

How to Talk into Action: Two Austinian themes on doing and saying

Syun Tutiya
(Chiba University)

J. L. Austin

- “How to Talk”
 - Simple ways of saying of things
 - Direction of fitting
- Speech acts/Illocutionary forces
 - Saying as doing
 - Saying to do
 - Illocutionary acts like request, order, instruct
 - Perlocutionary acts like make/force sb to do
 - **BUT NO IDEA OF COMMUNICATION**

PLAN of the TALK

- What was speech acts?
- Speech acts are action theory oriented
- From task oriented dialog to communication mediated task performance
- Map task useful in research
- Speech/action coordination: what and how to think
 - speaker's perspective and hearer/doer's perspective
 - Interruption, premature understanding and compliance
 - LOTS OF OPEN QUESTIONS

“Theory” of speech acts

- All saying is doing
- Doing is characterized by “illocutionary force”
- Illocutionary forces are classified according to the conditions of “felicity” and “success”
- Felicity conditions are situated
- Situations must be cognitively shared

Austin's dream

- LINGUISTICS: The total speech act in a total speech situation
- Shared parts of situation
 - Perceptual(visual, auditory, etc)
 - Consequences of action
 - Knowledge, belief, expectations
 - ETC
- The role of language/speech in action
- BUT no communication(no part of dream)

Rationalist hypotheses

- Understanding dictates action
 - Qualitatively : what action to do
 - Quantitatively: when to start the action
- What is said determines what is heard
- What is heard determines what is understood
- Understanding precedes action
 - People start to act(draw in this case) after what is said is understood
- Action feeds back
- Speaker dominates

Revised or somewhat irrationalist hypotheses

- Follower initiates
- What is said tends to be underdetermined, and has to be “negotiated”
- Understanding is often skipped
- Follower starts to talk while Giver is speaking (but no interruption)
- Follower starts to draw while Giver is speaking

BUT WHY?

Follower pre-understands? Plans? Ignores?

Map task dialogs as test bed

- Not only dialog, but task performance
- Instruction Giver instructs Instruction Follower to draw a route
- Different maps lead to “spontaneous conversing”
- Reasonable time to complete the task
- Video recordings

A sample dialog:J3E3

- Typical dialog by a male familiar pair
- 14.5 minutes (a bit longer than the average)
- 429 utterances
 - Instruction Giver: 250
 - Instruction Follower: 179
- 210 overlaps(about the average)
- 98 with backchannels and acceptance
 - 65 by Follower
 - Normal unidirectional flow of information
- Clever boys

4 out of 6 explicit questions about existence in the first minute

1. Questions on the landmarks close to the start
2. Once mutual belief is achieved, no further “factual” questions, just “confirmations”
3. No real “dialogs”?

9 explicit requests to draw(or stop)

- Follower starts to draw while Giver is speaking in 2 cases
- Follower waits himself to understand before he starts to draw in 2 cases
- In the two “stop” cases, Follower stops before Giver finishes his request
- In other cases, Follower starts to draw just after an explicit request is made

15 questions with query mark “ka”

35 confirmations with “ne”

- “ka”
 - Giver 0
 - Follower 15
 - Confirmation of direction 9
 - Confirmation of facts 6
- “ne”
 - Giver 28
 - Follower 7

Open questions

- Which initiates?
- Communication-mediated action adjustment?
- Structure of task performance and discourse
- How to tag
- What is it to understand what is said and to act

