

## COHESION IN BILINGUAL ACADEMIC SERVICE ENCOUNTERS

*Inbal Regev<sup>1</sup>*  
*Bar-Ilan University*

### 1. Introduction

Although cohesion in code-switched utterances has generally received limited analytical attention, code-switching (henceforward, CS) (as a general label for the alternate use of two languages) has been more fortunate. In fact, CS has been analysed from a variety of perspectives, all approaches making important contributions toward understanding the nature of spoken discourse. In this chapter I briefly review key ideas from the approaches I consider most relevant to the analysis of cohesion in CS.

In this paper I will outline a particular perspective on text organization, which places cohesion analysis within a broader framework for analysing discourse. The paper considers the interaction of the phenomena of CS, which is manifested in bilingual speech, and cohesion, which is a good candidate for a functional study of language use, as another kind of linguistic organisation. Examples of cohesion mechanisms produced in Hebrew and English are explored in terms of language interaction factors.

Pragmatic dimensions of CS are to be explored along with cohesion. As Auer (1995) notes, in bilingual language negotiation, there is more pressure to accommodate to participant's language choice in turns with a high degree of cohesion with previous turns –such as second-pair-partners– than in initiative turns. This study analyses the use of referential cohesion in turns which do *not* exhibit a participant's accommodation to the interlocutor's language choice, but altered between the languages. It demonstrates how different types of reference, such as endophoric links, exophoric reference groups, and lexical cohesion such as superordination is prevalent in bilingual speech.

The objectives of the paper are as following:

- To provide a detailed examination of referential cohesive devices which are manifested in juxtaposition with CS.

---

<sup>1</sup> Address for correspondence: Department of English, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, 52900, Israel; e-mail: <regevinbal@yahoo.com>

- To offer ways in which these cohesive devices can enhance and maintain the social process of communicating in bilingual academic service encounters.
- To demonstrate how certain sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of CS are reflected in the overt instances where cohesive ties are manifested in the data.
- To explain the findings in the light of Conversational Analysis (CA) and current pragmatic-based theories of CS.

## 2. The functions of cohesion in bilingual social interaction

Cohesion occurs frequently in spontaneous discourse, and serves a variety of functions in social interaction. Interactions are dynamic: Each utterance is emitted in the context of prior utterances, and constitutes the social relationship between speakers. Spoken text involves a process which unfolds dynamically, turn-by-turn, and cohesion and its specific devices is one of the main building blocks which assists in creating intelligible text. Fine (1994) sheds light on the dynamics of conversation:

In a conversation a speaker uses cohesion in a context that is constantly being built by at least one other speaker. Speakers are using cohesion in part to display the mutual construction of the conversation. Cohesion enables speakers to connect their speech to each other... The dependence of language on context and situation must be accomplished by both speakers. This dependence is not a *static* structural feature of a conversation, but is built interactively. The *dynamic* construction of conversation... is not random and unpredictable but follows patterns learned by the speakers as members of the speech community. Speakers can predict to some extent what another speaker will say and how the conversation will develop. The interpretation will be constructive and *dynamic*, but in relation to a background of expectations. The *dynamic* perspective also has implications for the cognitive processing of conversation. Speakers must be able to monitor conversations at a specific rate and have the ability to plan their contributions in relations to the *changing context*... Each contribution to conversation is a particular selection of option against the background of the typical choices. Speakers must be able to process the relevant probabilities and aspects of context that they are associated with. The dynamic perspective requires that all this processing and constant updating be done in real time as conversation develops.

(Fine, 1994: 258-9) [my emphases]

The merge of two linguistic phenomena, cohesion and bilingualism allows us to capture two aspects of language use: (1) the respective roles a speaker and listener play in the interaction, and (2) the negotiation of those non-linguistic roles of inclusion / exclusion, support / confrontation, alignment / distance. Social roles and language choice provide information about social interaction that can then be related to particular cohesion variables.

Not only Cohesion Functional Analysis, but also CA see meanings (in this approach, meanings of CS) as emerging out of the *sequential* and negotiated

development of conversational interaction. In other words, in its essence, discourse is built sequentially, turn-by-turn, developing dynamically and therefore the meanings and functions of CS instances in the unfolding dynamic discourse should naturally be analysed in a micro level before drawing conclusions on the macro level. The meaning of any particular code-switch can only legitimately be ascertained in the context of its surrounding turns, as the variety of social meanings of CS that participants produce are generated *in situ*<sup>2</sup>.

Any given difference in the use of cohesion has to be considered with respect to other differences in the use of language choice and non-linguistic social and cognitive factors. The functions of cohesion help suggest sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic associations. In other words, since the theory of cohesion is functional, the rates of specific variables can be related to aspects of social and cognitive abilities, which, in some cases, are correlated. Insisting on both cognitive and social aspects in CS analysis presents considerable challenges. In my view it is necessary to include both aspects of human behavior which can not be sealed in separate compartments. Fine (1994) strengthens my view with the following words: “cohesion is...not an *isolated patterning* available in language, but a functional resource that is used...to create social interaction” (Fine, 1994: 5) [my emphasis], such as CS is a functional resource in which sociolinguistic functions are not isolated from psycholinguistic functions, and cannot be sealed in separate slots.

### **3. Current findings within the field of discourse cohesion in bilingual speech**

The achievement of referential cohesion is particularly necessary for marking in language that events happen to the same character and in the same spatial scene. In discourse, the type of language production necessary for the establishment of characters and their positions, both spatially and temporally in context, is referred to as referencing. The area of referential cohesion has been investigated from varying perspectives (e.g., Eggins, 1994; Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Martin, 1992). However, there has been less work on discourse cohesion in bilingual speech. Some unique work of this sort is Aarssen (1996), Fine (1994: chapter 8), and Morgan (2000); Although

---

<sup>2</sup> A thorough discussion of sociological perspectives in CA appears in Regev (in process).

these researches seem to be disconnected at first sight, what they do have in common is the field of study: cohesion in children's speech, bilinguals and second-language-learners (see Aarssen; Morgan for bilinguals and Fine for second-language-learners), and the area of linguistics: language acquisition.

Aarssen (1996) studied the acquisition of cohesive devices by Turkish-Dutch bilingual children at school age. It appears through the results that when exposed to both languages in a constant and consistent manner bilingual children go through similar stages in their acquisition of each language as compared to monolingual speakers of each of their languages. Fine (1994: chapter 8) studied two types of cohesion, reference and lexical cohesion, in a naturalistic setting of a camp in Canada, where campers had to speak their second language (L2) with their guides and staff members, while using their native language (L1) to communicate with their peers. The results show that repetition serves the function of continuity of meaning in complex ways. "The social identity and roles of the speakers (camper or counsellor) and the conversational turn-taking (also an indication of social role) influence how repetition is used". Morgan (2000), in a rare study of narrative discourse across modalities, described the development of discourse cohesion in bilingual children, through an analysis of narrative discourses produced by hearing children of deaf parents in both British Sign Language (BSL) and spoken English. He focused on the bilingual children's use of *referential* organization devices in their development in a bimodal context. One major conclusion of this study was that although sign and speech require very different referential forms these children already are making appropriate shifts between languages. Thus, acquiring two reference systems can occur across modalities within the same child. At the same time there is an early sensitivity to those aspects which differ across languages.

Although the findings reported above seems irrelevant to the analyses I will present in the following sections, due to the fact that the participants are children at school age (as opposed to the participants of my study, which are adults), I do see the connection to the variables of studies (the ones reported above and mine), which are the types of cohesion studied: Reference and Lexical cohesion (Fine); Reference (Morgan). In light of the fact that literature dealing with discourse cohesion in bilingual speech paper is limited and rare, I chose to add my perspective to this field of research, which would examine the use of referential cohesive devices by Hebrew-English bilinguals in

an academic setting of service encounters, and the maintenance of the social roles of the participants (students and advisors) through using cohesive devices in language alternation.

In my view, the linguistic devices of cohesion should be studied along with the linguistic device of CS, because it is through studies of language use in real situations that we can understand the principles of the relationship of language to social reality and the cognitive process involved, and Fine (1994) strengthens this point: “Conversation is constructed by simultaneous and interlocking systems of language and conversational organization” (p. 250).

#### **4. The study**

##### **4.1. Method**

**Research Setting.** Data was collected in the offices of the Department of English at Bar-Ilan university. The department is comprised of approximately 350 undergraduate students and 150 graduate students divided between literature and linguistics. This setting offers a rich environment for CS data, since there are many bilingual speakers among students and staff. Language alternation as the medium of talk was evident in about half of the conversations. These participants presented a high ratio of CS, although every student in the department, at some point or another is engaged in CS throughout her/his studies, moving smoothly back and forth from one language to another, as an unmarked medium of talk. During registration for courses, the material is discussed both in Hebrew and English. Data was collected during registration hours, from 8:00 until 13:00.

**Participants.** The participants are students in the English Department in Bar-Ilan university, two secretaries/advisors and an assistant to the Department Chair. The 64 students who were willing to participate in the study can be divided into four language-dominance groups: 1) 30 students are native Hebrew (NH); 2) 16 students are native Russian (NR); 3) 11 students are native English (NE); 4) One student is native Arabic (NA). All participants currently live in Israel. These conversational participants generate many instances of CS since all three of the staff are bilingual in English and Hebrew and are accustomed to using both languages among themselves and with the students. Two staff people are native speakers of Hebrew and one is a native speaker of

English. The students are also comfortable with both languages among themselves and with the advisors due to the bilingual atmosphere in the department.

**Procedure.** The data being examined include tapes, transcripts and written observations from 64 conversations on the topic of registration for the courses at the Department have been recorded over a period of one month, in September 2000, and in September 2001. The recordings were carried out in a Panasonic mini cassette recorder RQ-L309. The corpus of data drawn upon in the present analyses comprised approximately twenty hours of audio-taped interaction. These tapes were then examined several times by the author, who noted instances of code-switching phenomena.

Those recordings which demonstrate rich use of CS were chosen to be analysed. The participants were acknowledged beforehand about the recordings, which took place during the registration procedure. Those who wished to withdraw from the research were free to do so at any time. All participants signed a consent form reassuring them anonymity and an opportunity to withdraw from the study.

The only criterion, which affected my selection of presenting one or another interaction in the analysis, is the criterion of rich use of CS (from a quantitative perspective). Other criteria as language history, language proficiency, and age were not regarded while collecting the data. No formal interviews with the participants took place. When I doubted the subject's native language, for the documentation, he or she were interrogated informally what is his/her dominant language.

Out of the 64 conversations I selected 32 conversations (half) to analyze, and omitted the 32 others, which didn't present rich use of CS. The distribution of these subjects is as follows:

- 1) 16 students are native Hebrew (NH);
- 2) 10 students are native English (NE);
- 3) 5 students are native Russian (NR);
- 4) 1 student is native Arabic (NA).

The transcriptions adhere to conversation analytic standards slightly modified to capture the bilingual nature of the data (cf. Appendix).

## **5. Code-switched utterances functioning as referential cohesive devices in the corpus**

In this section, and in the one which follows (section 5) the analyses will be based on the Conversational Analysis to CS which focuses specifically on the member's

procedures of arriving at local meaning of language alternation. I shall present an application of this approach, drawing upon my study in an institutional framework. On the basis of this analysis, I shall discuss the ‘brought about’ meanings of conversational CS, which emerge out of the *sequential* and negotiated development of conversational interaction. In other words, the meaning of any particular code-switch and cohesion device can only legitimately be ascertained in the context of its surrounding turns. Concepts from the theory of genre and register will be used to contribute to the analyses.

This section will demonstrate and analyse types of reference used as cohesive devices: *Non-phoric nominal groups*, *Endophoric links*, and *Exophoric nominal groups*. The second part of this section will demonstrate and analyse a type of lexical cohesion: *Direct repetition (reiteration)*.

### 5.1. Non-phoric nominal groups

The first type of reference used as a cohesive device in juxtaposition to CS is that of *Non-phoric nominal groups*, which require no further information in order to be understood by the interlocutor.

In the following cases there is a shared common-knowledge between the participants: academic terms as: “prerequisite”, “elective”, “outside department” all refer to the noun “course”, which has gone ellipsis in the following occurrences: the noun is covert throughout the segments, indicating that there a shared knowledge that these non-phoric nominal groups:

**Segment from excerpt 2.** Student – NE. Ad 1 – NH. Ad 2 – NE

[5] Ad 2: ((NAME of assistant to Chair)), EIFO HA – **prerequisite?**

(‘where is the prerequisite?’)

((calling Ad 1)): TAGIDI, 5-6-5 ETZEL ((NAME of lecturer)) HU HM **elective** LEXULAM?

(‘tell me, 5-6-5 by name of lecturer is hm elective for everyone?’)

[6] Ad 1: hm

[7] Ad 2: BEMIKRE HI OSA TE’UDAT HORA’A. AVAL ANI – ME’ANYEN OTI LADA’AT

(‘it is by coincidence that she does a teaching licence. But I – I’m interested to know’)

[8] Ad: ANI XOSHEVET SHEKEN. VEYESH LA **prerequisite**

(‘I think so, and she has a’) prerequisite

[9] Ad 2: ((calling another student)): AT RO’A? YESH LI KAN **prerequisites**

(‘do you see? I have prerequisites here’)

**Segment from excerpt 3.** Student – NE. Ad 1 - NH

Ad 1: ANI RO'A SHEBEANGLIT YESH LAX PTOR SAMAXLAKA. AT LOKAXAT ET KOL HAKURSIM SHEL SHANA ALEF

('I see that in English you have exemption in the department. You are taking all the first year courses')

S: MA BEDEREX KLAL LOKXIM?

('what are usually taken?')

Ad 1: TZARIX LAKAXAT **Outside department** EXAD VE'IM AT ROTZA AT YEXOLA LAKAXAT OTO BETOX HAMAXLAKA. IM AT BESIFRUT **Outside** BISHVILEX YAXOL LIYOT IM AT ROTZA. ME'A SHIV'IM ZE KURS BEBALSHANUT

('One should take one Outside department, and if you wish, you could take it in the department. If you are in Literature, Outside for you could be (unintelligible) if you want. 170 is a Linguistics course')

S: AH, OK, AZ MA ZOT OMERET **Outside?** ZE YAXOL LIYOT BEXOL MIKTZO'A SHE'ANI ROTZA?

('oh, OK, so what does 'outside' mean? Can it be in every course I want?')

Ad 1: KEN, XUTZ MI... YESH KAMA ( ) SHE'ASUR XINUX, HIT'AMLUT, TE'UDAT HORA'A VEYAHADUT. ZE LO NEXSHAV LE **Outside**, AT YEXOLA LAKAXAT BETOX HAMAXLAKA LEBALSHANUT **Outside**.

('yes, except for... there are a few ( ) that are not allowed: Education, Physical Education, Teaching License, and Judaism. These do not count as outside. You can take outside in the Linguistics department')

As manifested in the segments above, in which the phenomena of CS in non-phoric nominal groups of academic terms is revealed, this is a widespread phenomena in the corpus. It seems natural to switch into English when referring to types of courses (see excerpts 2, 3), names of courses, and types of Tracks (direct-A, indirect-B), even though the environment is in Hebrew, in a setting of an office of the English Department.

The direct repetition of a lexical item indicates that the speaker is continuing to talk about roughly the same thing. Lexical repetition is a safe option in cases where ambiguity of reference may arise and in contexts (such as the advising session) which do not tolerate ambiguity of reference when discussing concrete academic concepts such as 'elective', 'prerequisite' (to indicate types of courses). The repetition of a lexical item, at one end of the scale of reiteration, is much more frequent in the data than using synonyms and general words, at the other end of the scale of reiteration, to refer back to a lexical item. The use of concrete academic terms with fixed meanings rather than general words used with modifiers conveys a certain bond between the participants, who talk about shared (academic) knowledge.

According to Grice's (1975) co-operative principle, which is broken down into specific maxims and submaxims, including the maxim of Manner ("be brief and avoid ambiguity"), speakers in conversations are expected to provide only as much information as is necessary to convey what they mean to express, and this involves clear-cut and orderly reference. Thus, referring to the course my *it's* type ('elliptical', 'prerequisite') is by no means avoidance of ambiguity and clear-cut than adding general modifiers and synonyms, which add an interpersonal character to the referent and add an attitudinal meaning to the referent. The meaning conveyed when repeating these concepts is that of familiarity, as opposed to distance, since the speaker does not have to describe the concept s/he is referring to as new information for the interlocutor.

## 5.2. Endophoric links

A second type of reference used as a cohesive device parallel to CS is that of *Endophoric links* (person reference and demonstrative reference), in which some portion of prior talk gets repackaged in a reduced form, usually through a pronoun.

This requires careful monitoring of the speech of both speakers in a conversation.

In the following segment, the student uses a link ('*ze' it*) to previous stretches of language (*course, this test*), keeping in mind the information about potential reference. The use of the demonstrative maintains the text fluent and concrete, creating a flow of speech with the help of the pointer (which indicates attention to the previous turns). Specifically, we need to know what '*it*' refers to, which presents no problem for interactants sharing the unfolding sequential context.

**Two segments from excerpt 11.** Student – NH. Ad 2 – NE.

**D)**

Ad 2: there's another **course**, you know, outside. **it's** given twice a year and outside of the coursework there'll be a notice and there's a list attached so you can sign up for **it**. **It's** somewhere around January, the first one January-February and the second one at the end of the year.

S: what is **this test** about?

Ad 2: grammar

S: grammar? Okay.

Ad 2: and **it's** no credits but **it's** a must anyway

S: so what EH TZARIX PASHUT LA'AVOR ET **ZE** O SHEYESH TSIYUN MINIMALY? ('eh, should I just pass **it** or do I need a minimal grade?')

Before switching into Hebrew the student hedges with the hesitation marker ('*eh*') which indicates, according to the theory of performance (Clark, 1996) a meta-communicative act occurring in the *collateral track* (the performance itself –including delays, rephrasings, mistakes, repairs, intentions to speak, and the like).

One can claim, therefore, that the code-switch manifested here was a strategic one: to intensify and emphasise the central point in the turn, which functions as a rhetoric device. Besides its rhetoric value, the endophoric link to previous discourse creates a strong cohesion to the topic under discussion. With this device, the student distinguishes between 'given' and 'new' information: the new information the student seeks by this switch is the essence of the grade of the test. Thus, the use of CS to signal the given-new information distinction parallels the functions of cohesion in encoding assumptions about the shared understanding of the unfolding conversation.

As in the previous segment, here the student uses the demonstrative link (*it*) to previous stretches of language (name of course). Thus, cohesion plays a role in displaying what is regarded as a common understanding of the interaction.

## II)

S: HM, OK, ANI RO'A SHERASHUM KAN ARBA-ME'OT SHEZE SEMINAR. ANI RATZITI LAKAXAT ET

('hm, ok, I see that what's written here is a four hundred, which is a seminar. I wanted to take')

Two-o-nine, Culture and Sign Language

Ad 2: KEN

(yes)

S: is **it** open?

Ad 2: let me see, yes

S: good. I want to take **it**. **It's** with hm ((NAME of Dr.))

Ad 2: hm-hm

S: what number is **it**?

Ad 2: four hundred and fifty two

S: ZE YEMEY RISHON VEXAMISHI BEIN SHTA'IM LE'ARBA

('it is on Sundays and Thursdays between two and four')

### 5.3. Exophoric nominal groups

A third type of reference used as a cohesive device parallel to CS is that of *Exophoric nominal groups* (such as *I, you, mine, we*) which requires that information from outside the verbal environment be used to interpret the language. The speaker is assuming shared knowledge about the physical world.

**Segment from the same excerpt 11.** Student – NH. Ad 2 – NE

S: if I'm going to the, to track B

Ad 2: do **you** want to change?

S: I don't know, I might. I want to see how the seminars are so I can see how difficult they are, but anyway,

ANI TAMID YEXOLA LAXZOR LAMASLUL HARAGIL

('I can always return into the regular track')

The first person ('*ani*' I,) and the second person (*you*) can be retrieved only from the physical context. The switch from English into Hebrew occurs when the student uses first person to refer to herself, thus, in one view, creating a cohesive link, and in another view, such as that of Halliday & Hasan (1976) who distinct between the speech roles (first and second person) and the other roles (third person), creating repeated instances of exophora which are not text forming. "Only the third person is inherently cohesive, in that a third person from typically refers anaphorically to a preceding item in the text. First and second person do not normally refer to the text at all; their referents are defined by the speech roles of speaker and hearer, and hence they are normally interpreted exophorically, by reference to the situation" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 48). The third person forms, while typically anaphoric, may refer exophorically to some person or thing that is present in the context of the situation... it does not necessarily mean physically present in the interactants' field of perception; it merely means that the context of situation permits the identification to be made" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 49).

Applying CA ideas, the switch on the first person may function to differentiate between two options: The student is not sure whether she would stay in track B or change to track A throughout the year and she uses CS to indicate the two distinct 'inner voices' she is thinking of: the first, the act of staying in track B would teach her a thing or two about the course; the second, moving into track A could be a permitted solution.

Fine (1994) states that "Personal reference gives more information than demonstrative reference to guide the search for the appropriate antecedent" (Fine, 1994: 170).

The following examples (excerpt 33 and excerpt 8) not only illustrate aspects of how participants exhibit and orient to their institutional identities through person reference forms; they also show the inseparable constitutive relationship between the linguistic devices for person reference and managing institutional activities.

In the following segment (which has also been discussed in section 2, from a different perspective), Ad 2 responds with a first person singular, *I*, using explicit personal reference in order to index, for example, the delicacy involved in raising the topic. Thus here she uses resources available for person reference in the language to index a particular stance toward each single element of the encounter, in terms of dimensions such as who has the primary responsibility for executing the action (that is, carrying out the registration).

**Segment from excerpt 33:** student – NE; Ad 2 - NE

The topic of previous turns: The student claims that every course she wanted to register into is closed. The advisor offers her other courses which are still open, and she says, that the Chair would tell her the same thing.

[66] Ad 2: TIR'I ('see'), **I** suggest, if if if you are, if you would ( ) **I** suggest you wait for ((NAME of Chair)). If **he** says OK, EYN LI BE'AYA BIXLAL ('it's not a problem for me'). It's not **me**

[67] S: hm when is he supposed to come?

[68] Ad 2: he's already here probably he has an exam some place. He will be in soon. At eight thirty he has an exam so I'm sure he's outside already, some place

[69] S: OK hm

[70] Ad 2: so wait for a while and then you'll go with him. You'll tell him your problems and see what **he** says, MA ANI A'ASE? ('what shall **I** do?')

If **I** was the Chair of the Department, so –

[71] S: ((laughing))

[72] Ad 2: everything would be majestic but since I'm not the Chair, you might as well send the next person in, we'll see what they want that they can't have.

In this segment, the advisor explicitly reinforces the fact it wasn't her who decided not to open the course for more students, by CS into Hebrew EYN LI BE'AYA BIXLAL ('it's not a problem for me') [turn 66]. She is merely carrying out her role in the institutional encounter, that is, performing the secretary task of not opening courses which are already closed for registration; thus the code-switched tag: MA ANI A'ASE? ('what shall **I** do?') [turn 70] in which the first person singular is manifest, reinforces this point. She code-switches back into English when she describes what would have been if she would have been the Chair of the Department, in an *if*-clause [turns 70-72], using first person singular as well, to fortify the image, and ends with a sarcastic comment in turn 72, changing her person reference into a first person plural: *we'll* see what that they can't have. In this final comment the advisor refers to herself through the first person plural pronoun 'we' [turn 72], thereby indexing that she is speaking not in a personal capacity but on behalf of the English Department. The Chair of the English department is introduced through his name (proper NP). Adopting a thematic subject

(name of Chair) at the onset, allows the advisor to mark the two main character perspectives (her own perspective versus the Chair's perspective) through pronoun/noun distinctions:

Chair's perspective: "I suggest you wait for // if **he** says okay..."; "You'll tell **him** your problems and see what **he** says".

Advisor's perspective: MA ANI A'ASE? ('what shall **I** do?')

It is evident that the advisor adopts a thematic-subject strategy, which switches focus between the two main character perspectives, through the discourse.

#### **5.4. Lexical cohesive devices: Reiteration**

Lexical Cohesion creates ties within a text by the selection of vocabulary (that is, selection from relatively open sets of choices). In the classification by Halliday & Hasan (1976) lexical cohesion is represented by two groups: reiteration and collocation. Reiteration can be represented as much closely connected to substitution; the element that substitutes the one relevant can be substituted by the same item, by a synonym, by a near-synonym, by a superordinate and by a general noun. Collocation, on the contrary, in their classification includes various lexical relations that do not depend on referential identity and are not of the form of reiteration accompanied by 'the' or a demonstrative.

Each occurrence of a lexical item carries with its own textual history, a particular collocational environment, that has been built up in the course of the creation of the text and that will provide the context within which the item will be incarnated on this particular occasion. The relative strength of the collocational tension is really a function of two kinds of relatedness, one kind being relatedness in the linguistic system, and the other being relatedness in the text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

In the following segment advisor 2 (Ad 2) looks for the sheets which have descriptions of the courses of the department on them (the literature and the linguistics courses). When she speaks to advisor 1 (Ad 1) she uses Hebrew to refer to the sheets: '*te'arim*' (degrees). The repetition of the first consonant in this word may indicate hesitation, difficulties in lexical access and in retrieving and processing the lexical item. Advisor 1 switches into English of which here may be a psycholinguistic function: in order to make sure that advisor 2 was referring to the same lexical item that advisor 1 was retrieving: *description courses*. In other words, this may be an instance of verification to lexical access and retrieval. Then, advisor 2 was more specific in

defining what she was looking for: *description in Literature*. Then, the same advisor (Ad 2) refers to the sheets in abbreviated code-switched lexical items: *Ling* (which is an abbreviation for *Linguistics*) and *Lit* (which is an abbreviation for *Literature*). The cohesive relations illustrated here are of superordination, that is, the prototype is the description of courses (translated by the native English speaker advisor as ‘*te’arim*’ instead of ‘*te’urim*’ which would have been a more correct use). The superordinate noun is *description courses*:

**Segment from excerpt 13.** Ad 1 –NH; Ad 2 – NE

Ad 2: ((to Ad 1)) MISHEHU LAKAX LI ET HA TE-TE’ARIM

(‘someone took the degrees from me’)

Ad 2: description in literature

YESH PO Ling AVAL LO Lit VE HA Ling HAYA AL HASHULXAN

(‘there is Ling. but not Lit. and the Ling. was on the table’)

Ad 1: ZE SHELAX?

(is this yours?)

Ad 2: HU HAYA PO. ZE Ling. ULAY Lit BA’EMTZA

(‘it was here. This is Ling. Maybe Lit. is in the middle’)

A most important conclusion one can draw from this analysis is that psycholinguistic aspects of CS as *lexical access and retrieval* are reflected in the overt instances where cohesive ties are manifested.

## 6. Summary and conclusions

This paper is an attempt to fill a gap in CA research and to provide a detailed examination of referential cohesive devices which are manifested in juxtaposition with CS. It offers ways in which these cohesive devices can enhance and maintain the social process of communicating in bilingual academic service encounters, and shows how these linguistic devices contribute to the creation of a bond between the participants in this specific setting. It demonstrated the collaborative, juxtaposed strategies of CS and cohesion to achieve discourse-related goals. These sociolinguistic goals can be summarised as *distinguishing various types of information* (‘given’ and ‘new’); *emphasising a central point in the turn –a rhetoric device*.

It offered also some psycholinguistic phenomena to certain cases where CS and cohesion were in juxtaposition: *self-repair* –a change in utterance planning– deliberate

malformation used to indicate reluctance to perform the speech; and *lexical access and retrieval*<sup>3</sup>.

Applying conversation analytic tools to the understanding of socialization in institutions, such as at university is crucial to understand the salience of the social procedures visible there. The relationship between interaction and social institutions, which themselves can be taken as social categories (such as participant's role; i.e. student vs. advisor) or as organized realms of activity (such as strategies of language use; i.e. cohesion and CS, management of turn-taking, and discourse flow) has also captured my line of inquiry to understand how people exploit such strategies in academic encounters, which can be considered a micro-analysis which can reflect on macro-analyses as well.

### **Appendix: Transcription conventions**

In representing the talk in written form, I have chosen to transcribe the conversations in a way that is faithful to the spontaneity and informality of the talk, but is also easily accessible to readers not familiar with conventional literature or phonological/ prosodic symbols. Below is the complete transcription key.

#### Punctuation

Where possible, I have used punctuation to capture information obtained through intonation.

- a) Full-stops . These mark termination (whether grammatically complete or not), or certainty, which is usually realized by falling intonation.
- b) Commas , These signal speaker parceling of non-final talk.
- c) Question marks ? These are used to indicate questions or to mark uncertainty (typically corresponding to rising intonation or WH-questions).

#### Other transcription conventions used

- a) Non-transcribable segments of talk. These are indicated by empty parentheses ( ).
- b) Paralinguistic and non-verbal information. Information about relevant non-verbal behaviour is given within double brackets (( )). Such information is only included where it is judged important in making sense of the interaction.
- c) English translations to Hebrew phrases. Such translations, which convey the pragmatic meanings of the utterances, are given within single brackets ( ), in quotation marks ' '. Where there is a single word in Hebrew they follow the word, and where there is more than a word, they are placed beneath the whole utterance.

---

<sup>3</sup> Due to space limitation, other sociolinguistic-pragmatic functions of CS which appear in the context of cohesive devices, such as: accommodating to the language of the interlocutor, as a strategy to be better understood; change in participant constellation: addressee selection; identification with a certain group; change between informative and evaluative talk; direct speech reporting; etc. and other psycholinguistic aspects as: manipulation of numbers and arithmetic; a change in utterance planning; 'call-for-help' phenomena; idioms, collocations, curses and blessings, and formulaic expression, affect, etc. are not included in this paper. These issues are discussed in Walters (under review) and in Regev (in process).

d) Hebrew text. This is indicated in upper case, underlined text HEBREW TEXT

e) Points of focus in the analyses (i.e. person reference, demonstrative reference). These are indicated by boldfaced text, and do not indicate prosodic change, but used for ease of tracking the points of focus in the analyses.

### **Bibliographical references**

- Aarssen, J. (1996). *Relating events in two languages: Acquisition of cohesive devices by Turkish-Dutch bilingual children at school age*. Tilburg, Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Auer, P. (1995) "The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach". In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 115-35.
- Clark, H.H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eggsins, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. London: Pinter.
- Fine, J. (1994). "How language works: Cohesion in normal and nonstandard communication". In R.O. Freedle (ed.), *Series advances in discourse processes*. Vol. LI. New Jersey: Albex.
- Grice, H. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. Harvard University: William James Lectures [Reprinted in P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* Vol. 3, Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press, 43-58].
- Halliday, M.A.K. & R. Hasan (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Pinter.
- Martin, J.R. (1992). *English text: System and structure*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Morgan, G. (2000). "Discourse cohesion in sign and speech". *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 4(3), 279-300.
- Regev, I. (in process). *Social-pragmatic and psycholinguistic-cognitive aspects of bilingual code-switching*. Ph.D Dissertation, Bar-Ilan University.
- Walters, J. (under review). *Bilingualism: The sociopragmatic-psycholinguistic interface*.