

**WILLIS J. EDMONDSON,
JULIANE HOUSE AND
DÁNIEL Z. KÁDÁR**

Expressions,
Speech Acts
— AND —
Discourse

**A Pedagogic Interactional
Grammar of English**

Expressions, Speech Acts and Discourse

First published in 1981, *Let's Talk and Talk About It* is regarded as a cornerstone of research in pragmatics, which laid new and lasting foundations for the teaching of English. Forty years on, this extensively updated version is fully tailored for the 21st century. It provides a pedagogic interactional grammar of English, designed for learners and teachers of English and textbook writers, as well as experts of pragmatics and applied linguistics. The book includes a rigorous pragmatic system through which interaction in English and other languages can be captured in a replicable way, covering pragmatically important expressions, types of talk and other interactional phenomena, as well as a ground-breaking interactional typology of speech acts. The book is also illustrated with a legion of interactional and entertaining examples, showing how the framework can be put to use. It will remain a seminal work in the field for years to come.

WILLIS EDMONDSON was Professor of Applied Linguistics at Hamburg University. His research interests included language teaching and learning, English studies and pragmatics. He was Editor-in-Chief of the *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* (Wiley).

JULIANE HOUSE is Professor Emerita at Hamburg University and Professor at the Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics. She is also Distinguished University Professor at Hellenic American University. Juliane is Past President of the International Association for Translation and Intercultural Studies.

DÁNIEL KÁDÁR is Ordinary Member of Academia Europaea (M.A.E.). He is Professor and Director of Research Centre at Dalian University of Foreign Languages and Research Professor at the Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics.

‘A fully updated version of one of the most influential books on the pedagogy of pragmatics. *Expressions, Speech Acts and Discourse: A Pedagogic Interactional Grammar of English* gives thorough attention to relevant theoretical frameworks and provides a myriad of illustrative examples that make it accessible, practical and enjoyable. This crucially makes *Expressions* both student friendly and of interest to instructors and scholars of pragmatics. Versatile and unique: another classic in the making.’

Pilar G. Blitvich, Professor of Linguistics, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

‘This volume constitutes a highly creative update of Edmondson’s pioneering effort from 45 years ago. It provides a delightfully detailed description of types of talk from small talk to business talk, while continually calling attention to the significant role that grammar plays in interactional discourse. The book includes a timely focus on contrastive pragmatics, comparing empirically greetings and complaints in English and Chinese.’

Andrew Cohen, Professor Emeritus, University of Minnesota

‘This book is a brilliantly revised and updated version of an early classic. It should be essential reading for language teachers and students as well as applied linguists and pragmaticians.’

Themis Kaniklidou, Associate Professor of Translation and Communication Studies, Hellenic American University

‘This timely book not only re-animates, but also updates and extends, *Let’s Talk and Talk about It*, the influential interactional grammar of English published by Edmondson and House in 1981. Based on an extensive database of real-life data, it offers an invaluable typology of the most frequently used speech acts in communication in English among native and non-native speakers. With its numerous examples taken from everyday life and from the global classroom, and its suggestions for teaching, the book should be a most useful companion to any researcher or teacher studying or teaching how communicative competence is achieved in any language.’

Claire Kramersch, Emerita Professor of German, University of California, Berkeley

‘“Boldly” billed as a “pedagogic interactional grammar of English”, this renewed and extended reincarnation of *Let’s Talk and Talk about It* is a welcome contribution to the field of interactional linguistics. Its distinctive otherness lies in marrying pragmatics, pedagogy and practical use. The interactional typology of speech acts, complemented with illuminating real-life examples, is exemplary and refreshing, giving a feel of an “embodied grammar”. The book is well structured and is written in accessible style – keeping in mind the users, teachers and learners in particular – with thoroughness and in-depth analyses. In its goal, it is agenda-driven – not an end in and of itself – and will remain a nuanced resource in the envisioned future.’

Srikant Sarangi, Aalborg University, Denmark / Cardiff University, UK

‘This book is testimony to the innovative thinking of Willis Edmondson, and this revised version of the original publication he authored with Juliane House indicates its continuing potential relevance to the practical pedagogic concerns of the present.’

Henry Widdowson, Emeritus Professor of Education, University of London

‘This book is an ingeniously updated and extended version of an early classic. It is a must-read for applied linguists and pragmaticians, as well as language teachers and students across the globe.’

Zhou Ling, Northeast Normal University

Expressions, Speech Acts and Discourse

A Pedagogic Interactional Grammar of English

Willis J. Edmondson

Formerly: University of Hamburg (Deceased)

Juliane House

University of Hamburg and Hellenic American University

Dániel Z. Kádár

*Dalian University of Foreign Languages and Hungarian Research Centre for
Linguistics*



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108845144

DOI: [10.1017/9781108954662](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108954662)

© Willis J. Edmondson, Juliane House and Dániel Z. Kádár 2023

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

First published 2023

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-1-108-84514-4 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-108-94959-0 Paperback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page xi</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>xii</i>
<i>About the Authors</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xv</i>
1 Introduction	1
1.1. The Present Grammar	2
1.2. Contents	4
1.3. Conventions	5
2 Communicative Interaction in the Foreign Language Classroom	7
2.1. Introduction	7
2.2. Target versus Pedagogic Discourse	7
2.3. Bridging the Gap	11
2.4. Playing Games and Playing Roles	13
2.5. Some Controllable Variables	16
3 Basis for the Description of Discourse as an Interactive Process	23
3.1. Introduction	23
3.2. Different Types of Discourse	23
3.3. Interactional Structure	26
3.3.1 Elements of Exchange Structure	27
3.3.2 Types of Exchange Linkage	30
3.3.3 Interactional Phases	33
3.4. Conversational Strategy	33
3.5. Categories of Illocutions	35
3.5.1 Some Attitudinal Illocutions	36
3.5.1A Some Attitudes Concerning a Non-future Event or State of Affairs P	37
3.5.1B Some Attitudes Concerning a Future Event State of Affairs P	40
3.5.2 Some Informative Illocutions	43
3.5.3 Some Ritual Illocutions	45

3.6	Ritual Frame Indicating Expressions	47
3.7	Gambits	48
3.7.1	Uptakers	49
3.7.2	Clarifiers	50
3.7.3	Appealers	51
3.7.4	Other Gambits	51
3.8	Summary of the Descriptive System	51
4	On Keeping Talking Without Saying Anything (Much): The Use of Gambits in Interaction	55
4.1	Introduction	55
4.2	Different Types and Tokens	57
4.2.1	Uptakers	57
4.2.1A	Receipt	57
4.2.1B	Exclaim	57
4.2.1C	Go-On	59
4.2.2	Clarifiers	60
4.2.2A	Cajoler	60
4.2.2B	Underscorer	61
4.2.3	Appealer	62
4.2.4	Starter	64
4.2.5	Aside	66
4.3	Teaching Gambits in the Classroom	68
4.4	Linking Constructions – An Extended Type of Gambit	71
5	Using Words to Make Meaning: Ritual Frame Indicating Expressions in Everyday Talk	74
5.1	Introduction	74
5.2	Ritual Frame Indicating Expressions	75
5.3	Linguacultural Variation	77
5.4	Testing Procedure One: Testing Learners' Awareness of Standard Situations in English	78
5.4.1	How to Conduct the Test	80
5.4.2	Results	81
5.5	Testing Procedure Two: Testing Learners' Awareness of the Speech Act-Anchor of RFIEs in English	85
5.5.1	How to Conduct the Test	87
5.5.2	Results	89
5.5.3	'Transformed' Speech Act-Indicating Uses of the Expressions "Thank You" and "Thank You Very Much"	91
5.5.4	Modified Speech Act-Indicating Uses of the Expressions "Thank You" and "Thank You Very Much", Simultaneously Involving the Speech Acts Thanks and Leave-Take	93
5.5.5	'Non-speech Act-Anchored' Uses of "Hello"	94

6	On Saying What You Mean: Illocutions in Different Interactional Slots	96
6.1	Introduction	96
6.2	On Distinguishing Tokens – The Problem of ‘Appropriateness’	96
6.3	Style Markers (<i>[formal]</i> <i>[familiar]</i>)	99
6.4	Directness Markers (<i>[authoritative]</i> <i>[tentative]</i>)	100
6.5	Emotionality Markers (<i>[heated]</i> <i>[gush]</i>)	100
6.6	On Identifying Tokens: The Problem of ‘Hinting’	101
6.7	Our Typology of Illocutionary Acts	103
6.7.1	Requests	104
6.7.1A	Requests for Non-verbal Goods	107
6.7.1A(i)	Requests for Non-verbal Goods Initiating an Exchange	107
6.7.1A(ii)	Requests Appearing as Satisfies	112
6.7.1A(iii)	Requests Appearing as Contrasts	113
6.7.1B	Requests for Illocutionary Acts	114
6.7.1B(i)	Requests for Illocutionary Acts Initiating Different Types of Exchanges Initiating Head Business Exchanges Small Talk Exchanges Pre-exchanges Requests for Illocutionary Acts Initiating Pre-Responding Exchanges Requests for Confirmation Initiating Post-exchange Requests for Repair	117 117 118 119
6.7.1B(ii)	Requests for Illocutionary Acts Appearing as Primes	122 124 124
6.7.2	Suggests	126
6.7.2A	Suggests Initiating an Exchange	127
6.7.2A(i)	Suggests-for-You	127
6.7.2A(ii)	Suggests-for-Us	128
6.7.2B	Suggests as Satisfies	129
6.7.2C	Suggests-for-us in Post-exchanges	130
6.7.2D	Suggests Appearing as Contrasts (or Counters)	131
6.7.3	Invites	132
6.7.3A	Initiating Invites	133
6.7.4	Permits	134
6.7.5	Willings (Offers and Promises)	136
6.7.5A	Willings Initiating Exchanges (Offers)	136
6.7.5B	Willings as Contrasts (or Counters)	137

6.7.5B(i)	Offers Made Following an Offence	137
6.7.5B(ii)	Offers Made Following a Request	137
6.7.5C	Willings as Satisfies (Promises)	138
6.7.5D	Willings in Post-exchanges (Promises and Offers)	139
6.7.6	Resolves	141
6.7.7	Complains	142
6.7.7A	Complains as Initiations	144
6.7.7A(i)	Initiating Complains Following Non-verbal Offences	144
6.7.7A(ii)	Initiating Complains Occasioned by a Preceding Communicative Act	146
6.7.7B	Complains as Contras	148
6.7.8	Apologises	149
6.7.8A	Apologises as Contras/Counters to Complains	149
6.7.8B	Apologises Initiating Post-exchanges	150
6.7.8C	Apologises as Strategic Disarmers	150
6.7.9	Excuse/Justifies	152
6.7.9A	Excuse/Justifies Appearing as Counters/Contras	153
6.7.10	Forgives	155
6.7.10A	Forgives as Satisfies	155
6.7.11	Thanks	156
6.7.11A	Thanks Initiating a Post-exchange	157
6.7.11B	Thanks Initiating a Head-Exchange	158
6.7.11C	Thanks Appearing as Uptakers	158
6.7.12	Minimises	159
6.7.13	Congratulates	160
6.7.14	Sympathises	161
6.7.15	Remarks	162
6.7.15A	Remarks Initiating an Interaction	164
6.7.15B	Agreeing and Topping	164
6.7.15C	Remarks Used to Switch Topics	165
6.7.15D	Remarks in Pre-exchanges	165
6.7.16	Discloses	165
6.7.17	Tells	169
6.7.17A	Tells Satisfying Requests for Tells	170
6.7.17A(i)	In Head-Exchanges	170
6.7.17A(ii)	In Pre-exchanges	170
6.7.17A(iii)	In Pre-Responding Exchanges	171
6.7.17B	Tells as Supportive Moves	171
6.7.17B(i)	Tells as Grounders	172
6.7.17B(ii)	Tells as Expanders	172
6.7.17B(iii)	Tells as Sweeteners	172

6.7.18	Opines	173
6.7.18A	Modifying Opines	173
6.7.18B	Opines Appearing as Contrasts/Counters	174
6.7.18C	Satisfying Opines in Pre-Sequences	175
6.7.18D	Opines as Supportive Moves	176
6.7.18E	Opines in Extensive Discussion or Argument	176
6.7.19	Greets	178
6.7.20	How-are-yous	179
6.7.21	Welcomes	181
6.7.21A	Initiating Welcomes	182
6.7.21A(i)	After a Formal Introduction	182
6.7.21A(ii)	Among Familiars	182
6.7.21B	Reciprocating Welcomes	182
6.7.21B(i)	After a Formal Introduction	182
6.7.21B(ii)	Among Familiars	183
6.7.22	Okays	183
6.7.23	Extractors	184
6.7.24	Wish-wells	185
6.7.25	Leave-Takes	186
7	Building Up Interactional Episodes	188
7.1	Introduction	188
7.2	Opening Talk	190
7.2.1	General Characteristics	190
7.2.2	Some Possible Structures in Opening Talk	192
7.2.2A	The Structure of Openings in Telephone Interactions	195
7.2.3	The Use of Opening Talk in Teaching	197
7.3	Closing Talk	198
7.3.1	General Characteristics	198
7.3.2	Some Possible Structures in Closings	199
7.3.3	The Use of Closing Talk in Teaching	201
7.4	Corrective Talk	202
7.4.1	General Characteristics	203
7.4.2	Some Possible Structures in Corrective Talk	204
7.4.3	The Use of Corrective Talk in Teaching	206
7.5	Core Talk	207
7.5.1	Small Talk	208
7.5.1A	General Characteristics	208
7.5.1B	Some Possible Structures in Small Talk	209
7.5.1C	The Use of Small Talk in Teaching	211
7.5.2	Business Talk	213
7.5.2A	General Characteristics	213

7.5.2B	Some Possible Structures in Business Talk	214
7.5.2C	The Use of Business Talk in Teaching	220
7.5.3	Patch-Up Talk	221
7.5.3A	General Characteristics	221
7.5.3B	Some Possible Structures in Patch-Up Talk	222
7.5.3C	The Use of Patch-Up Talk in Teaching	226
7.5.4	Argumentative Talk	227
7.5.4A	General Characteristics	227
7.5.4B	Some Possible Structures in Argumentative Talk	228
7.5.4C	The Use of Argumentative Talk in Teaching	232
8	Types of Talk in the Global Classroom	234
8.1	Introduction	234
8.2	Learner Problems with Certain Types of Talk	234
8.3	Conventions of Greet in Opening Talk in English as a Lingua Franca	236
8.3.1	Hi	237
8.3.2	Hello	238
8.3.3	Good Morning/Afternoon/Evening	239
8.4	Experiments	241
8.4.1	Experiment 1	241
8.4.1A	Results of the English Production Tasks	242
8.4.1B	Contrastive Analysis	244
8.4.2	Experiment 2	244
8.4.2A	Outcome	246
9	The Interactional Practice of Grammatical Items	249
9.1	Introduction	249
9.2	Tenses	250
9.3	Modal Auxiliaries	255
9.4	Mood – Use of Periphrastic “Do”	257
9.5	Determiners and Pronouns	257
9.6	“If” Clauses	258
9.7	Some Verb Patterns	261
10	Conclusion	263
	<i>Notes</i>	267
	<i>References</i>	275
	<i>Index</i>	284

Figures

3.1	Types of discourse	24
3.2	Some attitudes concerning a non-future event or state of affairs P	37
3.3	Some attitudes concerning a future event or state of affairs P	40
3.4	Types of Gambits	49
3.5	Summary of our descriptive system	53
4.1	Our typology of Gambits	56
5.1	The system of altered speech act indication	86
6.1	Scale of ‘directness’	98
6.2	Our typology of illocutionary acts	103
7.1	Types of Talk	188

Tables

4.1	Exclaim tokens	58
4.2	Overview of Gambit types	67
5.1	Uses of comparable Apologise expressions in Chinese and English	79
5.2	Uses of comparable Request expressions in Chinese and English	79
5.3	The response rate of the Chinese respondents	82
5.4	Quantitative results of the task sheet responses (+ indicates appropriate responses; – indicates inappropriate responses)	90
8.1	The Greet expressions compared	236
8.2	Stand-alone uses of “Hi”	237
8.3	Uses of “Hi” in Greet→Speech act	237
8.4	Stand-alone uses of “Hello”	238
8.5	Uses of “Hello” in Greet→Speech act	239
8.6	Stand-alone uses of “Good Morning/Afternoon/Evening”	239
8.7	Uses of “Good Morning/Afternoon/Evening” in Greet→Speech act	240
8.8	British responses to the first [PRIV] questions/tasks	242
8.9	British responses to the first [PUB] questions/tasks	242
8.10	British responses in task group 1	243
8.11	British responses in task group 2	243
8.12	Choices of our British respondents	246
8.13	Choices of our Chinese respondents	247

About the Authors

Willis Edmondson received his BA and MA from the University of Cambridge, UK, and his Ph.D. from the University of Bochum, Germany. He was Professor of Applied Linguistics at the University of Hamburg, Germany. He was also Distinguished Professor of English Language and Literature at the University of Hebron, Palestine, where he set up an MA programme in English language and literature. His research interests included language teaching and learning, pragmatics, English studies, and theoretical and descriptive linguistics. Along with being a prolific academic, Willis was a dedicated language teacher who spent nearly all his adult life outside of the UK, including in Germany, the Fiji Islands and Palestine. He was an Editor-in-Chief of the *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* (Wiley). His books include, among others, *A Pedagogic Grammar of the English Verb* (Narr, 1977), *Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis* (Longman, 1981), *Twelve Lectures on Second Language Acquisition: Foreign Language Teaching and Learning Perspectives* (Narr, 1999) and *Einführung in die Sprachlehrforschung* (Introduction to Applied Linguistics) (with Juliane House, Franke-UTB, 4th edition, 2011).

Juliane House received her Ph.D. in applied linguistics from the University of Toronto, Canada, and honorary doctorates from the Universities of Jyväskylä, Finland, and Jaume I, Castellón, Spain. She is Professor Emerita at the University of Hamburg, Germany, where she was a founding member of the Research Centre on Multilingualism. She is currently a professor at the Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics. She is also Distinguished University Professor and Director of the Doctoral Program of Language and Communication at Hellenic American University, Nashua, USA, and Athens, Greece. She is Visiting Professor at Dalian University of Foreign Languages and Beijing University of Science and Technology, China. Juliane is Past President of the International Association for Translation and Intercultural Studies. Her research interests include cross-cultural and intercultural pragmatics, discourse analysis, (im)politeness, second language acquisition, language and politics, translation theory, and English as a global lingua franca.

She has published widely in all these areas. She was co-editor of the groundbreaking volume *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies* (Ablex, 1989). Some of her recent books include *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present* (Routledge, 2015), *Translation as Communication across Languages and Cultures* (Routledge, 2016), *Translation: The Basics* (Routledge, 2018) and *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics* (with Dániel Kádár, Cambridge, 2021). She is co-editor of *Contrastive Pragmatics – A Cross-Disciplinary Journal* (Brill).

Dániel Z. Kádár is an ordinary member of Academia Europaea (MAE). He also has a higher doctorate (D.Litt.) in pragmatics (2015) and Ph.D. in linguistics (2006). He is Qihang Chair Professor, Director of the Center for Pragmatic Research and Doctoral Supervisor at Dalian University of Foreign Languages, China. He is also Research Professor at the Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics. His areas of research involve cross-cultural, intercultural and historical pragmatics, linguistic (im)politeness and interactional ritual, language and politics, applied linguistics, and historical and modern Chinese language. He has published many books with internationally leading publishers, and research papers in high-impact journals. He is author of *Relational Rituals and Communication: Ritual Interaction in Groups* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), *Politeness, Impoliteness and Ritual – Maintaining the Moral Order in Interpersonal Interaction* (Cambridge University Press, 2017), and co-author of *Understanding Politeness* (with Michael Haugh, Cambridge University Press, 2013) and *Intercultural Politeness – Managing Relationships across Cultures* (with Helen Spencer-Oatey, Cambridge University Press, 2020). His most recent book is *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics* (with Juliane House, Cambridge University Press, 2021). He is co-editor of *Contrastive Pragmatics – A Cross-Disciplinary Journal* (Brill).

Acknowledgements

First of all, we are indebted to both the reviewers and the clearance reader who helped us to improve the quality of the present manuscript. We are also grateful to Helen Barton – the best editor one can imagine. We would also like to say thank you to all those colleagues who contributed to the birth of this book. In particular, we would like to say thank you to Emily Fengguang Liu, who contributed to the case studies involving Chinese learners of English that we presented in this book, as well as all those who agreed to join our case studies as subjects. Our thanks go to Puyu Ning for inputting and formatting various figures presented in this book.

On an institutional level, we would like to acknowledge the funding of the National Excellence Programme of the National Research, Development and Innovation Office of Hungary (grant number: TKP202-NKTA-02). This grant, which is the continuation of another one (Momentum Grant of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, grant number LP2017/5) allowed Juliane House and Dániel Kádár to collaborate. We would also like to acknowledge the funding of the National Research Development and Innovation Office of Hungary (grant number: 132969). All the above grants have been hosted by the Research Centre for Linguistics, Hungary. Dániel Kádár is also grateful to Dalian University of Foreign Language for all the institutional support he received.

On a personal note, this book could have never been completed without the fascinating input by Willis Edmondson, who unfortunately passed away some years ago. The current book is an updated and extended version of a grammar that was originally written by the first two authors, Willis Edmondson and Juliane House, in 1981. If Willis is in Heaven – and we are sure he is! – we are confident that he is delighted to see the original work in a new form. As his daughter Miriam put it, by writing this book we have brought him back to life. As well as to Willis, we are indebted to our families for all their loving support. Juliane would like to say thank you to Patrick, Miriam, Tessa, Wissem, Mailin, Lucia and Emilia, as well as Bobby. Dániel would like to say thank you to Keiko, Naoka, Zita, András and Eszter, as well as Koma. Thank you all for bearing with us while we spent very long hours in front of our computers.

1 Introduction

This book is a renewed version of the classic pedagogic interactional grammar of English, originally written by Willis Edmondson and Juliane House in 1981. This grammar was the first interactional grammar of English ever published, and it had a lasting impact on applied linguistics, language learning and teaching, and pragmatics. The framework of the grammar pioneered various ideas that became popular in interaction studies, particularly pragmatics, only much later. For example, the book argued that phenomena such as speech acts can only be systematically studied if one approaches them as part of situated interaction – a point which was largely ignored at the time. Unfortunately, the book went out of print and the original publisher ceased to exist. This is why we decided to make the book available again in a renewed, updated and extended form.

By the time of writing the present manuscript, both pragmatics and applied linguistics have witnessed major developments,¹ including the publication of the well-known communicative grammar of Leech and Svartvik (2003). Yet, we believe that there is a definite need for this book to come to life again in a revised and extended form, considering that its framework tackles many issues that continue to be in the focus of present-day research on language use in interaction. In particular, the book provides a rigorously systematic view of interactional phenomena, such as Gambits (or discourse markers), speech acts, interactional moves and so on. This sense of systematicity – which is the core of any grammar and the antithesis of idiosyncrasy – has been criticised by some in discursive research in pragmatics in the early 2000s.² However, ignoring the systematic and conventionalised features of language use would result in throwing out the baby with the bathwater.³ This is why we believe a grammar of interaction is very much needed today.

Thus, we have decided to make a bold move and reanimate a classic. We term this move a ‘bold’ one because in academic research one can often witness an assumption that new is unavoidably better than old, and classics of research are usually meant to be available as pure reprints – as mementos of past research. However, we believe that various ideas of the old 1981 version of this book are still innovative and fresh enough today, especially if we not

only directly reprint but also update and extend them. Accordingly, in this book we try to achieve a healthy balance between preserving the original text and updating it whenever needed. To this end, we kept many features of the original manuscript intact. For instance, back in time, this book was designed to serve as a grammar, and as such the authors were reticent about citations. We followed this convention in the new version, even at the risk of being at odds with the ‘ritual’ of citing a high number of studies to showcase our familiarity with academic research. However, considering the large amount of studies dedicated to interaction following the publication of the original grammar, we added endnotes to the manuscript, in order to more closely interconnect the grammar with the fields of pragmatics and applied linguistics.

1.1. The Present Grammar

A ‘grammar’ is commonly understood as a body of rules concerning the relations between different parts of sentences of a language. In a grammar, we expect to find references to transitive verbs, different classes of nouns, sentence structures featuring categories such as subject, object and so on. In other words, ‘grammar’ often means *syntax*. By an ‘interactional grammar’, we mean something rather different.

Firstly, we are attempting to describe language *in use*, such that we are less interested in sentences than in what speakers *do* with them when they talk to each other: they make requests, voice opinions, issue complaints, pay compliments and so on. We may say here that we seek to describe what speakers say as forms of *action*. In other words, we are pursuing an essentially pragmatic approach to language.⁴

Secondly, we are interested in describing what speakers *together* achieve through the use of language – we are interested in the *to* and *fro* of interaction, and not simply in isolated sentences or utterances. Together, speakers reach agreements, exchange opinions, make collective decisions, negotiate business deals, or simply satisfy very general social needs. Here, language is seen as not only a mode of action, but a means of *interaction*. When we refer to this grammar as ‘interactional’, we are referring to the ‘level’ of description – the perspective taken on language and its use.

Thirdly, we are interested in providing a *systematic* and *replicable* account of interaction, hence our choice of the expression ‘grammar’ in the title of this book.

We term this grammar, then, an *interactional grammar*. This grammar may be useful for teachers of foreign languages – in particular, English – and it may also be useful in the training of such teachers. It may also be used as a resource-book for textbook writers. It is a *pedagogic grammar*, and it seeks to make a contribution to applied linguistics, in making suggestions for

improving the teaching of English, on the basis of a body of *argued theory* and *empirical research*. Along with teachers and textbook writers, the grammar may also be relevant to academics working in the fields of applied linguistics, pragmatics and interaction studies, considering the pragmatic anchor of the framework proposed. Last, but not least, we sincerely hope that learners will find this grammar useful.

Our interactional grammar approaches English language use both inside and, mainly, outside of the classroom as an interactional engagement which follows conventional – and often ritual – practices.

What may this be taken to mean in practice? Firstly, this grammar is based on various extensive and systematically gathered corpora of spoken interactional data, including dialogues between pairs of English native speakers (speaking English, of course), between pairs of German native speakers speaking German, and between German learners of English, speaking English with native speakers. In two chapters, we also make use of large corpora, in particular the British National Corpus,⁵ as well as data elicited from Chinese learners of English. All these corpora helped us to systematise interaction and arrive at empirically derived categories to describe interaction in a bottom-up manner. Notwithstanding that we are working here with corpora, in order to exemplify elements of this grammar we often make use of relatively abstract examples, for example by referring to the interactants as ‘A’ and ‘B’, instead of providing details about their backgrounds or identities. We believe that the abstract form of the way in which data is presented in our book accords with the generic requirements of a grammar.

On the basis of the data studied in this book, we are in a position to take into consideration non-native English interactional behaviour, and various types of ‘errors’ commonly found in the conversational English of advanced learners.

We consider how classroom talk differs from the talk we find among expert speakers of English, or ‘native speakers’.⁶ Furthermore, we suggest ways in which interactional English may be incorporated into teaching programmes and into pedagogic settings, providing both empirical applied linguistic results and illustrative materials as practical examples. Such examples may be even more important now, in the globalised world, than back in time when the original version of this grammar was published. This is because by now English has become even more dominant as a global lingua franca.⁷

To sum up the goals of this pedagogic interactional grammar, we attempt to facilitate the teacher’s – and the learner’s – task by addressing the following issues:

1. What do English native speakers commonly say and do in their everyday talk? Here we address the basic issue of data.
2. When and why do speakers say and do different things in everyday talk? Why are there recurrences and related conventions and rituals in language

use, and how can one capture them? Here we address the problem of adequate description.

3. What can go wrong from the learner's perspective, and why? Here we address the problem of evaluation.
4. How can learners be helped to acquire conversational skills? Here we address the central pedagogic issue.

In organising the content of this grammar, we have sought to take into account a variety of differing teaching approaches and materials. We do this as the present grammar is not a coursebook, and is not intended to be used as a substitute for coursebooks that may currently be in use. Rather, it may be used to supplement and hopefully enrich existing course materials of English. We have therefore tried to organise the book such that it may be potentially useful whether a coursebook that is being followed has a 'functional' approach, a 'situational' approach or a 'grammatical' approach. Crudely, these three approaches to syllabus-design and course-book planning are reflected in various chapters of this book.

1.2. Contents

The present grammar is organised as follows: in [Chapter 2](#), we discuss the dilemma presented by the wish or requirement that 'communicative' English be taught in a foreign language classroom – which is naturally different from real life – and suggest different ways out of this dilemma, as general possibilities. The chapter therefore provides a practical applied linguistic background for the more theoretically motivated chapters to follow. In this chapter, we argue that many of the teaching dilemmas triggered by the setting of the foreign language classroom relate to the fact that that classroom provides its own ritual space, in which the conventions and practices and related rights and obligations holding for daily life are turned upside down.⁸ Thus, a key dilemma invariably facing the foreign language teacher is how to teach *real-life* language use in a *non-real-life* setting. The same dilemma, of course, faces the foreign language learner as well.

[Chapter 3](#) presents a comprehensive way of analysing and describing interaction, serving as a model for the descriptions offered in the rest of the book. In the descriptive system explicated in this chapter, we approach interaction through units of various size, including expressions, illocutionary acts and Types of Talk representing discourse. The system presented in this chapter was not derived in a top-down manner, but rather emerged as an outcome of extensive empirical research.

In [Chapters 4](#) and [5](#), we focus on the smallest component of the interactional grammar: expressions. [Chapter 4](#) presents a way of analysing and describing expressions that are meant to lubricate the flow of interaction. The acquisition

of such expressions is not without problems, but it is very important for learners to be made aware of their use. We define this category of expressions as ‘Gambits’. While it is a popular assumption that Gambits – often called ‘discourse markers’ in the literature – are void of meaning, we will show that this is far from being the case.⁹

In [Chapter 5](#), we examine those expressions through which language users conventionally indicate illocutionary acts such as requesting. We define these expressions as ‘Ritual Frame Indicating Expressions’ (RFIEs), arguing that they are recurrently used to indicate illocutionary acts in specific standard situations with preset rights and obligations for participants. Learning and teaching the use of such expressions can be particularly difficult due to their interactional load and linguistic specificity.

[Chapter 6](#) brings us to another component of this interactional grammar: illocutionary acts. In this grammar, we use the expressions ‘illocutionary act’ and ‘speech act’ interchangeably. The chapter provides a systematic and replicable interactional typology of such acts. This typology is particularly suitable for analysing discourse and understanding the role of illocutionary acts in discourse.

In [Chapter 7](#), we provide an introduction into the highest unit in this grammar, discourse, through the analytic unit of Types of Talk. Types of Talk consist of interactional structures, into which speech acts can be slotted. We propose an inventory of speech acts by means of which one can systematise Types of Talk.

[Chapter 8](#) presents an application of [Chapter 7](#): here we present a case study of an important Type of Talk, namely Opening Talk. The chapter illustrates why the acquisition of both speech acts and Type of Talk is important and often challenging for learners of English, by reporting on experiments we conducted with Chinese learners of English.

[Chapter 9](#) illustrates how conventional grammatic categories such as a specific tense or auxiliary verb may be linked with interactional behaviour as it is described in the current grammar. The aim of this chapter is to suggest to the reader how formal grammatical items may be practised in interactional sequences in the classroom.

[Chapter 10](#) summarises the contents of the present grammar.

1.3. Conventions

Finally in this Introduction, we need to give some indication of the graphic conventions used in this book, and of the system we have adopted for displaying intonation.

Technical terms will generally be given in capitals. Expressions of actual language use quoted in the running text will be indicated with single quotation

marks. In presenting ‘rules’ and structures, round brackets are used to present optional items, while curly brackets are used to present alternative items. Thus




- $\left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Hello} \\ \text{Good morning} \end{array} \right\} \right)$ I want to speak to Dr Smith (please)

indicates that either of the two greetings may, but need not necessarily, precede the request, and that this may, but need not, be followed by the expression “please”.

When an *inappropriate* utterance is cited, an uppercase z will precede it:

- ^zOh I’m very fine how are you

In displaying intonation patterns on utterances, we have adopted a system which is largely self-explanatory: the conventions followed are:

-  indicates a falling intonation
-  indicates a rising intonation
-  indicates combinations of the above

We seek to display the location and steepness of such intonational shifts directly. In addition

- " indicates a main stress
- ' indicates a secondary stress
- inserted between utterance elements indicates a brief pause

The issue of intonation in interaction is both complex and important: to deal with it adequately would require, however, a book in itself.¹⁰ When an utterance is cited to establish a point unrelated to its actual performance, intonation will not be marked. Further, our intonational markings do not suggest that our way is the *only* way an utterance may be spoken – stress, for example, is sometimes a moveable feast, cf.

" I would say you're wrong

I would say you're wrong

I would say - you're wrong

Regarding the use of pronouns, we preferred to avoid using the inclusive ‘he/she’, etc., so have opted to switch freely between pronouns ‘he’, ‘she’, etc.

Our conventions are generally much simpler than that of conversation analysis. This accords with the goal of this book to serve as an interactional pedagogic grammar of English, and not a reference material with relevance to academics only.

2 Communicative Interaction in the Foreign Language Classroom

2.1 Introduction

Language use in the foreign language classroom is ritually constrained: students are expected to mimic what the teacher says, roles are ratified,¹ and violations of the expected order of the interaction is usually sanctioned in one way or another.² A central issue we discuss is the following: how can we expect the learner to strive for an ‘authentic’ and everyday life-like use of the English language in a space in which language use is everything but everyday life-like?

It must be made clear from the start that, given the large number of variables at work in different classrooms – some of which we shall point out – there is no one ‘method’ which leads to learning ‘success’, and possible procedures for using the materials we wish to detail will be necessarily conditioned by the nature of the class the teacher is working with, the syllabus he is following, the textbook he is obliged to use, and so on. We give no recipes for success for the simple reason that such recipes do not exist. This said, it will be clear that the authors have opinions as to the relative value of different teaching procedures. These opinions will be argued, however, and presented without dogmatism. While the notion of infallible teaching recipes is illusionary, the concept of scientific neutrality is probably equally so. Ultimately, the present grammar aims to provide an essentially pragmatics- and interaction ritual-based view of the foreign language classroom, and so our objective is to raise awareness of the pragmatic complexity of the unachievable and unrealistic goal of learning how to sound life-like in a non-life-like setting.

2.2 Target versus Pedagogic Discourse

The type of English spoken in the classroom is clearly a major factor determining the type of English that is learnt there. The general thesis we want to propose here is that there is a tension in the foreign language classroom between using English which is appropriate to the *classroom*, and using English which is appropriate to the teaching *goals* – i.e. in the process of teaching English, we teach English of a particular kind, which we may call *pedagogic discourse*. This has

perhaps led in the past to the complaint that, while our learners are ‘successful’ in the classroom, and can do all that we as teachers demand of them there, when they try to use the skills we have taught them *outside* the classroom, they are less ‘successful’.³ No ‘transfer’ of learning has taken place. We are suggesting here that no ‘transfer’ of learning is actually possible, as often what is *learnt* and what is *needed* for non-classroom talk are two different things. In fact, if ‘transfer’ is effected, it often leads to ‘error’ – such errors we may term ‘teaching-induced’.⁴ The paradox here is that the learner makes a mistake in talking English precisely because he has successfully learnt how to speak English in the ritual space of the classroom. In a nutshell, there is a difference here between *pedagogic* and *target* discourse. While a grammar of the present scope cannot resolve this paradox, it can help at least to systematically reflect on it.

One obvious reflection of this difference is the common observation that question–answer sequences between teacher and learner often have some unusual features, one being that more often than not the teacher ‘knows’ the answer before he asks the question, and in fact the learner often ‘answers’ the question *with* a question:⁵

(1)

Teacher: What is the capital of England?

Learner: Is it London?

Teacher: Yes, that’s right.

This is a typically routinised ritual interaction, lacking the free flow of interaction outside of the space of the classroom. More specifically, the learner is obliged to answer, and so is the teacher to confirm that the learner is right, which is a typical conventionalised classroom ritual. Even if such learner ‘answers’ are not given in the form of a ‘question’ (i.e. no interrogative sentence is used), a question intonation is often present, meaning something like “I’m not so sure if what I’m saying (or the way I’m saying it) is what you want, so please tell me if I’m right or not.”⁶ An instance of teacher-induced ‘error’ would then be the case in which this intonation pattern is ‘transferred’ to non-pedagogic settings and used in everyday talk in English. It seems in fact clear that this happens even with advanced learners.

The peculiar nature of ‘teacher-questions’ is well known and will be considered again below. For another simplistic illustration of possible differences between pedagogic and target discourse, consider now the following short interactional sequence:

(2)

Teacher: Can you swim well?

Learner: Yes, I can.

Teacher: Do you like potatoes?

Learner: Yes, I do.

Here we have a sequence of two ‘question–answer’ sequences. Even if we disregard a possible purpose the teacher might have had in initiating these two sequences (practising short-form answers, use of periphrastic “Do”, or whatever), it is in fact not easy to contextualise sequences like this in a non-pedagogic setting. In other words, they typically represent ritual interaction in a classroom, with specific rights and obligations, the related expectation for a preset interactional dynamic, and so on. This issue becomes visible as soon as one adds a minimal sense of context to this interaction, by providing various responses to the above questions. As an example, consider the first ‘question’, and the following possible ‘answers’:

(3)

A: Can you swim well?

B:

- (a) Oh I’ll be allright - don’t worry
- (b) Of course what do you mean can I swim well
- (c) Yes
- (d) Okay - I’ll do it
- (e) Hmm quite well - I did a lot of swimming at school actually

If A is heard as expressing anxiety, B might seek to reassure (response a). If A is heard as challenging B’s competence, B might refute the implication that he cannot swim well (response b). If B cannot see the point of A’s ‘question’, he assumes A is leading up to something else, and via intonation asks what this is (response c). If A is heard as making a request (he might for example be looking for someone to play in a waterpolo team, or somebody to retrieve his plastic duck floating out to sea), B may agree to the request (response d). If A is heard as making a ‘genuine’ request for information as to how well B can swim (e.g. in the context of an interview for a job as a beach attendant in a summer camp), B is likely to downplay his affirmative response (to avoid bragging), but also to provide supportive evidence (response e). As this list shows, in our daily lives there are many situations in which rights and obligations are clearly different from that of the classroom, and as soon as we find ourselves in such situations, A’s question itself changes its implied meaning.

In all these five cases, a response of the form ‘Yes, I can’ (unless suitably modified by intonation and other prosodic features) is unlikely to be appropriate. Further, we find it difficult to imagine contexts in which the teacher–learner exchanges given in (2) above could actually occur. We have here then a case in which the English language is being used for pedagogic purposes, but what results is a classroom-specific type of discourse. The danger is that, in

teaching English, one is teaching something other than the English one in fact wishes to teach!⁷

The dilemma posed above by the distinction between pedagogic and target discourse can be overcome in several ways:

(1) We change our use of English in the classroom such that it better approximates to the English we aim to teach – this is possible to a certain extent. However, clearly the teacher cannot simply avoid his ratified responsibility for teaching!

(2) We draw our learners' attention to the differences such that they at least know about them – for example, it seems a reasonable procedure especially with older learners to point out before a particular exercise why it is being suggested, and what type of English is being used in the exercise. While such an explicit cognitive treatment seems certainly desirable (and ethical), it clearly leads only to talking about talk – that is, a type of metapragmatic exercise involving learning.⁸

(3) We accept the differences insofar as 1 and 2 above are (at best) only partial solutions, but seek ways and means of including samples of target discourse inside pedagogic discourse. This is, of course, what teachers have always done via the use of texts, for example. But we are here considering spoken interaction, rather than written discourse. We can, of course, play films or video-recordings in which native speakers are conversing. This may be useful but:

(a) All too often, in fact, the prepared recording is especially prepared to be used in teaching and it shows! More seriously:

(b) Such materials only help receptive skills, particularly, 'oral comprehension', and moreover the comprehension required is not that of a conversationalist, as the listener (the learner) has no interactional role: he cannot interrupt the recording to ask the speaker to repeat something, for example. He is a passive overhearer, not an active participant. Here we need to remind ourselves again that classroom learning provides a very different ritual setting from that of interaction in ordinary life, and very often it is impossible for the learner to take an active participation role in the interaction the learner examines.⁹

In sum, we are suggesting the following:

(1) In the interests of exposing the learner to target language, the teacher should attempt to reflect such language in his own pedagogic behaviour.

(2) It is potentially valuable to make explicit to the learner what he is learning, and how what he is learning relates to everyday interactional behaviour.

(3) Target discourse may be practised inside the pedagogic framework, most commonly via simulation, games, role-playing, drama and so on.

We now turn to some concrete illustrations of these points.

2.3 Bridging the Gap

Consider the following pedagogic exchange:

(4)

Teacher: Peter, ask me what time it is
 Peter: What time is it
 Teacher: Good

Clearly, Peter cannot be said to have asked the teacher what time it is: he has simply said “What time is it”. Consider then the following:

(5)

Teacher: Peter, ask Mary what time it is
 Peter: What time is it Mary
 Mary: It’s half past twelve
 Teacher: Good

Here we might wish to say that Peter has indeed asked Mary the time, a major reason for saying so being that Mary responds to what he says as though he had. However, we still have no idea why he might behave like this. Consider then the following:

(6)

Teacher: Peter, imagine you are looking forward to the end of this lesson and are wondering how much longer it’s going to last Lean over to Mary and ask her what time it is.
 Peter: What time is it Mary
 Mary: It’s half past twelve
 Teacher: Good

Now we have some degree of contextualisation¹⁰ but, in giving a context, we have made the interactional behaviour (particularly that of Peter) somewhat artificial. Basically, the teacher outlines the changing rights and obligations holding for a situation when the ritual situation of a lesson is going to end. Let’s therefore try again:

(7)

Teacher: (as in (6) above)
 Peter: Hey Mary
 Mary: What
 Peter: What time is it
 Mary: Half past twelve
 Peter: { Is that all }
 { Oh good }
 Teacher: Good

Note that not much more is said in version (7) than in version (6), but that there is much more interaction. We might then go on to consider the teacher's behaviour in the above sequence, and seek to make this rather more in line with non-pedagogic interactional norms:

(8)

- Teacher: Peter
 Peter: Yeah
 Teacher: I imagine you're looking forward to the end of this lesson aren't you
 Peter: Well er to tell the truth yes
 Teacher: I thought so imagine will you that your watch has stopped and you're wondering how much longer this lesson is going to last
 Lean over to Mary there and ask her what time it is okay
 Peter: Okay - hey Mary
 Mary: What
 Peter: What time is it Mary
 Mary: It's half past twelve
 Teacher: Thanks that was fine

What have we changed here? Well, the teacher first of all checked on Peter's attention instead of assuming it. Secondly, he tried to link the imaginary situation with Peter's 'real' situation (in fact, Peter may not have been looking forward to the end of the lesson at all: given the nature of schools, however, he is practically obliged by social pressures to say "yes" in front of his peer group!).¹¹ Thirdly, the expression "will you" inserted in the request implicitly seeks the connivance of Peter instead of assuming it, as does the "okay" at the end of the request. Finally, the teacher's closing acknowledgement contains the speech act Thank, normative after a Request is carried out unless one assumes by social right that the Request has to be carried out, and the evaluation ("good") is changed to an appreciation ("That was fine").

While there is nothing particularly 'new' or 'exciting' about the interaction in (8) above, as an example of teaching methodology, the language used and the way it is used differ significantly from what we started with in (4) above. The differences are slight, but cumulatively highly significant, if we are concerned with approximating target interactional behaviour in the classroom. Note the following:

(1) In examples (5)–(8), Peter's utterance is not directly addressed to the teacher: compare (5) above with the following:

- (9) Teacher: Peter ask me what time it is
 Peter: What time is it
 Teacher: It's half past twelve - good

This is less convincing than (5) as the teacher is acting both as ‘pedagogue’ and as ‘conversationalist’. Peter (and the rest of the class) might well be confused as to what exactly is going on.

(2) We tried to contextualise Peter’s utterance and bring about a sequentially relevant response by linking the critical utterances with a situational setting.

(3) The contextualisation may be minimal (as in 5) or more elaborate (as in 6), and may approximate to a greater or lesser degree to the actual situation the learner finds himself in (cf. 5 with “Imagine you are Robinson Crusoe and have just met Man Friday. You decide to ask him the time”).

(4) As soon as we provide a context, we need to make sure that the language we wish to use in fact fits that context. For we should note that a procedure whereby one starts with a linguistic expression (item to be taught) and then searches for an ‘appropriate’ context is a totally unnatural one. Speakers do not go around with specific, pre-packaged language items stored in their heads waiting to find a context in which they might use them – they find themselves in a context and choose elements of language they find appropriate!

(5) Many of the inserted items in the developmental stages of the dialogue have non-linguistic and/or non-verbal substitutes – the attention-getting “Peter” or “Hey Mary” are appropriately responded to by eye-contact or some grunt of acknowledgement, for example: Peter’s reaction to Mary’s telling him the time could be signalled via a groan, or a smile.

(6) We have paid some attention to the language used by the teacher in his ‘pedagogic’ talk framing the conversation between Peter and Mary, as well as to the learner-utterances making up the latter. This issue is not central to our concern in this chapter. We here make the point again with concrete illustration, however, to reinforce the argument developed in [Section 2.2](#) above. There is a difference then between target discourse and pedagogic discourse, but the latter may be embedded in the former. ‘How?’ is the next question. Given that (8) above is possibly more like a ‘natural’ conversation than (4), how can the teacher bring dialogues such as (8) into being, in preference to the type of pedagogic exercise exemplified in (4)? The [next section](#) will answer this question.

2.4 Playing Games and Playing Roles

If we seek to distinguish simply between role-play, games-play and other more formal and traditional classroom activities, we shall not find this an easy task. We shall therefore attempt only commonsense definitions of