



## Semantic Analysis of Silence in Conversational Discourse



### Review article

#### Journal of Linguistics and Foreign Languages

Volume 1, Issue 1, 2020

© 2020 The Author(s). This article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.

#### Article Information

Submitted: 4<sup>th</sup> April 2020

Accepted: 18<sup>th</sup> April 2020

Published: 20<sup>th</sup> May 2020

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest was reported by the authors

Funding: None

Additional information is available at the end of the article



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

To read the paper online, please scan this QR code



**Alberta Aseye Ama Duhoe<sup>1</sup> & Ebenezer Giddi<sup>2</sup>** 

<sup>1</sup>Department of Linguistics, Literature and Foreign Languages, Kenyatta University

<sup>2</sup>Department of Applied Linguistics, University of Education, Winneba

Correspondence: [duhoe12@gmail.com](mailto:duhoe12@gmail.com)

#### Abstract

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. A good conversation should involve back-channel support from the receiver. In some instances, especially during conversations, be it interrogation, peer discussion or formal interaction, one party may relent in responding to an ongoing discussion. Once this happens, the speaker is demotivated to continue and many thoughts begin to run through the mind of the speaker. However, it is especially evident when it happens, and may signify either an expression of control or an absence of control. The work focuses on pauses and differences, analyzes their power roles encrypted in silence. The study adopted a desktop literature review method (desk study). This study further used a behavioral approach while researching and writing this essay, which would involve evaluating the meaning embedded in a silence by considering the environment and the situation at hand in that very moment. The drawing and interpretation of observations and sense which is not a quantitative impact evaluation, was important in this context.

**Keywords:** *conversational analysis, conversational discourse, silence, silence message, semanticity*



#### How to Cite:

Duhoe, A. A. A., & Giddi, E. (2020). Semantic Analysis of Silence in Conversational Discourse. *Journal of Linguistics and Foreign Languages*, 1(1). Retrieved from <https://royalliteglobal.com/jlfl/article/view/105>



## Introduction

While watching BBC's Hard talk discussions and their equivalents in different languages, for instance, it is evident the continuous expression flow characteristic of this kind of fast-turned confrontational interviews, speakers distract each other more often than not, and regular overlaps that could last for a long time. That implies no speaker abandons the floor easily. During the entire interview there is an aspect of tension that is always on the verge of conflict. The remaining solution is for some of the members in the discussion to remain silent for the discussion to take the order. Silence, in human interactions, is a multifaceted naturally occurring phenomenon that carries knowledge rich in context and purpose. While "silence" is commonly characterized as the absence of speech (Jaworski, 1992) or a break in a communicative flow, its presence has the power to convey a message, as well as cause a similar human reaction to any other conversational action. Among others, silence in human interactions offers insights into the cycle of thinking, emotion, and attitude (Richmond et al., 1991). Simultaneously, silence is used to express authority (dominance) (Saunders, 1985), reverence, and conflict management.

Since the explanations for silence are infinite, it has many functions, too. One feature is "eloquent silences" which involve the use of silence at funeral, religious ceremonies, as a legal right, or in response to a rhetorical question (Ephratt, 2008). Besides this, silence can be used to suggest avoidance of subjects, lack of knowledge to provide answers, agreement, disagreement, indignation, disappointment, confusion, hesitation and others. While silence is an intrinsically beneficial phenomenon which 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. Since dialog actions are allocated to the fragments of speech (turns) accompanying the long silences, they provide the details that could be used to interpret the meaning of instances of silence (Schlegloff, 1972). This silence may have been used again to plan the response, or the answering speaker could have taken the time to formulate the next step. We pose a circumstance where the category of silence is intentionally used to compel another speaker to respond. The silence can perform other cognitive functions in both cases, such as managing emotional attitudes. The silence roles we observe range from the planning for the answer to the uncertainty to the questioning of certain questions. It is also noted that such long silences are often used deliberately to get a prompted response from another speaker. It may also mean that

the new speaker is undecided. The observed functions, such as hesitations, are also related to another speech phenomenon, that is, disfluencies.

### **Semanticity of Silence**

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, to; 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 the 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. The former is conditioned by theoretical demands while the latter is mainly influenced by tradition. A popular silence author, Adam Jaworski (1993), totally opposes any final concept of silence because of this apparent lack of agreement. Independent of how it is described, it is very clear that silence is syntactic, because it forms sequences of expression, semantic, and it carries meaning, and pragmatic, because it conducts social relationships (Kivik, 1998).

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. There is 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 are inter-generationally distinct, with earlier generations using silence in a more culturally traditional manner (Kivik, 1998). Introverts prefer to use silences longer and longer, and talk slower than extroverts (Crown & Feldstein, 1985). Indeed, it indicates that silences reported in a laboratory setting in 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 on 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, 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 verbalize but rather how to verbalize it (Chafe, 1985). In fact, having something in one's external consciousness will 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 narrative, and conversational silence work is minimal (Zuo, 2002). The third key approach to understanding silence arises from a cross-cultural viewpoint. Under this approach, there are two perspectives on silence: the relativist and the universalist (Jaworski, 1993). The preceding notes that there are no absolute universals with the use of silence cross-cultural, whereas the latter indicates that there are still certain aspects 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 as an 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, clear-cut contrary categories (Jaworski, 1993). The conceptualization of silence and expression encourages a modern collaborative approach to silence, which in silence study seeks to overcome most, if not all, dichotomies.

### **Silence in Conversations**

Each aspect of the conversations has significance, including a quick humming and even the avoidance of words or silence. Silence may convey various meanings, depending on what happens before or after the silence. As Maynard (1980) has said, while one speaker contributes developments in the field, the other may produce answers to the expression to continue the field. Nonetheless, silence most definitely existed in the case where the counterpart did not catch where the discussion is going. Silence in this kind of situation means that the participants have not come to an understanding on the subject of the conversation (Fakoya 1998). It is in contrast to the interruption that occurs commonly

when the speakers have agreed on the subject and when they are negotiating their judgment and knowledge. By analyzing the data, the members who can effectively create membership actively participate during the smooth conversations that result. The writers have also found that silence in the smooth discussions rarely happens (Jaworski, 1992). The study results, on the other hand, show that the high frequency of silence suggests tense conversations as the pre-conflict causes the silence. There are two common things causing silence: contrasting mutual awareness and discord (Schlegloff, 1972).

As the discussion goes on the members will show each other their feeling of belonging. There are cases also where participants find they have separate groups of friends. It leads to new, common information. Koudenburg (2011) proposed that smooth conversations would result in higher rates of belonging as opposed to disrupted conversations. Presence of silence shows the interrupted conversations. The above excerpts illustrate how the reluctance of the participants to take turns disturbs the discussion flow. If the speakers feel they have failed to assert common ground, they are more likely to withdraw from the conversation by remaining silent.

Pomerantz in Maynard (1980) also claimed that the discord could lead to silence. If the next speaker wants to give up the floor after dispute occurs, this means that the next speaker doesn't want to settle the conflict or address the topic further. Thus the previous speaker can take the floor as stated by Sacks. Usually a new subject would be introduced if the previous speaker decides that the issue will not be further explored and the various viewpoints remain as they are. Sacks (1995) said the optimum standard of silence was approximately 1 second. Conversation members typically attempt to end the silence after 1st second. Thus, what participants do when silence occurs shows the speakers' position as such. When one person decides to decline to take the floor and then the present speaker holds on the same subject, this implies the participants are not in a coordinated situation. In such a case, one participant may believe the participants refuse to assert common ground and have no mutual information (Schlegloff, 1972).

Silence is indicative of conflict between speakers. In this case, silence typically occurs after participants express their opinion on a given subject and find out they have different views. Typically, one of the speakers will lift various subjects, and obey the others. This ensures that both participants accept that they do not hold similar opinions and there is no need to further discuss them. 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 and suffer 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.

### **Interruptions in Conversations**

Participants in the talks sometimes continue the comments of the current speakers but there is no suggestion of whether or not the current speakers have completed their shifts. This repetition is known to be an interruption because it usually happens with no or very small difference between the present speakers 'last word and the succeeding speakers' first word (Jaworski, 1992). The object of this interruption is to finish transitions of other speakers. The speakers are attempting to put oneself in the same place with their speaking counterparts by completing turns of their speaking counterparts. Edwards and Middleton in Koudenburg (2011) proposed that the synchronization of information and conduct among speakers is indicated by talking in perfect harmony or completing the cycle of each speaker's opportunity. It also means consensus was reached among the participants. Accomplishing each other's turns is thus a reflection of the participants 'effort to present themselves as part of the very same group. To conclude, the existence of interruption suggests the participant's community membership (Fakoya 1998).

Interruption does not happen only in the scenario where the speakers are trying to finish the turn of their opponents talking. This can also occur in the case where the second speaker cuts the first speaker before finishing the utterance (Jaworski, 1992). This disruption cannot, however, be seen as an effort to dominate the floor and achieve supremacy. This can be called, on the opposite, a symbol of vibrant and constructive discussion. The following extract provides further insight into the circumstances in which cutting the turn of other speakers is seen as an attempt to establish and retain membership. Collaborative behavior represents the existence of interruptions, either to complete or to break other turns. Coates in Caskey (2011) claimed that it is normal for casual discussion participants to contribute to the discussion as a form of collaborative act at the same moment. This shows the ability of the participants to work with each other in developing the discussion. This group engagement would eventually create a relaxed atmosphere and build sense of belonging for the participants. Furthermore, interruption requires the synchronization of information and actions between speakers.

It is in line with Koudenburg (2011) who said synchronous moving people are viewed as a group. Therefore, it can be inferred that disruption is an indication of active interactions, and implies participant participation. The speakers don't actually know

every story their peers delivered during the discussion. It does not, however, allow speakers to express their opinions. Quite definitely, the opinions shared are based on the premise that the participants acknowledge each other's situation and understand how it feels to be in similar circumstance (Fakoya 1998). Speakers can therefore easily cut or complete the turn of their counterpart to convey their views. The interruptions occurring in the preceding excerpt are called cooperative interruptions as they are meant to display the same viewpoint among speakers. The interruption reflects the speakers' attempt to maintain membership in their group. According to Tannen (1994), interruption not only shows supremacy but can also be used to create solidarity. Interruption could be used to create a constructive dialogue in which the participants seek to build unity and communication.

It is important for the members in the discussions to find some common ground among the speakers. The common ground is fluent dialogue building (Fakoya, 1998). The common ground is typically asserted by sharing of mutual information and complementary viewpoint at the same time. On the basis of the extracts provided above, it can be inferred that interruption, either as a completion of other turns, or as a cut in the turn of counterparts, may mean the membership of the speaker. The interruption presence reflects common information and perspective exchanged amongst group members (Schlegloff, 1972). The conversations in which each participant can openly interrupt other speakers often reflect the fluidity of the conversations and the equal power exchanged between the participants.

A collaborative talk is characterized by speaker involvement. Under such talk, interruptions may occur at high frequency. The fast exchange of turns often suggests collective talk to hold the same topics for long conversation. On the contrary, high frequency silence and frequent change of topics identify a disruptive chat. Collaborative talks should create a greater sense of belonging and provide a positive condition for the participants to establish and sustain their membership. While, conversations with destructive flow can trigger more negative sentiment among the participants, undermining the speakers' sense of belonging.

### **Conversational Discourse**

Sacks, Schlegloff, and Jefferson (1974) developed conversational analysis. Conversational Analysis is a method to discourse analysis which focuses on conversational relationships such as formal and informal discussion or discourse. It is an approach to conversation analysis that advocates for the distribution of repeated trends and modes of organization across communications that occur naturally (Levinson, 1983 and Fakoya

1998:50). This reality sets CA apart from other approaches to the study of discourse. This is the study of speak social organization.

Natural language research in CA offers structure and control of the social contexts in which the interactions are conducted. Accordingly, CA offers a summary of how conversations achieve order. This concentrates on the specifics of real events. According to Levinson (1983), conversation is described as 'family predominant form of talk in which two or more members freely alternate in speech, and typically occurs in specific settings' that include religious events. Conversation has been regarded by scholars as informal expression, by some as formal speaking, and by others as both. Hornby (1974) considers communication as an informal discussion, in which people share news, feelings and ideas.

At the other hand, Schlegloff (1972) and Yule (1985) view conversation as a formal debate, with a turn-taking constraint law. Odekunbi (2006) regards communication as both a formal and informal communication. The contrasting views contribute to the number of participants associated; and habits of taking turns. Conversational characteristics characterize some forms of discourse, and sermons are an example. According to Heritage (1984), three theories characterize CA, namely (1) structurally ordered interaction; (2) context-oriented contributions to interactions; 3) These two properties indicate that no order of description, a priori as dysfunctional, unintentional or irrelevant, can be ignored or dismissed in the specifics of the relationship (Fakoya 1998:50). This informs the need to research the structures and characteristics of discourse in religious sermons, and the role they play in fulfilling the original purpose of sermons. CA includes the technique to examine trends in conversation, for example how to handle turn-taking in dialogue. Factors such as 'adjacency pairs' consisting of question and answer pairs, delays of various duration, or how certain utterances are 'repaired' by the speaker as per their occurrence and position in a conversation, which are CA details (Heritage, 2001).

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 and interactional 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



conversation, and further support the use of CA in this research to examine discourse features in sermonic discourse.

### **Silence, Culture and Religion**

Paul Simon and Art Garfunkel wrote and performed the song Sounds of Silence in 1963. A proverb from West Africa says, "Silence is also speech" In his book Sartor Resartus in 1831, the English poet Thomas Carlyle interpreted the sentence "Silence is Golden" from German. Chinese philosopher Lao Tzu 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 no concept of 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 many Western countries silence is seen as a vacuum to be filled in (Heritage, 2001).

In these societies, if they can't answer a question right away, people worry that the speaker may think they don't know the answer. Assume the uncertainty this can create in a Malaysian-American conversation. The American says something else when the Malaysian doesn't react immediately, trying to get an answer from the Malaysian; while the Malaysian is waiting for silence so they can continue the conversation. Ever tried to speak or write in a language other than yours? May be a challenge. One can write memos in English while still working in Indonesia many years ago, and afterwards translate them into Bahasa Indonesia (Adedun, 2010). While an individual could speak well enough to make oneself understood, without this layer of translation one would not be able to establish complex communication in Bahasa (Jaworski, 1993). When communicating to someone whose first language is not English, the person can need time to ponder the question, frame and respond, and then translate their thoughts into English before answering. When someone don't know this, one might unintentionally interrupt the silence and then ask the same question, assuming the person didn't understand your first question (Sifianou, 1997).

The Asian and Nordic countries have traditions of listening where silence signifies cautious thinking. Such cultures think that pauses (silence) hold the exchange balance in a conversation. Silence may be a way, in some situations, for all to save face (Heritage,

2001). What isn't said can be as significant as what has been in these communities. For group-oriented cultures it is respectful to remain quiet when the viewpoint is not in line with the group's viewpoint. Since silence has many implications in listening cultures, decoding silence in any situation is essential. If you give a presentation to a community in Japan, for instance, and the senior Japanese closes his eyes and is silent, this can mean contradictory things (Scollon, 1985). His silence could mean agreeing with what the interviewer is saying; but it could also imply he doesn't want to disagree openly. Why can you be conscious of the difference? Typically speaking, the optimal solution is to slow down your expression in speech and ensure that you speak in a way that isn't too complex and that it doesn't use too many idioms. Instead, one can try to ask a question to verify comprehension (Adedun, 2010).

Some Western cultures think silence is a case of lack of interest or even dissatisfaction in the discussion. For instance, Americans mostly see silence as meaning that the individual is indifferent, angry or disagree with them. The silence confuses and confuses them, because it varies too much from anticipated behavior (Scollon, 1985). Others are also humiliated by silence and race to fill the gap so they don't feel awkward any longer. Speaking is also the remit of the oldest or senior most person in hierarchical community cultures. Others are required to remain quiet and speak only when told or asked to confirm or deny. If one is from a more hierarchical community and usually watch your loquacious colleague become strangely quiet, this can be very unsettling to witness (Jaworski, 1993). Comprehending how different cultures react to the silence will help communication flow when holding a multi-cultural gathering. If the majority of the participants come from a community where silence is discouraged, they can acknowledge that their colleagues who do not speak up instantly have anything positive to say, they just need some space before they enter the conversation (Sifianou, 1997). Alternatively, if the majority of participants come from a country where silence is expected, they'll understand that their colleagues who don't let them get a word in isn't disrespectful.

Silence is also a symbol for inner stillness in the spirituality (Heritage, 2001). A quiet mind, liberated from the onslaught of patterns of thinking and feeling, is both a dream and a significant step in spiritual growth. This "inner silence" is not about the absence of sound; rather, it is understood to bring one into contact with the spiritual, absolute truth, or the sacred essence of one's own true self. Many religious practices suggest the importance of being quiet and still in mind and spirit in order to bring about transformative and fundamental spiritual development (Adedun, 2010). There is the silence of contemplative prayer in Christianity, such as refocusing prayer and Christian meditation; there are the Sufis 'wisdom teachings in Islam, which focus on the

value of keeping peace inside. In Buddhism the concepts of silence are suggested as a function of spiritual liberation, enabling the mind to become quiet (Scollon, 1985). In Hinduism, including Advaita Vedanta's teachings and the many paths of yoga, teachers insist that silence, Mauna, is necessary for inner development. Eckhart Tolle says that silence can be seen either as the lack of noise, or as the environment in which sound resides, just as the absence of thought or the space in which thoughts are interpreted can be seen as inner stillness (Sifianou, 1997). Silence is a tradition is a protection fence to Torah, tithing a security fence to property, attempting abstinence as a safety fence; a security fence for wisdom (Heritage, 2001).

### **Aspects of Negativity and Positivity in Silence**

Silence is necessarily ambiguous, regardless of its special symbolic nature. After all, one individual may perceive a woman's silence after a marriage proposal as approval, but a disapproval by another (Nakane, 2007). Correspondingly, Jaworski (1993) called it "likely the most confusing of all linguistic aspects." Actually, literature is rife with examples in which two individuals perceive the 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 listeners have extreme difficulty in keeping with the ongoing conversation and accurately translating it.

Silence may also provide feedback in some situations by having both interlocutors to demonstrate shared understanding, or by compensating for a failure to understand (Nakamura, 2004). For instance, in a class room, if instructors use silence as an engaging tool and a source of input, they may use it to include appropriate opportunities for students, such as rephrasing questions and inquiries, flipping the word order and making topic pronunciations more clear (Nakamura, 2004). In addition, by using silence, non-native English speakers eliminate face loss by evading asking to reiterate the native English speakers. Similarly, silence can be respectful in those cases where the speaker thinks that what he or she wishes to say could cause discord (Cruz, 2008).

However, silence also has a negative side. Silence which carries meaning is called "directly related silence" (Cutting, 2008), and long non-attributable silences results in discomfort in cultures with lower tolerance to silence. Participants usually break silences after about a second in most Western discussions, since long pauses build a stress that

people want to avoid (Gould, 2008). Indeed, researchers discovered that silence frequently carries negative associations, since talking is desirable behavior for competent vocabulary users simply because of social interactions (phatic communion) (Sifianou, 1997). There is an excess of adverse (often ethnic) silence assumptions, as Scollon (1985) found out, and attributions correlated with slower turn exchanges are almost all pessimistic. Silence is also seen as unsettling the smooth conversational flow (Jenkins, 2000). Indeed, plenty of people see speech as a machine. If one thinks the engine will still run, then silence will suggest failure. Also researchers (who use words such as "productivity" to characterize a decrease in interview pauses) hold the view that the natural state of the "process" is a steady hum, with delay or silence signaling trouble or difficulty (Scollon, 1985).

Indeed, the silence-is-bad perception is so profoundly rooted in the Western psyche that when people start talking to someone they don't like, they talk more slowly, with prolonged pauses between gestures, and use more silence (Jaworski, 1993). In addition, Walker's (1985) work into witness testimony found that silent gaps in the hearer can generate doubt. He showed that incorrect attribution about one of the testimonial features can also lead to misattributions about other aspects of it. Therefore, in a friendly witness what appears to be a pause for reflection is suspected of being a pause for concealment in a witness on the other side. In certain situations, thinking-before-talking can be a poor idea, after all. Work from classroom environments demonstrates that silence can also be a double-edged sword in there. Duff (2002) stated in her research that NNS students were often scared because of their English to be mocked or laughed at in class so silence preserves them from embarrassment. However, this intercultural communication isolation draws scorn from NS students, for whom silence is "a lack of ambition, an organization, a willingness to better one's English or an inability to deliver interesting material for the sake of the class" (Duff, 2002). Similarly, Nakane (2007) recorded that silence is frequently viewed inaccurately as either a lack of commitment or a negative attitude towards research.

### **Methodology**

This study further used a behavioral approach while researching and writing this essay, which would involve evaluating the meaning embedded in a silence by considering the environment and the situation at hand in that very moment. The drawing and interpretation of research findings and sense which is not a quantitative impact evaluation, was important in this context, which implies that qualitative and thematic analysis was most suitable in this study. A qualitative textual evaluation method was used in this research. Textual analysis consists of review and interpretation of scripts and

articles (Duff, 2002) and their inferential context in relations to the silence implications and message in the silence in relation to the environment. As a tool of interpretation and significance, an observer is likely to misunderstand the original intent, especially in cross-cultural analysis, of the message writer. Cutting (2008), nevertheless, reaffirmed its reliability and adequacy, in particular when the researcher pays attention to text itself. In this regard, Jaworski (1993) suggested more interpretation of the texts and their targeted discussion environment in view of the time and situation in which they were written.

### **Conclusion**

Far too often, when we have thoughts we think or feel confident the other person won't want to hear, we silence ourselves. We also do this because we love the partnership and are afraid when we say how we really feel it will change or even stop. Ironically, there is no chance of a deeper and stronger friendship, without frank and open dialogue. Silencing up leads to the exact thing that you want to stop. Furthermore, whether it's frustration, disappointment or some powerful negative feeling you've got, staying quiet doesn't dissipate the feeling. Only the contrary happens– the unspoken issue persists, distancing occurs, and as a result, the connection suffers. Many times you're feeling hurt, frustrated or offended about what someone else says or does. Since letting them know exactly how you feel makes you insecure, you prefer to hold those emotions and feelings inside and hide them from the other person. Sulking, pouting, pursing lips, not listening, abrupt replies, avoiding the other person, giving them the "cold shoulder" are indications of this kind of silence, better known as "the silent treatment." However, when we're in emotional pain, many of us prefer to withdraw and refrain, particularly from the person we perceive to be causing it. The realistic alternative to the silent treatment does not have to be a feeling left out on the other person in frustration. That just encourages the problem to escalate and turn into an even greater problem than it began to be. A much better way is being ready and able to speak frankly to them about how you feel and why – without blame. We feel relaxation, improved self-worth and a deeper sense of purpose when we remove our pretenses and defenses and become genuine in our significant relationships. It is one of the joys of being.

**References**

- Caskey, D. M. (2011). *Speak Like A Wo(Man): A Corpus Linguistic and Discourse Analysis of Gendered Speech*. The University of Western Carolina.
- Chafe, W. (1985) Some Reasons for Hesitating. In D. Tannen & M. Saviile-Troike (Eds.), *Perspectives on Silence* (pp. 77-111). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Crown, C.L., Feldstein, S. (1985). Psychological Correlates of Silence and Sound in Conversational Interaction. In D. Tannen & M. Saviile-Troike (Eds.), *Perspectives on Silence* (pp. 31-54). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation
- Cutting, Joan (2008). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.
- Duff, P. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity and difference. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 289-322.
- Ephratt, M. (2008). The functions of silence. *Journal of pragmatics*, 40(11), 1909-1938.
- Fakoya, A.A. 1998. University Classroom Interaction: A discourse-analytic description. Unpublished PhD thesis. Department of English, Faculty of Arts. University of Ibadan.
- George R Saunders. 1985. Silence and noise as emotion management styles: An Italian case. *Perspectives on silence* pages 165–83
- Heritage, J. (2001). Goffman, Garfinkel and conversation analysis. *Discourse theory and practice: A reader*, 47-56.
- Jaworski, A. (1992). *The power of silence: Social and pragmatic perspectives* (Vol. 1). Sage Publications.
- Jaworski, A. Coupland, N. (1999). *The Discourse Reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kivik, P-K. (1998). What Silence says: Communicative Style and Identity. *TRAMES*, 2, 66-90.
- Koudenburg, N., Postmes, T., & Gordijn, E. H. (2011). Disrupting the flow: How brief silences in group conversations affect social needs. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 512-515.
- Lestary, A., Krismanti, N., & Hermaniar, Y. (2017). Interruptions and silences in conversations: A Turn-Taking analysis. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 7(2), 53-64.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). Conversational structure. *Pragmatics*, 284-370.
- Maynard, D. W. (1980). Placement of Topic Changes in Conversation. *Semiotica*, XXX (3-4), 263-290.
- Nakamura, I. (2004). Understanding a learner's responses: Uses of silence in teacher-student dialogues. *JALT 2003 at Shizouka Conference Proceedings*, 79-86. Nakane, I. (2007). *Silence in intercultural communication: perceptions and performance*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.

- Nakane, I. (2007). *Silence in intercultural communication: perceptions and performance*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Nikolić, M. (2016). The Functions of Silence in Confrontational Discourse. *Sic: časopis za književnost, kulturu i književno prevođenje*, (1-Year 7), 0-0.
- Riazantseva, A. (2001) Second Language Proficiency and Pausing: A Study of Russian Speakers of English. *SSLA*, 23, 497–526.
- Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & Hickson, M. (2008). *Nonverbal behavior in interpersonal relations*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Robert, F., Francis, A. L., & Morgan, M. (2006). The interaction of inter-turn silence with prosodic cues in listener perceptions of “trouble” in conversation. *Speech Communication*, 48(9), 1079-1093.
- Sacks, H. (. (1995). Turn Taking; Collaborative Utterances Via Appendor Questions; Instructions; Directed Utterances Topic; Utterance Placement; ‘Activity Occupied’ Phenomena; Formulations; Euphemisms. (G. Jefferson, Ed.) *Lectures on Conversation*, I, II, 523-534.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. 1974. A Simplest Systematic s for the Organisation of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language* Volume (504), pp.696-735.
- Scollon, R. (1985). The Machine Stops: Silence in the Metaphor of Malfunction. In D. Tannen & M. Saville-Troike (Eds.), *Perspectives on Silence* (pp. 21-30). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Sifianou, M. (1997). Silence and politeness. In A. Jaworski (Ed.), *Silence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 63-84). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sobkowiak, W. (1997). Silence and markedness theory. In A. Jaworski (Ed.), *Silence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 39-61). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender and Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D., Saville-Troike, M. (Eds.). (1985). *Perspectives on Silence*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Zuo, Y. (2002). *The Golden Silence: Pragmatic Study on Silence in Dyadic English Conversation*. Muenchen: LINCUM Europa