



Laura Centonze\*

## ILLOCUTIONARY FORCE AND PERLOCUTIONARY EFFECT RECOGNITION IN THE (SEMI-)AUTOMATED PRAGMATIC ANNOTATION OF ELF SPOKEN DISCOURSE IN MIGRATION DOMAINS

### 1. Introduction

The aim of the present paper is to assess the feasibility of semi-automated means for the pragmatic annotation of speech acts (Austin 1962; Searle 1965; 1969) in English as a Lingua Franca (henceforth ELF; Seidlhofer 2001) conversation exchanges in asylum-seeking contexts. By means of a corpus-pragmatic approach (Aijmer and Rühlemann 2015), we shall investigate the extent to which such tools actually reveal pragmatic properties of speech and speech acts and, more specifically, how reliable such methods are for the exploration and recognition of illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect in multicultural settings as the one which constitute the core of the present study. Moreover, by means of two case studies we shall propose possible ways of implementation of categories for the pragmatic annotation of speech acts and provide evidence for the need for a three-phase model in determining the (semi-)automated pragmatic annotation of speech act illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect.

The (semi-)automatic capturing of pragmatic change represents a very challenging task for linguists, especially due to the highly versatile nature of spoken discourse, which is subject to possible different interpretations on the part of the listener. Analogously, what the speaker tries to convey by means of speech acts is not always clear to the listener, as the speaker him/herself may also avail of the use of indirect speech acts (Searle 1975) – which is why the perlocutionary effect of the speaker may be ‘altered’ or ‘deviated,’ depending on the interpretation operated by the counterpart in conversation and by his/her linguacultural background (Cogo et al. 2011). In addition to this, the pragmatic annotation of spoken discourse by means of (semi-)automated software has not been widely investigated over the years – probably due to scepticism towards these methodologies often seen as unreliable for pragmatic analyses (Sinclair 1992; McEnery et al. 2006).

Bearing this in mind, this study shall be articulated as follows: the next section (2) shall include an overview of speech act theory and explain the extent to which speech act theory comes to be intertwined with the notion of corpus pragmatics and with the ELF perspective on the study of discourse in asylum-seeking contexts (Guido 2008). Section (3) shall be devoted to exposing the approach that has been adopted for the annotation of speech acts in the study corpus and to the application of an automated dialogue annotation software methodology (i.e. the *Dialogue Annotation Research Tool*, henceforth DART, Weisser 2015) which is revisited in the light of the multicultural dimension of ELF interactions. Section (4) shall provide examples for the application of the revisited procedure for the (semi-)automated pragmatic annotation of speech acts, whilst in the conclusions section we shall highlight points for further discussion and implementation of the study.

### 2. Speech act theory, corpus linguistics and intercultural pragmatics in ELF discourse domains

Whenever a speaker produces an utterance, there are three phases which concur to the actual realisation of what is referred to as a “speech act,” i.e. the basic unit of the utterance in conversation. The first phase is the *locutionary* act, which refers to the realisation of the utterance in terms of words and sounds that make sense in a given language, while the function which we attribute to the utterance belongs to a second phase, in which the speaker produces what is referred to as *illocutionary* act, by means of which the speaker’s intention becomes manifest in communication (i.e. *illocutionary force*). Finally, the third phase, i.e. the *perlocutionary* act, refers to the effect that is generated by the utterance on the hearer in conversation (i.e. *perlocutionary effect*). From these key notions which represent the core of speech act theory it goes without saying that the actual realisation of speech acts is strongly related to the pragmatics of conversation and to the extent to which

---

\* *Laura Centonze is PhD Candidate in English Applied Linguistics and Lecturer in English Language at the Università del Salento, Lecce, Italy. Her main research interests include the analysis of spoken discourse in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), the exploration of new methodologies for the analysis of ELF corpora of spoken discourse in migration domains as well as the pragmatic annotation of speech acts in an intercultural perspective.*



both illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect are determined respectively by 1) what the utterer actually means as he performs an utterance, and 2) what the hearer actually thinks the utterer wants to convey by means of his/her utterance. It is on the basis of this dichotomy that also two different ways for categorising speech acts were elaborated, which include a classification of the speech act functions, and a classification on the basis of their directness/indirectness of meaning, the latter being related to the syntactic structure of the act itself. Searle's classification includes five functions for speech acts, i.e. *declarative*, *representative*, *expressive*, *directive* and *commissive*; by means of declarative acts we change a status of things; the purpose of a representative speech act is "to commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something that is being the case, to the truth of an expressed proposition" (Searle 1976, 10); expressive acts are usually referring to those acts by means of which a speaker conveys what s/he feels; directive speech acts refer to acts in which the utterer asks the hearer to do something, whereas commissive acts are performed by speakers whenever they want to undertake an action in the future. Speech acts can also be direct or indirect, depending on their transparency in terms of structure and function: if the relationship between the structure of the speech act and its communicative function is a direct one, then a direct speech act is being performed (e.g. "Do you go to school?," where an interrogative is being used in order to ask a question); if there is no direct relationship between them, then the act is an indirect one (e.g. "Can you tell me where the director is?," where an interrogative is used to ask for information).

It becomes clear, from the classifications provided above, how the notion of speech act is undoubtedly intertwined with the notion of pragmatics and studies in the field of speech acts in domain-specific contexts of communication have been thriving over the last decades, with a recent interest in the field of intercultural communication as well (Gass and Neu 2006; Ogiermann 2009; Beckwith and Dewaele 2012). In this respect, Wierzbicka's (2003) contribution to the analysis of human interaction in terms of "maxims of communication" and "cultural scripts" has revealed differences between a wide range of speech communities (to name but a few: English, Russian, Japanese, and Italian), which may be taken into consideration in order to teach intercultural pragmatics across different speech communities; Kecskes (2013, 1) position with respect to intercultural communication sees it as "a normal 'success-and-failure' process rather than a collision of cultures." It is this very last definition of intercultural communication which is more in line with the aims of the present paper, since the notions of speech acts and pragmatics acquire much more importance in the intercultural context of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), which represents a peculiar context where speakers belonging to different lingua-cultural backgrounds come to interact, and in which understanding of speech acts – whether direct or indirect – may be determined by categorisation processes which – citing Rosch (1978, 28) – "have to do with explaining the categories found in a culture and coded by the language of that culture at a particular point in time. [...] their formation in the culture" – what Carrell (1983) later defined *cognitive schemata*. Hence, the different conceptualisations of the world by the hearer which may not coincide with those of the utterer of a speech act, thus leading to misunderstandings. Lakoff (2004, xv) later explained this by means of a theory of *frames*, which are "mental structures that shape the way we see the world [...] the goals we seek, the plans we make, the way we act and what counts as a goal or bad outcome of our actions." Studies which have been carried out so far, however, have more than often focused on specific corpora and on specific categories of speech acts – sometimes even one or two categories – and, as a consequence, the quantitative aspect of their analysis has been neglected, thus not allowing for a generalisation of findings either in terms of certain categories of speech acts or of specific discourse domains. The urgent need for an integrated approach which could enhance analysis in the field of speech acts was highlighted by Aijmer and Rühlemann (2015), whose work paved the way for the establishment of corpus pragmatics as a discipline which integrates both quantitative and qualitative aspects of analysis. From such a pioneering contribution, several studies have been conducted, among which the most ambitious project has been the one implemented by Weisser (2014; 2015; 2016), who has drawn on the corpus pragmatic approach to elaborate a corpus-driven taxonomy of speech acts and a software tool for the (semi-)automated pragmatic annotation of speech acts, i.e. the DART (the Dialogue Annotation and Research Tool).

In the context of this study, we have drawn on the corpus pragmatic approach highlighted in Aijmer and Rühlemann (2015) which combines both corpus linguistics and pragmatics, and used the DART interface to point out the strengths and weaknesses of (semi-)automated pragmatic annotation and to provide an



integrated model which could help linguists cope with the issue of capturing pragmatic change in an intercultural domain of discourse as would be the case of ELF. Hence, DART shall be considered as the starting point for the pragmatic annotation of our corpus, which will be then integrated by the model that we propose in the present contribution.

### 3. Materials and Methods

For the purposes of our analysis, we compiled a corpus of ELF interactions in asylum-seeking contexts, the ELF MiDo (*English as a Lingua Franca in Migration Domains*; Centonze 2017, forthcoming) corpus, which collects transcriptions of oral interviews between asylum seekers and intercultural mediators predominantly carried out at the local seat of the Italian Council for Refugees (CIR, Lecce, Italy). Interviews are predominantly conducted on a one-to-one basis, in which an intercultural mediator asks a set of questions to every migrant concerning life in their home country, the reasons for leaving their own country, life and traditions, cultural differences between the home and the host country as well as the main problems related to living in Italy. The length of interviews varies, but one can say that their average length is approx. 30 minutes, with only occasionally longer interviews (45 minutes). A breakdown of the study corpus is provided in the following table (readapted from Centonze 2017).

	<b>No. words</b>	<b>Speaker's origin</b>	<b>Topic</b>
1	2,803 words	Mali	Culture; job opportunities; migration
2	3,055 words	Ghana	Migration; permit to stay; family
3	2,841 words	Ghana	Family; leisure activities; money
4	3,989 words	Mali	Hardship of life; problems; migration
5	3,277 words	Mali	School; family reunification
6	2,456 words	Ghana	Home country; host country; culture
7	3,466 words	Ghana	Money; family; children
8	2,279 words	Mali	Everyday life; family; home country
9	4,765 words	Mali	Family; children; home country; reunification
10	3,971 words	Ghana	Culture and traditions; home vs. host country
Tot.	<b>32,902 words</b>		

**Table 1:** Breakdown of the study corpus readapted from Centonze (2017)

Each interviewee was asked – in written form – to express their consent to being recorded for research purposes and data were subsequently anonymised. Each transcribed file was then converted into a .txt file, which is the only format supported by the DART interface. Once the file was converted, it was edited in DART. However, before moving on to the procedure adopted for the pragmatic annotation of speech acts, it is well worth providing some guidelines concerning the mechanism of DART and its interface.

As already pointed out earlier, DART embraces a corpus-driven approach to speech act identification and annotation, which considers huge amounts of corpora in order to determine and implement speech act categories – one might say that the approach is of a bottom-up type, where the speech act taxonomy is the result of already-existing corpora compiled by Weisser<sup>1</sup> and which represent the precursors of the DART speech act taxonomy currently employed. The DART interface is made of two sub-sections, i.e. an Input File section (on the left side of the interface screen) and an Output File section (on the right); the file is uploaded

<sup>1</sup> Further information about other available corpora at [http://martinweisser.org/index.html#spaadia\\_v01](http://martinweisser.org/index.html#spaadia_v01).



for pre-editing onto the Input File section, in which the dialogue is split into turns which are then numbered. An essential condition for the dialogue to be processed properly is the insertion of an .XML declaration at the very beginning of the dialogue section, which contains all the relevant information relating to each section of the corpus, e.g. language, name of .txt file, number of turns etc. This declaration works as a container for the dialogue split into turns. An example of .XML declaration is provided below, together with a short initial excerpt taken from the study corpus.

```
<?xml version="1.0?">
<dialogue corpus="mido" lang="en" id="02">
<turn n="1" speaker="a">
<frag n="1" sp-act="reqInfo" topic="name" mode="query">
whats your name <punc type="query" />
</frag>
</turn>
<turn n="2" speaker="b" polarity="positive">
<decl n="2" sp-act="answer-state-identifySelf" polarity="positive"
topic="name" mode="intro-decl">
my name is @@@ <pause /> @@@ ### <punc type="stop" />
</decl>
```

After the file has been pre-edited in the Input File Section, in order to start the automated pragmatic dialogue annotation in DART, we select *Annotation>Pragmatic* from the general Menu in DART and wait for the whole dialogue file to be processed. An example of the final pragmatically-annotated dialogue is provided below.

```
<q-wh n="16" sp-act="reqConfirm" polarity="positive" mode="query-
exclaim-partial">
and what <unclear />
</q-wh>
</turn>
<turn n="12" speaker="b">
<q-wh n="17" sp-act="reqInfo" polarity="positive" topic="time"
mode="correct-open">
when I was in libia I was <unclear />
</q-wh>
<frag n="18" sp-act="refer" polarity="positive" mode="decl">
<overlap type="start" /> just that <punc type="stop" />
</frag>
```

Even though it is not visible in the excerpt provided above due to the command limitations in the .XML editor Notepad, the information concerning the speech act function which is added to the pre-edited dialogue displays different colours based on the different type of speech act and the syntactic properties of each turn – this makes it easy to identify different categories of speech acts from various points of view. Moreover, the pragmatic annotation also involved the automatic addition of other relevant information for the identification of the speech act, e.g. polarity, topic, mode and punctuation type. An exhaustive list of all the categories and tagsets for speech acts is provided as an appendix at the end of the paper.

In order to assess the possibility for DART to identify and label speech act functions, we first uploaded the pragmatically-annotated corpus onto the DART software tool and then ran a first statistical analysis of speech act distribution, in order to see the extent to which categories for speech act function were identified. For space reasons, we are just reporting speech act categories for which at least 20 occurrences were found.

decl state	67
dm acknowledge	410
dm exclaim	92



dm	init	68
dm	hesitate	23
frag	state	220
frag	reqInfo	89
frag	answer-state	60
<b>frag</b>	<b>unrecognised</b>	<b>56</b>
frag	elab-state	23
frag	refer	21
q-wh	reqInfo	36
q-yn	reqInfo	24
yes	acknowledge	72

The DART software tool identified both syntactic and pragmatic features for speech acts: on the left syntactic categories found included declaratives (</decl>), discourse markers (</dm>), fragments (</frag>), wh-questions (</q-wh>), yes/no questions (</q-yn>) and yes responses (</yes>). Functions for speech act are sorted out according to these syntactic categories, and include *state*, *acknowledge*, *exclaim*, *initiate*, *hesitate*, *state*, *request for information*, *answer and state*, *elaborate* and *refer*. Among these categories there is one to which attention should be paid, which is represented by a categories of fragments labelled 'unrecognised.' The latters represent speech acts for which the DART pragmatic annotation software failed to identify a function and which display a relatively high number of occurrences (56), compared to other frequencies found. Hence, we had a closer look at unrecognised speech acts, in order to understand the mechanisms according to which the software was not able to recognise them. Below are the main instances for 'unrecognised' speech act functions.

```
(1)    <decl n="584" sp-act="" polarity="positive">
my story is a <overlap type="end" />
</decl>
-----
(2)    <decl n="686" sp-act="" polarity="positive">
i like many tings in italia <overlap type="end" />
</decl>
-----
(3)    <decl n="925" sp-act="" polarity="positive">
how you came to italy <overlap type="end" />
</decl>
-----
(4)    <decl n="929" sp-act="" polarity="positive">
we come by sea <overlap type="end" />
</decl>
-----
(5)    <decl n="946" sp-act="" polarity="negative">
you cannot remember <overlap type="start" />
</decl>
-----
(6)    <decl n="947" sp-act="" polarity="positive">
you came ah ah okay <overlap type="end" />
</decl>
-----
(7)    <decl n="1122" sp-act="" polarity="positive">
we came by <pause /> like by walk and <pause />
</decl>
-----
(8)    <decl n="1445" sp-act="" polarity="positive">
```



```
you are alone <overlap type="end" />  
</decl>
```

-----

At a first glance, it may seem that the issue related to unrecognised speech act functions is merely related to the failure to identify fragmented sentences, but this is not always true, as it can be seen from examples (2) to (8). Drawing on Austin's (1962) theoretical framework on speech acts, one can say that the illocutionary force is not always automatically identified in DART and this may bring about problems in the analysis of frequencies for speech act functions, as figures are of course altered. In order to solve the issue of unrecognised speech acts, we re-visited the principles for pragmatic annotation of speech acts and, in the case of unrecognised speech act functions, we applied an intermediate phase between the automated pragmatic annotation of speech acts and the output file which is ready for consultation: this intermediate phase draws on Ericsson and Simon's (1984) retrospective verbal report in protocol analysis, by means of which we were able to cope with the issue of unrecognised speech act functions. As part of this intermediate phase, we asked ten intercultural mediators to paraphrase each turn which fell under the "unrecognised" tag, and then attribute the most convenient tag. The "unrecognised" tag was then edited in the Input File menu in DART.

#### 4. Applying the retrospective verbal report for the pragmatic annotation of unrecognised speech acts: two case studies

In this section, we shall focus on examples of unrecognised speech act functions and apply the retrospective verbal report intermediate phase in the (semi-)automated pragmatic annotation of speech acts. The retrospective verbal report procedure also allowed us for a more reliable and objective pragmatic speech act annotation, which was carried out with the help of intercultural mediators.

##### 4.1 Case Study One: Unrecognised > sp-act="state"

In this section we shall see how retrospective verbal report is applied to identify speech act functions under the label of "statements" (sp-act="state"). The dialogue section submitted to the intercultural mediators for an interpretation is reported below.

```
<decl n="584" sp-act="" polarity="positive">  
my story is a <overlap type="end" />  
</decl>  
</turn>  
<turn n="350" speaker="b">  
<frag n="585" sp-act="state" polarity="positive" mode="decl">  
<overlap type="start" /> and your story in your country <punc type="stop"  
</frag>  
</turn>  
<turn n="351" speaker="a">  
<frag n="586" sp-act="" polarity="positive" mode="disflu">  
is is <overlap type="end" />  
</frag>  
</turn>  
<turn n="352" speaker="b">  
<frag n="587" sp-act="refer" polarity="positive" mode="partial-decl">  
in nigeria <punc type="stop" />  
</frag>  
</turn>  
<turn n="353" speaker="a">  
<decl n="588" sp-act="state" polarity="positive" mode="decl">  
my story is wit de? my story is wit @@@ my story is with he <punc  
type="stop" />
```



```
</decl>
</turn>
<turn n="354" speaker="b">
<dm n="589" sp-act="acknowledge" mode="backchannel">
mhm
</dm>
<dm n="590" sp-act="acknowledge" mode="backchannel">
mhm
</dm>
<dm n="591" sp-act="acknowledge" mode="backchannel">
mhm
</dm>
<dm n="592" sp-act="acknowledge" mode="backchannel">
mhm <punc type="stop" />
</dm>
</turn>
<turn n="355" speaker="a">
<decl n="593" sp-act="state" polarity="positive" mode="preference2-
condition">
if you want to know my story you?
</decl>
</turn>
<turn n="356" speaker="a">
<dm n="594" sp-act="acknowledge">
okay
</dm>
```

The highlighted part at the beginning refers to the speech act function labeled ‘unrecognised’ in the DART automated pragmatic annotation. For the extract above, the intercultural mediators predominantly provided a paraphrase which corresponded to a statement; in fact, as they paraphrased, they pointed out that “the speaker is trying to *TELL* the story of...,” “the speaker *STATES* his story,” “the speaker is *STATING* how he came from Nigeria,” so the pragmatic function which was associated with that particular turn was sp-act=“state.” Also for the following turn, it was possible to determine the speech act function by means of retrospective verbal report.

```
<decl n="686" sp-act="" polarity="positive">
i like many ti?ngs in italia <overlap type="end" />
</decl>
<frag n="687" sp-act="state" polarity="negative" mode="exists-decl">
is no a?ll country have your di? how will i put it dei have deir own way
to do deir own tings you know dis term <punc type="stop" />
</frag>
</turn>
<turn n="404" speaker="" polarity="">
<dm n="688" sp-act="acknowledge" mode="backchannel">
mhm
</dm>
<dm n="689" sp-act="acknowledge" mode="backchannel">
Mhm
```

For the unrecognised speech act function above, the retrospective verbal report procedure carried out by the intercultural linguistic mediators revealed that the speaker “was *EXPRESSING* an opinion on Italy,” “was *STATING* his feelings about Italy,” “was *MAKING A STATEMENT* about his life in Italy” – so the unrecognised



speech act function was associated again with a sp-act="state" in the final pragmatic annotation of the study corpus.

#### 4.2 Case study Two: Unrecognised > sp-act="ReqConfirm"

Another unrecognised speech act function in DART which we consider in this section is the one which the intercultural mediators associated with requests for confirmation, i.e. asking for information about something to be confirmed by the interviewee. An extract from the corpus is here reported, which corresponds to the part submitted to intercultural mediators for interpretation.

```
topic="number-location-time-arrival" mode="query">
a:nd how many people were with you when you arrived here <punc
type="query" />
</frag>
<dm n="942" sp-act="reqConfirm" mode="query">
how many
</dm>
<frag n="943" sp-act="reqInfo" polarity="positive" mode="query">
people <punc type="query" />
</frag>
</turn>
<turn n="559" speaker="b">
<dm n="944" sp-act="exclaim">
ah
</dm>
<decl n="945" sp-act="state" polarity="negative" mode="decl">
i cannot remember <punc type="stop" />
</decl>
</turn>
<turn n="560" speaker="a">
<decl n="946" sp-act="" polarity="negative">
you cannot remember <overlap type="start" />
</decl>
```

The interpretation provided in this case by the intercultural mediators corresponded to a request for confirmation, because “the speaker here *ASKS FOR CONFIRMATION* of something said before,” “the speaker is *TRYING TO GET CONFIRMATION* for a previous statement,” “the speaker *IS REQUESTING CONFIRMATION* about something.” Hence, the tag associated with this speech act function was sp-act="ReqConfirm.”

The second example provided below also fell under the same speech act function tag.

```
<turn n="711" speaker="a">
<dm n="1203" sp-act="init">
so
</dm>
<decl n="1204" sp-act="" polarity="negative" mode="reason-query">
you are not in sprar because you went to rome <punc type="query" />
</decl>
</turn>
<turn n="712" speaker="b">
<no n="1205" sp-act="negate">
no
</no>
```





```
<frag n="1206" sp-act="state" polarity="negative" topic="time"
mode="decl">
not rome i went out for some time <punc type="stop" />
</frag>
</turn>
<turn n="713" speaker="a">
<dm n="1207" sp-act="acknowledge">
okay
```

Here, as the intercultural mediators pointed out in their interpretation, the interviewer is “ASKING FOR CONFIRMATION” about the reason why the migrant is not in sprar,” he is “ASKING FOR FEEDBACK” to the interviewee,” he is “ASKING if the hearer can CONFIRM the statement.” Hence, the speech act function in this case was post-edited and changed in DART.

## 5. Conclusions

The present contribution has represented an attempt to address the issue of (semi-)automated means for the pragmatic annotation of speech acts in intercultural communication, where misunderstandings are more likely to take place in face-to-face conversation. The issue becomes even more complex, if speech acts and their illocutionary force are interpreted and captured by automated annotation systems outside their context of occurrence. The present study has also aimed at raising awareness of the existence of such methods for the analysis of spoken discourse and the extent to which they can be exploited in such sense.

From the two case studies provided above, one can notice the extent to which the DART software tool undoubtedly represents a very useful means for the identification and annotation of speech acts and their properties, but we are still a long way from a perfect matching of illocutionary force and speech acts as DART still has to be improved, in order to be able to identify speech acts also for fragmented and ungrammatical utterances and thus allow linguists to carry out a more reliable analysis of their distribution. Moreover, one should bear in mind that tagsets for speech acts are pre-determined within the DART software tool, so one should not exclude any new categories for speech acts which might be identified in larger corpora.

On the other hand, the need for larger corpora of pragmatically annotated dialogues, especially in ELF domains, might be very useful both in order to carry out analysis on the meaning negotiation in multicultural contexts and to train intercultural mediators to identify communicative strategies which might be used with a certain group of migrants rather than with another, according to their cognitive schemata.

## Works cited

- Aijmer, Karin, and Christoph Rühlemann (eds.). *Corpus Pragmatics. A Handbook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Austin, John. *How to Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Beckwith, Sarah and Jean-Marc Dewaele. “The Effect of Two Years Abroad on the Development of Apologies in the Japanese L2 of Adult English Native Speakers.” *Speech Acts and Politeness across Languages and Cultures*. Ed. Ruiz de Zarobe, Leyre and Yolanda Ruiz de Zarobe. Bern: Peter Lang, 2012. 275-306.
- Carrell, Patricia L. “Some Issues in the Role of Schemata, or Background Knowledge, in Second Language Comprehension.” *Reading in a Foreign Language* 1 (1983): 81-92.
- Centonze, Laura. *Using Discourse Annotation Software to Explore English as a Lingua Franca in Migration Encounters. A Corpus-Pragmatic Approach*. PhD Thesis, Lecce: Università del Salento, forthcoming.
- Centonze, Laura. “Towards a Corpus Pragmatics of ELF through Semi-automated Annotation Systems.” *Lingue e Linguaggi* 24 – special issue (2017): 139-156.
- Cogo, Alessia, Archibald Alasdair and Jennifer Jenkins, eds. *Latest Trends in ELF Research*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011.
- Ericsson, K. Anders and Herbert Alexander Simon. *Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1984.
- Gass, Susan and Joyce Neu. *Speech Acts across Cultures. Challenges to Communication in Second Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009.



- Guido, Maria Grazia. *English as a Lingua Franca in Cross-cultural Immigration Domains*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2008.
- Kecskes, Istvan. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Lakoff, George. *Don't Think of an Elephant! Know Your Values and Frame the Debate. The Essential Guide for Progressives*. Vermont, White River Junction: Chelsea Green Publishing, 2004.
- McEnery, Tony, Richard Xiao and Yukio Tono. *Corpus-Based Language Studies. An Advanced Resource Book*. London/New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Ogiermann, Eva. "Politeness and In-directness across Cultures: A Comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian Requests." *Journal of Politeness Research* 5.2 (2009): 189-216.
- Rosch, Eleanor. "Principles of Categorisation." *Cognition and Categorisation*. Eds. Rosch, Eleanor and Barbara B. Loyd. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1978. 27-48.
- Searle, John R. "What is a Speech Act?." *Philosophy in America*. Ed. Maurice Black. London: Allen and Unwin, 1965. 221-239.
- . *Speech acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1969.
- . "Indirect Speech Acts." *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. Eds. Peter Cole, Peter and Jerry L. Morgans. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1975. 59-82.
- . "A Classification of Illocutionary Acts." *Language in Society* 5.1 (1976): 1-23.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. "Closing a Conceptual Gap: The Case for a Description of English as a Lingua Franca." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11.2 (2001): 133-58.
- Sinclair, John. "The Automatic Analysis of Corpora." *Directions in Corpus Linguistics*. Ed. Svartvik, Jan. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992. 379-400.

## Sitography

- SPAADIA Corpus, versions 1 and 2, available at [http://martinweisser.org/index.html#spaadia\\_v01](http://martinweisser.org/index.html#spaadia_v01). Last visited May 21, 2018.
- Weisser, Martin. 2014, *Pragmatic Annotation and Analysis in DART*. Available at [https://www.academia.edu/8444880/Pragmatic\\_Annotation\\_and\\_Analysis\\_in\\_DART](https://www.academia.edu/8444880/Pragmatic_Annotation_and_Analysis_in_DART).
- . 2015, *DART – Dialogue Annotation Research Tool*, 32bit Windows. Available at [http://martinweisser.org/ling\\_soft.html#DART](http://martinweisser.org/ling_soft.html#DART).
- . 2016, *The DART speech-act taxonomy version 1.1*. Available at [http://martinweisser.org/publications/DART\\_taxonomy\\_v1.1.pdf](http://martinweisser.org/publications/DART_taxonomy_v1.1.pdf).

**Speech act categories in DART v. 1.1** (re-adapted from Weisser 2016 and representing an Appendix in Centonze 2017). The original file containing the speech-act labels in DART can be found at the following link ([http://martinweisser.org/publications/DART\\_taxonomy\\_v1.1.pdf](http://martinweisser.org/publications/DART_taxonomy_v1.1.pdf)).

Speech-act Label	(Approximate) Function
abandon	abandoning a unit, either choosing not to complete it or due to interruption
accept	responding in an active positive way
acknowledge	signalling decoding, understanding
add	signalling extension/elaboration of information
agree	signalling explicit agreement
answer	answering a question
apologise	apologising
approve	expressing appreciation or approval
attribute	expressing attribution to s.o.
bye	saying farewell; closing a dialogue
complete	completing the interlocutor's move
conclude	indicating a (logical) conclusion



<b>contrast</b>	indicating a contrast, e.g. by means of a contrastive conjunction
<b>confirm</b>	confirming a request for confirmation
<b>correct</b>	correcting what the interlocutor has said
<b>correctSelf</b>	correcting one's own utterance
<b>direct</b>	eliciting the interlocutor's non-verbal response
<b>echo</b>	repeating the interlocutor's words for verification
<b>elab</b>	elaborating the answer to a question or a directive
<b>enumerate</b>	enumerating
<b>exclaim</b>	expressing emotion or surprise
<b>explain</b>	providing an explanation
<b>expressAwareness</b>	expressing awareness, possibly knowledge of s.th.
<b>expressNonAwareness</b>	negative counterpart to the above
<b>expressConviction</b>	expressing conviction, e.g. through use of <i>of course</i>
<b>expressOpinion</b>	expressing an opinion/evaluation
<b>expressPossibility</b>	expressing a possibility
<b>expressImPossibility</b>	negative counterpart to the above
<b>expressRegret</b>	expressing regret
<b>expressStance</b>	expressing one's attitude, e.g. through <i>frankly (speaking)</i>
<b>expressSurprise</b>	expressing surprise
<b>expressWish</b>	expressing a wish or desire
<b>greet</b>	greeting the interlocutor
<b>hesitate</b>	hesitating before the beginning of a turn/unit
<b>hold</b>	signalling to the interlocutor to hold the line, usually to look up information or to think
<b>identifySelf</b>	identifying the speaker's name/institution
<b>init</b>	initiating a new phase of the dialog
<b>insult</b>	insulting the interlocutor
<b>negate</b>	responding negatively
<b>offer</b>	offering a service to benefit the interlocutor
<b>pardon</b>	signalling misunderstanding/the need for the interlocutor to repeat
<b>phatic</b>	semantically empty discourse-marking expression, such as initial <i>you know</i>
<b>predict</b>	predicting some future event
<b>predictPossibility</b>	predicting a possibility
<b>promise</b>	making a promise
<b>refer</b>	indicating a deictic reference (neutral option)
<b>referCondition</b>	referring to a condition
<b>referOpt</b>	referring to an option
<b>referPerson</b>	referring to a person (excluding vocatives)
<b>referReason</b>	referring to a reason
<b>referTime</b>	referring to a specific (point in) time
<b>referThing</b>	referring to a concrete or abstract object
<b>refuse</b>	responding negatively to an offer, etc
<b>reject</b>	rejecting a proposal
<b>reqConfirm</b>	requesting a confirmation
<b>reqDirect</b>	requesting a directive
<b>reqInfo</b>	requesting verbal information
<b>reqModal</b>	requesting permission, advice, etc.
<b>reqOpt</b>	requesting an option
<b>selfTalk</b>	speaking to oneself (the speaker)
<b>spell</b>	spelling out something
<b>state</b>	conveying information/awareness
<b>stateIntent</b>	indicating the speaker's intention



<b>stateConstraint</b>	stating a potential constraint
<b>stateOpt</b>	stating a potential option
<b>stateReason</b>	stating a reason
<b>summarise</b>	signalling a summary
<b>suggest</b>	proposing action by the interlocutor (or the interlocutor and the speaker)
<b>suggestOpt</b>	suggesting a potential option
<b>swear</b>	expressing an expletive
<b>thirdParty</b>	speaking to s.o. who is not the speaker or the interlocutor
<b>thank</b>	thanking
<b>unclassifiable</b>	a speech-act not classifiable according to the present scheme
<b>uninterpretable</b>	uninterpretable, due to missing or incoherent information