ADJACENCY PAIR. In conversation analysis, often two utterances produced by different interlocutors will be closely related, such as in the form question/answer, accusation/defence, greeting/reply, farewell/reply, apology/acceptance and so on. These two utterances are often syntactically, semantically, lexically and cohesively linked, so they are termed adjacency pairs. Note that adjacency pairs are not always adjacent: they can be interrupted by intervening utterances. For example, here is a full exchange:

1 Peter (to Nick): Can you give me a hand?

2 Peter (before Nick has a chance to answer, shouts across the road): BOB! Any chance of a hand here?

3 Bob: Yeah, be there in a minute.

4 Nick: Well, will it take long – it's just that I'm in a rush and—

5 Peter: No, a couple of seconds. Can you?

6 Nick: Sure. I've got to be at the station soon.

7 Peter: Thanks.

8 Nick: What do I do?

9 Peter: If you could just push, I'll be able to jump-start it.

10 Nick: OK.

There are two main adjacency pairs here: **1 and 6**, and **8 and 9**. Each of these pairs has an acknowledgement follow-up (6 and 10 respectively) which is known as feedback. The first adjacency pair is interrupted by another adjacency pair (**2 and 3**) which functions as a side-sequence: it is unconnected directly with the main discourse.

Nick begins an intervening question/answer adjacency pair (4 and 5) which functions as an insertion-sequence: the answer of the surrounding adjacency pair (1 and 6) depends upon this one. Another common feature of conversation appears here: Nick begins to explain he is in a rush (4), but is interrupted (5–6) and he **skip-connects** back to his explanation (6). The distance that **skip-connecting** is tolerated can be quite large, and skip-connects are especially prominent in online chat-room exchanges, where other users intervene before an interlocutor can return to 'their' topic.

COHERENCE. Coherence refers to the ways that a text is made semantically meaningful (as opposed to COHESION, which is concerned with grammar). Coherence can be achieved through techniques like IMPLICATURE or BACKGROUNDING actors. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981: 4) view coherence as one of seven 'standards of textuality', being concerned with 'the ways in which the components of the TEXTUAL WORLD, i.e. the configuration of CONCEPTS and RELATIONS which underlie the surface text, are mutually accessible and relevant'.

COHESION. Cohesion refers to the way that a text makes sense syntactically. Halliday and Hasan (1976) note that common cohesive devices include forms of reference (e.g. ANAPHORA and CATAPHORA), ELLIPSIS, SUBSTITUTION, LEXICAL COHESION, conjunction and replacement. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981: 3) view coherence as one of seven 'standards of textuality', claiming that coherence 'concerns the ways in which the components of the SURFACE TEXT, i.e. the actual words we hear or see, are mutually connected within a sequence. The surface components depend upon each other according to grammatical forms and conventions, such that cohesion rests upon GRAMMATICAL DEPENDENCIES'.

CONTEXT. An important aspect of many strands of **DISCOURSE ANALYSIS** – which helps in the interpretative process of linguistic phenomena as well as providing explanations. The analysis of context forms part of most CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS approaches. Van Dijk (2001: 108) makes a distinction between 1- **local contexts** which are 'properties of the immediate interactional situation in which a communicative event takes place' while 2- **global contexts** are 'defined by the social, political, cultural and historical structures in which a communicative event takes place'. Wodak (2001: 67) identifies four levels of context that are used in the DISCOURSE-HISTORICAL APPROACH:

1. **the immediate**, language or text internal CO-TEXT

2. **the intertextual and interdiscursive** relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses

3.**the extralinguistic social/sociological** variables and institutional frames of a specific "context of situation" (middle-range theories)

4. **the broader sociopolitical and historical contexts**, which the discursive practices are embedded in and related to (grand theories).

DEIXIS. Expressions in language that point to referents (or put more simply 'refer to things'). Such referents can be concrete (e.g. objects, people) or abstract (e.g. points in time, ideas). Examples of deixis include the words this, that, here, there, now, then, I, you, he and she. **Such words can only be understood by reference to context** (e.g. by considering the words, sentences etc. around the word or by addressing extralinguistic context – for example, in a conversation a person may say 'look at that' and point to something).

Because deixis locates referents along specific dimensions, they can be classified into different subtypes, for example, spatial, temporal, discourse, person and social. Huang (2007: 132) classifies 'deixis' into two ways:

(1) '**basic categories of deixis'** (person, time and space) and (2) '**other categories of deixis'** (social deixis and discourse deixis)'

DISCOURSE. In sociolinguistics and critical discourse analysis, discourse is **any connected piece of speech or writing in its social context** (this last circumstance sets discourse apart from text). In applied linguistics, discourse refers more narrowly to the interactive and communicative dimension of language, and involves conversation analysis, semiotics, and the dynamic processes of

text production and understanding. While usage varies, we most commonly apply the label discourse analysis to an approach which is based heavily upon traditional grammatical concepts, conversation analysis to an empirical approach which rejects traditional concepts and seeks to extract patterns from data, and text linguistics to the study of large units of language each of which has a definable communicative function.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS. An approach to the study of discourse which is based upon **traditional grammatical concepts and terms**. In principle, we might apply the label discourse analysis, or DA, to **any kind of investigation of the structure of discourse**, but in practice the label is most commonly reserved for an approach based upon **familiar grammatical concepts**. That is, a proponent of discourse analysis comes to the analytical task with a **complete battery of grammatical concepts** and terms of the sort familiar to any student of grammar and attempts **to see how these concepts are involved in structuring discourses**. To put it another way, DA is an attempt to extend our highly successful **analysis of sentence structure to units larger than the sentence** (analyse language in use and beyond the sentence).

Though there is considerable variation in practice, DA often begins by trying to identify **minimal units of discourse** and then by **looking for rules governing how these minimal units** can be strung together in **sequence to produce well-formed discourses**, much as smaller syntactic units are combined into sentences according to the rules of syntax. DA thus contrasts strongly with the alternative approach known as **conversation analysis**. Proponents of DA complain that conversation analysis is **hugely inexplicit and ad hoc**, and lacking in any identifiable underpinning, while the practitioners of the other approach in turn accuse DA of being **excessively a priori** and of paying too little attention to **real texts**, as opposed to deliberately constructed ones.

DA has been prominent since the 1970s; it is particularly important **in Germany and the Netherlands**, where it is often almost indistinguishable from text linguistics, but it has also been pursued with some vigour in the English-speaking countries. More recently, discourse analysis has been invigorated by the use of **corpus linguistics** and the availability of large corpora of spoken discourse transcriptions.

IMPLICATURE. Information which is implied in a statement but cannot be derived from applying logical inferencing techniques to it. An implicature is therefore what is suggested but not formally expressed. Instead, the reader or hearer must either understand that part of the statement has a conventionalized, special meaning or take context into account in order to decode the implicature (Grice refers to these as **conversational implicatures**). For example,

Speaker: I'm in an embarrassing situation; I'm confused.

Listener: My **door is always open**.

Here we might make the implicature that the listener interprets Speaker's utterance as a call for help; he therefore offers help to the Speaker and that he is a welcoming person. Consider now this example with the same phrase "**door open**":

Speaker: I **want** to settle the problem **right now**!

Listener: I see no problems, and the **door is open**.

In the second example, we imply that the listener orders the speaker to **leave** and to and the conversation.

N.B. Both examples above could serve different **speech acts.**

INFERENCE. Information that follows from a PROPOSITION or UTTERANCE without being directly communicated through its form is inferred, and the content or process of inferring is inference. Inferences can arise through semantic relations or pragmatic processes.

MEANING. The characteristic of a linguistic form which allows it to be used to pick out some aspect of the non-linguistic world. The study of meaning has a long history in a number of disciplines, notably philosophy, but the **linguistic study of meaning**, **semantics**, largely dates only from the late nineteenth century, and it has become generally regarded as a central part of linguistics only since the 1960s.

Linguists are chiefly interested in the meanings of linguistic forms in everyday speech. More particularly, linguists are interested in the way **some meanings relate to other meanings** – that is, it is the system of meanings which is seen as important, rather than the meanings of individual items.

Like philosophers, linguists carefully distinguish **different types of meaning**. The central and intrinsic meaning of a linguistic form is its **denotation or sense**, while the fuzzy and sometimes variable associations of that form constitute its **connotations**. The relation between a form and the non-linguistic thing it picks out in a given context is its **reference**. An extended and non-literal meaning is a **metaphor**.

Debates in linguistics around **meaningfulness** have been conducted, with formalist linguistics emphasizing the **arbitrariness of reference**, **cognitive linguists emphasizing its embodied and experiential construal**, **psycholinguists stressing its dynamically constructed nature**, and sociolinguists and discourse analysts pointing to the **performed and socially negotiated politics of the setting in meaning construal**.

PARALANGUAGE. The non-linguistic aspects of speaking. When we speak, of course, we communicate a good deal of purely linguistic information to our listeners. In addition, however, we make use of strictly non-linguistic variables like **pitch, loudness, tempo, timbre and voice quality**. Our use of these things conveys information about our **mood and attitude: about whether we are angry, amused, nervous, excited, impatient, tired or whatever**. These aspects of speaking are collectively called paralanguage or, informally, tone of voice.

Such paralinguistic features as high pitch, falsetto, creaky voice, a 'gravelly' voice, breathy or whispery voice, nasalization, and loud or soft speech are variously used in many languages to indicate **respect, submission, mockery, boredom, romantic or sentimental feelings, impatience and many other things**; the details differ greatly from language to language.

Note that the term **paralanguage is sometimes used more narrowly**, to include only voice quality, and sometimes more broadly, to include most or even all aspects of **non-verbal communication**.

The sense given here is recommended, since suitable terms are already available for the narrower and broader senses. The equivalent of paralanguage can also be observed in **sign language**.

POLITENESS. The linguistic expression of courtesy and social position. While politeness has non-linguistic aspects, we are here concerned only with its linguistic expression. Except when we are deliberately looking for a confrontation, we normally take care to ensure that what we say (and what we don't say) is chosen appropriately so as to avoid embarrassing or offending anyone.

Sociolinguists often discuss politeness phenomena in terms of **face**. **Face is what you lose when you are embarrassed or humiliated in public**. We may distinguish your **1**- **positive face** (your need to maintain and demonstrate your **membership in a social group**) from **your 2- negative face** (your need to be **individual and independent**, to get what you want **without offending anyone**). A **face-threatening act** is any piece of behaviour which can easily make another person lose face; a face-saving act is any piece of behaviour which lessens or removes the threat of losing face.

The linguistic aspects of politeness have been much studied in recent years, and a number of important variables have been identified: **tone of voice**, **markers of status**, **terms of address**, **degrees of certainty or confidence**, **discourse markers** (like English **please**), the choice between speaking and **remaining silent**, **acceptability of direct questions (directness and indirectness (implicatures, etc.)**, and others. The rules of politeness **vary considerably from society to society**, and it is **very easy to give inadvertent offence when talking to speakers of another language**. For example, speakers of Malagasy (in Madagascar) consider it impolite to give direct answers to questions or to make predictions that might turn out to be wrong. Speakers of Navaho (in the USA) consider **it impolite to speak at all in the presence of a higher-ranking person**, or to p**rovide their own names**. Both Javanese and Japanese have rich and complex systems for the overt linguistic marking of status among speaker, listener and person talked about, **including both different vocabulary and different grammatical forms**, and failing to mark status appropriately is a grave breach of decorum. Note that it is inappropriate to say that X language is more polite than Y language. Different languages simply encode their normal level of politeness with different features.

PRAGMATICS. The branch of linguistics which studies **how utterances communicate meaning in context**. The study of meaning, commonly known as **semantics**, has long been one of the most daunting and difficult areas of language study. In the 1950s and 1960s, however, linguists and philosophers slowly began to realize that part of the difficulty lay in their failure to distinguish two quite different aspects of meaning.

The first type of meaning is **intrinsic to a linguistic expression** containing it, and it cannot be separated from that expression. **The study of this kind of meaning is the domain of semantics**, as we now understand the term. But there is a **second kind of meaning**, one which is not intrinsic to the linguistic expression carrying it, but which rather results from the **interaction of the linguistic expression with the context** in which is it used. And to the study of this kind of meaning we give a new name: **pragmatics**.

It should be noted that, outside the USA, the term pragmatics is often used in a much broader sense, so as to include a great number of phenomena that American linguists would regard as belonging strictly to sociolinguistics: such as politeness, narrativity, and the signalling of power relations.

PRESUPPOSITION. A presupposition is a proposition which, although **not formally stated**, is understood and **taken for granted in order for an utterance or a statement to make sense**. For example, the statement 'John's presentation was well received' presupposes that 'John gave a presentation'. Presuppositions differ from ENTAILMENTS in that if the statement is negated, 'John's presentation was not well received', then the presupposition still holds true (John still gave a presentation). Entailments, however, cannot be shown to hold true when statements are negated.

Presuppositions are important in discourse analysis because they can **point to speakers' or writers' commonsense assumptions, beliefs and attitudes that are taken as given** (may be shared by both of them). Analysis of presuppositions allows the discourse analyst to **identify implicit meanings** in texts. Presuppositions are also features of ***INTERTEXTUALITY*** in that they 'constitute something taken for granted by the text producer which can be interpreted in terms of **intertextual relations with previous texts of the text producer**' (Fairclough 1992: 121). However, Chapman and Routledge (2009: 179) warn that '[t]here is not a consensus among scholars in the field about what constitutes a **standard notion of presupposition** in linguistics and the philosophy of language'

TURN-TAKING. That aspect of conversational structure by which the identity of the speaker changes from time to time. In our idealized notion of a conversation, we expect the floor to pass from one individual to **another in an orderly manner**: one person speaks while the others remain silent, and then the speaker falls silent and another person takes the floor. What is interesting about this is that there **appear to be clear rules determining when and how the floor is handed over from one person to another (**which the conversation analyst tries to identify**)**: if there were not, a conversation would be merely a noisy jumble of several people trying to speak at once.

It was the American sociologist Harvey Sacks and his colleagues who first drew attention, in the 1970s, to the importance of turn-taking and the rules governing it. However, **these rules are by no means easy to discover**, and sociolinguists have in recent years devoted a good deal of study to trying to elucidate them. Moreover, it seems clear that **very young children do not understand the concept of turn-taking**, and specialists in language acquisition are therefore curious to find out how an understanding of turn-taking is acquired (and at what age). Similarly, the operation of turn-taking and the different ways in which keeping a turn, giving up a turn and interrupting **indicate power dynamics** have generated interest from discourse analysts and sociolinguists, especially with reference to the way that **men, women and mixed groups conduct conversations.**