Review
Reviewed Work(s): Conversational Coherence: Form, Structure, and Strategy by Robert T. Craig and Karen Tracy
Review by: Donal Carbaugh
Source: *Language in Society*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Mar., 1989), pp. 103-109
Published by: Cambridge University Press
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/4168007
Accessed: 08-11-2018 19:55 UTC

nonreported and reported speech and for the varieties of reported speech. Perhaps there is a need for terminology developed on the model of blood group nomenclature (e.g., Direct report$_{\text{Japanese type}}$ or Indirect report$_{\text{Swahili type}}$), each subtype referring to particular syntactic and deictic patterns.

REFERENCES

Jespersen, O. (1968 [1922]). *Language: Its nature, development, and origin*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Menn, L., & Boyce, S. (1982). Fundamental frequency and discourse structure. *Language and Speech* 25:341–83.

Wierzbicka, A. (1974). The semantics of direct and indirect discourse. *Papers in Linguistics* 7:267–307.

Reviewed by SUSAN THOMAS
Department of Linguistics
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305

(Received 26 June 1987)

ROBERT T. CRAIG AND KAREN TRACY (eds.), *Conversational coherence: Form, structure, and strategy*. (Sage Series in Interpersonal Communication 2.) Beverly Hills: Sage, 1983. Pp. vii + 344.

This book includes a series of papers that were presented at the Third Annual Conference on Discourse Analysis at Temple University in March 1982. All of the papers in the volume are authored by scholars who were trained in, or are currently a part of, departments of communication. The singular theme that runs through the volume is conversational coherence, the guiding questions being: What is conversational coherence? How is it accomplished? What conceptual frameworks enable its description and explanation? Many of the contributions to the volume respond to these questions by appropriating from Grice's theory of implicature, Searle's speech act theory, and/or using the approaches of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. While the contributions taken as a whole vivify several colors of coherence, they refract others, rendering the broader spectrum of coherence difficult to see (hear and feel).

In the introduction to the volume, Craig and Tracy provide a useful overview of the emergence of communication research on conversation; a commitment to its study as a multidiscipline; definitions of coherence, form, and strategy; and an overview of the following chapters. The tone of the introduction is optimistic. Craig and Tracy claim "studies of conversation have proliferated and become one of the most vital fields of communication research" and "communication has always been a discipline with a particular openness to other fields of knowledge" (13). A special feature in the volume is a transcript (included as an appendix) that the editors asked each

contributor to use during some part of their essay. Thus, the reader is treated to several looks at "the same data," from different vantage points, giving a sense of how each author would approach such conversational moments. This is an interesting experiment, and it works well.

The first four chapters of the book are presented as a unit, Approaches to Coherence. The first chapter, by Julia Goldberg, "A move toward describing conversational coherence," provides a view of coherence grounded in a descriptive model of "conversational moves," or utterances which influence topic development. The model involves a typology of moves as well as a procedure for assigning moves to utterances. Goldberg demonstrates the advantages of the model, especially its ability to explore relationships between conversational moves, uses of particles such as *y'know*, macroconversational themes, and conversational sequences.

The second chapter, by Scott Jacobs and Sally Jackson, "Speech act structure in conversation: Rational aspects of pragmatic coherence," continues their work on a rational model of coherence. They begin by exploring the limitations of the sequencing rules model by focusing on the concept of the adjacency pair, then proposing their rational model to solve some of these difficulties. They treat coherence as a manifestation of cognitive reasoning from means to achieving goals. They use the game metaphor to highlight two levels of description, both knowledge of rules and knowledge of rational play, and properties of coherence, goal orientation, and alignment. Jacobs and Jackson extend Grice's and Habermas's universal rules by adding two of their own: a validity rule, a refinement of Habermas's sincerity condition; and a reason rule, acting in alignment with assumed standards of coherence and appropriateness. They conclude by discussing how their rational model of coherence can subsume and extend the sequencing rules model.

The third chapter, by Robert Sanders, explores "Tools for cohering discourse and their strategic utilization." Sanders gives a complex and detailed account of coherence from the standpoint of "meaning relations," or the relations between utterances and their antecedent sequences. Sanders argues that conversational coherence is more than a system of "structural relations" (such as the relation between grammatical segments and intonation, turn-taking and gazing or pausing, topic boundaries and verbal devices). Coherence involves "meaning relations that link structural components to each other" (72). Sanders develops his approach to coherence through "meaning relations," or how structural properties are connected (cognitively) through conversationalists' assessments of the relative "communicative value" of propositional content, implicature, and illocutionary force. The momentary resolution of this assessment coheres conversation by providing an order for various structural properties and their antecedents (and consequences). In this sense, Sanders advances a view of coherence from the standpoint of

meaning relations, which itself provides a base for organizing conversations' structural properties. Sanders then discusses the utility of the framework for describing and explaining coherence as a processual and strategic accomplishment (see Sanders 1987).

In the fourth chapter, Robert Hopper continues the strategic (rather than obligatory) and cognitive (more than speaking oriented) focus of Sanders by discussing "Interpretation as coherence production." Hopper discusses coherence as an activity of listening, hearing, and interpretation. His notion of interpretive coherence is based on conversationalists' orderings of "binary pairings" and relations (87), a process that, Hopper contends, emerges through time and involves the coordination of individuals through aligning actions.

The second unit of the volume is entitled Studies of Strategies. The fifth chapter presents a discussion of "Licensing violations: Legitimate violations of Grice's conversational principle." Susan Mura demonstrates instances of conversation where each of Grice's maxims is violated legitimately. Her effort is designed to develop a more pragmatic theory of coherence, one which shows how conversation that occurs contrary to Grice's principle "may also function in a cooperative manner" (114).

In the sixth chapter, Karen Tracy and John Moran discuss "Conversational relevance in multiple-goal settings." After summarizing the results of four previous studies, Tracy and Moran define "a relevant remark [as] one that responds to the main point of a speaker's immediately preceding message" (121). They then demonstrate how relevance is one of many conversational goals, and a matter of degree, by discussing three strategies for dealing with competing goals. They conclude by calling for studies of conversation that include its social and cultural dimensions, especially by probing goals and outcomes as they relate to assessments of competence.

In the seventh chapter, Bryan Crow discusses "Topic shifts in couples' conversations" by asking: How is topical coherence accomplished by intimate couples in the privacy of their homes? Crow builds a typology of topic maintenance that includes types of shifts, coherent and noncoherent shifts, inserts, and renewals as well as maintenance devices. Crow codes couples' conversations in terms of the typology, a procedure that enables him to discuss the relative frequency of shifts (an average of 1 every 48 seconds), frequencies of each type, the use of "shading" among topics, the necessity of topic theory being based on "acts" rather than "turns," and how such an approach can relate principles of communicative competence and coherence to specific situated performances.

In the eighth chapter, Sandra Ragan examines "Alignment and conversational coherence" in the context of job interviews by asking: How do participants construct role identities through conversation? After discussing strategies and devices of alignment, and their metalinguistic functions, she

induces a framework of aligning actions. Examining these actions by roles, she finds that interviewers use more summaries, interpretations, metacommunication, side sequences, and qualifiers, whereas interviewees use more justifications, excuses, and qualifiers. She discusses how these verbal actions lead the interviewer role into enactments of influence, with the interviewee acting more "defensive, tentative, deferential" (167). She concludes by noting the role of alignment patterns in (re)creating social relations of inequitable status.

The third unit of the volume is entitled The Influence of Context. Stuart Sigman begins the unit by discussing "Some multiple constraints placed on conversational topics." He sets the tone for the unit when he echoes the Hymesian plea: [S]cholars doing discourse analysis should extend their investigatory focus beyond the discourse text itself and toward the relationship between discourse and the encompassing social context" (175). Sigman goes on to critique identifiable trends in topic negotiation literature, for example, topics as unifunctional, conceived in terms of "internal linguistic relevance" more than instances of social force. He proposes a conceptual framework that explores conversational topics as interacting with the social, cultural, and normative aspects of situated actions (see Sigman 1987).

In the tenth chapter, Wayne Beach asks: How does language both create and occur in contexts? He explores "resources," "codes," and "common knowledge" (200–01) as features in communication that influence lexical choices and act sequences. His goal is to unravel various levels of meanings, referential to ideological, as they radiate from the use of conversational resources in contexts.

Don Ellis treats the relationship between "Language, coherence, and textuality" in the eleventh chapter by discussing four functional levels of language – phonemic, morphemic, syntactic, and discursive – then by proposing three levels of coherence: (a) the depictive, a level of "portraitive" coherence, beyond reference, to include "portraying objects, describing processes, characterizing events, expressing relations" (229), (b) the speech act level, deriving from Austin and Searle, and (c) the discourse level, "issues in structural binding beyond sentence or clause units" (233). He discusses how texts cohere because they fulfill functional linguistic requirements and are organized according to distinctive and complementary levels of coherence.

The final unit of the book is entitled Conversation as a Genre of Discourse. The twelfth chapter presents a study of "Tactical coherence in courtroom conversation" by Robert Nofsinger. Nofsinger argues that courtroom utterances must be recognized or recognizable as parts of "a tactical plan for the achievement of a known goal" (252). He presents and applies a framework that relates the symbolic acts (propositional and episodic force) of lawyers and witnesses to interactional goals and outcomes. His analysis dem-

onstrates tactical coherence as a way to identify links between symbolic acts and goals which together constitute a conversational plan.

In the thirteenth chapter, Thomas Farrell discusses "Aspects of coherence in conversation and rhetoric." The heart of this essay attempts to distinguish rhetoric from conversation, but it is not clear whether Farrell is distinguishing intentions of speakers, perspectives for inquiry, moments in face-to-face interaction, (American?) genres of (natural?) discourse, or the place of rhetoric within conversation. Farrell attributes four qualities to "conversation" (emerging "from the conventions and norms for exchange within the culture" [267], "eminently perishable" [268], "indeterminate in . . . direction" [269], "cannot leave the bounds of intentionality" [270]) and contrasts them with qualities of "rhetoric" ("comes from the intentional consciousness" [269], as "lasting . . . becomes part of a culture's form of life" [269], "usually has some end in view" [269], and strives toward cultural forms yielded by history [270]). He argues that "rhetoric" emerges at junctures of deliberateness, ambiguity, and disputation, and contends that since "conversation" is more "concealed," it requires a better coding in social knowledge if it is to be efficacious. He concludes contending that "rhetoric is always a background for conversation" (283), is involved in account-giving, and enacts issues of character and responsibility.

The final chapter of the volume is written by Leonard Hawes, who replies to the question, what is coherence? by building on Habermas's universal validity conditions. Hawes presents a kind of two-pronged dialectic, between truthfulness and appropriateness and between my sense and our sense, that he argues is central to cohering conversation. He explores these dialectics as they relate to meaning and its delimitation through "authoring" (in Foucault's sense) and "correcting" (as instances of managing the dialectics). He concludes by discussing conversation as a "sliding chain" of our appropriate meanings that is punctuated by my truthful subjectivity.

Taken together, these contributions provide a useful step toward understanding and interpreting conversational coherence. As a piece, the volume could be read as responding to three questions: (a) What is the locus for a theory of coherence? It is a cognitive (Sanders, Jacobs & Jackson, Hopper, Ellis) and/or interactional (Goldberg, Tracy & Moran, Crow, Hawes) phenomenon. (b) What communication resources (re)produce coherence? And how? Coherence is produced through various sequential structures (Goldberg, Sanders, Hopper, Tracy & Moran), more specifically through the interactional management of goals, means, and outcomes (Sanders, Jacobs & Jackson, Tracy & Moran, Nofsinger, Farrell), all of which involve coordinating individual acts through social frames (Hopper, Mura, Ragan), as well as managing topics (Crow, Sigman, Ellis). (c) What levels need be included in theories of conversational coherence? Linguistic levels such as lexical

choices, speech and symbolic acts, and episodic sequences (Ellis, Beach, Nofsinger), their relationship to social relations and cultural themes (Sigman), and their use in specific dialogues and contexts (Crow, Ragan, Nofsinger). The volume demonstrates movement toward a comprehensive understanding of conversational coherence.

As the volume highlights several important approaches to coherence, namely theories of speech acts and implicature, it tends to hide others. At times I was led to ask: Can conversation cohere without culture? or history? or social structure and institutions? Many contributions to the volume apply microanalytic frameworks in an a priori rather than heuristic way, defining communication resources from analysts' perspectives, then examining instances of the analytic categories. Thus one reads about "moves," "speech acts," "meaning relations," "telling-expansions," and so on without knowing whether such things are coherent to those being studied. What this too often yields is a model of coherence that is coherent to analysts but lacks demonstrable validity at the practical level of meaningful action. One finds pieces of data that illustrate analytic categories and hypotheses but little by way of meaningfulness and coherence to participants. What are conversationists' senses of conversational resources? form? style? What role do these assessments play in shaping conversation? For example, Jacobs and Jackson's fine extension of the sequencing rules model works well, given the assumptions of speech act theory and Western rational actions. But their model falls prey to facts of cultural variation, just as Searle's speech act theory has been questioned by Rosaldo (1982). What happens to models of coherence when "speech acts" do not express "psychological states," do not follow Western standards of "rationality," and do not issue forth from persons *as individuals* in our Westernized sense? To extend such theorizing, and to make models of coherence accountable for diverse patterns of action and meaning, cultural symbols and forms of coherence must be explored, cross-cultural study advanced. I am not saying that all analytic frameworks must account for the native view (although that type of argument could be made), only that a theory of coherence needs to include such a voice in its chorus. Without it, one is led to hear conversation as coherent, but coherent above and beyond the common culture. Several efforts have been made recently to include such a view, especially by exploring cultural codes that organize standards for public discourse (Philipsen 1986), native genres of speaking and cultural symbols of personhood (Carbaugh 1988; Katriel 1986), among various other concerns (see Philipsen & Carbaugh 1986). Without including the sociocultural level in theories of coherence, analysts risk examining conversations with an electron microscope neither knowing if they are studying rocks or iron nor exploring their role in moments or homes. The level of meanings to humans of their creations is too often skirted and elided, as particles without parables are explored.

REFERENCES

Carbaugh, D. (1988). *Talking American: Cultural discourses on DONAHUE*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
Katriel, T. (1986). *Talking straight: Dugri speech in Israeli Sabra culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Philipsen, G. (1986). Mayor Daley's council speech: A cultural analysis. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 72:247–60.
Philipsen, G., & Carbaugh, D. (1986). A bibliography of fieldwork in the ethnography of communication. *Language in Society* 15:387–98.
Rosaldo, M. (1982). The things we do with words: Ilongot speech acts and speech act theory in philosophy. *Language in Society* 11:203–37.
Sanders, R. (1987). *Cognitive foundations of calculated speech: Controlling understandings in conversation and persuasion*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Sigman, S. (1987). *Perspectives on social communication*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

Reviewed by DONAL CARBAUGH
Department of Communication
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

(Received 24 November 1987)

DONALD G. ELLIS AND WILLIAM A. DONAHUE (eds.), *Contemporary issues in language and discourse processes*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1986. Pp. x + 285.

This edited volume has much to offer scholars of discourse processes, particularly those who reflect on their theoretical commitments and methodological assumptions. Its principal audience is researchers who attempt to account for actual discourse practices. While uneven, most of the papers have thoughtful discussions of relevant issues and/or report on interesting, substantive studies.

The editors designed the collection to have the contributors, and hence the readers, step back from their specific empirical interests and reflect upon the assumptions of their research. They organized the book in three sections, each corresponding with a key issue. In each section there are three papers followed by a fourth that critiques and comments. Papers in the first section consider scripts, plans, and cognitive processes; those in the second, methodology; and those in the last, interaction strategies and discourse. The organization does not work entirely well. The papers in each section do not read as a coherent unit, and the response chapters stand more as separate discussions than as critiques. Still, readers should find their various theoretical, methodological, and substantive interests satisfied by approaching the volume on a chapter-by-chapter basis.

The collection starts with an introductory essay by Searle. In the interest of developing a theoretical account of sequencing rules of discourse, he first discusses the limitations of traditional speech act theory. Following a critique of Grice and Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, he proposes that the concepts