A Review of Silence in Conversation: Discoursal Perspective

Sahar Khademi [1]

[1]Ph.D. Candidate, English Department, Najaf Abad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran

Citation

Khademi, S. (2022). A Review of Silence in Conversation: Discoursal Perspective. *International Journal of Language and Translation Research, 2* (1), pp. 51-67.

Available online

Keywords:

Silence,
Conversation,
Interruption,
Meaning

Silence in conversations semantically carries varied interpretations. Since silence is a component of discontinuity in speech, it arises relatively rarely in confrontational discourse that is distinguished by continuous speaking flow and rapid turn-taking. This study sets out to investigate the purposes behind interruptions, the meanings of silences in conversations, and also pause and differences to analyze their power roles encrypted in silence. In terms of silence, the meanings behind it are highly dependent on what is uttered prior to or after the occurrence of silence. Silences can indicate topic switch, speaker's wish to continue the same topic, and disagreement. In a conversation, silences lead to awkward situations among speakers and show trouble in conversation flow, but the results of the study show that conversational flow induces a sense of belonging and positive self-esteem.

Introduction

Dialogue and conversations have been considered important tools for knowledge exchange and robust decision-making. Silence, as an act of information-withholding, hinders such processes. The notion of silence that crept into speech studies and linguistics in the 1970s was closely associated with negativity, passiveness, impotence, and death. It was treated as absence: absence of speech, and absence of meaning and intention (see e.g., Bruneau, 1973:18; Dauenhauer, 1980:5; Saville-Troike, 1994; Poyatos, 2002: II, 197–299; Zerubavel, 2006:13).

Silence can indicate topic switch, speaker's wish to continue the same topic, and disagreement.

*Corresponding Author's Email:
Khademisahar1@gmail.com

P-ISSN: 2750-0594
E-ISSN:2750-0608

In a conversation, silences lead to awkward situations among speakers and show trouble in conversation flow.

Silence is necessarily ambiguous, regardless of its special symbolic nature. After all, one individualmay perceive a woman's silence after a marriage proposal as approval, but disapproval by another (Nakane, 2007). Correspondingly, Jaworski (1993) called it "likely the most confusing of all linguisticaspects." Actually, literature is rife with examples in which two individuals perceive silence differently. While this uncertainty makes it a rich analysis field, it can also lead to communicative complications. Hence silence is axiological uncertain in communication: it does both positive and negative in contact (Jaworski, 1993) Starting with some of the positive features of silence, has been shown to be invaluable for speech output, as it enables preparation to take place (Riazantseva, 2001).Additionally, Nakane (2007) found that pauses help both speaker and listener: without breaks, listenershave extreme difficulty in keeping with the ongoing conversation and accurately translating it.

Paul Simon and Art Garfunkel wrote and performed the song Sounds of Silence in 1963. A proverbfrom West Africa says, "Silence is also speech" In his book Sartor Resartus in 1831, the English poetThomas Carlyle interpreted the sentence "Silence is Golden" from German. Chinese philosopher LaoTzu believed in the 6th century that "Silence is a source of great power". Evidently, silence is an important matter for societies all over the world. And still, do we know what that means? There is noconcept of a universe (Sifianou, 1997). The manner in which silence is used depends on both culture and circumstance. Most Asians are satisfied with a minute or two of silence; while Canadians and Americans are usually uncomfortable in discussions with more than a second of silence. For communities like Italians and Latin Americans, where people sometimes disrupt or complain to each other, this is distorted, and there's no silence. In several Asian countries, pausing for a few seconds before answering the question is considered respectful to demonstrate that you have concentrated on the question and your response, thus indicating enough gravitas. In comparison to this, there are manyWestern countries silence is seen as a vacuum to be filled in (Heritage, 2001).

Since the explanations for silence are infinite, it has many functions, too. One feature is "eloquent silences" which involve the use of silence at the funeral, religious ceremonies, as a legal right, or in response to a rhetorical question (Ephratt, 2008). Besides this, silence can be used to

suggest the avoidance of subjects, lack of knowledge to provide answers, agreement, disagreement, indignation, disappointment, confusion, hesitation, and others. While silence is an intrinsically beneficial phenomenon that has no function on its own, individual occasions of silence derive their meaning and function from the context around it. Modeling silence functions, therefore, includes conceptualization of the environment and the features capturing it. Context activities hold different communicative roles like asking, responding, voicing agreement, disagreement, etc.

Silence in human conversations provides insights into the thought process, emotion, and attitude (Richmond et al., 1991) among others. At the same time, silence is used to convey power (dominance)(Saunders, 1985; Tannen, 1990), respect, and manage conflicts.

Review of Related Studies

Multi-determinism characterizes silence, meaning its presence is defined by the multiplicity of environmental, psychological, linguistic, stylistic, and interactive considerations (Zuo, 2002). We cannot, therefore, analyze it in solitude, psychological, linguistic, heritage-based, stylistic, and collaborative dimensions of silence matter, but often they are ignored (Chafe, 1985; Nakane, 2007). Consequently, it is difficult to describe silence.

Sobkowiak (1997) thinks silence is best acoustically or pragmatically described. Tannen and Saville-Troike (1985) differentiate silence which is used from communicative silence to structure the communication. Enninger (1987) classifies silence into two types: situational silence, and cultural silence.

Pomerantz in Maynard (1980) argued that silence may occur due to disagreement. When the next speaker decides to give up the floor after a disagreement arises, it implies that the next speaker doesnot want to resolve the conflict nor discuss further the conflicted issue. Thus, as mentioned by Sacks, the previous speaker may take the floor. A new topic will usually be initiated if the previous speaker agrees that they should not discuss the conflict further and let the different perspective stays as it is. Sacks (1995) stated that the maximum standard of silence is about 1 second.

The participants of the conversations usually try to terminate the silence after the 1st second. Thus, what speakers do when silence emerges indicates the position of the speakers themselves.

Whenone participant decides to refuse to take the floor and then the current speaker hangs on the same topic,this means that the participants are not in a synchronized situation. In this kind of situation, one participant will feel that the participants fail to claim common ground and they do not have shared knowledge.

As an integral part and one characteristic feature of natural conversation, silence supplements verbal communication with its multiple informative and communicative functions. Therefore, studies on conversational silence occupy a significant position in conversation analysis. Scholars abroad havebegun to value studies on silence since the late 1980s. Tannen & Saville-Troike (1985) try to present current research on silence from a number of disciplines while emphasizing its complex nature as a cultural phenomenon. Samovar & Porter (1991) adopt a cross-cultural perspective. In *Silence: Perspectives*, Jaworski (1997) approaches silence from many points of view, Interdisciplinary including sociology, anthropology, aesthetics, and ethnography. Nakane (2006) conducts ethnographicstudies on silence patterns and their cultural meanings in the EFL class, especially in Mainland China.Each research above may focus on certain types or aspects of silence. There have been relevant studieson silence at home as well, such as research by Zuo, Y (1996); Gong & Wu (2003), and Liu & Zhong(2005). They are comparatively divisive and approach the issue from cross-cultural, pragmatic, and ethnographic angles. According to Sperber & Wilson (1986), silence as an ostensive-inferential act can convey the informative and communicative intentions of the communicator by sufficient processing efforts, from which contextual effect arises. The essay tries to approach conversational silence within the framework of relevance theory by elaborating its informative and communicative intentions and contextual effects: contextual implication, strengthening of contextual assumption, and elimination of a previously held assumption.

Silence can be oppression, community, or resistance, among other things, because it does something that has certain effects on the ways in which specific contexts of actions and enunciations unfold. In that respect, it is important to remember that, as Maurice Blanchot (1969) has demonstrated with regardto the figure of Bartleby in Herman Melville's Bartleby the Skrivener, one who does speak can also have an effect in a language game equivalent to that of silence. What is achieved through performing,or having others perform, depends on the configurations at play – that is, the polemic conflict throughwhich these actors interact with one another (see Berkman,

2011: 33, 41–42). Bartleby's 'I would prefer not to' and his silent attitude to the queries of the narrator demonstrates how the latter overinvestsmeaning into Bartleby's 'silences'.

Silence, however, can be said to be a radical irruption for it does not constitute the implementation of any 'linguistic system', as there is no operationalization through an 'act of speaking'; silence thus radically destabilizes a logocentric order. As noted, not all silences have that possibility, as silence (qua tacere) can be a specific maneuver and thus would constitute an art of not-saying (Glenn, 2004). Yet remaining silent in situations when/where it is allowed or assumed to be thenorm still remains an effect of the symbolic and political borders within which reality is working. Silence, however, does not constitute a (re)appropriation because it decenters and dissipatesthe place of voice in the polemological relations between strong and weak. In saying or doing, even within the situatedness of the arts of the weak, one is still taking part in the establishment of the contractbetween interlocutors, or what Scott (1990: 4–5) would call public transcripts. Silence qua silere is a radical irruption in the social and political contract between the state/the powerful and the rest that liesat the heart of the premises behind security studies and international relations (see Huysmans, 1998). It 'refuses' to enact that contract because it does not partake in a reaffirmation of an order, even by contesting it, that has been set by the state/the powerful.

Two forms of silence have been identified. According to Behnam and Nostratzadegan (2014), these include communicative silence and non-communicative silence. Communicative silenceis that form of silence that is relevant to discourse while the latter has little or no relevance to discourse.Significantly, communicative silence contributes to the success of the discourse in which it is applied andaccordingly, can be referred to as Eloquent Silence or Rhetorical Silence which is an active meanschosen by the speaker to convey his or her message during a conversational process (Ephratt 2008, in Behnam and Nostratzadegan 2014).

On the other hand, the linguists affirm that when silence experienced in discourse occurs in form of pause, or stillness, such are assumed to be non-communicative. It could be said that such a form of silence comes as a result of some physical or psychological limitations on the part of the speaker duringsocial interaction. That is why Ephratt (2007) states: Stillness is the absence of sound. It is the exterior to communicative interaction . . . Speakers' pauses inserted (when it is their time to speak) to breatheor to plan their next utterance, or for other psycholinguistic and cultural motives are non-communicative. As such, these pauses are differentiated from eloquent silence.

Silence in discourse is culture-specific. This is in line with Hudson's (1980) position that "many properties of language . . . (among which is silence) are also the property of culture in general and . . . meaning is best studied in relation to culture" He is of the opinion that culture is "something that everybody has some 'property' of a community, especially those which might distinguish it from other communities." Based on this, it could be said that the use of silence among speakers of Yorùbá language is culturally unique, and to study such silence usage efficiently, it is necessary to take into consideration the culture of the people involved, particularly that through verbal communication, culture influences non-verbal behaviors like silence a great deal (Matsumoto 2006).

Over the years, researchers have studied silence with respect to, but are not limited to, the location of silence in a conversation (Richmond et al., 1991; Jensen, 1973) or its role in a conversation (Cappella, 1980; Zimmermann and West, 1996; McLaughlin and Cody, 1982) or how its duration changes with different emotions (Alam et al., 2016). Silence has also been studied as a method for non-verbal communication (Kogure, 2007; Bruneau, 2008) and its practices in different cultures (Richmond et al., 1991), or in different contexts. It has also been observed as a powerful tool for conflict - management (Oduro,F, 2007), and within the context of psychotherapy (Frankel et al., 2006;Gale and Sanchez, 2005; Ladany et al., 2004; Ronningstam, 2006).

Silence, for Levinson (1983: 298-9), is the absence of speech and lack, whether relative or total, of audible sound. Analogously, it might refer to any absence of communication, even in media, otherthan speech. However, silence, with reference to nonverbal communication and spiritual connection, can be used as a total means of communication that, in a sense, refers to the no sounds uttered by anybody in any room and/or space. That is why McHoul (2006: 205) thinks silence in discourse refers back to a hidden 'meaning' that a historian or philosopher must find and interpret. Hence, having different interpretations in different contexts, silence shows its role as a vital factor from different cultural perspectives and in several activities, such as rituals. Wardhaugh (2006: 218) instructively draws attention to some of the ways in which people communicate in the world by employing lack oftalk, i.e. silence, as opposed to talk. Furthermore, the topic of silence has attracted many researchers.

In the field of law, for instance, depending on silence interpretation in legal contexts wherein a witness or suspect is questioned, Kurzon (1995, as cited in Nakane,2014, p. 165) identifies two

types of silence: unintentional non-deliberate silence that has some psychological reasons like embarrassment, shyness or needing to conceal ignorance, and intentional deliberate silence that showsthe addressee's attempt not to cooperate with the addresser; the latter is probable perceived negativelyby the addressers, i.e., police officers.

Furthermore, Kurzon (2006: 512) thinks that the accused's right of silence in the Anglo–American legal context, has been investigated pragmatically for more than one reason. First, it is investigated in order to answer the question of what the accused means by being silent during the police investigation. Second, it is investigated in terms of the comprehensibility of language communicationand establishing silence as a field of research associated with plain language.

In linguistics, silence in communication has been regarded as essential in communication as speech itself, despite being defined as “an absence of noise” (Paulston et al 2012: 158). Besides, for Fairclough (2015: 150), silence is a "weapon for the less powerful participant, [and] a way of beingnoncommittal about what more powerful participants say”. At various levels of discourse, it is said to be able to “affect power relationships in communication” (Paulston, et al., 2012: 161).

However, silence, in the form of silent pauses, is carefully examined in the light of the rules of turn-taking; so, there is no answer, and it is marked as “a violation of turn-taking rules” (Nakane, 2014: 166).

As an inaudible sound, silence is a 'fully-fledged event' in a conversation and consequential for the ensuing talk (Schegloff, 2001: 239). Hence, silences gain their interactional significance from their'sequential context' and their position there. A silence, for instance, where an utterance has not been brought to a possible end could often be taken not as silence but merely a pause in the continuous turnsof the speakers talking (Sacks et al. 1974: 715, in Schegloff 2001). Meanwhile, not all silences followinga turn’s possible completion are equivalent; following a question, silence may have different interpretations and results from a silence following an answer depending on structural or related empirical studies(ibid.).

Plenty of academic research has investigated the role of talk in the production of new knowledge (e.g. Tsoukas, 2009) creative problem-solving (e.g. Hargadon and Bechky, 2006), or robust decision-making (e.g. Nemeth and Goncalo, 2011). It is the voice rather than the silence, the talking rather thanthe withholding, which is endorsed in such paradigms. So, what difference do people make by their choice of what not to say in group discussion, or what to exclude from the

conversation? Surprisinglylittle research has tested at an empirical level the way in which the practice of self-censorship operatesin context.

Silence in the sense used in this paper draws on Van Dyne, Soon, and Botero's (2003) definition as being the withholding of suggestions, ideas, or information related to a work-related task. It is not simply an absence of sound. By its function of impeding the transmission of information that mightimprove the management of an organization or project, silence becomes conceptualized as somethingthat needs to be overcome for the benefit of the task at hand (Greenberg and Edwards, 2009).

The concept of self-censorship in organizational learning is not new, though it has appeared in different guises. Blackman and Sadler-Smith (2009), for instance, delineate a typology of silence basedon the accessibility of various types of knowledge. In their schema, self-censorship can be mapped against "withheld" or "suppressed" voices. It is what they term "the silenced" - that is, what could be said but which is not. Silence has been proposed as a barrier to knowledge exchange, creative innovation as well as constructive challenge and debate needed for robust decision-making (Morrison et al, 2011). The implications for organizational learning have been proposed as a lack of feedback about existing or potential problems, due in particular to a tendency to filter out or soften, negative messages (Milliken and Lam, 2009). Argyris refers to the cognitive assumptions which leadto issues being deemed undiscussable and hence to single-loop rather than double-loop learning (Argyris, 1990).

Such work starts from the proposition that speaking up involves some risk to the speaker and so needs to be nurtured by creating conditions of psychological safety for the voice to flourish (Perlow and Williams, 2003; Morrison and Milliken, 2003). Arguably the state of engagement being sought reflectswhat Tsoukas calls the relational, rather than calculated, engagement required for productive dialogue(Tsoukas, 2009). Morrison el al (2011) and LePine and Van Dyne (1998) provide two specific studiesof silence and voice within work groups. In both these studies, variables connected to the social context - group size, group cohesion, style of group management, etc. - are isolated and analyzed but the interactional process itself is external to the study, with methodology instead using post hoc, realist reports of people's perceptions and attitudes. How people act and talk while situated within the work group task, and the intersubjective processes of meaning-making, remain unstudied.

If we desire to communicate effectively with someone, it is essential to honor his or her map of the world, regardless of whether or not we agree. This allows us to gather information and more easilyunderstand their perspective, which will ultimately support us in creating consistent win agreements (Niurka, 2013). Trust influences organizational processes such as communication, cooperation, and information sharing, and it affects productivity. Trust is a basic element of functioning relationships in organizations.

Mental wellbeing is largely sustained by emotional support such as appreciation, respect, openness, and feedback. This can only be possible through true communication (Hakkinen, March 2011).The fundamental battle being fought in society is the battle over the minds of the people. The way people think determines the fate of norms and values on which societies are constructed because communication, and particularly socialized communication, the one that exists in the public realm, provides the support for the social production of meaning, the battle of the human mind is largely played out in the processes of communication (Castells, 2007).

Structures such as the wheel tended to have a more hierarchical structure, with the central membersreceiving more leadership nominations and having more control over the decisions made by the groupin contrast, structures such as common had flatter hierarchies with a more equal distribution of leadership nominations. Sometimes more centralized communication structures led to higher performance than less centralized communication structures, and sometimes to lower performance (Cameron Anderson, 2010). Communication exists within the family as a dynamic and essential force in the maintenance of relationships, and facilitates the development of the satisfied and healthy family." (Shwewyn P. Morreale, 2000).

The dynamics of not understanding each other's thoughts and discursive worlds can cause cooperative change efforts to break down, ending in frustrated professionals who refuse to take the interests of the others seriously (Jos H. Pieterse, 2012). The key to cross-cultural business understands one's business partners well enough to make cultural adjustments. The choice of trade language is normally a matter of convenience, reflecting thecompetencies of the parties involved. The primary purpose of intercultural communication is to increase understanding of culturally mediated communication phenomena. The "culture-specific" focuses on identifying the communication behaviors of a specific culture. A rich repertoire of verbal andnonverbal behaviors appropriate to the intercultural situation as well as effective capabilities to react sensitively to

fellow communicators from other cultures is a necessity in education (Hooker, 2008)Interpersonal communication skills are essential to all helping relationships of cross-cultural counseling (Gitimu, 2005).

We should use silence during our speech for emphasis. The effective use of silence is a powerful communication tool. Any bit of silence indicates that we are in charge and we want the attention of the audience in any conversation. The moment of silence will cause anyone not fully listening to refocus on us and will give greater impact to the phrase punctuated at either end by the silence. Silencecan be a real booster of our authority, competence, and self-assurance. Shakespeare called the eyes "The mirror of the soul." The eyes are a highly important communicator. The solution to sending the right signal with your eyes is simple and to the point: look at the person or people you are talking to (Collins, 2009). Pauses are a powerful and essential part of any presentation. A pause allows the listenersto make a personal connection to the word he or she just heard. A pause invites the listener to relax into the presentation. A pause makes it possible for the speaker to sense the response of an audience to a presentation. Pauses are those beautiful moments when meaning happens and common ground emerges. Because many of us are afraid of pauses and silence, we tend to clutter them with speech fillers. The ehms and OKs and you knows, the coughs, the giggles, heavy breaths, and the smacking of our lips. All the sounds we sneak into our speech to banish the silence (Nowak, 2013).

Silence is an under-explored theme in the mainstream literature on second language acquisition and on the methodology of teaching a second language (Bao, 2019). Silence is a hard topic to deal with when it comes to empirical research, simply because when learners talk, the research can recorddata for analysis, yet when learners are speechless, data hardly exist for one to collect and read. In fact, the association between words and silence has historically divided Eastern and Westernsocial, educational, and academic attitudes over the past century toward which one is the more cherished mode of communication (Zembylas, 2008; Belanoff, 2001).

While in some non-Western cultures, silence may be required to express a role or a voice, in manyWestern contexts, the obsession with words sometimes causes one to be intolerant toward silence andview the wordless person as subordinate, or in Karmen's (2001, p. 4) words, as being 'inadequately educated, believe it or not, more research on silence has come from other disciplines including psychology and sociology than research in second languageacquisition.

Although the discourse has embraced rich discussion on the silent period (Krashen, 1985), the inner speech stage (Vygotsky, 1986), internalization (Winegar, 1997), private speech (SavilleTroike, 1988), and inner voice (Tomlinson, 2001), it has been acknowledged that today's research on inner speech is not much easier than such research in Vygotsky's time (Ehrich, 2006). Given all the subtletiesand complexities of human talk that make it hard to research on talk (Edwards & Westgate, 1987), research on silence is many times more difficult as there is virtually no scientific method to transcribesilence. As a constantly evolving discipline in the fields of linguistics and psycholinguistics, second language acquisition was initially concerned with cognition and over the years has moved to exploree effect (Chambers, 2007) as well as other areas in language development. Despite such dynamics, the role of silence in L2 education has been treated with great caution and, as far as research findings areconcerned, has hardly been connected to learning abilities in optimistic ways.

Scholarly research during the 1960s and 1970s pointed out that children who remain reticent in class were often perceived as socially and intellectually incompetent (Gordon & Thomas, 1967) as they make poorer school progress than their peers (Feshback et al., 1974; Stevenson et al., 1976; Colligan, 1979). In fact, silence in SLA discourse until the 1980s was mentioned as resistance to speech(Harder, 1980), difficulty in performance, and lack of comprehension (Dulay et al., 1982; Gibbons, 1985). While acknowledging silence as the initial stage of language study, SLA scholarly research untilrecently remains uncertain about how to proceed to address the continuing role of silence in the 'post-silent era' – a term which indicates the end of the silent film era and which is mentioned to criticize how excessive talk can weaken the subtlety of communicative silence. Although this debate in the movie industry seems irrelevant to language learning, it reminds us that silence should be seen as more than just a period when we were hopeless due to the inability to produce speech and that silence continues to play a significant role in L2 development.

In fact, SLA shows less interest in private speech than overt production (Saville-Troike, 1988) andseems 'insufficiently curious about silence as part of the second language learning process' (Granger,2004, p. 30).

Silence has been analyzed using various methods and various viewpoints. The first approach, the social-psychological method, examines how the use of silence corresponds with social and psychological features such as sex, age, gender, and temperament. There's proof to prove it does.

Thereis a high prevalence of the use of silence among middle-class individuals than among working-class people and disparities in the prevalence of silence between cross-gender and same-sex contact(Scollon, 1985). Gender may also influence the degree and length of silence, and silence behaviors areinter-generationally distinct, with earlier generations using silence in a more culturally traditional manner (Kivik, 1998). Introverts prefer to use silence longer and longer and talk slower than extroverts (Crown & Feldstein, 1985). Indeed, it indicates that silences reported in a laboratory settingin English conversations have a more solid relationship to personality and attitude differences (as tested on standard behavioral tools) than vocalizations would (Tannen, 1985)

The second approach, the psycholinguistic approach to silence, emphasizes the diffusion of silence in speech sequences, and its role in the preparation and development of speech. Researchers who follow this line of thought conclude that silence in speech represents the lexical decision-making processes of the speaker and his / her choice of individual terms. In spontaneous expression, silence appears to precede words of great unpredictability and complexity (Nakamura, 2004). Compared to simpler speech, nevertheless, semantically complex speech does not necessarily imply more silence, and therefore no more preparation is needed to generate it (Zuo, 2002). Indeed, the silence between syntactic units tends to perform two features: boundary marking and hesitation.

Hesitations are generally due to the speaker having trouble in determining, not whether to verbalizebut rather how to verbalize it (Chafe, 1985). In fact, having something in one's external consciousnesswill eliminate uncertainty when otherwise it would occur (Chafe, 1985). All in all, much of the work that comes under this approach is restricted to spontaneous speech in monologs and narratives, and conversational silence work is minimal (Zuo, 2002). The third key approach to understanding silencearises from a cross-cultural viewpoint. Under this approach, there are two perspectives on silence: therelativist and the universalist (Jaworski, 1993). The preceding notes that there are no absoluteuniversals with the use of silence cross-cultural, whereas the latter indicates that there are still certainaspects that we all have general similarities in our use of silence, given the differences. For instance, initial findings from Riazantseva (2001) illustrate that although patterns of pause length may be linguistically-specific, the pause frequency and pause spread may be standardized. Further work is required before an argument of this nature can be completely

validated.

Lastly, earlier silence scholars regarded silence and speech as two discrete, opposite categories (Jaworski, 1993). Nevertheless, more lately, scholars have proposed that, rather than seeing silence asan antithesis to speech, it is easier (and more logical) to place silence and expression on a communicative spectrum of most to least verbal-linguistic types. Therefore, speech is put at one end of a spectrum, and silence at the other end, and both are formulated as alternating forms instead of two separate dichotomous, and clear-cut contrary categories (Jaworski, 1993). The conceptualization ofsilence and expression encourages a modern collaborative approach to silence, which in silence studyseeks to overcome most, if not all, dichotomies. The analysis of literature on the theory of conversation in CA indicates that sermons can be interpreted as discussion; and as such, the trends which characterize the data for this analysis, the sermons of Pastor E.A. Adeboye, fall within the context of conversational analysis. The CA methodology recognizes and analyzes trends such as repeated verbal and nonverbal characteristics andinteractional approaches in the sermons. Classroom Discourse (Fakoya, 1998), (Nwachukwu, 2011), Religious Discourse (Adedun, 2010), and (Rotimi, 2007, 2011) are instances of such studies. The studies illustrate the suitability of Conversational Analysis as a theoretical model for the analysis of discourse aspects that define discourse in general, and in specific religious conversations, and further support the use of CA in this research to examine discourse features in sermonic discourse.

Some studies have been conducted to investigate interruption. Zimmerman & House (1975), for example, claimed that interruption displays power and dominance. The infamous result, later, has beenreferred to in many following studies by different researchers. Another researcher, Li (2001), explored interruption by using a different approach. In her study, she investigated interruption based on the cultural background of the speakers – Canadian and Chinese. Quite the opposite of interruption, as mentioned in many studies, the absence of words might also carry meaning. Thus, the writers believe that silence could also indicate the situation or the feelings of the participants. It is surely understandable that participants of the conversation, especially casual conversation, would expect a harmonious exchange of turns in order to create smooth conversations. The smooth conversations willeventually induce a sense of belonging. Meanwhile, disrupted conversations will result in negativefeelings such as the feeling of being rejected.

Conclusion

Successful communication requires us not only to get information from speech but also to understand what is conveyed by silence, because sometimes “silence is more useful than speech. Though silence means a total lack of audible sound, it is in no way related to the absolute absence of communication.

It is self-evident that studying silence is so significant that it inters into the various domains and different levels of linguistics. Unmarked speech and marked silence are what identify a certain talk with organized communicative functions of silence and classify them in different ways.

Apparently, Pinter in The Dumb Waiter has employed Jaworski's (2006) three functions of silence.However, the most employed one is the interpersonal function as it reflects the 'power' of one of the characters over the other and shows the 'distance' between them.

Silence as mental rehearsal provides conditions for self-directed learning which may be either connected to or independent from the teaching. Pedagogy founded on a profound understanding of productive silence can liberate learners from the constraint of having to produce impulsive, low-qualityparticipation. Silence needs to be managed with an acute awareness of why, how, when, and how long a student needs it to support their own learning and when the verbal mode of learning should take over.

Obligatory talk can be frustrating when learners are required to publicize their half-baked thoughtswhen they are unprepared to do so. Silence training should be organized to include reflectivity, concentration, outcome, and avoidance of idle, unproductive moments–the same way as talk that needsto be directed to enhance learning rather than become a mere social time in the classroom. The structureof learning might fundamentally change when this knowledge is applied so that learners can employ both silence and talk as learning tools in conscious, informed ways.

Robert, Francis, & Morgan (2006) proposed silence may be a sign of difficulty in conversation. The study results suggest that the regular occurrence of silence is an indication of the conversations 'interrupted flow. The participants in an interrupted conversation would most likely feel excluded andsuffer negative sentiments according to Koudenburg (2011). The involvement of silence in a discussion can be said to cause negative feelings for the participants and represent a strained discussion. Therefore, the low level of silence in any discussion indicates the active participation of the participants in the talks and their progress in group membership growth.

References

Adell, J., Bonafonte, A., & Mancebo, D.E. (2007). Filled Pauses in Speech Synthesis: Towards Conversational Speech. *TSD*.

Agyekum, K. (2002). The communicative role of silence in Akan. *Pragmatics 12*(1), 31–51and in Interpersonal Relations. Riesling, Tel Aviv, (in Hebrew), pp. 7–25.

Argyris, C. (1990). Overcoming organizational defenses: Facilitating organizational learning. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Behnam, B., & Nosratzadegan, N. (2014). A Discourse Study of Rhetorical Silence in Persian and English Literature.

Berger, Charles R., (2004). Speechlessness: causal attributions, emotional features, and social consequences, *Journal of Language and Social Psychology 23*(2):147-179.

Bilmes, Jack, (1994). Constituting Silence: Life in the world of total meaning. *Semiotica* 98, 73–87.

Bindeman, S. L. (1981). Heidegger and Wittgenstein: The Poetics of Silence. Blackman.

Sadler-Smith, E. (2009) 'The Silent and the Silenced in Organizational Collins, P. (2009). Speak with power and confidence: tested ideas for becoming more consequences. *A Journal of Language and Social Psychology 23*(2), 147–179.

Cortini, M. (2001). Silence in multi-parties' conversations. In: Weigand, E., Dascal, M.Cotterill, Janet, 2005. 'You do not have to say anything': instructing the jury on the Courtenay, Charles, (19160. The Empire of Silence. Sturgis and Walton, New York.

CROWN, C. L., & FELDSTEIN, CS. (1991). The perception of speech rate from the sound-silence patterns of monologues. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 20, 47–63.

Dat, B. (2020) Exploring How Silence Communicates. Monash University, Australia3, (1),1-13. defendant's right to silence in the English criminal justice system. *Multilingual 24*, 7–24.

Dressen-Hammouda, D. (2002). Textual silence in scientific research articles: Recontextualizations of the field account in geology. *Hermes: Journal of Language and Communication Studies, 28*, 81-107.

Ephratt, M. (2007). On silence—introduction. *Silences—Silence in Culture and in Interpersonal Relations. Resling, Tel Aviv, (in Hebrew)*, 7-25.

Feshbach, S., Adelman, H. and Fuller, W. W. (1974). 'Early identification of children with high

General, *Semantics*, 30, 249–257.

Glenn, C. (2004). Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence. Carbondale, IL: Southern IllinoisUniversity Press.

Glenn, Cheryl, (2004). Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, IL.

Hawkings, P. R. (1971). The syntactic location of hesitation pauses. *Language and Speech* 14, 277– 288.

Huckin, Thomas, (2002). Textual silence and the discourse of homelessness. *Discourse & Society*.

Jensen, V. J. (1973). Communicative functions of silence. A Review of Knowing and Learning, *Management Learning, 40*(5), 569-585.

Kurzon, D. (1995). The right of silence: a socio-pragmatic model of interpretation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 23*, 55-69.

Kurzon, Dennis, (1998). Discourse of Silence. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, and Philadelphia.

Lane, R. C. Koetting, Mark. G. & Bishop, J. (2002). Silence as communication in *Language and Intercultural Communication 2*(1), 37–54.

Liu, J. (2002). Negotiating Silence in American Classrooms: Three Chinese Cases. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 2*, 37 - 54.

Jason, (2001). The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis.

Lam, N., & Milliken, F.J. (2009). Making the decision to speak up or not: Implications for organizational learning.

Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2003). Speaking up, remaining silent: The dynamics of voice and silence in organizations-Guest editors' introduction. *Journal of Management Studies, 40* (6), 1353-1358.

Olsen, T. (2003). Silences. Feminist Press at the City University of New York, New York Organizations', *Organization Science, 20* (6), 941-957.

Peterkiewicz, J, (1970). The Other Side of Silence: The Poet at the Limits of Language. Philadelphia, pp. 167–180.

Rovine, H. (1987). Silence in Shakespeare: Drama, Power, and Gender. University of Michigan silence and communication, happiness, sexual love, and death. International Review Silent: implications for organizational learning' in Greenberg, J. a. E., Marissa S., ed.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). Relevance: communication and cognition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Steiner, G. (1967). Language and Silence. Faber & Faber, London. synthesis: toward conversational Text, Speech, and Dialogue, LNCS In: Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on speech 4629.Springer, Plzen, Czech Republic, pp. 358–365. Thesis. The University of Haifa, Israel.

Tsoukas, H. (2009) 'A Dialogical Approach to the Creation of New. Knowledge in University Pressof America, Washington, DC.

Vainioma¨ki, T. (2004). Silence as a cultural sign. *Semiotic* 150, 347–361. Voice and Silence in Organizations, Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 225 – 244Voice and Silence in Organizations', *Journal of Management Studies, 40*(6), 1353-1358.

Zelotsovsky-Levy, H. (2003). The silence (Samt) in early Islamic mysticism. Unpublished MA.

Zembylas, M. (2008). 'The sound of silence in educational pedagogy,' *Educational Theory, 54*(2), 1.

Zimmerman, D., & House., C. W. (1975). Sex Roles, Interruptions and Silences in Conversation.