Avoidance in Language Production*

*Dr. Hussein Ali Ahmed*** & *Dr. Huda Fadhil Isma'eel****

تاريخ القبول: 2011/11/14 تاريخ التقديم: 2011/9/19

ABSTRACT

One of the most remarkable features of language is the fact that it is an effective force in communication. Yet, still in some situations, avoiding certain linguistic items is necessarily needed in communication among different interlocutors in order not to break communication. The current work is open to one major objective: unearthing an interesting linguistic phenomenon, namely avoidance with its two main types: verbal and nonverbal. The verbal aspects have been tackled by shedding light on five main types of avoidance, morphological, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and semantico-pragmatic avoidance, side by side with the reasons that lead to avoidance in one of the aforementioned linguistic fields or another. As for non-verbal avoidance in linguistic settings, again three main types of avoidance, viz. positive (represented by two manners) and negative avoidance have been studied in detail. The present paper ends with some concluding remarks that highlight the main points attended to in the preceding pages of the research.

* The present paper is abridged from the Ph.D.thesis entitled"A Synthetic Approach to the Study of Avoidance in Language Production" by Dr. Huda Fadhil Isma'eel supervised by Asst. Prof. Dr. Hussein Ali Ahmed..

** Dept. of English/ College of Arts/ University of Mosul.

*** Dept. of English/ College of Arts/ University of Mosul.

I. Introduction:

In everyday communication, language is used variably by different speakers in the expression of varied thoughts and feelings while addressing different audiences. Such variation in language use is characterized, in the main, by a plethora of different linguistic means and techniques resorted to by the locuters, i.e. speakers who usually bear in mind that although the main goal behind any event of communication is the conveyance of information, yet they should also bind by the rules of communication, namely politeness, formality and appropriateness that make the messages sent more understandable, plausible and better fit the situations or contexts.

Avoidance is said to be part and parcel of the techniques already referred to. It is said that avoidance guides speakers to say what should be said and get rid of the unsaid. As such, in our attempt to approach the linguistic phenomenon of avoidance, we have endeavoured here to capture a significant characterization of the phenomenon first through the presentation of its nature and meaning and then by considering its two main types, namely verbal and non-verbal avoidance in terms of its occurrence in varied linguistic settings.

II. Aims of the Research:

The current research paper aims at a theoretical presentation of a quite common phenomenon in linguistic settings, namely avoidance. It further tries to shed light on the two main types of avoidance, namely verbal and nonverbal avoidance. Finally, reference is made to some subtypes that lie under the umbrella of the two main types of avoidance already highlighted.

III. The Nature and Meaning of Avoidance:

It is worthy to note that, according to Krashen (1987: 51), avoidance is a linguistic phenomenon whose historical roots go back to the realm of applied linguistics as it was first brought to light by the pioneer Schachter (1974 cited in Liao

& Fukuya, 2002: via the net), and in due course, it has cut across different disciplines other than linguistics such as cognition, psychology, sociology, etc. Consequently, this passes some of the trouble spots for a researcher in collecting the seminal materials and in finding a suitable framework to adopt.

Avoidance, as a term, is problematic and vague. Its meaning varies from one situation to another. As such, it becomes problematic in the sense whether to make a distinction or not and even how to make it between avoidance and other terminologies. Yet, one can say that avoidance belongs to the experiential world of the language community. As such, it cannot be viewed as a creativity of the native speakers of any community. Rather, it should be viewed as the outcome of much experience with the written and/or spoken form of any speech community.

Avoidance is distinctive in terms of its equivocal nature starting from its definition, description, and analysis for being a dynamic significant means used by people to convey different messages everywhere and at any time. It voices the following: The said and the unsaid, The done and the undone.

IV. Verbal Aspects of Avoidance in Linguistic Settings:

When it comes to distinguishing avoidance as a phenomenon in various linguistic domains, a shift of emphasis can be noticed on seminal queries which are waiting for answers like: What are these linguistic domains? Which domain is the starting-point for avoidance, and why?

“The study of avoidance as a linguistic phenomenon is of fairly recent origin”(Irujo, 1993: 205). Schatcher (1974) has first brought to light the phenomenon of avoidance behaviours in second language acquisition, especially what is embodied in error analysis of second language (i.e. learners of the target language). Since then, her study has drawn the attention of many researchers who have pursued investigating this phenomenon (Liao and Fukuya, 2002: via the net).

It must be noted that the works of these researchers have the task of patiently clarifying each particular type of avoidance, whether verbal or non-verbal, as it arises in different linguistic levels as far as the present domain is concerned.

In what follows, verbal aspects of avoidance will be covered with focus being on various linguistic fields, namely morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics:

a. Morphological Avoidance:

In verbal communication, the user of the language finds himself, in some cases, in need of fulfilling certain communicative needs by adopting or even inventing certain mechanisms to reduce the full-length words into certain abbreviated forms. Thus, what is intended here is to focus on the morphology or word formation in language and to explain: first, *why?* and second, *how?* the speaker or even the writer is after avoiding the use of full words and substituting them with various short cuts. A set of terms seems to be pertinent to the discussion here which helps us to understand what is beneath one of these mechanisms which is avoiding saying lengthy words or phrases.

Reasonably enough, 'acronyms' is the focal point in this part of the discussion. The origins of acronyms are a little unclear due to the shortage of good articles about the history and development of acronyms. The term acronyms, etymologically speaking, “is derived from a combination of the Greek words *akros*, meaning top, and *onyma*, meaning name” (Dringer, 2005; Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia: via the net).

In spite of acronyms’ widespread use in daily life nowadays, this use is relatively a modern phenomenon. In other words, acronyms are known to have been used in Rome dating back even earlier than the Christian era as Cannon (1989 cited in Shultz, 2006: 411) says: “It has been noted that these types of abbreviations, i.e. acronyms occurred during the Roman Empire with SPQR used for Senatus Populusque Roamnus”. (This acronym is used to refer to the official name of the Roman Empire).

Since at least the middle ages, acronyms have also been used in Hebrew, particularly when referring to several important rabbis. For instance, ***Ra**bbi **M**oshe **B**en **N**ahman* is known as the *Ramban*. Even Jesus, Yehoshuah is called *Yeshu* in short by intimates (Via the net).

In modern times, acronyms have been increasing since the beginning of the 20th and 21st centuries. Many acronyms originated during the two world wars; others have been formed as short names for government agencies and international organizations(Adams, 1973: 136).

b. Syntactic Avoidance:

Various studies highlight the existence and the potential causes of avoidance behaviour in second language learning as far as the syntactic aspects of language are concerned. One must reckon, then, with instances to explain such a behaviour when discussing some of scholars' views:

Schachter (1974) marks the birth of avoidance as a phenomenon in linguistic studies. Her contribution can be summarized as follows: In comparing the errors in relative clauses made by native speakers of four different languages, namely Chinese, Japanese, Persian and learners of English as a second language, she has found that the difficulty of producing relative clauses for both Chinese and Japanese learners is not determined by the number of errors made by the learners. Rather, it is determined by the number of relative clauses produced. This number is much smaller in the production of the learners of the first two, i.e. Chinese and Japanese groups than the last two groups, i.e. Persian and Arab formerly mentioned.

In line with these observations, Schachter concludes the following two points: First, Error Analysis, as a prevailing field, is incapable of explaining what is meant by avoidance. Secondly, "if a student finds a particular construction in the target language difficult to comprehend, it is very likely that he will try to avoid producing it" (Schachter, 1974).

Kleinmann (1977, 1978) tested other different English grammatical structures, viz. passive, present progressive, infinitive complement, and direct object pronoun against the performance of two groups of intermediate level learners: native speakers of Arabic and native speakers of Spanish and Portuguese. The results show that there is an interaction of linguistic and psychological variables in determining learner behaviour in a second language in that structures which otherwise would be avoided are likely to be produced depending on the affective state of the learner. (Kleinmann, 1977: 93).

Kamimoto, Shimura, and Kellerman (1992) propose that for the purpose of investigating whether avoidance is a reason behind the underproduction of any group of second language learners, one must consider the following: The form, the distribution, and the function of first language linguistic entity which are supposedly avoided in second language. To add, one must look at the means used to prove whether and to what extent such linguistic entities are used in second language; i.e. their uses and functions in contexts.

Observing these different views concerning the factors behind avoidance, as a behaviour in second language learners, it may be of interest too to argue that the structural linguistic differences in the first language and second language and the psychological states of the learners are considered to be important factors behind avoidance, as Schachter and Kleinmann respectively claim. Yet, Kamimoto et al.'s attempt is more significant than other studies due to the following:

(1) It focuses on the learner's knowledge of the linguistic entities in the first language.
(2) It follows that it makes a bridge between such a knowledge of learners and their avoidance behaviour in the second language. So, there is an implicit match between linguistic entities of the firs language and their counterparts in the second language.
(3) Knowledge of the first language implies not only a mastery of the forms and structures of linguistic features, but also their functions and uses in different contexts in the second language.

It should be noted that it is not enough to simply designate avoidance as a safe strategy adopted by second language learners to avoid making mistakes on different linguistic levels. Let us consider how avoidance and the design of English as a foreign language texts interlock together. Avoidance of sexism is a case in point here.

Sakita (1995) examines the prevalence of sexism in the textbooks of English education in Japan, and its effect on both teaching and learning. Essential questions beg answering here: *What are the various aspects of sexism in these books?*, and *What is behind the prevalence of sexism in these books?*

Based on a survey of 10 textbooks widely used in Japanese Junior and Senior high schools (all published between 1989 and 1992), Sakita's findings show different aspects of sexism; i.e. gender imbalance, or demeaning women in these textbooks with different proportions at different levels of learning.

Viewing these different proportions, we can now turn to the second question raised earlier and its answer would be as follows. The prevalence of sexism in such textbooks springs from the following facts:

(1) The English language, it has been claimed, is sexist (Cherry, 1988 and Sakita, 1991 cited in Sakita, 1995: via the net) and possesses male-as- norm elements.

(2) English is said to be the only foreign language through junior and senior high schools in Japan. It is, also, taught in most of the elementary schools.

(3) Building on (1) and (2), the only foreign language Japanese children learn, by definition, has sexist features (cf. Sakita: Ibid.).

According to these points, we approach closely a significant problem: teaching English with its sexist features to Japanese children affects their world-view as far as gender imbalance is concerned. This matches what Trudgill (1974: 25) states: "a language can affect a society by influencing or even controlling the world-view of its speakers". Consequently, such features are reinforced gradually in the Japanese society due to the fact that though "sexism is a cultural bias, yet expressed in and reinforced by the language people learn from childhood on"(Florent & Walter, 1988).

This severe inequity clearly exists in English textbooks designed for Japanese learners, thus involving omission of women in the sense that far more women appear without occupations, or they had limited stereotypical jobs assisting males. Stereotypical roles became clear both in adjective usage and activities and topics: physical state, size, and reputation are associated with men, weakness and attractiveness with women; intellect and education are never fairly talked about for women; … only women take care of somebody, do housework, go to parties, talk long, receive flowers and are concerned about marriage; …the offensive use of girl for adult women introducing women by first name or no name, but men by full name, …. (Sakita, 1995: via the net).

In the same vein, some space of the present research is devoted to shedding light on another syntactic device, viz. ellipsis. It seems convenient to discuss first, the nature of ellipsis in order to manipulate the relation that may hold between ellipsis and avoidance.

Syntactically speaking, "ellipsis is purely a surface phenomenon" (Quirk et al., 1985: 536). In other terms, the ellipted part, whatever its syntactic function is, does not indicate any change in the meaning of the sentence itself; it is a matter of changing the form only (cf. Thomas, 1987: 1; Carter & McCarthy, 1995: 145 and Selders, 1995: via the net cited in Wilson, 2000).

Ellipsis may, also, be described as grammatical omission compared with other kinds of omission. There is, for instance, the phonological loss of a certain syllable in a word known as aphaeresis as in the familiar form of because, often spelled 'cos. Clipping of words is regarded as another instance of the process. *Flu* which is clipped from the word formation *influenza* is described in terms of phonological units (i.e. syllables) rather than in terms of morphological units (i.e. morphemes) or grammatical units (i.e. words) (Quirk et al., 1985: 883-884). It is presupposed that the following reasons play a role in omitting parts of a sentence whether in spoken or written language:

1. Unique Recoverability:

The sense of ellipsis implies that words can be ellipted under one condition – viz. when the words are uniquely recoverable. In other words, there is no doubt as to what words are to be supplied, and it is possible to add the recovered words to the sentence. Given the sentence, for instance,

(1) She can't sing tonight, so she won't (sing).

(based on Quirk et al., 1972: 536),

it is presupposed that the verb 'sing' is ellipted due to the fact that the ellipted item is uniquely recoverable from a previous clause in the same sentence. In addition, what is uniquely recoverable depends on the context (Quirk et al., 1985: 861-862).

2. Reducing Redundancy and Avoiding Repetition:

Ellipsis is most commonly used to reduce redundancy and avoid repetition. In this respect, ellipsis is just like substitution. It is possible, then, to avoid repetition not only by ellipsis, as in sentence (3), but also by substitution. Sentence (4) is a good example:

(2) She might sing, but I don't think she will *do so*.

(based on Quirk et al., 1972: 537)

The use of the proform represented by "do so" is but a substitute of the verb sing to avoid repetition which is not favoured in speech or writing; it is even avoided for stylistic reasons (ibid.).

3. Attracting Attention to the New Material:

By omitting certain items that are shared, attention is focused on new material as in the dialogue:

(3a) Have you spoken to him?

(3b) (I have) Not yet (spoken to him).

Sentence (3b) shows that omitting those items mentioned between brackets will lead speaker A to focus on the items which are newly mentioned in the speech of speaker B (Quirk et al., 1972: 538).

4. Economy:

Another important motivation that one can assume here is economy. The speaker always needs to convey his/her message faster with less effort. Consequently, the s/he tends to omit parts of the sentence.

c. Semantic Avoidance:

The belief that idioms, as a significant part of the semantic structure of English are avoided on the part of learners, has no clear evidence for the researchers in the 1970s. Instead, much of the evidence available is observational and indirect indicators. For Henzl (1973), one of such indirect indicators is the learner's belief that idioms avoidance is language specific; hence, not transferable to second language. This springs from the fact that idioms are not common in the "foreigned talks"; that is, teachers may not use idioms when addressing the learners. In their two experimental studies in the Netherlands, Jordens (1977) and Kleinmann (1977) present another indicator. When idioms have first language equivalents, second language learners may judge them as ungrammatical structures. This indirectly indicates their reluctance to transfer them to the second language. Hence, they avoid using them (Irujo, 1993: 205-206).

Moving to the 1980s, the use of communication strategies, including avoidance, in acquiring lexical terms has been documented in several studies (Bialystock & Frohlich, 1980; Poulisse et al., 1984 and Paribakht, 1985). Still, avoidance in the use of idioms has never been concerned with.

Nevertheless, second language teachers' viewpoint is that even their most advanced students tend to avoid using idioms. This avoidance might be due to the fear of not getting the idioms right, since learners know that idioms do not literally mean what they say (Irujo, 1993: 205).

Now, one question that may be debated is the following: *Does avoidance occupy a place in second language learning, as far as this particular linguistic area (i.e. idioms) is concerned?* This query may be answered positively and/or negatively by considering different factors. Going back to the most obvious slogan of second language teachers mentioned earlier, it can be said that idiom avoidance is, truly, there in second language classes taking into account:

- the classroom as a major learning setting,
- the age of learners of second language (i.e. different ages at different levels of learning),
- the background knowledge of the learners; and

- the curriculum developed by teachers for each level of learning, giving no clear alternative strategy for learners to produce idioms. It is also, a no- answer, as a proof, which is originally worked out by Irujo (1993) in her experience where
- culture is an additional setting for learning
- age of learners of second language is advanced (in our case, advanced fluent bilinguals)
- curriculum developed by teachers must match the advanced level of the learners.

So, there is already an alternative – may be literal – means of expressing the same meaning of idioms in second language by paraphrasing.

d. Pragmatic Avoidance:

Studies on transfer, as far as language teaching and learning are concerned, have usually focused on different types of linguistic entities of the first language and the second language. Still, such works have totally overlooked transfer of the communicative functions of these entities in the two languages in question.

Nowadays, however, there is a large body of research on the patterns and regularities of talks – talk between students and teachers in the classrooms, talk between learners, and talk between learners and proficient speakers in natural settings outside classrooms. Some of these works have pedagogic focus, learning focus, or communicative focus, much of which is mainly concerned with what people say- their linguistic products rather than how they say it or what the linguistic process is. Transfer of the communicative competence has become relevant in most of the investigators' studies plus the various strategies of talk and situations. It is worth considering that research in this area has tackled, interalia, among different situations, talk speech acts, as one of the basic issues, which is, in turn, a principal topic in pragmatics (Fraser, 1981: 435 and McDonough, 1995: 16). It is possible, then, to find areas where pragmatic avoidance plays a significant role in English as a second language or English as a foreign language classes. For the present researcher, both Fraser's (1981) and McDonough's (1995) contributions, as available materials, may help to act and think more reasonably for the purpose of connecting three terms – avoidance, pragmatics, English as a second language or English as a foreign language.

e. Semantico-Pragmatic Avoidance:

As the title suggests, speakers are controlled by certain rules or principles when communicating with each other. Some are said to be universally oriented; some others are culturally-oriented varying from one situation to another or from one speaker to another. Any attempt, then, at answering the query raised in the title must take into account the semantic and pragmatic nature of these rules. In many respects, it seems somehow exhausting to cover the infinite set of aspects of what is called, in the researcher's terminology, *the unsaid* in humans' interaction.

To avoid repetition and redundancy, the researcher aims to catalogue some instances that explain how the meaning of the unsaid (which could be a lexeme, an expression, an idiom, etc.) and the whole circumstances that necessitate the unsaid (including the speaker, channel of communication, the hearer, etc.) modify the way avoidance works in two highly interwoven fields, viz. semantics and pragmatics.

Diachronic and synchronic investigation of vocabulary, expressions, phrases, etc. used by speakers in different communities draws on the following fact: some sets of vocabulary or expressions related to different fields are embraced under what is called the *unsaid* if their emotive connotative meanings are carefully diagnosed. The following range of instances are good candidates:

1. The Religious Unsaid:

Ardó (2001: via the net) says: "Perhaps it is not too far-fetched a statement to say that most of us like to think of ourselves as (more or less) rational, articulate and disciplined human beings". In accordance with this rationality, it is a universal fact that humans regard with great respect or reverence every single entity related to religion. Hence, people prefer not to mention such entities in an ad hoc way or on trivial occasions. Some examples are pertinent here: ***names*** of

Almighty Allah, ***God*** or ***gods***, also names of prophets like ***Mohammad (PBUH)***, ***Jesus***, ***Saint Mary*** in Islam and Christianity, respectively.

2. The Superstitious Unsaid:

On the basis of superstitious beliefs, people strive not to use or utter vocabulary related to black magic, witch curses, etc. Beliefs like these may affect a wide range of linguistic phenomena, and thus, include animal names. It is wolf, for instance, which the peasants in the Ukraine term as uncle or nice little dog (Smal-Stoki, 1950 cited in Saville-Troike, 1982: 200).

3. The Social Unsaid:

One may not take to the risk of prosecution if one uses one of the words, topics, or actions which are very private and personal on all occasions. This is clearly shown in the language of sex. Certain parts and functions of the body, words of bad connotation, even swear words are considered obscene. These, in turn, as Greenberg (1966: 245) states "are unrestricted universals since they are governed by social and cultural factors". Still, one might wish to say, like it or not, such social unsaid remain universal features across space and time, especially swearing (Ardó, 2001: via the net).

4. The Unsaid Disease:

Serious fatal diseases or infectious diseases which are highly spread in communities, whether in ancient times or nowadays, are not much favourite to talk about, so is uttering the lexemes identifying the disease itself even in civilized communities. Such diseases include T.B., Cholera, Measles, Cancer, and recently Aids.

5. The Unsaid Death:

To a greater or lesser degree, people do not prefer issues related to death. Thus, names of dead people, funeral ceremonies and burying, undertaker, coffin, and grave are not directly referred to.

6. The Unsaid Naming:

Names of people may sometimes create some problems. An English professor, for instance, unwilling to call any student named Jesus in the class is usually rechristened Jessie by the second week of class (Saville-Troike, 1982: 202).

A palpable semantic trait of these examples and of many others is that the unsaid or the unspeakable or the undone are connotatively bad, dirty, unacceptable, unpreferrable, unpleasant, fearful, etc. They are given a technical term in semantics, viz. taboo. Etymologically, it is a Polynesian word which Captain Cook introduced into English then it passed into other European languages (Ullman, 1962: 204). It is simply defined as "a word that is used for something unpleasant" and "because the word is associated with a socially distasteful subject, it becomes distasteful itself" (Palmer, 1981: 10 and 92). Here, avoiding the bad connotative meanings of entities in the world comes into picture which is not an up-to-date phenomenon as Turner (1973: 116) remarks "throughout history there has been a desire to avoid naming the fearful and unpleasant". But, why avoid tabooed words? Commonly, tabooed words are avoided by people cross-culturally due to social, psychological, religious, idiosyncratic or cultural factors. By definition, all these factors are encapsulated in what is called pragmatics. So, the phenomenon of avoidance does work properly in the two interwoven fields, namely semantics and pragmatics.

No doubt, one wishes to know an answer to a question like: Is there any safe strategy to avoid mentioning or using tabooed words in communication? In most, if not all cases, tabooed words are abandoned and a harmless substitute or alternative, a euphemism, is introduced to fill the gap in communication (Ullman, 1962: 205). As a technical term, "euphemism" is viewed by scholars as "a softened, agreeable, or indirect expression used instead of the one that seems too harsh, indelicate or direct" (Anderson & Stategberg, 1962: 139).

Such is the case, it seems, that taboo and euphemism are two faces of the same coin, so to speak. This can be explained in terms of politeness purposes which govern universally different cultures; tabooed words are undesirable and euphemism is used as a remedy instead. Besides, it is possible to suggest that avoidance could be viewed here as a super-ordinate strategy which subsumes euphemism as a subordinate strategy as far as politeness is concerned.

V. Non-Verbal Aspects of Avoidance in Linguistic Settings:

So far, we have remarked that avoidance in second language settings commonly lends itself to the definite nature of learners' behaviour, as a dynamic safe strategy in the process of learning, which involves avoiding certain linguistic features verbally. Yet, it may seem out of keeping that some faces of non-verbal avoidance can be viewed to function either positively or negatively, in the same area. Such faces sometimes could be methodologies for teachers or strategies for learners. Some instances will be sketched here:

1. Positive Avoidance: Non-verbal Teacher vs. Verbal Learner:

Silence is a dynamic methodology frequently observed in teaching foreign languages. This is proved in La Forge's observation of classrooms for more than five years, especially during group learning activities (1977: 373). La Forge examined the different reactions towards silence of learners- Japanese, Spanish and American groups- engaged in Community Language Learning or even in ordinary classes. Basically, his work is based on cataloguing silence from three different perspectives: silence on the part of the teacher, silence on the part of the learner, and silence when called for by the Community Language Learning contract (e.g. during reflection period or evaluation period after the given tasks). More basic or revealing in the argument here is the first perspective leaving the other two, particularly the second one, for subsequent discussion.

Now, the principal meaning of silence or "social silence", using the author's terminology, is a psychodynamic phenomenon referring to "what goes inside and between folks" (Stevick, 1976: 119). In his definition, Stevick points out two types of silence; the first type is related to silence within learners, and the second type is related to silence between teachers and learners, respectively. Accordingly, one finds oneself in the thick of psychology, within the realm of foreign language teaching, that controls both types of silence to achieve different purposes on the part of the learner and teacher. A question, then can be brought essentially under this heading: How is it possible to test silence as a dynamic psychological methodology used by the teacher?

2. Negative Avoidance: Verbal Teacher vs. Non-verbal Learner:

The sound of silence, here, may shout another message different from that used by teachers in the class as shown above. This time, the researcher attempts to encode this message tracing silence on the part of the learners starting from childhood; that is, early stages of learning moving to more advanced stages so as to magnify, briefly, the function of silence in English as a second language or English as a foreign language classes- a strategy adopted by learners.

Teachers may label some of the English as second language children as untalkative, non-verbal or silent in the class. In this sense, the child would not reply to any type of questioning; rather, responding with lowered eyes and heads and silence. Tracing those signs, or even, the silence adopted by children may explore and map many areas related to that atmosphere of teaching English, whether as second or even a foreign language for children; above all is psychology.

The psychodynamic effects, remarked earlier still play a significant role on the part of the member of Community Language Learning groups, especially what goes on inside the learners. This can be proved simply in what is called reflection period, which simply means that the students are given the opportunity to appraise the learning experience they practice given after each type of the activities in the Community Language Learning contract. This helps the teacher a great deal to assist the learner in pointing out the problems and suggest remedies.

3. Positive Avoidance: Listening – A Healthy Technique in Classes

Listening, as opposed talking or speech, is another good candidate to be included in the set of the non-verbal faces of avoidance. It seems on the surface that listening is like silence, yet there is a virtue in being obliged to draw a distinction between the two terms, especially what concerns the field at issue. As noted earlier, silence implies the meaning of an obligatory avoidance of verbal or oral production on the part of both teachers and learners in the class achieving different purposes. It is on the one hand, a methodology used positively by teachers to provoke learners' speech. On the other hand, it is a safe strategy adopted by learners to avoid making mistakes for fear of talking or for any other reason.

Though listening implies silence in the sense defined above, yet this silence is controlled by rationale; it involves a set of processes which are positively evaluated to facilitate learning more than speaking or talking. Thus, for a group of applied linguists, listening comprehension, as a methodology or approach in language teaching, influences the process of learning, and it is given the priority over talking or oral production methodologies. In this line of thinking, such a group argues against opponents who widely hold the opposite view.

Basing their analysis on the accumulation of research- both of theoretical and experimental nature- which strongly suggests this priority, Gary & Gary (1981) review and expand the arguments to include delaying and reducing the oral practices while providing for increased listening practices.

VI. Conclusion:

In the present abridged research paper on avoidance, an attempt has been made to have a new format of the original copy of the work starting with the suggestion of a new title, namely "Avoidance in Language Production". This has been followed by having a way of presentation and organization of the sections different from the methodology adopted by the researcher of the original work.

When it comes to the contents, avoidance has been attended to in the first place as a technique that guides speakers, in their verbal performance of language, to say what should be said and get rid of the unsaid, and also in their nonverbal performance, i.e. when silence dominates the situation, As such, it has been highlighted that avoidance, as a term, is problematic and vague as any variation in the communication situation or the linguistic setting, entails a different meaning of avoidance. Added to that, in terms of its occurrence in any verbal linguistic settings, five main types of verbal avoidance are usually distinguished, namely syntactic, morphological, semantic, pragmatic, and semantico pragmatic avoidance with vivid indication of the ways that avoidance takes place. As for non-verbal avoidance, that is represented, in the main, by the silence phenomenon, reference has been made to three sub-types of this type depending on the nonverbalness and/or verbalness of the teacher or the student..

References

Adams, V. (1973). **An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation**. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Anderson, W. and Stageberg, N. (1962). **Introductory Readings on Language**. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Ardó, Z. (2001). "Emotions, Taboos and Profane Language". **Translation Journal**. April 5(2): via the net. Available: http://www.accurapid.com/journal/16review.htm-20k-

Baum, S. (1957). "Formal Dress for Initial Words". **Am Speech**. 32(1), pp.73-75.

Bem, S. and Bem, D. (1973). "Does Sex-Biased Job Advertising 'aid and abet' Sex Discrimination?". **Journal of Applied Social Psychology**. 3, pp.6-18.

Bialystock, E. and Frohlich, M. (1980). "Oral Communication Strategies for Lexical Difficulties".

Interlanguage Studies Bulletin. 5(1), pp.3-30.

Bosmajian, H. (1974). **The Language of Oppression**. Washington, DC.: Public Affairs Press.

Cannon, G. (1989). "Abbreviations and Acronyms in English Word-Formation". **Am Speech**. 64(2), pp.99-127.

Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (1995). "Grammar and the Spoken Language". **Applied Linguistics**. 16(2), pp.141-158.

Cherry, K. (1988). **Womansword: What Japanese Words Say about Women**. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Dringer, D. (2005). "Acronym", in Shally-Jensen, M. (ed.), **Encyclopedia Americana**. International ed. Danbury, CT: Scholastic Library Publishing, p.120.

Florent, J. and Walter, C. (1988). "A Better Role for Women in TEFL". **ELT Journal**. 43(3), pp.180-184.

Fraser, (1981). "Insulting Problems in a Second Language". **TESOL Quarterly**. 15(4), pp.435-441.

Gary, J. and Gary, N. (1981). "Caution: Talking may be Dangerous to your Linguistic Health". **IRAL**. 19(1), pp.1-14.

Greenberg, J. (1966). **Universals of Language**. Massachusetts: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Hartman, P. and Judd, E. (1978). "Sexism and TESOL Materials". **TESOL Quarterly**. 12, pp.383-393.

Hasegawa, K. (1990). **Enjoy English I**. Tokyo Shoseki: New Horizon I.

Henzl, V. (1973). "Linguistics Register of Foreign Language Instruction". **Language Learning**. 23, pp.207-229.

Irujo, S. (1993). "Steering Clear: Avoidance in the Production of Idioms". **IRAL**. (31)3, August, pp.205-219.

Jaszczolt, K. (2002). **Semantics and Pragmatics: Meaning in Language and Discourse**. London: Pearson Education Ltd.

Jordens, P. (1977). "Rules, Grammatical Intuitions and Strategies in Foreign Language Learning". **Interlanguage Studies Bulletin**. 2(2), pp.5-77.

Kamimoto, T.; Shimura, A. and Kellerman, E. (1992). "A Second Language Classic Reconsidered – The Case of Schacter's Avoidance". **Second Language Research**. 8, pp.251-277.

Kearns, K. (2000). **Semantics**. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Kleinmann, H. (1977). "Avoidance Behaviour in Adult Second Language Acquisition". **Language Learning**. 27, pp.93-107.

___________ (1978). "The Strategy of Avoidance in Adult Second Language Acquisition", in Ritchie, W. (ed.), **Second Language Acquisition Research: Issues and Implications**. New York: Academic Press, pp.157-174.

Krashen, S. (1987). **Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition**. Englewood Cliff: Prentice-Hall International.

La Forge, P. (1975). **Research Profiles with Community Language Learning**. Apple River, Illinois: Apple River Press.

___________ (1977). "Uses of Social Silence in the Interpersonal Dynamics of Community Language Learning". **TESOL Quarterly**. 11(4), pp.373-382.

Leech, G. (1983). **The Principles of Pragmatics**. London: Longman Group Limited.

Liao, Y. and Fukuya, Y. (2002). "Avoidance of Phrasal Verbs: The Case of Chinese Learners of English". **Second Language Studies**. Spring 20(2), pp.71-106. Available: http://

www.hawaii.edu/sls/uhwpesl/20(2)/Liao& Fukya.pdf06/02/2005.

Lyons, J. (1977). **Semantics (Vol.I)**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McDonough, S. (1995). **Strategy and Skill in Learning a Foreign Language**. London: ARNOLD.

Nilsen, A.; Bosmajian, H.; Gershuny, H. and Stanely, J. (1977). **Sexism and Language**. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Palmer, F. (1981). **Semantics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paribakt, T. (1985). "Strategic Competence and Language Proficiency". **Applied Linguistics**. 6, pp.132-146.

Poulisse, N.; Bongaerts, T. and Kellerman, F. (1984). "The Use of Compensatory Strategies by Dutch Learners of English". Paper Presented at the 17th International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Brussels.

Quirk, R.; Greenbaum, S.; Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1972). **A Grammar of Contemporary English**. London: Longman.

____ (1985). **A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language**. London: Longman Group Limited.

Riordan, J. (1947). "Some G. I. Alphabet Soup". **Am Speech**. 22(2), pp.108-114.

Sakita, T. (1991). "Sexist Language in Japan: With a Focus on Marriage". Paper Submitted to the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

_______ (1995). "Sexism in Japanese English Education: A Survey of EFL Texts". **Women and Language**. Vol.18. Issue: 2, pp.5+. Available: http://www.questia.com. Retrieved: 05/09/2006.

Saville, Troike, M. (1985). "The Place of Silence in an Integrated Theory of Communication", in

Tannen, D. and Saville Troike, M., **Perspectives on Silence**. Norwood, New Jersey: ABLEX Publishing Corporation, pp.3-18.

Schachter, J. (1974). "An Error in Error Analysis". **Language Learning**. 24, pp.205-214.

Selders, D. (1995). "Artwork: Discourse Processing in Machine Translation of Dialogue". New Mexico State University. Available: http://crl.nmsu.edu/Research/ Projects/artwork.

Shultz, M. (2006). "Mapping of Medical Acronyms and Initialisms to Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) across Selected Systems". **Journal of Medical Library Association**, 94(4), pp.410-414.

Smal-Stoki, R. (1950). "Taboo on Animal Names in Ukrainian". **Language**. 26, pp.489-493.

Stevick, E. (1976). **Memory, Meaning, and Method: Some Psychological Perspectives on Language Learning**. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

Svartvik, J. (1966). **On Voice in the English Verb**. Hague: Mouton & Co.

Thomas, A. (1987). "The Use and Interpretation of Verbally Determined Verb Group Ellipsis in English". **International Review of Applied Linguistics**. 25(1), pp.1-14.

Trömel-Plötz, S. (1981). "Languages of Oppression". **Journal of Pragmatics**, 5, pp.67-80.

Trudgill, P. (1974). **Sociolinguistics**. England: Penguin Books Inc.

Turner, G. (1973). **Stylistics**. England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Ullman, S. (1962). **Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning**. Oxford: Basil Blackwell & Mott Ltd.

Wilson, P. (2000). **Mind the Gap: Ellipsis and Stylistic Variation in Spoken and Written English**. England: Pearson Education Limited.

SITES ON THE INTERNET CONSULTED

http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communication. Retrieved: 12/03/2007.

http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The-Demolished-Man. Retrieved: 23/04/2007.

http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The-Whole-Man. Retrieved: 23/04/2007.

http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tales-from-the-White-hart. Retrieved: 23/04/2007.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Acronym. Retrieved: 23/04/2007.

http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Short-message-service. Retrieved: 21/05/2007.

http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Racial-demographics-of-the-United- States. Retrieved: 27/07/2007.

http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political-correctness. Retrieved: 7/10/2007.

http://en.wikipedia.org.wiki/swearing. Retrieved: 23/08/2007.

ظاهرة الاجتناب في الأداء اللغوي

د. حسين علي أحمد * **د. هدى فاضل إسماعيل****

الملخص

تتمثل أحدى الميزات البارزة للغة في حقيقة كونها قوة فعالة للتواصل، بيد أنّه، وفي بعض المواقف، تكون الحاجة إلى تجنّب أمور لغوية معينّة أمرا ضروريا للغاية في التواصل بين المتكلمين عموما بغية تجنب فشل التواصل. إن الهدف الرئيس للبحث الحالي هو سبر غور ظاهرة لغوية رئيسة و ممتعة، ألا وهي الاجتناب بنوعيه اللفظي وغير اللفظي. تمّ تناول الجوانب اللفظية للظاهرة من خلال تسليط الضوء على خمسة أنواع رئيسة: الاجتناب المورفولوجي والبنيوي والدلالي والبراغماطيقي والدلالي–البراغماطيقي، إلى جانب الأسباب التي تؤدي إلى الاجتناب في المجالات اللغوية الآنفة الذكر. أمّا فيما يتعلق بالاجتناب غير اللفظي في السياقات أو المواقف اللغوية، فتوجد أيضا ثلاثة أنواع رئيسة : أولها الاجتناب الايجابي (المتمثّل بنوعين فرعيين) والاجتناب السلبي، حيث تمّت دراستها جميعا بالتفصيل. ينتهي البحث الحالي بخاتمة تتضمّن ملخصا للمواضيع التي تمّ تناولها في البحث.

---

* قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/ كلية الآداب/ جامعة الموصل.

** قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/ كلية الآداب/ جامعة الموصل.