

ANOTHER LOOK AT UNPLANNED AND PLANNED DISCOURSE

Sandra Tawake

The University of the South Pacific

In Keenan's pioneering work on planned and unplanned discourse (1977) she proposes an alternative to the replacement model of language development in which she questions the assumption made by many that as the learner moves from one stage of language development to the next, he does not go back to use strategies developed during an earlier period. In Keenan's model, language development is viewed not in terms of a series of subsequently replaced stages that move successively closer to some ideal target but rather as a widening and development of the learner's linguistic potentialities. Gaining more competence in a language involves increasing one's knowledge of the potential range of structures available for use and increasing one's ability to use them. In this model, communicative strategies are not replaced but retained to be relied upon under certain communicative conditions.

One implication of Keenan's model is that competence in communicative expression continues to develop not only during the period of the learner's language acquisition but throughout adult life. Therefore, early developed communicative patterns co-exist in the learner's repertoire with more recently developed patterns. Keenan's model predicts that the degree to which an adult will rely on earlier developed patterns depends upon the amount of time available for planning.

Keenan defines planned discourse (1977:6) as discourse produced when sufficient time for thinking and organizational preparation prior to expression has been available to the principal. She defines unplanned discourse as discourse which lacks forethought and organizational preparation. This lack of planning may be a result of situational demands which require continuous monitoring by the principal or conceptual demands due to the cognitive complexity of the topic, either of which will interfere with the principal's attention to planning the form the discourse will take.

Keenan examined data from child-child, child-adult, and adult-adult communicative situations and found that when principals had not planned the form of their discourse, they relied more heavily on morpho-syntactic and discourse patterns acquired early in language development such as: simple active sentences, deictic modifiers and propositions conveyed over a series of utterances. Conversely, she found that more planned language use featured a higher proportion of non-present tense verbs than unplanned discourse. It also featured a preponderance of morpho-syntactic structures acquired relatively later in life, perhaps transmitted through formal education, such as: passive voice, complementation, cleft constructions, certain types of relative clauses, and more formal discourse devices of textual cohesion and transition like: "for example," "that is," "furthermore," "on the other hand," and the use of topic sentences to begin paragraphs in writing.

Keenan also found that adult speech behavior took on many of the characteristics of child language where the communication was spontaneous and topics were relatively unpredictable, conditions according to Keenan, predicting unplanned modes of discourse would result. For example, in Keenan's unplanned data, principals often relied less on syntax and more on context which resulted in arguments and predicates being tied through their sequential position in the discourse rather than through syntactic means. An excerpt from Keenan will illustrate this (1977:19).

Two girls
(Discussing classes at the local university)

3: Ohh I g'ta tell ya one course

A: (incred-)

B: The mo- the modern art the twentieth century art,
there's about eight books

In this sequence there is no explicit semantic or syntactic link between the

initial three noun phrases and the subsequent sentence. The semantic relation is not expressed but is inferred from the positioning of the structures **within** the discourse. **This** type of construction which **Keenan** calls a sequentially expressed proposition rarely appeared in her planned discourse samples.

Keenan's unplanned discourse **samples** also featured more repetition of the same words **and** more words with the same sounds, showed higher rate of time adverbials over tense to mark **time**, **involved** more deictics than relative clauses and featured **numerous** instances of a construction linguists have called left dislocation. According to Ross (1967) cited in **Keenan (1977:20)**, left dislocation is a **transformation** that moves an NP out of and to the left of a clause leaving in its place a co-referential pronoun. Examples of left dislocation from **Keenan's** unplanned data are given below. **(1977:20)**

(1) (K has been talking about the fact that **his** car radio was taken from his car)

K: They cleaned **me out**. And my father oh he's **fit** to be tied.

(2) K: Uh Pat **McGee**. I don't know if you know **him**, he--he lives in Palisades

(3) (Discussing students falling asleep in **class**)

K: **Uh!!** this **guy**, you could yell "**Hey John**, Hey Joh_ " 'n you **c'd** go over an' tap him on the shoulder

R: So he's **gotta//** good imagination

K: **That's** the **only** way you **c'd** **snap** him out of it.

In these examples the left dislocated NP's are "**my father**," "**Pat McGee**," and "**this guy**" respectively. These constructions are particularly interesting because they appear in one way similar to sequentially expressed propositions earlier described **as** characteristic of unplanned discourse in that the initial referent appears to be **part** of a separate utterance. They are also worth noting because no left dislocations were found in **Keenan's** samples of highly planned discourse. Indeed, left dislocations are considered non-standard

by syntacticians.

Keenan, in examining samples of communication that had been planned (written), found evidence that definite articles were **used** in place of **deictic** modifiers, and restrictive relative clauses tended to replace the simpler **determiner** or demonstrative + noun construction she had found in the unplanned versions. Keenan cites two comparisons of a planned and unplanned version of the same narrative to illustrate this. One of these is given below (1977:18).

Subways in London (unplanned version)

(G. has been telling story of how he had to grab hold of a **woman** to keep from falling **off** a subway platform. The woman started to fall back as well but was stopped by a nearby man.)

G: ...and **it** seemed like a long time when **it** happened but when I look back at **it** it happened just like that ((snaps his fingers)) this man--this guy there almost casually looked over at '**er** and just grabbed '**er** **am** (.7) and pulled '**er** back up and then I just kind 'a grabbed her ((laugh)) and looked at **me** like I had the nerve to assault '**er**. **it** was like how dare you ((**high-pitched**))

Subways in London (planned)

The train sped nearer as we were both ready to fall off the edge. A friend with **whom** she had been talking, clutched her other **arm** and steadied her as I pulled on the purse's shoulder strap moving closer to her **arm**. **My** balance was finally steadied and it wasn't until after some exchanges of looks did I move on with a quick "Excuse **me**."

Schachter (1974) discussed the tendency of certain speakers learning English **as** a second language to avoid the use of relative clauses altogether. Keenan has demonstrated here that native speakers as well often **rely** on syntactically **simpler** alternative **forms** of reference in spontaneous spoken discourse **where time** for planning is not available.

Bennett's examination of verb voice (1977) within the same data source available to Keenan found passive voice verbs comprised only .9% of the total verbs in **the** spoken mode but they accounted for 7.05% of the total verbs **in**

the samples of written discourse. Bennett also **found stative verbs e.g. "I was horrified by then," "I knew I was lost," "the street was lined with trees"** seemed to favor the planned versions in three out of five narratives which had **statives.**

This data is consistent **with** the psycholinguistic theory of sentence comprehension and production processes described by Foss & Hakes (1978:115) which suggests that these processes directly incorporate part of the grammar of the language. In this direct incorporation model of sentence comprehension and production, a simple version of a sentence is one whose surface form is close to the underlying form and **so** does not require many transformations in its derivation. A complex version is a surface form which differs greatly from the underlying form. Since passive sentences require more transformations to produce, they are , therefore, more complex and require more attention by the principal in both production **and** comprehension processing. In several experiments conducted by **Forster & Olbrei** (1973) subjects were presented with strings of words **and asked** to judge as quickly **as** possible whether or not each string constituted a sentence. Some of the word strings were nonsense while some were , in fact, sentences. The decision time was assumed to reflect the difficulty of comprehending the string. Foster & Olbrei presented four types of sentences: reversible actives and passives and non-reversible actives **and** passives. A sample from Forster & Olbrei follows:

<u>Sentence Voice</u>	<u>Sentence Type</u>	
	<u>Reversible</u>	<u>Non Reversible</u>
Active	The parents dismayed some teachers. 1.436	The essays dismayed some teachers. 1.351
Passive	Some teachers were dismayed by the parents. 1.709	Some teachers were dismayed by the essays. 1.668

Passive sentences always took longer than active sentences in these experiments

even when they **were** non-reversible. Thus, sentences whose surface form was complex (passive) always took longer to understand than did those whose surface **form** was simple. Other experiments investigating production time for passives (**Tannebaum & Williams,1968**) cited in (**Foss & Hakes,1978:188**) obtained results consistent with **Forster & Olbrei's** findings **for comprehension time**. Intuitively, one would expect a higher proportion of passive voice verbs to occur in more highly planned discourse and this is exactly what **Keenan** observed.

In Lehman's (1977) investigation of the relation between relative clause constructions and the stress and prominence attached to communicative units in discourse within the same data base as **Keenan's**, she found relative clauses occurred infrequently in both planned and unplanned discourse but they occurred twice as often in planned as in unplanned discourse. Lehman found that of the relative clauses occurring in her planned data, only 33% were in sentence final position; whereas of the relative clauses occurring in her unplanned data, 80% were in sentence final position. Lehman hypothesized that an NP + relative clause in a sentence final position functions **as** a focusing device or a means of attaching prominence within the context of the total discourse. If this is in fact **the** case, it is apparent that a certain amount of planning has occurred to insure **that the** head NP + relative clause will be last in the sentence. This is one occasion on which the spoken-written contrast in **Keenan et al's** research may have been confounded **with** the unplanned-planned distinction the study purports to investigate.

What Lehman has designated a characteristic of unplanned discourse **i.e.** the placement of relative clauses in sentence final position rather than within the sentence **may** be, in fact, a direct consequence of the spoken mode. Wanner (**1974**) cited in **Foss & Hakes** (1978) demonstrated that listeners had lost the exact wording of a sentence when only sixteen syllables intervened between presentation of a sentence and its test. The principals retained in **memory**

only the information contained in the sentence and not the sentence form. Within **Lehman's** spoken data the NP + relative clause constructions may have been placed last in the sentence **not because** this placement is **psycholinguistically** easier or requires less planning **on the part of the principal** than having it occur before **the** verb. Rather **it** has been placed last because this position is **nearer** to **the** next utterance and thus more likely to be retained in the listener's short **term memory** long enough for **it** to dominate the immediate sequel to that utterance. The motivation for giving such focus to the NP may be that **it** will represent a prominent feature of subsequent discourse. **It** may, on the other **hand**, provide an otherwise unexpressed contrast for what comes later or **it** may serve to urge the **hearer** to remember the element in question. However, the important point to note here is that **Lehman's** characterization of planned vs. unplanned discourse in **terms** of relative clause placement **may** have **inadvertently** confounded the spoken and written variables. In comprehension processing **the** listener to spoken discourse is limited by his sixteen syllable short term memory capacity for the form the utterance takes **i.e.** what structure occurs in sentence final **position, while** comprehension processing by the reader of written discourse is not limited in this way. Therefore, a speaker may be obliged to use sentence final relative clause placement **as** a focusing device whereas **the** writer may have other alternatives.

Shimanoff and Brunak (1977) using the same data base **as Keenan** found a greater tendency for principals to repeat and replace lexical items in the expression of a proposition in unplanned than in planned discourse. Since in most cases, repetition and word replacement indicate trouble spots in the communication, they may be interpreted as signs that the speaker is searching for a particular word, or that **he** is offering another **term** because he feels **his** initial word had not been decoded properly or that he is simply attempting to think out the idea further before continuing with the **expression**

of the proposition. Intuitively, one would expect more instances of this phenomena in discourse that has not been planned prior to its expression. But one would also expect to find a higher proportion of these kinds of repairs in spoken discourse than in written discourse even with comparable time for planning since one who is writing tends to stop and think or re-read what he has already written rather than continue by repeating a lexical item or by replacing **it** with an alternative. This is another instance where the researchers' characterization of unplanned discourse may have been attributable **to** the medium of expression rather than the amount of time available for planning.

Hyman (1975) cited in Keenan (1977) pointed out that word replacement is a part of a larger phenomena he finds characteristic of unplanned discourse-- afterthought. **This** phenomena is exemplified when the communicator **remembers** after the relevant point in the discourse that certain information is missing, and adds **it** on. **Keenan** found instances of whole propositions expressed as afterthoughts in her unplanned data. The following example illustrates this.

People scare **me** (Unplanned)

F: Well (.2) we () came um we stayed across the street from our house. I used ta live in Florida an' we stayed across the street cuz my mm was in the hospital an' we were really small.

The planned version of the same narrative omitted these afterthoughts as is exemplified below.

People scare **me** (planned)

F: When **I** was ten years old **my** sister, brother and **I** stayed with the neighbors across the street while my mother was in the hospital.

Keenan's data illustrates the point that the presence of afterthoughts contributes to a lengthier expression for the same proposition in unplanned versions of the **same** narrative **than** in the planned versions. In other **words**, highly planned discourse tended to express the **same** propositions in a more concise manner than the unplanned **discourse**.

PILOT STUDY - METHOD

Each writer was instructed to write steadily **for** ten minutes on the **topic** of **some** trait or quality they admired or disliked in a person. These **writings** were collected after ten minutes and labelled "unplanned." The writers were then asked to produce a second writing on the **same** topic to be collected two weeks **later** with no time constraints to interfere with planning. These writings **were** collected and labelled "planned." The following tabulations represent the results of an analysis of those two sets of writings: unplanned (written) and planned (written).

RESULTS

	<u>Unplanned</u>	<u>Planned</u>
Total sentences	40	58
Total clauses	114	157
dependent clauses	62	75
Total verbs	156	218
Simple active verbs	50 (34%)	61 (29%)
Passives	8 (5%)	13 (6%)
Statives	1 (.6%)	5 (2.3%)
Total Auxiliaries	33	43
Modals: shall, should, will, would, } can, could, may, might }	19	23
Perfectives (have + en)	6	8
Progressives (be + ing)	8	12
Total Non-Finite Verbals	37 (24%)	71 (33%)
Infinitives	20	31
Gerunds	7	13
Participles	10	27
Clefts	0	3
Total relative clauses	23	57
Relative clauses occurring before verb	4 (17%)	15 (26%)
Complementation	17	25

	<u>Unplanned</u>	<u>Planned</u>
Total Logical connectors	42	76
I. Addition: and, or, especially } as, nor }	28 (66%)	44 (57%)
II. Adversative: in spite of, while, though, } but? however* otherwise, } yet, nevertheless }	7 (16%)	21 (27%)
III. Causal: thus? so, as , for, thus, because } unless }	6	7
Hedges	15	7
quite? perhaps , as far as I could tell, really, I guess, I think, I suppose, probably* somewhat, sometimes		
Afterthoughts	12	0
Dashes	10	0
Parallel Syntactic structures	6	15
Sequentially expressed propositions	3	0

DISCUSSION

Results of the pilot study were generally **consistent** with **Keenan's** findings. Planned written discourse exhibited greater reliance **on** complex syntactic constructions than unplanned discourse, including a greater number of clefts, more instances of complementation, a higher proportion of relative clauses with a higher proportion of relative clauses occurring before the verb, consistent with **Lehman's** findings that relatively more planning is required to have the clause occur before the verb. The planned discourse also contained more passives, and **statives as well** as a higher proportion of logical connectors (except those signalling simple addition) and a higher incidence of each of the uses (adversative* causal **and** sequential) of logical connectors in proportion to the total was also found. The planned discourse also featured a wider range of different logical connectors for each **use** and it contained four separate instances of two negative sentences conjoined with **nor**. This structure was not found in the unplanned discourse.

Celce-Murcia and **Larsen-Freeman** (1980) describe this construction as **more** syntactically complicated **than** simple multi-sentence conjunction **or** two sentence conjunction with semantically contrastive information or sentence conjunction in which the truth of only one of two or **more** alternatives is presupposed. **In** view of this, **it** seems appropriate that **it** should occur only in the planned discourse.

Planned discourse contained twice as many parallel syntactic constructions as unplanned discourse. This represents an additional **use** of syntax not noted by **Keenan** to focus and to highlight crucial information. Planned discourse **featured** a greater **use** of **modals**, perfectives and progressives as well as a higher proportion of **infinitives**, gerunds and participles than unplanned discourse.

Unplanned discourse, on the other hand, featured three sequentially expressed **propositions**, and twice as **many** hedges as planned discourse. **Brown & Levinson** (1978) have discussed the use of hedges as a **method** of disarming routine interactional threats to face by limiting or modifying the force of a speech **act**. **However**, they also point out that hedges are not restricted to politeness usage citing the Watergate transcripts as the source of a formidable array of hedges designed to limit **criminal culpability**. In distinguishing planned from unplanned discourse, **I** have interpreted the greater use of hedges in unplanned discourse as expressive of a tone of tentativeness or uncertainty which derived **from** the lack of forethought inherent in **the** unplanned **mode** and which was totally missing from the planned discourse.

Twelve instances of afterthought occurred in the unplanned mode and in some **cases** were punctuated by dashes which set them off as separate expressions. These dashes **were** totally missing **from** the planned writings. **These** constructions bore a remarkable similarity to the sequentially expressed propositions and the referent + proposition constructions characteristic of early child discourse strategies.

This preliminary characterization of planned and unplanned written discourse is consistent with **Keenan's** results and suggests that for those and only those **who** are already highly competent writers, the amount of time available for planning exerts a considerable **influence on the form their expression will** take. However, **these results are not interpreted** as suggestive that for all writers, the greater the amount of time available for planning, the more highly planned discourse will result. That proposition goes **beyond** the scope **of** this study and must be **investigated** by an examination of the planned and unplanned written **discourse** produced by both highly experienced as well as inexperienced writers.

APPENDIX A

Unplanned #1

I think of all the traits I **admire most in** admirable people and dislike most **in** unlikeable people^p **loyalty and lack of loyalty** affect me most strongly. This in spite of the fact that there are certainly exceptions to my general rule.

Probably, I cannot define loyalty but perhaps I can exemplify it. In **major** cases, I suppose I'm thinking of loyalty in a political **sense** (to country, I guess), in **an** economic sense (don't bite the hand that feeds), and in a personal sense. **The** last is what I have in mind most clearly if I **am** to think of behaviors I **like** or dislike. Some personal examples of loyalty:

—When my father died, he left clear instructions that there was to be no funeral at **all**, no flowers, no **wake**, no notice taken. He **was** cremated and **his** ashes scattered in a private place by me and my brother, and **it** was **never** discussed with others. This was hard on my mother, harder yet I **think** on friends, business associates and the like. My father had been a "prominent citizen" type (banker) in a small **town**, so everyone pressured my mother to do the conventional almost required, social **ritual**. **But** she did not—as he had asked her **many** times not to. I think that **was** loyalty. **Then**, one year later to the day, my mother carried **out** the rest of his request. **She** borrowed a friend's mansion **on** an island, flew in a dozen musicians (personal friends) from all over the U.S. Flew in and ferried over two hundred guests for one of the best **jazz** concerts **ever** produced on Cape Cod. Only the **musicians** **knew** the reason for the **party--that**, it was the anniversary of my **Dad's** death. **If** others guessed, they didn't say anything.

Unplanned #2

I suppose I admire honesty in a person--honesty very broadly defined. I admire and am attracted to people who are **just themselves**, who don't put on acts and who **don't** try to be **something they're not**. I'm **trying to connect** this somehow with simplicity but I'll **have** to think a **bit** about the relationship. The honesty **I'm talking** about has nothing to do with tactlessness--Lucy's **list** of faults for Charlie Brown. **It's** not an insensitive or self-righteous honesty **but** more **like** personal integrity—no, **it's** not that **either**. **Maybe** it has to do with orientation--people who are oriented outward toward others rather than inward toward themselves. **No--it's** not **that** either. I'm **turned** off by **people who** feel they have to impress others, for whatever reason and **who** are deliberately **harming** their real natures, who are pretending in order to present **what** they suppose to be a **better** face to the world,

Unplanned #3

I guess the characteristic I admire the most in a **person** (at least right now when I feel it so absent **from** myself) is kindness. I remember a **woman** I really liked because she never said an unkind word about anyone, even a person she really did not like to be with (which was hard to realize unless you knew her really well). She always found the **niciest** aspect or quality of a person **and** mentioned that quality when speaking of that person. **How** nice that seems when compared to the type of person I **know** only too well who is tempted to say (even if he avoids saying) the cattiest of **things about** other people. Besides this woman was kind when people came to her home; whether she wanted to see them or not she would smile and make them **feel** liked and welcome. At the **same** time she could get rid of them really **quickly--and** not really be making an excuse or telling a lie. Oh, I **know** other people who try to be kind by telling you how nice you look even when you hadn't brushed your hair for a week. She didn't do that, **as far as** I could **tell**. Instead, she would find an **aspect** of you which was both true and nice. She might **comment** on **the** type of shoes you were **wearing--or** on some nice action you performed. And if she did comment on your unbrushed **hair, she might** tell you quite honestly that it **needed** brushing, but in such an uncritical **way** that you wouldn't feel embarrassed, not **even** about the **fact** that you'd been running around with your hair unbrushed. **She is** so different **from that** kind of person (shades of my father) **who will** try to **tell you** that you made an honest mistake in buying this lemon of a car, and ends up sounding as if he thinks you **are** too stupid to **live** if you were stupid enough to buy that car.

There were so many **ways** she was kind, but I think, at one point in her life she had decided to be that way, and trained herself away from cattiness and back biting. I wish I **knew** how she did it, **so** I could follow in her footsteps.

There are many people whom I envy, especially those who have accumulated great wealth or beautiful possessions or power, but envy is not admiration. The people whom I actually admire are far fewer, and my admiration is based not on the rewards they have received but on what they did to get them. I admire especially people who are extraordinarily productive. Workaholics get my approbation, as do creative people in general: writers, painters, dancers, athletes. As long as they are creating, actually producing. The "writer" who never writes but agonizes over it continuously does not impress me in the slightest. The "artistic personality" turns me off immediately. I believe in genius and admire it immensely, but believe with Edison that it's 10% inspiration and 90% perspiration.

However, if I consider the people whose company I actually seek out, I find a somewhat different sense of values. I do seek out the productive, the talented and the accomplished, but I demand more than that from my friends. I think that the essential extra I look for is consideration of others and the absence of obsession with self. I admire people who are articulate, but only if that verbal skill is not directed at self-aggrandizement and the belittling of others. I admire those who write well, but not if they always write autobiography. My interest in artists is well known, but I discriminate between those who see art as communication with the viewer (+) and those who see art as the means of expressing the tortured self (forget it). I admire successful business persons but to the extent that they are outfoxing all competition and cheating and scrapping their way up the ladder, I'll leave them alone. From considering my day to day reactions to people, I'd have to say that the quality I notice most frequently in people is sensitivity, which I consider to be the best and worst trait in people. Sensitive in the sense of perceptive and considerate of other people's feelings is wholly admirable. Such people are wonderful to be with, and I would like to be like that. Sensitive in the sense of being sensitive about one's self and one's positions, i.e. bristly and prickly, is the trait I like least in people, and I cringe whenever I detect signs of that in myself.

So, talent, hard work and consideration. It would be hard to rank them. One of the people I admire most is an 80 year old woman who has never accomplished anything of note, has never worked, is certainly not famous in any way. Yet almost a thousand people showed up for her 75th birthday party, and a large percentage of them considered her their best friend! An amazing accomplishment as a human being. One of my heroes is Dolly Parton, one of the nicest people I've been lucky enough to meet, who has it all. On balance, though, I would have to put the personal qualities ahead of the talent and luck. I have enjoyed and profited from being a friend to someone who is severely retarded. I have been scarred by long term association with someone who is immensely talented but psychotically paranoid.

Planned #2

A quality that most people value in a close friend is trust. I must be able to trust her and she must be able to trust me. Otherwise, **intimacy** is not possible.

In order to be able to trust someone, I must first be sure **that** she understands basically who I am. I find it difficult to become close to people who constantly jump at conclusions **about** me with insufficient evidence and **who then** stick to their conclusions even when presented with counterevidence, **who** put me into one of their preformed categories, boxing me in and ignoring aspects of me **that** don't **fit** nicely into that box. Then again there are those people who are unable to see things from anyone else's point of view, failing to understand me because they assume I am feeling **the** same way they would under similar circumstances. Instead of seeing me, **they see** themselves in me.

After I am sure someone is seeing who I really am, I need to be **sure** she is not going to misuse this information. I need to know that she is going to try to **see** things from my point of view, not trying to reshape me to fit her own idea of who I should be, nor using this information against **me**.

A particularly **pleasing** characteristic in any person is kindness. Someone who is kind makes life more liveable, while lack of kindness, which is closely related to lack of courtesy, can **make** life ugly and depressing. However, despite the preceding contentions, kindness is hard to define except by example.

Kindness, to paraphrase Webster's **Seventh** New Collegiate Dictionary, is the quality or state of being affectionate, friendly, sympathetic, gentle, forbearing or agreeable. Nevertheless, anyone who gives you a hug at any time cannot be automatically considered kind, nor can someone who pats you on the back in sympathy, nor just anyone who forbears patiently to tell you when you are being stupid. Easily identified acts of kindness are sometimes the least kind acts in reality, and if not done out of true kindness of the heart, can be actually unkind.

Let us compare two different, though similar, acts. Standing in the middle of a room in which a crowd of colleagues are gathered for socializing, one is suddenly approached by a member of the same sex whom one sees two or three times a week at work. This individual, with no apparent motive, puts an arm around the other's shoulders and announces to others nearby, "See how wonderful my good friend is." A completely different sensation is produced when one drops in on a friend because one does not wish to be alone, and that friend takes one good look at one's face and then silently gives one a hug. Perhaps, it's the act which is done privately that is preferred; perhaps it's the deducible motives that gives one its character of kindness.

Another time when private acts of sympathy may seem more kind than public ones may be in the expression of consolation for a death. He who appears at the funeral wearing the darkest clothes and carrying the largest **wreath** may be showing his guilt for not feeling sorrow, while she wearing the brightest colors and broadest smile may be deeply touched by the sorrow and pain of loss. How should they be judged, if not by the sincerity of their motives?

And as for forbearance, public forbearance is akin to obvious forbearance, which is much more harmful and hurtful than impatience, for someone who makes it clear to all that he is avoiding criticism criticizes in the loudest voice of ail by making the existence of criticism evident but not allowing self-defense. Another time when forbearance can be much more cruel than its opposite is when there is truly something wrong. If a woman constantly wears a color **which** brings out the worst in her own coloring, it may actually be more kind to make her aware of it and thus to allow her to improve her looks. In such a **case**, it is not the act which is kind or unkind, but the motivation and method of performing the act.

So in all acts of "kindness," motives, methods and sincerity seem to determine whether the individual is truly kind or not. No one of these aspects is sufficient, nor even two. All three aspects need to radiate kindness, or "**kind**" will not be the adjective applied to the person. And without kindness, people will be hurt by others who are unable or unwilling to express their sincerity of feeling even when such exists.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, T. An **extended** view of verb voice in written and spoken personal narratives. In E. Keenan and T. Bennett (Ed.), Discourse across time and space. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 5, U.S.C., 1977.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. **Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena**. In Ester Goody (Ed.) Questions and politeness: strategies in social interaction. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Celce-Murcia, M. and Larsen-Freeman, D. An English grammar course for ESL teachers. Pre-publication version. 1980.
- Forster, K. I. and Olbrei, I. Semantic heuristics and syntactic analysis. Cognition, 1973, 2, 319-347.
- Foss, D. J. and Hakes, D. T. Psycholinguistics an introduction to the psychology of language. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1978.
- Keenan, E. Why look at planned and unplanned discourse? In E. Keenan and T. Bennett (Ed.), Discourse across time and space. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 5, U.S.C., 1977.
- Lehman, C. Stress and sentence position: ways of indicating discourse prominence. In E. Keenan and T. Bennett (Ed.), Discourse across time and space. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 5, U.S.C., 1977.
- Schachter, J. An error in error analysis. Language Learning, 1974, 24, 205-215.
- Shimanoff, S. and Brunak, J. Repairs in planned and unplanned discourse. In E. Keenan and T. Bennett (Ed.), Discourse across time and space, Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 5, U.S.C., 1977.