ADDITIONAL HELP FOR LEARNERS AND TUTORS

The commentary of this book aims to be clear. Moreover, the copious examples are designed to not only illustrate points but also to show how theory can be put into action. Nevertheless, much is packed into this book; the point of these webpages is to help unpack it, should help be needed. The following four sections may be of use:

**An illustration of our approach** – For the purposes of exposition, our book focused on particular examples with particular concepts and frameworks in mind. Those examples were chosen because they contain something interesting that could be accounted for by those concepts and frameworks. However, this may lead to a rather atomistic impression. In this section, we take one short example and work it through in order to illustrate a more complete pragmatic analysis.

**Further reading guide** – It goes without saying that our book does not exist in a vacuum. Further readings can support (deepen or extend) what we have written about. In this section we provide groups of readings oriented to specific topics. It is important to note that these could form the basis of a week-by-week or session-by-session course reading list. What we present in our book is a particular view of pragmatics which does not always map straightforwardly onto the literature. The case in point is chapter 3 on informational pragmatics, which maps onto several areas in the literature. Consequently, we have split the area covered by chapter 3 into two reading groups, the first dealing with more structural (grammatical) phenomena, the second dealing with more cognitive (inferential) phenomena. Otherwise, our "topic readings" follow the core contents and order of our book chapters. Note that we have not attempted to provide exhaustive lists of readings. We (perhaps cynically!) believe in the law of diminishing returns when it comes to giving reading lists to students – a huge list of readings can simply seem overwhelming and deter any attempt at reading.

**Pragmatics-related websites** – Here we provide a list of websites relating to pragmatics that contain short descriptions of phenomena, papers to download, and information about conferences and associations.

**Methods** – As we try to show you in our book, integrative pragmatics is based on close engagement with data. In the first section mentioned above, the illustration of our approach, not only demonstrates our approach, but also offers a worked example of how to do a qualitative pragmatic analysis of interactional data (our use of film data here is primarily for the sake of exposition). Needless to say, there are other ways of engaging with data,. We cannot provide a full overview of the methods undertaken in pragmatics (we are, in fact, doing this in another book), but here we provide brief illustrations of common methods.

---

**AN ILLUSTRATION OF OUR APPROACH**

Consider the following excerpt from the movie, *Jeepers Creepers 2*, where a horrific flying creature is attacking high school children on a broken down bus:

[1] (Two high school boys, Scotty, who is a white American, and Deaundre,
who is an African American, are arguing over what to do about the creature)

Scotty: You want to play cock of the walk, bro?
Deaundre: Why do I think you want to call me something else?
        You want to call me something else, Scotty?
        ‘Cause I don’t think you get I can see you thinking it
        whether you say it or not.

(Jeepers Creepers 2, 2003)

Needless to say, for a more in-depth analysis we would need more information about the context and their behaviours, including, for example, whether they were friends, whether they liked each other, the experiences they had shared, their facial expressions and tone of voice. (While an analysis of the latter is precluded here, if one views the relevant clip, one will observe Deaundre’s slight frowning, up-turned chin, and eye gaze being fixed on Scotty, all of which lend themselves to a pre-analytic gloss of Deaundre’s turn as “emotionally heated”). As one might expect in an interaction between two speakers, deictic you is used by both, for each pointing to the other. The excerpt begins with Scotty challenging Deaundre about the suggestions he has been making in regard to how they should try to survive the attacks. He uses the formulaic expression, cock of the walk, which here means a “dominating or overbearing person in a group”, thereby implicating via a flout of the maxim of Relation that Deaundre is being overbearing in making these suggestions (i.e. a particular kind of utterance-type meaning). In doing so, Scotty also demonstrates awareness of a pecking order - a hierarchy of power or decision making - that is emerging in their group, and paints Deaundre’s suggestions as an attempt to gain a dominant position in that pecking order (i.e. a particular kind of interpersonal relation). The interrogative construction, along with the use of the referring expression bro by Scotty to address Deaundre frames this as a kind of baiting challenge (i.e. a particular kind of pragmatic act). From Deaundre’s response we can see that he takes bro to implicate something much more derogatory or offensive. Why do I think you want to call me something else? is a wh-interrogative structure embedding the presupposition that he does think that he wants to call him something else. In light of the fact that Scotty (a white American) is addressing an African American, and given the common ground between these characters and the others witnessing the exchange in regards to their understanding of race relations in the US at the time the movie was set, it is more than likely that Deaundre is alluding to a referring expression with racist overtones (i.e. indexing a particular kind of interpersonal attitude) in his response to Scotty. Deaundre responds to Scotty’s baiting challenge by issuing one of his own, namely, that Scotty come clean and use this more offensive referring expression. Being seen as racist, sexist or more generally impolite and offensive is often face damaging, something people seek to avoid. Note the pattern of pragmatic acts emerging here: challenge followed by challenge, a conflict spiral that may escalate their dispute into a physical altercation. However, while Deaundre attributes an intentional state to Scotty (i.e. the desire to call Deaundre something worse), he does not treat it as part of what was meant by Scotty. Instead, he marks it as a recipient meaning (i.e. a kind of pragmatic meaning distinct from speaker meaning), something which is derived independently of whatever Scotty is taken to intend to mean (I don’t think you get I can see you thinking it whether you say it or not). Nevertheless, Scotty is held accountable for having such an intentional state, namely, an offensive (possibly racist) interpersonal attitude and the desire to voice it. In attributing this attitude and desire to Scotty, Deaundre displays reflexive
thinking, that is, where one thinks about what others think one thinks and so on. In this case, Deaundre is asserting that he thinks that Scotty thinks that Deaundre won’t realise (i.e. think) that Scotty has a particular covert or tacit attitude underpinning his use of bro. It is also reflexive in that Deaundre himself indexes a particular attitude on his part that can be evaluated, in turn, with respect to a particular social discourse on race relations in the US, the latter of which forms part of their presumed common ground.

**FURTHER READING GUIDE**

**What might be worth buying?**
Well, you may well be reading this webpage because you have bought our book! Or maybe you have borrowed it from a library (possibly a university library). But perhaps you want to buy/borrow something to complement our book. A strong possibility is Archer, D. and P. Grundy (2011) *The Pragmatics Reader*, Routledge. This Reader contains many of the classic pragmatics works (usually somewhat abbreviated). Alternatively, if you want to read another that book is consistent with the kind of pragmatics promoted in this book, we recommend Thomas, J. A. (1995) *Meaning in Interaction*, Longman (it’s also quite entertaining). It does not, however, cover all key pragmatics topics (there is nothing on presuppositions, for example). You could patch this deficit up with readings from the Reader. But we would recommend that you supplement it with this pragmatics textbook: Birner, B. (2013) *Introduction to Pragmatics*, Wiley-Blackwell Routledge. This is an excellent overview of the traditional areas, and one that is genuinely accessible.


Coming at things from a completely different angle, it may be that our book has inspired your interest in the English language. If that is the case, we recommend Culpeper, J., Katamba, F., Kerswill, P., Wodak, R. and T. McEnery (2009) *English Language: Description, Variation and Context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave. This huge (over 700 pages!), though relatively inexpensive, volume covers practically every aspect of English language study, and is pitched at first year undergraduate level.

**Encyclopedias and handbooks**

Mey, J. L. (1998) *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*, Pergamon Press contains very useful overviews of most topic areas. However, for something more up-to-date and an excellent starting point, consider Cummings, L. (ed.) (2009) *Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*, Routledge. For more comprehensive discussions, there are several

**Topic readings**

We have divided each topic list into two parts: 'recommended' readings we consider to be particularly important for students; 'additional' readings are optional extras. In each of these sub-sections, we supply a number of readings. We do this, not because we would expect students to read all of them (some overlap in content), but simply because some books may be available whilst others are not. Note that the readings are alphabetically listed; they do not reflect an order of priority.

**REFERENTIAL PRAGMATICS**

**Recommended**

Archer, D. and P. Grundy (2011) *The Pragmatics Reader*. Routledge. [There are two chapters on deixis, 4.1 and 4.2.]

Birner, B. (2012) *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Wiley-Blackwell. [Chapter 4 on reference is excellent.]


**Additional**


Fox, Barbara (1987) *Discourse Structure and Anaphora: Written and Conversational English*. Cambridge University Press. [Covers anaphora and other phenomena in a way that is in tune interactional pragmatics.]


**INFORMATIONAL PRAGMATICS I: INFORMATION STRUCTURE**

**Recommended**

Birner, B. (2012) *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Wiley-Blackwell. [Chapter 7 is an excellent overview of information structure (this is the author’s particular area of expertise) (there is a little logical notation here, but this is fully explained in the opening chapter). Chapter 5 is a good overview of presuppositions.]

**Additional**
Archer, D. and P. Grundy (2011) The Pragmatics Reader. Routledge. [There are two chapters on presuppositions, 2.4 and 2.5.]
Lambrecht, Knud (1994) Information structure and sentence form. Cambridge University Press. [The major work in the area of information structure. Dip into bits that are of interest.]
Levinson, S.C. (1983) Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 4 on presuppositions, BUT this is heavy reading. Focus on the most useful bit - the list of presuppositional triggers, pp.181-184.].
Yule, G. (1996) Pragmatics. Oxford University Press. [Chapter 4 provides an excellent, though very brief, overview of presuppositions.]

**INFORMATIONAL PRAGMATICS II: ASSOCIATIVE INFERENCING**

**Recommended**

**Additional**
Scollon, R. and Scollon, S.W. (1995) Intercultural Communication, Blackwell. [Chapter 4 discusses how background knowledge is an issue in cross-cultural communication.]

**PRAGMATIC MEANING I**

**Recommended**
Archer, D. and P. Grundy (2011) The Pragmatics Reader. Routledge. [2.3 for Grice’s classic work; 3.1 for Levinson with Neo-Gricean pragmatics; and 3.2.1, and also 3.2.2, for Relevance theory.]
Birner, B. (2012) Introduction to Pragmatics. Wiley-Blackwell. [Chapters 2 and 3 on Grice, the NeoGriceans and Relevance Theory.]
Clark, B. (2013) Relevance Theory. Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 5 gives a useful and up-to-date overview of the relevance theoretic notions of explicature and implicature.]
reprinted, along with other key papers by Grice, in H.P. Grice (1989) *Studies in the Way of Words.*

Huang, Y. (2007) *Pragmatics.* Oxford University Press. [Chapter 2 on Grice. Note this includes a clear summary of two Neo-Gricean theories.]


**Additional**


Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986) *Relevance: Communication and cognition,* Blackwell. [The classic work on relevance theory; there is also a second edition published in 1995 which is slightly better.]


**PRAGMATIC MEANING II**

**Recommended**


**Additional**

Haugh, M. (2013) Speaker meaning and accountability in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 48, 41-56. [Expands upon the discussion in section 5.4.1 on pragmatic meaning and accountability.]

Haugh, M. (2014) *(Im)politeness Implicatures.* Mouton de Gruyter [Chapter 3 on implicatures, social action and indeterminacy expands upon the discussion in section 5.4 on pragmatic meaning in interactional contexts.]

**PRAGMATIC ACTS**

**Recommended**

Archer, D. and P. Grundy (2011) The Pragmatics Reader. Routledge. [There are two chapters on speech acts, 2.1 and 2.2.]
Longman. [Chapters/sections on speech acts, and also the final chapter on speech events and activity types.]

Additional
Austin, J.L. 1962 How to do Things with Words, Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Austin’s classic work.]

INTERPERSONAL PRAGMATICS

Recommended
Archer, D. and P. Grundy (2011) The Pragmatics Reader. Routledge. [Chapters 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 are all highly relevant.]
Kádár, D. Z. and M. Haugh (2013) Understanding Politeness. Cambridge University Press. [Introduces the field of politeness research in an accessible overview of... ]
concepts and approaches used in the field to date; see especially chapters 2 to 5.]

Additional
Lakoff, R. (1973) ‘The logic of politeness; or, minding your p's and q's’, Chicago Linguistic Society. [Lakoff’s classic work on politeness.]

METAPRAGMATICS

Recommended
Grundy, P. (2008) Doing Pragmatics (3rd edn). Hodder. [Chapter 7 offers a useful introduction to the ways in which metapragmatic awareness can be signalled in interaction.]

Additional


[Top]

Pragmatics-related websites

http://plato.stanford.edu/index.html
The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. This outstanding online encyclopaedia includes articles on language and philosophy which overlap with pragmatics. For example, check out the entries on convention, Grice, indexicals, pragmatics, presupposition, reference and speech acts. Of course, bear in mind that you are not getting a complete overview of these topics – you are getting the perspective from philosophy.

http://online.sfsu.edu/kbach/
Kent Bach’s home page. This seems to contain all of Kent Bach’s published outputs made easily accessible online. Many classic topics are covered. The emphasis is rather more on philosophical aspects of pragmatics.

http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/index.html
This website reflects the fact that pragmatics in North America is often pursued within departments or research centres orientated to second language acquisition (SLA). This is the website of the Centre for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA), based at the University of Minnesota (USA). Pragmatics in the context of SLA is often preoccupied with speech acts, and this is what these pages are devoted to. They contain descriptions of particular speech acts, associated bibliography, as well as content on learning strategies.

The website of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA). It contains material relating to their events, publications and other activities.

http://research.shu.ac.uk/politeness/
The website of the Linguistic Politeness Research Group (LPRG). It contains material relating to their events, publications and other activities.

http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/impoliteness/index.htm
The idea behind this website was to reproduce some of Jonathan Culpeper’s thinking on impoliteness, shaped by a three-year fellowship, in a more digestible form than a book length monograph.

METHODS

Here, we will briefly illustrate and comment on four methods used in pragmatics research.

(1) Naturally-occurring

We take naturally-occurring language data to be any language data other than that created to illustrate linguistic, including pragmatic, points of discussion. Prototypically, people think of naturally-occurring data as spoken face-to-face interaction, such as the following example:

[TV documentary, *The Clampers*. S1 = a traffic warden; S2 and S3 = the car’s owners]

S1: the car is going he has a
S2: what the fuck you doing . excuse me what are you fucking doing
S3:

<S2 hits S1 in mouth - S1 starts speed dialling on the phone>

S1: court order police please yeah <indistinct>
S2: really . you want some fucking money right
S3: all you have to do is

S1:
S2: all you have to do is ask for the money you don’t have
S3: ask for the fucking money right

S1: you can’t get in the car madam
S2: to fucking take the car piss off <indistinct>
S3: jackie come here

Note that any representation of such data involves transcription, and transcription involves interpretation of the original. The above example is a ‘stave transcription’, which represents all the participants involved in a ‘stave’, so that it is easy to see when they are speaking and when they are not. Transcriptions can be broad or delicate, depending on their level of detail. The above example is fairly broad; it does not include any information about prosody, example, or much information about non-verbal aspects. Note that a screenshot of video data can often help in this respect.
The next example, following CA (Conversation Analysis) transcription conventions, which were originally developed by Gail Jefferson, illustrates a more delicate and detailed approach to transcription.

32 Sher: You didn’t come t’ talk t’ Karen?
33 (0.4)
34 Mark: No, Karen (.) Karen ’n I ’r having a fight.
35 (.)
36 After-sh’ went out with Keith (the night before.)
37 Sher: [(
38 Ruth: [UH HUH HUH HUH
39 (0.2)
40 Ruth: .huh .huh
41 ?: ((sniff))
42 Kar: [W’ll Mark you never asked me ou:t.

(Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974: 717)

In our book you will notice that we sometimes used these transcription conventions and sometimes we did not. The use of transcription conventions depends on the kind of analysis that is being carried out. While it is sometimes thought that a more detailed transcription always represents best practice, our view is that it only represents best practice to the extent that such details actually enter into the analysis of that data. We have thus avoided fine-grained transcriptions in our book when such details were not relevant to the discussion at hand or the nature of the data itself did not warrant it. You can find a list of what the various conventions mean and tutorials on how to carry out CA transcription at websites created by Charles Antaki or Emanuel Schegloff:

http://homepages.lboro.ac.uk/~ssca1/sitemenu.htm
http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/schegloff/TranscriptionProject/index.html

There are, of course, other approaches to transcription. Transcribing Talk and Interaction (2011, John Benjamins) by Christopher Jenks provides a useful and accessible overview of the issues involved in transcribing naturally occurring spoken interaction.

Naturally-occurring data can also be written, as illustrated by this text appearing on a medicine bottle:

**DO NOT EXCEED THE STATED DOSE**

If symptoms persist, consult your doctor

Of course, this is also a transcription of the actual data, as the ‘real’ data involved a slightly different font, size and colour. Indeed, an image of the label would have provided more detail. Note that interactional electronic data (emails, blogs, tweets, etc.) are also written.

(2) **Role-play**

The method of role-play moves one step away from naturally-occurring data, in that that situation is contrived by the linguist to a degree. Participants are usually given a card with instructions about the role they should play. Other participant(s) are similarly given card(s) with relevant instructions for the other role(s). Here is an example of an instruction card:
You are attending the first session of a University course. You do not know the other people on the course. You have just lost your mobile phone. Unfortunately, there are no public payphones that take coins, yet you need to make a call to a friend whom you promised to meet at the station later that day. You decide to ask one of the other students on the course.

So, the situation is contrived, but the specifics of what the participants actually say and how they interact are not.

(3) Discourse completion tasks

Discourse completion tasks (DCTs) are in some respects a kind of questionnaire. As with role-play, a written instruction creates a particular situation, and then participant writes what they would have said. Here is an example:

**Fill in the blanks for the following scenarios**

A) You're on a university residential course, but you forgot to tell your friend (visiting from London) that you wouldn't be able to meet her at Lancaster station. There aren't any coin phones on campus. You decide to ask another student on the course if you can use their mobile. What do you say?

…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..

B) You're on a university residential course, but you forgot to tell your friend (visiting from London) that you wouldn't be able to meet her at Lancaster station. There aren't any coin phones on campus. You decide to ask your tutor if you can use their phone. What do you say?

…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..

Note that A and B manipulate the power parameter. This method is efficient in achieving a lot of data, and for enabling researchers to tweak certain parameters of the interaction. However, it has been much criticized for being unnaturalistic. Note, for example, that participants are asked to imagine a situation, and then they have to write what they would have said.

(4) Judgment tasks

Again, judgment tasks involve a kind of questionnaire. The informant is presented with a scenario, and asked to assess an utterance according to a scale or number of scales. The following is an example:

**Scenario:** At a gathering of staff in the factory meeting room, the boss is explaining the work-schedule for that day. An employee is chatting to workmates about what they are going to do that night. The employee says to the boss “You aren’t being quiet”.


Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about what was said:

* It was inappropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree somewhat</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* It was hurtful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree somewhat</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* It was impolite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree somewhat</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As with DCTs, we are quite far away from naturally-occurring data here.

These are not of course the only methods one might deploy in pragmatics research. Interviews and focus groups are amongst the methods that one could add, and then there are experimental methods that involve the examination of brain activity, such as MRI scans (often in order to study activity). One particular area that has seen an explosion of activity over the last decade also concerns corpus-based methods, and has resulted in the rise of Corpus Pragmatics.

We would not argue that any method is without value. Every method has its own strengths and weaknesses. For example, more naturalistic methods involving a greater degree of qualitative analysis may be limited in the extent to which their findings can be generalised; in contrast, less naturalistic methods involving a greater degree of quantitative analysis may be limited in the extent to which their findings can be claimed to be authentic. The important thing is to know those strengths and weaknesses, and to acknowledge them. And, of course, a mixed methods approach can compensate for the weaknesses of a particular approach.