

**PRAGMATIC TASKS AND THEIR RESULTS OF LANGUAGE SELECTION,
CODE-EXCHANGING, AND NON- EXCHANGING OF SOCIATAL ENCODING
AND DECODING OBSERVATION**

Odeh Sahmi Alhatim

Faculty of Languages and Communication, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin Terengganu,
Malaysia

Abstract

Pragmatics is a branch of Semiotics which interprets the relation between symbols and signs. People's utterances whereas interacting have completely different meanings in step with the circumstances and therefore the intentions that speakers try and convey to an observer, whereas the same person might interpret and even get affronted due to the dearth of knowledge concerning the topic. It's a field studied by linguistics however, the majority study of this paper elucidates the indispensable effort that ought to be created by speakers once conveyance a concept by adding a lot of details doable so as to stop insulting. The paper deals with all options of linguistics together with speech acts, reference and reasoning, supposable and illation, cooperation and implication, additionally discourse and culture. Varied samples are given on every feature within the most applicable manner doable to gift the explanation for insults that will occur while the individuals are interacting. It also deals with the six functions of the language towards the coding scheme. The six functions involved are: the *referential* function, the *directive* function, the *expressive* function, the *phatic* function, the *metalinguistic* function and the *poetic* function. It also elucidates the factors influencing language choice and code-switching.

Keywords: speaker, encode, decoded, listener, belief, insult, six functions, code switching

Introduction

In all languages, there are expressions that rather than conveyance the supposed which means they bring about up completely different perceptions and in most of the cases as results of this, they cause insults. So this paper deals with two new terms to be utilized in linguistics so as to avoid the uncaused insults.

The six functions of language: Towards a coding scheme for utterance function

Appel & Muysken (1987) also acknowledge that language choice and code switching are not clearly distinguishable. They apply the six functions of language systems distinguished by Mühlhäusler (1981- 81) (which is itself based on earlier work by Jakobson and Halliday) to

language choice. The six functions involved are: the referential function, the directive function, the expressive function, the phatic function, the metalinguistic function and the poetic function.

Applied to language mixing, this model has great potential if its six functions are considered as main categories. That is to say: almost all factors influencing language choice and/or code switching which are mentioned in the literature, the additional factors. Only the category 'metalinguistic' had to be extended a little, so as to include general language skills of the speakers. As an example, the subcategories which were assigned to the category of 'directive factors' are shown below.

Inclusion

- 1) Wish to accommodate to interlocutor
 - (a) By using the only language shared with this person
 - (b) By using his/her dominant language
 - (c) By using his/her preferred language
- 2) Wish not to exclude bystanders
 - (a) By using the only language shared with these persons
 - (b) By using their dominant language
- 3) Translate and explain Exclusion
- 4) Rebellion
 - (a) Uttered by using unknown language interlocutor
 - (b) Uttered by using non-dominant language interlocutor
- 5) Secrets
 - (a) Told in unknown language bystander(s)
 - (b) Told in non-dominant language bystander(s)
- 6) Politeness/wish not to bother someone
 - (a) Uttered by using unknown language interlocutor
 - (b) Uttered by using on-dominant language interlocutor
- 7) Respect/social distance (age and socioeconomic status interlocutor)
- 8) History of linguistic interaction with interlocutor
- 9) Exploring interlocutor's language skills, dominance and preference
- 10) Accommodation to previous turn interlocutor

Of course, if it turns out that every conceivable category is sometimes instantiated by a code switch, and then we have only proved that code switching is nothing special, since the reason linguists have uncovered these functions is because they occur in monolingual language use. What we expect to find is a preponderance of code switches with certain categories only. Factors influencing language choice and code-switching

One of the criticisms often levelled at the sociolinguistic studies of code switching is that they merely provide an unordered list of functions CS is shown to fulfil in bilingual

interactions (see Myers-Scotton, 1993). The list is open-ended, and there is no structure to it. Both points are typical of a field in development: the list has to be open-ended until we can be reasonably sure, in the name of descriptive adequacy, that we have uncovered all or most of the functions that theoretically can be fulfilled by CS, or by any utterance, for that matter.

Structure can be imposed once a certain critical mass has been established. We feel enough headway has been made to impose some sort of structure on a list that we don't pretend is complete, but which we do think is not all that incomplete anymore, either. The result is a structured inventory, which we have used as our coding scheme for coding the pragmatic functions of every single utterance in a portion of our data. We are, of course, not the first to try to impose structure on the inventory of functions; ours differs from the efforts of, for example, Myers-Scotton (1993) and Auer (1998), in that we are less theoretically ambitious at this point, and work at a lower level of abstraction.

It will not come as a surprise that, in many cases, a single utterance manifests several factors. Therefore, if a clause happens to be a case of CS, it is often not just one factor that determines the selection of the code for a particular utterance. On the contrary, several factors can operate in conjunction, and reinforce each other in their effects on code choice. Some factors will always be accompanied by other factors, by definition perhaps. 'Reiteration' (a phatic factor), for instance, will always be accompanied by something, since people generally don't repeat something for the sake of repeating it, unless their interlocutor didn't hear it. Factors that belong to different main categories will combine naturally. 'Accommodation to the previous turn of the interlocutor' (a directive factor) does not say anything about the content of what is being said, so some other factor, which describes the intent of the utterance, will be needed as well.

Of course, factors don't always conspire; some will even be mutually exclusive, such as 'disagreement' and 'acceptance' (both phatic factors). Others will not co-occur because they are different points on a continuum, such as 'Topic change' and 'elaboration' (phatic factors as well). In such cases, it may be difficult to establish a cut-off point between them. In their influence on language choice, contradictory factors may compete with each other. For example, regarding the 'speaker's own language dominance' (a factor concerning general language skills) code A could be the most appropriate choice, while at the same time the 'interlocutor's language dominance' (a directive factor) could make code B the best alternative. Similarly, while the age of an interlocutor could call for the minority language code A because it is most suitable for 'expressing respect' (a directive factor), the annoyance of the speaker at a certain point in the conversation could make him want to 'express rebellion' (another directive factor), which is often done in the majority language code B, especially by young people. At such moments, the speaker has to deliberate which factor is

most important at that very moment. Grosjean (1981: 143) calls this the ‘weighting of factors’.

What we have called phatic factors, i.e. factors which concern the structuring of a conversation, the tone of a conversation or the instantiation of a certain speech act, have always garnered most of the attention in the CS literature. While most of them have been shown to trigger CS at one point or another, they are usually not strongly associated with one particular language (although some of them may be, e.g. personalizing, which is usually done through the minority language, or rebellion, which is usually associated with the majority language; these are the sorts of functions which typically figure in discussions of ‘we’ and ‘they’ codes). This may be a contributing factor to an important finding in the more recent literature on alter national CS. Many times, more so in some communities than in others, it is the signalling function of the contrast between two codes, which is exploited, rather than the direction of the switch (Alfonzetti, 1998).

Of all the factors, it’s the directive ones that are most often mentioned in our language choice questionnaires. This is interesting because analyses of the communicative functions of code switching in bilingual transcripts rarely mention these factors (concentrating on phatic ones instead). One could imagine that directive factors are not important in conversations between close friends, but our data show otherwise.

Analysis

The main problem for demarcating language choice and code switching seems to be that, on the assumption that language choice always involves a rational decision by a speaker, on the basis of conscious motivations, code switching sometimes is language choice (i.e. a conscious decision), while at other times speakers seem to have produced it more or less without thinking. That is, it may be justified to define language choice as what speakers do when deciding in which language to conduct a conversation and code switching as alternating between languages within a conversation, but we need to be aware of two things:

- 1) There are ‘conversations within conversations’, for which a language may be chosen, creating another definition problem: what counts as a ‘conversation’?; and
- 2) The same factors do indeed bring about both phenomena, though some factors are more typically associated with language choice and others with code switching.

However, if we change our perspective from individual cases of switching to the way of speaking as a whole, we are forced to see code switching itself as a ‘language mode’, i.e. a variety. Since varieties are reified ways of speaking, and can thus be ‘chosen’ by speakers, we are forced to say that one language choice speakers may make is ‘the mixed variety’. In fact, it is even more complex than this, as any glance at a bilingual transcript will reveal, because this ‘mixed variety’ itself is not homogenous. It’s almost never a neat system of, for

instance, only Matrix Language clauses with Embedded Language content words, or regular alternation of sentences in Languages A and B.

Instead, what are normally encountered, are conversations that move back and forth between the languages, with sometimes A dominating, and sometimes B, with sometimes dense insertion and at other times virtually monolingual stretches in B. This is what Meeuwis & Blommaert (1998) refer to as 'layered code switching', in which the switch is between two varieties that are themselves 'mixed'. We can speak of such a 'third choice' (not 'A', not 'B', but 'C', in which 'C' may be a new variety or an ad-hoc combination of 'A' and 'B'), when the conversation only seems to contain two different linguistic systems from the linguist's point of view,

i.e. to be full of alter national code switching, while the speakers themselves clearly do not perceive themselves to be switching between two varieties and, perhaps more important for us linguists, do not appeal to the languages' potential for indexicality. An early expression of this methodological principle can be found in Gardner-Chloros (1995: 87)

It is time to concentrate on the distinctions in language behaviour which are organising principles for speakers, leaving to last any positive linguistic categorisation of the units or varieties involved. We have little doubt that this view is correct. No doubt many cases of language mixture have erroneously been ascribed to actual conscious switching from one linguistic system to another in the mind of the speaker. The fact that 'code switching' is a misnomer for many of the cases we all hold to be prototypical instances of it, i.e. cases of insertion, may stand as a reminder. However, it is not so easy to find convincing evidence against this interpretation of 'conscious motivation' for cases of alternational CS. The most successful criterion uncovered so far in the Conversational Analysis literature, to our minds, is the identification of switches that are not exploited to mark any recognizable function in discourse.

On the other hand, as we have shown, pragmatic motivations for can be found for any utterance, if only because every utterance has a pragmatic function. The challenge, to our minds, is not just to find the functions carried out by individual switches, but also to establish which functions, out of a preferably exhaustive set of pragmatic functions, are served by CS more often, relatively speaking, than others. We may add at this point that, so far, no functions have been uncovered that are uniquely served by CS, not even functions that are considered typical for switches, such as quotations and parenthetical remarks.

This paper also brings two new terms to form the supposed which indicates an easier understood. The new terms exercised for understanding the supposed meanings are linguistics Encoded Message and linguistics Decoded Message so as to avoid insults. The terms Encoded and Decoded don't seem to be new in English language; they're employed in general

for tolerating on the knowledge born-again into symbols and therefore the reversing method. However, they're received by a receiver. But these two terms are used for various functions in numerous fields together with info Technology, arithmetic, Army etc... However, linguistics Encoded Message and pragmatics Decoded Message do completely different meanings although the general use of them.

Justification

This paper is focusing in victimization these two terms in field of linguistics with the tries to elucidate that semantics and distance, reference and reasoning, suppose and illation and every one what pragmatics cares of are often sorted in two major terms:

Pragmatics Encoded Message and Pragmatics Decoded Message

Scrutiny assumption

According to the study of pragmatics, literature the subsequent hypotheses is proposed:

Hypothesis one

The term linguistics Encoded Message describes the speaker's belief that his/her message is absolutely understood by the listener and therefore the failure to achieve this objective may end up in insult

Hypothesis two

The term linguistics Decoded Message describes the listener's belief that the knowledge sent by a speaker shall be clearly understood and therefore the failure to achieve this objective may end up in insult

Scrutiny query

According to linguists 'Pragmatics'-Pragmatics cares with the study of which means as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and understood by a listener (or reader). Some linguists say 'Pragmatics could be a subfield of linguistics that studies the ways that within which context contributes to meaning'. There are a unit varied definitions of linguistics but we've taken solely these two approaches to be mentioned during this paper. Considering these two approaches and alternative approaches explaining linguistics the analysis question of this paper is: Is it doable to cluster all Pragmatic issues among two major groups: the one in all speakers' belief and of listener's belief of that intention?

Pragmatics Encoded and Decoded Message

The term Pragmatics Encoded Message is that the speaker or writer's belief that what a speaker has in mind shall totally be properly understood by a listener or a reader.

The term linguistics Decoded Message is that the listener or reader's belief that the speaker's message shall convey the complete data to be right understood by the listener. There are two acronyms used here for linguistics Encoded and Decoded Message:

Pragmatics Encoded Message - PEM

Pragmatics Decoded Message – PDM

They can even be referred through symbols wherever > + > is assigned for PEM denoting that the primary sign > is employed for the primary intention whereas the second sign +> denotes the second doable intention.

The image > + < is assigned for PDM denoting that the primary intention could also be understood properly whereas the second symbol +< denotes that it should be incorrectly understood. PDM has another image denoting that the encoded message is understood as per speaker's intention and it comes as a results of >+>/ .The last image (/) is employed to denote that it's PDM and not PEM.

Pragmatics Encoded and Decoded Message in deixis.

The deixis could be a Greek term that means 'pointing via language'. Thus the Pragmatics is explained in terms of person's Pragmatics, spatial semantics and temporal semantics. But PEM and PDM area unit used solely nose to nose semantics whereas the spatial and temporal semantics are unit totally transfer the message per PEM and PDM.

PEM and PDM area unit employed in proximal and distal forms.

Person Pragmatics PEM and PDM

Let's imagine that there are girls wearing blue dress standing about to the speaker and listener .However they're totally different at height , weight etc. Therefore the speakers intends to speak concerning the taller one therefore the PEM is taller one whereas the listener interprets it as he's talking concerning the short one.

Discourse and Culture

Speaker and listener's belief of discourse in Pragmatics measures set to be based mostly upon the background of one's culture. But considering that discourse in linguistics is totally different from the discourse in different linguistic fields it's over crucial that the cultural schema is applied. But mistreatment PEM and PDM can straightforward create the turning away of insult even if not previous data of one's background and culture.

For example:

Let's imagine an individual visited India as a guest to an Indian Family and in the mean time he's looking at a woman in the house that brings the meal (rice) and puts it on the table. The

guest is staring at her and doesn't begin feeding. So, the hostess makes the subsequent utterance:

Cultural schemata	PEM	PDM
We don't use forks for rice	we eat mistreatment fingers	he is threatening me
any unhealthy intention		I wasn't staring at her for

>+> results >+<

This might be insult to a listener and also the PEM could avoid this if it uses totally different expressions:

Cultural schemata	PEM	PDM
We eat rice without forks	we eat using fingers	I shall eat it by using fingers

>+> results >+>/

The above examples not lack of knowledge but due to wrong pragmatics encoded message or wrong speaker's belief

Conclusion

As we have shown, pragmatic motivations for can be found for any utterance, if only because every utterance has a pragmatic function. The challenge, to our minds, is not just to find the functions carried out by individual switches, but also to establish which functions, out of a preferably exhaustive set of pragmatic functions, are served by CS more often, relatively speaking, than others. Of all the factors, it's the directive ones that are most often mentioned in our language choice questionnaires. Apart from these the six functions of the language is also impotent .The main problem for demarcating language choice and code switching seems to be that, on the assumption that language choice always involves a rational decision by a speaker, on the basis of conscious motivations, code switching sometimes is language choice (i.e. a conscious decision), while at other times speakers seem to have produced it more or less without thinking.

The study of the new terms linguistics Encoded and Decoded Message gift loads of data required to be applied thanks to the messages which will cause insulting. Thus they're not to notice the most effective method of avoiding this the maximum amount as attainable. Generally, the study was meant to avoid the inappropriate meanings sent by speaker

consistent with his/her own belief in interpretation by a listener's belief. The methodology method has been supported linguistics designated literature and failure and success of application of the new terms are thought of. But these two notions aren't being applied in some linguistics considerations resembling speech acts and events, politeness and interaction, spoken language and preference structure since the speaker's beliefs are understood in accordance with the listener's beliefs. By victimization these two terms not all the linguistics considerations may be sorted in two major teams of Pragmatic Encoded Message and linguistics. Decoded Message as a result of not all of the considerations of linguistics is in violation of those terms. Though applications of those two terms aren't necessary to be applied for understanding the linguistics however they're needed for the proper interpretation of messages and in addition they will be a subject matter of critics and discussion by citing more studies with reference to the sent meanings of utterances. More studies concerning these two terms may be enticing and prospectively helpful for future application throughout the social interactions in our existence.

References:

- Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding by Georgia M. Green Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996 (2nd edition)
- Applied Organizational Communication: Perspectives, Principles, and Pragmatics by Thomas E. Harris Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993.
- Formal Pragmatics: Semantics, Pragmatics, Presupposition, and Focus by Nirit Kadmon ,2001
- Subjectivity and Perspective in Truth-Theoretic Semantics (Oxford Studies in Semantics and Pragmatics) by Peter Lasersohn 2017
- The Semantics and Pragmatics of Honorification: Register and Social Meaning (Oxford Studies in Semantics and Pragmatics) by Elin Mc Cready , 2019
- Inquisitive Semantics (Oxford Surveys in Semantics and Pragmatics) by Ivano Ciardelli, Jeroen Groenendijk, et al. ,2019
- Language Production and Interpretation: Linguistics Meets Cognition (Current Research in the Semantics / Pragmatics Interface) by Henk Zeevat | Jan 30, 2014