



Salience in Intracultural Communication: A Pragmatic Analysis of Jinnah's Selected Interviews

Tayyaba Tajamal¹

Dr. Nighat Shakur²

ABSTRACT:

This research evaluated the structured salience used by interlocutors in Jinnah's Interviews and analyzed adjacency pairs to structure salience by the interlocutors in the conversational pattern. The research is descriptive and employs a qualitative approach. Two interviews are selected from "*Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah: Speeches, Statements, and Interviews as Governor-General of Pakistan (1947-1948)*" for the content analysis. The researcher has adapted the theoretical framework entitled "Language Production Model" for the analysis. This framework is prepared by incorporating certain features proposed by Bock and Levelt's "*Language Production Model*" (1994), Osgood and Bock's "*three principles*" (1977) and Sacks et al. conversational pattern (1960). It has been found that salience is structured to form a message (both perceptual salience and emergent salience). The message is delineated through grammatical encoding, where salience is given on syntactic ordering. This syntactic ordering is carried out from naturalness (S+V+O) and subject-prominent sentence construction, vividness and motivation. Finally, following the perceptual and conceptual processing, the utterances are generated at the linguistic level in the language production model. Thus, it is concluded that both inherent and emergent salience are structured in the selected interviews, focusing on the syntactic ordering, naturalness, vividness, and motivation in the language production model.

Key Words: Communication, Intercultural, Language Production, Pragmatics, Saliency, Utterance

¹ Foundation University Islamabad (tajamaltayyaba@gmail.com)

² International Islamic University, Islamabad





1. Introduction

Kecskes (2004, 2010a) states that intercultural pragmatics is the study of how language is used in cross-cultural encounters. Understanding Intercultural Pragmatics can help us to avoid misunderstandings and communicate more effectively with people from different cultures. Language can be used to persuade, negotiate, or simply get things done. Within interactions, the communicative process is *synergistic* in the sense that *existing pragmatic norms and emerging, co-constructed* characteristics coexist to variable degrees. Intercultural Pragmatics is a socio-cognitive approach in which past experiences and real social situational experiences are both relevant in the formation and perception of meaning (Kecskes, 2014).

Intracultural communication, according to Samovar and Porter (2001), is communication between members of the same dominant culture who have somewhat different values while *intercultural communication*, refers to the communication across two different cultures. *Intracultural communication* occurs when participants of a properly defined L1 speech group communicate with each other using language and conventions, norms, rules, and customs, as well as their personal preferences and choices (Gumperz, 2005; Kecskes, 2015). *Intercultural communication* denotes the exchanges among speakers who speak in a common language (*lingua franca*) but represent distinct cultures and have different languages.

Kecskes (2015, pp. 172-173) stated that theoretically, whenever interlocutors communicate with each other, they follow the two extremes of communication: *Intracultural communication* and *intercultural communication*. But, interlocutors are always in the middle, nearer or distant from one of the extremes, in the production and interpretation of meanings using their current language skills. To discuss a dichotomy between these two ends would be a misconception. Real *intracultural or intercultural communication* has no substitution. We have something in a continuum between the two extremes. But the theorists like (Kecskes, 2014; Gumperz, 2005; Samovar & Porter, 2001) agree that *intercultural and intracultural communication* can be different in the communication process; the speakers have the same cultural-linguistic background in a specific speech community, but they may use *lingua franca* to communicate, and multilingual speakers having a different cultural and linguistic background.

Salience is highlighting the most prominent and significant information in the communication process. Kecskes (2013b, pp.71-73) refers to salience as a *semiotic notion*. He defines that “salience refers to the relative importance or prominence of signs”. When *relative salience* is addressed from the perspective of others, it enables the individuals to categorize various and big volumes of data to give significance and therefore emphasize what is most relevant. Kecskes (2014) argued that *context, common ground, and salience* are three important facets of intercultural pragmatics that impact our communication. He called these crucial elements the “big three”.



Kecskes (2014) illustrated that the Socio-cognitive approach is very important to keep in consideration concerning salience. This approach combines social and human aspects of communication, viewing communication as a dynamic process where individuals are both restricted and shaping society settings. SCA highlights not just the value of an individual's previous knowledge as the foundation of salience in the encounter but also the function of co-construction. It emphasizes the complex role and interaction of social and cultural models with private individual mental models, how these are applied categorically and reflectively by individuals in response to socio-cultural environmental feedback mechanisms, and how this leads to and explains various meaning outcomes and knowledge transfer. Individuals rely on both pre-existing encyclopedic information based on past experiences and current knowledge co-constructed by interlocutors throughout the interaction process for meaning-building and understanding.

Discourse analysis, according to Yule (1996), stresses the flexibility of language in certain settings to reveal meanings. The conversational analysis is approached through discourse analysis. Harold Garfinkel, Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson established Conversation Analysis together in the 1960s and 1970s. Schegloff (1974) states that conversation might be considered the medium of action. Interlocutors in discussion conduct act by talking about them. *Opening section, middle section, and closing section are the structure of the conversation. Turn-taking, overlapping, backchannels, sequence organization (adjacency pair, preference organization, dispreferred responses), insertion sequence, turn design, and repair are all part of the conversation analysis framework.* This research is conducted to identify the structured salience and analyze adjacency pairs to structure salience used by interlocutors in Jinnah's Interviews published in "Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah: Speeches, Statements, and Interviews as Governor General of Pakistan (1947-1948)".

The selected book captures the essence of Muhammad Ali Jinnah's vision for Pakistan through his official pronouncements from 1947 to 1948, a crucial period in the nation's infancy. Compiled by Rafique Afzal and published with official backing, it presents a treasure trove of speeches, statements, interviews, and addresses delivered by Jinnah as Governor General. These carefully chosen excerpts transcend mere historical record, offering a roadmap for Pakistan's survival and prosperity. Jinnah's words encompass every facet of national life, from governance and economy to religion and social ethics. As if laying bricks for a future yet to be built, Jinnah's messages provide insightful pointers for the young nation's constitution. His pronouncements serve as a powerful reminder that nation-building is not solely the government's responsibility, but a shared calling for every citizen. More than just a historical document, this book serves as a timeless call to action, urging each individual to take ownership of their role in shaping Pakistan's destiny. It is a clarion cry for unity, reminding us that the nation's strength lies not just in its leaders, but in the collective resolve of its people.



2. Literature Review

According to Kecskes (2014), when we talk about *salient information* in pragmatics, we are talking about information that the speaker expects and should be at the forefront of the hearer's mind at the time the utterance is made. Attention is a process, whereas salience is a property of an item (both *contextual and subjective* property). "Intercultural pragmatics aims to explain how *salience* is influenced by former experience and *current situational experience*, as well as how salience influences *attention and common ground formation*. These processes have a significant impact on interlocutors' *language production* and understanding in general and *intercultural communication in particular* (Kecskes, 2014: 176).

Kecskes (2014) describes linguistic *salience* as referring to how elements in a person's memory are *accessible* and how this *accessibility* influences *language production* and comprehension. *Perceptual salience* refers to how an entity's condition or usefulness of information gets prominence in comparison to nearby entities. The assumption of the comparative predominance of various exterior aspects of an item is called perceptual salience (or physical salience). This kind of *salience* is calculated automatically, without any labor, and *in real time*. Perceptual salience is related to visual salience that depends on the visual familiarity of entities (Kecskes, 2014: 177-178).

Inherent salience is similar to "*inherent accessibility*," as defined by Prat-Sala and Branigan (2000), and "*canonical salience*," as defined by Pattabhiraman (1993). *Inherent salience* is defined as a natural preference embedded in the speaker's broad conceptual and linguistic expertise. It has evolved as a result of the individual's earlier experience with lexical elements, and it evolves both diachronically and synchronously. According to Kecskes (2014), "*Collective salience is shared with the other members of the speech community and changes diachronically*." *Emergent salience* can arise as a result of factors including vividness, speaker motivation, and mention frequency. In a real-world setting, both collective and situational salience influence and determine intrinsic salience. Both inherent and emergent salience are important to structure salience in communication (Kecskes, 2014). Both salient information and contextual knowledge run in parallel in language processing, according to the graded salience hypothesis, and prominent information may not be screened even when it is contextually unsuitable. The retention of knowledge as a result of *familiarity, frequency, proto-typicality, and conventionality* is the core interest of the graded salience hypothesis (Giora, 2003).

According to Osgood and Bock (1977), there are *three principles of salience*: "*naturalness, vividness, and motivation*". The concept behind these *three principles* is that more significant or *salient* entities occur first in a statement. "The subject is more prominent than the object". They claimed that "naturalness" is demonstrated by the fact that subjects usually precede objects in languages all across the world. Such predominance is frequently the result of a sequence of interactions. There are *subject-prominent and topic-prominent languages*, this should be



highlighted here. According to Li (1976), Chinese, and Japanese are topic-prominent languages, whereas English is considered a subject-prominent language. The morphological or syntactic structure of *subject-prominent languages* emphasizes the contrast between “*the topic and the comment (what is said about the topic)*.” The *topic-comment structure* could be free of the syntactic organization *as subject, verb, and object*. While the *subject-prominent languages* are dependent on *subject, verb, and object in syntactic ordering*. It is found that *naturalness* is based on syntactic ordering. Because they have higher significance in the minds of interlocutors, the earlier appearing elements of a speech will be more prominent.

Osgood and Bock (1977) stated that the emotional properties of a specific aspect are referred to as vividness. The higher the *emotional intensity* of an item, it will emerge first in the phrase. *Emotional intensity* inherently elevates the speaker's significance. Therefore, it's only logical that such a shift would occur to give salience earlier in the sentence. They stated that “*vividness is derived solely from the lexical ratings*.” “Motivation” refers to how much significance a speaker provides to a specific entity that could otherwise be overlooked in a sentence focusing on syntactic ordering (Osgood & Bock 1977). *Topicalization*, which is commonly manifested through *forward movement*, demonstrates the *fronting of salience-high parts in languages all around the world*. This means that irrespective of its syntactic category, the phrase/entity meant to have the most salience or importance is placed at the front of the sentence. In *configurational languages*, this shift is followed by a syntactic change; in *non-configurational languages*, this shift is not necessary because the pertinent words or phrases still convey the sentence's meaning (Osgood & Bock, 1977; Kecskes, 2014).

Bock and Levelt (1994) proposed a *modular approach for language production*. Kecskes (2014, pp. 187-189) illustrates that this model gives a comprehensive note on *utterance generation in the socio-cognitive paradigm in intercultural pragmatics*. Interlocutors' pragmatic approach emphasizes the generation and perception of utterances simultaneously. Interlocutors' utterance generation is given equal attention. As a result, it is essential to describe how utterances are produced. Bock and Levelt's (1994) model focus more on *language production*. According to SCA, utterance structures show the *cognitive processes* responsible for the planning and execution of utterances. As a result, basic *cognitive* functions like “*memory retrieval and attentional tracking of entities*” become crucial phenomena underpinning features of the execution of utterances (Kecskes, 2014). The speaker shows a *commitment* to some knowledge and action for which he or she may be responsible by generating an utterance. The speaker's level of commitment and responsibility, on the other hand, differs between *saying and implying*.

According to Haugh (2010a), the interlocutors take accountability for the interpretation when several speakers *co-construct* the utterances (what is said). If several interlocutors co-construct an implied meaning, however, the level whereby the interlocutor should consider himself/herself responsible for that interpretation seems usually considerable debate. Haugh



(2010a) did not intend to propose that interlocutors are less responsible for comprehending the meanings generated by “implying.” Rather, he claimed that a deeper knowledge of *speaker meanings* could be attained by looking more closely at how interactants build meaning in conversation.

A proceeding interest in Conversation Analysis over the last four decades is reflected in the present research that has been mentioned. Abbas et al. (2010) reviewed how the turn-taking system proved beneficial in portraying how characters work up through social interaction, especially Anne, who developed through a funny, sometimes unhappy, and wonderful auspicious journey from a naive child into a fully adult young lady. Politeness, conversational implicature, and speech acts give a comprehensive analysis of the novel. Rui and Ting (2014) concluded from *Ellen Show* that the turn-taking strategies include the turn-claiming strategy, turn-holding strategy, and turn-yielding strategy. The host, Ellen, preferred to claim the turn by using interjection or conjunction to maintain the turn by using closing lines at the end of the whole talk and to give up the turn by inaugurating the guest to give the second part of an adjacency pair. The fundamental adjacency pair in *Ellen Show* is the Question-Answer type. However, there are also other types of adjacency pairs like compliment-appreciation, request-grant, etc. The researchers also found that Ellen would like to use backchannels “ur” and “yeah” to point out that she was attentively listening to and encouraging the guest to share more information. Ghilzai (2015) applied Conversational Analysis on three radio programs, and she found specific turn-taking rates between male-male, female-female, and mixed-sex conversations. The findings disclosed that there was no meaningful difference observed in male-male and female-female conversations. But turn taking rates became higher in male-female conversations in which females remained persuasive.

3. Research Questions

- i. How do interlocutors organize salience in Jinnah’s Interviews published in “*Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah: Speeches, Statements, and Interviews as Governor General of Pakistan (1947-1948)*”?
- ii. How are adjacency pairs used to structure salience by the interlocutors in Jinnah’s Interviews published in “*Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah: Speeches, Statements, and Interviews as Governor General of Pakistan (1947-1948)*”?

3.1 Problem Statement

As salience is structured to highlight the important information in sentences and language production and comprehension (Sala & Branigan, 2000; Kecskes, 2013b), the researcher intends to know how salience is structured in language production within communication. The structure of salience is addressed by intertwining the aspect of conversation pattern from the conversational analysis framework (Sacks et al, 1960) and language production model in this study, which is not found in any previous research. So, this is also considered the research gap. To serve this purpose,



the researcher selected two interviews from the book “*Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah: Speeches, Statements, and Interviews as Governor General of Pakistan (1947-1948)*”

3. Research Methodology/Research Design

The present study is descriptive. Creswell (2003) defined that descriptive research attempts to systematically describe a situation or problem and describe or inform about attitudes towards an issue. The qualitative approach is used. According to Creswell (2003), qualitative research is most normally employed in fields where the focus is on interpretation and representation rather than projections, in sociological, cultural anthropological, and psychological fields. Two interviews are selected from the book “*Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah: Speeches, Statements, and Interviews as Governor General of Pakistan (1947-1948)*” for the analysis.

3.1 Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework of the present research is Bock and Levelt’s “*Language Production Model*” based on salient information (Bock and Levelt, 1989, 1994) with the incorporation of Osgood and Bock’s “*three principles*,” which are also grounded on salience (Osgood and Bock, 1977). The incorporation is developed by the researcher by adopting the specific features of the two theories to analyze the structure of salience used by interlocutors in intracultural communication in the selected book. This study aims to examine this structured salience in communication by adopting the “*Conversational Analysis*” framework. This is also incorporated in Bock and Levelt’s “*Modular Approach*” and Osgood and Bock’s “*Three Principles*.” By adopting certain features from the discussed three approaches, the theoretical framework for the study is adapted by the researchers as follows:

Table 1: Language Production Model

Stages	Modular Approach (Bock & Levelt, 1994)	Incorporating three principles (Osgood & Bock, 1977)	Incorporating Conversational Analysis (Sacks et al, 1960)
1	Message Component Perceptual Process	What is the Message/topic? Salience at the message level	Topic of conversation
2	Grammatical Component ↓ • Functional processing level • Positional processing level Conceptual Process	Syntactic Ordering ↓ • Naturalness • Vividness • Motivation Salience at Syntactic Level	Conversation Structure • Opening • Middle ↓ • Turn Taking, • Adjacency pairs, • Sequence Organization
3	Phonological Component Linguistic Process	Utterance Generation Salience at Utterance generation	• Closing



The modular approach divides utterance generation into three levels or stages:

1. *MESSAGE COMPONENT*
2. *GRAMMATICAL COMPONENT*, and
3. *PHONOLOGICAL COMPONENT*

According to (Bock & Levelt, 1994), each stage of the module *gets input from the preceding stage*. A *communicative intention* is generated as the first stage in creating an utterance. The message is named for this intention. Before any language processing, pre-verbal thinking (intention) is processed and arranged into a conceptual framework of the incident at the message stage. Saliency becomes an essential feature at this level of communication. This stage is integrated with “Three principles,” and Conversational Analysis, where both focus the same on the message or topic of the conversation. This is called the first stage in this model.

The *grammatical component* is the second stage, which is further subdivided into two stages: *functional and positional processing*. The *functional stage* works for *word selection*: lemma selection. Myachykov (2007) states that *Lemmas* are “*mixtures*” of the attributes of a single lexical idea produced by interlocutors, such as its *semantic representation and Morpho-syntactic aspects*—grammar functions such as Subject and Object at the grammatical level. The positional substage is loaded with lemmas and grammatical functional information. At this substage, lemmas are systematically put into a sentence construction, which is then set as the arrangement of the constituents in an utterance. According to Bock (1987), the sequence wherein the input becomes accessible throughout the syntactic phases of processing is reflected partly by the syntactic structure of an utterance. Conceptual accessibility influences flexibility by which mental concepts may be recovered and translated into syntactic patterns (Bock & Warren, 1985). Osgood and Bock’s (1977) concept of syntactic ordering is incorporated with the grammatical component of Language Production model. They gave “three principles” for the theory of saliency, naturalness (focus is on the sentence structure of an utterance), vividness (placing the emotional intensity of the entities in utterance generation) and motivation (how much attention a speaker gives to a particular entity that may be omitted in a phrase that focuses on syntactic order. (Osgood & Bock, 1977). Conversation Structure; Opening, Middle (Turn Taking, Adjacency pairs, Sequence Organization), and Closing is embedded in this second stage.

The third stage of the language production model is *phonological component*. Lastly, the linguistic structures for the words, phrases, and sentences are retrieved as well as an explicit speech/utterance is formed at the phonological level. At this stage, saliency is at utterance generation, in which utterance is generated and ultimately leads to the topic or message of the utterance. The theoretical framework for the analysis is:

- ***Stage 1: Message Component: Saliency at Message level: Topic of the Conversation***



- *Stage 2: Grammatical Component: Salience at syntactic ordering: Conversation Structure*
- *Stage 3: Phonological Component: Salience at Linguistic Utterance*

4. Analysis and Discussion

In this section, the researcher analyzed Quaid-e-Azam's TWO (02) Interviews. The first interview was on the "**Protection of Minorities**". Jinnah gave this interview at a "**Press Conference at New Delhi: July 14, 1947**". The second interview was on "**Pakistan Will Never Agree to Union with India**". Jinnah gave this interview to "**Duncan Hooper, Correspondent of Reuter: October 25, 1947**". This interview not only covers one aspect but it covers three different aspects in to which Jinnah answered in detail; "*Response to Pakistan's Appeal; No Union between Hindu State and Functions of Muslims*". The journalist, was labeled "**Speaker A.**" and Jinnah was labeled "**Speaker B**" in both interviews. Twelve (12) questions were asked to Jinnah, and he responded to all of them. The researcher analyzed these interviews by following the "**Language production Model.**" Following is the analysis and discussion:

4.1 Analysis and discussion of the first interview

Stage 1: Message Component: Salience at Message level: Topic of the Conversation:

The message component of this interview focuses on both *perceptual salience* and *emergent salience*. Perceptual salience lies in this interview on protecting minorities. This interview was taken when Pakistan gained independence on August 14, 1947. The whole interview and conversation were about protecting the *rights, faith, religion, and prosperity of minorities* as they got migrated from the sub-continent. Speaker B was very concerned about the rights of the people in minorities.

"Minorities to whichever community they may belong to will be safeguarded. Their religion of faith or belief will be their freedom of worship. They will have their protection with regard to their religion, faith, their life, their culture. They will be, in all respects, the citizens of Pakistan without any distinction of caste or creed...."

".... I have stated the broad principles of policy, but the actual question of safeguards and protection for minorities in the respective States can only be dealt with by the Constituent Assembly..."

The above analysis shows that the topic of conversation was "protecting minorities in Pakistan as they moved to Pakistan in 1947 after independence." Now, this shows how *perceptual salience (inherent salience)*, based on the prior knowledge of both interlocutors (journalist and Jinnah) leads towards the *emergent salience (actual situational salience)* at the message level. In this interview, both interlocutors know perceptually that minorities need to get protection in Pakistan after independence. If they will not be given protection, the minorities will suffer. So,



based on this perceptual salience, the emergent salience is the need for actual situational context, which Jinnah emphasized in his whole conversation and suggested measures to protect minorities and give them their rights.

Stage 2: Grammatical Component: Salience at syntactic ordering: Conversation Structure:

Stage 2 is incorporated with grammatical components (Levelt & Bock, 1994), Syntactic Ordering (Osgood & Bock, 1977), and Conversation Structure (Sacks et al, 1960). The interview comprised of six to twelve question-answer pairs. (Appendix A)

Here, it is found that in the grammatical component, the selection of words (functional processing) and its construction into sentences (positional processing) revolves around the discussion on “*Congress ministries*; Question 1-6, *rights of minorities in constituent assemblies*, question 7, *recent reports/statements about the treatment of minorities as Hindus in Pakistan and Muslims in Hindustan*, Question 8, and *Pakistan a theocratic state or secular state*, Question 10” Appendix A). The questions are asked by selecting different words/lemmas but the salience at message/topic of the conversation level was ultimately the same “*protecting minorities in both countries*.” Only Question 10 was different, which was found from the selection of words. Here, it becomes evident how grammatical component has their salience in changing the topic of conversation. The grammatical component is loaded with syntactic ordering. Naturalness, vividness, and motivation are part of this syntactic ordering (Osgood & Bock, 1977). *Naturalness* refers to the sentence structure of utterances in the language production model. “*Subject-prominent sentences*” are found in the utterances of Speaker B. S+V+O; syntactic ordering is there in Speaker B’s Utterances. But, it is analyzed from Question 6 that Speaker A has not used the structure of Interrogative Sentence construction. On the other hand, he produced this utterance (question) in the form of a statement. However, this question was in the form of a statement, the question mark (?) at the end of the statement shows its salience (Appendix A). The rest of the questions follow the structure of interrogation.

Emotional intensity (vividness) by *syntactic ordering* is found by both interlocutors when they are talking about how the rights of minorities can be part of the Ordinance in *Constituent Assemblies* not only in Pakistan but also in India. Both Hindus and Muslims need to take the security of their rights in both countries, and it can only happen when there will be some measures documented in the ordinance (suggested by speaker B, Question-Answer pair 7, 8, and 9). The emotional intensity is found when he, again and again, talks about the preservation of “*rights, faith, religion, life, and culture of people in the minority*.” Motivation through *syntactic ordering* is also embedded here for the same. (Appendix A)

The conversation structure is incorporated in *syntactic ordering*. Question-answer pair is found in the set of conversations. The conversation Structure is Opening, Middle, and Closing. Opening starts with Adjacency Pairs (Sacks et al, 1960). Adjacency pairs are found in this



interview. The interlocutors are making only the Question-Answer Pair. The opening has Greeting-Greeting Pair traditionally. But Greeting-Greeting Pair is not found in this interview. The Middle part of the Conversation included Adjacency pairs, Sequence Organization, and Turn-taking). In this interview, both speakers wait for their turn and respond accordingly. Speaker A questions first, and Speaker B takes his turn and answers the question. No overlapping, Pause, and Gap is found in Turn construction units. Speaker A transferred the turn to Speaker B systematically. Both speakers follow the decorum of transition-relevance response (TRP).

Yule (1996) refers to sequence organization to link up a conversation in consecutive turns. Adjacency plays a key role in organizing a course of action among participants with a greeting-greeting pair, offer-acceptance/denial pair, etc. He further adds preference structure which denotes that in conversation the first part can contain a request, and if the second part gives acceptance, it is the preferred structure, and if denial occurs, it will be the dispreferred structure. In 1-5 question and answer pairs, systematic turn construction unit and sequence organization are found. The responses given by Speaker B are considered preferred responses: Question and its answer (Appendix A). It is also noticed that dispreferred responses are given by speaker B. As in responses to questions 6 and 10, speaker B gave a dispreferred response while refusing to say, *"I cannot go into the details..."* and *"It is no use of picking up the statements of this man here and there...."* (Appendix A). Emotional intensity is also observed here that speaker B did not want to involve himself in the so-called *"recent reports and statements."* He vividly gives more salience through the syntactic ordering and in his conversation on the emergent situation to protect minorities. In question 10, the strong dispreferred response is recorded from the word selection and syntactic ordering by Speaker B. The sentence construction is a *subject-prominent sentence*, but it shows that speaker B did not intend to answer this question. As he said, *"You are asking me a question that is absurd. I do not know what a theocratic state means."* (Appendix A). This utterance also shows that both perceptual salience (inherent) and emergent salience have nothing to do with this question by Speaker B.

Dispreferred responses are also found in questions 11 and 12 (Appendix A). Speaker B generated the utterance, *"We will consider that question when the time comes"*. Moreover, *"No responsible man expresses his personal opinion...."* It is analyzed from these utterances that emergent salience (actual situational salience) is not on these so-called questions. After independence, the emergent salience was on the *"protection of minorities,"* which was the topic of conversation in this interview. Therefore, Speaker B puts salience (inherent and emergent) through syntactic ordering, following the decorum of *"subject-prominent sentences"* in the English language, giving emotional intensity and motivation to the most important issue after independence.

The interview is closed with the statement given by the journalists *"The Quaid-i-Azam requested press to convey his thanks....."* (Appendix A). Now, it is analyzed that a formal closing



was done collectively which shows that Jinnah gave his closing remarks showing collective saliency to all the members at the press conference. Both stages (stages 1 and 2) ultimately lead toward the *linguistic generation/phonological level*. This stage will be analyzed in the second interview in detail.

4.2 Analysis and discussion of the second Interview

The analysis of this interview is focused on the perspective of stage 3 (Phonological Component/Linguistic Generation). The following analysis and discussion are based on the Language Production Model reveal how explicit utterances are generated.

Stage 3: Phonological Component: Saliency at Linguistic Utterance:

The phonological component is the result of the “Message and Grammatical Component,” where the saliency is at linguistic generation. It focuses on the restoration of forms of words and the generation of explicit utterances. In this interview, saliency is found at the message level, which is in *Response to Pakistan’s Appeal; No union between Hindu State; the relationship between India and Muslims and Functions of Muslims*”.

The clear message from this interview was analyzed in question-answer pairs 1-3 (Appendix B).

- In the first pair, saliency was given to the “*earnest response for Pakistan from the Prime Minister of England and other Dominions.*”
- In the second pair, saliency was given to the relationship between India and Pakistan. Though it was said by Speaker B that there should be a friendly relationship between both countries, saliency was given to the separation of both countries based on the “Two-Nation Theory.” Because of this “Two-nation Theory,” both countries can never be united. It is found through linguistic markers that speaker B gives saliency to suggesting measures not to promote anger among the people of both countries as he said, “*All this propaganda and agitation, all the threats..... we must stop any such effort.....* (Appendix B). Such linguistic utterances at the phonological stage provide an explicit message by giving saliency to the selection of words.
- In the third pair, speaker B suggested the “Role of Muslims” as *protecting the minorities; fair deal with Indians, no revenge*. As in Appendix (B):

“To protect and advance the political, religious and other rights and interests of Indian Muslalmans and other communities of India and to maintain and strengthen brotherly relations between the Musalmans of India and those of other communities.”

“The main objective of Muslims in India is to play their part in ensuring that they get a fair deal.”



“I must make it clear that I deplore and condemn without reserve the horrible deeds of killing and destruction that have taken place of killing and destruction that have taken place irrespective of their place of occurrence or origin.”

The production of these linguistic utterances retrieves saliency in the message/topic of this interview.

Based on these messages, utterances are generated by the interlocutors. Speaker A used syntactic ordering to form interrogative sentences to ask questions (Appendix B), and Speaker B produced utterances to answer those questions by following the syntactic ordering of the English language. *Naturalness* is found in the forms of words at the phonological level. This naturalness is found even in every utterance produced by both interlocutors, i.e., generating interrogation and responding in the form of a statement using the decorum of subject-prominent sentences.

Vividness is an important factor that is found in producing utterances at the phonological level. Saliency in emotional intensity is found in question-answer pairs 2 and 3. In response to question-answer pair 2, speaker B figures out the saliency of the relationship between India and Muslims. The linguistic utterances are generated to portray the following message. Both countries should “restore peace by maintaining law and order situation, help each other as neighbors, protect minorities” as the utterance is generated (Appendix B)

“First and foremost, both Dominions must make all-out efforts to restore peace and maintain law and order in their respective State....”

“We should bury the past and resolve that despite all that has happened, we shall remain friends. There are many things which we need from each other as neighbors and we can help each in diverse ways, morally, materially, and politically, and thereby raise the prestige and status of both Dominions....”

In the same question-answer pair, speaker B, talking about the steps which both countries should adopt for the survival of both dominions, gave emotional intensity to the “unfortunate situation going on between India and Pakistan” under the name of the “Two-nation theory”. Speaker B produced the utterance at the phonological level to give this over message. As in Appendix B:

“It is very unfortunate that vigorous propaganda has been going on from the moment that the division was agreed upon and the two states were created that Pakistan is only a truncated Pakistan, that is merely a temporary madness on the part of the Muslim League that has brought about this ‘secession’, repentant, erring son and that the; two-nation theory’ is responsible for all that has taken place.”

Speaker B generated utterances to suggest that there cannot be a union between India and Pakistan and that Pakistan will stay as a free country. He also suggested that people should stop promoting anger among the people of Pakistan against the Muslim League. His strong emotional



appeal is shown in the following utterances where the salience is given on utterance level (Appendix B).

“I want to make it quite clear that Pakistan will never surrender and never agree in any shape or form to any constitutional union between the two sovereign States with one common center. Pakistan has come to stay and will stay.”

“We must try to stop any efforts or attempt which is intended to bring about a forced union of the two Dominions.....”

Salience at the utterance level not only shows the emotional concentration of speaker B towards the survival of Pakistan but also reflects both perceptual and emergent salience in producing linguistic utterance for both interlocutors. The above-stated references also suggest that speaker B, by using the linguistic marker *“deplorable events of the past two months,”* activates the prior knowledge of Speaker A and produces an utterance that these two countries cannot be united. The emergent salience here is also depicted through the utterance that *“Pakistan has come to stay and will stay”*. This utterance represents the emergent salience after Pakistan’s independence. So, the linguistic utterances generated at the phonological level emphasize both inherent and emergent salience. Motivation is also found from these utterances that speaker B is motivating the people of Pakistan while showing saliency on different aspects through this interview.

Salience, while generating the utterances in question-answer pair 3 is also analyzed which is about the *“functions of Muslims/Muslim League”*. There are various functions uttered by speaker B in the interview, which are as follows. The utterances produced by Speaker B in response to question 3 are (Appendix B):

“The Muslim League has already achieved its mission--- its fundamental objects----which was to establish the independent state of Pakistan.”

“I quote, “to protect and advance the political, religious and other rights and interests of Indian Muslalmans and other communities of India and to maintain and strengthen brotherly relations between.....”

Vividness and motivation are observed in the above utterances at the phonological level. Salience in these utterances is found in the different roles of Muslims and the Muslim League. The emotional appeal is portrayed in every role: *“protection of minorities, a fair deal with India, No retaliation, No revenge.”* The linguistic utterances are generated to show these explicit roles and functions. Here, the conversation of this interview ends without following the closing section in the conversation structure.

5. Conclusion

It is concluded that salience plays a significant role in conversation structure/communication. It is concluded from the above analysis that the word/lemma selection,



syntactic ordering, and conversation pattern emphasize salience in utterance generation (Kecskes, 2014; Osgood & Bock, 1977; Levlet & Bock, 1994; Sacks et al. 1960). The study answered the first research question that interlocutors structure salience in the conversation. This salience is structured in three stages: Message Level, Grammatical level, and Utterance level. This structured salience is observed in all utterances of the selected Jinnah's interviews. Adjacency pairs are used to structure salience in this study that answers the second research question. The Salience of the selected interviews is found in adjacency pairs, which were based on question-answer. In both interviews, both inherent (perceptual) and emergent salience (actual situational salience) are observed in utterances generated by interlocutors. As Kecskes (2014) suggested "salience is both individual and societal phenomenon in SCA". Interlocutors' previous and current situational experience is privatized/subjectivized and prioritized in their minds. Their various past experiences, assessments of the real situational environment, constantly shifting goals, and distinct degrees of salience converge in an individualized production and comprehension of utterances. In this study, both interlocutors were aware of the prior situation of Pakistan's independence. This prior situation enables them to emphasize perceptual salience. The actual situational experience was that Pakistan came into being, and now the emergent salience was given to the actual situational context. Through the lens of the Language Production Model, this analysis reveals how Jinnah strategically employed language to convey his messages. He used clear and concise language, often employing subject-prominent sentence structures, to ensure his points were understood. He also demonstrated emotional intensity, particularly when discussing the plight of minorities and the challenges facing Pakistan. The analysis also highlights the importance of both perceptual and emergent salience in shaping Jinnah's utterances. While his prior knowledge and beliefs (perceptual salience) informed his overall message, the specific context of each interview (emergent salience) influenced the specific details and emphasis he placed on different issues. Thus, both inherent and emergent salience are structured using adjacency pairs in the selected interviews, focusing on the syntactic ordering, naturalness, vividness, and motivation in the language production model.

References:

- Bock, J. K. (1987). Co-ordinating words and syntax in speech plans. In A. W. Ellis (Ed.), *Progress in the Psychology of Language*. 3, pp. 337–389. London: Erlbaum.
- Bock, J. K., & Warren, R. K. (1985). Conceptual accessibility and syntactic structure in sentence formulation. *Cognition*, 21, 47–67.
- Bock, J.K., Levelt, W.J.M., (1994). *Language production: grammatical encoding*. In: Gernsbacher, M. (Ed.), *Handbook of Psycholinguistics*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 945--984.
- Branigan, H.P. & Sala, M.P. (2000). *Discourse Constraints on Syntactic Processing in Language Production: A Cross-Linguistic Study in English and Spanish*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. University of Nebraska-Lincoln





- Collister, L. B. (2008). *Virtual Discourse Structure: An Analysis of Conversation in World of Warcraft*.
- Grosz, B.J., Sidner, C.L., (1986). Attention, intention and the structure of discourse. *Computational Linguistics*.12 (3), 175-204.
- Ghilzai, S. A. (2015). *Conversational Analysis of Turn taking Behavior and Gender Differences in Multimodal Conversation*.
- Giora, R., (2003). *On Our Mind: Salience, Context, and Figurative Language*. University Press, Oxford.
- Grosz, B.J., Joshi, A.K., Weinstein, S., (1995). Centering: a framework for modeling the local coherence of discourse. *Computational Linguistics* 21, 203-225.
- Gulfam, G. Q., Hasan, W., & Bhatti, A. M. (2022). Cognitive Metaphor Theory: A Review. *Jahan-e-Tahqeeq*, 5(2), 280-287. Retrieved from <http://www.jahan-e-tahqeeq.com/index.php/jahan-e-tahqeeq/article/view/836/732>
- Gumperz, J. J. and Jenny, Cook-Gumperz. (2005). Making space for bilingual communicative practice. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(1), 1–24 .
- Haugh, M. (2010a). Doing speaker meaning in interaction. Submitted to *the Conference of the International Pragmatics Association*.
- Kong R. and Sui T, (2014). An Analysis of Conversation Structure in Ellen Show. *Studies in Literature and Language*.
- Kecskes, I. (2006). On my mind: Thoughts about salience, context, and figurative language from a second language perspective. *Second Language Research*, 22 (2), 219–237 .
- Kecskes, I. (2013a). *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford, uk: Oxford University Press.
- Kecskes, I. (2013b). Why do we say what we say the way we say it. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 48 (1), 71–84 .
- Kecskes, I. (2014). *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford, uk: Oxford University Press.
- Li, C. N., (1976). Subject and topic: a new typology of language. In: Li, Charles N. (Ed.), *Subject and Topic*. Academic Press, New York, p. 475.
- Myachykov, A., (2007). Integrating perceptual, semantic and syntactic information in sentence production. Submitted for the Degree of Ph.D. to the Higher Degree Committee of the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Glasgow.
- Nawal F. Abbas, Raja R. Raja S.; Shakila A. (2016). A Conversation Analysis of Some Excerpts from Montgomery's Anne of Green Gables. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*.
- Osgood, C. E., & Bock, J. K. (1977). Salience and sentencing: Some production principles. In S. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Sentence Production: Developments in Research and Theory* (pp. 89 140). London: Erlbaum.
- Piturro, V. (2014). Documentary Film Rhetoric: Saving Face and the Public Sphere. *The IAFOR Journal of Media, Communication and Film* .
- Stevenson, R.. (2002). The role of salience in the production of referring expressions: a psycholinguistic perspective. In: van Deemter, K., Kibble, R. (Eds.), *Information Sharing: Reference and Presupposition in Language Generation and Interpretation*. CSLI, Stanford, pp. 167 -192.



Samovar , L. A. and Richard E. P. (2001). *Communication between Cultures* (4th ed.) . New York :Thomas Learning Publications .

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Express.