A Study on the Pragmatic Functions of Self-Repetition in Dr. Phil's TV Show

*Amr Mohamed Anany

*Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Helwan University

Abstract

Self- repetition is a natural phenomenon that has been frequently used by interlocutors to perform a range of linguistic functions within conversational discourse. In this research, a pragmatic analysis to the discourse of Dr. Phil and his guests on Dr. Phil's TV show was carried out while holding Austin's theory of speech acts (1962) to determine the illocutionary force inherent in each utterance. This study attempted to explore the pragmatic functions of such repetitions as used by English native speakers. The data was collected from conversations between native speakers of English in 4 full episodes of Dr, Phil's talk show. The study revealed that one of the prominent linguistic features of TV discourse is repetition, which is employed to perform a variety of linguistic functions. It was evident that self- repetition was employed to achieve several functions: adding emphasis, expressing emotional effect, showing annoyance, seeking persuasion, highlighting surprise, being questionable and functioning as filler, when the speaker was searching for a proper word to say what would come next. The study concluded that these findings had significant implications for EFL/ESL teachers and the development of EFL/ESL learners.

2. Introduction

2.1 Context of the Study:

Since TV shows have emerged in 1920s, they received undivided attention and attracted wide and diverse audience from all walks of life. Among the most successful TV shows is Dr. Phil's TV show that was debuted for the first time in 2002. Linguistically, TV shows are primarily based upon conversations in the form of speech events. The number of possibilities arising from conversational practice has certainly found a new dimension in the context of the mass media, and on TV in particular (cf. Vande Berg et al. 1991 and 1998). Since repetition is a natural phenomenon in conversations taking place in all TV shows, this research assumes that the both the host (i.e. Dr. Phil) and his guests exploit self- repetition as a pragmatic tool and a communicative strategy in order to realize their goals.

According to Thomas (1995), Pragmatics is:

> The study of "meaning in interaction" where meaning is interpreted as "not something which is inherent in the word alone, nor is it produced by the speaker alone, nor by the hearer alone …[because] [m]aking meaning is a dynamic process, involving the negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer, the context of utterance (physical, social, and linguistic), and the meaning potential of an utterance. (p22)

Similarly, (Yule, 1996) has also defined pragmatics as the study of how more gets communicated than is said.

In essence, repetition is regarded as a communicative strategy (CS) used to overcome the crisis which occurs when language structures are inadequate to convey the individual thought (Tarone, 1977:195). CSs have been constantly used not only by non-native speakers but also by native speakers. Furthermore, self-repetition is used as a strategy of self repair. The basic format of self-repair as initiation with a non-lexical initiator is followed by the repairing segment (p. Schegloff et al; 1977: 376). These non-lexical initiators are comprised of cut-off, lengthening of sounds, and quasi-lexical fillers such as "uh" and "um". Although a lot of research was performed to analyze conversation TV shows from a CDA perspective, a few number of research was conducted to analyze them based on a pragmatic perspective.

2.2 Objectives of the Study:

This study aims at:

1. Exploring the various functions of repetition as used by native English speakers on Dr. Phil's TV show.

2. Conducting a pragmatic analysis to excerpts from conversations in Dr.Phil's Talk Show through a qualitative and statistical analysis of instances of self-repetition in full four episodes.

3. Gaining better understanding of the functions and reasons of self-repetition applied by native speakers in TV discourse.

2.3 Research Questions:

1. Do native speakers (NS) happen to apply self-repetition in their conversations?

2. What are the functions of using such repetitions?

2.4 Significance of the study:

It is hoped that the current study would be able to:

1- Provide a pragmatic analysis for chosen episodes of Dr. Phil's Talk Show in terms of self-repetition and its various functions contributing to achieve the aims of interlocutors.

2- Uncover the communicative strategies used by means of self-repetition showing their significance and functions.

3- Realize a better understanding to the role of self-repetition in TV Talk Show.

3. Review of Literature

3.1 What is repetition?

The area of repetition has been the cause of an outflow of gallons of recondite ink. In fact, the study of repetition was repeatedly carried out within a broad framework of communication strategies (Genc, 2007). Communication Strategies (CSs) are defined as strategies "used by an individual to overcome the crisis which occurs when language structures are inadequate to convey the individual thought" (Tarone, 1977:195). On the other hand, Faerch and Kasper (1983:36) viewed them as "potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal."

CSs are manipulated by both native and non-native speakers. This fact has been supported by many researchers (e.g., Dornyei and Thurrell, 1991; Dornyei 1995; Kocoglu, 1997; Rabab'ah, 2001). In addition, Dornyei and Thurrell (1991) stated that strategic competence (i.e., ability to use communication strategies) was "relevant to

Academy of Scientific
Research & Technology

both L1 and L2, since communication breakdowns occur and must be overcome not only in a foreign language but in one's mother tongue as well." (p.17). Furthermore, Dornyei (1995) described CSs as "various verbal and non-verbal means of dealing with difficulties and breakdowns that occur in everyday communication" (p. 55). Moreover, in a study conducted on Turkish learners of English, Kocoglu (1997) contended that native English speakers employed fewer communication strategies than did Turkish learners of English (e.g., self-repair, repetition and paraphrase). Similarly, Rababah (2001:3) found that "Arab learners used CSs in their native language, but when compared to the CSs used in their target language; these were fewer in terms of frequency and vary in terms of type." Most importantly, Rabab'ah (2007) performed another study in which he investigated CSs used by learners of Arabic as a Second Language. He found that repetition, as a CS, was one of the most frequent strategies.

Not only was repetition given due attention in the taxonomies of communication strategies, but also its types and functions have been elaborated. Dörnyei and Scott (1997) reported that "the L2 speaker's frequent need for more time to process and plan L2 speech than would be naturally available in fluent communication associated with strategies such as the use of fillers, hesitation devices, and self-repetitions" (p.183). In addition, Dornyei and Thurrell (1994) concluded that repetition is a conversational strategy for dealing with communication 'trouble spots'. In their research on native and non-native speakers, Stuart and Lynn (1995) find that non-native speakers resorted to repetition strategy more frequently than native speakers do.

Ochs and Schieffelin (1983) described repetition as one of the most misunderstood phenomena in psycholinguistics. Indubitably, repetition is a human, social activity, clearly part of our everyday conduct and behavior and not just a marker of a "disfluent" or "sloppy" speaker (Schegloff 1987). According to Tannen (1989), repetition is a phenomenon that occurs quite naturally in conversational speech.

Similarly, Fillmore (1979) stated that the frequency of its occurrence allows us to question whether repetition, in fact, may not be "native- like". They may be too much, too little or even inappropriate use of repetition. As for fillers, they are used to gain time in search for a vocabulary or a grammatical item. Shimanoff and Brunak (1977) suggest:

Sophisticated speakers attempt to avoid absolute redundancy. For example, the speaker who uses 'let's say, let's suppose' will probably be perceived as a more eloquent communicator than the speaker who says 'let's let's let's suppose (p. 136).

Repetition as a strategy of repair, has been intensively investigated in the discourse of native speakers (NS) as well as the discourse of non-native speakers (NNS), (e.g., Schegloff et al., 1977; Tarone, 1980; Wong, 2000; Rieger, 2001; Haeyeon, 2002; Sawir, 2004; Cho, 2008; Laakso, 2010).

In addition, Schegloff et al. (1977) explains the basic format of self-repair as initiation with a non- lexical initiator that is followed by the repairing segment (p. 376).

These non -lexical initiators are comprised of cut-off, lengthening of sounds, and quasi-lexical fillers such as uh and um. Two of the four functions of self-repair suggested by Schegloff et al. (1977) are relevant to this study: word search and word replacement. Most of these functions involve the replacement of one lexical item by another. According to Koshik and Seo (2008), the search for words during communication is used by both NS and NNS. This is not because they do not know or have not learned the words they are looking for, but they may have momentarily forgotten them. Therefore, both NS and NNS resort to repetition of a lexical item while searching for an appropriate word to fill the gap.

Based upon this perspective, Rieger (2003) also investigated repetitions, as self-repair strategies, used in conversations in two related languages: English and German. Rieger (2003:51) argues, "Repetitions -which are also called recycling - consist of the consecutive usage of the same quasi-lexical or lexical item or items. Her study revealed that her subjects repeat more pronoun-verb combinations, more personal

pronouns, and more prepositions in English than in German, and they recycle more demonstrative pronouns in German than in English. These differences are attributed to the structural differences in both English and German languages. Thus, the structure of a particular language shapes the repair strategies of language users because it creates opportunities for recycling. In addition, Rieger concluded that repetition as a self-repair strategy is an orderly and systemic phenomenon. Similarly, Cho (2008) examined repair strategies of elementary second language learners. The latter study revealed that partial repetition and request for repetition were among the most frequent strategies used.

3.2 What are talk shows?

Hess-Lüttich (2001) defines 'Show Conversations' as conversations staged for show which address an audience, and they do not only include TV talk shows, but also dialogues on the theatrical stage. They are also regarded as prepared conversations that adopt basic communication rules, or they violate these rules in certain ways to achieve certain effects or goals. Although several studies have investigated the discourse of TV talk shows, these studies have been limited to the structure and the argumentative aspects of this discourse. They were primarily focused on Critical Discourse Analysis CDA. For example, in examining the argumentation in two TV shows both in Germany and Switzerland, Hess-Lüttich (2007) investigated the discursive strategies in terms of empirical criteria (turn taking, speaking time, etc.), and the discursive strategies of the invited politicians in terms of qualitative data on the distribution of verbal power. Lüttich (2007) concluded that:

… argumentation in talk shows serves to stage politics as symbolic action rather than to argue for better solutions to existing problems. The debate is presented as a controversy, contest, even as a battle, rather than as rational discussion and argumentation. " (p. 1369).

In studying the relationship between argumentation theory and discourse analysis, Rees (2007) concluded that both can take advantage from each other. Bilal,

H., Ahsan, H., Mujeeb, H. Gohar, S., Younis, Y, Awan, S. (2012) aimed to scrutinize the structures of two political talk shows of TV channels in Pakistan (Capital Talk and Lekin (but)) to make clear relationship between structure and meaning. Through the analysis, the researchers suggested that these TV talk shows used different tactics to "unravel the hidden truth and to project them to the public." and "gain a social power and the favor of public" (p.218). In addition, Thornborrow (2007) examined the function of narrative discourse in the development of arguments in television talk shows. She demonstrated that TV talk arguments are "sequentially emergent from lay participants' narratives, and these narratives function to structure the production of opposing opinions and stances." Thornborrow discussed how stories are elicited, and "the problematising and evaluation of narrative actions by the host and other participants" (p. 1436). She argued that the articulation between narrative discourse and argument is one of the most important organizational features of TV talk show interaction.

Conversely, it has been found that very limited research has investigated the communication strategies and devices used by TV show hosts and guests. As far as the literature review is concerned, there is lack of studies that analyzed the discourse of TV shows from **a pragmatic perspective** (e.g., Aznárez-Mauleo´n, 2013). Aznárez-Mauleo´n noticed that in analyzing TV talk shows:

Scholars in media studies often focus on external parameters---features such as the topic, the participants, audience targets, production---adopting what we might call a macro- perspective. This kind of description can be greatly enriched by an analysis of an essential component in most broadcast products, particularly in this kind of program: the use of language (2013, p. 50)

Consequently, and based upon that assumption, Aznárez-Mauleo´n (ibid) investigated the interactions between the TV talk hosts and guests. She found out that hosts use listenership devices, attention grabbing markers, repeating what the guest says, paraphrasing, and using compensatory strategies. She concluded that these strategies are related to "the hosts' role and their goals as managers of this kind of show."

3.3 Discourse Functions of Repetition:

A number of researchers and scholars have observed different functions of self-repetition in discourse. For instance, Kernan (1977:95) notes, "repetition recalls and reasserts the preceding token". Erickson (1984) finds that repeating oneself adds preciseness. Bublitz (1989) suggested that repetition is employed both to establish and maintain the continuous and smooth flow of talk, and also to state the participants' positions so as to help to ensure comprehension of what has been said and meant. Bublitz (1989) attempted to describe other functions of repetition, which include facilitating comprehension since self- repetition allows time for the speaker to plan what to say next or how to say it, and facilitates message comprehension on the part of the listener or second speaker. Bublitz added that self-repetition helps speakers to bridge gaps in conversation, and to state their position (agreement or disagreement) with respect to the other speaker's attitudes, decisions or opinions.

Repetition has been often handled 'under the rubric of communicative redundancy' (Brody 1986:255). According to Brody, "Repetition not only performs a variety of functions, but it may also be manifested in a number of different linguistic structures." (p. 255). The author argued for the multi-functionality of repetition. Norrick (1987:257) described four main functions of same-speaker repetition: semantically   based, production-based, comprehension-based and interaction-based. Semantically based self- repetition may be idiomatic or may reflect the iterative nature of the described object in an iconic manner. This kind of self-repetition is also realized through avoidance of ellipsis to be emphatic. Production-based self-repetition, takes place when a speaker wants to hold the floor and to gain planning time while searching for what to say next, or planning the rest of the move or turn, and to bridge an interruption. Comprehension - based self-repetition can also be used to increase textual coherence in the ongoing talk, by the strategies of summarizing, paragraphing and reintroducing a topic or a point of view. However, interaction-based self-repetition occurs when a speaker employs self- repetition to ask and answer his own questions within the same turn. It can also take the form of repeat without any change, repeat with stress on a significant word of the original utterance

Academy of Scientific
Research & Technology

and repeat with expansion.

On the other hand, Tannen (1989) identified several functions served by repetition in conversation, whose major role was to establish coherence and interpersonal involvement:

- participatory listenership, which shows that the person is listening and accepting what has been uttered;

- ratifying listenership, which occurs when the speaker incorporates the repeated phrase into their own narrative;

- humor;

- savoring through, which a speaker appreciates the humor in a situation;

- stalling, a function that allows time to interlocutor to find what to say next;

- expanding, which is the reformulation of an utterance followed by on-going talk; and

- repetition as participation, which helps develop the conversation.

(Tannen, 1989:47-52)

However, Tyler (1994:672) suggested that certain repetition patterns work as metadiscoursal markers, which signal to the listener how to interpret new information in an unfolding discourse. Similarly, Murata (1995) saw repetition as a culture-specific signal of conversational management, and considered immediate repetition of words and phrases as one feature of communicative behaviors. His study reveals that the use of immediate repetitions is closely related to the turn-taking system. McCarthy (1998:115) argued that
'repetition gives out important interactional signals' in spoken discourse, and this observation was based on the notion that self-repetition is a fundamental feature of a speaker's lexical competence, and constitutes a basic characteristic of vocabulary patterning in talk.

Holmes and Stubbe (2003) contend that there are different functions of self-repetition in spoken discourse, and these include intensifying the force of the basic

message and using repetition as a softener to manage and moderate the speech situation. Rieger (2003:1687) finds that his German bilinguals repeat items for two main reasons: (1) to provide time for the planning of new utterances, that is, producing a 'filler' which compares to vocalized fillers, such as ah, er, erm, etc., and (2) to self-repair that is, attempting to correct a produced utterance.

Based on the assumption that CSs are used in times of difficulty, Bada (2010) shows two movies to non-native speakers of English (NNSE) and non-native speakers of French (NNSF). The participants' comments on these movies were analyzed in order to observe prevalence, type and systematicity of repetition. The results of this study showed that repetitions of grammatical and/or lexical elements were made irrespective of types or word class, phrase or sentence level. Most repeated elements among NNSE were observed to be verbs, pronouns and prepositions, and among NNSF, pronouns, determiners and verbs. Repetitions were made (1) as vocalized fillers, and (2) as self- repairs.

In analyzing repetition and intensity, Bazzanella (2011) asserted that "Repetition, besides being a useful cognitive device (as a simplifying/clarifying device, a "filler", and a support both for understanding and memorizing), an efficient text-building mechanism, and a widespread literacy and rhetorical device, is a powerful conversational and interactional resource." (p. 249). She concluded that repetition vary in its forms and functions, according to different contexts. In a study on repetition in social interaction, Hsieh (2011) pin-pointed that self-repeats can be used to emphasize function or when the listener does not catch up what was said in the previous turn. He also found that self- repetition can be used to "double up the illocutionary force, i.e., to do emphasis or to do persuasion, by means of repeating the linguistic form" (p.163).

To sum up, this literature review reveals that repetition is a natural phenomenon, which is used to accomplish various functions, that the majority of previous research on repetition focused on ESL learners, that little research focused on native English speakers, and that TV shows received little attention in CS research. The primary aim of this paper is; therefore, to explore the various

functions of repetition as used by native English speakers on Dr. Phil's TV show. In other words, this study is an attempt to provide greater understanding of the functions or reasons of repetition in TV shows. The main focus of this research is self-repetition, which is considered a pragmatic resource having various functions.

4. Methodology

4.1 Data:

The current study attempts to explore the various pragmatic functions of repetition as used by native English speakers on Dr. Phil's TV show. Therefore, it relies upon gathering data from a selection of four full different episodes of Dr. Phil's TV show: Mark Osterman's Interview with Dr Phil as well as a series of three consecutive interviews with George and Cindy Anthony in three episodes: The Interview, The Revelations and The Trial – The Truth.

4.2 Procedures:

All episodes on YouTube were watched and collected and for several times focusing on the utterances of repetition inherent in these episodes. After watching the episodes, the researcher transcribed all the utterances of repetition. When one word was repeated in the same utterance, it was counted as a single instance of repetition; that is, not all repeated words were counted.

Afterwards, these repetitions were classified in accordance with their pragmatic functions and based on the analysis of their illocutionary force.

4.3 Approach:

In order to analyze the goals of each utterance made either by Dr. Phil or his guest, the researcher worked on Austin's theory of speech acts by means of analyzing the illocutionary force (i.e., the social function of what is said). According to Thomas (1995), illocutionary acts is:

A theory that examines what kinds of things we do when we speak, how we do them and how our acts may "succeed" or "fail". (P. 31)

Therefore, each utterance that contained self-repetition was analyzed in

accordance with Austin's theory of speech acts revealing its illocutionary force or intention.

4.4 Tools:

The researcher used a set of pragmatic functions to analyze these episodes unveiling that both the host, Dr. Phil and his guests exploit self- repetition as a pragmatic tool and a communicative strategy in order to realize their goals.

These pragmatic functions of repetition were narrowed down to 7 main functions as follows:

1- Adding emphasis

2- Expressing emotional effect

3- Being questionable

4- Expressing annoyance

5- Seeking Persuasion

6- Expressing Surprise

7- As a filler

5. Analysis

The present research attempts to analyze the utterances of repetition by means of classifying them into the following functions:

5.1 Adding emphasis:

Hsieh (2011:163) states, "Pragmatically speaking, repetition, both self-repeats and other- repeats, can be used to double up the illocutionary force, i.e., to do emphasis or to do persuasion, by means of repeating the linguistic form." This study revealed that Dr. Phil and his guests employed self-repetition because they wanted to emphasize a particular word or phrase or sometimes highlight an obvious fact. Dr. Phil and his guests used repetitions, but it was noticed that Dr. Phil's guests used them more frequently. This kind of repetition is manifested in the following scripts which are taken from different episodes:

1- He didn't approach the truck, he didn't knock on the window and say 'what are you following me'

2- <u>That's</u> the mistake, <u>that's</u> the first link in the chain

3- Mr. Osterman: Oh, <u>absolutely not</u>, <u>absolutely not</u>.

4- Alicia:' '<u>I did</u> this,' '<u>I did</u>

5- Alicia: Zimmerman <u>killed him</u>--he <u>killed him</u>. He hunted him down and he <u>killed him</u>.

6- Ms. CINDY ANTHONY: <u>Right</u>. <u>Right</u>.

7- Mr. ANTHONY: Yes, sir, <u>I do</u>. <u>I do</u>.

8- <u>I know</u>. <u>I know</u> what everyone's thinking. Here's a mother justifying the jury's acquittal of her daughter.

9- Ms. CINDY ANTHONY: ….Our body is just a vehicle to be on this earth. But <u>I would never</u>--<u>I would never</u> place anybody that I loved like Caylee was found, <u>I would never</u> do that.

10- Mr. ANTHONY: No, sir. <u>I did not. Did not</u>. I couldn't--I couldn't <u>do that</u>, would not <u>do that</u>.

These scripts show that self-repetitions were used to assure a given fact making the listener focus his/her attention on something in particular. For example, repeating "But <u>I would never</u>--<u>I would never</u>", "Zimmerman <u>killed him</u>--he <u>killed him</u>" and "<u>Yes, sir, I do</u>. <u>I do" are all means of laying emphasis to the discourse uttered.</u>

Notably, in script 10, Mr. Anthony assures and emphasizes that he did not molested the girl, by repeating: " I did not..I did not". However, he uses other words to persuade the audience: "I couldn't--I couldn't do that, would not do that". Here, we have two goals achieved by one repetition: adding emphasis and seeking persuasion.

5.2 Expressing emotional effect:

The study revealed that when Dr. Phil or his guests were emotionally affected, they resorted to self-repetition, which was manifested in clarification requests, especially when a particular point or the message which has been said earlier by his/her interlocutor was not clear. Clarification was made by asking a question, which required the hearer to answer. However, in some cases, due to the significance of the

idea, and in order not to be skipped without being fully understood, Dr. Phil repeated his clarification requests more than once to clarify the unclear ideas or points because he was either irritated or surprised. As can be seen in script 12, Dr. Phil seemed very irritated when he said "You know that she lies, but yet you say, `OK, I--OK, I believe you, I believe you, she's asleep.' She's this, she's that. She's not there" Thus, he repeated different utterances to show different feelings of irritation and surprise. In addition, other scripts conveyed a variety of emotions and achieved different emotional effects. Some of these scripts that were used to express emotional effects are as follows:

11. Ms. Fulton: That's my baby, that's my son that was yelling. He was murdered.

 12. You know that she lies, but yet you say, `OK, I--OK, I believe you, she's asleep.' She's this, she's that. She's not there.

13- Mr. ANTHONY: I know is that Caylee isn't with us anymore. I know that. I know that

14- Mr. ANTHONY: I've already hurt your mom <u>too</u>, <u>too</u> much

15- Mr. ANTHONY: I tried to commit suicide. I tried to take my own life

16- …..She immediately grabbed Caylee and began to cry and cry and cry.

5.3 Being questionable:

The study revealed that repetition was also utilized as an interrogative tool. When both Dr. Phil and his guests had no answers to some profound concerns, they deliberately resorted to repetitions as an interrogative technique. In scripts 17 and 20, Dr. Phil was puzzled, questionable and annoyed. However, in script 18, the guest used repetition for two linguistic goals: being questionable and implying that the man was not guilty.

17- In all of your mentoring, modeling and talking to George Zimmerman did you ever tell him 10 things to do, three things to do, five things to do before you have to draw that weapon?

18- Alicia: OK, you believe it was him? You heard the tape?

19- And people, they have questions about you as parents, they have questions about you as grandparents

20- You're arrested people, you've busted people for drugs and other crimes. Why do they do what they do?

5.4 Expressing annoyance:

The study also revealed that repetition was applied as a pragmatic tool to convey a sense of irritation and annoyance. in scripts 21, 25 and 26, the lexical choices reflect a deep sense of irritation and annoyance. This can be shown in the choice of the words "Kid" to reflect irresponsibility, "lying" to signal a bad behavior and "angry" to express anger and annoyance.

21- This is a kid, this is a kid. it's a child

22- Alicia: If Zimmerman never put his hands on him, this wouldn't have been--we wouldn't be here right now. Right now!

23- Alicia: You could--anybody could say whatever they want to say

24- There are millions of people in America right now that want to shake you awake. They want to shake you awake and say, `Lady, smell the coffee.

25- : I didn't know she was lying for two years about the job. I didn't know she was lying about Zanny.

26- Ms. CINDY ANTHONY: … I'm angry the hell that we've been put through the last three years. I'm angry that I searched for Caylee for all that time when, you know--I'm angry that we didn't have a proper way to take care of Caylee's remains. I'm angry about it.

5.5 Seeking Persuasion:

Usually, persuasion is regarded as a situation that involves an agent (the speaker) who attempts to persuade another agent (the listener) in order to take a specific action. As a matter of fact, this study demonstrated that persuasion was always sought by both Dr. Phil and his guests. In order to achieve persuasion, Dr. Phil and his guests resorted to repetition as a pragmatic tool.

27- Now, I'll confess, I don't dance, I don't sing but I can and will help people

28- Mr. Osterman: There was no option. When things happen in a split-second, according to what he told me, there was no time to think, to make--to go through a ….

29- Why do people lie? They lie to escape accountability, to embellish reality. They

lie to create something, avoid something, take something that isn't real, isn't right. I mean, that's why you lie, right?

30- Mr. ANTHONY: But did Casey cover something up? Yes. You can see that. You can see by the lies

31- Did you all know and think about that your testimony, whatever you would be asked and whatever you say, might actually contribute to convicting your daughter?

32- You didn't buy that he was there. Did you buy the affair?

In script 29, It is evident that Dr. Phil uses repetition as a means to convince his audience by explaining to them the reasons that make people lie. Then, he confirms such reasons with them saying: "isn't right. I mean, that's why you lie, right?".

In addition, in script 30, one of Dr. Phil's guests cleverly uses self-repetition to convince Dr. Phil along with his audience by repeating the utterance: "You can see that" 2 times.

5.6 Expressing Surprise:

The study shows also that self-repetition was used to express surprise in some instances. With the development of the events conversations among Dr. Phil and his guests had a sort of surprise as they both were unable to accept some facts given in the context.

33- Where was Casey? Where was Caylee? And what was that suspicious odor coming from the trunk?

34- Ms. CINDY ANTHONY: I don't know why she's having a seizure. Does she have a brain tumor where the seizure's caused by stress? I don't know. I don't know

35- Mr. ANTHONY: I can't, I can't visualize that. I don't want to visualize that

36- Mr. ANTHONY: See, I don't--I don't want to believe that. I can't understand how she could drown and all of a sudden end up at the end of our street. I can't understand it

37- Mr. ANTHONY: If there was an accident and something happened, why couldn't Casey turn to us, even turn to her brother? Why, why, why? That's a question I've asked myself hundreds of times.

38- With what--with the lawyers, the defense team!

In scripts 33, Dr. Phil seems to be both surprised and questionable. However, in scripts 35 and 37, Mr. Anthony seems to be puzzled, upset and surprised. Indeed, self-repetition achieved the goals of the interlocutors with the context of the conversations.

5.7 As a filler:

According to Shimanoff and Brunak (1977), fillers are usually used to gain time in search for a vocabulary or a grammatical item. Although it was believed that L2 speakers depend upon fillers as a communication strategy due to their not being fluent in a target language, fillers are also used by native speakers to gain time, fill in the silence and hold the floor. This is clearly shown in the present research where Dr. Phil and his guest used a variety of fillers as follows:

39- Mr. Osterman: And that reflects absolutely nothing upon any agency that I--that I belong to. They have no impact on this whatsoever. This is completely my...

40- Mr. Osterman: Absolutely, I understand from--I'm a--I'm a real kind of basic kind of simple kind of guy when it comes to most things in my life..

41- Mr. Osterman: It was--it was--it was deadly serious that at any time someone's going to discover where he lives and he's going to come to my home, and I'm...

42- Mr. Osterman:... that's why when we heard this story, that it happened, I have--I have other friends that I would have said……

43- Mr. Osterman: he said, 'You know what, I just--I don't why--I don't--I don't want to frequent like on Friday nights or Saturday nights going out to clubs with my friends and such and I don't wish to do all this anymore.

44- Dr. Phil: I think it's significant that she went halfway through a pregnancy before she said anything to you all. I mean, that's a--that's a big omission to me as a parent.

45- but he was--he was in a bad spot.

In scripts 39, 40, 41 and 42, it is very obvious that only one guest, Mr. Osterman, was exploiting fillers as a pragmatic tool and a communication strategy to gain much time and to ease his stress. Similarly, Dr. Phil himself used fillers to hold the floor and consume more time as in scripts 44 and 45.

5.8 Results:

Concerning the first question in this research, which is related to whether

native speakers (NS) of English repeat language items in their interactions as manifested on Dr. Phil's TV show, the results of the present study revealed that Dr. Phil, the host, employed self-repetition as a communication strategy that performs several functions. Since the study was limited to Dr. Phil TV show, it was observed that both Dr. Phil and his guests used many repetitions. They amount to (135) repetitions in only 4 episodes. Indeed, these repetitions performed a wide range of functions.

However, it was also found, and particularly in these episodes, that Dr. Phil's guest resorted to repetition more than Dr. Phil himself did, 47 and 88 instances, respectively. This can be attributed to the fact that Dr. Phil's guests, and especially in these episodes, were countering bitter criticism from their society or even in some case they were facing charges of sexual abuse and murder. This also reveals that Dr. Phil was in power as he represented the dominant ideology in society. The guests used more repetitions than Dr. Phil did, because they were hesitant trying to repair their positive face in front of the audience.

Table 1 shows the frequency of self-repetition in the four episodes, which represents the data of the present study:

Episode	Dr. Phil's utterances of repetition	Guests' utterances of repetition	Total repetition
Mark Osterman's Interview	13	42	55
The Interview	11	11	22
The Revelations	7	19	26
The Trial – The Truth	16	16	32
Total	47	88	135
Percentage	34.8%	65.2%	100%

Table 1: Frequencies and percentages of self-repetition in Dr. Phil's episodes

Academy of Scientific
Research & Technology

In answering question two, concerning the functions performed by repetitions, the study revealed that repetition was used by Dr. Phil and his guests not only to perform various functions, but it also was manifested in different linguistic structures. Repetition was employed for expressing emotional effect, adding emphasis, showing annoyance, seeking persuasion, highlighting surprise, being questionable and functioning as filler. Another significant finding was that a single utterance in the interaction between Dr. Phil, the host, and his guests was used to perform a wide range of functions. For example, one utterance was used to express surprise, emphasis, and being questionable.

In addition, the study went further to analyze which pragmatic function was used the most and which one was used the least. In this regard the study revealed that using self-repetition as a means of adding emphasis is the most frequent pragmatic function recurring with a percentage of 25.3% with 34 repetitions out of a total of 135 repetitions. On the other hand, using self-repetition as a means of being questionable is the least frequent pragmatic function recurring in all episodes with a percentage of 6.7% with only 9 repetitions out of a total of 135 repetitions.

This can be shown in the following table:

Table 2: Analysis of Pragmatic Functions in Dr. Phil's episodes

Function / Eposide	Mark Osterman's Interview	The Interview	The Revelations	The Trial – The Truth	Total	Percentage
Adding emphasis	17	3	5	9	34	25.3%
Expressing emotional effect	6	5	3	5	19	14%
Being questionable	3	3	1	2	9	6.7%

Expressing annoyance	8	4	4	1	17	12.6%
Seeking Persuasion	10	1	6	7	24	17.7%
Expressing Surprise	2	2	4	2	10	7.5%
As a filler	9	4	3	6	22	16.2%
Total	55	22	26	32	135	100%

The findings of the present study reveal that self-repetitions have specific functions in discourse and they are not meaningless. Indeed self-repetition is a natural phenomenon that does not only exist in all human interactions of non-native speakers, but also it exists in all human interactions of native speakers.

6. Conclusion

The analysis of the present study concludes that Dr. Phil and his guests resorted to the repetition of some words and phrases to achieve a wide range of functions, using several linguistic forms. They resorted to repetition to emphasize a particular proposition, sympathize, express puzzlement, convey annoyance, persuade the audience, express surprise and use it as a filler to plan in order to take time, fill in the silence and hold the floor. However, it was found that Dr. Phil's guest were the ones who used self-repetition more frequently to defend themselves and repair their face in front of a dominant ideology adopted by society. In addition, using self-repetition as a pragmatic function to add emphasis was the most frequent function used by Dr. Phil and his guests in all the four episodes subject to this analysis whereas using self-repetition as a means of being questionable was the least frequent function used by Dr. Phil and his guests. These findings can be of importance to ESL/EFL teachers. They can make use of self-repetition while teaching English to their NNSs to achieve several linguistic goals, the most important of which is adding emphasis. Thus, their better understanding to self-repetition as a linguistic and pragmatic

function would certainly help them perfect their language, communicate well and achieve their linguistic goals.

References

Aznárez-Mauleo´n, M. 2013. An approach to the host's discursive style in Spanish''testimony'' talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 45: 50-73.

Bada, E. 2010. Repetitions as vocalized fillers and self-repairs in English and French interlanguages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42: 1680-1688.

Bazzanella, C. 2011. Redundancy, repetition, and intensity in discourse. *Language*

Sciences, 33: 243-254.

Bilal, H., Ahsan, H., Mujeeb, H. Gohar, S., Younis, Y, Awan, S. 2012. Critical discourse analysis of Political TV Talk Shows of Pakistani Media. *Journal of International Linguistics*, 4 (1): 203-219.

Brody, J. 1986. Repetition as a rhetorical and conversational device in Tojolabal

(Mayan). *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 52 (3): 255-274.

Bublitz,W. 1989. Repetition in spoken discourse. *Anglistentag* 352-368.

Cho, Eun Hye 2008. *An Examination of the Use of Repair Strategies of Elementary English as a Second Language (ESL) Students: By Class Type and Grade Levels.* PhD Dissertation. Texas A and M University.

Dornyei, Z. 1995. On the Teachability of Communication Strategies. *TESOL*

QUARTERLY, 29: 55-85.

Dornyei, Z. and Thurrell, S. 1991. Strategic competence and how to teach it.

ELT Journal, 45 (1): 16-23.

Dornyei, Zoltan, Scott, Mary L. 1997. Communication strategies in second language:

definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47: 173-210.

Dornyei, Z. and Thurrell, S. 1994. Teaching conversational skills intensively: Course content and rationale. *ELT Journal,* 48: 40-49.

Erickson, F. 1984. Rhetoric, anecdote, and rhapsody: Coherence strategies in a conversation among Black American adolescents. In Tannen D. (ed.) *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse (*pp. 91-102). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Færch, C., Kasper, G. 1983. Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In

Færch, C., Kasper, G. (eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 20-44). Longman, London.

Fillmore, C. J. 1979. On fluency. In Fillmore, C. J., Kempler, D. and Wang W. S. Y. (Eds.), *Individual differences in language ability and language behavior (*pp.85-102). New York: Academic Press.

Fung, L. 2007. The communicative role of self-repetition in a specialised corpus of business discourse. *Language Awareness*, 7 (3): 224-239.

Genç, B. 2007. *An Analysis of Communication Strategies Employed By Turkish- Speakers of English.* PhD Dissertation. Adana: University of Çukurova.

Green, G.M. 2008. *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*, 2nd ed. NY: Routledge.

Hess-Luttich, E., 2001. Textsorten gesprochener Sprache. In: Helbig, G., Lutz, H., Gert, Krumm H.-J. (Eds.), Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Ein internationales Handbuch

[German as a Foreign Language] De Gruyter, Berlin, New York, pp. 280–300.

Hess-Luttich, E. 2007. (Pseudo-) Argumentation in TV-debates. *Journal of Pragmatics*,

39: 1360–1370.

Holmes, J. and Stubbe, M. 2003. *Power and Politeness in the Workplace*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Hsieh, F. 2011. Repetition in social interaction: A case study on Mandarin conversations. *International Journal on Asian Language Processing,* 19 (4):153-168. Kernan, K.T. 1977. Semantic and expressive elaboration in children's narratives. In Ervin-Tripp, S. and Mitchell–Kernan, C. (eds.), *Child Discourse (*pp. 91–102). New

York: Academic Press.

Kim, H. 2002. The form and function of next-turn repetition in English conversation.

Language Research, 38: 51-81.

Kocoglu, Z. 1997. The role of gender on communication strategy use. *ERIC.* Retrieved on March 23, 2010 from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED409725.pdf.

Koshik, I., Seo, M. 2008. Language learners' solutions to word (and other) searches.

2008 Conference of the National Communication Association. San Diego, CA. Laakso, M. (2010). Cut-off or particle-devices for initiating self-repair in conversation.

Journal of Pragmatics, 42: 1151-1171.

Lee, Jee Won 2010. *Repetition of Personal Pronominal Forms in Mandarin and Construction of Stance in Interaction.* PhD Dissertation. Los Angeles: University of California.

McCarthy, M. 1998. *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

McCarthy, M. and Carter, R. 1995. Spoken grammar: What is it and how can we teach it? *ELT Journal*, 49: 207-218.

Murata, K. 1995. Repetitions: A cross-cultural study. *World English*, 14: 343-356.

Norrick, Neal, R. 1987. Functions of repetition in conversation. *TEXT,* 7 (3): 245-264.

Ochs, E., and Schieffelin, B. 1983. *Acquiring Conversational Competence.* London:

Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Rabab'ah, G. 2001. *An Investigation into the Strategic Competence of Arab Learners*

of English at Jordanian Universities. PhD Dissertation, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne/U.K.

Rabab'ah, G. and Bulut, D. 2007. Compensatory Strategies in Arabic as a Second

Language. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics,* Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 83-106.

Rees, M.A (2007). Discourse analysis and argumentation theory: The case of television talk. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39: 1454–1463.

Rieger, C. L. 2003. Repetition as self-repair strategies in English and German conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35 (1): 47-69.

Rieger, C.L. 2000. *Self-repair Strategies of English–German Bilinguals in Informal Conversations: The Role of Language, Gender and Proficiency.* PhD Dissertation. University of Alberta

Sawir, E. 2004. Keeping up with native speakers: The many and positive roles of repetition in the conversations of EFL learners. *Asian EFL Journal*, 6: 1-32.

Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G., Sachs, H. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the

organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53: 361-382.

Schegloff, E. 1987. Recycled turn beginnings: A precise mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In Button, G. and Lee, J. (eds.), *Talk and Social Organisation, (pp.*70–100). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Shimanoff, S. and Brunak, J. 1977. Repairs in planned and unplanned discourse. In Keenan, E. and Benett, T. (eds), *Discourse across Time and Space* (pp. 123-167). Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Tannen, D. 1987. Repetition in conversation as spontaneous formulaicity. *TEXT,* 7: 215-243.

Tannen, D. 1989. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarone, E. 1977. Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage. In Brown, H., Yorio, C., Crymes, R. (eds.), *On TESOL'77. TESOL* (pp. 194–203). Washington.

Tarone, E. 1980. Communication strategies, foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage.

Language Learning, 30 (2): 417-431.

Thornborrow, J. 2007. Narrative, opinion and situated argument in talk show discourse.*Journal of Pragmatics*, 39: 1436–1453.

Thomas, J. (1995) What is pragmatics. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics, London*: Longman, (p 22)

Thomas, J. (1995) Speech acts. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics, London*: Longman, (p 31)

Tyler, A. 1994. The role of repetition in perceptions of discourse coherence. *Journal of*

Pragmatics, 21: 671-688.

Walsh, S. 2006. *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Wong, J. 2000. Repetition in conversation: A look at 'first and second sayings'.*Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 33: 407-424. Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

دراسة الوظائف الدلالية الخاصة بالتكرار الذاتي في برنامج دكتور فيل الحواري

عمرو محمد محمود موسى عناني

*باحث بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها ـ كلية الآداب ـ جامعة حلوان

رئيس فرع الترجمة، معهد اللغات للقوات المسلحة

حاصل على ماجستير في اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها – تخصص اللغة والترجمة

عضو بجمعية المترجمين الأمريكية

عضو بجمعية مترجمون بلا حدود

ملخص

يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة الوظائف الدلالية الخاصة بالتكرار الذاتي في برنامج "دكتور فيل" الحواري. يجري البحث تحليلا دلاليا للخطاب اللغوي الذي يستخدمه مُقدم البرنامج مع ضيوفه من متحدثي اللغة الإنجليزية الأصليين مع تسليط الضوء على نظرية أفعال الكلام للفيلسوف الإنجليزي جون أوستن (1962) لتحديد القوة الدلالية بكل منطوق كلامي.

اشتملت مصادر البحث على أربع حلقات كاملة من البرنامج التليفزيوني الحواري الشهير "دكتور فيل" تم الحصول عليها من موقع Youtube لتحميل الفيديوهات، وقدم البحث تحليلا دلاليا كاملا لمرات التكرار الذاتي لعبارات الكلام التي يرددها مُقدم البرنامج مع دراسة الغرض الدلالي والوظيفة البلاغية لها. وجد البحث أن التكرار الذاتي هو خاصية لغوية فريدة يستغلها متحدثو اللغة الإنجليزية الأصليين لتحقيق العديد من الوظائف اللغوية وهي التأكيد، والتعبير عن التأثر العاطفي، وإظهار الضيق، والسعي للإقناع، والاستفسار، ووضع ألفاظ الحشو في الخطاب. وقد خلص البحث إلى أن تلك الوظائف الدلالية لها تأثيرات كبيرة على معلمي ومتعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية ومتعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية ثانية.