PONTIFÍCIA UNIVERSIDADE CATÓLICA DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL
PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS

DEISIANE DE OLIVEIRA GOMES

DEVELOPING AWARENESS RAISING OF RHETORICAL ASPECTS IN ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE

Porto Alegre
2011

DEISIANE DE OLIVEIRA GOMES

DEVELOPING AWARENESS RAISING OF RHETORICAL ASPECTS IN ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE

Dissertação apresentada como requisito para a obtenção do grau de Mestre pelo Programa de Pós-Graduação da Faculdade de Letras da Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul

Orientadora: Dra. Cristina Lopes Perna

Porto Alegre
2011

Dados Internacionais de Catalogação na Publicação (CIP)

DEISIANE DE OLIVEIRA GOMES

**DEVELOPING AWARENESS RAISING OF RHETORICAL ASPECTS IN
ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE**

Dissertação apresentada como requisito
para a obtenção do grau de Mestre pelo
Programa de Pós-Graduação da Faculdade
de Letras da Pontifícia Universidade
Católica do Rio Grande do Sul

Aprovada em: _____ de _____ de _____.

BANCA EXAMINADORA:

_____
Profa. Dr. Cristina Lopes Perna – PUCRS

_____
Prof. Dr. Jorge Campos da Costa – PUCRS

_____
Prof.Dr. Ubiratã Kirckhöfel Alves – UFRGS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Firstly, to God for my life and for the determination to pursue the masters degree.

To PUCRS, for making my studies possible.

To my advisor, Cristina Lopes Perna, who was always ready to help me and guide me on this enterprise.

To my friends, especially to Daniela do Nascimento Cardoso, for their encouraging words.

To my professors at PUCRS, for their motivating words and inspiring classes.

To Professor Jorge Campos, for his great contribution to my writing.

To my former advisor, Paulo Roberto de Souza Ramos, for spending his time giving me advice and for encouraging me to accept this challenge in my life.

To Moisés, for his love, support and patience.

When a diplomat says *yes*, he means 'perhaps';
When he says *perhaps*, he means 'no';
When he says *no*, he is not a diplomat. *(Voltaire)*

RESUMO

Aprender uma língua não é somente conhecer seu vocabulário, gramática e fonologia. Estes são, sem dúvida, aspectos importantes da língua. Por outro lado, para se tornar apto a comunicar-se eficientemente, o aprendiz também necessita estar familiarizado com os aspectos pragmáticos da língua. A fim de demonstrarmos isto, faremos uma análise de dois textos (um literário e outro político). A Retórica será discutida como sendo uma subárea da Pragmática, e analisando suas questões teóricas e aplicação. Posteriormente, será feita uma comparação da Retórica com as teorias de Atos de Fala e Implicaturas Conversacionais. O objetivo desta pesquisa é, então, comparar ambas as teorias e verificar se é possível trabalhar com ambas na mesma análise como ferramentas complementares para promover uma análise mais completa de textos e discursos. Com as considerações finais, pretende-se sugerir para professores de ILA, assim como para ensino de língua materna, estratégias que visam promover a tomada de consciência pragmática nos estudantes, nisto estando incluída a consciência retórica.

Palavras-chave: Retórica. Pragmática. Persuasão.

ABSTRACT

Learning a language is not just knowing its vocabulary, grammar and phonology. These are undoubtedly important aspects of language. On the other hand, in order to be able to communicate efficiently the learner also needs to be familiar with the pragmatic aspects of language. Bearing this in mind, we will propose an analysis of two texts (one literary and other political). We will discuss Rhetoric considering it a subarea of Pragmatics and analyze its theoretical issues and application. Afterwards we will compare it to Speech Act and Conversational Implicature theories. The aim of this research is, then, to compare both theories and check if it is possible to work with both in the same analysis as complementary tools to promote a more complete analysis of texts and speeches. With the final considerations we intend to suggest for English as Additional Language (EAL) teaching, as well as for first language teaching, strategies aspiring to promote pragmatic awareness raising skills among students, being included the rhetorical awareness.

Key-words: Rhetoric. Pragmatics. Persuasion.

LISTA DE SIGLAS

CI – Conversational Implicatures

CP – Cooperative Principle

EAL – English as Additional Language

ISA – Indirect Speech Acts

SAT – Speech Act Theory

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

This work aims to suggest the possibility of promoting the awareness raising of rhetorical aspects as well as speech acts in an English as Additional Language (EAL) class using literary or daily texts or speeches as instruments of analysis. It also aims to promote the ability of producing proper communication for that specific context avoiding or at least minimizing mistakes and complex cultural differences through the discussion of these texts or speeches. The main theme of this work will be about the possibility of using Speech Act Theory (SAT) and Rhetoric assembled as tools for text or discourse analysis on EAL activities. This research has the purpose of being used as a starting point for further EAL projects and classes in order to promote ways to develop skills among learners for the proper mastering of Rhetoric in English as additional language.

We propose the use of Rhetoric as a tool in additional language teaching to develop pragmatic awareness. Rhetoric is being considered here a subarea of Pragmatics because it studies the speech and its influence on the listeners, as Pragmatics does. By means of this, it is possible to perceive the use of the power of utterances to persuade people and this analysis is what the rhetorical studies propose.

This work was idealized as a qualitative research and it does not have the ambition of being definitive and conclusive on this topic, but it was made to, maybe, provoke new questions and ideas about additional language teaching methods, and we will consider the link Rhetoric to text analysis in an EAL class in order to achieve this. We suggest, then, the use of rhetorical awareness raising skills in the additional language to improve the new language learning process. For this, two different texts will be analyzed in order to show how many possibilities of interpretation are possible and what is between the lines.

In the first chapter we will discuss the language science and the human interaction through it. In order to check the influence of utterances in a person's act through speech act analysis, we will consider Austin, Searle and Grice as theorists of the SAT and Indirect Speech Acts (ISA).

However, to achieve this goal of promoting rhetorical awareness among learners, it is also necessary to consider the social context in which they are and its influence in a person's act. It is also important to observe the utterances people produce considering Rhetoric, taking into consideration the analysis of rhetorical aspects in speech analysis.

In order to conduct this, we will discuss the awareness raising skills on pragmatic and rhetoric aspects in an additional language learning context, and for this we will present in the first chapter Rhetoric and its theoretical foundations.

In chapter 2, Awareness Raising Theory in additional language teaching will be presented and discussed focusing on the application of this tool for the promotion of rhetorical awareness in additional language classes.

In chapter 3, to further discuss these subjects and possibilities of interpretation and think deeply about them, we will present characteristics of the two texts that will be the instrument of these analyses: one text being literary, canonic and classic as *Macbeth* by Shakespeare, considering that it represents the literary work in general that are usually full of rhetoric and the other text being a political speech from Barack Obama, representing the political, midiatic and current text that can be taken from a current magazine or newspaper.

In the first text, the play *Macbeth,* three weird women that are considered witches tell prophecies to Macbeth, what moves him to act in order to promote a 'help' to the fate and he, who was predicted as the next king by the Weird Sisters, plans the current king's murder. Our questions for the analysis are: How do the rhetorical aspects used by Shakespeare to conduct the speech of the sisters lead the reader to interpret their acts as magic powers? And how did the Weird Sisters influence Macbeth to understand their words as metaphors when they were in fact literal, considering this was highly important to the plot? Our aim is to show how this was achieved by using rhetorical and pragmatic procedures to convey these effects on the character and also on the reader.

In the second text, the speech of Barack Obama entitled *Yes, we can*, we will analyze a political speech that represents this category of text, which is usually full of rhetoric. This speech occurred after the primary election for presidency of the United States of America and in a moment when he was trying to get more votes for the final election. We will notice in this chapter that his

speech was full of motivation and emotion, when he showed himself as an equal to his people.

Finally, in chapter 4 we will analyze the two texts that were exposed in chapter 3, showing the pragmatic and rhetorical features presented in them and promoting the discussion about the relevance of working with SAT and Rhetoric as an interface. It has the objective of presenting the amount of rich inferences, metaphors and ambiguity these texts contain and how it is important to comprehend these features to master an additional language in its entirety.

2. THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE AND HUMAN INTERACTION

Language, being oral as much as written, is considered a particular ability of human beings. Considering that, language is so widely studied through the ages and many different aspects and theories were and are created along the years. Considering the fact that the origin of language in our brains is innate as well as a result of social interaction, we can say that language is established by social interaction, and as such, we have to consider what is implicated within the utterances.

In social communication there are many aspects that go beyond the words and that can cause confusion and misunderstandings. According to Arndt *et al* (2000, p. 18), the social perspective of language in use is that "language is dynamic and powerful: it reflects and it is reflected by the changing ways human societies order themselves". The author also declares that "language is rarely either straightforward or value-free".

Language can be considered a miracle and makes us impressed, as expressed by Searle,

> [h]ow is it possible that when a speaker stands before a hearer and emits an acoustic blast such remarkable things occur as: the speaker means something; the sounds he emits mean something; the hearer understands what is meant; the speaker makes a statement, asks a question, or gives an order? (…) What is the difference between saying something and meaning it and saying it without meaning it? (SEARLE, 1976, p. 3)

The initial discussions about language possibly started with the ancient Greeks, and they spent many hours discussing its secrets and uses. The ancient Greeks were followed by the Sophists, who discovered the power of pragmatic aspects in order to convince people and manipulate opinions. Rhetoric, as the area of language developed by them, means *convincing* and *persuading* and can be considered the origin of Pragmatics as the first concerns about language as a science. Although the field of Rhetoric is older than Pragmatics, Pragmatics is broader and, because of this, we consider here Rhetoric as a subarea of Pragmatics.

According to the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Rhetoric is the

> speech or writing that is intended to influence people, but that is not completely honest or sincere; the skill of using language in speech or writing in a special way that influences or entertains people (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2005, p. 1303).

In this definition, there is a prejudiced conception that comes from the Aristotelic point of view about the Sophists and, consequently, about Rhetoric itself. Plato, in *The Sophist*, did not recognize their art of convincing, persuading, or being able to notice the intentions beyond the words uttered. He defended that the Sophists used the power of rhetorical utterances to lie or spoof people. Sophists won this stigma also because they were the first people who charged for teaching their knowledge about persuasion. However, as they taught and provoked discussions and thoughts about persuasion on language, their contribution was very important for the theory developed about rhetorical resources and techniques.

In Aristotle's view, Rhetoric is defined as "the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatsoever" (1947, p. 15). This expression "any subject whatsoever" gives us the idea that he was intending to suggest that Rhetoric was not made with true or false statements, but was based on how to influence the ideas of the people.

However, Aristotle recognized the importance of this art of speech and left us the work entitled *The art of Rhetoric,* in which he sustains that this is a useful tool in the oratory and that it can be used for telling lies or truths, so this will depend just on the speaker, as he declares:

> It is clear, then, that all other rhetoricians bring under the rules of art what is outside the subject, and have the rules of art what is outside the subject, and have rather inclined to the forensic branch of oratory. Nevertheless, Rhetoric is useful, because the true and the just are naturally superior to their opposites, so that, if decisions are improperly made, they must owe their defeat to their own advocates; which is reprehensible (1947, p. 11).

Within the field of rhetoric there are some aspects to be considered as the *ethos* (speaker's character and credibility), *pathos* (the way of leading the listeners to some conclusion), and *logos* (the reasonability of the contents).

We can also say that this is a part of Applied Linguistic analysis because in Applied Linguistics, as it is defined by the Center for Applied Linguistics (PEREIRA and ROCA, 2009), we deal with knowledge about language, how it

works and how it is used to contribute with issues about real life, considering that it is analyzed in many different social contexts and situations.

Pragmatics, being a field of applied linguistics, studies the point of view of the users, their intentions and the consequences of what is said; and Rhetoric is not only concerned with these aspects, but it also pays much attention to how it is possible to convince or persuade a person by using some devices (known as rhetorical devices) as metaphor, emotion, prosody, among others. Considering these similarities, and because Rhetoric deals with more aspects of language and linguistic phenomena, it is considered here as a subarea of Pragmatics. In being so, we could take Crystal's definition for the term:

> [Pragmatics] is the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication (1985, p. 240).

With this excerpt we can conclude that the author suggests that Pragmatics is the study of social interference on language. Agreeing with this conception about it, O'keeffe *et al* (2011, p. 3) state that "pragmatics can be defined as the study of the relationship between context and meaning".

Considering that Pragmatics encompasses the unsaid aspects of language, as implicit speech and implicatures, and that Rhetoric is also concerned with them, we propose an interface between pragmatic and rhetorical studies in order to address some aspects that are not studied yet in the current pragmatic theories.

We suggest, then, that Rhetoric awareness strategies can be developed in an English as Additional Language (henceforth EAL) class, as it has aspects of language most commonly known as pragmatic and rhetorical features. We also address some views of other aspects of pragmatics in language analysis such as Speech Acts, considering the theories of Austin, Searle and Grice in order to compare both fields (Rhetoric and Pragmatics) to show that they are related in some way.

2.1 PRAGMATICS

As human beings, one of our most important abilities is to communicate. However, to communicate is not just to utter words and sentences and to be able to be understood by others, but it is also the ability to comprehend the contextual aspects of what it is said. The meaning of words is only determined when it is in use, as Armengaud (2006) defines.

O'keeffe *et al* state (2011, p. 2) that Pragmatics is "the art of the analysis of the unsaid". This is based on the fact that Pragmatics is concerned with nonlinguistic aspects of what is said, as intonation, emphasis, irony, metaphor, intentions, the manipulation of information, among others. Considering that pragmatic aspects involve much more than syntax, semantics, morphology or phonology, and go beyond what is specifically related to language, it is important to consider the contextual aspects as the moment, the place, the situation and the people involved (speaker and listeners) in the speech event.

As Arndt *et al* (2000) highlight, the context of communication embraces some questions: 'what is it about?'; 'when was it produced?'; 'who produced it?', 'why?', 'where?', 'to whom?', 'in what way?', 'what are the cultural and social expectations involved?'; 'what happened before?'; 'what is likely to happen after?'. The authors (2000, p. 28) also state that "the natural language of many real-world contexts is too difficult for a language learning context". This is true considering that many cultural, historical and social aspects of the target language are unknown by the learner, what makes him/her sometimes become unable to comprehend and interact.

Yule (1996) presents some different contexts to Pragmatics, and this field is considered by him the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker/writer and interpreted by a listener/or a reader. Moreover, he considers it as the study or the analysis of contextual meaning. He also suggests that Pragmatics is the study of what is communicated beyond what is said. And his most interesting concept of Pragmatics is that it is the study of the expression of a sentence, which can vary **considering the distance between speaker and listener, i.e. the farther the listener is from the speaker, the more information has to be given**. This last perspective indicates the importance of the affinity among interlocutors in order to develop a better and more effective communication.

As it is stated by Ferreira (2010), language is not objective, and the reality is interpreted by interlocutors, therefore, because of this, it is not neutral, but full of intentionality. The competence of perceiving and producing pragmatic inferences in an additional language is not a painless task for a learner who is in the beginning of his/her learning process. This competence has to be improved as the learner is exposed to the language in use, and starts building on his/her own ability as s/he improves his/her knowledge about the additional language.

According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2008, p. 266), an argument can be called *pragmatic* when it "permits the evaluation of an act or event in terms of its favorable or unfavorable consequences". According to the authors, in order to judge an event or act it is necessary to refer to its effects.

However, Pragmatics is also concerned about the motivation of the utterances and their effects on the listener. Similarly, Rhetoric is concerned about the effects on the hearer, as well as in the elements that are used in order to promote results as persuasion and convincement, such as the tone of it, the sonority and implications of the aspects of what is said, what emotions it provokes on the hearers and what kind of thoughts it motivates on them. We can say these aspects that are not of the concerns of Pragmatics are addressed by Rhetoric.

In order to check Pragmatic aspects and move further into Rhetoric, we present below some of the main pragmatic theories, as Speech Act Theory and Conversational Implicatures.

2.1.1 Speech Acts and Implicatures

Speech can be considered an act of the speaker. Considering this, it is extremely relevant to pay attention to speech due to the reason that, for many people, it is considered the most characteristic manifestation of a person and of his/her intentions and character. In order to grant rhetoric its place in speech, it is marked by prosody, irony and metaphor among others.

So as to make a difference between literal and metaphorical meanings, it is necessary to define *literal meaning*. As for *literal meaning*, Searle (1995) states

that it can be defined as the meaning that the expression has, independently of any context.

According to Searle (1995), many people try to identify metaphors by concluding that there are two essential meanings: the literal and the metaphorical ones. However, sentences, words and utterances will just bear the meaning they really have. When we talk about the metaphorical meaning of an utterance, we are wondering about what that speaker intended to say, then, we talk about the possible intentions of the speaker.

As Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2008) declare, when even the words pronounced previously by other people are repeated by another speaker, they change their meanings, and many times, their purpose. In the process of repetition the speaker always adopts a new position in some way, although this difference is just on the importance given to that subject. A statement made is not the same coming from a person or another, and its meaning changes as a reinterpretation of that subject in a new context.

There are some words or expressions that are considered speech acts and others that are considered implicatures. As Speech Acts, we consider the utterances that make some action through them as, for example, "I do" uttered by the bride in a wedding ceremony. That utterance is an act at the same time it is said, for it is representing the act of marrying someone. *Implicature* is a kind of implication, and it is out of the meaning and it is in context, as states Armengaud (2006).

Austin started the Speech Act Theory (SAT), followed by Searle and Grice. The latter introduced the concept of Conversational Implicatures (CI), which consist in the study of what is implicit in the utterance, what is not said but is understood by the interlocutors. These theories are addressed next.

J. L. Austin developed the Speech Act Theory (SAT) as a series of lectures delivered in 1955, at the University of Harvard, USA. They were published after his death in 1962 as *How to do things with words.* This work is concerned with the meaning of words and the relation between a speaker and what s/he says, and also about the effect of those words on the audience. Thus, one actually performs acts when s/he produces a specific kind of utterance.

The author distinguishes two types of utterances: the *constatatives* and *performatives*. *Constatatives* are those which describe or report a state of things,

and they are considered statements. As he sustains (2008), not all statements are descriptions, true or false ones, but they can also be findings. For this reason, he preferred the use of the word 'constatative'.

Performatives do not describe or report anything but realize actions when uttered in the first person singular of present indicative tense (the first subject: I). Performatives have the grammatical form of statements, but they are not statements at all. This name is derived from 'perform', the usual verb with the noun 'action'. It indicates that it is the performance of an action, and not just the saying of something. These types of utterances make the action real or execute it indicated by the verb on the exact moment they are uttered.

Austin previewed the language analysis considering the social and cultural background in which it is used, as well as the social practice, paradigms and values that are shared by a community because, as he sustains, these elements are inseparable. He considers that a language is defined as a concrete social practice and that it must be analyzed as it is. It is a paradigm in which the language is an action about the 'real'. What must be analyzed on speech acts is not only the sentence structure but the conditions of some utterances and how they produce certain effects and consequences in a determined situation.

This theory sustains that "saying is not only sharing information", but also a way of acting in the world. Because they are realized acts, performatives cannot be subjected to truth or falsity, as happens in semantic studies, but to *felicity conditions*, which explain their success or failure, as the circumstances in which the words are uttered must be appropriate. In other words, *felicity conditions* are the context need to be in accordance of what is happening that makes the event valid. For example, in order to marry a couple one has to be a priest or a minister of a church, otherwise this person does not have authority for performing this action. Felicity conditions are a list of favorable conditions that classify a performative. If any of them not occur, there is an infelicity, and consequently the performative not occur. As Austin declares

> (A.1) There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, that procedure to include the uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances, and further,
> (A.2) the particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked.
> (B.1) The procedure must be executed by all participants both correctly and

(B.2) completely.
(I.1) where, as often, the procedure is designed for use by persons having certain thoughts or feelings, or for the inauguration of certain consequential conduct on the part of any participant, then a person participating in and so invoking the procedure must in fact have those thoughts or feelings, and the participants must intend so to conduct themselves, and further
(I.2) must actually so conduct themselves subsequently.
Now if we sin against any one (or more) of these six rules, our performative utterance will be (in one way or another) unhappy (AUSTIN, p. 15).

In other words, a performative utterance must be appropriate. Taking this into consideration, a performative can fail, or be cancelled and this results in *infelicities*. Infelicities can be originated from ambiguities, failure in the procedures, when people are not prepared for that procedure, misunderstandings, false feelings, thoughts and intentions, or absence of understanding the utterance or order.

Infelicities are utterances 'without effect', but not necessarily 'without consequences' or results. Thus, the simple act of uttering a performative utterance does not guarantee its achievement. For a performative to be successful, the circumstances must be adequate for that situation.

Austin also verified that constatative utterances could be transformed into perlocutories and then he identified three simultaneous acts that are realized by each utterance: *locutionary, illocutionary* and *perlocutionary*. The author states that each speech act is a trichotomy, being at the same time *locutionary, illocutionary* and *perlocutionary*. *Locutionary* is the act of saying something that has a conventional meaning, it is to talk about a subject, and it is the actual production of a language. *Illocutionary* is the force of a particular utterance when its status is a promise, threat, command; it is to act in saying something, to act through the language. *Perlocutionary* is the result of what is being said on the listener's acts, thoughts, attitudes, beliefs, feelings or behavior, it is the utterance's consequence on the listener's mind. Perlocutory is an act that is realized by language and not on the language.

Thus, the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts are produced at the same time that the locutionary act is uttered, because the three acts happen through the same linguistic expression. They are three different dimensions, aspects or moments of the same speech act. There is no sense in trying to distinguish locutionary from illocutionary acts; or performative from constatatives, because

they are inseparable. Furthermore, in the case of a perlocutionary act it is essential that its author has had the purpose to fulfill it, that is, to cause these effects on the listener. For example, when someone says "It's pretty hot here" (s)he intends to ask for the other to open the window or turn on the air conditioner.

As Austin started the analysis of speech acts, other linguists continued in this research line, as John Searle. He tried to synthesize ideas from Austin, as the term "illocutionary act", and developed concepts of intentionality. He also improved the SAT with the ISA theory.

John Searle developed the theory of the ISA. Indirect speech is understood by a multiplicity of meanings, as the author states that

> speaking a language is performing speech acts, acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises, and so on. (…) all linguistic communication involves linguistic acts. (…) speech acts are the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication (1976, p. 16).

According to Searle (1975), an indirect speech always has more than one meaning, or illocutionary force, as Searle (1976, p. 19) says that "often we mean more than we actually say". In uttering "This soup needs salt" in the right circumstances, the utterance may mean both "I assert to you that this soup needs salt" and "I request you to pass the salt."

Armengaud specifies *ISA* poetically, as they were "(…) in a world in which the appearance overreaches: under the green grass slips the serpent of irony, insinuation, allusion, inference, mistake, double meaning. Refined politeness and masked mock go hand in hand" (2006, p. 119, my translation).

Probably, the main reason for the multiplicity of ISA is the politeness factors, because direct requests usually presume a certain status of one over the other interlocutor. Other reason for a multiplicity of ISA is that when one uses an indirect speech instead of a direct speech s/he will have the possibility of negating what was understood by the interlocutor, considering it was not said, but only suggested or implied. Intentionality is another feature of ISA because they intend to have a specific effect on the interlocutor, as to persuade him/her or to make his/her act in some intended way.

SAT has a social view of linguistic meaning. This is sometimes opposed to the intentionalist view favored by Grice. He emphasized the difference that there is in what the speaker literally says when using them and what the speaker

intends to communicate, with words that often have other meanings than the literal one.

Herbert **Paul Grice** (1913 – 1988) developed the theory of *Conversational Implicatures* in the *Cooperative Principle (CP)*. His first texts appeared in 1956 and 1957. However, his work known as *Logic and Conversation* provoked a strong theoretical impact in researches about Pragmatics. The author explains a conversational implicature as it follows:

> A general pattern for the working out of a conversational implicature might be given as follows: 'He has said that *p*; there is no reason to suppose that he is not observing the maxims, or at least the CP [cooperative principle]; he could not be doing this unless he thought that *q*; he knows (and knows that I know that he knows) that I can see that the supposition that he thinks that *q* is required; he has done nothing to stop me thinking that *q*; he intends me to think, or is at least willing to allow me to think, that *q*; and so he has implicated that *q* (GRICE, 1989, p. 31).

Grice sees *Conventional Maxims* as being the usual meaning of words, and they do not depend on the deductive thinking. *Conversational implicatures* do not depend on the conventional meaning, being determined by certain principles of the communicative act. When some rules of the conventional implicatures are broken, the CI's are produced. As Grice (1991, p. 26) states, CI's are "essentially connected with certain general features of discourse". The author understands that when people are talking there are implicit laws that command the communicative act, as rules that he calls the *CP.* As the author declares:

> Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. One might label this Cooperative Principle (GRICE, 1991, p. 26).

Conversational implicatures depend on the context in they are uttered and they can be cancelable. True or false statements cannot be canceled nor can have another meaning. By the other hand, an implicature can be canceled considering they are not what was said, but what was implied by it. With this property, the implicatures are a useful tool when we intend saying something without compromising ourselves by saying it. As O'Keeffe *et al* (2011, p. 2) state, "in any language, what is said is often quite distinct to what is meant, or to put it another way, form is often very different to content."

According to Grice, there are four maxims, namely the *maxim of quantity*; *maxim of quality*; *maxim of relation*; and *maxim of manner*. Thus, they consider the focus on the speaker that has the principle: *Maxim of quantity* – "be informative. Do not make your contribution more or less informative than it is required". *Maxim of quality* – "be trustful – do not say things that are false or for which you lack evidence". *Maxim of relation* – "be relevant". *Maxim of manner* – "be clear, brief and orderly – avoid ambiguity and obscurity".

When the principles are not followed, and we have then a conversational implicature, some things can also happen in order to make them lose their face value. There are some implicatures that are cancelable. This can happen simply because the CP must be respected in order to exist, unless in a particular context. When this does not happen, the principle is canceled. There are also some implicatures that are undetermined. This can happen when there is a list of possible meanings, and there is no certainty about what was said.

The interlocutor or hearer may follow the same maxims. Next there is a list of maxims regarding the point of view of the listener. *Maxim of quantity*: if the speaker is giving too much or too little information, assumedly s/he is doing it for a reason. *Maxim of quality*: assumedly the message is truthful. *Maxim of relation*: assumedly the message must be relevant. *Maxim of manner*: if the message is disorganized or ambiguous or obscure, assumedly it has been composed that way for a reason.

For example, the utterance *Can you pass the salt?* is assuming the hearer's ability to pass the salt; that there is cooperation in the conversation; the background information (both are able to hear and speak, and understand the language spoken); the known answer (yes). Therewith, it is possible to conclude that it is not a question to be answered, but a request for a favor. Thus, according to Grice's theory of CP, every single utterance must obey certain rules in order to make communication possibly comprehensible and, then, possible.

To sum up, the Speech Acts are under great importance on speech analysis, but certainly there are more to analyze beyond them, considering that all of its philosophers of language ignored the Rhetoric and its great difference and important aspect that is the analysis of convincing and persuasion art.

One can study the utterances, and the intentions that are hidden in them. SAT can certainly contribute to show them, but not all the aspects are previewed

in this theory. Speech Acts deal with many rhetorical features without naming them as rhetorical. However, this theory does not take emotions into consideration on its analysis, nor the process to produce a perlocutionary act; in other words, the process to influence people using the language.

It is important to mention that the ulterior perlocutionary effects on the listener, intended or not by the speaker, are often forgotten by Pragmatics. Rhetoric can contribute to it, as persuasive, convincing and other perlocutionary acts can be the basis of rhetorical studies in the linguistic use.

It is also necessary to pay more attention to other rhetorical features as form, sound, intonation, situational and emotional context, which result in persuasion and convincing that can be considered rhetorical consequences; in other words, the strategies to reach the speech act results, as it is presented next.

2.1.2 Rhetoric

Rhetoric was born related to the philosophy of language, in the Ancient Greece, with Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, and some other thinkers as the Sophists, who were, according to the Britannica Online Encyclopedia, "certain Greek lecturers, writers, and teachers in the 5th and 4th centuries" B.C. that 'sold' their knowledge by changing it for money. Moreover, they usually distorted the truth.

According to Kreis (2000), the Sophists taught the subtle art of persuasion. They could argue eloquently, and even prove a position whether that position was correct or incorrect. They trained and educated the sons of Athenians. In their education program, there were basically the skills of rhetoric and oratory. Rhetoric, as defined by Kreis (2000), "can be described as the art of composition, while oratory was the art of public speaking". To sum this, for Sophists, persuasion was most important than truth. They were relativists because they believed that there was not a thing that was a universal or absolute.

However, their act of selling instruction was not well regarded by the great philosophers of that age, as it is possible to check on how Plato defined *The*

Sophist (Plato, 2003) as a liar, a person able to persuade young people, making them convinced that he was saying the truth, and transforming them in simply imitators. However, Plato ignored the great importance of this new art that was arising in that moment, that is the art of convincing and persuading, leading arguments and manipulating words and facts.

Anyway, as Ferreira (2010, p. 32) puts it, *truths* are created by general agreement and, normally, they solidify in order to constitute what we know as *dominant discourse*. As Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca declares

> Plato represented all the sophists as braggarts because, thinking, as he did, that truth was more important than gaining the adherence of others, he could not see how the prestige of the speaker could be relevant (PERELMAN AND OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, 2008, p. 318).

The argument that something is not true but seems to be, or changing minds about a subject, is known as a *fallacy*. Ferreira (2010) defines *fallacy* as situations when the arguments are inconsistent, without valid substantiation or failure in the moment of proving what they say. It is not necessarily a lie, but a way of leading the thinking, considering the speaker takes advantage of the emotion besides the logic. According to Cummings (2005, p. 165), *fallacy* is "a belief or opinion that lacks an accurate basis in fact, but which is nonetheless generally accepted". It is also considered "errors of reasoning" in the formal fallacy.

For this reason, the sophists were badly interpreted (and this still happens until today) because people commonly thought that they had created "the art of lying" (known as fallacies), and Rhetoric is commonly badly understood in consequence of the fallacy, as well as rhetorical theory is usually reduced to this. Despite this fact, the Sophists also contributed with the art of persuading (does not matter if it is the "right side" or not, a very useful method in areas related to law), and the art of speaking well (very profitable in politics and business).

Rhetoric is an ancient discipline that is neglected today because its idea is commonly linked to the literary viewpoint. In spite of this, it is considered, as stated by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2008, p. 509), "the dialectical relationship between thought and action" has been distorted for centuries and it needs to be revived considering its richness and deepness in speech analysis and the intentions behind each sentence uttered. According to the *Aristotle: Philosophy and Ethics* website, "Rhetoric is a tool for practical debate. It is a

means for persuading a general audience using probable knowledge to resolve practical issues".

Rhetoric is about emotion, and also logical thought and reason (and it is beyond the faculty to calculate). It is like Rhetoric being considered as a non-logical thought versus the logical thought. However, rational and irrational work together in some way, because it seems that one depends on the other. Costa (*apud* KLÖCKNER, 2011) states that Aristotle comprehended that even being especial effects on form, rhetorical processes reverberate on content, intentions, emotions, etc. Considering this, to analyze a speech or text rhetorically is to reinterpret it taking all these elements on count.

The theory and practice of argumentation are judgments of reality and value. According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca,

> [t]he theory of argumentation will help to develop what a logic of value judgments has tried in vain to provide, namely the justification of the possibility of a human community in the sphere of action when this justification cannot be based on a reality or objective truth (2008, p. 514).

As defended by Costa (2011), Rhetoric could be understood as a subarea of Pragmatics, considering that Pragmatics is concerned about what is implied, what is beyond what is said; and Rhetoric adds the effects on the emotion to this. Still according to Costa (2011), it is possible to explain why Rhetoric has such power of convincement, even when its arguments are fallacious, when we consider Rhetoric as a subarea of Pragmatics. For Costa (2011), Rhetoric can be considered the effect of form over content, as every language is like a glass through which we can see the world. Depending on the kind of glasses we are wearing, the world changes to us. Everything depends on the point of view one is adopting to a situation. This possibility of changing our perception of subjects and things can be considered a rhetorical effect.

As Arndt *et al* (2000, p. 21) state, "[n]othing is value free". This is the base of Rhetoric, which shows that every word uttered has some things behind it, other intention, meaning, or purpose. Rhetoric means the convincing and persuasion or even discouraging acts. According to the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, Rhetoric is the

speech or writing that is intended to influence people, but that is not completely honest or sincere; the skill of using language in speech or writing in a special way that influences or entertains people (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, p. 1303).

In other words, Rhetoric is the art to persuade people. Then, it is important to check this perspective of analysis too, although this subject (Rhetoric) is forgotten in Brazilian curricula regarding the current language analysis, a fact that reduces the value of what Rhetoric can contribute in order to explain, or at least to think more deeply, about the persuasion on the speech aspects. Still, according to *Philosophical Dictionary* website, definition of *persuade* is "an effort to influence attitudes by surreptitiously attaching emotive significance to the meaning of a term".

Some aspects must be considered within Rhetoric in order to make a relevant analysis, as the *ethos* (speaker's character and credibility), *pathos* (the way of leading the listeners to some conclusion), and *logos* (the reasonability of the contents).

The Sophists, represented in the excerpt below by Protagoras, taught relativity and different points of view, as it is possible to notice as follow:

> The relativity of truth was the basis of Protagoras' rhetorical teaching. He trained his students to argue on both sides of a question because he believed that the whole truth could not be limited to just one side of a question. Therefore, he taught his students to praise and blame the same things and to strengthen the weaker argument so that it might appear the stronger. These techniques are based on the belief that truth is relative to the individual. Arguments on both sides of a question are equally true because those debating a question can only truly know those things which exist in their own mind and therefore cannot make a definitely true statement about objective realities outside the mind (phenomenalism). Truth is what it appears to be to the individual. As Protagoras said: "Man is the measure of all things, of the things that are, that they are and of things that are not, that they are not (DUNKLE, 1986).

The view of truth as a relative subject was introduced by Protagoras in the ancient time and started the concept of what Rhetoric is. Before this, there was just the idea of the absolute truth, when there was no space for divagations about situations and points of view. This is based on the idea that the truth is relative to the individual and introduced the concept of respect to other's opinions and motives. However, this concept was not so well accepted by the society at that time.

About I Century B.C., Cicero spread a view of culture in that Rhetoric is elevated to the level of arts. But declamation caused classes to become fictional and meaningless throughout the years, and when a tool becomes artificial, it loses its effectiveness. Because of this artificialization of Rhetoric, it lost field in the study areas. As a consequence, in 1885 rhetorical studies disappeared from the French teaching programs.

But recently, around the 20th century, there was a revival of rhetorical study manifested in the departments of Rhetoric and Speech at academic institutions, as well as the formation of national and international professional organizations. Now, it is not focused on how to compound texts, but on showing different possibilities on how to interpret speeches. Probably, a significant reason for the revival of the study of Rhetoric was the renewed importance of language and persuasion in the increasingly mediated environment of that century, mainly in the political speech.

A contemporary theorist of the rhetorical area is McLuhan. He suggests that if we do not consider the environment's interference, it is not possible to understand the message, as it is stated in the excerpt below:

> the gratuitous assumption that communication is a matter of transmission of information, message or idea... blinds people to the aspect of communication as participation in a common situation. And it leads to ignoring the form of communication... which is more significant that the information or idea 'transmitted'" (McLuhan, 2003, p. 6).

As Costa (2011) suggests, the way of uttering in Rhetoric is as important as or more important than what is said, and the language is the effect of the forms of use. It is the image and emotion in the language. For him, the role of Rhetoric is not to analyze but recognize and identify.

Costa (2011) also sustains that metaphors, appearance and prosody are important elements of Rhetoric, considering they are much meaning by a little cost, so metaphors and slogans can be considered concentrated unities of Rhetoric. *Metaphor* means *transport*, and it allows an amplitude of meanings of what is said. However, there are other important elements on this theory, like *antithesis*, that is the presence of opposite words or ideas on the speech or text; *parallel construction*, that is the repetition of the same word or sentence; *personification*, that is abstractions or inanimate objects with human attributes or feelings; and *paradox,* as ideas or thoughts that are contradictory. There are also

other elements of figure of speech that are commonly used on rhetorical speeches, but they are not relevant to this work.

According to Ferreira (2010), as we have beliefs, values and opinions, we use the word as an instrument that shows to others our impressions about the world, our feelings, doubts, passions and aspirations. Through the word, we also try to influence people and excite or calm their emotions to guide their actions, join interests with them and establish agreements that allow us to live together harmoniously. But we are, also, social builders as active subjects that reveal ourselves by living together with other people. In order to make it, we need to use argumentation because it is the civilized and polite way, although not always ethic, to discuss about a subject without using violence, authoritarism or strength.

The first and most common function of Rhetoric is the persuasion, which has the terms *to persuade* or *to convince* as considered synonymous. However, apart from the fact that they are both segments of rhetorical speech, *to persuade* is, according to Ferreira (2010), to move by heart, by exploiting the emotional side. It is to guide the speech through the other's passions. Still according to the author, *to convince* is to move by reason, by exploiting logical proofs; to coordinate the speech through rational arguments. To sum up, it is possible to state that Rhetoric takes advantage of two ways of persuading: the exploitance of reason and the exploitance of affection.

However, we cannot forget the *argumentation*, a basic aspect of rhetorical speeches, considering Rhetorical speech influences the entire personality of the hearers, positively or negatively, but it is not possible do not take an ideological position through rhetorical arguments. If a person is not sure about what he/she thinks about a subject, at least that speech will make him/her think deeply about it. The goal of every argumentation is to adhere or confirm ideas to their listeners, and consequently, to motion a positive or absence of action, or, at least, to create on the auditorium the willingness of acting.

Taking this into consideration, the study of Rhetoric considers the language in use in a socio-interactional context, and, for this, it is necessary to pay particular attention to some rhetorical features. Among them, we can mention the most important ones considering that they are very frequent in use. They are the *ambiguity*, the *metaphor* and the *irony*.

According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2008, p. 167), there are "certain modes of expression which are different from the ordinary". They are recognized as *rhetorical figures.* As a *figure of speech* it is possible to understand, according to *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, "a word or phrase used in a different way from its usual meaning in order to create a particular mental picture or effect".

Ambiguity can be defined as what happens when there is more than one possible meaning in a same sentence. This term is defined by the *Philosophical Dictionary* as

> [t]he presence of two or more distinct meanings for a single word or expression. In itself, ambiguity is a common, harmless, and often amusing feature of ordinary language. When unnoticed in the context of otherwise careful reasoning, however, it can lead to one of several informal fallacies (Philosophical Dictionary website).

Ambiguity is also defined by Camara Jr. (2002) as the circumstance of a linguistic communication that has more than an interpretation. *Ambiguity* can be formed as a consequence of the polissemy, homonymy and deficiency of syntactic patterns. Some ambiguities are composed by metaphors and literal meanings, when both possibilities are able to be considered as the speaker meaning.

As *metaphor* it is possible to consider an expression that is not possible to be right in certain situation, then, the interlocutor needs to find another meaning for that word or expression. It is possible to think on it as a dichotomy between metaphorical and literal meanings.

According to Camara Jr. (2002), *metaphor* is a figure of language which is the transference of a term for a meaning that is different of its usual concept. In other words, it is a word or sentence used differently from its normal use in order to make the utterance better understandable.

The most ancient notion of metaphor comes from Aristotle, from the IV century A.C. In *Poetic Art,* he presents four types of metaphor: from gender to species, from species to gender, from species to species, by analogy. The contemporary definition of *metaphor* is more similar to the fourth type. According to him, *metaphor* allows the expression of a new idea.

As examples of rupture between the significance of the speaker's utterances and the literal meaning of the sentence, Searle (1995) indicates irony,

metaphor and ISA. In each one of these cases, what the speaker means to say is not the same of what the utterance really means and, notwithstanding, what he wants to mean depends on what the utterance means in many ways.

In order for the interlocutor to be able to understand what the speaker means to say, s/he must have to share the same context and knowledge about that subject. A metaphorical sentence is different of what a literal sentence is. As the literal meaning is understood a situation in that the utterance's first meaning and the speaker's intention are the same.

Metaphors are often used to fill in the semantic gaps in paraphrases as Searle (1995) indicates. He also suggests (1995) that there are strategies to discover if an utterance has a metaphorical meaning or it presents communicational defects, as obvious insincerity, semantic nonsense, transgression of the speech acts' rules or transgression of the conversational principles of communication. He (1995) also defends that the hearer must have an idea of what the speaker intends to mean – his/her contribution to communication has to exceed the mere passive comprehension and s/he has to do it using a semantic content that is different from the spoken and that is related to it. Metaphor, according to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2008), is "a trope", that is the artistic alteration of the meaning of a word or sentence.

Sardinha (2007) affirms that metaphors are powerful rhetorical resources and that they are consciously used by politicians, lawyers, journalists, writers and poets, among others, to give more "color" and "strength" to their speech and writing. The author sustains that a metaphor is an economic way of expressing a huge quantity of information, and that it creates proximity with the interlocutors because when they interpret it they become accomplices of the speaker.

The author (2007) still defends that there are three different theories about metaphor, namely the conceptual metaphor, the systematic metaphor and the grammatical metaphor. Sardinha (2007) states that, nowadays, figures of speech are taught in oratory and argumentation courses as techniques to improve the power of convincing and the communication in general. He suggests, as a way of discovering if an expression is metaphorical or not, trying to describe it by using the formula "be like", for example, in an utterance like "your eyes *are like* the blue sea".

He also sustains that we do not have a choice: if we want to belong to the society, to interact, to be understood, to understand the world and so on, we need to obey, to live by the metaphors that our culture offers to us.

Irony is another important feature of the rhetorical speech and sometimes it is related to metaphor, because some ironies are built through a metaphor with the inverse idea of what corresponds to the real situation. As *irony* we can understand, according to the Camara Jr. (2002), a figure of thought that leads us, from a word or sentence, to understand it diversely to its usual meaning.

As for *irony*, Searle (1995) suggests that its mechanisms consist in the emission which, if taken literally, are obviously not adequate for that situation. Being strongly inadequate for the situation, the interlocutor must reinterpret it, turning it in an adequate utterance. For this, the most natural way to interpret it is to understand what *the opposite* of its literal shape means.

As it is known in rhetorical theories, intonation can also be a way of being ironic. When the utterance does not make sense in its literal interpretation, the interlocutor looks for an alternative meaning for it. Another usual resource is *polissemy*, that is, a word that has many possible meanings.

To summarize this subject, it is possible to say that when the meaning is different from the literal meaning, there is a *metaphor*; when the utterance has the real meaning as being opposite of what was said, there is an *irony*; when an expression has several possible meanings, it is a *polissemy. Polissemy* is the phenomena of words or sentences that in certain situation have more than one interpretation or meaning. When the utterance means literally what was said but also something more, we find *CI and ISA.*

We also have to address emotions and the social aspects in the context that they are spoken. As some examples of these characteristics, it is possible to mention gender, age, race, beliefs and their differences in the society. In order to analyze all of these in language, it is important to consider that the rhetorical theory admits the existence of, according to Ferreira (2010): *a speaker,* symbolized by *ethos* (as it was first mentioned by Aristotle), that is the speaker that has his/her credibility supported on his/her character, virtue, honor and confidence; *an auditorium,* symbolized by *pathos,* that in order to be effective we need to convince it and seduce it; and *a speech,* symbolized by *logos* (the word, reason), that is what is said and its style.

Moreover, Ferreira (2010) also argues that the auditorium has a common posture that is to look for the speaker's image on the speech and give him/her or not the authority of saying what s/he is saying. The speaker explores this authority and adds his/her personality (ways of being, acting and seeing the world) to the speech. The interaction between the speaker and the auditorium is by the image one has from the other one.

As Aristotle states,

> It is thus evident that Rhetoric does not deal with any one definite class of subjects, but, like Dialectic, [is of general application]; also, that it is useful; and further, that its function is not so much to persuade, as to find out in each case the existing means of persuasion (1947, p. 13).

Aristotle suggests that the function of Rhetoric is not just to persuade, but also to find out the existing means of persuasion and, consequently, to recognize attempts of persuasion in other speeches. The author declares that the aim of Rhetoric is not just to persuade people, but also to become better succeeded in the arguments if circumstances allow it. And, for this to happen, it is important to present the idea of a moral and ethic person, trustful and honest. Everything depends on this for the rhetorical success of the speech. It is important to emphasize here that the real character of the speaker does not matter; what really takes place is the image s/he sells to his/her interlocutors.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2008, p. 320) suggest that, "the audience must get the impression that it has full freedom of decision". The listeners must have the sensation that they are totally responsible for their own decisions and thoughts. They need to feel their egos being respected by the speaker.

Ethos consolidation occurs in the rhetorical act according to the acceptance of the auditorium, what is essential for a rhetorical speech. Even in the media such as television or radio speech, or even in a book, there is an interlocutor, someone who the speaker is talking to and planning his/her discourse according to the interlocutor's beliefs, wishes and purposes.

The speech, as Ferreira (2010) defends, is never an isolated event: it comes from other speeches and goes to others agreeing, complementing or disagreeing among them. Facing such a huge responsibility, the speaker gives the hearers the following positions: *to act as judges* because they will analyze and consider the cause; *to act as assembly* considering they will think about the future;

or *to act as spectators,* because they will evaluate the speech in the end of it, enjoying it or not, agreeing or disagreeing, without having the compromise of taking an ultimate position.

Still according to Ferreira (2010), there is a natural stress on Rhetoric, which is a characteristic of the social communication, as difference of concepts, distinct views of the world, ideological divergences, and others. The speaker has to consider these interlocutor ideas in order to agree or disagree to them. The speaker has also to consider the present, past and future of his/her motive because the auditorium assume several factors in their decision, as moral, values, wisdom, personal interests, emotions, among others.

Therefore, the speaker has to be prepared to receive criticism, in order to avoid vulnerability on the speech. However, this depends on the interpretation, or, in other words, on the hermeneutics, the science of interpreting texts. In this hermeneutic act, to opt by order of expressions in a sentence, or even the choice of certain vocabulary instead of other, can mold opinions and provoke emotions on the listeners. As Ferreira (2010) shows, facts can be the same, but the discursive emphasis can influence opinions and act persuasively on the listeners.

According to the rhetorical context, in front of a problem, as Ferreira (2010) defends, reason and emotion will be present on the auditorium mind, and the speaker has to present arguments in order to show a plausible solution for that trouble.

It is common in slogans and advertisings the truth not being relevant, as Ferreira (2010) suggests, but the truth sensation that the statements print in their auditorium, being verosímil and persuasive. The advertisers create necessities, include concepts and modify "truths" in their customers. The author (2010, p. 34) also states that "the practice of rhetoric allows the coexistence of several views of reality […]. […] no product is impossible to be sold". This phenomenon of persuasion is also known as eloquence.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2008) cite Lasswell, considering they believe that the essential difference between educators and propagandists is that the educator deals with topics that are not an object of controversy to his/her audience. Educator has the authority for saying those contents, and his audience expects this from him, meanwhile the propagandist has to gain the goodwill of his audience. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2008, p. 26) also state that "audiences

are almost infinite in their variety, and that, in the effort to adapt to their particular characteristics, a speaker faces innumerable problems". This happens also with readers of literary works that are totally heterogenic, and the author has to consider this fact when s/he is writing to them.

Ferreira (2010, p. 86) argues that Rhetoric uses, more than anything else, emotion (considering that reason and emotion in Rhetoric are inseparable). It defends the most probable thesis through persuasion. According to him, Rhetoric is based on feasibility and not on truth and it manipulates facts and thoughts, mixing reason and emotion.

The uses of resources that may influence people have to do with different characteristics of the audience, as sociocultural ones. According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2008, p. 26): "[…] audiences are almost infinite in their variety, and that, in the effort to adapt to their particular characteristics, a speaker faces innumerable problems".

Ferreira (2010) also states that beyond different meanings words can evoke, text harmony and musicality are also relevant in the final rhetorical effect. As several other resources that are possible in order to use it in a rhetorical speech, one of the most common and that better identifies a rhetorical speech is the metaphor.

It is worth to mention here that Aristotle, in his work *Rhetoric,* presents three rhetorical genres: Deliberative – that looks for persuade or dissuade, and gives orientation for future decisions; Judicial/Forensic – that defends or accuses considering the purpose of a past action. It determines the fair and unfair; Epideictic/Epidictic – that praises or censures contemporary acts.

For reviewing some aspects that are important in a speech, as *Ethos, Pathos* and *Logos: Ethos* means character, and implies the speaker's attitude and character; *Pathos* means the feelings the speaker arise on his/her audience; *Logos* means logical thinking through it the speaker can lead his audience to a convincement. All of these aspects are important in a successful rhetorical speech and these abilities are necessary in order to achieve the listeners' attention and agreement.

In order to make a rhetorical analysis it is important to ask some questions as: *who, how, what, agreeing with what, against what, to whom,* and *when.* Here it is not important to verify if the text or speech is right or not, but we have to pay

attention on how rhetorical elements take shape, in other words, how arguments are arranged in order to convince the readers or the auditorium.

As Ferreira (2010) claims, the rhetorical problem is always a symbolic building of reality considering it involves a context of reality added to the interpretation of who lives it. The author (2010) also suggests that every speech is a political speech considering that it aims the common welfare. He still brings the difference in convincing (moving by reason) and persuasion (moving by emotion).

However, the difference between *persuading* and *convincing* is subtle. As Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2008, p. 27) state, "*persuading* surpasses *convincing,* since convincing is merely the first stage to progression toward action". Also Rousseau (*apud* PERELMAN AND OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, 2008, p. 27) sees the difference between persuade and convince, as for him it is "considered useless to convince a child *if you cannot also persuade him*". It is possible to convince someone that smoking is dangerous for his or her health, without convincing this person to stop smoking. Still according to the authors (2008, p. 28), we can apply the term *persuasive* "to argumentation that only claims validity for a particular audience, and the term *convincing* to argumentation that presumes to gain adherence of every rational being".

There is a dichotomy between action on the mind (as in Dialectics) and action on the will (as in Rhetoric). The problem with this dichotomy is that man is not made with completely segregated faculties. These faculties are linked. If you remove all rational thought, it makes the human decisions absurd, and if we see this process made by only rational thought we take aside the emotions, which are constantly involved in our decisions. The non-logic has its own logic.

Speeches are made of arguments. As *argument* we can understand, according to *Philosophical Dictionary website*,

> a collection of two or more propositions, all but one of which are the premises supposed to provide inferential support—either deductive or inductive—for the truth of the remaining one, the conclusion. The structure of arguments is the principal subject of logic (Philosophical Dictionary website).

As an analysis of argumentation, the concerning with what is supposed to be accepted by the hearers is the most important point. But it is also important to consider: what is the context of this argument, its motif or intention, its hearers' point of view about that subject, among others.

The hearers may, however, refuse the arguments given, even because they do not adhere to what the speaker presents to them, or they may see that these arguments are one-sided, or that they perceive the tendentious way in which the arguments were advanced. These are three different aspects of the criticism about a speech.

As it is contemplated in the Speech Act Theory, the argument of *authority* is also of extreme importance for Rhetoric. Although it is permissible to question its value, it cannot be dismissed as irrelevant without further ado. Considering that an argument, even if the proposition is considered true or false, if it comes from a person with authority, it holds a legitimate place on the listeners' minds. The authority of the speaker is very relevant to what s/he is saying to his/her listeners, and from this, among other aspects, it will depend his/her credibility.

However, an argument of authority does not depend only on the political, professional or religious position of the speaker. It also depends on his/her credibility and character. As Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (2008, p. 307) argue, "in any case, the person invoking an authority commits himself: there is no argument from authority without some repercussion on its user".

The authority sometimes can be a "unanimous opinion" or a "general opinion", or even a great institution. It can also be a category of profession or a religious group. Authority can also be impersonal, as a subject like "Physics", "Religion" or "The Bible". It still can be referred to as designated by a name. An authority will not convince by itself (most of the times), but this will corroborate to a well-developed argumentation. In a proportional action-reaction, for the greater authority, the more unquestionable will be the argumentation.

What is, then, the relation between *Pragmatics* and *Argumentation*? According to Cummings (2005), Argumentation and Pragmatics did not have exactly a friendly relationship, but the relatively recent interest on studies of argumentation brought Pragmatics to a central position on investigations of the structure and function of argumentation. This fact establishes the argument as a different speech act in the verbal communication. To theorists of this new pragmatic conception arguments are more accurately described and evaluated considering the SAT and the felicity conditions.

As Contrastive Rhetoric we can understand the study of the differences among the discourses of different languages and cultures. All languages contain a

variety of organizational modes, and native speakers recognize which modes to use and the consequences of their choices. However, the non-native speaker does not have many possible alternatives of vocabulary. S/he also does not recognize the sociolinguistic constraints of his/her alternatives. In order to analyze these differences, it is possible to use Contrastive Rhetoric.

To sum what Rhetoric is, it is important to highlight aspects like argument, intention of the speaker and the listener, as well as reason, emotion and persuasion. In these days, a New Rhetoric emerged, which shows that Rhetoric is also concerned with rational and emotional effects on the listeners. In the Classical Rhetoric (from Plato and Aristotle) it has the effect due to the way it is uttered (as soundness, intonation, accent and context, as ironic or metaphorical). In the literary view, Rhetoric only has its base on rhythm and form. However, it is also necessary to pay attention on the utterance's context, with the thoughts, ideas, impressions and emotions it brings, and that results on the rhetorical effect on the utterance.

However, a learner of an additional language is not able to pay attention on rhetorical effects when they are starting their learning. It is not an easy task for an additional language teacher to promote this awareness either. In order to help students on discovering these new possibilities of comprehension and interpretation, the teacher can use the Awareness Raising Theory, as it is a way of providing favorable situations to students so that they may realize these rhetorical characteristics by themselves.

2.2 AWARENESS RAISING THEORY IN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE TEACHING (ALT)

When the theme is additional language learning or acquisition, many pragmatic features can be unnoticed or missed, as in the use of appropriate words or expressions in certain situations, such as the use of metaphors and irony, or implicitness of utterances. As all of these are integrant parts of the additional language learning process, it is important that the teacher promotes pragmatic and rhetorical awareness raising in class with different activities and focused exercises. Teachers need to assist students in their pragmatic awareness

process, considering it is an essential ability they need in order to communicate appropriately.

Awareness raising activities are the ones that make the subject that will be learned explicit, in other words, it can be considered as the conscious knowledge of an additional language. In the explicit learning process the teacher provides students with some rules and the opportunity of practicing it through activities. Another possibility of explicit teaching of awareness raising activities in class is to allow students firstly to try to infer and understand the implicit meanings of a speech or text and, after they have some time for discussion, the teacher can explain what they are and how to recognize the pragmatic aspects in it.

As Ellis *et al* (2009, p. 25) declare, "different educational experiences generate different type of knowledge". Because of this, all the existing kinds of teaching are important to be used in class. According to the authors, implicit learning proceeds without attentional resources. In contrast, "explicit learning typically involves memorizing a series of successive facts and thus makes heavy demands on working memory" (2009, p. 3). Consequently, this procedure becomes a conscious one.

According to Ellis (2005), the acquisition of the grammar of a native language is implicit and extracted from the user´s experience rather than from explicit rules. The implicit instruction is mainly automatic, in other words, the learner acquires the language without noticing clearly what s/he is learning. In an additional language acquisition process performed by adults, acquisition happens mainly in an explicit way, and it is compared with the native speaker productions.

According to Alcón and Jordá, pragmatic awareness raising involves

> the conscious, reflective, explicit knowledge about pragmatics. It thus involves knowledge of underlying appropriate language use in particular communicative situations and on the part of members of specific speech communities. (ALCÓN and JORDÁ, 2008, p. 193).

As the authors declare in the excerpt above, awareness raising involves the explicit, conscious and reflective knowledge about the pragmatic aspects of language. It is the possibility or opportunity the teacher gives to students to learn, discover, think critically about certain communicative subjects or situations of language, and here we could insert the implicit, metaphorical or ironic utterances, apologies, commands, requests, etc, in order to raise their knowledge and ability

on the language competence. However, the combination of implicit and inductive processes is also clearly important as in the case of children acquiring the first language without being conscious of this process.

As Sayers states,

> awareness-raising is a process which opens opportunities for information exchange in order to improve mutual understanding and to develop competencies and skills necessary to enable changes in social attitude and behavior. To be effective, the process of awareness-raising must meet and maintain the mutual needs and interests of the actors involved (2006, p. VII).

We, as EAL teachers, must be able to distinguish explicit learning from explicit instruction, as there is a difference between what is taught and what is learned. In explicit instruction the learner can be exposed to many rules and examples of a pragmatic aspect and sometimes s/he does not learn them because they may not be significant for him/her. Considering this, the most important on the pragmatic awareness raising process is to make the student become interested and involved in the activity.

Schmidt (1990) suggests that for a successful acquisition to occur, the L2 aspects must be noticed or consciously learned by the additional language learner. Considering this, there are some aspects on language that are beyond learner knowledge and, thus, they need to be pointed out by the EAL teacher in order for him/her to notice them. The author (1995, p. 2) also states that "[...] mistakes in a foreign language are the result of either not knowing the rules, forgetting them, or not paying attention". We can see here the importance of attention in the awareness raising process for additional language learning. Still according to him, "[...] input and interaction, attention and awareness are crucial for learning" (1995, p. 3).

Alves and Magro (2011) suggest that the term "explicit instruction" should include not only linguistic aspects, but also pedagogic steps in order to instruct students about how to be more effective on the target language. Therefore, the authors (2011) refer to "explicit instruction" as a term that encompasses

pedagogic procedures that teachers should adopt to promote more effective learning in EAL classes.[1]

An EAL teacher needs to keep in mind the fact that if comprehension among speakers of the same language is not guaranteed, it will be a more arduous task for the learner to understand the implicitness and rhetorical features people constantly apply, many times unconsciously on their speech.

As Sayers (2006) affirms, communication is irreversible: once something is said, it is not possible takes it back or undoes it. The challenge is to avoid or, at least, minimize possibilities of misunderstanding or misinterpretation. But why does human communication usually fail? The author suggests that factors as language, cultural or personal differences and lost information are usually responsible for mistakes or errors on communication.

Bardovi-Harlig (1996), in her attempt to bring Pedagogy and Pragmatics together, emphasizes the importance of helping learners increase their pragmatic awareness, avoiding a teacher-centered classroom where only the teachers talk and tell what to do and learners are allowed just to receive and apply the information. Nevertheless, it is known that teaching pragmatics is a complex mission indeed and the appropriate use of certain language is straightly connected with cultural values, aspects, situations, interlocutors, among other aspects. Just teaching formulaic sentences or leading learners into the considered standard language is possibly not enough to enhance pragmatic ability. Besides that, it seems that an awareness-raising approach can empower learners to discern cultural and linguistic differences involved in language use. It is expected, then, that learners will be able to apply the pragmatic awareness acquired in class in any different or new situation they may encounter in the future.

As it is exposed by Arndt *et al* (2000), there is a basic framework for awareness of language-in-use (features of language in use): choice of words and structures (basic ways in which language is organized and structured); flexibility (the way language is dynamic and able to adapt to changing circumstances); attitude (people use language to convey different attitudes as well as they have different attitudes towards the language they find); effectiveness (degree which

---

[1] In the appendance we added two examples of the possibility of using simple activities with little texts including some exercises about them. The first one is about the text *The 4 wives*; and the second text is called *A Real Short Story,* by Anthony Rain Starez.

users of a language successfully achieve their purpose); variety (different ways language may appear); medium (the models or channels through which language is manifested); knowledge of the world (cultural background) and context of language in use (situation, environment and expectations about it).

As Arndt *et al* (2000) defend, *variety* comprehends form (written or spoken), style (formal, informal, assertive, tentative), source (newspaper, novel, chat show, telephone conversation), purpose (to advise, inform, warn, amuse), context, speaker/writer origin, social factors and personal usage. *Medium* is considered the face-to-face conversation, via telephone, e-mail or a hand-written letter. *Attitude* is considered by Arndt *et al* (2000) thoughtfulness, sarcasm, irony, anger, puzzlement, interest, sympathy, threat, gratitude, complaint, disapproval, support, congratulation, approval, praise. There are also some basic parameters with which we can form judgments of *effectiveness*: ostensive purposes of speakers or writers, attitude and likely interpretations of intended audience, and relationships among those involved in the communication; and extent of language shared among people involved in the interaction.

Jenkins (2000) declares that there are aspects that are teachable (i.e., possible to be explained in the classroom in explicit lessons), and others that are learnable (students are exposed to a kind of situation and learn it by their need to do that). Jenkins also suggests that, for successful communication to occur, one has to pay attention to the context of the utterance, and to the possible intention the speaker had in uttering it. The teacher can teach these pragmatic aspects by calling students attention to the different uses language can have, depending on how, where, when, and by whom it is applied.

The objective here is to promote the minimal occurrences of misunderstandings through the offering of adequate use and comprehension of linguistic expressions. Along with these pragmatic features there are also other pragmatic aspects that could come along in the formal additional language teaching, namely the rhetorical aspects as sonority, accent, tone, gestures and other features of an utterance that are not considered in the common analysis, although they are important to influence, convince or persuade people.

Commonly, additional language classes (mainly in public schools) are most of the time focused on grammar and vocabulary, being pragmatic aspects and adequacy out of the teaching program. Blum-Kulka declared that,

> even fairly advanced language learners' communicative acts regularly contain pragmatic errors, or deficits, in that they fail to convey or comprehend the intended illocutionary force or politeness value (1989, P. 10).

In other words, acquiring a relevant degree of proficiency in an additional language learning process does not guarantee a considerable pragmatic level of competence. Considering that, it is necessary to promote opportunities in class for learners to be able to improve their pragmatic abilities in order to comprehend others and to express themselves more efficiently. As Ellis *et all* (2009) state, even explicit teaching does not guarantee immediate improvement on learner's communicative competence if the aspects exposed by the teacher are not put into practice by learners, considering that the instructions could be forgotten if they are not reinforced through contextualized activities.

However, to promote this access of the student to all this unsaid information in the utterances, the teacher needs to know not only pragmatics but also how to apply it in class in order to promote this learning. To achieve all these results, the teacher needs to rethink his/her classes with a methodology that focuses on the pragmatic features such as inferential activities, as well as aspects on grammatical instruction. For this new reality to take place in an additional language class it is important to acknowledge the necessity of developing the ability of noticing rhetorical resources on the learner and to stimulate it by means of awareness raising activities, focusing on effective communication in the target language.

To put it into practice, Kasper (1997) suggests two types of activities: the ones focused on raising students' pragmatic awareness and the ones offering opportunities for communicative practice. In other words, it is important not only to plan activities that have to do with specific pragmatic aspects, but also to offer students opportunities to put the new knowledge in practice. In general terms, theory without application is not meaningful for learners.

What usually happens in a conventional additional language teaching environment is that learners acquire high proficiency in the target language without noticing the speaker's implicit intentions. Awareness raising activities must be designed to develop recognition of how language can be used appropriately in

context. They have to be designed to make learners aware of differences between their native language and the target language.

Considering this, we suggest the promotion of pragmatic (and rhetoric is included in this) awareness raising activities about styles and features in order to promote the possibility for the learner to notice and to become familiar with them.

3 TEXTS (LITERARY OR EVERYDAY) AS INSTRUMENT OF ANALYSIS

In order to promote rhetorical awareness among students of English as additional language, we suggest the use of some samples or excerpts of texts or speeches, news, advertisements or literary works in which rhetorical features can be observed. It is possible to develop this idea with many possibilities and benefits of working through all kinds of texts. In this work, we illustrate the use of two texts, namely *Macbeth* and the speech of Barack Obama *Yes, we can*.

3.1 MACBETH

In the first analysis some excerpts of the Shakespearean play *Macbeth* are suggested. This play is about a noble who met the three Weird Sisters, strange old women, who told him that he would become king. This forecast influenced or induced his murdering acts against the king and his friend.

However, even with the Weird Sisters being presented as supernatural beings, more specifically as witches, we suggest the use of the "what if" question, the rhetorical awareness raising on the assumed students (as it was an in-class activity) about Macbeth's acts not being the result of witchcraft, but only the speech art of convincing and persuading through words. In order to analyze this, we consider only the exchanges between Macbeth and the Weird Sisters. Then, we have a lyrical sample of persuasion.

In order to contextualize the Shakespearean play, we share some curiosities about it. As Gomes (2009) explains, a characteristic of the tragedies of Shakespeare is

> [...] the fact that mankind is constantly trying go beyond its limits but mankind is not perfect itself and is frequently failing in its attempts. *Macbeth* is about destiny, free will and fate, but it is also about superstition, ambiguity and the contradiction between appearance and reality. The main reason for the continuous critical interest in Macbeth is because he represents humankind's universal propensity to temptation and sin and reminds us that nobody is perfect (2009, p. 9).

Shakespeare was born in 1564 and died in 1616, but his works are still fascinating because each time we read them we can find different aspects and perspectives in them. His plays were made for the Elizabethan audience, and because of this, his works have a little of everything in order to satisfy all kinds of people.

The play is the 35th work of Shakespeare and it is dated from 1606. In fact, Shakespeare was certainly motivated to write the play *Macbeth* inspired by the fact that the current king of that time, James I, was interested in witchcraft and also considered himself a descendant of Banquo. According to ancient books, Banquo was one of the accomplices of Macbeth on King Duncan's murder. However, it was not a good idea for the playwright to present James' ancestor as a regicide's accomplice. Probably for this reason, the author had preferred to change this part of the real story by making Banquo, if not a hero, at least a kind of martyr. Besides many characters had really lived, their stories were not exactly as the presented on the play.

In order to clarify the story that is depicted in *Macbeth,* a short summary is presented below. Macbeth is presented as a hero of the battle against Ireland troops. Some acts after, the witches appear to the lords Macbeth and Banquo telling to Macbeth that he will be the Lord of Cawdor and king; to Banquo they say that he will be father of kings, although he will not be one himself. The witches disappear and Ross and Angus come closer telling the news that Macbeth is the new lord of Cawdor. To Macbeth come thoughts of murdering and the idea of becoming king.

Some acts after, Lady Macbeth, in her castle, reads Macbeth's letter telling her about the strange meeting with the Weird Sisters, and their prophecies. This brought on her the greed to become more than what she was, and with it, thoughts of murder. The king is kindly welcomed by Lady Macbeth in Macbeth's castle. King Duncan is killed, and the perpetrators make it appear as if his own servants were responsible for the slaughter. The murder is discovered and the two sons of the king, afraid for their own lives, run away. As they escaped, the suspicion for the killing falls on them.

Considering he knows much more than was appropriate, Banquo is killed, but his son escapes from the murderers. Some time after that, the ghost of Banquo appears to Macbeth. Some nobles joint and ask for military support in

order to annihilate Macbeth. The witches invoke their "masters" for Macbeth. The apparitions say to Macbeth to be careful about Macduff; to be sanguinary and fearless because no man born of a woman could harm him; and that he has not to be afraid until the Birnam wood walks towards to Dunsidane hill. Macbeth is informed that his queen is mad, but he is too busy preparing himself for the battle that is coming. In Birnam wood, Malcolm orders the men to get a branch and hold it while the walk to Dunsidane.

In the final acts, Macbeth knows that his wife is dead. A messenger comes and says to him that Birnam wood seems to be moving towards to Dunsidane. At the battlefield, Macbeth meets Macduff, and discovers that Macduff had been taken out of his mother by a c-section and, consequently, he was not born naturally out of a woman. Macduff kills Macbeth, and the throne goes then to Malcolm, the son and heir of King Duncan.

As the Weird Sisters' speech is ambiguous and intentionally leads Macbeth through the play, their dialogues are analyzed in this work. Besides having a strange appearance and being involved in supernatural conditions, it is possible to wonder if the Weird Sisters achieved their interests just using the power of words by ambiguity. In order to show that, we provide three excerpts below:

Excerpt 1 – To Macbeth

FIRST WITCH.
All hail, Macbeth! hail to thee, Thane of Glamis!
SECOND WITCH.
All hail, Macbeth! hail to thee, Thane of Cawdor!
THIRD WITCH.
All hail, Macbeth! that shalt be king hereafter! (Act I, scene III)

And

Excerpt 2 – To Banquo, as he asks them
FIRST WITCH.
Hail!
SECOND WITCH.
Hail!
THIRD WITCH.
Hail!
FIRST WITCH.
Lesser than Macbeth, and greater.
SECOND WITCH.
Not so happy, yet much happier.
THIRD WITCH.
Thou shalt get kings, though thou be none:
So all hail, Macbeth and Banquo!
FIRST WITCH.
Banquo and Macbeth, all hail! (Act I, scene III)

and

Excerpt 3 - The apparitions to Macbeth
APPARITION (1).
Macbeth! Macbeth! Macbeth! Beware Macduff;
Beware the Thane of Fife.--Dismiss me:--enough.
[Descends.]
[…]
APPARITION (2).--
Macbeth! Macbeth! Macbeth!
MACBETH.
Had I three ears, I'd hear thee.
APPARITION.
Be bloody, bold, and resolute; laugh to scorn
The power of man, for none of woman born
Shall harm Macbeth.
[Descends.]
MACBETH.
Then live, Macduff: what need I fear of thee?
But yet I'll make assurance double sure,
And take a bond of fate: thou shalt not live;
That I may tell pale-hearted fear it lies,
And sleep in spite of thunder.--What is this,
[Thunder. An Apparition of a Child crowned, with a tree in his hand, rises.]
That rises like the issue of a king,
And wears upon his baby brow the round
And top of sovereignty?
ALL.
Listen, but speak not to't.
APPARITION.
Be lion-mettled, proud; and take no care
Who chafes, who frets, or where conspirers are:
Macbeth shall never vanquish'd be, until
Great Birnam wood to high Dunsinane hill
Shall come against him (IV, i).

As it was presented a literary text, we now will offer a sample of a political speech, what is also plenty of pragmatic and rhetorical aspects.

3.2 THE POLITICAL SPEECH OF BARACK OBAMA

In the second text to be analyzed, there is a speech from Barack Obama (it is in the Appendance of this work), in New Hampshire, on 8 January 2008. It is called "Yes we can", and this sentence became his slogan. In it, he defends ideas of leading the country close to the people, when they would be active in decision-

making and would become part of the history of the country. He emphasizes the importance of the union of the people, and constantly makes them feel that they will be important and powerful when he becomes President.

As any political speech, it is recognized as an advertised proclamation, richly filled with rhetorical elements. In this case, we have a political sample of persuasion. This is the reason why this text is selected here.

Barack Hussein Obama II is the 44th and current president of the United States. Obama previously served as a United States Senator from Illinois, from January 2005 until 2008, when he resigned following his victory in the presidential election of that year. Obama was born in Honolulu, Hawaii, in 1961. He graduated from Columbia University and Harvard Law School.

Obama is the first African American to become president of the United States of America. This is an important conquest for the afro-descendants, immigrants and poor people in the country. Prejudice towards this population is manifested by means of the use of jokes, offensive words, or by avoiding personal contact with them. After Obama´s election for presidency, social and racial differences present in the country were minimized.

At the moment of the elections people were disappointed with the former president, George W. Bush, for the fact that he made war in Afghanistan for years, and many soldiers were killed in that country. This war was considered by the electors as being totally useless and without purpose. Considering this background, when a person representing the people, mainly the ones from minorities, showed up running for presidency, he was considered the solution for a revolution in the political situation of the country, he was considered by thepeople as a new direction to be followed.

Obama´s speech is rich in rhetorical elements, and it defined his election as the President of United States of America. It shows his ability to persuade people with emotions and thoughts. In the next chapter, both texts are analyzed using SAT and Rhetoric as tools. To illustrate this, the excerpts of the speech are available below:

Excerpt 1
A few weeks ago, no one imagined that we'd have accomplished what we did here tonight. For most of this campaign, we were far behind, and we always knew our climb would be steep.

Excerpt 2

There is something happening when Americans who are young in age and in spirit - who have never before participated in politics - turn out in numbers we've never seen because they know in their hearts that this time must be different.

Excerpt 3

There is something happening when people vote not just for the party they belong to but the hopes they hold in common - that whether we are rich or poor; black or white; Latino or Asian; whether we hail from Iowa or New Hampshire, Nevada or South Carolina, we are ready to take this country in a fundamentally new direction. That is what's happening in America right now. Change is what's happening in America.

Excerpt 4

You can be the new majority who can lead this nation out of a long political darkness - Democrats, Independents and Republicans who are tired of the division and distraction that has clouded Washington; who know that we can disagree without being disagreeable; who understand that if we mobilize our voices to challenge the money and influence that's stood in our way and challenge ourselves to reach for something better, there's no problem we can't solve - no destiny we cannot fulfill.

Excerpt 5

Our new American majority can end the outrage of unaffordable, unavailable health care in our time. We can bring doctors and patients; workers and businesses, Democrats and Republicans together; and we can tell the drug and insurance industry that while they'll get a seat at the table, they don't get to buy every chair. Not this time. Not now.

Excerpt 6

And when I am President, we will end this war in Iraq and bring our troops home; we will finish the job against al Qaeda in Afghanistan; we will care for our veterans; we will restore our moral standing in the world; and we will never use 9/11 as a way to scare up votes, because it is not a tactic to win an election, it is a challenge that should unite America and the world against the common threats of the twenty-first century: terrorism and nuclear weapons; climate change and poverty; genocide and disease.

Excerpt 7

But the reason our campaign has always been different is because it's not just about what I will do as President, it's also about what you, the people who love this country, can do to change it.

Excerpt 8

Yes we can to justice and equality. Yes we can to opportunity and prosperity. Yes we can heal this nation. Yes we can repair this world. Yes we can.

Excerpt 9

And so tomorrow, as we take this campaign South and West; as we learn that the struggles of the textile worker in Spartanburg are

not so different than the plight of the dishwasher in Las Vegas; that the hopes of the little girl who goes to a crumbling school in Dillon are the same as the dreams of the boy who learns on the streets of LA; we will remember that there is something happening in America; that we are not as divided as our politics suggests; that we are one people; we are one nation; and together, we will begin the next great chapter in America's story with three words that will ring from coast to coast; from sea to shining sea - Yes. We. Can.

These analyses (of "Macbeth" and "Yes, we can" texts) attempt to show that rhetorical aspects can be found in any kind of text or speech, and that they are not exclusively literary texts or political speeches. They are used here considering they are richer in rhetorical elements.

4 DEVELOPING PRAGMATIC AWARENESS OF RHETORICAL ASPECTS THROUGH TEXT ANALYSIS

We attempt to show in this work the importance of developing pragmatic awareness of rhetorical elements in EAL teaching through text analysis. In order to illustrate this practice in class we suggest the use of two texts that can be worked with students of English as an additional language. The role of Rhetoric in this realm is not to analyze the texts, but rather to recognize and identify the rhetorical aspects of language in them. Below, in order to illustrate the subtle difference from the two areas of study, both texts are analyzed pragmatically and rhetorically.

It is important to highlight here that in the appendance we added two examples of the possibility of using simple activities with little texts including some exercises to explore them. The first one is about the text *The 4 wives*; and the second text is called *A Real Short Story* by Anthony Rain Starez. They were inserted in this work only to illustrate the innumerous possibilities of working with texts of several kinds, proportions and complexities.

4.1 MACBETH

The first text is *Macbeth,* a Shakespearean play that contains a rich vocabulary complexity. It has many literal meanings that seem to be metaphorical when they are uttered; metaphors; ironies and ambiguities. On this play, it seems that the sentences uttered by the Weird Sisters are non-literal or metaphorical, although they are literal in their essence, and this fact is just possible to be perceived in the end of the play. Besides this fact, Macbeth's perspective of the Weird Sisters' utterances are considered here, in other words, the pragmatic and rhetorical aspects of what was said by them in the play.

When the Weird Sisters say that Macbeth will be king, they are producing a locutionary act; they are making a suggestion to him and this is an illocutionary

act; and, finally, when they are influencing him to murder King Duncan in order to become the new king, they are producing a perlocutionary act.

The possible questions that can be posed when analyzing these excerpts of the play are: What is the role of the ambiguity and metaphor in this tragedy? How it is obtained? How are the utterances manipulated (if they really are) by the Weird Sisters? How the Weird Sisters manipulate their speeches? What are the rhetorical features applied on them?

The Weird Sisters seem to manipulate Macbeth by delivering ambiguous utterances which resulted in perlocutory acts. Besides having a strange appearance and being involved in supernatural conditions, the Weird Sisters achieved their interests just using the power of words by ambiguity, which is also a very common rhetorical feature.

In this excerpt 1, taken from Act I, scene III, the Weird Sisters greet Macbeth saying two truths and the last one as another probable truth for him. These last two utterances are illocutionary acts because they have the intention to make Macbeth think about the possibility of becoming king of Scotland and this probability encourages him to think more carefully about it. Rhetorically, one can say that their persuasion is based on acquiring Macbeth's trust through their foresights, considering that the first one was a truth; the second was a real prediction of a very close future; and the third seems to be a lie in order to manipulate him.

In the excerpt 2, as the sequence of the act, the Weird Sisters utter some foresights instigated by Banquo to say something about him as well. Their words imply that Banquo will be lesser than Macbeth but greater because he will not be king but father of kings; or he will achieve this status without doing anything wrong or ethically incorrect in order to achieve it.

Banquo, according to the Weird Sisters, will not be so happy, yet much happier than Macbeth probably because he is much more fortunate than Macbeth for being the ancestor of a lineage of kings, even if he will not see the advantages of that status in life. Taking this in order to imagine what conclusions Macbeth got from these prophesies, it is possible that he felt less guilty about thinking that he would not be the only one that would get advantage and usurp the throne. He probably felt then like sharing his guilt with his companion Banquo. However, he

failed in not asking the Weird Sisters, or even himself, about why he would *only be king* while Banquo would get to be *father of kings.*

These foresights, if taken together, imply that something was not right. They could imply that Macbeth would not live long enough to have children of his own, and, consequently, this would not leave him very 'happy', or certainly less happy than Banquo, who, at least, would have glory after life. Greed blinded Macbeth to facts; and to get Duncan's throne became his main thought. One can notice the ambiguous utterances of the witches influencing Macbeth's thoughts and acts. Macbeth did not even question the motives the Weird Sisters could have. He did not think about the moral consequences of killing his king and relative. His ambition and of his wife, as well as the belief that he was predestined to become king, overcame their reasoning.

In a SAT analysis, it is possible to affirm that the utterances of the Weird Sisters are illocutionary acts, considering they made Macbeth confused about his future and tried to confuse Banquo as well. But these utterances are also perlocutory acts because they really awoke the ambitious feelings and thoughts inside Macbeth and his wife provoking their intention of murdering the king and hinting their hidden objective.

In a rhetorical analysis we can say that the utterances are considering that Macbeth would achieve power, but they also imply that he would lose his peace, integrity and honor. Comparing them, their words are ambiguous and confusing. The Weird Sisters say what they intended to provoke future events on Macbeth's life, but in a way that does not expose the terrible consequences of his acts. Why would Banquo be father of kings? As the play ends with the son of Duncan as king this is not clear, and it would be just an attempt of provoking Banquo to act in evil ways too.

In excerpt 3, as a SAT analysis of the utterances, we can notice the perlocutionary acts achieved by Macbeth, considering that Macbeth did not question the Weird Sisters' motives when he felt insecure about his fate. On the contrary, he searched for them again in order for them to say to him what was coming next. All their prophecies would lead him to his downfall as they go through his emotions and aspirations. The last of their utterances is a perlocutionary act, which resulted in Macbeth's downfall. Macbeth's defeat and

decease were caused by his own acts, which, on their turn, were influenced by the witches' utterances from their first meeting to his final.

Macbeth was influenced by the Weird Sisters to think that he would be safe by the strength of the illusion of the Apparitions. Their ambiguous utterances are at the same time locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. They are locutionary considering they were pronounced; illocutionary acts because they were uttered with the intention that Macbeth felt invincible; and perlocutionary acts considering they achieved their objective of guiding Macbeth to his death.

In these utterances, they tell Macbeth that he must be careful with Macduff, but not so much. Here, their intent is not to worry him so much, and as a consequence of it, to be unprepared for the fight. The Weird Sisters also say to him that he needs not to fear the future events because no men born of a woman could harm him. It is an illocutionary act. As a consequence of it a perlocutionary act happened, as he felt safer then.

When they suggest that he would be secure until the wood moves toward Dunsidane Hill, they intend to reaffirm his feeling of invincibility, and this can be considered an illocutionary act. Macbeth considered it an impossible thing to happen and as a consequence he relaxed, what made him vulnerable in the battle. It is a perlocutionary act, considering it is the consequence of the witches' utterances, as they intended his downfall.

In a rhetorical view of the third excerpt, the Apparitions seem to have the authority of a supernatural and superior being that is able to foresee, what made Macbeth believe in their utterances. As a perlocutionary resulting act, they made him feel invincible and immortal. These utterances contain apparent metaphors for logical thinking; however, they have a literal meaning as they occurred exactly as it was previewed. Too late Macbeth realized that they tricked him and conducted him to his own failure. This fact of making him understand their words as metaphorical when they were literal is a perlocutionary act, as it was intended by the Weird Sisters in order to make him unworried and easily defeatable. Again, they reinforced his feeling of invincibility and power, exalting his pride.

As rhetorical features we can point ethos as the Witches. They acquired Macbeth's trust and belief considering they had an authority of supernatural beings and thus he could imply that they could preview the future. As pathos it is the emotion and feelings of desire of becoming the next king. This idea was

introduced to him without his noticing that he was being manipulated through persuasive words. They made him have the sensation of being free for deciding his own acts.

The logos of this play are their speeches and their ways of uttering them. By saying the truth in some foresights they made the other previews rationally accepted by Macbeth. Their arguments on excerpt 3 seem to be absurd if taken in a literal meaning, so his rationality led him to believe that their words meant that he was invincible. Taking this into advantage, the Weird Sisters said exactly what would happen for his downfall.

Considering all these aspects presented before in a pragmatic view, it is possible to believe that Macbeth's acts are the results of ambiguous utterances which resulted into perlocutory acts, considering they are the results of an utterance on the listener's acts. Besides the Weird Sisters being strange and mysterious characters, as their name suggests, we can say that they just influenced Macbeth using ambiguous utterances and illocutionary acts that resulted into perlocutionary acts. Or we can say that they persuaded him by using ambiguous utterances and promoting his emotions and feelings, making him forget the use of logical thought about their real intentions towards him.

It is important to emphasize here that, although the Weird Sisters are presented in the play as witches and, as a consequence, supernatural beings, we can affirm that they did not do any witchcraft, magic or anything supernatural. We can say that they just used their rhetorical ability to influence Macbeth. We can perceive their knowledge of language usage in order to manipulate the acts of a person. The Weird Sisters use Macbeth's presumption that they knew him well enough for him to believe in their utterances. The Witches anticipated Macbeth´s immediate reactions in order to lead his thoughts, conclusions and, finally, his actions, which are considered here perlocutory acts. It is possible to claim that the witches knew exactly how Macbeth would interpret their utterances.

The Weird Sisters used polissemy in their words, as they could be understood as metaphor, although they actually had literal meaning. Because of this use of polissemy their utterances are ISA. They provoked CI when it was not necessary, considering their utterances had literal meaning. As they seemed to be nonsense, Macbeth was led to make implicatures about their real meaning. For him, their sentences seemed to break relevance and maxims of manner,

considering some things appeared to be nonsense or impossible to happen, and they used an obscure and ambiguous manner of saying it.

When Shakespeare portrayed them as witches and mentioned their supernatural deeds, he gave the opportunity for the audience to think about the possibility of these outcomes; moreover, due to the fact that they were witches and did witchcrafts, they merely used their rhetorical ability in order to lead Macbeth to murder and, consequently, to his downfall.

As the analysis of a literary text was made here, in the next section we will discuss how is it possible to analyze, pragmatically as well as rhetorically, also a political speech.

4.2 THE POLITICAL SPEECH OF BARACK OBAMA

In the **second text**, in a general SAT analysis we can state that when Barack Obama spoke to his electors he realized three acts at the same time: locutionary acts, considering he spoke in phonetic sounds, he uttered his words; illocutionary acts, considering he acted through his speech, he promised to be a better president than the USA had had until that moment - he promised to people that they would have power of decision about the country's subjects on his government - and he also performed perlocutionary acts, by producing his illocutionary acts he guaranteed the trust of the people and, consequently, their vote. Then, he managed what he intended most: to become president of the United States of America.

All the three acts were produced at the same time they were uttered, although the results of perlocutionary acts are usually noticed some time after the utterance is executed.

Obama' speech can also be considered an Indirect Speech Act (ISA), as he intended to make people feel powerful and trust him not only by empowering them and giving them voice and action, but also to achieve his deep intention of becoming the next president. He broke the quantity maxim when he emphasized and repeated several times the same slogan and when he illustrated it with many different situations or problems people were facing. This fact could make one infer

that he intended to reinforce that the country needed a change and that people could make this change possible by voting for him.

We can see that a political slogan as "Yes, we can", in a rhetorical view of this speech, is a minimalist rhetoric, considering that with the minimum it is possible to produce great rhetorical effects and big consequences. The slogan is reinforced in the speech by examples of everyday life and it confirms the idea that people "can" make something different for their country now, such as voting for Obama.

In the first excerpt, Obama starts his speech by saying that no one had imagined that result: he being well voted in the first elections. Here he is possibly making an allusion to the prejudice that black people suffer in the USA.

In the second excerpt we can perceive a strategy in Obama´s speech, when, referring to people who voted for him, he states that "they know in their hearts that this time must be different". This gives people strong and emotional arguments, considering he uses their dissatisfaction as an incentive to go further on elections and vote for him because he may make this change possible.

As rhetorical features of the speech we can mention the ethos by Barack Obama, with his transparence, ethics and correct posture. He represents the people, considering he conveyed the idea that he suffered prejudice and, because of this, he can understand them. His authority, then, can be personal as the person that is running for presidency, but he can also have impersonal authority as he represents the people.

In excerpt 3: "[…] we are ready to take this country in a fundamentally new direction. That is what's happening in America right now. Change is what's happening in America", Obama persuades his audience by conducting them to think that he will win the elections, encouraging them to vote on him again in the final elections.

In excerpt 4 we can see that Barack Obama has a strong rhetorical speech, when he makes people feel as they had the power of decisions about the country. He makes them feel as part of the government. He also, in his speech, addresses the prejudiced people as poor and/or black, latinos, immigrants. In his speech, he stimulates people's trust and hope.

Obama is skilled in making the people perceive themselves as powerful and in control of the decisions of the country, when he declares that

> you [audience] can be the new majority […] who understand that if we mobilize our voices to challenge the money and influence that's stood in our way and challenge ourselves to reach for something better, there's no problem we can't solve – no destiny we cannot fulfill.

This sensation of being part of the decisions is also present in excerpt 7, when he reinforces the empowerment of his audience by saying that

> […] the reason our campaign has always been different is because it's not just about what I will do as President, it's also about what you, the people who love this country, can do to change it.

In order to reach people's feelings and to provoke emotions in them, he mentions (in excerpt 5) social, health, environmental, security and economical problems, as the drug and insurance industry that is too expensive, or the bad quality in schools, the war that took or could take the life of the beloved ones, or the terrorism that brings fear to people.

In excerpt 6, Pathos is the people, his listeners. They were dissatisfied about Iraq's war and with the manner the current president was governing. They wanted a change. Obama provoked their wish of being part of this change by voting for him, without perceiving that they were being manipulated through their feelings and emotions.

Logos is his direct speech, a frank and moving speech of a person that equals himself to his people. He promoted their feeling of pride for being American, leading them to vote for the "best option", as his speech implies.

The strongest impact of his speech is the slogan "Yes we can", which is repeated several times as the speech is happening and starts many paragraphs. Repetition is a very common rhetorical resource that is used in political campaigns and this effect is called parallel construction. The slogan, besides being short, has many meanings and purposes. It provokes emotions on the listeners considering he also relates facts that people can identify themselves with. The slogan encourages people to feel as active members of the history of the country.

In the excerpts 8 and 9 of his speech, Obama places himself against every kind of prejudice and segregation that can happen to people, and persuades his listeners to think the same. He also implies that he will be different from the other politicians, for his words suggest that people are segregated as when he says "that we are not divided as our politics suggests".

At the end of his speech, in excerpt 9, he reinforces the strength people can have if they are united; he reinforces the power of people to act on political issues, and strengthens their hope in his government. He finishes his speech by saying:

> And so tomorrow, […] we will remember […] that we are not as divided as our politics suggests; that we are one people; we are one nation; and together, we will begin the next great chapter in America's story with three words that will ring from coast to coast; from sea to shining sea – Yes. We. Can.

Next, we will see a summary of both analysis, checking their similarities and contrasts.

4.3 GENERAL ANALYSIS OF BOTH TEXTS

In order to sum up, both texts are samples of the deliberative genre of Rhetoric, considering they attempt to persuade or dissuade their audience and to give orientation for future decisions. We may consider both texts persuasive and convincing, considering that persuasion is to acquire the agreement of hearer, and convincement is to provoke on the listener the will for action. Both texts also have great authorities uttering them: supernatural beings, and a very important and intelligent man in the USA, besides being black. A black person running for presidency was an unbelievable fact some time before it, considering the country is known for its segregation of cultures and color of skin.

Here we intended to suggest the possibility of working with different kinds of texts, as well as differences and similarities of SAT and Rhetoric, in order to analyze what is behind what is said, what is implied, and its rhetorical aspects and, with this, to suggest these strategies to be used in EAL classes. These are important aspects for an additional language learner to pay attention to if s/he intends to understand the language in a more thorough way and under several different points of view. They are examples of the several possible interpretations of an utterance that can be realized by the learners, this way provoking implicit learning of rhetorical aspects and effects as well as speech act effects.

The similarities between Rhetoric and SAT, more specifically regarding ISA, are that they are both concerned with the strength of an utterance and its

result on the listener. SAT, as represented by Austin, involves illocutionary acts, i.e., when what was said becomes an action, as a promise, threat, and so on. Perlocutionary acts are considered by these theories as the result or effect of what is said on the listener, culminating in the listener's attitudes, beliefs, feelings, and so forth.

For Searle, ISA is considered as having a multiplicity of meanings or more than one illocutionary strength. ISA deals with the multiple possibilities of understanding what is said, if it is literal or metaphorical, implicit or explicit, etc. It is focused on the speaker's intention, as what s/he says and what s/he intends to communicate.

Grice, with the Cooperative Principle and the Conversational Maxims (CM), aims at the understanding of what is said through the criteria that he named CM. When one of these patterns of communication is broken, it means that the meaning is not conventional, but that the speaker intends to convey another message.

Rhetoric deals with all these aspects of language, but it also addresses the relation with the strategies employed to manage the speech act or implicature on the listener by persuading, moving to an action or convincing her/him. There are many resources that can be used, such as intonation, manipulations of emotions, etc in order to reach the result of a speech act or of an implicature. Rhetoric, similarly, is also concerned with what is implicit on what is said.

Due to the fact that language learning is a complex activity, we believe that by focusing on rhetorical aspects in addition to the usual pragmatic ones we may add another option for the several activities that can be offered in the EAL class, considering that there are many other important aspects of language to may be worked with. Accordingly, this research aims to offer an alternative for working in EAL classes, focusing on these pragmatic features of language as rhetoric and speech acts.

We suggest the use of the Awareness Raising strategy, by exposing students to pragmatic and rhetorical styles and to their features in order to promote students' awareness of these issues, so that they can be used as a trigger for language understanding. This awareness raising process may be possible through the explicit teaching of certain aspects of language to students of EAL.

The purpose is to offer the suggestion of including pragmatic and rhetorical awareness raising activities in EAL classes, by means of the example of these two texts. This suggestion can be adapted to any type of additional language class, considering the criteria used in the choice of texts, dialogs and/or audio-visual material.

We believe the EAL class may benefit from the implications of offering the strategies we suggest for exploring the two texts analyzed herewith. For such, a sample of activities is offered (see appendance) as a way to increase the use of awareness raising strategies in Additional Language Teaching).

CONCLUSION

This work aimed to suggest the promotion of awareness raising of rhetorical aspects as well as of speech acts and implicatures in an English as Additional Language (EAL) class, by using texts or speeches as instrument of analysis. It was idealized as another possibility for the learner to improve his/her ability of proper communication, so as to minimize mistakes and complex cultural differences. In this way, the main discussion of this work was about the possibility of using Speech Act Theory (SAT) and Rhetoric assembled, as complementary tools for text or discourse analysis with EAL activities.

In the first chapter we presented language and human interaction. Pragmatics was defined as "language in use" and the study of what is communicated beyond what is said, depending on the context. It was placed as a linguistic area and, within the area of Pragmatics we focused on the Speech Act Theory and the Indirect Speech Act theory, with their issues and particularities. Their theorists (Austin, Searle and Grice) were cited and their theories were resumedly exposed. Speech Act was defined as what happens when a word or sentence is an act per se, as in promises, threats, and so on. It was also defined as when we provoke an action or reaction on the listener by an utterance.

Austin defined the constatatives and perlocutionary acts. Constatatives are considered by him statements that can be true or false and performatives are considered the utterances that realize actions through their oral performance. However, for an utterance to be considered a performative it must be subjected to felicity conditions, that are: to respect an existent and valid procedure; to have authority for making that act; to proceed correctly and completely; and to have the thought, intention or feeling in accordance with the act, otherwise, we may have an unhappy condition and our performative act will be useless or canceled.

We saw in this chapter that the author states that each speech act is a trichotomy, being at the same time *locutionary, illocutionary* and *perlocutionary*.

Locutionary is the act of saying something. *Illocutionary* is to act in saying something, to act through the language. *Perlocutionary* is the result of what is being said on the listener's acts, thoughts, attitudes, beliefs, feelings or behavior.

Another linguist, John Searle, tried to synthesize ideas from Austin, as the term *illocutionary act*, and developed concepts of intentionality. He also improved the SAT with the *Indirect Speech Act (ISA)* theory that is understood as an utterance having a diversity of meanings or more than an illocutionary force.

The last linguist discussed in this chapter was Paul Grice, who developed the *Conversational* Implicatures (CI) and the *Cooperative Principle (CP)*. He defined *Conventional Maxims (CM)* as the patterns for literal meaning and CI as what occurs when some of these CM are broken. As a result of it, the utterance acquires another meaning that is non-literal.

The CM, developed by Grice, are four, they are called: *maxim of quantity*; *maxim of quality*; *maxim of relation*; and *maxim of manner*. Thus, they consider the focus of the speaker and they have the following principles: *Maxim of quantity*: "be informative – do not make your contribution more or less informative than it is required". *Maxim of quality*: "be trustful – do not say things that are false or for which you lack evidence". *Maxim of relation*: "be relevant". *Maxim of manner*: "be clear, brief and orderly – avoid ambiguity and obscurity". When these principles are not followed, we have a CI.

Every single utterance must obey certain rules in order to make communication possible. Nevertheless, Pragmatics often neglects the perlocutionary effects on the listener in a long term. Rhetoric can contribute with this, considering that persuasive, convincing and other perlocutionary acts can be the basis of rhetorical studies in Linguistics.

According to Costa (2011), Rhetoric could be understood as a subarea of Pragmatics, considering that Pragmatics is concerned with what is implied, beyond what is said, and Rhetoric adds the effects of emotions with regards to this. Our interest in adding Rhetoric in the pragmatic analysis has to do with the fact that Rhetoric goes beyond, for it is not just concerned with the consequences on the listener, but also about how the process of persuading, convincing or manipulating persons occurs.

Moreover, besides the fact that the field of Rhetoric is older than Pragmatics, Rhetoric was considered here a subarea of Pragmatics because it

studies the speech and its influence on the listeners, as Pragmatics does. However, Pragmatic is broader. Rhetoric is about emotions and also about logical thoughts and reason.

We could state that Rhetoric takes advantage of two ways of persuading: the exploit of reason and the exploit of affection. Additionally, we cannot forget a*rgumentation*, a basic aspect of rhetorical speeches, considering Rhetorical speech influences the entire personality of the hearers, both positively or negatively, although it is not possible not to take an ideological position through rhetorical arguments.

In order for the interlocutor to understand what the speaker means to say, s/he must share the same context and knowledge about that subject. A metaphorical sentence is different from a literal one, as the literal meaning is understood as a situation in which the utterance's first meaning and the speaker's intention are the same. We can understand *irony* as a figure of thought that leads us, from a word or sentence, to understand it diversely of its usual meaning. And, as it is known in rhetorical theories, intonation can also be a way of being ironic.

It is common in slogans and advertisings the fact that truth is not relevant, but, as Ferreira (2010) suggests, the truth sensation that the statements print in their auditorium are verisimilar and persuasive. For making a rhetorical analysis, it is important to ask some questions as: *who, how, what, agreeing with what, against what, to whom,* and *when.*

As it is contemplated in the Speech Act Theory, the argument of *authority* is also of extreme importance on Rhetoric. Although it is permissible to question its value, it cannot be dismissed as irrelevant without further investigation. However, an argument of authority does not depend only on the political, job or religious position of the speaker. It also depends on his/her credibility and character.

A learner of an additional language is not able to notice rhetorical effects when they are starting their learning. It is not an easy task for an additional language teacher to promote this awareness either. The teacher can use the Awareness Raising Theory in order to help students discover these new possibilities of comprehension and interpretation that Rhetoric provides.

Considering that, we also discussed the promotion of the awareness raising in pragmatic (and rhetorical) aspects in an additional language learning context. Awareness Raising is considered the explicit, conscious and reflective

knowledge about the pragmatic aspects of language. It is the possibility or opportunity the teacher gives to students to learn, discover, think critically about certain communicative subjects or situations of language, and here we could insert the implicit, metaphorical or ironic utterances, apologies, commands, requests, etc, in order to raise their knowledge and ability on the language competence. Schmidt (1995) suggests that for acquisition to occur, the L2 aspects must be noticed by learners.

Then, Awareness Raising can be considered the conscious knowledge of an additional language. As an application of it in class, in the explicit learning the teacher provides to student some rules and the opportunity of practicing it through activities. Another possibility of promoting awareness raising in class is to make the students first try to infer and understand the implicit meanings of a speech or text and after they discuss it the teacher can explain what the pragmatic aspects are and how to recognize them.

In chapter 3, in order to illustrate the promotion of rhetorical awareness in students of English as additional language, we presented characteristics of the **two texts** that were the instruments of these analyses: one text being literary, canonic and classic as *Macbeth* by Shakespeare; and the other text being a political speech from Barack Obama.

Finally, in chapter 4 we analyzed both texts that were exposed in chapter 3, showing their pragmatic and rhetorical features and we discussed about the relevance of working with SAT and Rhetoric as an interface. Is this useful for EAL teachers? Is the role of Rhetoric in this realm not to analyze the texts, but rather to recognize and identify the rhetorical aspects of language in them?

The **first text** is *Macbeth,* a Shakespearean play that contains a rich vocabulary complexity. It has many literal meanings that seem to be metaphorical when are uttered; metaphors; ironies and ambiguities. In this play, it seems that the sentences uttered by the Weird Sisters are non-literal or metaphorical, although they are literal in their essence, and this fact is just possible to be perceived in the end of the play.

In a summary of the analysis, we could point the ethos as being the Witches. They acquired Macbeth's trust and belief considering they had an authority of supernatural beings. Macbeth was able to infer that they could preview the future. As pathos, we considered the emotion and feelings of desire of

becoming the next king. This idea was introduced on him without his noticing that he was being manipulated through persuasive words. They made him have the sensation of being free for deciding his own acts. The logos of this play is their speeches and they way of uttering them. By saying the truth in some foresights they made the other previews rationally accepted by Macbeth.

Taking this in a pragmatic analysis, it is possible to affirm that Macbeth's acts are the results of ambiguous utterances that resulted into perlocutory acts, considering they are the results of an utterance on the listener's acts. Besides the Weird Sisters being strange and mysterious characters, we can say that they persuaded him by using ambiguous utterances and promoted his emotions and feelings, making him forget the use of logical thought about their real intentions about him.

The **second text** offered a SAT analysis, in which we demonstrated that when Barack Obama spoke to his electors he realized three acts at the same time: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts. By performing these three acts he managed what he intended most: to become president of the United States of America.

A political slogan as "Yes, we can", in a rhetorical view of this speech, is a minimalist rhetoric, considering that with the minimum it is possible to produce great rhetorical effects and big consequences. The slogan is reinforced on the speech by examples of everyday life and it confirms the idea that people "can" make something different for their country now as voting on him.

Barack Obama has a strong rhetorical speech, when he makes people feel as they would have the power of decisions about the country. He makes them feel as part of the government. In his speech, he stimulates people's trust and hope.

Both texts are samples of the deliberative genre of Rhetoric, considering they attempt to persuade or dissuade their audience and give orientation for future decisions. We may consider both texts persuasive and convincing, considering that persuasion is to acquire the agreement of hearer, and convincement is to provoke on the listener the will for action.

The similarities of Rhetoric, SAT and ISA are that they involve the force of an utterance and its result on the listener. There are many rhetorical resources that can be used as intonation, manipulations of emotions, etc in order to reach

the result of a speech act or an implicature. Rhetoric, as well as Pragmatics, is concerned with what is implicit on what is said.

In this work, we intended to suggest the possibility of working with different kinds of texts, as well as differences and similarities of SAT and Rhetoric, in order to analyze what is implied in what is said and its rhetorical aspects. By doing so, we suggested activities in EAL classes in the appendance, considering that these are important aspects for an additional language learner to pay attention to if s/he intends to deeper understand the language.

As our most contribution we brought some implications for the classroom and we suggest further applications in classes of first and additional languages. We discussed here how the awareness raising strategies can be developed in order to promote an improvement in the learner's linguistic competence, considering rhetorical and pragmatic aspects of an additional language. However, this work did not have the ambition of being definitive and conclusive on this topic, but it intended to provoke a critical thought about this possibility of working in class. We also suggest that in further research about Rhetoric the consequences of *emotions* are investigated, as well as their strategies, which result on rhetorical speeches.

REFERENCES

ALCÓN, Eva; JORDÀ, María Pilar Sanfont. **Pragmatic awareness in second language acquisition.** In: CENOZ, Jasone; HORNBERGER, Nancy H. (eds.) Encyclopedia of language and education. Dordrecht: Springer, 2008.

ALEXANDER, Peter (Org.). **The complete works of William Shakespeare.** 2006.

ALVES, Ubiratã Kicköfel; MAGRO, Vivian. Raising awareness of L2 phonology: explicit instruction and the acquisition of aspirated /p/ by Brazilian Portuguese speakers. In: **Letras de Hoje.** V. 46, n. 3. Porto Alegre: Edipucrs, jul/set 2011. p. 71-80. Available at: <http://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/fale/article/viewFile/9746/6672>. Accessed on: November 01/2011.

ARISTOTLE. **The Art of Rhetoric.** Translated by John Henry Freese. London: Harvard University Press, 1947.

_____. **The Poetics.** Available at: <http://www.manybooks.net/build/pdf_builder.php/aristotletext04poeti10/.pdf/custili ad/aristotletext04poeti10custiliad.pdf.>. Accessed on: 12/04/2011. Translated by: Ingram Bywater.

ARISTOTLE: PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS. Available at: http://www.aristotle-philosophy.com/philosophy/rhetoric.html. Accessed on: 01/11/2011.

ARMENGAUD, Françoise. **A pragmática.** São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2006.

ARNDT, Valerie; PAUL, Harvey; NUTTAL, John. **Alive to language:** perspectives on language awareness for English language teachers. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

AUSTIN, John Langshaw. **How to do things with words.** 2008.

BARDOVI-HARLIG, K. **Pragmatics and Language Teaching:** Bringing Pragmatics and Pedagogy Together. In BUTON, L.F. (ed.). Pragmatics and Language Learning. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, 1996.

BLUM-KULKA, S.; HOUSE, J.; KASPER, G. **Cross-cultural pragmatics:** Requests and apologies. Norwood: Ablex, 1989.

CAMARA JR., J. Mattoso. **Dicionário de Linguística e Gramática.** Petrópolis: Vozes, 2002.

CARSTON, R. **The semantics/pragmatics distinction:** a view from relevance theory. In UCL Working Papers in Linguistics 10, 1998.

COSTA, Jorge Campos da. **A Relevância da Pragmática na Pragmática da Relevância**. Porto Alegre: Edipucrs, 2008 (pdf version).

_____. **Curso de Pragmática e Retórica.** Available at: <http://cursopragmaticaeretorica.blogspot.com/2011/01/inicio-das-aulas.html#links>. Accessed on: August 15th, 2011.

CRYSTAL, D. **A dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.** Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.

CUMMINGS, Louise. **Pragmatics:** a multidisciplinary perspective. Edinburgh University Press, 2005.

DAMÁSIO, António. **O mistério da consciência.** São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2000.

_____. **O erro de Descartes:** emoção, razão e cérebro humano. Publicações Europa-América, 1994.

DUNKLE, Roger. **The Classical Origins of Western Culture**. The Core Studies 1 Study Guide. Brooklyn College, 1986. Available at: <http://depthome.brooklyn.cuny.edu/classics/dunkle/studyguide/sophists.htm>. Accessed on: 05/24/2011.

ELLIS, Nick. **At the interface:** Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, v. 27, 2005.

ELLIS, Rod; LOEWEN, Shawn; et al. **Implicit and Explicit Knowledge in Second Language Learning, Testing and Teaching.** Multilingual Matters, 2009.

ESLAMI-RASEKH, Z. Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. In: **ELT Journal.** Volume 59/3 Oxford University Press, 2005.

FERREIRA, Luiz Antônio. **Leitura e persuasão:** princípios de análise retórica. São Paulo: Contexto, 2010.

FRIED, Mirjam; ÖSTMAN, Jan-Ola; VERSCHUEREN, Jef. **Variation and Change:** Pragmatic perspectives. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010.

GOMES, Deisiane de Oliveira. **Acts and speech acts:** appearance and reality in Shakespeare's _Macbeth._ Monografia de especialização em Língua Inglesa. Canoas: Unilasalle, 2009.

GRICE, Paul. **Studies in the way of the words.** New York: Academic Press, 1989.

JENKINS, Jennifer. **The phonology of English as an international language:** new models, new norms, new goals. Oxford University Press, 2000.

KASPER, G. **The role of pragmatics in language teaching education.** In: BARDOVI-HARLIG, K; HARTFORD, B. (eds.). Beyond Methods: Components of Second Language Teacher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1997.

KASPER, Gabriele; ROSE, Kenneth R. **Pragmatic development in a second language.** Blackwell Publishing, 2002.

KITAYAMA, Shinobu; MARKUS, Hazel Rose (edit.). **Emotion and culture:** empirical studies of mutual influence. Washington: American Psychological Association, 1997.

KLÖCKNER, Luciano. **Nova retórica e rádio informativo:** estudo das programações das emissoras TSF-Portugal e CBN-Brasil. Porto Alegre: Evangraf, 2011.

KREIS, Steven. Lecture 8 - Greek Thought: Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. In: **The History Guide**. 2000. Available at:
<http://www.historyguide.org/ancient/lecture8b.html>. Accessed on: 01/11/2011.

LEVINSON, S. C. **Pragmatics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

LOCASTRO, Virginia. **An introduction to pragmatics:** social action for language teachers. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. 2006.

LOGOS DEFINITION. Available at:
<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/346460/logos>. Accessed on: 26/04/2011.

MCLUHAN, M. **Understanding Media:** The extensions of man. Edited by: W. T. Gordon. Corte Madera: Gingko Press, 2003.

O'KEEFFE, Anne; CLANCY, Brian; ADOLPHS, Svenja. **Introducing Pragmatics in use.** New York: Routledge, 2011.

OBAMA, Barack. **"Yes, we can" Speech.** Available at:
<http://my.barackobama.com/page/community/post_group/ObamaHQ/CGTN>.
Accessed on: September, 04th, 2011.

OLIVEIRA, Manfredo Araújo de. **Reviravolta lingüístico-pragmática na filosofia contemporânea.** São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 1996.

OXFORD AVANCED LEARNER'S DICTIONARY. Oxford University Press, 2005, 7th edition.

PEREIRA, Regina Celi; ROCA, Pilar. **Linguística Aplicada:** um caminho com diferentes acessos. São Paulo: Contexto, 2009.

PERELMAN, Chaïm; OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, L. **The New Rhetoric:** A Treatise on Argumentation. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2008.

PHILOSOPHICAL DICTIONARY. Available at: <http://www.philosophypages.com/dy/p2.htm#perv>. Accessed on: 13/09/2011.

PLATÃO. **O sofista.** 2003. Available at: <www.odialetico.hpg.ig.com.br>. Accessed on: 05/20/2011.

RÉCANATI, François. **Literal meaning**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

RICHARDS, Jack; PLATT, Heidi. **Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics**. Pearson ESL, 2003.

ROEHE, João Eduardo. **O processo inferencial na aprendizagem da Língua Inglesa como língua adicional com o emprego de tomada de consciência por aprendizes idosos. Dissertação de mestrado em Linguística.** Porto Alegre: PUCRS, 2011.

ROYLE, Nicholas. **How to read Shakespeare.** WW Norton, 2005.

SARDINHA, Tony Berber. **Metáfora.** São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2007.

SAYERS, Richard. **Principles of Awareness Raising for Information Literacy:** a case study. Thailand: UNESCO, 2006.

SCHMIDT, Richard. Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In: Richard Schmidt (Ed.). **Attention and awareness in foreign language learning**. (Technical Report #9). Honolulu: Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i, 1995.

SEARLE, John R. **Speech acts:** an essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press, 1976.

_____. **Expressão e significado:** estudos da teoria dos atos de fala. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1995.

_____. **Indirect speech acts**. In P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts. New York: Seminar Press, 1975.

SOPHIST DEFINITION. In: Britannica Online Encyclopedia. Available at: < http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/554705/Sophist>. Accessed on: 05/15/2011.

WOLFSON, Nessa; ELLIOT, Judd. **Social Linguistics and language acquisition:** series of issues in second language research. Newberry Inc Rowley, Massachusetts, 1983.

YULE, George. **Pragmatics**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

APPENDANCE

APPENDANT A - "YES, WE CAN" – SPEECH OF BARACK OBAMA TO ELECTION CAMPAIGN

I want to congratulate Senator Clinton on a hard-fought victory here in New Hampshire.

A few weeks ago, no one imagined that we'd have accomplished what we did here tonight. For most of this campaign, we were far behind, and we always knew our climb would be steep.

But in record numbers, you came out and spoke up for change. And with your voices and your votes, you made it clear that at this moment – in this election - there is something happening in America.

There is something happening when men and women in Des Moines and Davenport; in Lebanon and Concord come out in the snows of January to wait in lines that stretch block after block because they believe in what this country can be.

There is something happening when Americans who are young in age and in spirit - who have never before participated in politics - turn out in numbers we've never seen because they know in their hearts that this time must be different.

There is something happening when people vote not just for the party they belong to but the hopes they hold in common - that whether we are rich or poor; black or white; Latino or Asian; whether we hail from Iowa or New Hampshire, Nevada or South Carolina, we are ready to take this country in a fundamentally new direction. That is what's happening in America right now. Change is what's happening in America.

You can be the new majority who can lead this nation out of a long political darkness - Democrats, Independents and Republicans who are tired of the division and distraction that has clouded Washington; who know that we can disagree without being disagreeable; who understand that if we mobilize our voices to challenge the money and influence that's stood in our way and challenge ourselves to reach for something better, there's no problem we can't solve - no destiny we cannot fulfill.

Our new American majority can end the outrage of unaffordable, unavailable health care in our time. We can bring doctors and patients; workers and businesses, Democrats and Republicans together; and we can tell the drug and

insurance industry that while they'll get a seat at the table, they don't get to buy every chair. Not this time. Not now.

Our new majority can end the tax breaks for corporations that ship our jobs overseas and put a middle-class tax cut into the pockets of the working Americans who deserve it.

We can stop sending our children to schools with corridors of shame and start putting them on a pathway to success. We can stop talking about how great teachers are and start rewarding them for their greatness. We can do this with our new majority.

We can harness the ingenuity of farmers and scientists; citizens and entrepreneurs to free this nation from the tyranny of oil and save our planet from a point of no return.

And when I am President, we will end this war in Iraq and bring our troops home; we will finish the job against al Qaeda in Afghanistan; we will care for our veterans; we will restore our moral standing in the world; and we will never use 9/11 as a way to scare up votes, because it is not a tactic to win an election, it is a challenge that should unite America and the world against the common threats of the twenty-first century: terrorism and nuclear weapons; climate change and poverty; genocide and disease.

All of the candidates in this race share these goals. All have good ideas. And all are patriots who serve this country honorably.

But the reason our campaign has always been different is because it's not just about what I will do as President, it's also about what you, the people who love this country, can do to change it.

That's why tonight belongs to you. It belongs to the organizers and the volunteers and the staff who believed in our improbable journey and rallied so many others to join.

We know the battle ahead will be long, but always remember that no matter what obstacles stand in our way, nothing can withstand the power of millions of voices calling for change.

We have been told we cannot do this by a chorus of cynics who will only grow louder and more dissonant in the weeks to come. We've been asked to pause for a reality check. We've been warned against offering the people of this nation false hope.

But in the unlikely story that is America, there has never been anything false about hope. For when we have faced down impossible odds; when we've been told that we're not ready, or that we shouldn't try, or that we can't, generations of Americans have responded with a simple creed that sums up the spirit of a people.

Yes we can.

It was a creed written into the founding documents that declared the destiny of a nation.

Yes we can.

It was whispered by slaves and abolitionists as they blazed a trail toward freedom through the darkest of nights.

Yes we can.

It was sung by immigrants as they struck out from distant shores and pioneers who pushed westward against an unforgiving wilderness.

Yes we can.

It was the call of workers who organized; women who reached for the ballot; a President who chose the moon as our new frontier; and a King who took us to the mountaintop and pointed the way to the Promised Land.

Yes we can to justice and equality. Yes we can to opportunity and prosperity. Yes we can heal this nation. Yes we can repair this world. Yes we can.

And so tomorrow, as we take this campaign South and West; as we learn that the struggles of the textile worker in Spartanburg are not so different than the plight of the dishwasher in Las Vegas; that the hopes of the little girl who goes to a crumbling school in Dillon are the same as the dreams of the boy who learns on the streets of LA; we will remember that there is something happening in America; that we are not as divided as our politics suggests; that we are one people; we are one nation; and together, we will begin the next great chapter in America's story with three words that will ring from coast to coast; from sea to shining sea - Yes. We. Can.

APPENDANT B – THE 4 WIVES

THE 4 WIVES

There was a rich merchant who had 4 wives. He loved the 4th wife the most and adorned her with rich robes and treated her to delicacies. He took great care of her and gave her nothing but the best.

He also loved the 3rd wife very much. He was very proud of her and always wanted to show off her to his friends. However, the merchant was always in great fear that she might run away with some other men.

He too, loved his 2nd wife. She was a very considerate person, always patient and in fact was the merchant's confidante. Whenever the merchant faced some problems, he always turned to his 2nd wife and she would always help him out and tide him through difficult times.

Now, the merchant's 1st wife was a very loyal partner and had made great contributions in maintaining his wealth and business as well as taking care of the household. However, the merchant did not love the first wife and although she loved him deeply, he hardly took notice of her.

One day, the merchant fell ill. Before long, he knew that he was going to die soon. He thought of his luxurious life and told himself, "Now I have 4 wives with me. But when I die, I'll be alone. How lonely I'll be!"

Thus, he asked the 4th wife, "I loved you most, endowed you with the finest clothing and showered great care over you. Now that I'm dying, will you follow me and keep me company?" "No way!" replied the 4th wife and she walked away without another word.

The answer cut like a sharp knife right into the merchant's heart. The sad merchant then asked the 3rd wife, "I have loved you so much for all my life. Now that I'm dying, will you follow me and keep me company?" "No!" replied the 3rd wife. "Life was so good over here! I'm going to remarry when you die!" The merchant's heart sank and turned cold.

He then asked the 2nd wife, "I always turned to you for help and you've always helped me out. Now I need your help again. When I die, will you follow me and keep me company?" "I'm sorry, I can't help you out this time!" replied the 2nd wife. "At the very most, I can only send you to your grave." The answer came like a bolt of thunder and the merchant was devastated.

Then a voice called out: "I'll leave with you. I'll follow you no matter where you go." The merchant looked up and there was his first wife. She was so skinny, almost like she suffered from malnutrition. Greatly grieved, the merchant said, "I should have taken much better care of you while I could have!"

Actually, we all have 4 wives in our lives

a. The 4th wife was our body. No matter how much time and effort we lavish in making it look good, it'll leave us when we die.

b. Our 3rd wife? Our possessions, status and wealth. When we die, they all go to others.

c. The 2nd wife was our family and friends. No matter how close they had been there for us when we're alive, the furthest they can stay by us was up to the grave.

d. The 1st wife was in fact our soul, often neglected in our pursuit of material, wealth and sensual pleasure.

APPENDANT C – THE 4 WIVES QUESTIONS

THE 4 WIVES QUESTIONS:

1. What kind of story is this?
a) A novel.
b) A fable.
c) A short story.
d) A tale.

2. How did the merchant treat his wives?
a) He treated them differently.
b) He treated them equally.
c) He was indifferent to them.
d) He was bad to all of them.

3. How did the merchant like his wives?
a) He loved all of them equally.
b) He didn't love any of them.
c) He didn't have any wives.
d) He loved them differently.

4. When the merchant fell ill, how did the 4th, the 3rd and the 2nd wives react?
a) They were happy.
b) They were ungrateful.
c) They were loyal to him.
d) They were sad.

5. How did the 1st wife react when the merchant fell ill?
a) She was sad.
b) She was relieved.
c) She was loyal.
d) She was really happy.

6. How did the merchant feel with what the 4th, the 3rd and the 2nd wives answered him?
a) He felt hurt.
b) He felt jealous.
c) He felt disgusted.
d) He felt angry.

7. What did the merchant feel after the 1st wife told him she would leave with him?
a) He felt jealousy.
b) He felt regret.
c) He felt happiness.
d) He felt envy.

8. How do you think the merchant would argue in order to persuade his wives to follow him after death?

_____
_____
_____
_____

Why?

_____
_____

9. What answer do you think the wives could have given in order to avoid hurting the merchant?

_____
_____
_____
_____

Justify your answer:

_____
_____

APPENDANCE D – A REAL SHORT STORY

A Real Short Story[2]
by Anthony Rain Starez

Once upon a time, just a short time ago, there lived a smart and very shy young man named Shea. Shea was a lovable boy, who'd share anything with anyone at anytime, but there was one problem, Shea was not only shy but very short too!!
At school, Shea would hear the same annoying students screaming: "Here comes shorty Shea...Hey Shea, how'd you get soooo short?"

Shea would just shrink even further and slowly slip away....

Sometimes Shea would secretly enter the school's science center where he loved experimenting with solutions, mixing this with that, with a little of this to a touch of that. "Someday I'll be a scientist, and I'll never be called shorty-Shea again," Shea would say to himself silently.

One snowy Sunday, while other children were out skating, or sledding or something Shea was working in his small science lab he'd built in his father's shed. Shea had mixed some yellow stuff with blue stuff to create a green stuff that seemed to smoke, and then the stuff started to smell like sour squash with sweet sticky syrup.

So, Shea sipped some!!

"Ummmmm, not bad for a short order chef," Shea joked. Suddenly, Shea began to shake...then he shook...then he shook some more!! When the shaking stopped Shea stared at his shoes....the laces had snapped and the stitches burst open. Shea's shirt was too short, and his pants only reached his shins.
Realizing that his scientific solution stuff had somehow caused his growth and made him taller, Shea screamed with joy.
The next day, Shea took some solution stuff to school. Shea was now prepared for those "shorty statements" by students. Sure enough, some kids started calling Shea "shorty." Shea just sat there steaming as the bullies shouted: "Shorty, shorty, shorty..." When he had lost all his patience, Shea pulled the green smoky solution stuff from the pocket of his shirt.....and sipped, and sipped, and sipped until it was all sipped away.

Shea stood there staring at his tormentors...then he slowly started to shake. Smoke started coming out of Shea's sneakers as a high pitched scream escaped Shea's mouth. His face became red as he began to grow and grow and grow until his head hit the ceiling.....for a few seconds the students stood there stunned.

---

[2] SOURCE: ROEHE, João Eduardo. **O processo inferencial na aprendizagem da Língua Inglesa como língua adicional com o emprego de tomada de consciência por aprendizes idosos. Dissertação de mestrado em Linguística.** Porto Alegre: PUCRS, 2011. Anexo W. (Adapted material).

Shea's size was now the size of a giant, the size of seven men. With Police sirens outside and the building surrounded, Shea sat there stuck and cried, cried and cried until there was a small salty sea. "....Ohhh, how Shea now wished he was short", Shea thought for a second. He remembered he was smart!! And so Shea thought of a scientific study about how fresh seafood would soak up solutions in the bodily system, and he smiled and said: "Someone supply me with sumptuous seafood!

Soon scaffolds filled with savory succulent seafood were being lifted to his mouth. Then, the seafood began soaking up and the sinister solution was expelled from Shea's saturated system.
Slowly Shea started to shrink...and shrink...and shrink until he'd shrunk to his same short smaller self.
Scratching his head, Shea searched for the words to explain the sensation of being Shorty Shea again....Right after, the bullying students who started this stupid situation, started shouting: "Shorty, shorty, shorty, shortyyyyyy Shea......"
But this time Shea simply smiled!

APPENDANCE E – A REAL SHORT STORY QUESTIONS

A Real Short Story Questions:

1. How did Shea's classmates treat him?
a) Friendly.
b) Indifferently.
c) Respectfully.
d) Badly.

2. How did Shea feel when other students called him shorty?
a) He felt happy.
b) He felt ashamed.
c) He felt disgusted.
d) He felt desperate.

3. What was Shea's favorite school subject?
a) Mathematics.
b) Chemistry.
c) Science.
d) History.

4. What did Shea intend to do with the solution stuff he created?
a) Teach them a lesson.
b) Kill all of them.
c) Be as tall as them.
d) Become a giant.

5. How did Shea feel when he became very big and got stuck in the classroom?
a) He felt sad.
b) He felt really happy.
c) He felt extremely angry.
d) He felt sleepy.

6. When the students were shouting "shorty!", what were they doing to Shea?
a) They were bullying him.
b) They were complaining about him.
c) They were cheering him.
d) They were beating him.

7. In the end, how did Shea feel for being short?
a) He felt sad again.
b) He felt stupid.
c) H felt ashamed.
d) He felt happy.

8. What Shea would say to the students in order to make them stop of calling him "shorty" before the scientific experiment?

_____
_____
_____
_____

Why?

_____
_____

9. How Shea, after the scientific experiment, could convince the students of not bullying people?

_____
_____
_____
_____

Why?

_____
_____