

# Interjections in English: An Interlingual Pragmatic Study

Sami Basheer Matrood  
University of Al Qadisiya  
College of Education  
Department of English

## Abstract

The present study tackles the pragmatic significance of teaching ESL or EFL learners how to use interjections appropriately according to the context they find themselves in. It falls into four sections where the first of which sheds light upon 'interjection' a linguistic forms manifesting emotions or feelings when speakers encounter events that cause pain or surprise or any other unexpected feelings, while the second is to compare interjection with onomatopoeia imitating the natural sound of an event to transform certain communicative values, the third of which is to deal with the discursual functions of interjections for being context-sensitive or dependent as a sort of communicative adjacent pairs, and the last one focuses on the importance of learning how to use and respond to others' use of interjection in interaction. Finally the conclusion sums up the findings of the study considering teaching interjections is a way to contextualize language that aims at having a situationally competent ESL or EFL speakers

## 1.1. Interjection in English:

In some modern grammars of English, e.g. Quirk et al.(1985), interjections or exclamations are seen as a nuisance which disturbs the orderly structure of the language, or at least the grammarians' idea of how language should function properly, and are accordingly condemned and largely ignored. This negative treatment is a relatively new phenomenon. However. In traditional grammars, e.g. in Aelfric's bilingual grammar from around 1000 A.D., interjection was regularly listed as the last of the eight word-classes, parts of speech, and the grammars usually explained that interjections have the specific function to express emotions. To be fair, the most recent grammars such as Biber et al. (1999) see interjection in a much more positive light than Quirk et al.(ibid.)and recognize their function to "signal relations between speakers, hearers, and discourse", see (1.3).

The first ones to consider interjections in English as an independent part of speech are Latin grammarians. To Precisian, "interjections are words manifesting emotions, feelings which are expressed when interjections are interposed in a referential enounce as exclamations". Interjections mean 'thrown in between' from the Latin 'inter' that means 'between' and 'iacere' meaning 'throw'. They are emotive words which do not enter into syntactic relation; they are resorted to when speakers encounter events that cause pain, surprise or any other unexpected feelings (Jovanovic, 2004: 18). Trask (1993:144) describes interjection as "a lexical item or phrase which serves to express emotion and typically fails to enter into any syntactic structures at all". Interjections are 'Hyper holophrastic' for being replaced by the whole sentence in this they are used as 'pro-sentences'. Quirk, et al. (1985:853) describe interjection as "purely emotive words which do not enter into syntactic

relations". Sometimes they combine with other words to form a sentence, but not with finite verbs. To Wilkins (1992:119), "interjections have semantic, propositional or conceptual content...", they reflect complex conceptual structures through which communication is achieved. There are several other terms under which interjections are analyzed where some consider them as a sort of 'minor sentences' which lack those basic constituents of composing major sentences; in this sense they are treated just like 'vocative' and 'elliptical constructions'. Others label them under the term 'formulaic language' that refers to utterances lacking normal syntactic and phonological characteristics (Crystal, 2003: 94-187). To him (Ibid), there is unclear boundary between interjections and exclamations in the sense that some of the interjections have certain referential meaning and may be composed of more than one word, for instance, Excellent!, Lucky devil!, Cheers!, Well!, and this is what Eckersley and Eckersley (1966: 316) refer to saying that the dividing line is thin between interjections (reproducing of sounds or special words we utter involuntarily under the stress or some emotion) and exclamations, in which an ordinary word or group of words are used as interjections. For instance, 'oh' is traditionally viewed as an exclamation or interjection. Used alone, without the syntactic support of a sentence, it is said to refer to strong emotional states, e.g., surprise, fear, or pain as in :

1) A : Jack: Was that serious picture?

B : Freda: *Oh. Gosh Yes!*

But in (B), '*Oh*' is used as an exclamation

Jack: Like I'd say, 'what d 'y' mean you don't like classical music?

'*Oh!* I can't stand it! It's druggu...

(Biber et al., 1999:1083-084)

Jovanovic (2004:19) agrees with Eckersley and Eckersley (1966:316) in the sense that the former considers exclamations as a way to define interjections depending on the similarity of the phonological intensity in the tone of voice that is employed in the production of one or the other, as in

2) A. Mary said it was "ordinary".

B. Ordinary!

'B's utterance is exclamatory, orthographically, known by the exclamation mark that marks its end. And this represents a difference between exclamation and interjection.

To Biber et al. (1999:1080-1082), the matter is different where interjections are a separate class, particular words that are used to express certain communicative value. The difference between interjection and exclamation lies in the fact that the former is mainly used as a one-word utterance or a monosyllable utterance, whereas the latter may be of several words incorporated into a full-fledged utterance manifesting the structure of predication.

### 1.2. Interjection and Onomatopoeia

To Langacker (1968:24), "a language is a device that establishes sound-meaning correlations, pairing meanings with signals to enable people to exchange ideas via observable sequences of sounds." There is a set of interjections in English which are built on onomatopoeia in the sense that they present an orthographic representation of sound, suggest the virtual sound or imitate it as closely as possible. The production of such a sort of interjections is limited by the flexibility of the phonemic system of the language to mimic the natural sounds. Such interjections are:

*Atishoo! atishoo!* to represent noises accompanying a sneeze.

**Bam!** to suggest the sound of a sudden, hard impact.

**Boing!** to reflect the noise made when a compress spring is suddenly released.

**Boo! Boo!** to imitate the lowing of oxen.

**Boohoo!** to refer to the sound of noisy weeping or laughter, also to express contempt.

**Bow-wow!** to imitate the parking of a dog.

**Hem!** the sound made in clearing the throat.

**Piff!** to imitate the sound made by swiftly going bullet through the air.

**Plump!** to represent the sound made by a heavy object or body falling into water.

**Swash! Swash!** to imitate the sound of splashing into water, or to resound a blow.

**Tee-tee!** to represent the sound of titter or snicker.

**Tra-ra!** to imitate the sound of a horn, or some similar sound.

**Tu-whit! Tu- whoo!** to imitate the call of an owl.

**Tut-tut** to refer to alveolar click functioning as a sort of rejection.

Many of the above mentioned forms are "onomatopoeic", imitative of non-linguistic sounds. There is a special relationship between meanings and pronunciation. What is interesting to observe is that even those imitative forms are different in different languages despite their similarity to one another. Langacker (1968:25-6) states that the crowing of a rooster, as a classic example, is represented as cock-a-doodle-doo in English, as kikeriki in German, and as coquerico in French. Thus, the speaker, or the language learner, must learn the correct imitation for the language he is speaking or learning.

### 1.3. Interjection and Discourse

Language is, according to Sapir (1949:8) "a purely human and non-instinctive of communicating ideas, emotions, and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols". Language can be used to engage in social actions, and this implies a concern not only for the talk itself, but also for the context in which it takes place. To Firth, language is a set of events which speakers utter or an action one learns in doing things. He states that whatever one said must be understood in the context of situation (Brown and Yule, 1983:37). Such a process of give and take in conversation, including various interactions of feedback, repair, and clarification is called negotiation. Negotiation is mainly resorted to in order to get meaning across. It is sometimes centered on clarifying vocabulary, grammar, or even pronunciation details

Distinct prosodic entity, tend not to have a specific semantic meaning, and contribute to the core meaning poses many problems, since each element may appear in such a multiplicity of functional context, and with such a varied array of meanings, it is difficult to a core meaning, especially in the case of pause markers and interjections. To Schiffrin (1987:74), interjections have unlimited number of discourse functions or 'adjacency pairs' to play in communication and this is what Biber et al (1999:1083) emphasize. They have not only to be seen as a sort of words which express speakers' internal feelings but also to have different interpretations according to the context in which they are used. Some of the monosyllable interjections like 'yeah', 'no', 'and', 'mm', lack full syntactic articulation of the clause, which might be interpreted

according to the context of the preceding turn, adjacent pairs. Goffman points out that if you are being told by a friend about a particularly gruesome moment from their last trip to the dentist's, you might utter 'ouch' sympathetically on their behalf, or it might be used as in (6):

**(6) Dentist: That'll be £75 for the consultation and £3 for the cavity.**

**Patient: Ouch!**

This shows that interjections are not just simple 'natural overflowing'. It is intuitively clear that while they are instinctive in some respects, *ouch* and most other interjections are under our conscious control. If one brings a hammer down forcefully on his thumb, the four-letter word he utters is unlikely to begin with 'o'. A person screaming in agony is not screaming 'ouch'. So interjections do convey some kind of meaning despite their expressive and instinctive nature. Interjections are sound sequences, words, typical phrases or clauses which can be realized as utterances signaled in speech by being produced with greater intensity, stress and pitch, and as sentences in writing by an exclamation mark, see(1.1). To Sapir (1949:5), it is a mistake to identify speakers' conventional interjections such as 'oh!', 'ah!' and 'sh!' with the instinctive cries. These interjections are merely conventional fixations of natural sounds. To him, "they therefore differ widely in various languages in accordance with the specific phonetic genius of each of these ... they may be considered an integral portion of speech, in the properly cultural sense of the term, being no more identical with the instinctive cries themselves than such words as 'cuckoo' and 'killdeer' are identical with the cries of the birds..."

Discourse is co-constructed by two or more interlocutors dynamically adapting their expression to the ongoing exchange. What is obvious is that the to-and-from

movement of discourse between the speaker and hearer is evident in the occurrence of utterances which are either form a response, or to elicit a response. Such utterance-response sequences in conversation analysis are known as 'adjacency pairs', which may be symmetric, as in the case of one greeting echoing another or a nonsymmetrical as in the subsequent of questions followed by answers (Biber et al.,1999:1081). The use of interjections as response-forms such as 'oh', 'right', 'yeah', and 'okay' is known as 'discourse markers' (Schiffrin,1987:75-6). To Crystal (2005: 55), 'Discourse markers' is a term that refers to some single word inserts, like 'well' and 'now' as utterance introducers, as well as formulaic clausal forms such as the inevitable use of 'I mean', 'you know', to Trillo (2008: 1-5), these discourse markers create pragmatic coherence of interaction.

In addition, Trillo (ibid.) describes discourse markers, depending on what is called 'a discourse-cognitive approach', as elements that fill in the discourse and cognitive slots that spoken language needs to weave the net of interaction. This approach focuses upon two main issues: the first of which is of a 'core meaning' for each marker is meaningful in communication while the second question is the elaboration of an accepted repertoire, discourse is not just series of discourse markers, rather, it contains discourse slots, functions where any element provided fulfilling several conditions related to context and prosody.

The phenomenon of discourse markers shows that spoken interaction needs to have pragmatic skeleton, consisting of such discourse slots, that holds the communicative force of the interaction together. The possible way to account for the multiplicity of the communicative uses of discourse

markers is by appealing to the notion of 'appropriateness', that is, according to Trillo (2008: 9), "the possibility to choose the most adequate element in the realization of a certain function in a specific content.". By using this notion, one can say that the use of a particular form, interjection, in discourse is not dependent upon any kind of grammatical assessment; i.e., many discourse markers do not belong to any particular grammatical category, but on their frequency in a significant corpus-based language sample. Many response forms, minimally such as monosyllables as yeah, no, and mm, lack full syntactic articulation of the clause in the sense that they rely on the context in which they are used according to the preceding turn (Biber et al., 1999: 1086). Discourse markers can either stand alone or attach themselves to longer discourse units, e.g.

7) **A. Let's serve this dam chill!**

**B. Okay, let's serve the Chill!**  
(*ibid.*)

Within adjacency pair framework, inserts often have a stereotyped initiation or responding function within adjacency pair framework, e.g., greetings such as 'hi', farewells, such as bye, backchannels for instance, 'uhhah' response elicitors as 'Okay'. To Beach (1990:124), depending on repeated examinations of a large collection of recorded and transcribed data of naturally occurring interactions, okay is indispensable for speakers where it is employed pivotally by recipients and current speakers alike in both of the casual and institutional discourse; and not in any sequential environment, but involves movements from prior to next matters. Schegloff and Sacks (1973:50) state that 'okay' is always resorted to as a device initiating movement to ending the turn or closure or as passing the turn to terminating the phone calls as in,

(8) **Caller: You don't know w-uh what that would be, how**

**much it costs.**

**Crandall: Would you think probably, about twenty five dollars.**

**Caller: Oh boy, hehh hhh! Okay, thank you.**

**Crandall: Okay dear.**

Beach (1990:130-31) adds saying that 'okay' may be relied on as 'a free-standing receipt marker' that displays the sense of acknowledgement, understanding, confirmation of, affiliation, alignment or agreement with prior speakers' utterance. Accordingly, 'okay' often stands alone, adjacently placed and specifically designed to demonstrate recipients' orientations to the topic of discourse, e.g.

(9) **Sha: Your mother wants you!**

**Flo: Okay.**

Flo's 'okay' signals adequate receipt of Sha's informing. It is not a signal that Flo will necessarily and immediately abide by her mother's wishes. On the contrary, 'okay' may be used as an answer to the preceding utterance, consider (9):

(10) **A : Can I borrow your car?**

**B : When?**

**A : This afternoon.**

**B : Okay.**

It is placed as an answer to the initial question by 'B' as recipient one following an insertion sequence interjected between the first and the second parts of the 'Q-A' adjacency pair (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1989:676). Okay is employed in diverse ways and in varied sequential environments to function as partial solutions to ongoing communicative problems. It might be resorted to for initiating and managing actions like closing preceding topics and moving to next ones (Beach, 1990:22). Its communicative value depends on the context that is continually and intrinsically re-achieved as participants display their understanding of particular

moments of conversational involvement. Each emergent action is both context-shaping in the way it is tailored to prior and immediate circumstances, and context-renewing by means of its contribution and the impact on the next-positioned actions.

However, it should be noted that different functions overlap into one another, and that individual inserts can be versatile in taking on different conversational roles, for example, 'oh' that is, to most scholars, the most common of interjections where it is of routine use to introduce utterances or to respond to the utterances of others that often gives it the characteristic of being a discourse marker, e.g.

(11) A : I think it's a mosaic.

B : *Oh*, it is a mosaic (AmE)

(12) A : *Oh*, I should have let you read the paper

B : I never thought of it (AmE).

A : *Oh* how awful! How absolutely how naff! (BrE).

(Biber et al., 1999: 1085 )

Moreover, 'Oh' can also function as utterance-initiator, either followed by a brief pause or repair initiation, and completion, see (13-14 below) respectively, where native speakers of English are sometimes guilty of mispronunciation, false starts, back tracking, stuttering, etc., but in most cases they feel nothing similar to the embarrassment, that many non-native speakers feel when they make such 'mistakes', Moerman (1977: 53). To Kaplan (2002: 32), "... speakers often fail to correct their speech errors, and when they do, it is with a delay, suggesting that errors are picked up after, rather than during the [speech]". One difference between these two groups of people is that native speakers know how to handle their mistakes better, that is,

how to competently repair them. When speakers detect flubs of various kinds and correct themselves, it is called 'self-repair'. When a speaker corrects another, it is called other-repair. Learners need to be taught how to correct their own errors, how to understand and accept correction from others, and eventually, how to correct errors that others make without creating offense. In this sense 'Oh' is used in 'repair', that is a speech activity which speakers locate and replace a prior information unit. Focusing on prior information, 'repairs' achieve information transitions anaphorically; forcing speakers to adjust their orientation to what has been said before responding to it in upcoming talk.

(13) John: I think it was in seventeen: fifteen, or seventeen

fifty five, I am not sure when. *Eh*: I'm wrong.

Seventeen seventeen.

(14) Henry : Did you go to Olney?

Zelda: *Yeh*: *Oh no* [Girls High: *Oh that's right. No*

Girls High. Girls' High.

It is possible to see how John does self-initiate ,Oh I'm wrong, precedes his self-completion "seventeen seventeen" and Zelda self-initiates and self-completes her replacement of 'yeh' with no and 'Girls, High', and then further self-completes with 'oh' that's right (Schiffirin, 1987: 76-7). To Heritage (1984: 299), the preceding use of 'Oh' is "to propose that its producer has undergone some kind of change in his or her locally current state of knowledge, information, orientation or awareness". It serves as a particle that organizes the information state. Accordingly, 'Oh' marks two information-handling tasks, the first of which 'oh' of information recognition, while the second is new information receipt. These shifts in orientation result not only when

information is presented by one speaker to another, but when information is accessed by the speakers' own recall or made available through context changes.

In addition, it is possible to find 'Oh' prefacing a question to reflect the idea that the speaker has suddenly remembered something to ask about as in Debby's situation that had been checking his schedule seeing a question that had not yet asked, he said:

**(15) Debby: Oh listen: I forget to ask you what your father did when you were grown up.**

or to find 'Oh' prefacing answers to make explicit to the questioner the violation of a prior expectation about information. Such re-orientation may be caused by a mismatch between the information that the questioner assumed to be shared, or the questioner may have made a wrong assumption. Consider that Irene has been informed that Debby is a student at a local university:

**(16) Irene : How can I get an appointment to go down**

**there to bring my son on a tour.**

**Debby : Oh, I did n't even know they gave tours! I'm not the one to ask about it.**

Debby's 'oh' shows both of the receipt of this new information and the change to Irene's misguided expectation as to what information the speakers had shared, (Schiffirin, 1987: 86).

Furthermore, speakers respond not only to their interlocutors' talk, but to their own talk. Doing so, they are shifting orientation towards what is being stated. Such shifts may consist of adjustments to the ideational content of talk, changes in the deictic center of discourse, reported speech, and alternation in the objectivity of talk, reflexive frame breaks. As

opposite to 'oh' that functions to organize the information state, 'well' serves to participate in the framework of discourse. The use of 'well' with self-repairs, e.g. category replacement, and answers is sensitive to the linguistic form of the prior question, consider (17) and (18) respectively. 'Well' is more frequent when a large set of answers or options is encoded through the form of the question. Asking a yes-no question, for example, proposes two options in the sense that the respondent will either confirm or negate the proposition, it is a term that refers to a unit of meaning which constitutes the subject-matter of a sentence. It is both context-free and language-free, (Bell, 1991: 107-08). When the respondent does not take the ideational options offered by the form of a prior question, 'well' is frequently used to mark the answer, or to modify, correct, replaced as speakers display that talk as a propositional object to be monitored and attended to as carefully as an interlocutor's talk, as in (18) :

**(17) Zelda : Are you from Philadelphia?**

**Sally : Well I grew up in the suburbs. And then I**

**lived for about seven years up in upstate**

**New York. And then I came back here t' go**

**to college.**

Here, the questioner's assumption that the respondent is, or is not from Philadelphia is not exactly accurate. Thus, neither option offered by the questioner provides a sufficient basis from which to choose answer

**(17) Look at Bob's par-eh father an' mo- well I don't think**

**his father accepted it.**

**(18) Well like I say the only thing different I think may be**

with – well in our area, It isn't because of the school.

But the only difference I would think would be may

be the better schools out there  
(Schiffrin, 1987: 106).

Accordingly, 'well' locates a speaker as a respondent to one level of discourse and allows a temporary release from attention to others. It is like 'oh' in the sense that both can be used to serve for a general discourse function due to their lack of inherent semantic meaning. The main difference is that 'well' is used to mark responses at an interactional level while 'oh' is resorted to for marking responses at a cognitive level. This is what the English language teacher should focus upon in teaching to enable learners to be socially competent in the use of language according to the situation they find themselves in. To Sack, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974:77), studying turn-taking in oral interaction implies certain systematic features through which speakers organize their turns. For instance, transitions occur quite smoothly and at relevant points in the talk and overlap is brief and preferably avoided. In general, the turn-taking system is both context sensitive and context free in the sense that it is influenced by the context of the interaction, including the immediately preceding talk, restrictions on the channels of communication, topic, speakers, and time.

#### 1.4. Interjection and Interlanguage Pragmatics

For many years, the focal point in learning English as a second language was to analyze linguistic competence through mastering grammar. As a shift, the communicative approach to second language learning has put grammar-centered classes to one side and fostering the use of pragmatics aiming at

developing learners' pragmatic competence, as well as communicative competence, that means learners' ability to put into practice the knowledge which s/he has of the target language in order to express intentions, feelings, etc and interpret those of the speakers. Interlanguage pragmatics refers to the study of "non-native speakers' use and acquisition of linguistic patterns in a second language" (Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993:3). It is concerned with how non-native speakers understand and carry out linguistic action in a target language, and how they acquire the second language pragmatic knowledge, (Nikula, 1997:188). To Schmidt (1993:21-23), the language learner needs to take into account linguistic functions and the context to acquire pragmatics.

To Jovanović (2004: 1), mastering any language would be incomplete without being able to understand perfectly and use appropriately these kinds of communicative elements. Knowing the communicative functions of interjections, learners might be able to use language in its appropriate context. Interjections are of dual communicative value for learners in the sense that they may resort to when they cannot understand or be understood by others to clarify their message. When a fluent learner spots that a listener could not understand through verbal signals, gestures, facial expressions, etc. the learner will typically try to clarify by rephrasing, defining terms, summarizing, using gestures, drawing a picture, etc.

One important aspect of grammar teaching is that it helps learners discover the nature of language, i.e., that language consists of predictable patterns that make what the speaker says, reads, hears and writes intelligible. Without grammar, the speaker would have only individual words or sounds, pictures, and body

expressions to communicate meaning. Grammar is the weaving that creates the fabric. It has often said that though people have studied the English language for a long time, understanding spoken English remains a difficult area to deal with. This is due to the fact that spoken language does not follow the rules of the written language. This is what Leech (1983:11-12) states through answering the question that "Is there a special grammar of the spoken English?" To him (ibid), there are three answers to such a question that are: (1) spoken English has no grammar at all; it is grammatically formless. (2) Spoken English does not have a special grammar; its grammar is just like that of the written one. (3) Spoken English does have a special grammar; it has its own principles, rules and categories which are different from those of the written language. According to Brown and Yule (1983:27), the source of difficulty in dealing with the spoken discourse is that the analyst is investigating the use of language in context; he is more concerned with the relationship between the speaker and the utterance in a particular occasion than with that between one sentence and another. One of the characteristics of the spoken language is speakers' use of different interjections according to the context they are involved in. Resorting to interjections enables the speaker to keep the conversational turn in communication; to be fluent. To Callison (2003:1), "Fluency is normally associated with the ability to speak and write easily, smoothly, and expressively. The levels of fluency change with communication challenges, audiences, and experiences." in interaction. Sometimes the production of interjections reflects the sense of disfluency that is defined as "any expression uttered or decided pause which breaks the on-going flow of the

conversational exchange at that point and yet does not appear to be intended to do so", for example, speakers' production of filler words or inserts, "an expression uttered without semantic content in the context of the discourse but rather in order to keep the conversation flowing while the speaker thinks of what to say next"; e.g., *We need to, ahh, talk about, ahh, uh, something about the project*, or repairs, "any sequences of two utterances in which the second either restates the first in a different way or simply starts a new sequence of utterances without completing the first.", for instance, *because I, look, at one from one to six I work...*

However, pause and hesitators are not just dead time. Learners need to understand that using slower speed with pauses and hesitators may necessitate the use of fillers. To Brown and Yule (1983: ), "the lack of planning time for the speaker, combined with the fact that, in most speech, the listener has to cope with a feeling and often imperfect signal, leads speech to be less dense,..." Some fillers in English are just sounds like uhm, er, uh, ah, and umm; other fillers are words such as okay, you know, well, so, etc. the discursual function of such fillers is to fill silence, which in turn makes communication seem more natural-and fluent. Fluency, to Richards, Platt, and Weber (1985:108), is the use of "... features which give speech the qualities of being natural and normal, including native-like use of *pausing, rhythm, intonation, stress, rate of speaking, and use of interjection and interruption.*" Native speakers of English do hesitate and pause, but they do not seem to be able to tolerate long silence. Instead, they will use fillers to appropriately avoid long silence. A nice side effect of all this is that the process of using fillers also gives them time to think. Thus, fluency, through the use of

interjections, is the ability to master one technique, strategy, or model for learning or teaching. It is related to information inquiry; it is speakers' ability to analyze information needs and move confidently according to the demands of the social context of speech, ( Callison, 2003:1).

A language teacher can use interjections to develop learners' language fluency, to Harrel (2007:3-8), it is used to refer to "a high level of language proficiency, most typically foreign language or another learned language, and more narrowly to denote fluid language use, as opposed to slow, halting use", depending on a number of communicative strategies that can help learners to communicate fluently with whatever proficiency they have. To Brown (2003: 8), the untrained teachers often think of fluency as being speed. This does not express the real sense of fluency since even fluent native speakers vary their speed according to the context in which they find themselves. However, fast speech is not automatically fluent speech. The teacher has to make his learners aware of the fact that it is natural to speak relatively slowly as long as it is done at an appropriate speed and this is what native speakers often do to think as they talk. Thus, the appropriate speed is the one at which the speaker can think clearly and succeed in transforming the message. What learners have to know is that the use of pauses and hesitations are necessary and natural parts of spoken language for having enough time to think when they are talking. Teacher role in this case is to audiotape or videotape some actual native speakers talking in a natural situation, not actors, to be demonstrated for learners to imitate.

To Kaplan (2002:40), at the level of conversation," speakers need to attend to a number of signals of their interlocutors' attitude to the current topic; e.g., 'Hm', 'Hmhm', and 'Uhuh.', which, in turn,

according to Gardner( 1998: 204), "such signals in English present problems of interpretation for non native speakers. The production of such signals is referred to as 'feedback' reflecting that a listener directs at a speaker to indicate that the message is or not getting through. Feedback may express agreement or disagreement, understanding or misunderstanding, comprehension or confusion, etc. In addition, the signals used to express these meanings may include not only sounds, but also gestures and facial expressions. Sounds could include grunts of agreement, sounds like mm, uh huh, hmm, etc. Words might include feedback signals like really, 'yep', 'right', 'yeah', 'okay', etc. Goffman (1981: 99) regards interjection as "response cries" saying that "We see such 'expressions' as a natural overflowing, a flooding up of previously contained feeling, a bursting of normal restraints".

Teachers should not simply focus upon this set of strategies by saying that students will pick them up easily along the way. "Such feedback signals should be taught because they are clear and obvious indicators of fluency [and mutual understanding] that can make the speaker seem very foreign or very fluent depending on how well they are used..." Kasper and Dahl (1991: 216). The non native speaker's comprehension and production of such signals according to the context of situation in which the speaker finds himself refer to the inter language pragmatic study of interjections.

#### **Conclusion:**

The present study sums up the findings that interjections play communicatively significant receptive and productive roles; speakers are able to replace, recognize, receive and re-evaluate information without verbalization through the use of interjections. Teaching interjections pragmatically paves the

ways to contextualize language in the sense that it helps learners understand how language users construct language in a given context and allows language users to infer contextually adequate meanings of discourse providing them with knowledge of speech act or communicative action, which is neutral between the spoken and written mode. Shedding the light upon the use of interjections has an interlingual pragmatic significance in teaching English as a second or a foreign language learners providing them with certain communicative strategies. It develops learners' internal system that they have constructed at a single point of time and the series of the interconnected system that characterize their progress over time. In other words, learning how to use interjections appropriately according to the context of communication improves learners' pragmatic ability in a second or foreign language imitating the fluent or natural native speaker's use of language.

#### Bibliography

- Beach, W., A. (1990). 'Conversation Analysis': "Okay" as a Clue for Understanding Cosequentiality'. San Diego University. <http://www.sil.org/asia/Philippines/ical/papers.html>.
- Biber, D.(1999) . *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Brown, J.D. (2003). "Promoting Fluency in EFL Classrooms". Annual JALT Pan-SIG Conference 2003. Kyoto, Japan : Kyoto Institute of Technology.
- Brown G. and G. Yule. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Callison, D. (2003). *Key Words, Concepts and Methods for Information Age Instruction: A Guide to Teaching Information Inquiry*. Baltimore: LMS Associates.
- Crystal, D. (2003 ). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goffman, E.(1981). *Replies and Responses. Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, C.(1981). *Conversation Organization. Interaction between Speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Harrel, B. (2007). "Speech-Language Pathology". <http://www.muncie.k12.in.us/shsweblspeech%20and%20pathologists.htm>.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *A Change- of – State token and Aspects of its Sequential Placement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- J.R. Ekersley, J. M. Ekersley (1966). *A Comprehensive English Grammar for Foreign Students* . London: Longman.
- Jovanovic, V.(2004). "The Form, Position and Meaning of Interjections in English". "Meaning of Interjections in English" Facta Universtatis. Series Linguistics and Literature. Vol.3, No 1, 2004, pp.17-28.
- Kaplan, R. (2002). *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford Univ. Press, Inc .

- Kasper, G. and S. Blum-Kulka (1993). *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Langacker, R. (1968). *Language and its Structure*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Leach, G. (1983). *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Moreman, M. (1977). "The Preference for self-Correction in Tai Conversational Corpus". *Language*: 872-82.
- Nikula, T. (1997). "Interlanguage view on Hedging". *Hedging and Discourse Approaches to the Analysis of a pragmatic Phenomenon in Academic Texts*. R. Markkannen and R. Schroder (eds). New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Quirk, R. Greenbaum, S., G. Leech and J. Svartvik. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Richard, J. C., J. Platt, and H. Weber. (1985). *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Sacks, H., E. Schegloff and G. Jefferson. (1974). "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation". *Language*, 50.
- Schegloff, E. and H. Sacks. (1973). "Opening UP Closings". *Semiotica*, 298-377.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R. (1993). *Consciousness, Learning and*

*interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Trash, R.L. (1999). *Language: The Basics*. London: Routledge.
- Trillo, J. (2002). "The Pragmatic Fossilization of Discourse Markers in Non-Native Speakers of English." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 769-84.
- Wilkins, D. (1992). "Interjections as Deictics". *Journal of Pragmatics*(18): 119-58.

#### ملخص البحث:

يشغل البحث على بيان استعمال التأثر والتعجب في اللغة الانكليزية بوصفه قيمة دلالية وركنا "أساسياً" في الكلام، وتوزع البحث على أربعة مباحث، فقد كان المبحث الأول تمهيداً، إذ عرض لمصطلحات التأثر والتعجب عند النحويين في اللغة الانكليزية، أمّا المبحث الثاني فقد وقف على بيان القيمة اللغوية لهذه الظاهرة المفصلية، وقد تناول (اسم الصوت) بوصفه علامة من علامات التأثر أو التعجب، حتى إذا جاء المبحث الثالث عرض للوظائف التواصلية لهذه الظاهرة في المحادثة، ليكون موطناً لمبحثٍ رابعٍ أخير يشغل على بيان مزية (التورية) في اللغتين، الم (العربية) واللغة الهدف (الإنكليزية) لمتعلمي اللغة الانكليزية، إذ ان الكشف عن هذه الظاهرة مفهوماً وبياناً ودلالةً ووظائف له أثر بالغ في امتلاك ناصية اللغة وتطور الطلاقة في المواقف اللغوية والمحادثات.