



مجلة كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية

مجلة علمية فصلية محكمة تصدرها كلية التربية للعلوم
الانسانية - جامعة ذي قار

ISSN:2707-5672

المجلد (11) العدد (4) 2021

جامعة ذي قار -- كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية - مجلة كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية
utjedh@utq.edu.iq

Vol (11) No.(4) 2021

هيئة التحرير

أ.م.د احمد عبد الكاظم لجلاج
مدير التحرير

أ.د انعام قاسم خفيف
رئيس هيئة التحرير

الاختصاص	الجامعة	الاسم	ت
طرائق تدريس	جامعة بغداد	أ.د. سعد علي زاير	1
اللغة العربية	جامعة ذي قار	أ.د. مصطفى لطيف عارف	2
علم النفس	جامعة كربلاء	أ.د. حيدر حسن اليعقوبي	3
اللغة الانكليزية	جامعة ذي قار	أ.د. عماد ابراهيم داود	4
علم النفس	جامعة عمان	أ.د. صلاح الدين احمد	5
الجغرافية	جامعة اسويط	أ.د. حسام الدين جاد الرب احمد	6
التاريخ	جامعة صفاقس/تونس	أ.د. عثمان برهومي	7
التاريخ	جامعة ذي قار	أ.م.د. حيدر عبد الجليل عبد الحسين	8
ارشاد تربوي	جامعة البصرة	أ.د. فاضل عبد الزهرة مزعل	9
الجغرافية	جامعة ذي قار	أ.م. انتصار سكر خيون	10

المحتويات

اسم الباحث و عنوان البحث	ت
دلالة حروف الجر المتصلة بلفظ الملائكة في القرآن الكريم (دراسة تحليلية وصفية) م . م . سارة هاشم عبد اليمه الركابي	1
الكفاءة الذاتية المدركة لدى موظفي صحة ذي قار أ.م.د عبد العباس فضيب شاطي فاطمة كامل صكر	2
دور الانشطة التعليمية والترفيهية في توعية طفل الروضة بالثقافة الصحية من وجهة نظر المعلمات والامهات م. د ليلى نجم ثجيل	3
جمهورية ايطاليا في مرحلة التأسيس (1946-1948) (دراسة في اوضاعها السياسية والاقتصادية) م.م غازي عيدان راضي الحجيمي	4
نحو الجملة ونحو النص، رؤى في الاختلاف والمقاربة ا.د أسعد خلف العوادي م. نسوم عوني حسون	5
سياسة باكستان الداخلية والخارجية من خلال جريدة العراق 1979-1988 ا.م.د سبأه طلال ياسين	6
المرونة المعرفية لدى الهيئة التدريسية في ظل التعليم الالكتروني م.د حسين زغير محيسن	7
فاعلية استخدام استراتيجيات الصف المقلوب في تنمية مهارات الكتابة الإبداعية باللغة الإنجليزية لدى طالبات الصف الثاني الثانوي د. إيمان طا د. إيمان طارق صالح ريس د. ختام محمد حمدان الغزو	8
التفاؤل المتعلم لدى الموظفين بالأجر اليومي في جامعة ذي قار أ.د انعام قاسم خفيف منار نعيم مطشر	9

سلطة الأنساق الثقافية في شعر المرأة العربية في عصري الجاهلية والإسلام	10
أ.د حسين علي الدخيلي م.م هند كامل خضير	
الاستبداد في الاستحواذ على غنائم الحرب	11
أ.د. كاظم محمد محراث الباحثة فاطمة لامي عبد	
ألفاظ النوم في القرآن الكريم دراسة دلالية	12
أ.م. د. يعقوب يوسف خلف أ.م. د. حيدر علي حلو الخرسان	
الاثر السياسي لمؤتمر كربلاء عام 1922 والموقف البريطاني منه	13
م. شيماء ياس خضير العامري م. فاطمة عبد الجليل ياسر	
تداولية التلقي - مقارنة منهجية	14
م. د. زينب هاشم حسين	
الأخطاء اللغوية في العملة العراقية	15
د. حامد حسين حنيح	
تقييم النخبة الأكاديمية العراقية لتغطية القنوات الفضائية العراقية لجائحة كورونا العالمية	16
د. حسين جاسم جابر	
الذكاء الشخصي الذاتي لدى طلبة الجامعة	17
أ.د. عبد الكريم عطا كريم م.م. صباح مهدي راضي	
الأوضاع الاقتصادية في نقرة السلطان 1921-1968	18
أ.د. عماد جاسم حسن الباحث عبد الله خير الله مسير	

<p>طبيعة تحركات الامام السجاد(ع) بعد واقعة الطف م . م : وسن عبد الامير حمود</p>	<p>19</p>
<p>الأمتحان الشامل لطلبة الأقسام العلمية في كلية التربية ابن رشد للعلوم الإنسانية مؤشر لضمان جودة البرنامج التعليمي صفاء طارق حبيب كرمه فاتن خيري محمد سعيد الرفاعي</p>	<p>20</p>
<p>Conversational Stylistics: Conversational Pragmatic Perspectives Dr. Hussein Huwail Ghayadh</p>	<p>21</p>

الأسلوبية التحوارية: رؤى تداولية تحاورية

Conversational Stylistics: Conversational Pragmatic Perspectives

Dr. Hussein Huwail Ghayadh

Faculty of Basic Education University of Thi-Qar- thi qar - iraq

م. د حسين حويل غياض

كلية التربية الأساسية- جامعة ذي قار - ذي قار- العراق

huwailhussein@utq.edu.iq

**Keywords: Stylistics, Conversational Stylistics, Conversational
Pragmatics, Contextual Comprehension, Theme**

الكلمات الرئيسية: الأسلوبية ، أساليب المحادثة ، البراغماتية التخاطبية ، الفهم السياقي ، الموضوع

الملخص

التداولية الحوارية (التخاطبية) هي مجال دراسي يركز على كيفية تشفير وفك تشفير الأشخاص للمحادثات. في بعض الأحيان ، يمكن إدراك التعبيرات اللغوية على إنها ناتجة من الارتباط المتجذر والمتداول الذي يناسب لشكل معين مع معنى تداولي محدد (التعبيرات التداولية الاتفاقية). هذه التعبيرات لا تعتمد على التوقعات حول طبيعة السياق ، لكن البعض الآخر ليس كذلك ، أي يجب أن يكون هناك سياق. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى إثبات أن الأسلوبية تلعب دوراً حيوياً في التداولية الحوارية آخذين بنظر الاعتبار أن المحادثة هي تواصل اجتماعي لغوي معتبرين أن استخدام اللغة ، كنتيجة للاختيارات الأسلوبية ، هو مجموعة متنوعة من الآليات الضمنية والظاهرة التي يعتقد الناس من خلالها أن المعرفة الموجودة في السياق هي عنصر حاسم في ترميز المعاني وفك تشفيرها. تُبنى فرضية البحث على أن بعض الخيارات الأسلوبية تكشف عن معرفة متبادلة (مشتركة) لها تأثير ملحوظ على التواصل البشري. وتُظهر النتائج أن التداولية الحوارية ما هي إلا انعكاس للعلاقة بين

الخيارات الأسلوبية والسياق. وهنا يجب على المُخاطب (المُرسل) الذي يقترح مقولة ما ممكن معرفة ماتدل عليه بطريقة ما من خلال افتراضه أن المرسل إليه (المُخاطب) مستعد لتوفير سياق يسمح بفهم هذا التفسير كون السياقات تعمل كدوافع لتوليد تعبيرات لغوية معينة (اختيارات أسلوبية). أما عدم التوافق بين السياق الذي يتوقعه المرسل والسياق الذي يستخدمه المرسل إليه يؤدي إلى حدوث تفسير خاطئ ومن ثم يؤدي إلى سوء الفهم.

Abstract

Conversational pragmatics is a field of study that focuses on how people encode and decode conversation. Sometimes linguistic expressions are perceived from the appropriately deep-rooted and conventionalized correlation of a certain form with a specific pragmatic meaning (conventionalized pragmatic expressions). These expressions do not count upon expectations about the nature of the context; but others are not, i.e. there should be a context. This study aims at proving that stylistics plays a vital role in conversational pragmatics taking into account that conversation is a linguistic social communication. Language use, as a result of stylistic choices, is a variety of effective connotative and denotative devices by which people think of contextually existing knowledge as a crucial component of encoding and decoding meanings. It is hypothesized that certain stylistic choices reveal mutual (shared) knowledge that has a remarkable influence upon human communication. The findings show that conversational pragmatics is a reflection of the correlation between stylistic choices and context. An addresser who proposes an utterance to be inferred in a specific manner must also assume the addressee to be ready for providing a context that permits that interpretation to be captured because contexts work as motives for generating certain linguistic expressions (stylistic choices). An incompatibility between the context anticipated by the addresser and the one used by the addressee may give rise to a misinterpretation and then leads to miscommunication.

1. Introduction

The conversation is a cooperative communicative process between two or more participants who follow certain social rules, such rules rely on social conventions (standards, norms, etc.). Conversation, in the viewpoint of Thornbury and Slade (2006, p. 25), "is the kind of speech that happens informally, symmetrically and for the purposes of establishing and maintaining social ties." Social ties can be realized and categorized as definite procedures for conversation develop from the cooperative principles to accomplish useful and powerful conversational communication (participants' cooperation). Conversational pragmatics, as argued by Luppicini (2008, p. 339), "deals with conversation use and how people construct and interpret language . . . and emphasizes how utterances are understood in conversation", i.e. how participants realize, understand, and produce a useful conversation. Participants' conversations stand for a harmonized arrangement of speech acts which are contained within wide-ranging conversation structures. These conversation structures are socially and stylistically constructed.

The concept of stylistics is applied in a wide range of linguistic perspectives by different linguists. The area on which stylistics works on is the linguistic realization and linguistic functions of spoken or written language. Stylistics, as pointed out by Nørgaard et al (2010, p. 1), "is the study of the ways in which meaning is created through language in literature as well as in other types of text". As methods of stylistic analysis, linguistic frameworks are used to give the detail of and explicate "how and why a text works as it does". According to the stylistic methods, linguistic levels such as phonetic, phonological, lexical, grammatical, semantic,

pragmatic ones can be traced, investigated, and interpreted. Part of these levels works as a stimulus to uncover and communicate different interpretations. A step further, language in use, as pragmatic realization (Verschueren, 1991, p. 1), can be examined stylistically. The relationship between stylistics and pragmatics can be searched, viewed, and perceived as relevant to the topic of pragmastylistic studies. Here linguistic choices are constrained by different types of context (social, cultural, and so on). Hickey (1993, p. 578) identified the relationship between stylistics and pragmatics stating that "Pragmastylistics is stylistics but with a pragmatic component added to it . . . involves the study of all the conditions, linguistic and extralinguistic, ". Pragmastylistic focuses on the variation of linguistic choices and how these choices with their semantic implications can be manipulated with the help of context to achieve certain pragmatic goals. From this perspective, conversations, as an area of linguistic study, can be studied stylistically (as linguistic choices) and pragmatically (as interpersonal exchange or turns).

In spoken or written language, the speaker attempts to select certain effective linguistic structures, while on the part of the hearer, these linguistic structures motivate him to anticipate a certain context (circumstances and background of the communication). In both cases selecting or motivating, stylisticians are interested to describe these linguistic structures. Describing the two processes (selecting and motivating) helps in realizing and perceiving the appropriate or inappropriate, effective or ineffective (powerless) linguistic utterances. In this regard, particularly that of utterance appropriateness, Grice (1975: 43) pointed out that the communicatively appropriate characteristics of utterances commonly implicate deliberate meanings (addresser's meaning) that are reasonably different from the pragmatic content of what is truly

stated. Grice asserted that addressers' meanings are effectively communicated through processes of conversational implicature in which addressers use what they know about hearers and about the conversational context to transfer certain meanings. Similarly, recipients depend on related kinds of information to understand these meanings.

Bearing a conversational companion's information in mind is surely central for keeping to the principles put forward by theories of the cooperative principle and its associated conversational maxims. To effectively transfer a certain message, addressers need to be familiar with that the hearers will be able to decide what the intended meanings are. In accordance with, to solve these conversational implicatures, hearers be obliged to take into account not merely the conventional meanings of the addresser's utterances, but also consider the context: Physical context (what is going on around, objects adjacent the communication, time and place of the communication, i.e. physical factors at play); linguistic context (what has been said before in the conversation, i.e. discourse that surrounds a language component and facilitates to govern its explanation); social context (the social bond among individuals engaged in social interaction, i.e. the culture they live in and individuals that they cooperate communicatively with); epistemic context (what is known by both speaker and hearer, i.e. relevant background knowledge). Van dijk (1972, p. 172) pointed out that there is a certain relationship between stylistics and pragmatics, stylistics "coincides with the theory of performance and with pragmatics." So it is possible to say that stylistics is the vehicle of the speaker or writer's intention based on Van Dijk's idea that there is some sort of coincidence between stylistics and pragmatics. This coincidence can be seen through the direct engagement of the speaker or writer's linguistic choices from varieties of grammatically satisfactory linguistic structures.

As a matter of assumption, it seems that to understand how people communicate effectively, one has to keep in mind that mutual stylistic choices with their contextual implications (mutual knowledge) play a very important factor in determining the addressers' intended meanings.

2. Utterance Meaning and Context

Undeniable fact, the linguistic context is not enough to understand the interpretation of the utterance. The relationship between words, phrases, and even a number of successive utterances is not enough to make the addressee decode and makes sense of the addresser's message. For example:

1. a. Are you sure he will?

b. I am not sure, but he might.

a. I think he has to do it as others ordered him.

b. perhaps he will do his best.

Utterances in **1a** and **1b** are ambiguous utterances because there are no specified and directed referents. Also without situational context, which refers to a particular speech environment, speakers are unable to convey or interpret what the conversation is. Pronouns without antecedents, modal and auxiliary verbs without enough finite verbs make utterances hard to be conceived. Systematic stylistic choices without situational context give the impression of the grammaticality of the sentence but without accomplishing the second condition of each sentence which is related to its acceptability. From this short turn-taking example, it is possible to realize to what extent that linguistic context or linguistic cohesion is not enough to comprehend the speaker's intentions.

According to their linguistic structures (stylistic choices) or situational appropriateness (pragmatic perspectives), utterances with the same meaning, as stated by Hickey (1993, p. 578), are stylistically different.

Sometimes the evaluation of an utterance depends on convention. In this respect, Grice (1989: 298) argues that conventions are not the basic necessity to sentence meaning, pragmatically it is an utterance (word, phrase, clause or sentence) meaning (utterance meaning: pragmatically utterance is more comprehensive than a sentence), but it indeed helps in detecting meaning, i.e. it is one of the ways. Coupled with, the evaluation of utterances depends on its context (cultural and social contexts), sometimes depends on indexical references (time and place), or sometimes quantifiers play a crucial role since they are the contextually determined domain of discourse.

Schlenker (2004: 2) argues that, in communication, context plays a very crucial role. For this reason, he proposes that there are two types of contexts: *Thought Context* and *Utterance Context*. The first one (thought context) is the argument at which thought creates; it contains the person who thinks, time duration of thought, and an atmosphere of thought (in some circumstances a thought might also have a proposed recipient). The context of utterance is the argument at which the thought is communicated; it contains an addresser, an addressee, time duration of utterance, and an atmosphere of utterance. Here a question may arise: to what extent there is a relationship between the propositional context and what the addresser or addressee have in their mind? In this sense, it is essential to know that the propositional components of the context are those speaker and hearer share or the addresser supposes that he shares with the addressee.

Context and linguistic choices, linguistic choices as an area of stylistics, are overlapping. Sometimes the use of linguistic choices may influence context, or the context determines what type of linguistic choices should be used having in mind that appropriateness is a determinant factor in social relationships. Investigating one of the above perspectives, particularly the

impact of the generic pronoun 'he' as a linguistic choice on the social academic generic context, will lead to realizing that this type of pronouns affects comprehension, so it is problematic. For example, a professor addressing his students:

2. a. If anyone buys *his* article on the internet, *he* will never be rewarded for his efforts.

The stylistic choice of the generic pronoun 'he', for some addressees is unacceptable since it eliminates reference to the female students. Here the sex-specific interpretation of the masculine pronoun 'he' governs the contextual comprehension. The indefinite pronoun 'anyone', as an antecedent, cannot be categorized as a determinant or decisively antecedent to support the addressees' interpretation of the generic pronoun. Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, in its weak version, here indicates that sexist use of the generic pronoun influences the professor's and the addressees' thoughts. The generic use of 'he' reproduces male societal power (perpetuation of social male domination), males have superiority and social unfairness between males and females. Unacceptability and inappropriateness of the above one-sided viewpoint can be stylistically modified to reduce the negative social implication. The stylistic modification contributes to accomplishing the professor's aim through using he/she combination as a non-sexist alternative:

b. If anyone buys *his* or *her* article on the internet, *he* or *she* will never be rewarded for *his* or *her* efforts.

In **2b**, the specific use of pronouns reveals a non-sexist interpretation of linguistic choice of pronouns. Not only he/she combination or specific use of pronouns, plurality or what is called unspecified sex, can be realized and comprehended as a remedy:

c. Students who buy *their* articles on the internet will never be rewarded for *their* efforts.

A step further, it is essential to know that people sometimes communicate their unclear beliefs in normal contexts. In other words, it is important to have an idea about the interpretation of probability.

3. Interpretation of Probability (Belief Strength)

It is not easy to determine the degree of strength of the addresser's belief (interpretation of probability). For example, if someone tells us:

3. A: Can you guess the percentage of John's passing this year?

B: There is a 50% chance that John can pass this year.

Does utterance 3b mean anything valuable? Here Grice's cooperative principle shows that the above utterance is restricted by certain Gricean pragmatic conversational standards.

To elaborate, the maxims of quantity in which the speaker should be economical and informative, just saying a certain percentage of '*passing*' encodes a message without further details (not saying too much or too little). The maxim of relation, according to the strategies of the interpretation of probability or communicating uncertainty, the listener is interested or concerned with the information he can handle to anticipate expected conditions of the future events, here the probability of '*passing*'. The maxim of quality strongly advises the addresser to communicate the truthfulness or non-truthfulness of the probability of '*passing*'. In the preceding example, neither the achievement nor non-achievement of '*passing*' authenticates or refutes the '50% chance' assertion. Here having due regard for the idea that stylistics focuses on how things are linguistically constructed, maxim of manner can be considered the most convenient maxim among others to stylistics.

In conversational pragmatic respect, stylistic concentration on linguistic structure variety coincides with Grice's perspectives of manner maxims particularly when he indicated that the maxim of manner refers to "HOW

what is said to be said" (Grice 1975: 46). From a stylistic viewpoint, well-organizing and minimizing the linguistic structures to be brief can be comprehended as one criterion of manner maxim, while from a pragmatic perspective, maximization and appropriateness of the message content to avoid obscurity contribute to transmitting the planned and intended illocutionary aspect to the recipient. This can reveal an idea that remarkable stylistic impacts can be realized by making use of the rules and criteria of communication. Therefore, people must be aware of how to use language with, to some extent, perfect realization and comprehension of the proposed communicative meaning. As Jeffrey (1992: 41) argued, "learning to use a language properly is in large part like learning such skills as riding bicycles and flying airplanes. One must train oneself to have the right sorts of responses to various sorts of experiences, where the responses are degrees of belief in propositions."

4. Stylistic Choices and Contextual Boundaries

The major functions of language are to communicate, transfer information, and express certain feelings and emotions. Linguistic choices, as stylistic variations, appeal to individuals to perform speech acts according to different communicative situations, to show agreement or disagreement with the transferred information, or to show positive reactions towards emotions and feelings. Context varieties require different varieties of linguistic choices and common expressions that are appropriate to certain specific contexts.

It is essential to think that there is not a one-to-one relationship between grammar and pragmatics (between structure and function). What someone says may look like lacking information but could be an indirect way of demanding things. For example, we identify that if somebody says:

4. Behaviourism is a good theory that can be applied in teaching.

I have a certain problem with understanding earthquakes, is it possible to explain them?

a. Come in time.

Here the speaker in (4a) wants to convey certain information to the hearer; in (4b) is asking the listener to give enough information about earthquakes; while in (4c) the speaker orders the listener to be committed in time. In this regard and according to the influence of context, it seems there are probable and straightforward linguistic techniques to create meanings through the best normal way of giving information is a statement (4a), the best normal way of asking for information is a question (4b) and the best normal way of obliging others to do something is a command (4c). But, in fact, the linguistic context, especially the grammatical context, does not always work as straightforward and predictable rules to understand the intention of the speaker. In other words, sometimes the grammatical structure gives the listener a different understanding not based on previous grammatical rules, for example:

b. I will be there at 10 p.m.

c. Would you mind arriving in time?

Here in (4c) the statement, as a grammatical statement structure, is not used to convey information, but it is used to express promise; while in (4d) the grammatical interrogative structure is not used for asking about information the speaker lacks but it is used to express request.

In this sense, the listener's demanding information and speaker's giving information or expressing ideas are not often realized at the grammatical dimension then at the semantic aspect which is mostly connected with using individual words or sentences, i.e. syntactic structures and conceptual

semantics are not enough. To put it another way, there is no straightforward and predictable linguistic context approach that the listeners follow to detect the meaning. Due to this, it is determinate to propose that pragmatic factors provide listeners with adequate tools for understanding the intentions of speakers. In this respect, Ahlsen (2005: 434) argued that "looking at language and communication in different social activities provides clues to the roles of different determining factors behind the observed behaviours."

5. Conversational Optimal Relevance, Context, and Stylistics

In relation to relevance theory, Sperber & Wilson (1986:15) pointed out the contextual factors of a certain utterance are regarded as a "psychological construct", in effect, it is the supposed paradigm of the beliefs arising from the addressee concerning the world. Beliefs as such characterize the arguments on which the addressee relies on the understanding of an offered utterance. Certain conversational utterances are optimally appropriate particularly when they permit the addressee to realize the proposed implication of the addresser's message with no excessive attempt. Such implications offer the addressee the suitable advantages required.

In parallel with this, Gutt (1998: 43) proposed that advantages as such are certainly 'psychological' because of their being made up of definite knowledge belonging to a certain person, and are categorized as "positive contextual effects". Here when a certain person considers communicating a definite matter as we would expect, transfers the assumption that what he/she will transfer is maintained to be "optimally relevant to the addressee". From this point of view, optimal relevance serves the addressee to read between the lines and comprehend the effects of the contextual aspects of a certain utterance proposed by the addresser. Contextual

elements permit the addressee to construct proper anticipations with respect to the probable access to the contextual items that will be needed for accurate interpretation. The addressee, for that reason, initiates the process of interpretation with the manipulation of the points gained. To realize the assumption that the addressee will make when he merges the points he has gained with the suitable contextual knowledge, Morini (2013: 20) stated that the utterance will by all means put forwards or suggest the interpretation whose handing out has demanded definite effort to be employed. Making use of such beliefs, the addressee will oblige by the procedure of analysis as far as he touches the topic of interpretation that comes across, an interpretation that conveys about suitable and optimal contextual influences along with it is inferable with minor engagement (Gutt, 1998: 44).

Together with, Hatim and Mason (1990: 95) argued that the communication of new aspects engaged with a certain utterance and the deep-rooted knowledge identified by the addressee may give rise to contextual results connected with three conceivable categories. It might increase old-held expectations as soon as the new aspects admit the deep-rooted knowledge. Equally, it might weaken or eradicate unacceptable or incorrect expectations when the new aspects conflict with the deep-rooted knowledge. The third perspective is that the combination of the first-hand aspects and the deep-rooted knowledge may represent principles that may work for the focal foundation from which various contextual inferences are obtained.

Stylistically, as they are spoken discourse, conversations give rise to different implications owing to the interaction and negotiation between what is stored in the mind and stylistic choices, knowledge under what certain linguistic choices are normally implicated, and how they are used.

The focal concentration is on the inferential procedures, as they are constrained by processes of relevance, associated with stylistic choices and deriving effects. To exemplify the stylistic variation and relevance principles:

5. John: Do you feel very tired?

Allen: a. Yes, I do.

b. Yes, I do. I'm going to have a fever.

Allen's answers in 5a, 5b are stylistic variations to give two different affirmations to what has been mentioned in John's question having in mind both answers are applications of relevance theory. 5a has certain relevance for John for the reason that he can infer results from it, i.e. John realizes that Allen feels very tired. 5b, based on the idea that " Relevance theory claims that extra effort implies extra effect", (Clark, 1996, p. 167), is more relevant than 5a since John can infer further results, i.e. John can predict that Allen will have a fever and whatever follows from that.

From another stylistic and conversational perspective, searching for common ground is a procedure interlocutors practice to promote interpersonal relationships (what one's conversational partner be familiar with). Clark and Marshall (1981: 26) offer that addressers and addressees use heuristics to deduce common ground. They detect three crucial heuristics that interlocutors can practice to guess that information is in common ground. Common ground can be expected to be in common ground if it is: (1) mentally copresent; (2) presented linguistically into the discourse; and (3) information that can be concluded from the public relationship.

Along with the idea of the common ground, stylistics provides the common ground between interlocutors having in mind that the common ground of a certain conversation is the set of possible worlds, common knowledge, or propositions that the addresser and the addressee have found

an agreement to treat them as true. Pragmatic ambiguity, as a stylistic common ground feature, can be categorized as the main factors that impede our comprehension and reasonable interpretation of utterances taking into account that misinterpretation and miscommunication are embedded in the decisive idea of ambiguity. Sometimes ambiguity refers to the use of utterances that allow alternative interpretations. Utterances as such, Information is omitted and must be taken for granted, are not specific and the context does not provide enough information needed to clarify them.

For example,

6. I love you too.

This utterance is pragmatically indefinite and a confusing declarative one.

The speaker may be proposing:

6. (a) to the same degree you love me.

(b) I love you as others do.

(c) and I love someone else.

(d) I love you and bearing other relationships.

In a related move, such an utterance is vague because the addresser could be using it to transfer a variety of potential meanings. This brings down a possibly heavy responsibility on interlocutors in conversation because to cooperate successfully oblige them to reduce ambiguity.

To clarify how interlocutors make intentions clear, pragmatic notions shape a number of principles. Based on the cooperative principle, scholars advocate that interlocutors come to the conclusion that shared faithfulness to the cooperative Principle. This assumption diminishes vagueness for addressees and as a result makes things would be easier for them. In reference to Relevance Theory, scholars have pointed out that interlocutors take advantage of their mutual ground to communicate competently.

Addressers employ mutual information and negotiation (schema theory) in creating their utterances, and listeners use it to find out what the intentions of the addressers are. On the grounds of this, there is no doubt that common ground, shared beliefs, shared suppositions between interlocutors are varieties of shared information.

6. Stylistic and Conversational Negotiation

Turning to Schema Theory perspectives, Nørgaard et al. (2010, p. 8) argued that "Schema theorists claim that meaning is not only contained in the text; meaning needs to be built up by the reader using the text in negotiation with their background knowledge." In parallel to this, meaning is not only restricted in conversation; to build meaning, the hearer should realize, keep in line with, and manipulate the spoken discourse in negotiation with his own linguistic and social awareness. A similar argument was proposed by Weigand (2010: 508) stating that "Human beings act and react in the process of negotiating meaning and understanding." Therefore, it is possible to propose there is a pragma-stylistic conversational approach that highlights the conversational dialogic quality of interaction emphasizing that the addresser and addressee who act and react. So the addresser–addressee's role is not only reading between the lines but also responding to the other participant's linguistic expressions (act and react).

Associated with the schema theory, Buber (1955, 2002: 22) assumed that authentic conversation, particularly that of a dialogue, can be achieved between two or more people, "each of the participants really [must have] in mind the other or others in their present and particular being and turn to them with the intention of establishing a living mutual relation between himself and them". More to the point, dialogue can be perceived as a short-lived practice in which interlocutors are intentionally mindful and sensible.

Maintaining the creative Buberian notion of an exchange of ideas and feelings, dialogue is a give-and-take information flow in the course of which participants are intentionally conscious of the companions. In light of this, Tracy and Craig (2010: 155) stressed that verbal exchange of information and emotions is created by the collaborative and communicative intention of approaching a perception that conforms with the succession of questions and answers as the following dialogue:

7. *Chief Executive Officer (a)*: How did you deal with our business affairs?

Operations Manager (b): Look, don't get so upset. Let's just leave our business affairs

aside, shall we?

Chief Executive Officer (a): Do you ever stop giving unsolicited advice?

Operations Manager (b): I understand your pain.

Chief Executive Officer (a): Think about all those competitors around us, they will

surely destroy us if we don't put plans.

Operations Manager (b): Could you tell me about your plans?

Chief Executive Officer (a): I have more than one plan. I can't manage them all. I'm

hoping you can help me with.

Here action and reaction, as stylistic variations, are pragmatically not the same. Table 1 illustrates this:

Table 1 Stylistic Choice and Cognitive Encoded Message

Agent	<p style="text-align: center;">Stylistic Choice</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Cooperative Conversation</p>	Cognitive Encoded Message
Agent 1	<i>How did you deal with our business affairs?</i>	(theme – anger)
Agent 2	<i>Look, don't get so upset. Let's just leave our business affairs aside, shall we?</i>	(theme – avoidance)
Agent 1	<i>Do you ever stop giving unsolicited advice?</i>	(theme – Cognitive dissonance)
Agent 2	<i>I understand your pain.</i>	(theme – control)
Agent 1	<i>Think about all those competitors around us, they will surely destroy us if we don't put plans.</i>	(theme – conflict)
Agent 2	<i>Could you tell me about your plans?</i>	(theme – reorganization)
Agent 1	<i>I have more than one plan, so I can't manage them all. I'm hoping you can help me with.</i>	(theme – Necessity and collaboration)

Actions are realized as self-motivated, while reactions, which reveal the mark of the pragmatic perception of Agent 1 and Agent 2, can be viewed as respondents. In dialogic collaboration and communication, it is possible to identify to what extent power, as a negative or positive integrated component, can be perceived as a force of communicative processes.

In chief executive officer (*a*) and operations manager (*b*), hearers can use their schema knowledge (consciousness frames), particularly that of business to detect the encoded message. Links can be made between actions and reactions (stylistic choices) and enough clues or elements that

they carry to help hearers to guess certain pragmatic implications from their schema knowledge. Addressers and addressees reveal only some clues, and hearers understand such actions and reactions by merging these clues with their suitable knowledge from schemata. Clues as such provide cognitive reinforcement to assist hearers in detecting pragmatic inferences and also in helping them in filling gaps in the given conversation. A general business schema contains elements that provide certain information about what is hidden and also granting more interpretation of what is expressed. Table 2 shows to what extent linguistic elements that are socially and culturally constructed participate cognitively in detecting pragmatic inferences:

Table 2 Stylistic Choice and Schematic Representation

Interlocutors	Stylistic Choice	<p style="text-align: center;">Schematic Clues or Elements</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Pragmatic Inference</p>
Chief Executive Officer	<i>How did you deal with our business affairs?</i>	<p>Schema1: an open-ended question requires cognitive consideration and reflection. It prepares the addressee to give free-long answers attributed to the addressees' viewpoints.</p> <p>Schema2: '<i>deal with</i>' is used here when there is a conversation about solving problems, to show to what scope the addressee is concerned, or to accomplish a certain task.</p>
		<p>Schema1: '<i>look</i>' is used here when the addresser aims to make the addressee</p>

<p>Operations Manager</p>	<p><i>Look, don't get so upset. Let's just leave our business affairs aside, shall we?</i></p>	<p>careful or to pay attention to a focal point.</p> <p>Schema2: '<i>don't get so upset</i>': to tell the addressee to be self-controlled.</p> <p>Schema3: '<i>let's</i>': a first-person plural imperative formal suggestion in which the addresser participates together with the addressee.</p>
---------------------------	--	--

<p>Interlocutors</p>	<p>Stylistic Choice</p>	<p>Schematic Clues or Elements</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Pragmatic Inference</p>
<p>Chief Executive Officer</p>	<p><i>Do you ever stop giving unsolicited advice?</i></p>	<p>Schema1: '<i>stop giving unsolicited advice</i>': giving unsolicited advice could be a factor in relationship problems. Unsolicited advice implies that the previous reaction may not be wanted (rude and presumptive viewpoints), or it may carry a sense of superiority.</p>
<p>Operations Manager</p>	<p><i>I understand your pain.</i></p>	<p>Schema1: '<i>understand your pain</i>': what individuals most want is the cooperation of others through understanding and sharing their pain, it is a kind of sympathy that means more attention is paid. So the conversation process is the most communication technique</p>

		(know-how) individuals can have.
Chief Executive Officer	<i>Think about all those competitors around us, they will surely destroy us if we don't put plans.</i>	Schema1: ' <i>think about</i> ': denotes an implicit invitation for more extended and focused attention or an extensive time of contemplation on the subject at hand, to use the powers of the mind (mental competence) to reintroduce images, to conceptualize ideas, to figure out inferences, to make decisions or judgments and so on.
Operations Manager	<i>Could you tell me about your plans?</i>	Schema1: ' <i>could you</i> ': as it is a form of a polite request, the use of indirectness of request implies the conversation is in a progress, looking for more information to show collaboration and to accomplish interpersonal communication.

Interlocutors	Stylistic Choice	Schematic Clues or Elements ↓ Pragmatic Inference
Chief Executive Officer	<i>I have more than one plan, so I can't manage them all. I'm hoping you can</i>	Schema1: ' <i>more than</i> ': indicates more than one plan to use if it is needed. Schema2: ' <i>manage</i> ': indicates an individual's concentration on how difficult to deal with, the challenge in which he is involved requires

	<i>help me with.</i>	<p>much effort and collaboration with others.</p> <p>Schema3: <i>'hoping'</i>: -ing suffix (continuous effect) indicates the individual's interest or concern in a particular issue.</p>
--	----------------------	---

Linguistic clues actions work as a stimulus, linguistic elements reactions work as a stimulus, too. Different types of schemata such as conversation schemata (participants, turn-taking, context, reference), linguistic schemata (phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, . . .), social schemata (culture, social status, cooperation, conflict, . . .), and business schemata (sender, receiver, message, channel, practical and concise information, . . .) participate in revealing certain pragmatic implications. As a result of this, Schema works on shaping stored knowledge and arranging for a framework for future comprehension.

Conclusion

Interlocutors modify the way (style) they are using the language in agreement with whom they are interacting. Normative conversation, which is structurally arranged and contextually oriented, can be accomplished through certain linguistic and nonlinguistic criteria. Conversational stylistics, as a method of tracing normative conversation, examines and investigates everyday spoken language to make analysts realize and comprehend how individuals manage and develop their social interactions through the use of verbal discourse. Spoken discourse, which is under analysis, consists of linguistic components (linguistic choices), these components establish and put on view that each conversational linguistic turn is created from several linguistic choices such as single words, phrases, clauses, or sentences which are not enough. Various elements,

paralinguistic or extralinguistic aspects, such as intonation and body language contribute stylistically in shaping and reshaping the encoded or decoded messages. Maxims, by some means associated with shaping styles, make the interactants realize the ways in which stylistic choices constitute social relations. Stylistically, conversational linguistic and nonlinguistic choices are used in depicting or presenting the identity of the interlocutors, they provoke different styles of effects for them and then work on forming the final messages and to what extent they are pragmatically conceptualized. Various kinds of contexts work as operators (retrieval knowledge) to demystify ambiguous and inconclusive meaning. An inconsistency between the context anticipated by the addresser and the one used by the addressee may give rise to a misinterpretation and then leads to pragmatic failure. Schema theory draws the analyst's attention to how linguistic clues can work as stimulus having in mind that every linguistic clue is coordinated with another and with the whole conversation.

References

- Ahlsen, E. (2005). Argumentation with restricted linguistic ability: Performing a role play with aphasia or in a second language. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 19(5), 433-451.
- Buber, M. (1955). *Between man and man*. Ronald Gregor Smith (trans.). London & New York: Routledge.
- Clark, B. (1996). Stylistic Analysis and relevance theory. *Language and Literature*, 5, (3) 163-178
- Clark, H. & Marshall, C. (1981). Definite reference and mutual knowledge. In A.K. Joshi, B.L. Webber, & I.A. Sag (Eds.), *Elements of discourse understanding* (pp. 10-63). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, vol.3, PP. 41–58. New York: Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gutt, E. (1998). Pragmatic aspects of translation: Some relevance-theory observations. In L. Hickey (ed.), *The pragmatics of translation* (pp. 41-53). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. London: Longman.
- Hickey, L. (1993). Stylistics, Pragmatics, and Pragmastylistics. *Revue Belge De Philology Et D'histoire*, Vol. 71, No. 3, pp. 573-586.
- Jeffrey, R. (1992). *Probability and the art of judgment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Luppicini, R. (2008). Conversational pragmatics and learning in virtual organizations. In, Goran D. Putnik, Maria Manuela Cunha (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Networked and Virtual Organizations*, (PP. 337-345). New York: Information Science Reference.

Morini, M. (2013). *The pragmatic translator: An integral theory of translation*. London/New York: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

Nørgaard, N., Montoro, R., & Busse, B. (2010). *Key terms in stylistics*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Schlenker, Ph. (2004). Context of Thought and Context of Utterance. *Mind and Language* 19, PP. 1-28.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance : Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Thornbury, S., & Slade, D. (2006). *Conversation: From description to pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tracy, K. & Craig, Robert T. (2010). Studying interaction in order to cultivate communicative practices: Action-Implicative discourse analysis. In Jürgen Streeck (ed.), *New adventures in language and interaction*, (pp.145–165). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1972). *Some aspects of text grammars: A study in theoretical linguistics and poetics*. The Hague: Mouton.

Verschueren. J (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold

Weigand, E. (2010). Language as dialogue. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Vol. 7. No. 3: 505—515.