



## Linguistic Analysis of Unplanned Discourse in David Sedaris “Calypso”

Binin Mustafa Saeed\*

Rozgar Yousif Omar\*\*



\* Department of Physics,  
College of Science, Salahaddin  
University-Erbil

\*\* Department of Mathematics,  
College of Science, Salahaddin  
University-Erbil

[binin.saeed@su.edu.krd](mailto:binin.saeed@su.edu.krd)  
[rozgar.omar@su.edu.krd](mailto:rozgar.omar@su.edu.krd)

Reiceved | 12/07/2023

Accepted | 18//08/2023

Published | 15/02/2024

### Keywords:

Unplanned discourse,  
discourse analysis,  
conversational discourse,  
linguistic analysis,  
language use.

### Abstract

This study aims to investigate the linguistic features that distinguish spontaneous and informal communication between individuals, often known as unplanned discourse. This study thoroughly examines a range of grammatical features and patterns seen in conversational discourse. The study analyzes the distinctive grammatical structures and phenomena that develop in unplanned discourse by studying a wide range of conversational data from different scenarios, dialogues, and casual conversations found in David Sedaris' Calypso. The study takes a qualitative approach, employing linguistic analysis techniques to discover recurrent patterns and syntactic variations contributing to spontaneous conversational discourse's overall order and coherence. The findings emphasize the informality, flexibility, unfinished utterances, and dynamic nature of grammatical usage in conversations, as seen by the inclusion of colloquial expressions, and digressions. The research adds to our understanding of how language is used in everyday interactions by throwing light on the various grammatical elements that distinguish conversational speech and their significance in supporting efficient communication. The findings of this study can be used to improve language teaching approaches and discourse analysis frameworks, as well as to contribute to the development of linguistic theories about unplanned discourse.

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License



### About the Journal

ZANCO Journal of Humanity Sciences (ZJHS) is an international, multi-disciplinary, peer-reviewed, double-blind and open-access journal that enhances research in all fields of basic and applied sciences through the publication of high-quality articles that describe significant and novel works; and advance knowledge in a diversity of scientific fields.  
<https://zancojournal.su.edu.krd/index.php/JAHS/about>

## 1. Introduction

Unplanned discourse, defined by its spontaneity and informality, offers a rich tapestry of language occurrences to be explored. In this work, we look at the diverse grammatical structures and phenomena that develop in such discourse, to identify the recurring patterns and syntactic variants that contribute to its overall order and coherence. This is accomplished by analyzing a large range of conversational data obtained from numerous scenarios, dialogues, and informal talks in David Sedaris' *Calypso*. By employing a qualitative approach and utilizing linguistic analysis techniques, we seek to shed light on the informality, flexibility, unfinished utterances, and dynamic nature of grammatical usage in conversations.

Unplanned discourse, which includes casual conversations, dialogues, and spontaneous interactions, is essential in everyday communication. While formal language has its own set of norms and conventions, the study of spontaneous discourse allows us to investigate language's intrinsic flexibility and adaptability in real-time communication. Understanding the grammatical complexity of unplanned discourse can provide useful insights into how language functions in naturalistic circumstances and how speakers navigate conversational complexities. To undertake this study, we turn to David Sedaris' *Calypso* as a source of conversational data. *Calypso*, a collection of personal essays, showcases a multitude of dialogues and casual conversations that capture the essence of spontaneous discourse. By examining this diverse array of conversational data, we aim to uncover the unique linguistic features that characterize unplanned discourse.

Our study is built on a qualitative method, which allows us to immerse ourselves in the depth and complexity of conversational interactions. We can discover recurring patterns and grammatical changes that contribute to the overall order and coherence of spontaneous language by evaluating the data qualitatively. This method captures the subtle and context-dependent nature of unplanned discourse, moving beyond surface-level observations and digging into the underlying linguistic structures and processes at work (Keenan, 1977).

Linguistic analysis techniques form the backbone of our investigation. By meticulously examining the conversational data, we can identify distinct grammatical structures and phenomena that manifest in unplanned discourse. This study aims to use these techniques to enable us to uncover the intricate web of linguistic choices and strategies employed by speakers to convey meaning, maintain coherence, and negotiate shared understanding. By applying these techniques to the conversational data from *Calypso*, we aim to unravel the underlying mechanisms that contribute to the fluidity and dynamic nature of spontaneous conversation.

The findings of our study emphasize the informality and flexibility that characterize unplanned discourse. One notable aspect is the prevalence of unfinished utterances, where speakers engage in ongoing thought processes and leave sentences open-ended. These unfinished utterances reflect the dynamic nature of conversational exchanges, providing opportunities for interlocutors to collaboratively construct meaning and contribute to the unfolding dialogue. Additionally, the inclusion of colloquial expressions and digressions further exemplifies the informal nature of spontaneous discourse, as speakers draw upon a repertoire of linguistic resources to express their thoughts and emotions.

By shedding light on these distinctive grammatical structures and phenomena, our study contributes to a deeper understanding of how language is employed in naturalistic conversations and can be used as a technique in teaching conversation for second language learners. The informality and flexibility observed in unplanned discourse challenge traditional notions of grammar and highlight the importance of context in shaping linguistic choices. Furthermore, our findings have implications for fields such as linguistics, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis, as they offer insights into the intricate dynamics of spontaneous conversations and the interplay between language, social interaction, and individual creativity.

## 2. Literature Review

The linguistic analysis of unplanned discourse has gotten a lot of scholarly attention in recent years. Unplanned discourse, as a fundamental mode of human communication, is dynamic and varied,

providing academics with a rich source of linguistic data. This literature review attempts to explore and synthesize current research that has employed linguistic analysis techniques to investigate unplanned discourse. We hope to gain a comprehensive understanding of the theoretical frameworks, methodologies, and key findings that have contributed to our understanding of the linguistic analysis of unplanned discourse through grammatical discourse structure by examining the diverse range of research conducted in this field.

McCarthy and Carter (2006) highlight the urgency of investigating spoken grammar in language teaching. Understanding how grammar is utilized in everyday speech is valuable for enhancing speaking skills in a communicative methodology. With global connectivity enabling real-time conversations, proficiency in spoken language, especially in a lingua franca like English, becomes an empowering skill. Studying spoken grammar illuminates the textual and interpersonal aspects of messages in face-to-face interactions. Neglecting this research impedes learners' development as effective global communicators. The presented criteria serve as valuable guidelines for research and practical applications. The design and implementation of spoken grammar are crucial in language teaching today.

Thanh (2015: 138-153) discusses the course of historical research, in which different perspectives have emerged regarding the nature of spoken language in English. Nonetheless, it is indisputable that unplanned discourse analysis is integral to the English language. Consequently, the examination of various aspects of spoken language, including grammar, continues to be a pertinent subject of investigation for researchers. The researcher has undertaken a study that examines the distinctions between spoken and written grammar in English. It highlights the flexibility of spoken grammar and the difference in subordination between speaking and writing. The analysis also explores the varying frequencies of adverbials and adjectival phrases in spoken and written languages. The study emphasizes the significance of both spoken and written English as integral components of language. Despite grammar differences, speaking and writing are interdependent, suggesting a balanced approach to teaching English grammar that incorporates both forms to facilitate learners' comprehensive understanding.

Ariel (2009) conducts a study and put forward an overview that focuses on the commonalities and intersections between discourse and grammar, recognizing that while some principles differ, there are significant connections. The review explores various linguistic phenomena, such as phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, all influenced by recurrent discourse patterns. It emphasizes speakers' careful selection process to adapt grammar to their communicative goals in specific discourses. Additionally, the study highlights how salient discourse patterns contribute to the development of grammar. The relationship between discourse and grammar is complex and not universally transparent or invariant. Differences can be observed where a discourse pattern in one language becomes a grammatical convention in another.

Suarnajaya (2009) undertakes research wherein she illustrates that Discourse and grammar are closely intertwined in discourse functional linguistics, as various grammatical aspects serve as discourse markers, including information flow, discourse structure, speaker attitude, and interactional factors. Systemic functional linguistics has contributed to the development of practical functional grammar that caters to genuine social purposes in language teaching. These grammars focus on how meanings are conveyed in texts rather than disconnected language structures. The significance of functional grammar lies in its ability to establish connections between grammatical structure and meaning expression within specific contexts. As a comprehensive theory of language, systemic functional grammar facilitates the description of grammatical structure concerning social structure and cultural situations.

Quaglio and Biber (2006) conduct thorough research investigating conversational analysis that typically examines the structure and organization of conversations. However, their focus in this study is on the specific grammatical characteristics commonly found in conversation. They identify a set of features that are prevalent in conversation compared to other forms of communication. Some of these features, such as dysfluencies, false starts, and hesitations, are primarily restricted to conversation due to the nature of spoken language. They have also explored how these linguistic features are functionally associated with the typical situations and communicative purposes of

conversation. Additionally, they propose that television dialogue serves as valuable data for linguistic analysis, both as a substitute for natural conversation and as an independent object of study. While some conversational features can also be observed in written registers like emails or letters, they argue that there exists a continuum of usage reflecting the communicative needs of speakers and the characteristics of spoken language. Notably, conversation exhibits numerous grammatical features that occur more frequently in this register due to its distinct situational characteristics.

Other works that have been done in the area of the grammar of unplanned discourse, or as some linguists refer to it; conversational discourse, include; Ford's (1993) *Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations*, Fox and Thompson's (1990) *A discourse explanation of the grammar of relative clauses in English conversation*, Rühlemann's (2006) *Coming to terms with conversational grammar: 'Dislocation' and 'dysfluency'*, and Beeke, Wilkinson and Maxim's (2007) *Grammar without sentence structure: A conversation analytic investigation of agrammatism*. Many more linguists have conducted research examining the similarities and distinctions between the grammatical structures of unplanned discourse and written grammar. While these studies offer diverse perspectives on this topic, the focus of this paper is solely on the grammar of unplanned discourse, precluding a detailed exploration of the diverging viewpoints presented in the literature.

## 2.1 Unplanned Discourse

Unplanned Discourse is spontaneous conversation lacking forethought, deliberation, and organizational preparation. It arises without pre-planning due to situational demands, requiring uninterrupted monitoring due to the topic's complexity, potentially disrupting the discussion's structure. This form of discourse blends concepts of interaction dynamics, standards, and cognitive processes involved in recognizing actions. Speakers in Unplanned Discourse benefit from various 'voice quality' effects and facial expressions, enhancing the impact of their words. Nonverbal cues, known as paralinguistic cues, are inaccessible to writers, leading to differences in perceived genuineness based on speakers' use of such cues (Keenan, 1977; Handford and Gee, 2013: 35-50; Brown and Yule, 1983).

While speaking, the speaker is required to continuously assess whether their words align with their intentions. They must monitor their current phrase, ensuring it aligns with their desired message, while simultaneously planning their next utterance and incorporating it into the overall structure of their intended speech. Additionally, the speaker must monitor not only their performance but also how their words are being received by the listener. Unlike a written record, the speaker does not have a permanent record of what they have previously said, and in rare cases, they may have notes to remind them of their upcoming points (Brown and Yule, 1983).

Unplanned Discourse typically follows a fully reciprocal pattern, where all participants have equal conversational options. If one participant can pose a question and anticipate a response, others can do the same. Similarly, if one participant can ask a specific type of question or make a particular statement about the other person's financial affairs or personal appearance, the other participant holds the same privilege in return. Likewise, if one participant chooses to neglect to answer, the same applies to others. Although occasional violations of this principle occur in everyday conversation, when they do happen, participants perceive it as a breach of a conversational rule, making them uncomfortable. In contrast, nonreciprocity in a lecture setting is expected and generally comfortable for participants (Tannen, 1982).

Mahmud (2017) brings to light the fact that Unplanned Discourse and Discourse Analysis are handled identically, both Unplanned Discourse and Discourse Analysis revolve around the study of language and action. The primary distinction lies in the focus of analysis, wherein discourse analysis encompasses more than just verbal communication, whereas unplanned discourse specifically examines talk. Essentially, these terms can be used interchangeably with varying emphasis.

To provide a more comprehensive understanding of Discourse Analysis, Handford, and Gee (2013: 35-50) define it as the examination of language as it is employed in practical contexts. It investigates the significance attributed to language and the behaviors enacted during its usage within specific

situations. Furthermore, Discourse Analysis encompasses the exploration of language beyond the sentence level, focusing on how sentences combine to convey meaning, and coherence, and achieve communicative goals. However, even a solitary sentence or utterance can be analyzed as a form of communication or action rather than solely as a sentence structure with a literal meaning derived from grammar alone. While grammar may reveal the literal meaning of a sentence like "I pronounce you man and wife," it does not provide insight into when and where this statement signifies that a marriage has taken place.

Mahmud (2017) explains that Discourse Analysis does not solely concentrate on the form or structure of language. Its primary objective extends beyond form to encompass the study of language in action, language in use, and the manifestation of language through text and talk.

Despite their differences, these two disciplines share an integrated relationship. Unplanned Discourse Analysis serves as a subset of Discourse Analysis, with the latter encompassing a broader scope of language use analysis. While Discourse Analysis explores various aspects of language use, Unplanned Discourse Analysis specifically concentrates on the analysis of conversational interactions. However, Discourse Analysis may also include an examination of this type of analysis (Wood and Kroger, 2000).

Wooffit (2005) talks further about the emergence of Unplanned Discourse from the contributions of Harvey Sacks, exploring language as a social activity. It delves into the systematic organization and orderliness of talk-in-interaction. The main source of research data for this field consists of audio recordings of naturally occurring interactions, supplemented by video recordings if required, or analyzing Unplanned Discourse as the form of dialogue through a fictional work, which is what this paper will deal with.

The first definition provided is the best one because it provides a concise and comprehensive explanation of Unplanned Discourse. It defines Unplanned Discourse as a spontaneous conversation without forethought, deliberation, or organizational preparation, arising from situational demands and potentially disrupting the discussion's structure. The definition also highlights the blending of concepts related to interaction dynamics, standards, and cognitive processes. Additionally, it mentions the role of 'voice quality' effects and facial expressions in enhancing the impact of spoken words, while acknowledging the inaccessibility of such cues to writers (Keenan, 1977; Handford and Gee, 2013: 35-50; Brown and Yule, 1983). This definition covers the essential aspects of Unplanned Discourse in a clear and succinct manner that can help the analysis of this study based on the unplanned conversations which were chosen for it.

## **2.2 Characteristics and Features of Unplanned Discourse**

Lakoff (1982: 25-42) and Clayman and Gill (2004: 120-135) give explanations of the characteristics and features of Unplanned Discourse and put forward the elucidation that discourse diverges inherently from planned speech, exhibiting distinct characteristics such as disfluency and a lack of fluidity. Speakers engaged in unplanned discourse frequently encounter difficulties in word selection and exhibit frequent pauses as they gather their thoughts. Disruptions, self-corrections, and the inclusion of filler words such as "um" and "like" are also prevalent in spontaneous speech. Another hallmark of unplanned discourse lies in its informal nature, where speakers commonly employ colloquial language, slang, and contractions. Furthermore, a noticeable absence of structure and organization often characterizes unplanned speech.

According to Ochs (1979) and Tawake (1982), Unplanned Discourse is characterized by spontaneity and lack of preparation. Another characteristic inherent in spontaneous speech is the absence of prior arrangements. During an unplanned conversation, speakers frequently exhibit abrupt shifts in topics without prior indication. This lack of preparation serves as a distinguishing factor between spontaneous speech and prepared forms of expression, such as scripted speeches or rehearsed presentations. Consequently, unplanned discourse may pose challenges for listeners who are not well-acquainted with the subject matter, as its flow can be less predictable. However, proponents argue that this absence of preparation can also engender a heightened sense of authenticity and genuineness in communication.



Starks (1994: 297-320) and Redeker (1984: 43-55) further explain certain characteristics; ordinary spoken discourse commonly exhibits the characteristics of being spontaneous, informal, and targeted towards a specific, familiar audience with whom the speaker engages in immediate interaction. This interaction involves the provision of prompt verbal and/or nonverbal feedback. Another prominent characteristic that distinguishes unplanned discourse is the utilization of informal and casual language. Participants involved in such exchanges commonly employ colloquial expressions, idioms, slang, and non-standard grammar, reflecting the spontaneous and relaxed nature of the interaction. Moreover, conversational partners heavily rely on personal anecdotes and experiences, infusing humor and self-deprecating remarks into the discourse. This facilitates the establishment of rapport, the creation of shared understanding, and the cultivation of a comfortable and enjoyable communication environment. Nonetheless, the informality inherent in unplanned discourse also implies a potential lack of precision and clarity in language usage. Consequently, when attempting to convey more intricate ideas or information, misunderstandings and difficulties may arise.

In spontaneous conversations, especially in dyadic interactions, the occurrence of frequent digressions and interruptions is a common phenomenon. These instances can manifest in diverse forms and originate from various factors, encompassing cognitive processes like hesitation or disfluency, as well as social factors such as politeness or power dynamics. Digressions serve multiple functions, including providing contextual information, indicating shifts or transitions in topics, or expressing emotions. Similarly, interruptions serve diverse purposes, such as displaying agreement, disagreement, impatience, or signaling changes in topics. Although these features may initially appear disruptive, they play a vital role in maintaining the fluidity and coherence of unplanned discourse, as they enable dynamic and adaptable communication. The analysis of disfluencies in unplanned discourse has revealed interesting findings about verbal communication. Fillers, hesitation, and other disfluencies are commonly used by speakers, and their frequency may be influenced by multiple factors, including the speaker's age, gender, and education level. These disfluencies not only serve as a tool for speakers to organize their thoughts and signal their intentions, but they also reveal important variations in speech patterns across different communicative contexts. Furthermore, disfluencies can also be used to convey pragmatic meanings, such as politeness, humor, or emphasis. Therefore, a comprehensive understanding of the use of fillers, hesitation, and other disfluencies is essential for effective communication and for studying the intricacies of spoken language (Zhu and Pen, 2006: 197-200).

### **2.3 Linguistic Analysis of Unplanned Discourse**

According to Mahmud (2017), the linguistic analysis of unplanned discourse encompasses the scrutiny of language employed in impromptu and unprepared communicative exchanges, encompassing everyday conversations, interviews, and naturalistic contexts. This analytical approach entails investigating multiple linguistic facets, including the structural organization, syntactic patterns, lexical choices, grammatical structure, and employment of discourse markers within the discourse. By examining these linguistic elements, we aim to uncover insights into the underlying mechanisms and features that shape the dynamics of spontaneous verbal interactions.

Unplanned discourse and grammar often appear as distinct aspects of human communication. Grammar pertains to language-specific rules and codes that primarily govern sentence-level structures. It provides guidelines for constructing sentences, which are subsequently connected through a separate set of discourse principles to form a coherent discourse. Unplanned discourse, on the other hand, arises from the application of grammar within specific natural contexts. It typically encompasses a series of utterances, predominantly in sentence form, arranged in a deliberate manner rather than randomly (Ariel, 2009).

Suarnajaya (2009) has convincingly stated that the utilization of discourse structure can serve as an explanatory tool for elucidating the distribution of grammatical patterns within discourse. This implies that grammar functions both as a generative force and as a reflection of the overarching textual organization at a higher level, manifesting in various ways.

The grammar underlying unplanned discourse adheres to the same linguistic rules employed in conventional grammar. However, as Leech (1998) explains, unplanned discourse exhibits variations in grammatical structures because the spontaneous spoken language to a degree tends to be grammatically chaotic – Primarily attributable to the widely recognized occurrence of disfluency, which affects speakers while attempting to manage the demands of real-time language processing. In this study, our primary focus is to discover recurrent patterns and syntactic variations contributing to spontaneous conversational discourse's overall order and coherence. The informality, flexibility, unfinished utterances, and dynamic nature of grammatical usage in conversations, as seen by the inclusion of colloquial expressions, and digressions, specifically drawing from David Sedaris' book "Calypso". This particular book was selected due to the presence of spontaneous conversations and dialogues within its content, which accurately represent spoken utterances characterized by their unplanned nature. The linguistic analysis of unplanned discourse in this study will be undertaken by examining grammatical discourse structure, with particular emphasis on verb tense and aspect, verb voice, coordination, and subordination.

#### **2.4 Recurrent Patterns, syntactic variations, and dynamical behavior of Unplanned Discourse in David Sedaris “Calypso”**

A recurrent pattern in unplanned discourse is a language structure, phrase, or behavior that happens or repeats repeatedly throughout a dialogue or over numerous conversations. These patterns can entail grammar and vocabulary, among other things. In casual talks, for example, the use of specific phrases or expressions, such as "you know," "like," or "I mean," can be considered recurring patterns. These statements are frequently used as fillers or discourse markers to help maintain the flow of discussion or to emphasize certain points. Similarly, certain grammatical structures or syntactic variations, such as the use of ellipsis (omission of words or phrases) or unfinished sentences, may reoccur throughout the unplanned discourse. The structure of repeated patterns can exhibit varying degrees of complexity or flexibility. When we refer to "extension," we are considering the average length of a repeated pattern, which can range from brief linguistic forms to complete utterances. Since interlocutors typically don't mimic each other exactly, we also assess the "complexity" of structures in terms of the variety of linguistic forms being repeated (Fusaroli and Tylén, 2016).

The verb in the English language typically conveys actions or events and undergoes variations in the form to indicate the timing of these actions or events. This variation, known as tense, involves the use of different verb forms in various combinations. The term tense is derived from the old French word for "time," and it is the most major alteration impacting form in English verbs. The present and past tenses are the only tenses considered "real" in the English language since they are verb forms with a distinct inflection. Because there is no unique form of the verb to represent future events, there is no proper future tense in English. Future occurrences are described using various other constructs, the most common of which are shall/will and be going to. However, in this article, future will be dealt with as an independent tense. The present tense refers to something that happens now, the past tense refers to something that happened in the past, and the future tense refers to something that will happen in the future. The present tense, past tense and future tense in English have several forms: simple present, simple past, present progressive, past progressive, present perfect, past perfect, present perfect progressive, and past perfect progressive. The future tense also has aspects: simple future, future progressive, future perfect, and future perfect progressive. Tense and aspect are both properties of verbs, tenses refer to the verb's temporal position, categorizing it as either past, present, or future. On the other hand, aspects pertain to different perspectives through which an action or event can be understood about time, rather than specifying its exact timing (Sabra, 2020).

Voice is the form of a verb that specifies whether a grammatical subject performs or is the recipient of an action. Grammatical voice consists of both active and passive. When a sentence is written in the active voice, the subject does the action; when the sentence is written in the passive voice, the subject receives the action. The action remains constant, yet the emphasis shifts depending on the context. Passive voice makes use of tenses and aspects; the grammatical voice in present tense

consists of the aspects simple present, present progressive, present perfect, and present perfect progressive. Voice in the past tense consists of the aspects; simple past, past progressive, past perfect, and past perfect progressive. Voice in the future tense consists of four aspects; simple future, future progressive, future perfect, and future perfect progressive. Passive voice is used to emphasize the receiver of the action instead of the doer, to sustain the emphasis on a specific subject over the course of multiple sentences or paragraphs, in instances where the agent responsible for acting is unidentified or unimportant, when we mean to keep the doer of the action unidentified, when we feel it might be better to sound objective or avoid using the subject "I" (Cooray, 1967: 203-210; Yannuar, et al., 2014: 1400-1408).

Syntactic variation in unplanned discourse analysis refers to the study of the different ways in which speakers use and manipulate sentence structures and grammatical patterns during spontaneous conversation. It involves examining the range of syntactic choices made by speakers in their utterances, including word order, sentence structure, verb forms, and the use of grammatical constructions. In conversation, speakers often deviate from strict grammatical rules and engage in syntactic variation to achieve specific communicative goals or to reflect the interactive and dynamic nature of the discourse. Syntactic variation can occur through the use of ellipsis (omission of words or phrases), fragments (incomplete sentences), coordination (linking clauses or phrases), subordination (embedding one clause within another), and other grammatical phenomena. By analyzing syntactic variation in unplanned discourse, researchers aim to understand how speakers adapt their language to the context, negotiate meaning, convey emphasis or attitude, manage turn-taking, and maintain conversational flow. It provides insights into how syntax is influenced by the interactional aspects of communication and contributes to our understanding of the relationship between grammar and conversation (Cheshire, 2005).

Linguistic analysis of unplanned discourse recognizes that conversations are dynamic and interactive, occurring in real-time. It focuses on how participants collaboratively construct meaning, manage turn-taking, and shape the flow of discourse. Researchers analyze the organization of talk, by observing how speakers take turns, respond to each other, and use verbal and non-verbal cues. They examine details such as interruptions, overlapping speech, and repairs. Contextual factors like social norms, cultural influences, and power dynamics are considered. By studying conversation dynamics, researchers uncover how meaning is negotiated, the underlying mechanisms of conversation, and the strategies used to achieve understanding (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990).

The informality of unplanned discourse contributes to the presence of ellipsis, which is the phenomenon where certain elements of a sentence or discourse are omitted or left unexpressed, relying on the context or shared knowledge between participants to fill in the missing information. This linguistic phenomenon is prevalent in both spoken and written discourse and plays a significant role in maintaining efficiency and coherence in communication.

In unplanned discourse, the evidence of ellipsis can be observed through various linguistic and pragmatic cues. Like in contextual dependency where ellipsis is highly dependent on the context in which the conversation takes place. The omitted elements are typically recoverable from the immediate linguistic or situational context. In syntactic patterns, ellipsis often follows specific syntactic patterns. Common instances include the verb phrase ellipsis. Parallelism and repetition where ellipsis can occur when parallel structures are repeated within a discourse, allowing subsequent instances to omit repeated elements. In pragmatic inference, it plays a crucial role in identifying ellipsis. Listeners or readers rely on their pragmatic knowledge and shared assumptions to infer the missing information. This can include the speaker's intention, the topic under discussion, or the overall coherence of the conversation. And finally, prosodic cues in unplanned discourse, prosody, including intonation, stress, and rhythm, can provide cues for identifying ellipsis. Pauses or changes in pitch and timing patterns can indicate the presence of omitted elements. When examining the evidence of ellipsis in unplanned discourse academically, researchers analyze these linguistic and pragmatic cues to identify instances of ellipsis, understand its functions in discourse, and explore its impact on communication efficiency and comprehension (Kempson, et al., 2015).

Regarding hesitation pauses in unplanned discourse, Shofa (2008) refers to the brief pauses or delays that occur during speech, often indicating hesitation, uncertainty, or the need to plan an upcoming



speech. These pauses play a significant role in the dynamics of conversation and have been extensively studied in various fields such as linguistics, conversation analysis, and psycholinguistics. An academic examination of hesitation pauses helps shed light on functions, underlying mechanisms, and their impact on communication.

### 3. Methodology

The data chosen for this study are taken from David Sedaris's "Calypso", which was published in 2018 and is his tenth book, continuing his tradition of sharing witty and poignant essays based on his life experiences. In "Calypso," Sedaris presents a collection of personal essays that touch on various themes, including family, aging, mortality, and his observations of modern life. As with his previous works, Sedaris infuses humor into his writing, using his keen eye for the absurdities and idiosyncrasies of everyday life. The book also delves into Sedaris's experiences as he and his family purchase a beach house on the Carolina coast, which he affectionately calls the "Sea Section." The beach house becomes a focal point for family gatherings and a backdrop for humorous and heartfelt tales of vacations and interactions with his siblings, father, and long-time partner, Hugh. "Calypso" received positive reviews for its mix of humor, wit, and emotional depth. David Sedaris's unique storytelling style, which blends satire with heartfelt sincerity, makes "Calypso" a compelling and engaging read for fans of his work and newcomers alike (Manteuffel, 2018).

The reason for choosing Calypso is that the conversations found in the book are actually unplanned discourses that occurred in the writer's life. Based on what is said, the conversations that are selected do not fall under the category of fiction which serves this study since they are spontaneous and realistic, and that helps in revealing the actual characteristics of unplanned discourse.

The data analysis used in this paper is qualitative. The analysis focuses on examining the content of the conversation, identifying patterns, and interpreting the meaning conveyed through the speakers' interactions and language use. It includes the identification of recurrent patterns, syntactic variations, interruptions, contrastive connectors, repetition, rhetorical questions, anaphora, and the overall tense, aspect, and voice of the utterances.

Since discourse analysis is a qualitative research method that involves the study of language in its social context, looking at how language is used to convey meaning, construct identity, and create social realities, subsequently the elements such as syntactic variations, use of interjections, incomplete sentences, informal language, and coherence in storytelling are examined to understand how meaning is conveyed and how the speakers engage in natural, spontaneous communication.

Additionally, the analysis also touches on the dynamics of the conversation, including the use of storytelling and shared knowledge to maintain coherence and fluidity in the discourse. The exploration of the tense and aspect of verbs used in the conversation also adds to the understanding of how time is represented and how the speakers frame their memories of their late sister.

### 4. Results and Discussion

This section deals with a number of dialogues found in Calypso, where each of them has distinct linguistic patterns to be uncovered in detail.

1. A: *"What about the Halloween she spent on that Army base? And the time she showed up at Dad's birthday party with a black eye?"*  
 B: *"I remember this girl she met years ago at a party, she'd been talking about facial scars and how terrible it would be to have one, so Tiffany said, 'I have a little scar on my face and I don't think it's so awful.' Well, the girl said, 'You would if you were pretty.'"*  
 A: *"Oh, that's a good line!"*  
 B: *"Isn't it, though? Funny, but I don't remember a scar on her face."* (Sedaris, 2018: 21)

The unplanned discourse above takes place on a beach between a brother and a sister. They are lying, on bedspreads, dazed in the sun. The conversation is about their sister Tiffany who had committed suicide before her fiftieth birthday.

Recurrent patterns in this conversation include storytelling by both speakers A and B. They share anecdotes and memories related to the person they are discussing (their late sister Tiffany). Speaker B uses direct quotes said by their late sister Tiffany. The tense in the first and second utterances is past tense as seen ("spent", "showed up", "met", "she'd been talking", "said", and "were"), the aspect of all these verbs is past simple, except for "she'd been talking" which is past perfect progressive. The last two utterances are in the present time and their aspect is present simple. The voice of the utterances is active voice. Syntactic variations can be observed in the last two utterances, where speaker A uses the interjection ("Oh") and Heritage (1989: 21-47) explains that it is often used in conversation, to express surprise, sudden realization, or a sudden change in understanding. It can indicate that new information has been received or that something unexpected has happened. "Oh" here is also used to add emphasis or intensity to the utterance that speaker B said earlier. Incomplete sentences are also used, as in "Isn't it, though?" is an example of an incomplete sentence that still conveys meaning. Incomplete sentences in unplanned discourse show Informality and efficiency because unplanned discourse often prioritizes speed and efficiency of communication. Incomplete sentences can convey a message with fewer words or minimal effort, allowing for faster and more fluid conversation. Incomplete sentences in unplanned discourse may also involve the omission of words or phrases that can be inferred from the context. When participants in a conversation share common knowledge or assumptions, they can leave out certain elements, making communication more concise. The unplanned discourse above is dynamic in nature, it uses informal language like the use of contractions (e.g., "she'd," "don't") and colloquial expressions (e.g., "that's a good line") to contribute to the casual tone of the conversation. The first two questions stated by Speaker A are not answered by Speaker B, perhaps because these two questions are rhetorical and Speaker A is merely stating a memory from the past in the form of a question. However, the conversation maintains coherence through shared knowledge of the person being discussed and the use of storytelling to share memories. The speakers can smoothly transition between topics, without overlapping speeches or repairs, and their informal language creates a natural, spontaneous flow in the discourse.

2. A: *"What do you want?"*

B: *"I want to come inside."* (Sedaris, 2018: 18)

The unplanned discourse above takes place in a house where the family lives. One of the siblings who is also the narrator of the book (David Sedaris) retells the story about a time when he had just come back from a trip and had gone to the biggest room to unpack, his parents, however, did not let him unpack in that specific room claiming it to be theirs. In the process, he leaves, goes and knocks at his sisters' room.

In this short conversation, we can identify several elements that contribute to the overall order and coherence of the brief unplanned discourse. The conversation follows a simple question-answer pattern, which is common in everyday interactions. This pattern helps maintain the coherence of the discourse as it allows the interlocutors to exchange information effectively. Both sentences are simple, with minimal syntactic variations. Speaker A's sentence is interrogative, while Speaker B's sentence is a declarative sentence. The use of these different sentence types contributes to the coherence of the discourse by establishing a clear distinction between the question and the response. The tense of both utterances is present, and the aspect is present simple. Both utterances are in active voice. The conversation is not complex, as it consists of only two sentences with a simple structure. The simplicity of the conversation makes it easy for the interlocutors to understand each other and maintain coherence in the discourse. Although the conversation is brief, it demonstrates flexibility in the sense that Speaker B could have responded in various ways, such as providing more details or asking a question in return. However, Speaker B chose to give a direct answer. There are no unfinished utterances in this conversation, as both Speaker A and Speaker B

provide complete sentences. The absence of unfinished utterances contributes to the clarity of the unplanned discourse. The conversation is coherent, as the response from Speaker B directly addresses the question posed by Speaker A. Both speakers stay on topic, and their exchange is easy to understand and follow. Both speakers take their turns, no interruption occurs and there are no overlapping speeches.

3. A: *"So is that one of your sisters?"*  
 B: *"It is, and so are the two women standing on either side of her."*  
 A: *"Then you've got your brother. That makes five – wow. Now. that's a big family."*  
 B: *"Yes, it certainly is."* (Sedaris, 2018: 31)

This conversation takes place in the final moments of standing on the front porch of a beach house that belonged to David Sedaris, with a real estate agent named Phyllis who had just locked the door to a house that had just been sold to David Sedaris.

Several recurring patterns can be observed in the course of this unplanned discourse. Use of contractions ("it's," "that's"), use of ellipsis ("wow. Now. that's a big family."). Use of simple and compound sentences. The tense of all four utterances is present, and the aspect of the first, second, and fourth utterances is present simple, however, the third utterance's aspect is present perfect. The voice of all four utterances is active voice, including the fourth utterance where ("it") refers to the mentioned subject in the previous utterance ("family"). The coordinating conjunction ("and") is used to coordinate between the utterance "it is" and the other utterance "so are the two women standing on either side of her". Use of the adverb ("certainly"), and demonstrative pronouns ("that"). The conversation follows a logical order, with Speaker A asking about Speaker B's family members and Speaker B providing the information. The dialogue is coherent as it maintains a consistent topic throughout. Informality can be seen through the use of casual language ("wow," "big family"), and the use of colloquial expressions ("on either side of her").

The conversation demonstrates flexibility in its structure. Both speakers can adapt their responses based on the information provided by the other speaker. There are no clear examples of unfinished utterances in this conversation. However, the use of ellipsis in Speaker A's statement ("wow. Now. that's a big family.") could be interpreted as a pause or hesitation in speech, which may indicate an unfinished thought or a change in direction during the conversation. In the given conversation, we can observe the dynamic nature of grammatical usage through the incorporation of colloquial expressions and digressions. Nurani and Harared (2017: 1-19) define colloquial expressions as informal phrases or sayings that are commonly used in everyday speech but may not be suitable for formal writing. In this conversation, we can identify a few colloquial expressions: ("So is that one of your sisters?"). Raymond (2004) discusses the occurrence of ("so") as a conversation opener as being informal and common in casual conversations. When "So" is used at the beginning of a spoken utterance, it often serves as a discourse marker or a transitional phrase. It can be used to indicate a connection to or continuation of the previous topic, to introduce a new topic, or to summarize what has been said before. The interjection "wow" is used to express surprise or admiration and is typical in informal speech. – ("Now, that's a big family"). The phrase ("now, that's") is a colloquial way of emphasizing a point or expressing agreement. Digressions occur when a speaker deviates from the main topic of conversation, either temporarily or permanently (Goldwyn, 1985). In this conversation, there is a slight digression when Speaker A counts the number of siblings: ("Then you've got your brother. That makes five – wow."). Speaker A briefly shifts focus from asking about Speaker B's sisters to counting the total number of siblings. This digression helps emphasize the point that Speaker B has a large family.

4. A: *"Is that a watch?"*  
 B: *"No, it's a Fitbit. You sync it with your computer, and it tracks your physical activity. It's like a pedometer, but updated, and better. The goal is to take ten thousand steps per day, and once you do, it vibrates."*  
 A: *"Hard?"*

B: *"No, it's just a tingle."* (Sedaris, 2018: 42)

The unplanned discourse takes place in an Italian restaurant in Melbourne. David Sedaris is listening to a woman named Lesley talking about her housekeeper. While Lesley pushes back her shirtsleeves, and as she reaches for an olive, he notices a rubber bracelet on her left wrist.

Unplanned discourse often exhibits flexibility and the dynamic nature of grammatical usage due to the inclusion of colloquial expressions and digressions. This analysis will focus on a conversation between two individuals discussing a Fitbit. The recurrent patterns in the discourse above follow a typical question-and-answer pattern where Speaker A asks questions and Speaker B provides answers or explanations. The topic of the conversation remains consistent, focusing on the Fitbit device. The tenses of all utterances are in the present tense; ("is", "sync", "tracks", "it's", "take", "vibrates", "it's"). Their aspect is all in present simple. The voice of all utterances is active. Syntactic variations are seen including incomplete sentences like "Hard?" which is a shorthand way of asking if the vibration is hard or strong. Use of contractions, the speakers use contractions such as "It's" to make the conversation more casual and informal. Casual Language is seen in the use of casual language like "it's just a tingle" which contributes to the informality of the conversation, and abbreviations like the use of abbreviations like "Fitbit" instead of the full name of the product adds to the informality of the discourse. The conversation maintains a clear structure and coherence as it follows a question-and-answer pattern, stays focused on the topic, and uses informal language to create a casual atmosphere. In the given conversation, colloquial expressions are used to provide a casual and informal tone. For example, ("It's like a pedometer, but updated, and better") uses informal language to describe the Fitbit. The use of ("it's") instead of ("it is") and the phrase ("and better") exemplify colloquial expressions. The conversation also includes digressions, which deviate from the main topic. For instance, when A asks, ("Is that a watch?"), B starts explaining the features of a Fitbit. Although the response is related to the question, it digresses from the main topic of whether or not it is a watch. The conversation demonstrates flexibility in grammatical usage through the use of sentence fragments and informal language. For example, Speaker A's question ("Hard?") is a sentence fragment that relies on the context of the conversation for understanding. Similarly, Speaker B's response ("No, it's just a tingle") uses an informal term ("tingle") to describe the vibration of the Fitbit.

5. A: *"I am American, but now I live in England. I am on vacation with my sisters."*

B: *"Oh, your sisters!"*

A: *"I am a doctor."*

B: *"What kind?"*

A: *"A... children's doctor."*

C: *"Did you just tell that lady you're a doctor?"*

A: *"A little."* (Sedaris, 2018: 76)

The unplanned above takes place in Tokyo, where David Sedaris is grocery shopping in a supermarket. He engages in an unplanned discourse with the Japanese cashier and later with his sister.

Recurrent patterns appear in the Question-and-answer exchanges. This conversation features a series of questions and answers, which is typical in unplanned discourse. For example, Speaker B asks ("What kind?"), and Speaker A answers ("A... children's doctor."). Topic shifts are seen in the conversation moves from discussing Speaker A's nationality and residence to their profession, illustrating how topics can change fluidly in informal conversations. The tense of all the first five utterances is in the present tense: ("I am", and "live"), however, Speaker C's utterance is in the past tense: ("did"). The aspect of the five first utterances is in present simple, and that of Speaker C's is in past simple. The voice of the unplanned discourse above is in active voice.

Syntactic Variations are seen in incomplete sentences, and in unplanned discourse, speakers often use incomplete sentences or phrases (Hacking, 1986: 458), as seen in Speaker B's response ("Oh, your sisters!") and Speaker C's question ("Did you just tell that lady you're a doctor?"). Kempson, et al. (2015) explain that Ellipsis refers to the phenomenon where certain elements of a sentence or discourse are omitted or left unexpressed, relying on the context or shared knowledge between participants to fill in the missing information. This linguistic phenomenon is prevalent in both spoken and written discourse and plays a significant role in maintaining efficiency and coherence in communication. In the unplanned discourse above, the ellipsis is evident where the omission of words that are understood from the context is common in informal conversations. For example, Speaker A says ("A little") instead of ("I told her a little.").

The speakers use contractions like ("I'm") and ("you're,") which are typical in informal speech. Informal vocabulary and informal terms are used by the speakers, such as ("lady") instead of ("woman") and ("kind") instead of ("type") or ("specialty"). Hesitations and pauses which according to Shofa (2008) are explained as short pauses during speech that indicate uncertainty, hesitation, or planning. They are crucial in unplanned discourse dynamics and have been widely studied in linguistics and psycholinguistics. Research on hesitation pauses reveals their functions, mechanisms, and impact on communication. They are used like when Speaker A hesitates before answering Speaker B's question with ("A... children's doctor.") This reflects the natural pauses and hesitations that occur in spontaneous conversational discourse.

Unplanned discourse often displays a flexible and dynamic nature in terms of grammatical usage, as they include colloquial expressions and digressions. Colloquial Expressions are seen in Speaker B's utterance: ("Oh, your sisters!") – This exclamation demonstrates informal language use, as it omits a complete sentence structure. Speaker A: ("A... children's doctor.") - The hesitation marker ("A...") is a colloquial element that shows uncertainty or a thinking process in speech. Speaker C: ("Did you just tell that lady you're a doctor?") - The use of "just" in this context is informal, emphasizing the recent action. Speaker A: ("A little.") - This response is an informal way of admitting something without providing a full explanation. Digressions are seen in Speaker A's utterance when he starts by talking about their nationality and vacation but then shifts to their profession as a doctor. Speaker B's question ("What kind?") prompts Speaker A to specify their field of expertise, which is not directly related to the initial topic of vacation and nationality. Speaker C's interruption brings up the fact that A mentioned being a doctor, diverting the conversation from its original focus.

6. A: *"So there are other children?"*

B: *"There are, three who are living and a daughter, Chloe, who died before she was born, eighteen years ago."* (Sedaris, 2018: 16)

The aforementioned dialogue takes place within the context of an airport in California, United States, involving a middle-aged man and another individual accompanied by his son. Speaker A, who hails from a family comprising six siblings, is now reduced to five siblings as a result of his sister's tragic suicide. Observing the presence of the man and his son, an unplanned discourse takes place.

The recurrent pattern in this brief dialogue lies in the grammatical tense, in which both utterances are in present tense, and their aspect is simple present because they are discussing something which is happening now, however, the use of the past tense ("died" and "was born") in the last part of Speaker B's utterance indicates that the events being discussed happened in the past, specifically eighteen years ago. The voice for both utterances is in passive voice because Speaker A does not mention the subject in his question, he does not say ("Do YOU have other children?") instead, he makes the subject unknown in his question. Speaker B in return also replies in passive voice, and does not mention the subject ("I"); he does not say ("I have three who are living..."). Speaker A deviates from strict grammatical rules to achieve specific communicative goals by starting his utterance with ("So") which is known to be very common at the beginning of starter utterances in unplanned discourse unlike what is advised in traditional grammar. Knapp and Watkins (1994) explain the basis for discouraging the use of ("so") at the beginning of sentences is often rooted in the idea that sentences should begin with a subject followed by a verb (subject-verb order) to



establish clear and concise communication. Traditional grammatical rules often promote a more structured sentence construction and discourage sentence-initial conjunctions like ("so"). However, it's worth noting that language and grammar usage evolve, and there are instances where the use of ("so") at the beginning of sentences has become more accepted and prevalent, particularly in informal spoken language. Using ("so") at the beginning of spoken utterances is more common in unplanned discourse and can contribute to a conversational tone. It is often used in casual settings or everyday conversations where adherence to strict grammatical rules may be less important, Speaker A is specifically using it to get Speaker B's attention. In the above interaction, turn-taking occurs, Speakers A and B do not interrupt each other, and there are no overlapping speeches or repairs.

7. A: *"I don't want to hear this."*

B: *"This happened years ago, thousands of miles away from here."*

A: *"That doesn't matter. I'm not interested."*

B: *"But..."*

A: *"No."* (Sedaris, 2018: 222)

The unplanned discourse above occurs between David Sedaris as Speaker B and Hugh as Speaker A. Before the unplanned discourse at hand, Speaker B had started telling a story which as it appears makes Speaker A uncomfortable.

Recurrent patterns occur with the presence of interruptions and incomplete sentences: ("But...") Use of contractions: ("I don't", "I'm not"), and short sentences and responses: ("No.") Informality can be seen in the use of casual language: ("I don't want to hear this."). Colloquial expressions: ("That doesn't matter."). Lack of formal greetings or closings. The tense of the first utterance is in the present tense ("don't"), and the aspect is present simple. The tense of the second utterance is in the past tense ("happened"), and the aspect is past simple. The tense of the third utterance is in the present tense ("doesn't", "I'm"), and the aspect is in present simple. Syntactic Variations are evident in the use of ellipsis: ("This happened years ago, thousands of miles away from here.") (Omission of "it" before "happened"). Simple sentence structures: ("I don't want to hear this.", "That doesn't matter.", "I'm not interested.").

The unplanned discourse is coherent as it follows a clear pattern of disagreement between the two speakers. Speaker A consistently refuses to engage with the topic, while Speaker B attempts to provide context or justification for discussing it. The informality and syntactic variations contribute to the natural flow of the conversation, making it relatable and easy to follow. In this conversation, we can observe the dynamic nature and flexibility of grammatical usage through the inclusion of colloquial expressions and digressions. ("I don't want to hear this.") – The use of "this" instead of specifying what the speaker is referring to is a colloquial way of expressing disinterest or annoyance. – ("That doesn't matter.") - This phrase is a casual way of dismissing the importance or relevance of something. - "No." – Speaker A simple, informal way of expressing disagreement or refusal. There are a few examples of digressions: Speaker B's statement, ("This happened years ago, thousands of miles away from here,") is a digression from A's initial statement. Instead of addressing Speaker A's disinterest directly, Speaker B tries to provide context to make the information more appealing or relevant. – Speaker A's response, ("That doesn't matter. I'm not interested,") brings the conversation back to the original point, but it also serves as a digression since it moves away from discussing the event itself.

In this unplanned discourse, we can observe the following aspects of flexibility in grammatical usage; in this case, we can see an ellipsis in Speaker B's response ("But...") The speaker omits the rest of the sentence, but the meaning is still clear. Sentence fragments are also present in this specific unplanned discourse, which are defined by Rothschild and Yalcin (2017) as incomplete sentences that are used for emphasis or to convey a specific meaning. In this conversation, Speaker A's final response ("No.") is a sentence fragment. It lacks a subject and a verb, but it effectively communicates Speaker A's refusal to continue the conversation. Contractions are also seen in this unplanned discourse, defined by Brainerd (1989: 176-196) as shortened forms of words or phrases, often used in informal speech. In this conversation, we can see contractions in Speaker A's responses ("I don't

want to hear this.") and ("That doesn't matter.") The use of contractions contributes to the casual tone of the conversation. Overall, the flexibility in grammatical usage in this conversation reflects the informal nature of the interaction and allows for effective communication between the speakers.

8. A: *"Do you need pastry to go with that?"*  
 B: *"I wasn't too shy to order the coffee, so what makes you think I'd hold back on a bear claw if I wanted one?"*  
 A: *"We have Danish too."*  
 B: *"On second thought, I don't want anything, I would like nothing but coffee. Just coffee. Period."*  
 A: *"No cup?"*  
 B: *"Well, of course I want a cup."*  
 A: *"No milk or anything?"*  
 B: *"And milk, coffee in a cup with some milk in it but nothing else."* (Sedaris, 2018: 97-98)

This conversation takes place in an airport where David Sedaris wants to drink coffee before his flight. He engages in an unplanned discourse with a barista.

Recurrent patterns are seen in the question-answer format: The unplanned discourse predominantly follows it, where Speaker A asks a question and Speaker B responds. The unplanned discourse also exhibits informal language usage, such as contractions (e.g., "don't" and "I'd") and colloquial expressions (e.g., "bear claw"). Syntactic variations are seen in the use of ellipsis where words are omitted without affecting the overall meaning (e.g., "Do need pastry to go with that?" instead of "Do you need a pastry to go with that?"). Some sentences are incomplete, reflecting the spontaneous nature of conversational discourse (e.g., "No cup?"). Speaker B repeats certain phrases for emphasis and clarification (e.g., "I don't want anything, I would like nothing but coffee. Just coffee. Period."). The unplanned discourse demonstrates coherence through the consistent focus on the topic of ordering coffee and pastries. The recurrent patterns and syntactic variations contribute to the natural flow of the conversation, reflecting the spontaneity and informality of everyday spoken discourse. The dynamic nature of this conversation is evident in the way the speakers adapt their language and respond to each other's statements. They adjust their language based on the context and the information they receive from one another. Informality is seen in the use of contractions, colloquial expressions, and casual language. For example ("I wasn't too shy to order the coffee") (informal tone) – ("What makes you think I'd hold back") (colloquial expression) – ("No cup?") (Informal question) – ("Well, of course I want a cup") (casual language). The flexibility of grammatical usage is demonstrated by the speakers' ability to switch between different structures and expressions to convey their thoughts. For instance ("We have Danish too.") (Simple statement) – ("On second thought, I don't want anything, I would like nothing but coffee. Just coffee. Period.") (Multiple structures and emphasis) – ("And milk, coffee in a cup with some milk in it but nothing else.") (Compound sentence with contrasting ideas).

Colloquial Expressions are used like when Speaker B. ("I wasn't too shy") - An informal way of saying they had no hesitation or problem ordering coffee. ("Hold back") - Informal expression means to restrain oneself or not do something one wants. ("Bear claw") - A colloquial term for a type of pastry. ("On second thought") - Informal way of expressing a change of mind. ("Just coffee. Period.") - Informal emphasis on wanting only coffee. ("No cup?") - Informal, sarcastic question implying the obvious need for a cup. Digressions are seen in Speaker B's response about not being shy to order coffee and questioning A's assumption about holding back on a bear claw is a digression from the main topic of ordering pastries. Speaker A's sarcastic question ("No cup?") is a digression from Speaker B's clear statement of wanting only coffee with milk. Colloquial expressions and digressions contribute to the casual, informal tone and create a sense of familiarity between the speakers. The use of these elements reflects the everyday nature of the interaction and highlights the speakers' personalities and attitudes.

9. A: *"Do you want me to be happy after you die?"*

*B: "No, I want you to be alone and miserable. And if you do find someone, I am going to return from the dead and haunt you." (Sedaris, 2018: 183)*

The unplanned discourse above occurs between David Sedaris as Speaker A and Hugh with whom he shares a house in England as Speaker B.

Recurrent patterns occur in the use of questions and answers: The conversation starts with a question posed by Speaker A, which is followed by a response from Speaker B. Speaker B's response contains sarcasm, which is a common pattern in informal conversations. Informality is seen in the use of contractions: (e.g., "I'm" instead of "I am") is an indicator of informality in the conversation. The use of informal language using phrases like ("alone and miserable" and "return from the dead and haunt you") contribute to the informal tone of the conversation. Syntactic variations are seen in the use of incomplete sentences: Speaker B's response begins with ("No,") which is a one-word sentence that lacks a subject and verb. This is a common feature of spontaneous conversational discourse. The use of coordination in Speaker B's response contains two independent clauses joined by the coordinating conjunction "and." This syntactic structure is common in conversational discourse as it allows speakers to express multiple related thoughts within a single sentence.

The unplanned discourse primarily uses the present tense ("do", "want", "want", "find") and the active voice. However, B's second statement introduces a future tense construction, indicating an intention or plan for future action. The aspect of the first utterance and half of the second utterance is in the present simple, however, the aspect of the second half of the second utterance is in the simple future. The overall order and coherence of the unplanned discourse follow a clear question-answer format, with Speaker A asking a question and Speaker B providing a response.

The use of sarcasm and informal language adds a sense of humor and playfulness to the conversation, while syntactic variations contribute to its natural, spontaneous feel. The given unplanned discourse demonstrates the dynamic nature and flexibility of grammatical usage in everyday conversations, particularly through the inclusion of colloquial expressions and digressions. Colloquial expressions are used in unplanned discourse to convey emotions and humor. For example, Speaker B's statement, ("No, I want you to be alone and miserable,") employs sarcasm as a means to express their feelings. This informal language reflects the casual nature of the conversation and contributes to the overall flexibility of the discourse.

The conversation also includes digressions, which serve to create a more engaging and dynamic interaction between Speaker A and Speaker B. When Speaker B says, ("And if you do find someone, I am going to return from the dead and haunt you,") they introduce an unexpected element to the conversation. This digression not only adds humor but also creates a sense of spontaneity and unpredictability, further emphasizing the dynamic nature of the conversation.

*10. A: "You bought a brand-new iPad for some kid you don't even know? Now, that's just showing off."*

*B: "Now, hold on a minute ---"*

*A: "If you really want to help someone, you should think about those Syrian refugees."*

*B: "I know, but ---"*

*A: "I see them on TV, some of them drowning, their children dead, and it just tears me apart. That's who you should be reaching out to, not some American kid who probably has a car and who knows what else." (Sedaris, 2018: 172)*

This unplanned discourse takes place in David Sedaris's house between him and Hugh's mother. He lives in this house with Hugh. In this exchange, Speaker B, who is David Sedaris, is trying to brag about a good deed that he has done some time in his life.

In this spontaneous conversational discourse, recurrent patterns and syntactic variations contribute to its overall order and coherence. Interruptions occur throughout the conversation, Speaker A frequently interrupts Speaker B, as indicated by the dashes (---) in Speaker B's responses. Roger, et al. (1988: 27-34) explain that this pattern of interruptions demonstrates the dominance of Speaker A and their control over the conversation.

The use of contrastive connectors, such as ("but") in Speaker B's responses, indicates an attempt to present a different perspective or argument (Wang, 2011). However, due to the interruptions, Speaker B is unable to fully express their thoughts. Repetition occurs when Speaker A repeats the phrase ("you should") in their statements, emphasizing their opinion on what Speaker B ought to do. This repetition creates coherence in Speaker A's argument and reinforces their stance on the issue (Wong, 2000). Rhetorical questions are also present in this unplanned discourse where Speaker A uses rhetorical questions, such as ("You bought a brand-new iPad for some kid you don't even know?") to express their disbelief and disapproval of Speaker B's actions. Rhetorical questions serve to strengthen Speaker A's argument and provoke thought in the listener (Lee-Goldman, 2006). The use of anaphora, or the repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of successive clauses, is evident in Speaker A's statements. In unplanned discourse, anaphora as explained by Fox (1993: 297-316) refers to a linguistic phenomenon where a word or phrase is repeated in subsequent utterances to refer back to a previously mentioned entity or idea. It is a form of referencing that helps establish cohesion and coherence within the conversation. Anaphora serves as a strategy for maintaining and clarifying the shared understanding between participants. For example, "I see them on TV, some of them drowning, their children dead..." The repetition of "their" creates coherence. Anaphoric references can take various forms, including pronouns, definite or indefinite noun phrases, or even repeated keywords. By using anaphora, speakers can avoid unnecessary repetition, enhance efficiency, and contribute to the flow of the conversation. It helps in maintaining coherence by linking ideas across turns and sequentially facilitating the understanding of referents.

The overall tense of the unplanned discourse is in the present tense, except for the first part of the first utterance is past tense. The aspect of all the verbs is in the present simple, except for the first part of the first utterance which is in past simple. The voice of the whole utterance is in an active voice.

The provided conversation exhibits the dynamic nature, informality, and flexibility of grammatical usage in conversations through the inclusion of colloquial expressions and digressions. The conversation reflects a dynamic nature characterized by interactive exchanges, alternating perspectives, and reactions between participants. Each participant responds directly to the previous statement, creating a back-and-forth flow. The dynamic nature is evident in the interruption by Speaker B, signaling the need to interject and respond to Speaker A's assertion. The conversation maintains an informal tone, characterized by the use of casual language and everyday expressions. Both Speakers use colloquial expressions and contractions, such as ("hold on a minute" and "I know, but.") These informal elements contribute to a conversational atmosphere, promoting familiarity and ease of communication.

The conversation showcases flexibility in grammatical usage, including syntactic variations and incomplete utterances. For example, Speaker A uses a complex conditional sentence ("If you really want to help someone, you should think about those Syrian refugees"), emphasizing the flexibility to construct more intricate sentence structures in conversation. Additionally, both Speakers utilize fragmented utterances like ("Now, hold on a minute" and "I know, but") to convey their thoughts concisely and maintain the conversational pace.

Colloquial expressions are employed to add authenticity and convey meaning efficiently. For instance, Speaker A uses the phrase ("showing off") to express their opinion about buying an iPad for an unknown child, while Speaker B interjects with ("hold on a minute") to pause the conversation and request attention. These colloquial expressions contribute to the informal and conversational tone of the interaction.

The conversation includes digressions, where participants momentarily deviate from the main topic to introduce new perspectives or arguments. Speaker A's statement about Syrian refugees and the emotional impact they have on them is a digression from the initial discussion about buying an iPad for a child. These digressions showcase the flexibility of conversation and the ability to explore related topics or personal thoughts. Overall, the conversation demonstrates the dynamic nature, informality, and flexibility of grammatical usage in conversational discourse. The inclusion of colloquial expressions and digressions contributes to the natural flow of conversation, enabling participants to express their thoughts, challenge perspectives, and engage dynamically and flexibly.

## 5. Conclusions

This work has focused on the linguistic analysis of Unplanned Discourse in David Sedaris's "Calypso", in which the dynamic nature and flexibility of grammatical usage in conversations can be observed through the incorporation of colloquial expressions and digressions. These elements contribute to everyday discourse's casual and engaging atmosphere, allowing for a more authentic and lively exchange between individuals. Accordingly, the following conclusions from the analysis can be reached:

- The cooperative interaction exhibits effective turn-taking, facilitating clear communication and shedding light on the speakers' communicative strategies;
- Conversations may follow a question-answer pattern, along with effective turn-taking, absence of interruptions, and on-topic responses, maintaining clarity and the orderly, coherent nature of the discourse;
- The analysis reveals important findings regarding recurring patterns, syntactic variations, incomplete sentences, language informality, and smooth transitions, highlighting the natural flow and dynamics of the conversation;
- Certain linguistic features may contribute to the structure, coherence, and dynamic nature of conversations, including the use of contractions, ellipsis, and colloquial expressions, sustaining a consistent topic and logical order;
- Typical patterns and characteristics may be found in informal conversations, including topic shifts, interruptions, disagreement patterns, sarcasm, humor, varied tense and aspect usage, hesitations, and engaging digressions, along with contrastive connectors, rhetorical questions, and anaphora that contribute to the overall order, coherence, dynamics, and flexibility of the conversation, exemplifying the natural flow and engagement of conversational discourse.

## 6. References

- Ariel, M. (2009). *discourse, grammar, discourse*. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249712802\\_Discourse\\_grammar\\_discourse](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249712802_Discourse_grammar_discourse) [Accessed: 19 June 2023].
- Beeke, S., Wilkinson, R. and Maxim, J. (2007). Grammar without sentence structure: A conversation analytic investigation of agrammatism. *Aphasiology*, 21(3-4), pp.256-282. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02687030600911344> [Accessed: 19 June 2023].
- Brainerd, B. (1989). The contractions of not: A historical note. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 22(2), pp.176-196. Available at: <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=ca452b918dd0498837c9d127dae5b5db833e51ee> [Accessed: 23 June 2023].
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511805226.
- Cheshire, J. (2005). Syntactic variation and spoken language. *Biolinguistic and Sociolinguistic Accounts of Syntactic Variation: Doubts about Dichotomy*. Available at: <http://jennycheshire.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/syntactic-variation-and-spoken-language.pdf> [Accessed: 22 June 2023].
- Clayman, S.E. and Gill, V.T. (2004). Conversation analysis. *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, pp.120-135.
- Cooray, M. (1967). The English passive voice. *ELT Journal*, 21(3), pp.203-210. Available at: [https://glenji.github.io/pdfs/blog\\_6/Cooray.pdf](https://glenji.github.io/pdfs/blog_6/Cooray.pdf) [Accessed: 21 June 2023].
- Ford, C.E., 1993. *Grammar in interaction: Adverbial clauses in American English conversations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, B.A. and Thompson, S.A. (1990). A discourse explanation of the grammar of relative clauses in English conversation. *Language*, pp.297-316.
- Fox, B.A., 1993. *Discourse structure and anaphora: Written and conversational English (No. 48)*. Cambridge University Press.



- Fusaroli, R. and Tylén, K. (2016). Investigating conversational dynamics: Interactive alignment, Interpersonal synergy, and collective task performance. *Cognitive science*, 40(1), pp.145-171. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/cogs.12251> [Accessed: 22 June 2023].
- Gee, JP & Handford, M. (2013). *The Routledge Handbook of discourse analysis*. Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203809068> [Accessed 18 Jun 2023].
- Goldwyn, H. (1985). CONVERSATION ET CONTESTATION: ETUDE DES DIGRESSIONS NARRATIVES ET DISCURSIVES DU " GRAND CYRUS." (FRENCH TEXT)(BAROQUE ROMANCE, 17TH CENTURY NOVEL, WOMEN'S EDUCATION, DISINTEGRATION, NEOPLATONIC CONCEPT, DE SCUDERY). New York University. Available at: <https://www.proquest.com/openview/bb9f52cf172e41deb1975b2fddb8c235/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y> [Accessed: 22 June 2023].
- Goodwin, C. and Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual review of anthropology*, 19(1), pp.283-307. Available at: <https://shorturl.at/ixBX8> [Accessed: 22 June 2023].
- Hacking, I. (1986). The parody of conversation. *Truth and interpretation: Perspectives on the philosophy of Donald Davidson*, 447, p.458. Available at: <https://shorturl.at/gNP04> [Accessed: 22 June 2023].
- Handford, M. and Gee, J.P. eds., 2013. *The Routledge Handbook of discourse analysis*. Routledge, pp. 35-50
- Heritage, J. (1989). Current developments in conversation analysis. D. Roger & P. Bull (Eds.), *Conversation: An interdisciplinary perspective*, pp.21-47. Available at: <https://tinyurl.com/4chvj9cv> [Accessed: 22 June 2023].
- Keenan, E. (1977). WHY LOOK AT UNPLANNED AND PLANNED DISCOURSE? [online] Available at: [http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/anthro/faculty/ochs/articles/Ochs\\_1977\\_Why\\_Look\\_at\\_Unplanned\\_and\\_Planned\\_Discourse.pdf](http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/anthro/faculty/ochs/articles/Ochs_1977_Why_Look_at_Unplanned_and_Planned_Discourse.pdf) [Accessed 18 Jun. 2023].
- Kempson, R., Cann, R., Eshghi, A., Gregoromichelaki, E. and Purver, M. (2015). Ellipsis. *The Handbook of contemporary semantic theory*, pp.114-140. Available at: <file:///Users/besttech/Downloads/6505-Article%20Text-9730-1-10-20200517.pdf> [Accessed: 22 June 2023].
- Knapp, P. and Watkins, M. (1994). *Context, text, grammar*. Broadway: Text Productions. Available at: <https://shorturl.at/mQYZ0> [Accessed: 22 June 2023].
- Lakoff, R.T. (1982). Persuasive discourse and ordinary conversation, with examples from advertising. *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk*, pp.25-42.
- Lee-Goldman, R., 2006. A typology of rhetorical questions. *Syntax and Semantics Circle*, UCB. Available at: <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=0fe417c80dcccaca247f7fbab664eb2035b403de> [Accessed: 24 June 2023].
- Leech, G. (1998). *English grammar in conversation*.
- Mahmud, M. (2016). DOING DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: AN INTRODUCTION. [online] eprints.unm.ac.id, Makassar: Phoniex Publisher. Available at: <http://eprints.unm.ac.id/20699/> [Accessed 18 Jun. 2023].
- McCarthy, M. and Carter, R. (2006). Ten criteria for a spoken grammar. *Explorations in corpus linguistics*, 27, pp.27-52. Available at: [file:///Users/besttech/Downloads/Explorations%20\(1\).pdf](file:///Users/besttech/Downloads/Explorations%20(1).pdf) [Accessed: 19 June 2023].
- Nurani, S. and Harared, N. (2017). Commerce Register Analysis of Minangkabau Vernacular in a Colloquial Conversation: A Sociolinguistics Studies. In UHAMKA International Conference on ELT and CALL (UICELL) (pp. 1-19). Available at: <https://shorturl.at/juKW3> [Accessed: 22 June 2023].
- Ochs, E. (1979). Planned and unplanned discourse. In *Discourse and Syntax* (pp. 51-80). Brill.
- Quaglio, P. and Biber, D., 2006. The grammar of conversation. *The Handbook of English linguistics*, pp.692-723.
- Raymond, G. (2004). Prompting action: The stand-alone " so" in ordinary conversation. *Research on language and social interaction*, 37(2), pp.185-218. Available at: <https://shorturl.at/fzN28> [Accessed: 22 June 2023].
- Redeker, G. (1984). On differences between spoken and written language. *Discourse Processes*, 7(1), pp.43-55. Available at: <https://shorturl.at/qJS04> [Accessed: 19 June 2023].
- Roger, D., Bull, P. and Smith, S. (1988). The development of a comprehensive system for classifying interruptions. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 7(1), pp.27-34. Available at: <https://shorturl.at/dtvG7> [Accessed: 24 June 2023].
- Rothschild, D. and Yalcin, S. (2017). On the dynamics of conversation. *Noûs*, 51(1), pp.24-48. Available at: <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1470274/1/nousrewrite.pdf> [Accessed: 23 June 2023].
- Rühlemann, C. (2006). Coming to terms with conversational grammar: 'Dislocation' and 'dysfluency'. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 11(4), pp.385-409. Available at: <https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/ijcl.11.4.03ruh> [Accessed: 19 June 2023].
- Sabra, A. (2020). Tense and Aspect in the English Language: A study about newly arrived students with Arabic as their mother tongue. Available at: <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1429992/FULLTEXT01.pdf> [Accessed: 20 June 2023].
- Sedaris, D. (2018). *Calypso*. First edition. New York, NY, Little, Brown and Company.
- Shofa, A. (2008). *Hesitation pauses in conversational interaction of the English Letters and Language*

Department's students at the State Islamic University of Malang (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim). Available at: <http://etheses.uin-malang.ac.id/4585/1/03320005.pdf> [Accessed: 23 June 2023].

- Starks, D. (1994) "Planned vs Unplanned Discourse: Oral Narrative vs Conversation in Woods Cree," *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique*. Cambridge University Press, 39(4), pp. 297–320. doi: 10.1017/S0008413100015437 [Accessed: 19 June 2023].
- Suarnajaya, I.W. (2009). The Relationship Between Discourse And Grammar In Discourse Functional Approach And Its Implication In Language Teaching. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 42(2 Jul). Available at: [file:///Users/besttech/Downloads/aditra,+536%20\(2\).pdf](file:///Users/besttech/Downloads/aditra,+536%20(2).pdf) [Accessed: 19 June 2023].
- Tannen, D. (1983) *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Tawake, S. (1982). Another Look at Unplanned and Planned Discourse. Available at: <https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/a3a5cd42-d267-4f2b-be3f-c02fd49cf195/content> [Accessed: 19 June 2023].
- Manteuffel, R. "After nine books, what more could David Sedaris have to say? A great deal". "The Washington Post, 2018." Available at: <https://shorturl.at/jvyI0> [Accessed: 29 July 2023].
- Thanh, N.C. (2015). The Differences between Spoken and Written Grammar in English, in Comparison with Vietnamese (Las Diferencias entre la Gramática Oral y Escrita del Idioma Inglés en Comparación con el Idioma Vietnamita). *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 11, pp.138-153. Available at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1084418.pdf> [Accessed: 19 June 2023].
- Wang, J. (2011). *Contrastive connectors in English and Chinese: A corpus-based study* (Doctoral dissertation). Available at: <file:///Users/besttech/Downloads/whole.pdf> [Accessed: 24 June 2023].
- Wong, J. (2000). Repetition in conversation: A look at " first and second sayings". *Research on language and social interaction*, 33(4), pp.407-424. Available at: <https://shorturl.at/amABU> [Accessed: 24 June 2023].
- Wood, L. and Kroger, R. (2000). *Doing Discourse Analysis: Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text*. [online] SAGE Knowledge. Thousand Oaks, California. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452233291> [Accessed 18 Jun 2023].
- Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208765> [Accessed 18 Jun 2023].
- Yannuar, N., Shitadevi, I.A., Basthomi, Y. and Widiati, U. (2014). Active and passive voice constructions by Indonesian student writers. *Theory and Practice in language studies*, 4(7), pp.1400-1408. Available at: <https://shorturl.at/ksxJM> [Accessed: 21 June 2023].
- Zhu, X. and Penn, G. (2006, June). Comparing the roles of textual, acoustic, and spoken-language features on spontaneous-conversation summarization. In *Proceedings of the Human Language Technology Conference of the NAACL, Companion Volume: Short Papers* (pp. 197-200). Available at: <https://aclanthology.org/N06-2050.pdf> [Accessed: 19 June 2023].

## شيكارى زمانه وانى بۆ گوتارى بى پلان' له چيروكى "كالييسو"ى ده بفيده سيداريس

## بينين مصطفى سعيد

به شى فيزيا، كۆلتىزى زانست،  
زانكۆى سه لاهه ددين-هه ولير  
binin.saeed@su.edu.krd

## رۆزگار يوسف عمر

به شى ماتماتيك، كۆلتىزى زانست،  
زانكۆى سه لاهه ددين-هه ولير  
rozgar.omar@su.edu.krd

## پوخته

ئهم توؤزىنه وه به ئامانجى ليكۆلپينه وه به له و تايه تمه ندييه زمانه وانپانه ي كه به يوه ندى خۆبه خۆ و نافه رمى له نيوان تاكه كاندا جيا ده كه نه وه، كه زۆر جار به گوتارى بى پلان' ناسراوه. ئهم توؤزىنه وه به به وردى له كۆمه ليك تايه تمه ندى و نه خشه ي پزىمانى ده كۆلتىته وه كه له كاتى گفوتگۆدا ده بينرئى. ئهم توؤزىنه وه به شيكارى ئهو پىكهاته و ديارده پزىمانيه جياوازانه ده كات كه له گوتارى بى پلاندا كه شه ده كه ن به ليكۆلپينه وه له كۆمه ليك داناي گفوتگۆي به فرهاون له سيناريو و ديالوگ و گفوتگۆي ئاساي جياواز كه له كالييسوى ده بفيده سيداريسدا دۆزراونه ته وه. ههروهها، پيازيكى چۆنايه تى ده گرپته بهر، تهكنيكه كانى شيكارى زمانه وانى به كارد هيتت بۆ دۆزىنه وه ي نه خشه دووباره بووه كان و گۆرانكاريه رسته سازيه كان كه به شدارن له يه كگرتووي گشتى گوتارى گفوتگۆي خۆبه خۆ. دۆزىنه وه كان جهخت له سه ر نافه رمى، خۆگونجاوى، گوتته تهواونه كراوه كان و سروشتى دايناميكى به كارهينانى پزىمانى له گفوتگۆكاندا ده كه نه وه، وهك له وه رگرتى ده ربرپنى ئاخوتتى و لادانه كاندا ده رده كه وئىت. ئهم توؤزىنه وه به تيگه يشتنمان له چۆنيه تى به كارهينانى زمان له كارليكه پۆزانه كاندا زياد ده كات به تهركيز خسته سه ر ئهو توخمه پزىمانيه جۆراوجۆرانه ي كه قسه كردنى گفوتگۆي جيا ده كه نه وه و گرنگيان له پشتگير كردنى به يوه ندى كارادا. ده تانرئى ده رنه جامه كانى ئهم ليكۆلپينه وه به بۆ باشتركردنى پيازه كانى فيركردنى زمان و چوارچۆيه ي شيكارى گوتار به كاربهيترئىت، سه ربارى به شداريكردن له په ره پيدانى تيؤرييه زمانه وانپانه كان سه بارهت به گوتارى بى پلان'.

**وشه سه ره كيه كان:** گوتارى بى پلان؛ گوتار و شيكرده وه؛ گوتارى گفوتگۆي؛ شيكارى زمانه وانى؛ به كارهينانى زمان.

## التحليل اللغوي للخطاب غير المخطط له في ديفيد سيداريس "كالييسو"

## بينين مصطفى سعيد

قسم الفيزياء، كلية العلوم، جامعة صلاح الدين-أربيل  
binin.saeed@su.edu.krd

## رۆزگار يوسف عمر

قسم الرياضيات، كلية العلوم، جامعة صلاح الدين-أربيل  
rozgar.omar@su.edu.krd

## ملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التحقيق في السمات اللغوية التي تميز الاتصال التلقائي وغير الرسمي بين الأفراد ، والتي تُعرف غالبًا باسم الخطاب غير المخطط له. تبحث هذه الدراسة الأكاديمية بدقة في مجموعة من السمات والأنماط النحوية التي تظهر في خطاب المحادثة. تحلل الدراسة الهياكل والظواهر النحوية المميزة التي تتطور في الخطاب غير المخطط له من خلال دراسة مجموعة واسعة من بيانات المحادثة من سيناريوهات مختلفة ، والحوارات ، والمحادثات العرضية الموجودة في ديفيد سيداريس "كالييسو". تتخذ الدراسة منهجًا نوعيًا ، باستخدام تقنيات التحليل اللغوي لاكتشاف الأنماط المتكررة والاختلافات النحوية التي تساهم في الترتيب العام لخطاب المحادثة التلقائي وتماسكه. تؤكد النتائج على الطابع غير الرسمي والمرونة والألفاظ غير المكتملة والطبيعة الديناميكية للاستخدام النحوي في المحادثات ، كما يتضح من تضمين التعبيرات العامة والاستطراد. يضيف البحث إلى فهمنا لكيفية استخدام اللغة في التفاعلات اليومية من خلال إلقاء الضوء على العناصر النحوية المختلفة التي تميز خطاب المحادثة وأهميتها في دعم التواصل الفعال. يمكن استخدام نتائج هذه الدراسة لتحسين مناهج تدريس اللغة وأطر تحليل الخطاب ، بالإضافة إلى المساهمة في تطوير النظريات اللغوية حول الخطاب غير المخطط له.

**الكلمات المفتاحية :** خطاب غير مخطط له؛ تحليل الخطاب؛ خطاب التخاطب؛ التحليل اللغوي؛ استعمال اللغة.