**Discourse Analysis**

**Third lecture**

**6/5/2021**

**Grammar and Communication**

1. **Grammatical (Linguistic) competence**
2. **The three types of pragmatic meaning:**
* **Locutionary act**
* **illocutionary act ( force)**
* **Perlocutionary act ( effect)**
1. **Communicative competence**
2. **Elements of communicative competence:**

**Examples:**

* ***He has put it in a safe place and it will not be found ( the context: a crowded train)***
* ***They has put it in a safe place and it will not be found***
* ***The Taxi will be here in a quarter of an hour***

***Grammatical(linguistic) competence***. This type of competence will be understood to include knowledge of lexical items and of rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology.

* ***Grammatical (Linguistic) competence*** is knowing how to use the grammar, syntax, and vocabulary of a language. Linguistic competence asks: What words do I use? How do I put them into phrases and sentences?

Communicative competence encompasses a **language user's grammatical knowledge of syntax, morphology, phonology** and the like, as well as social knowledge about how and when to use utterances appropriately.

**A meaning of an utterance has three pragmatic (communicative)aspects :**

* **Locutionary act**
* **illocutionary act ( force)**
* **Perlocutionary act ( effect)**

The concept of **illocutionary acts** was introduced into [linguistics](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linguistics) by the philosopher [J. L. Austin](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J._L._Austin) in his investigation of the various aspects of [speech acts](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Speech_acts).

In Austin's framework, *locution* is what was said and meant, *illocution* is what was done, and *perlocution* is what happened as a result.

When somebody says "Is there any salt?" at the dinner table, the *illocutionary act* is a request: "please give me some salt" even though the *[locutionary act](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Locutionary_act%22%20%5Co%20%22Locutionary%20act)* (the literal sentence) was to ask a question about the presence of salt.

The *[perlocutionary act](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Perlocutionary_act%22%20%5Co%20%22Perlocutionary%20act)* (the actual effect), might be to cause somebody to pass the salt.

***Sociolinguistic* competence**. This component is made up of two sets of rules: sociocultural rules of use and rules of discourse. Sociocultural rules of use will specify the ways in which utterances are produced and understood appropriately with respect to the components of communicative events outlined by Hymes (1967, 1968). The focus of rules of discourse in our framework is the combination of utterances and communicative functions and not the grammatical well-formedness of a single utterance nor the sociocultural appropriateness of a set of propositions and communicative functions in a given context.

***Discourse competence***: the ability to use cohesion and coherence among phrases and paragraphs.

***Strategic competence***. This component will be made up of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence. Such strategies will be of two main types: those that relate primarily to grammatical competence (e.g. how to paraphrase grammatical forms that one has not mastered or cannot recall momentarily) and those that relate more the sociolinguistic competence (eg various role-playing strategies, how to address strangers when unsure of their social status).

Blyth summarizes four strands of communicative competence thus:

* *grammatical* (ability to create grammatically correct utterances),
* *sociolinguistic* (ability to produce sociolinguistically appropriate utterances),
* *discourse* (ability to produce coherent and cohesive utterances), and
* *strategic* (ability to solve communication problems as they arise).
1. **Four aspects of communicative competence:**

***Possibility, feasibility, appropriateness, and performance***

**Communicative competence (native-speaker)**

**Hymes 1972**

The seminal text by Hymes opposing communicative competence to Chomsky’s linguistic competence, and also responding of necessity to the latter’s competence-performance distinction .

1. Whether (and to what degree) something is formally *possible*;
2. Whether (and to what degree) something is *feasible* in virtue of the means of implementation available;
3. Whether (and to what degree) something is *appropriate* (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated;
4. Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually *performed* and what its doing entails.

***Possible***This formulation seems to express an essential concern of present linguistic theory for the openness, potentiality, of language, and to generalise it for cultural systems. When systemic possibility is a matter of language, the corresponding term is of course grammaticality.

***Feasible***The predominant concern here has been for psycholinguistic factors such as memory limitation, perceptual device, effects of properties such as nesting, embedding, branching, and the like. With regard to the cultural, one would take into account other features of the body and features of the material environment as well.

***Appropriate***As we have seen, appropriateness is hardly brought into view in the linguistic theory under discussion, and is lumped under the heading of performance, and, correspondingly, acceptability. […] ‘Appropriateness’ seems to suggest readily the required sense of relation to contextual features.

***Performed***The study of communicative competence cannot restrict itself to occurrences, but it cannot ignore them. Structure cannot be reduced to probabilities of occurrence, but structural change is not independent of them . Something may be possible, feasible, and appropriate and not occur. No general term is perhaps needed here, but the point is needed, especially for work that seeks to change what is done.

### Guiding principles for a communicative approach

1. **Communicative competence** is composed minimally of **grammatical** competence, **sociolinguistic** competence, and **strategic** competence (communication strategies).

2. A communicative approach must be based on and respond to the **learner’s communicative needs**.

3. The second language learners must have the opportunity to take part in **meaningful communicative interaction** with **highly competent speakers of the language**, i.e. to respond to genuine communicative needs in realistic second language situations.

4. Particularly at the early stages of second language learning, optimal use must be made of those aspects of communicative competence that the learner has developed through acquisition and use of the **native language** and that are common to those communication skills required in the second language.

5. The primary objective of a communication-oriented second language programme must be to provide the learner with the **information, practice** and much of the **experience** need to meet their communicative needs in the second language.