terms of speaker intentions. A conversation is seen as a series of utterances or turns, each produced by an individual speaker rather than as contributions which are essentially sequentially organised and jointly accomplished. Meaning is assigned to utterances by virtue of linguistic meaning and specific contextual conditions (such as felicity conditions), rather than by interactants' active exploitation of the meaning potentials of words (and linguistic constructions) in combination with emergent contexts. Accordingly, monologism is associated with assumptions such as: (a) thinking (cognition) as information processing within individuals (the computational metaphor), (b) communication as transfer of information and meaning (the conduit metaphor), and (c) language as a more or less fixed code.

5. Methods

Dialogical theory is not directly co-terminous with a set of specific methods of analysis, although some methods can be derived from, or taken as consonant with, its basic assumptions. These methods generally involve the analysis of authentic discourse in relation to various kinds of contexts. Some scholars recommend a methodology which implies that analysts remain close to manifest discourse, thus primarily considering situational or closely discourse-related contexts (this is basically the stance of many practitioners of conversation analysis). Others insist on the inclusion of more global, cultural contexts in the analysis (ethnographically oriented discourse analysis). The analysis of texts, particularly within the Bakhtinian tradition (cf. below), often aims at relating particular texts to other texts ('intertextuality') and (the 'voices' of) different authors and selves ('polyvocality'), to cultural traditions and possible audiences or receptions.

6. Traditions

If taken in a reasonably broad sense, dialogical analysis is characteristic of many traditions in the study of discourse and cognitive, social and cultural practices. The notion of dialogism (cf. Holquist 1990) is closely associated with Mikhail Bakhtin, who explored polyvocality in literary works, e.g. in Dostoyevsky (Bakhtin 1984), and also outlined a theory of spoken discourse (Bakhtin 1986). Yet, dialogism has a much broader history (Marková & Foppa 1990), encompassing cultural semiotics (Mukarovsky and Bakhtin) and sociocultural theory (Vygotsky and the neo-Vygotskians), but also variants of pragmaticism, phenomenology, ethnomethodology (and hence conversation analysis), and ethnographically-based discourse analysis (e.g. Duranti & Goodwin 1992).

References: M.M. BAKHTIN (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky' poetics*. Univ. of Minnesota Press. ----- (1986) *Speech genres and other late essays*. Univ. of Texas Press. A. DURANTI & C. GOODWIN (eds.) (1992) *Rethinking context*. Cambridge Univ. Press. E. GOFFMAN (1981) *Forms of talk*. Univ. of Pennsylvania Press. M. HOLQUIST (1990) *Dialogism*. Routledge. S.C. LEVINSON (1979) Activity types and language. *Linguistics* 17: 365-399. I. MARKOVÁ & K. FOPPA (eds.) (1990) *The dynamics of dialogue*. Harvester Wheatsheaf. H. SACKS (1992) *Lectures on conversation*, 2 vols. Blackwell.

ELICITATION   Gunter Senft

The technical term 'elicitation' is derived from the classic Latin verb *elicere* (to coax, entice, call forth, summon, extract, induce, provoke). In linguistics (as in sociology, social psychology, and other social sciences) elicitation is the general term for describing various methods of directed data collection and thus for corpus construction.

    With the rise of the interest in dialects, and thus in spoken languages, linguists had to develop

means for gathering their data. One of the first, and classic, means they came up with were questionnaires with sentences written in the standard language that had to be translated (in general by teachers and priests) into the local language. The pioneer for this kind of research was probably Georg Wenker with his 40 'Wenker-sentences' which he started to send off in the German Rhineland in 1876 (Knoop et al. 1982: 47ff). Comrie & Smith's famous *Lingua descriptive studies: questionnaire* (1977) and other comparable publications can well be regarded as continuing in one way or another this tradition of data gathering. However, although questionnaires can be extremely helpful, at least for starting data gathering procedures, they are of little use if the linguist is interested in how the language is really spoken in co-present interaction. Already 40 years before Wenker, Johann A. Schmeller emphasized the relevance of what we now call participant observation and field research — the interaction between linguists and their informants — for the collection of speech data (Schmeller 1855).

These two types of data collection — asking questions (or just a question) following a questionnaire on the one hand and participant observation together with intensive field research on the other hand — mark the two extremes in linguistic data elicitation. However, this does not imply that these extremes are mutually exclusive. Fieldworkers have to use as broad a variety of elicitation procedures as possible in their linguistic field research.

It goes without saying that scientific data are always collected according to specific research interests and purposes. Linguists must decide on

- what kind of speech data they want to elicit
- in what group(s) of informants
- in which situations and settings
- within which speech communities and cultures.

The respective interests then are the guidelines for choosing the adequate elicitation method(s) and for defining a sample of informants that should be (as) representative (as possible).

Another basic decision that has to be made is whether the linguist's informants may or may not all the time be aware of the fact that their speech and their speech behavior is being observed.

If linguists want to learn something about the (inflectional) morphology and the syntax of a language they have to start with the (sometimes tedious) elicitation of the respective morphological and syntactic patterns (see e.g. Foley 1991). This kind of elicitation is quite similar to other kinds of data elicitation that rely mainly on questionnaires.

If linguists are interested in, e.g., the lexicon of color terms in various languages, they just can confront their informants with the 329 color chips provided by the Munsell Color Company — as Berlin & Kay (1969) did — and ask them to name the colors of the chips presented as stimuli in front of a tape recorder.

If linguists are interested in formal styles of articulation they may ask their informants to read a wordlist (of minimal pairs) or a text out to the researcher in front of a microphone which then even helps to mark this situation as being formal.

If linguists with special interests in pragmatics want to investigate the realization of speech act patterns such as requests and apologies crossculturally, and if they also want to investigate similarities and differences between native and non-native speakers' realization patterns in these speech acts, they can devise controlled elicitation procedures like discourse completion tests — as Blum-Kulka & Olshtain in their 'cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns' project did. The discourse completion tests used in this project consist of incomplete discourse sequences representing socially different situations. Before relatively brief discourse sequences in the form of incomplete dialogues are presented to the consultants, the situative context of the dialogue is

outlined so that the setting, the social distance between the interlocutors and their status relative to one another is specified. The consultants are then asked to complete the dialogue, thereby providing the speech act aimed at in the given context (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain 1984: 198) — in this case a request and an apology. The consultants' answers to these discourse completion tests allow for inferences with respect to preferences speakers have for realizing requests for action among persons of the same and different social status on the one hand and for inferences with respect to the appropriateness of apologies in the given situation on the other hand. Moreover, the cross-cultural design of this study also allows for answering the question whether there are differences in the types of strategies speakers choose to realize the respective speech acts under the same social constraints across languages and what these differences actually look like.

If researchers want to find out how spatial relations are encoded in various languages, they can confront their informants with a kit of stimuli such as the one developed for this purpose by the Cognitive Anthropology Research Group at the Max-Planck-Institute in Nijmegen. This kit contains, i.a., two sets of identical photographs together with the objects actually photographed, drawings, and toys. With these stimuli researchers can ask their informants to play matching games in front of video camera and microphone. In these games, one informant (the director) describes what is shown on a photo in such a way that the other informant (the matcher) can either find the same photo within a series of similar photographs or reconstruct the described spatial configurations with toys. The game situation asks for verbal interaction that centers on the spatial conceptualisations and their expressions in the lexicon of the various languages that are investigated (see e.g. Levinson 1992).

If linguists are interested in narratives, they can ask their informants — be it children or adults — to look, e.g., at a book of 24 pictures with no written text that presents a story (e.g. the so-called 'frog'-story) and then tell this story to another person while being video-filmed and tape-recorded (Berman & Slobin 1994). Linguists may also ask their informants to watch a movie (like e.g. 'the pear film') and then, after even telling the informants that the researchers are interested in studying how people talk about things they have experienced, ask the informants to tell about the movie to people who have not seen it in front of a video camera and/or a tape recorder (Chafe 1980). Both elicitation methods permit verbal interaction between the informants.

However, if linguists do not like the idea that their informants are always aware of the fact that they are being observed and that their speech is being recorded, they have to find some ways of overcoming what Labov so aptly called the observer's paradox: "The aim of the linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain these data by systematic observation" (Labov 1972a: 209).

Linguists may get the permission to just leave a tape recorder somewhere in a room in their informant's house for a whole day and to record whatever is being said there. Of course, the tapes have to be renewed every hour or so and the risk is quite high that nothing is said in this room for a long time, but — as Ruoff (1973: 116) reports — the chances to document "how people talk when they (think or forget that they) are not systematically observed" are not too bad. However, the data gathered in this way are more documented by chance than elicited in the strict sense of the term.

Labov developed and described a number of techniques to overcome the observer's paradox. One of these techniques is the use of rapid and anonymous observations (see also Labov 1972b: 117) which Labov applied in his study on *The social stratification of [r] in New York City department stores* (Labov 1972a: 43-69). In three stores with different social prestige the interviewer approached an informant asking for directions to a department on the fourth floor. The informant normally responded to this question with the (elliptic) utterance 'fourth floor'. The interviewer then pretended to have not understood the informant and thus elicited a second

utterance, this time spoken in careful style under emphatic stress. After this encounter the interviewer noted down some information about the informant and the use of (r) in preconsonantal and final position in casual and emphatic styles of speech.

However, even if linguists decide to elicit speech data in interviews, they can prepare and structure these interviews in such a way that they not only result in the elicitation of comparable speech data but that they also provide situations that more or less guarantee the documentation of data that are as 'natural' as possible. These interviews are usually called structured intensive interviews, and they are best prepared on the basis of the linguist's participant observation (Senft 1982: 17-70). In periods of participant observation linguists — like anthropologists — should attempt to immerse themselves into the daily lives of their informants in a kind of field research situation. On the basis of their experiences in this situation the researchers cannot only get acquainted with their future informants, they also have the chance to get a better understanding of what they are asking their informants about. This understanding and the fact that there is already a certain kind of relationship established between interviewer and informant may transform the structured interview into a talk between acquaintances where it does not really matter whether there is a tape recorder running or not. If linguists want to elicit 'the natural speech data' they should keep Labov's general advice in mind:

> A field worker who stays outside his subject, and deals with it as a mere excuse for eliciting language, will get very little for his pains. Almost any question can be answered with no more information than was contained in it. When the speaker does give more, it is a gift, drawn from some general fund of good will that is held in trust by himself and the field worker. A deep knowledge implies a deep interest, and in payment for the interest the speaker may give more than anyone has a right to expect. Thus the field worker who can tap the full linguistic competence of his subjects must acquire a detailed understanding of what he is asking about, as well as a broad knowledge of the general forms of human behaviour. (Labov 1972b: 114ff; see also Ruoff 1973: 83)

In linguistics, elicited data certainly help to answer a number of specific questions; however, as Duranti (1981: 9 and 162ff) points out, elicitation sessions are speech events that as such influence the kind of language used. Therefore, it should go without saying that linguists aiming at describing the language and speech behavior of a certain speech community as completely as possible just cannot do without additional data that document their informants' daily verbal communication in face-to-face interactions.

For additional information about elicitation I would like to refer the interested reader to Ammon et al. (eds.) (1988) (vol. 2, chapter 8 on 'Elicitation methods'), Craig (1979), Dixon (1984), Malinowski (1922), Mayntz et al. (1976), Samarin (1967), Shopen (ed.) (1979), and Whyte (1943).

References: U. AMMON, N. DITTMAR & K.J. MATTHEIER (eds.) (1988) *Sociolinguistics*. De Gruyter. B. BERLIN & P. KAY (1969) *Basic color terms*. Univ. of California Press. R.A. BERMAN & D.I. SLOBIN (1994) *Different ways of relating events in narrative*. Erlbaum. S. BLUM-KULKA & E. OLSHTAIN (1984) Requests and apologies. *Applied Linguistics* 5: 196-213. W. CHAFE (ed.) (1980) *The pear stories*. Ablex. B. COMRIE & N. SMITH (1977) Lingua descriptive studies: Questionnaire. *Lingua* 42: 1-72. C.G. CRAIG (1979) Jacaltec — field work in Guatemala. In T. Shopen (ed.): 3-57. R.M.W. DIXON (1984) Searching for aboriginal languages. Univ. of Queensland Press. A. DURANTI (1981) *The Samoan fono*. Australian National Univ. W.A. FOLEY (1991) Field methods. In K. Malmkjaer (ed.) *The linguistics encyclopedia*: 121-127. Routledge. U. KNOOP, W. PUSCHKE & H.E. WIEGAND (1982) Die Marburger Schule. In W. Besch et al. (eds) *Dialektologie*: 38-92. de Gruyter. W. LABOV (1972a) *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Univ. of Philadelphia Press. -----(1972b) Some principles of linguistic methodology. *Language in Society* 1: 97-120. S.C. LEVINSON (1992) Primer for the field investigation of spatial description and conception. *Pragmatics* 2: 5-47. B. MALINOWSKI (1922) *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. Routledge & Kegan Paul. R. MAYNTZ, K. HOLM & P. HUEBNER (1976) *Introduction to empirical sociology*. Penguin. A. RUOFF (1973) *Grundlagen und Methoden der Untersuchung gesprochener Sprache*. Niemeyer. W. SAMARIN (1967) *Field linguistics*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston. J.A. SCHMELLER (1855) *Sogenanntes Cimbrisches Wörterbuch*. Joseph Bergmann. G.

SENFT (1982) *Sprachliche Varietät und Variation im Sprachverhalten Kaiserslauterer Metallarbeiter.* Lang. T. SHOPEN (ed.) (1979) *Languages and their speakers.* Winthrop. W.F. WHYTE (1943) *Street corner society.* Univ. of Chicago Press.

[*See also:* Fieldwork; Interview]

ERROR ANALYSIS   Håkan Ringbom

1. Introduction

Error analysis (EA) is the systematic investigation of the types and causes of errors made by speakers and writers in their non-native languages (L2). Interest in EA as a systematic branch of study arose in the late 1960s, in close connection with contrastive analysis (CA), which had developed a little earlier.

The original idea behind contrastive analysis was a practical one: a detailed comparison of the linguistic systems of two or more languages was thought to reveal what problems learners with the same mother tongue have in learning another language. It was soon realized that CA could not really provide the answers language teachers would have wished to have. The feeling was that in its minute description of details, CA had little to offer to practicing language teachers, and its underlying theoretical and methodological assumptions were severely criticized. The criticism has not, however, destroyed the two basic underlying ideas of CA, (1) that the learner's L1 to a large extent determines what problems the L2-learner is going to face, and (2) that important insights can be gained from comparisons and contrasts between languages. Only, the combination of these two ideas, one from theoretical, the other from applied linguistics, does not work. It is not possible to have (1) as an axiom for (2), or of using (2) to illuminate (1).

One of the shortcomings soon noticed about the predictions made by early CA was that many of the predicted errors did not occur at all, while a number of errors actually occurring were not predicted by CA. It was therefore natural to revert the original CA procedure by starting out from the texts learners actually produce, an approach already suggested as a necessary supplement to contrastive studies by Lado in his seminal work (1957).

EA has been used for two different purposes, pedagogical and psycholinguistic. The pedagogical aim is, as it was for early CA, to provide feedback to the teacher about material and methods. More important today, however, is the psycholinguistic aim of EA: to illuminate how languages are learnt and produced. EA may provide a window for observing what goes on in the learner's mind.

EA has three different stages: identification, classification and explanation of the errors in a corpus.

2. Identification of errors

Identification of errors presupposes a clear idea of what an error is, a norm against which the utterance can be judged, and thus brings up the whole vast problem of acceptability in language. The question 'To whom and in what context is a particular expression erroneous?' can be given a number of different answers, illustrating how vague, subjective and artificial the term 'error' really is. Still, it is a convenient term to use, and as long as the corpus analysed has been produced by beginners and intermediate learners, few serious identification problems arise, since such learner language shows clear differences from any adult native speaker usage. With advanced learners, however, even the recognition of errors may be problematic. We often notice that a text has a non-native ring, even though we cannot say exactly what it is that produces this

impression, i.e. what aspects of the text are 'erroneous'.

3. Description and classification of errors

The methodological principle of CA is to compare and contrast two languages by means of the same model. In EA, the contrastive aspect comes in at a stage when the errors have already been identified and are to be classified according to a model which suits not only the target language but also the source language. Particularly for grammatical errors, the choice of which model to use is complicated by the present turmoil in linguistic theory. Error analysts, however, have a task more practical in nature than contrastive linguistics, and might therefore be allowed more eclecticism than contrastive analysts. When analysts are faced with the fact that a model originally devised for a language such as English is not necessarily well-suited to describe aspects of a language wholly unrelated to English, some other model may at times better meet the needs of the case.

4. Explanation of errors

Most analyses have assigned errors to one of two mutually exclusive causes: overgeneralization and transfer. This is clearly an oversimplification. The same word or construction may well have been arrived at by different routes. If the definite article in English is used in a context where, according to normal usage, it should not have been used, one learner may have done so because the equivalent L1-construction has the article, while another learner might have overgeneralised an existing L2-pattern. Also, interaction between L1-based and L2-based processes is perfectly possible. EA is practically the only area where transfer has been investigated, since the influence of the L1 is most easily recognizable in erroneous constructions. Yet there are also instances of positive transfer: L1 must be seen as primarily an aid, not an obstacle, to the learning of another language (see e.g. Ringbom 1987). The closer the two languages are perceived to be, the more transfer there will be, aiding the learner especially in comprehending the new language. Thus, unless EA is supplemented by other types of investigations it will give a biased picture of transfer, ignoring its positive manifestations.

The error analyst needs a large corpus to work with, and sufficient attention must be paid to comparisons of error frequencies. If translations are analysed, frequencies can easily be calculated, but in free compositions this is more problematic. In some cases, however, the concept of potential errors may be used: the number of errors made with a particular construction (e.g. concord) is balanced against the number of correctly formed constructions. A potential error index can then be calculated by dividing the number of erroneous constructions with the total number of constructions used.

EA has been frequently used in the areas of phonology, morphology, syntax and lexis. Discourse analysis, on the other hand, has made little direct use of the concept of error. The absence of explicitly stated norms for discourse clearly makes the concept less applicable to units larger than the sentence. The various comparisons made between L1 and L2 discourse have thus generally been descriptive in nature, merely stating differences between L1 and L2.

The term 'error' has a negative ring. It implies something undesirable and avoidable in the learner's language. However, EA has, perhaps somewhat paradoxically, contributed a great deal to creating a different and sounder perspective: errors are, in fact, normal and inevitable features of the process of language learning. The study of learner errors should primarily be taken as evidence not of failure to conform to L2-usage but of success and achievement in the course of the learning process.