

# Pragmatics Matters

Issue 48, Summer 2016

語用論事情

2016年夏第48号

## JALT Pragmatics SIG Newsletter

全国語学教育学会 語用論部会 ニュースレター

### Contents:

Page

1. From the editor
2. Pragmatics Presentations at Pan-SIG 2016
5. PanSIG Journal Showcase
7. Classroom Utilities: Discourse Analysis  
*William Wentworth Jr. Yongin University*
10. Turn-Taking and Arrhythmia: Looking at Prosody  
*Neil Talbert Catholic University of Daegu*
14. Conference news

### From the editor

Those lucky enough to be in the position to attend the recent (ish) JALT PanSIG conference in Okinawa were treated to a full program of presentations. Over three days there were a large variety of presentations dealing with a comprehensive range of issues related to language teaching. Within the conference as a whole, the pragmatics SIG was especially well organized in running a mini 'conference within a conference'. Starting with a data session on Friday and then running continuously through the Saturday and Sunday of the conference, one room was entirely dedicated to talks connected to pragmatics. Well done to Tim Greer, in his post as program chair, to getting this to work so well. The pragmatics sessions at the conference are reviewed below. In addition to this 2016 conference review, the proceedings from the 2015 PanSIG conference have now been published. There are several papers that deal with topics that may be of interest to the JALT Pragmatics SIG membership and to showcase the work of our members the abstracts are included here.

Also in this edition we have a paper by William Wentworth Jr. regarding discourse analysis in the language classroom, looking at some of the key concepts from DA and

investigating ways in which these concepts can be made accessible to language learners who may have limited proficiency and only nascent understanding of the importance of discourse based views of language and communicative competence.

Neil Talbert investigates the prosody of spoken language and the ways in which speakers manage turn taking through prosodic cues. This is an area that I have perhaps not given enough attention to in my own teaching and the paper gives valuable food for thought on a complex issue.

Finally, there is some information on upcoming conferences that may be of interest to PragSIG members. Remember, if you attend a conference, either as a speaker or as an audience member you can always drop me a line (or a few paragraphs) and share your impressions and insights with the JALT pragmatics community at large.

The editor can be reached at [joncamlar@hotmail.com](mailto:joncamlar@hotmail.com)

## Pragmatics Presentations at PanSIG 2016

The JALT PanSIG conference was held at Meio University in Okinawa from May 20-23, 2016. Our SIG was well-represented with 21 presentations and a forum. The conference kicked off on the Friday afternoon with a Conversation Analysis (CA) data session which was attended by 15 people. We looked at an episode of natural interaction video-recorded among Japanese learners in a homestay context in the US, observing their interaction from the perspective of the speakers themselves.

Picking up the theme of Multimodal L2 Interaction, the SIG forum was held on the Saturday morning, and featured presentations by Eric Hauser, Adam Brandt and Tim Greer. These papers became the basis for some lively discussion about how and why to incorporate descriptions of embodied features of interaction into our analysis. We discussed the challenges of transcribing things like gaze, posture, proximity, and gesture, and talked about how these might be relevant to research into second language interaction.

There were plenty of interesting Pragmatics presentations, and it was good to see new members taking an active part in the conference. Rather than just give my own views about the event, I have asked some of them to give me a short summary of their impressions.

Tim Greer  
*Kobe University*

### What some of the participants had to say

"As a first-timer at a Pan-SIG conference, it was a great experience presenting in the Pragmatics/CA room. The supportive and knowledgeable audience provided new perspectives to the analysis. It was also great catching up with old friends and meeting SIG members in person whom I've only known from their articles."

Aki Siegel  
*Rikkyo University*



"I enjoyed the PanSIG conference because there were many insightful and thought-provoking presentations and discussions. It was also a great opportunity to meet new people from the Pragmatics SIG and receive feedback on my research from other researchers in the same field."

Jeffrie Butterfield  
*Kanagawa University*





The conference venue and program was very good. I wish I had been able to see all the pragmatics presentations; I missed some, ones on CA in particular, due to the Prag-SIG concurrent sessions.

Mayuki Fujioka  
*Kindai University*



"PanSIG 2016 in Okinawa was a great opportunity to broaden my outlook on L2 pragmatics, especially through the presentations using Conversation Analysis. There were a number of participants who presented distinguished descriptions of interactional phenomena with a huge variety of research interests: language learning, guiding, translanguaging, instruction, and interacting through/with objects, to name a few. I hope we can maintain this flourishing research again in Akita."

Yusuke Arano  
*Chiba University*

I mostly attended sessions devoted to conversation analysis, an area of Pragmatics that tries to figure out the underlying social organization of talk-in-interaction. The data presented dealt primarily with language learners and looked at interaction between language learners themselves, as well as with teachers.

Jack Barrow  
*Osaka International University*

The Friday CA data session was so lively. Not only CA professionals but also many CA beginners like me could enjoy discussing the conversation between a Hawaiian host dad/mom and their Japanese host students. As a presenter, I really appreciated the support, patience and precious

comments from colleagues. As an audience member I regret I could not attend all the presentation of pragmatics, but the up-to-date research has given me much insight and inspiration! I appreciate the painstaking effort of the organizers and I thank them with all my heart.

Ritsuko Izutani  
*Osaka University*

## PAN SIG JOURNAL 2015

### Showcase

The proceedings from the 2015 PanSIG conference have now been published and there were several papers that dealt with aspects of language from a pragmatics standpoint. To whet your appetite, some abstracts are presented here. The full papers can be accessed at:

<http://pansig.org/publications/2015/2015pansigjournal.pdf>

A big thank you to all of those authors who wrote up their presentations, and also to the editorial team, in particular Gavin Brooks, Donna Fukimoto, Donna Tatsuki and Matthew Porter for all of their hard work in getting the journal out and available.

### Repair Sequences as Potential Sites of Learning

**Jeffrie Butterfield**

Kanagawa University

[jeffriebutterfield@gmail.com](mailto:jeffriebutterfield@gmail.com)

Because most conversation analytic studies on learning lack a traceable learning object, there is skepticism regarding the ability of conversation analysis to deal with the issue of learning. The present study hopes to contribute to previous research on learning by showing how and where learning may occur in second language interaction. It first attempts to demonstrate how participants show a lack of knowledge or a problem in understanding, a change of state following a repair as seen through the participants' production of change of state tokens (Heritage, 1984), and their application of just-encountered linguistic items in the subsequent interaction.

### Redressing Imbalanced Positioning through Narrative

**Kaori Hata**

Osaka University

[hata@lang.osaka-u.ac.jp](mailto:hata@lang.osaka-u.ac.jp)

The aim of my paper is to clarify how the participants in an institutional framework co/deconstruct or redress imbalances in status by using characters in narratives. In such a framework, so many imbalances exist. They are not always necessarily redressed, but in more than a few cases they can be redressed in a here-and-now narrative situation. In my data, it can be seen that the participants effectively use characters in narratives to create multiple dichotomies which the participants use to put themselves into the same category as each other and redress their imbalanced positions/knowledge. By analyzing layers of dichotomies, the multiple identities of one of these participants can be better discerned.

## Developing Understanding Through Storytelling

**Baikuntha Bhatta**

Kanagawa University

trishuliriver@yahoo.com

This paper examines language teachers' use of stories to explain the teaching goals in classroom interaction. It analyzes the video-recorded data from Nepalese and Japanese EFL classrooms that shows three different teachers using narrative formats and relating them to their teaching. The analysis explicates the way teachers initiate stories and relate them to student understanding. One observation is that the application of story-telling generates possible background in order for the students to grasp the objective of the lessons and develop their understanding for upcoming instruction. The paper also describes the teacher's movement to the story-telling sequence, and back to teaching.

## Spoken Narrative: Multiple Voices, Multiple Perspectives

**John Campbell-Larsen**

Kyoto Women's University

joncamlar@hotmail.com

Spoken narrative is a linguistic universal, and one of the most frequently occurring activities in spoken interaction. However, engaging in spoken narrative is more than just creating a series of well-formed sentences and placing them in temporal order. Narratives have a macro-structure and that is analyzable on the level of discourse and at the same time are interactional events that are co-constructed by both teller and audience at a micro-level. This paper will describe some of the research findings concerning these macro-structures and micro-practices. It is proposed that metacognitive awareness of these facets of narrative, on the part of both learners and teachers, combined with repeated encouragement and opportunities to engage in narrative in class time will enable learners to develop abilities to engage in one the central uses of natural language.

# Classroom Utilities: Discourse Analysis

**William Wentworth Jr.**

Yongin University, Korea

This article examines some of the key concepts of discourse analysis, and then discusses how they might apply in the language-learning classroom. First, the important work of defining discourse analysis will be conducted. Among the subsections that will then go under review: discourse competence, anaphoric reference and discourse communities. An important feature running through the paper is the idea of *utility*: what is useful to use in a standard language classroom, and what would prove to be too costly in terms of time or effort. Finally, a general opinion about discourse analysis topics in the classroom will be provided, based on what was seen throughout the article. This piece will hopefully generate some thoughts and guide educators into new avenues of thought when working on the communicative competence of their students.

Discourse analysis can be a difficult topic to get a handle on, being made of many facets. In literature and professional development discussions, the notion of usefulness in the classroom setting can come up from time to time. Here, it is quite right that the interested reader delve deeper into that issue. Understanding a concept is always good for the intellectual growth of the individual. What is more important for teachers, however, is to understand how to take the complex and theoretical and apply it to practices that would improve the ability of students to learn another language. Can Discourse Analysis (DA) do this? To what extent and how can DA do this for language learners?

First, it is critical to understand just what Discourse Analysis is. According to Brian Paltridge, Discourse Analysis is “an approach to the analysis of language that looks at patterns of language across texts as well as the social and cultural contexts in which the texts occur.” (Paltridge, 2006, pg. 1) For the purposes of this paper, it was decided to rely on a narrow definition of *texts*, which are written documents or transcribed utterances only. With that in hand, from what perspectives can one look at what a person says? There are actually quite a few, but it is important to focus on those that are most useful in the classroom setting (or the real-life setting, if that is a main curriculum objective in the class). As it stands for this paper, where personal experiences in the classroom will provide illustrating examples, wide swaths of DA is pushed aside because of the low level of the students being observed. Where this might appear to be egregious, a note will be made

One aspect of Discourse Analysis that could be of great help to students would be in the area of communicative competence, which involves “not only knowing a language, but also what to say to whom, and how to say it appropriately in a particular situation.” (Paltridge, 2006, pg. 6) An excellent example of this kind of skill would be in the phrase “that’s too bad.” This is widely taught in the English language classroom, but coming from American English, a teacher might try to discourage my students from using it because it has a sarcastic connotation that they may not be aware of if they try to use it. “I’m sorry to hear that” would be more appropriate in all situations where a speaker might want to show sympathy.

While the notion of a discourse community, which can be defined as “a group of people who share some kind of activity” (Paltridge, 2006, pg. 24) would be a great way to target language to maximum utility for a group of students, it has not been possible in some classroom experiences. A teacher would need a group that is homogenous beyond being from the same country and educational level. Many classes are mixed-major (or mixed-interest, if not university-level) classes, where the needs are multi-variate. Where this is true, the possibility of using the ideas of a discourse community in lesson planning has proven too difficult and classtime-consuming to be useful.

One area that might work for more fluent students is the notion of anaphoric reference, defined by McCarthy as “referents... [which] can be confirmed by looking *back* in the text” [emphasis in the original] (McCarthy, 1991, pg. 35). This has the potential for a greater utility

for a larger number of language instructors, and a quick comprehension check to make sure students understand would be fairly simple. One would imagine that the ease of understanding would be directly correlated to the level of English ability. For lower-level classes, one would be cautioned to either abandon the instruction because it is not worthwhile, or be prepared to explain very carefully. The challenge there would be to frame the topic in a way that they could understand, but that is a key component to being a language teacher.

Part of being a teacher is to present language to the students in a way that is simple to understand and fits within the restrictions that the classroom and the rules of the institution impose. Some expansion can be done through homework or extracurricular assignments that recur throughout the class, but that is somewhat limited. A teacher who is somewhat risk-averse would also want to use avoidance strategies to steer clear of potentially job-threatening topics, although each instructor can decide for himself or herself the level of danger within the institution. If a risk is present, one should always look at any discussion of discourse and societal divisions (such as class, gender, identities) as places that, for reasons of limited classtime or simple self-preservation, he or she should not venture into. Instead, an attempt to be as even-handed with the choice of language and how one elicits language from the student might be preferable. The readings reviewed here do not discuss the necessity of delving deeply into these subtopics, but one can make the argument that there is not enough time in the class to break down conversations in such a way. That is not to say that examining conversations and other pieces for overly stereotypical language and possibly modify what is there if it is believed too biased in one way or another is not worthwhile. That is part of being even-handed.

When examining the idea of themes and rhemes, one might be surprised by the definition of theme being “the point of departure’ of a message” (Wang, 2007, pg. 166). Based purely on personal experience, it does not seem like a topic that is covered in conventional English classes. Teachers do engage in the task of breaking down sentences, but usually they might use comprehension questions, not an explicit look at “texts at the discourse level.” (Wang, 2007, pg. 165).

Looking at the written texts for cohesion is another point where most basic English teachers do not delve deeply. It would seem that a cursory look at cohesion would be enough, but the literature points to a massively labor-intensive move. Herein lies an important lesson to consider - do not read articles as gospel for how to teach. Each teacher understands how much time should and can be devoted to certain subjects. Cohesion is important, but not a be-all-end-all for good writing. One might never give much thought about cohesive devices or discourse features beyond the instinctual level of “not feeling right” as one reads along. What are these two important aspects of writing? J. Y. Kang explains that “cohesion refers to connections at the surface level, determined by lexically and grammatically over intersentential relationships.” (Kang, 2005, pg. 264) Written discourse features are not explicitly defined in the same article, but the author notes that “Chafe (1982) identified ... devices as specific to written narrative discourse.” (Kang, 2005, pg. 265) To be honest, this paper was far too complex a look at written discourse for a lot of humble language teachers to consider it necessary to follow in the classroom, but those teachers should be glad that there are names for the things that are found in students’ writing errors.

After examining various aspects of Discourse Analysis, large and small, the best answer seems to be to take the safe but boring moderate course. There is a lot to consider when evaluating conversations and example texts that are found in coursebooks and in supplemental materials, and they should be seriously assessed before they are taught to the students. However, given the low-level of the students and the limited time spent with them, getting into deep minutiae with them would be confusing and wasteful. While one is risking misunderstanding and the fossilization of those misconceptions, deeper examinations of what the discourse means would be best set aside for a higher-level class in most instances. However, the ideas that we have looked at in the class are important still for the low-level English teacher, so that he or she can catch a severe language problem before the student makes it in real-life. Something that would create a catastrophic failure of communication should be taught to any



level of language student, and Discourse Analysis is most useful when it helps the teacher see the potential for it, and find a way to steer the students away from committing it.

### References

- Kang, J. (2005). Written Narratives as an index of L2 competence in Korean EFL learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Continuum.
- Wang, L. (2007) Theme and Rheme in the Thematic Organization of Text: Implications for Teaching Academic Writing. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9 (1), pg. 164-176.

### About the Author

William Wentworth Jr. is an assistant professor of English at Yongin University, in the Republic of Korea. He is also studying Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) at Kyunghee University, also in the Republic of Korea. As such, generating ideas for improving classroom practice is a key focus of his work and research.

# Turn-Taking and Arrhythmia: Looking at Prosody

Neil Talbert

Catholic University of Daegu.

## Introduction

While I was a student, I conducted a small study comparing the pragmatic aspects of the first-time interactions of two pairs of participants. I was inspired by Gumperz and his research on contextualization cues. According to Gumperz (1982, p. 131), "a contextualization cue is any feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signaling of contextual presuppositions." These cues may be carried through different linguistic channels--the area of interest in the present study is prosody. Through these cues, speakers frame the explicit content of their conversational moves in cues that draw upon a set of tacit rules for how conversation may proceed. The governance of turn-taking, for example, may be encoded only paralinguistically, such as through head nodding or eye contact. Yet as Gumperz goes on to say, these cues, in their indirectness, can be problematic for interlocutors who operate under different sets of rules for contextualization cues. In Gumperz, Jupp, and Roberts (1979), we hear an East Indian English-speaking bank patron interacting with a British English-speaking bank teller. When the Indian English speaker requests his money, the teller interprets the Indian's falling intonation as rude and demanding, supporting Gumperz's (1982) conclusion that a lack of shared presupposition regarding the meaning of contextualization cues can lead to a misunderstanding of a speaker's intent. That kind of misunderstanding is the topic of this article.

## Methodology and Background

This study compared the interactions of a pair of native English speakers to another pair comprising a native speaker of English and an English language learner (a native speaker of Vietnamese). All of these participants were female students at a university in the Southern US in their 20s and 30s.

The participants were directed to meet in a closed library room, in which a digital audio recorder was placed openly to record their conversation for about eight minutes per pair, after which the researcher returned and stopped the recording. Participants were later identified against each other in the audio data according to differences in vocal quality, with the pair of native English speakers labeled NS1 and NS2 and the pair of non-native and native speakers respectively labeled NNS and NS, the focus of this article being the latter pair. Prosody was rated according to the auditory perceptions of the researcher, and the baseline pitch of each participant was measured according to what seems to have been their average during the recorded interaction.

This article owes much to the model developed by Brazil (1997), which was helpful in its focus on the ways in which intonation affects discursive and pragmatic interpretations, as well as by its transcription model, a simplified version of which is summarized below:

- // – tone unit boundary
- capital letters – prominent syllable
- underlined letters – tonic segment
- r – rising intonation
- p – falling intonation
- l – level tone
- (notes and pauses marked in parentheses)
- [overlapping speech marked in brackets]

Brazil (1997) characterizes intonation according to its role in social convergence. For example, rising tones are known as referring tones, in that they are said to refer to information already

established as being in the space of convergence between speaker and hearer. Falling tones, on the other hand, are called proclaiming tones, because they proclaim new information and are intended to expand the state of convergence between interlocutors. Thus, in the hypothetical utterance

//r WHEN i've finished what I'm DOing //p i'll HELP you //

the initial tone unit is marked with a rising tone because it presumably refers to something already known to both the speaker and hearer, perhaps because it is visibly apparent that the speaker is busy doing something. The second tone unit, being marked with a proclaiming tone, is meant to expand the state of convergence by proclaiming the speaker's intent to help the listener. The pattern in English, at least according to Brazil's model, then, is to not terminate a tone unit in a conversational move with a referring tone unless such an utterance is intended not to proclaim information but to elicit. In all cases, though, Brazil (1997, p. 67) emphasizes the importance of "local interpretations" to understanding the specific pragmatic implication of a tone.

Another important concept that informs my analysis in this article is the exploration of interactions between counselors and students developed in Erikson & Shultz (1982)--specifically, how an interaction was found to show evidence of comfort and rapport between interlocutors. One of the measures by which a moment in an interaction was found to be correlated with raters' subjective sense of comfortableness or uncomfortableness was interactional arrhythmia. In their analysis of the talk between students and counselors, Erikson & Shultz (1982) found that utterances tended to follow a regular beat established between interlocutors. However, this beat was sometimes disrupted, which could be manifested in the speech of either one or both interlocutors as a mutual slowness or "wobbling" of the conversation, interference and overlap between interlocutors, or even competitive overlapping of utterances.

Drawing on Gumperz, Jupp, & Roberts (1979), Erikson & Shultz point out that differences between the contextualization cues in East Indian and British English lead to misinferences and miscommunication. In their own study, Erikson & Shultz (1982) show that the point at which a listener is expected to respond is marked differently through intonation by black and white speakers of English, despite their shared nationality. For a listener not to respond to contextualization cues such as intonation in a way a speaker expects, as the study described in this paper shows, can indeed lead to arrhythmia and its accompanying uncomfortableness.

## Findings

This sample between NS-NNS shows the effect of intonation in yielding and maintaining the floor, and these two participants seemed to be operating under different presuppositions regarding how the floor is yielded with rising and falling tones.

0:30-0:39

NNS: //p this is my LAST semESTer in here //p so NEXT semESTer //r i will do (removed) COLlege // (.5 second pause) //p for eduCation MAior //

NS: //p OH //p YEAH //

NNS: [/l WHAT'S your //]

NS: [/p how long] are you gonna GO to (removed) //

NNS: //r HUH //

NS: //p how long do you GO to (removed) //

Though NNS does not speak English as her first language, she demonstrates awareness of the ways in which intonation marks turns in English. For example, in this sample, NNS marks her first tone unit with a falling tone, projecting into the information convergence new information. Following that, NNS selects a falling tone to mark her utterance, which could be interpreted as

having the effect of contrasting "next semester" with "last semester," proclaiming that, "At this point, I will now discuss next semester." When NNS marks the final tone unit in this first utterance with the proclaiming tone, NS takes this, along with a short pause here, as her cue that the floor is open. She responds with some back-channeling, yet when NNS attempts to take the floor, she is interrupted by NS, who asks NNS a follow-up question ("How long are you gonna go to"). When NNS yields the floor, this mutual rhythmic interference (Erikson & Shultz, 1982) is quickly resolved, yet the issue of what caused it is not entirely clear.

One possibility is that NNS and NS are operating under different contextualization conventions for the yielding of the floor. Different rules for wait time may be to blame, or the cause may be a lack of shared understanding about intonation. Rising tones in US and UK English refer to information already shared between interlocutors (Brazil, 1997), and therefore, unless an utterance is an elicitation, they tend to end with falling tones. The following excerpt exemplifies use of rising and falling tones as integral in marking the end of an utterance.

1:33-1:44

NS: // r i took a concenTRAtion in LITerature // r so it's MOSTly like FOCuses on  
STUdying CLASSics and LANguage // (.5 second pause) // p and i'm NOT really  
SURE what i'm gonna DO with it //

The pause in this sample may show that NS was not immediately decided upon what to say next, yet because of the rising tone the precedes it, NS must have sensed that she was still in control of the floor, and therefore that a tone unit with a falling intonation must follow. In my analysis of the conversation between NS1 and NS2, I discovered a common discourse marker, "so yeah" (marked with a falling tone), which tended to follow tone units with a rising intonation. As it is devoid of much significant content (except perhaps for the speaker to confirm what has been said), "so yeah" may simply be a way for speakers to mark their utterances as complete.

By this, it is apparent that there is a general principle that tone units marked with rising tones, unless intended to elicit information, tend to be followed by tone units marked with falling tones, which is a constraint that sometimes requires informationally empty intonation units. Returning to the earlier sequence between NNS and NS, we can now see that NNS may operate under the principle that a rising tone tends to indicate an incomplete tone unit or an elicitation, and a tone unit marked by a falling tone and followed by a pause tends to indicate a finished turn. After NS's back-channeling ("oh yeah"), NNS seemed to take her falling tone as a signal that the floor was open. However, NS continued to speak, defying what may have been NNS's expectation about falling tones and yielding the floor, the confusion from which seeming to have led to the interruption.

The correlation between arrhythmia and intonation is more clear in another sample of the conversation. Here, NNS begins to share information about her experience about her experience in the US.

1:22-1:32

NS: // p WHERE do you LIVE [// like do you //]  
NNS: [// p i LIVE with] my UNCLE // p YEAH // p and IT'S like // p ONE // r i've  
been here like ONE and a HALF year // (1 second pause)  
NS: // p OH // p SO // (quietly)  
NNS: //r are you INTEResting in ENGLISH //

Based on what has been described about intonation and the yielding of the floor, NNS's first turn with a rising tone here marks her speech to NS as incomplete, and the one second pause may be NS awaiting NNS to complete her turn, the effect being that NNS and NS failed to interpret each other's cues, leaving an arrhythmic gap in the conversation that could have been perceived as uncomfortable.



As the conversation went on, though, the interaction between NS and NNS became smoother, and though there was overlapping speech, it was mostly back-channeling and did not seem to disrupt the flow of conversation.

2:30-2:37

NNS: // r HOPEfully // r WHEN you graduATE // p it's gonna BETTer //

NS: // p YEAH // r HOPEfully by the TIME i GRADuate // r i'll be ABle to ACtually get a JOB //

NNS: // p YEAH //

As this excerpt exemplifies, the pair seemed to adapt to a functional turn-taking sequence.

### Implications

As Gumperz (1982, p. 132) observes, contextualization cues become layered one upon the other, such that a lack of mutual understanding of the implications of these cues can quickly build into mutual misperception between interlocutors. Recognizing this, it is apparent that language might do well to teach the ways in which contextualization cues such as prosody affect communication and perceptions of intent. Though it is unlikely that a teacher would be able to fully show students the ways in which these cues are used as signals, raising awareness of some of the basic principles, such as the use of the rising and falling tone, would help students learn to avoid uncomfortable moments and have smoother interactions in English.

### References

- Brazil, D. (1997). *The communicative value of intonation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coupland, J. & Coupland, N. (1992). "'How are you? ': Negotiating phatic communication. " *Language in Society* 21: 207-230.
- Erikson, F., & Shultz, J. (1982). *The Counselor as Gatekeeper: Social Interaction in Interviews*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Gumperz, J., Jupp, T., & Roberts, C. (1979). *Crosstalk: A study of cross-cultural communication*. Southall, Middlesex: The National Center for Industrial Language Training and B.B.C. Continuing Education Department.
- Zegarac, V., & Clark, B. (1999). "Phatic interpretations and phatic communication." *Journal of Linguistics* 35: 321-346.

## Conference news

### Some dates for your diary:

#### **2016 CUE Conference**

**September 24, Kinki, University, Osaka**

The JALT College and University Educators SIG is holding its 2016 conference on Saturday 24<sup>th</sup> September at Kinki University, Osaka. The editor will be in attendance and I hope to see a few familiar (and new) faces at the conference. It is a great opportunity to network and catch up with what is going on around the JALT University teacher's community in a more intimate setting than the hurly-burly of the big national and international conferences. Full details available at the conference website here:

<http://conference.jaltcue.org/>

#### **2016 KOTESOL International Conference**

**October 15-16, 2016 (Sat-Sun) Sookmyung Women's University, Seoul**

If you fancy a quick hop across the sea to our neighbors in Korea the 24<sup>th</sup> KOTESOL International conference is taking place on 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> of October (Saturday and Sunday) at Sookmyung Women's University in downtown Seoul. This is always an interesting conference, providing a wide variety of topics and giving an interesting insight into what is going on in another part of Asia. Flights can be really cheap if you book early with an LCC. It is often cheaper to fly to Korea than travel around the archipelago! Full details available here:

<https://koreatesol.org/IC2016>

#### **JALT2016: Transformation in Language Education**

**42nd Annual International Conference on Language Teaching and Learning & Educational Materials Exhibition Friday 25<sup>th</sup> to Monday 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2016**

The showcase event of the JALT calendar, the international JALT conference will take place in Nagoya over the weekend of 25<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> November. There promises to be a wide variety of talks with a diverse range of plenary and invited speakers, with something for everyone. As usual there will be a number of pragmatics themed presentations. Watch this space for more information. If you are considering attending, it might be a good idea to look into accommodation options now, as hotels often get booked out some considerable time in advance. Full conference information can be found here:

<https://jalt.org/conference>

#### **15th International Pragmatics Conference**

**Belfast Waterfront Conference Center**

**Belfast, Northern Ireland, 16-21 July 2017.**

Looking ahead to 2017, the 15th International Pragmatics Conference (IPrA2017) will be held in Belfast, Northern Ireland, 16-21 July 2017. The call for papers is now open, with a deadline of October 15<sup>th</sup> for those wishing to submit an individual paper or poster session.

In addition to submitting an individual, stand-alone proposal the conference also organizes themed panels to which presenters can submit. (The October 15<sup>th</sup> deadline applies here also.)

For a full list of panels see here:

<http://ipra.ua.ac.be/main.aspx?c=.CONFERENCE15&n=1520>

To submit to the IPrA conference you must be a member both at the time of submission and at the time of the conference. Note that membership runs from January to December, regardless of when you actually pay your membership dues, so if you are planning on submitting a proposal, you will have to pay your membership dues for 2016 and be prepared to pay your dues again in early 2017. (Membership is 80 Euros per year.)

Full information can be found here:

[http://ipra.ua.ac.be/main.aspx?c=\\*CONFERENCE2006](http://ipra.ua.ac.be/main.aspx?c=*CONFERENCE2006)

## Afterword

That's all for now. Hopefully I will see some of you at various upcoming conferences and events. Remember, if you attend any conferences, workshops, data-sessions, drinking bouts or any other events, you can always write up your impressions and let the rest of the JALT Pragmatics SIG community know what is going on. Let's keep up to date with what everyone is doing and cement our reputation as one of the most active and engaged SIG's in JALT. Pragmatics Sig can be found on Twitter at the following handle:

@pragsig

Visit our homepage:

<http://www.pragsig.org/>

## Pragmatics SIG Committee Members

Coordinator	Donna Fujimoto
Treasurer	Kimiko Koseki
Program Chairs	Chris Ruddenklau & Kumiko Kizu
Publicity Chairs	Rob Olson & Chie Kawashima
Membership Chairs	Nobuko Trent & Yosuke Ishii
Newsletter Editor	John Campbell-Larsen
Japanese Newsletter	Yukie Saito
Web manager	Philip Riccobono
Publications Chair	Donna Tatsuki
Members-at-large	Jack Barrow & Sanae Oda-Sheehan

### Email addresses

[fujimotodonna@gmail.com](mailto:fujimotodonna@gmail.com),  
[koseki@myad.jp](mailto:koseki@myad.jp),  
[chisruddenklau@asahi.email.ne.jp](mailto:chisruddenklau@asahi.email.ne.jp),  
[tk\\_kizu@yahoo.co.jp](mailto:tk_kizu@yahoo.co.jp),  
[robolson32@hotmail.com](mailto:robolson32@hotmail.com),  
[kawashimachie@hotmail.com](mailto:kawashimachie@hotmail.com),  
[nobukotrent@gmail.com](mailto:nobukotrent@gmail.com),  
[yowske@gmail.com](mailto:yowske@gmail.com),  
[joncamlar@hotmail.com](mailto:joncamlar@hotmail.com),  
[ty-saito@yacht.ocn.ne.jp](mailto:ty-saito@yacht.ocn.ne.jp),  
[psricc@gmail.com](mailto:psricc@gmail.com),  
[dhtatsuki@gmail.com](mailto:dhtatsuki@gmail.com),  
[jack\\_e@mac.com](mailto:jack_e@mac.com),  
[sheehan@nifty.com](mailto:sheehan@nifty.com)