts in a process that serves as a build up to specific/micro speech acts; thus: "informing" NOT "Representative: → informing"

Construction Grammar (CxG)

- Construction Grammar has a theoretical orientation in context-influential conceptual meaning.

- It thus blurs the distinctions between semantics, syntax and pragmatics.

- Key types include: Berkeley Construction Grammar, Sign Based Construction Grammar, Goldbergian/Lakovian construction grammar, **Cognitive grammar**, Radical construction grammar, Embodied construction grammar and Fluid construction grammar.

- **This presentation benefits from the cognitive type**.

Cognitive Construction Grammar (CCxG)

- Developed by Goldberg (2006), Cognitive Construction Grammar (CCxG) has its key resources woven around argument structure constructions.

- Its most popular thesis is that these constructions are independent of "lexical argument-taking" (Boas 2009: 4).

- Key constructions of CCxG, found relevant to this presentation, are Ditransitive Caused- motion Construction, Deprofiled Object Construction, Nominal Extraposition Construction and Implicit Theme Construction .

Cognitive Construction Grammar (CCxG)

- **Ditransitive Caused-motion Construction:** works to demonstrate the avoidance of the "claim that the syntax and semantics of the clause is projected from the specifications of the main verb" (Boas 2009: 4); Goldberg 1995: 224).

- **Example**: They laughed the poor guy out of the room (Goldberg 1995)

- **Deprofiled Object Construction** (Goldberg 2000): This construction, which moves the prominence of discourse from patient argument, "licenses cases in which an argument that is normally associated with the verb is unexpressed due to a combination of its low discourse prominence together with an increased emphasis on the action":

- **Example**: Tigers only kill at night ((Boas 2009: 8): "kill" argument unexpressed because the patient argument is not focal or topical (see Lambrecht 1994).

Cognitive Construction Grammar (CCxG)

- **Nominal Extraposition Construction**: blends information structure with grammatical information.

- **Example**: It's AMAZING the people you see here.

- **Implicit Theme Construction**: theme arguments are omitted.

- **Example**: He donated to the United Way (Goldberg 2004).

OPERATIONALISING "CURRENT"

- In this presentation, current analytical approaches are defined as methods of analysis that subsist from a long historical existence or are newly introduced to the pragmatics scholarship.

- Such methods are conceived as a set of systematised theory-rich principles applied to data sets in a rigorous manner.

Why New/Current Approaches?

a. **Changes in theoretical thinking and the emergence of new theories often necessitate change in analytical approaches, e.g. politeness theories; speech ac theory and participation framework theory**

Ai. Politeness Theories

- At the early stage of politeness research, politeness and face were taken as one concept, but in current pragmatics scholarship, efforts have been made to separate the two; and approaches to both strands have changed significantly.

- New emphasis is now on discursivity (including negotiation and co-construction).

Some Politeness/Face Theories/Models

- **Leech (1983): Interpersonal rhetoric**

- Leech's model of politeness is founded on interpersonal rhetoric and views politeness as conflict avoidance.

- Leech introduced the Politeness Principle.

- The function of the principle is "to maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly relations which enable us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative in the first place" (p. 82).

Theories/Models

- **Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987): Facework**

- Brown and Levinson's facework was proposed a universal model of linguistic politeness:

- Recognises positive and negative faces across cultures.

- For them, face is invested, can be gained and lost.

Profiles

- **Fraser and Nolen (1978), Fraser (1990): Conversational contract**

- Fraser (1978) and Fraser and Nolen (1981), Fraser (1990) presented: the notion of politeness as a Conversational Contract.

- Emphasises interactants' rights and obligations that define expectations

- R&Os are negotiated and renegotiation over conversational time

Theories/Models

- **Spencer-Oatey (2000): Rapport management**

- It excludes the notion of negative face by B&L, and inserts group identity which replaces the independence of individuals in facework

- Introduces the notion of association rights: social interaction as appropriate behavior and rapport management

- These are co-constructed by interlocutors as per their sociocultural expectations and their unmarked assumptions.

Theories/Models

- **Scollon and Scollon (2001):** social interaction model

- Recognises involvement and independence

- Involvement: collectivity: strategies include paying attention to others, claiming in-group membership and using first names

- Independence: individuality of participants: strategies include: making minimal assumptions, using formal names and titles and giving options to the interlocutor:

Theories/Models

- **Relational work**: the interactional negotiation of face relationships (Locher and Watts 2005; Watts 2003, 2005): It covers:

- Polite: Thank you for this great service

- Impolite: That's very empty-headed of you.

- Direct: That's not good enough

- Indirect: That's a bit odd

- Appropriate (politic): You've got to see this as foolish you know (laughing)

- Inappropriate: Mother, your big and stupid hair-do is exciting to me!

Theories/Models

- **Ruhi's Face-sensitivity model (2006) a model of face**

- proposes a replacement of the term "face threatening act" with "face sensitive act", the former considered a misnomer in the light of Brown and Levinson's (1987) balance principle

- It recognises:

✓ **Face threatening acts**, "utterances that lead to perceived damage to face" (Ruhi 2006),

✓ **Face-boosting acts**, utterances "that attend to interlocutor needs" (Ruhi 2006 [Bayraktaroglu 1991: 15]).

Profiles

Arundale's Face Constituting Theory (FCT) (1999, 2006, 2010): a theory of face

- It posits that politeness is interactionally co-constituted and co-maintained.
- It identifies threat, support and stasis
- ✓ **Threat**: conjointly co-constituted damage to face
- ✓ **Support**: conjointly co-constituted boost to face
- ✓ **Stasis**: face maintenance in terms of the routine attention humans accord to face; e.g. Iwo/eyin (you) in Yoruba (when asymmetry is culturally-ingrained)

Theories/Models: FCT Ctd

- It recognises two types of relational orientation: **relational connection** and **relational separation**

- Relational connection: "meanings and actions that may be apparent as unity, interdependence, solidarity, association, congruence, and more" (Arundale, 2006:204)

- Relational separation: "meanings and actions that may be voiced as differentiation, independence, autonomy, dissociation, divergence, and so on' (p.204)

Theories/Models

- **Interpersonal Pragmatics (Locher and Graham 2010)**:

- A coalescence of theoretic insights from relational work, rapport management, face constituting theory and impoliteness research

- It deals with how "social actors use language to shape and form relationships in situ" (p.1) .

- It emphasises "relational, attitudinal/emotive, and evaluative aspects of embodied language use" (Haugh, et.al 2013: 3).

Why New/Current Approaches?

- Pragmatic analysis should be sensitive to new theoretic developments

- The analyst is expected to know the latest theoretic thinking or the latest version of a theory (e.g. aspects of discursivity) and submit to its influence, if relevant to their research questions.

- However, they should equally determine the level of acceptability of the new developments to sections of academics in the global spread, and allow that to guide their 'political' decisions sometimes if interested in the scholarship in such sections of the globe.

- For example, Gricean pragmatics is the only approach acceptable to a number of pragmaticians in the US; Relevance is not.

Why New/Current Approaches?

- **Participation Framework (in addition to politeness theories)**

✓ Built on the weaknesses of traditional models of communication: the speaker, the medium and the hearer

✓ Goffman (1981) shows that messages produced by participants are often meant for many hearers, but that a subset of the messages is intended for the real targets.

Why New/Current Approaches?

- He recognises two categories of hearers or targets, namely, ratified and unratified, in the participation space.

- **Ratified participants**: the actual targets

- **Unratified participants**: "side participants" (Clark and Carlson 1982) who are either overhearers or eavesdroppers.

Why New/Current Approaches

- Injecting a new dimension into the theory, Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2004) has suggested that all participants be grouped as ratified participants, but be differentiated by degrees of participation.

- In other words, rather than the Goffmanian definition of ratified participants as the only group entitled to produce and receive messages, all participants should be seen as ratified, but some should be seen as more ratified than others.

Why New/Current Approaches?

- Kerbrat-Orecchioni's (2004) proposal not being clear enough for the analysis of certain data, Odebunmi (2012) in the journal, *Pragmatics and Cognition*, further modifies both Goffman's theory and Kerbrat-Orecchioni's position by recognising two types of participation and two types of participants: **marked/unmarked.**

- Odebunmi (2012) furher modifies aspects of the concept of ratification.

- ✓ **Unmarked participation**: Found in a dyadic or triadic exchange in which Goffman's ratification and non-ratification framework is strictly observed.

- ratified speakers are "talk-contributing or non-talk contributing participants (my own terms to integrate Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2004) modification of Goffman's participation framework)

- unratified hearers are conceptualised as bystanders

Why New/Current Approaches?

- Marked participation: The marked participation configuration involves a bystander or an unaccredited talk contributor who intrudes into an interaction.

Why New/Current Approaches?

✓ **Accredited participants**: In-group participants, located in the local participation space as ratified or unratified participants.

✓ **Non-accredited participants**: (out group participants) Talk participants not captured by Goffman's ratified and unratified participation framework.

- They are not located in the local participation space; only intrude.

- A feature of marked participation.

Why New/Current Approaches?

- In applying Goffman's theory, the pragmatician has to be aware of the new theoretic thinking and apply it if it fits with their data and research questions.

- They should also work within the affordances of the theory: It permits a blend of top-down and bottom-up approaches, but the analysis of the conversations falls essentially in the a moment-by-moment tradition.

New/Current Approaches: An Example from Odebunmi (2012): Text

1.A: ((Looks at B)) Wey be my 101 note? (Where is my 101 note?)

2.B: ((Smiles and dips his hand into his bag)) E dey my bag. Please! Make you give me….

(It is in my bag. Please, give me …)

3.A: ((Frowns and stretches forth his hand)) Give what? You think say I be mumu! Me I no go read for test? (Give what You think I am a fool! Will I not read for the test?)

4.B: Sorry. I don forget say test dey. Take. I go collect…)

(Sorry, I have forgotten there is a test. Have it. I will collect…)

5 →.D: ((Rushes into the setting, pointing to A)) You be my man oh!(shakes hands with A) You are my man!

6. → B: Before nko. How una dey?

((That is obvious. How are you?))

New/Current Approaches: An Example from Odebunmi (2012:)

- **Top-down:**

- **Accommodated Marked Participation**

- The marked accommodated participation is an interaction structure in which interruptions by unaccredited participants are treated as appropriate despite disrupting impacts on the flow of the interaction. Usually, the unaccredited participant enters the participation space using lexical or grammatical markers of familiarity or solidarity indicative of in-group membership. The cues sent are usually rated by accommodating ratified participants as indexical of deep social bonds which should be permitted entry in the ratified space.

New/Current Approaches: An Example from Odebunmi (2012:)

Bottom-up

Accommodated Marked Participation

- ✓ A initiates the interaction on a common ground note: "Wey be my 101 note?".

- ✓ Presupposed is the knowledge of the full form of "101" (GES 101), a compulsory general English course taken by all students of the university.

- ✓ The sequential position of the utterance, together with its tone, makes it a bit impolite, a point further evincible from A's follow-up move (line3).

- ✓ The pidgin "e dey my bag", locates the object of A's request endospatially.

- ✓ "E' anaphorically connects with A's "101 note", and " dey my bag" with his "Wey (where) be (is)", where "my bag" provides the physical location of the note.

Why New/Current Approaches?

b. Analytical changes occur over time as a result of heavy modifications to theories, knowledge advancement, critical perspectives, theoretical calibrations and cultural relativity

✓ Three models/theories are considered here:

❖ Face constituting theory

❖ Hierarchy politeness

❖ Procedural pragmatics

Why New/Current Approaches? Face work to FCT/HP

✓ The weaknesses of B & L's face work have received two major reactions in the scholarship: those that condemn it heavily and suggest the discursive path to politeness ; for example, Watts (2003), Watts and Locher (2005), Arundale (2009, 2010), etc and those that modify its configuration and fix the deficiencies noticed in it, for example Yabuuchi (2006)

✓ The "discursive approach" (Watts (2003: xii) foregrounds the mechanisms for realising politeness in particular contexts of interaction.

Alternative Approaches: Face Constituting Theory

- See details under the theories/models of politeness above.

Configuration Modification: Hierarchy Politeness

- Best selected when the pragmatician/analyst in interested in a version of facework that is consistent with cultural norms or asymmetry of any form;

- say, doctor-patient interaction, parent-child discourse, husband-wife discourse (in the strict African sense), teacher-student discourse, etc.

Hierarchy Politeness

- Yabuuchi (2006) recognises the following face wants:

a. **Autonomy-face**: "a person's image that s/he is in control of their own fate, that is, s/he has the virtues of a full-fledged, mature, and responsible adult" (Lim 1994).

b. **Fellowship-face:** "a person's image that s/he is a worthy companion", e.g. being' "friendly," "agreeable," "cooperative, etc." (Lim 1994)

c. **Competence-face: "**the image that one is a person of ability", e.g. being "knowledgeable," "in- telligent," "wise," "experienced," "influential,", etc' (Lim 1994)

d. **Culture- specific face**: Culture products such as being "praiseworthy and admirable, blameworthy and reprehensible…." O'Driscoll (1996)

Hierarchy Politeness

- For Yabuuchi (2006), the problem with B&L's politeness model lies in its collapsing two scarcely compatible wants into one: the want for solidarity/ fellowship and the want for recognition/admiration), which is connected to power.

- He thus injects hierarchy politeness into B&L's scope: deference and ingratiation, which are expressed through sincere or insincere actions.

- Modifies the theory as "a trichotomous [rather than a dichotomous] system that consists of fellowship, autonomy, and hierarchy politeness"

Hierarchy Politeness

- **Fellowship politeness: "**the expression of sincere politeness based on the recognition of various qualities held in common".

- **Autonomy politeness:** "the deference to the alter's self-confidence that s/he has the competence to do everything that is necessary at least to maintain his/her present status".

- **Hierarchy politeness:** "deference paid to the competence that is greater than that of ego, plus the insincere surplus of fellowship politeness and the insincere surplus of downward autonomy politeness".

Hierarchy Politeness

- Yabuuchi's position:

a. Upward deference is "exaggerated in collectivistic societies", and is therefore insincere

b. Upward deference is "minimized in individualistic societies".

c. Hierarchy politeness is reflected in "upward praise, downward fellowship, and downward autonomy recognition that are exaggerated to curry favor or counterbalance power difference, [which are] all products of power difference"

Procedural Pragmatics

- Procedural pragmatics is an example of theoretic/analytical changes ascribed to knowledge advancement and critical perspectives.

- Spearheaded by Saussure (2003, 2007), procedural pragmatics has a target to raise cognitive pragmatics, particularly Sperber & Wilson's (1986) *Relevance theory*) "to a higher level of operability for proper analysis"

Procedural Pragmatics

- Saussure sees "a discourse is an ordered set of representations which are outputs of the interpretive procedure, a set of representations corresponding to various intentions of the speaker"

- His proposal is anchored to the value of coherence in strengthening the analytical applicability of Relevance theory to discourse.

Procedural Pragmatics

- Saussure's position:

✓ Utterance interpretation depends on context constituted by "a number of salient previously verbalized propositions".

✓ Since U1 serves as contextualisation to U2; and since U1's function is combinable "as a contextual premise with U2,… a set of representations coming from the previous utterances correspond to, say, (P & Q) [what is said and what is recovered], … and the current utterance U corresponds to a proposition presented as implied by (P & Q), [therefore] (P & Q) count as a contextual premise for the conclusion U".

✓ In other words, the coherence relationship between utterances (the one before (U1) and the one following (U2) provides adequate background information for the determination of utterance meaning .

Procedural Pragmatics

- For Saussure, the procedure makes it possible to explain anything "through online utterance processing", including the reconstruction of argumentative structures.

- She captures procedural pragmatics thus: M = U & [(P & Q)   U].

- This, she argues, satisfies relevance and "the intuition of coherence".

Key Considerations in Pragmatic Analysis I

1. **Where dealing with heavily battered theories, such as face work (and speech acts), the revised/modified version, e.g. Yabuuchi (if the researcher believes, contrary to the latest development, that face is not separable from politeness)/ (pragmatic act) should used.**

✓ However, the nature of the data, if related to non-discursive/non-negotiative face or politeness features, face work may still be used on the strict condition that the features explored are perfectly consistent with the theoretic affordance of face work theory. An example is hierarchical communication in the army where the boss-subordinate roles are strictly defined.

✓ It is also possible to apply updated versions of the speech act theory: Kreider (1982), Thomas (1985), etc, but teaching has to account for all forms of theoretic knowledge!

Key Considerations in Pragmatic Analysis II

2. **The choice of theory is determined by the nature of the data and the objectives or research questions of the study.**

✓ Details/demonstration below.

Key Considerations in Pragmatic Analysis

Nature of data, objectives/research questions and choice of theory

SN	Nature of data	Objective/research questions	Possible theory
1	Doctor-patient interaction	To identify talk patterns in medical interviews	Conversation analysis
2	Doctor-patient interaction	To examine doctors' and patients' level of commitment to propositions during medical interviews	Stance & appraisal theories; de/responsibilisation models
3	Political speeches	To highlight the key context-sensitive strategies used by Obasanjo in his natural speeches on Buhari's performance	Self-organised criticality model[1] (Gibbs and Orden 2012); common ground theory
4	Football games	To identify the negotiation mechanisms used by the Super Eagles in their match against Croatia	Levinson's notion of activity type
5	Spousal conversations	To account for the inferential processes deployed by couples in quarrel situations	Relevance theory; interactional sociolinguistics

Key considerations III

3. Data nature and researcher interest determine the number of theories or amount of theoretic insights to be selected from favoured theories.

✓Hence, until the research interests of the researcher are completely known (e.g. persuasive strategies, data-distinctive themes (e.g. beggary, diplomacy, etc.), contexts, identities, etc., it is impossible to know the amount and scope of theories needed.

✓There are two possibilities in theoretical scope:

❖Major scope

❖Supplemental scope

Key Considerations III

✓ **Major theoretical tools** constitute the theoretical framework in that they refer to the main theoretical perspectives copiously drawn upon by the researcher.

✓ **The supplemental tools** are those the researcher merely draws upon in the course of the analysis to support their arguments.

✓ While the major ones have a place in the review of literature, the supplemental ones do not necessarily have to be so treated. Foot notes or glosses at the point of mention and application suffice.

Key considerations IV

4. Analytical principles are not only theories; they are, in addition, concepts and principles derived from reviewed literature and other, non-selected theories for a study.

✓ Some of these derive from findings of earlier studies; e.g Maynard's (2004, 2005, etc.):"citing the evidence", "asserting the condition", "flooding out response", "stalling", etc.

✓ Some are features of certain genres, e.g. medical, legal, judicial, military, etc; e.g. "pathological biography", "organ-specific practice", "clinical communication", etc.

Key considerations

- Usually, the genre features are integrated with main tenets of selected theories to analyse data

- Sometimes, where the analyst has high intellectual abilities, these joint insights are structured into charts/figures which not only enrich the analysis but which also raise the elegance of the presentation of findings.

- Where charts (with multiple parts) are used, the analyst must be able to connect each of the constituents with specific objectives or research questions.

Key Considerations V

5. **A pragmatic analysis, of necessity, makes a statement, overtly or covertly, about contexts where context covers participants/actors, objects, participation space, mental/ physical setting and discursive/interactive or discourse conditions.**

✓ Pragmatic analysis' main point of departure is its emphasis on how contexts determine or constrain communicative choices;

✓ Considerations such as setting-constrained choices, setting-neutral choices, agency, spatiality, temporality, role relationships, identity (co-)construction, cultural constraints and glocalised orientations are crucial to pragmatic analysis

Key Considerations VI

✓ **6. To carry out a pragmatic analysis, it is compulsory to clearly understand the concepts, nature and principles of pragmatic theories being deployed.**

✓ **It answers questions such as:**

✓ What does the concept mean?; e.g. deresponsibilisation (taking reduced/weakened responsibility)

✓ What can it help to determine? – how interactants express different levels of uncertainty and avoid taking responsibility.

✓ What resources does it deploy to required effect? "Bush", "mitigation", "deresponsibilities", etc.

Key Considerations VII

7. **The principles/tenets of the theories and the tradition to which they belong drive the direction of the analysis, e.g.**

a. **Interactional sociolinguistics**: usually calls for a blend of bottom up and top down approaches

b. **Participation framework**: a blend of bottom-up and top-down

c. **Pragmatic act (Pragmeme)** – strictly top-down,

d. **Procedural pragmatics:** top down

e. **Critical pragmatics**: strictly top down

Key Considerations VIII

8. **Like analysis in every discipline, a pragmatic analysis takes the following into consideration:**

a. A clear gap required: What gap exists in the scholarship? But sometimes this is not strictly observed. Details later under GSP.

b. Gap-informed objectives/ research question

c. A-b are instrumental to determining or pointing to the contribution or significance of the study.

d. Clear and detailed methodology (cf. Professor Ogbulogo's presentation)

e. Specifically in pragmatics: relevant theoretical resources are connectable to each objective

f. Clearly conceptualised charts ,where relevant, - breakable on the basis of objectives

Key Considerations 9

9. **Analysis has to be faithful to set objectives, e.g.:**

✓ To identify the context-shaped thematic concerns of Wole Soyinka's stage-acted plays: **themes of the plays that are strictly tied to the situations in which the characters interact**.

❖ Types of themes and types of context in which they occur NOT ONLY THE FORMER

❖ How the contexts shape the themes NOT ONLY THEMES AND CONTEXTS

❖ Example 1: Theme of hero worship in three discursive contexts, namely, asymmetry, ingratiation and deceit.

❖ Example 2: Asymmetry: shapes hero worship through the use of power-imbued locutions which play up the economic power of Speaker X.

Key considerations 10

10. **The application of theoretic insights to data in the analysis has three manifestations (my classification):**

✓ conceptual

✓ procedural

✓ Terminological

❖ For the most effect, all three are expected to be observed in a standard pragmatic analysis.

Key considerations: conceptual

a. Conceptual manifestation: the main driving idea of a theory is enunciated without necessarily using relevant terms of the theory:

✓ "Both interactants understand the implications of the knot on the head of the masquerade" – Clarks (1996) **communal common ground (common ground theory)**.

✓ "The speaker's response to the question is assisted by his experience before the interaction" – Kecskes' (2014) **declarative knowledge/common ground (socio-cognitive approach to pragmatics)**.

✓ " 'Yes' ", with a rising tune, picks out X's non-expectation of an answer from Y" – Gumperz's (1982) **contextualisation cue (interactional sociolinguistic theory)**

Key considerations: Procedural

a. **Procedural manifestation**: the processes or analytical steps recommended by a theory.

b. Not all theories recommend processes; some only provide features; e.g. appraisal system, stance theory, etc.

✓ **Pragmatic act theory**: identification of activity part; identification of co-textual or contextual features; explanation of transformations into practs or allopracts.

✓ **Procedural pragmatics**: identification of cohering items; establishment of connection between P & Q; explanation of the mechanisms and processes that account for utterance meaning from a combined interaction of coherence resources.

Key considerations: Terminological

- **Terminological manifestation**: the actual terms prescribed by a theory.

✓ These terminologies should be mastered and used appropriately.

✓ **In applying terminologies, caution is required**: each theory's labels should be distinctively recognised and not be used in interchange with another theory, even when they are conceptually the same or synonymous.

✓ **A number of terms are however shared by different theories**; these should be used only in reference to the sharing theories.

- **Examples below:**

Key considerations

Key Considerations: Terminological

- **Critical Pragmatics**: singular reference, reflexive-referential theory of content, token/tokening (utterance), acts of agents, file or notion, agent's buffer, role-linking, nested roles, detached notion, etc.

- **Relevance theory**: creation of expectation, positive cognitive effect, ostensive-inferential communication, input, explicature, implicature, informative intention, communicative intention, etc.

- **Metapragmatics**: monolexemicity, non-monomorphemicity, monomorphemicity, semantic transparence, metapragmatic reflexivity, etc.

- **Interactional sociolinguistics**: background knowledge, contextualisation cue, conversational inference, reflexive process, repair negotiation, etc.

Generic Structure of Pragmatic Analysis:

- Derived from 53 papers sampled from five pragmatics journals: *Pragmatics, Pragmatics and Society, Pragmatics and Cognition, Intercultural pragmatics* & *Journal of Pragmatics.*

Overall Structure: Pre-analysis^Analysis^Conclusion

Generic Structure: Pre-analysis

Pre-analysis: (Aim)^ (Background to the study) ^(Gap identification)^Justification of research focus^Objectives/Research questions^(Review of literature)^Theoretical framework^Methodology

Obligatory elements: Justification of research, Objectives/research questions, Theoretical framework and Methodology.

Optional elements: Aim, Background to the study, Gap identification, Review of literature

Note: In thesis/project writing, all are obligatory.

Generic Structure: Analysis

Analysis: (bottom-up)/(top-down)/(top-down+bottom-up)

- ✓ Predominantly top-down

- ✓ The approaches favoured are determined by the theories selected (procedure/features-based), researcher goal and designed outcomes.

Generic Structure: Bottom-up

- **Bottom-up analysis**: moment-by-moment analysis^categorial build-up
- ✓ **Obligatory elements**: All
- ✓ **Optional elements**: None

Generic Structure: Top-down

3. **Top-down Analysis**: (Paradigm-driven analysis)/(theme/issue-driven analysis)

Generic Structure: top-down (paradigm-driven)

3. **Paradigm-driven analysis**: concept-based classification^characterisation of theory(+)/(genre)-informed/data features^exemplifications

- ✓ Obligatory elements: Concept-based categorisation, characterisation of theory-informed data features and exemplifications
- ✓ Optional elements: Genre-informed data features.

Generic Structure: top-down (theme/issue-driven analysis)

- **Theme/issue-driven analysis**: theme /issue (+genre)-based categorisation^concept-based characterisation of data features^(procedure-based)/(theoretic features-based) exemplifications

- ✓ **Obligatory elements**: theme/issue-based categorisation, concept-based characterisation of data features and exemplifications.

- ✓ **Optional elements**: genre-based categorisation, procedure-based exemplification and theoretic features-based exemplifications

Generic Structure: Top-down+bottom-up

- **Top-down + bottom-up**: theme/issue-driven analysis/^paradigm-driven analysis^moment-by-moment analysis

✓ **Obligatory element(s)**: either theme/issue-driven analysis or paradigm-driven analysis + moment-by-moment analysis

✓ **Optional elements**: Theme/issue-driven analysis or paradigm-driven analysis

Generic Structure: Conclusion

- **Conclusion**: Summary of key findings^Meta-analytical comments^(Joining the debate)^(Contribution of the research)

✓ Obligatory elements: Summary of key findings, meta-analytical comments.

✓ Optional elements: Joining the debate and contribution of the research.

My Recommended GSP: Pre-analysis

- **Pre-analysis**: [Background to the study] ^Gap identification^Research justification^Objectives/research questions^Review of literature^Theoretical framework^Methodology

My Recommended GSP: Analysis

✓ **Bottom-up analysis**: moment-by-moment analysis^categorial build-up

✓ **Paradigm-driven analysis**: concept-based classification^characterisation of theory(+)/(genre)-informed/data features^exemplifications

✓ **Theme/issue-driven analysis**: theme /issue (+genre)-based categorisation^concept-based characterisation of data features^procedure-based/theoretic features-based exemplifications

✓ **Top-down + bottom-up**: theme/issue-driven analysis/paradigm-driven analysis ^moment-by-moment analysis

My Recommended GSP: Conclusion

- **Conclusion**: Summary of key findings^Meta-analytical comments^Joining the debate^Contribution of the research

CONCLUSION

✓ (Current) pragmatic analysis is a complex interplay of genre, theoretical, methodological and analytical principles in application to specific data sets.

✓ It invites the analyst's ambidexterity in the resources and methodologies of pragmatics

✓ It requires great depth and minute theoretical and data-related details

✓ The final product of the near tortuous process is always a worthwhile and revealing intellectual piece.