Analytic tool: look at intuitively-problematic discourse as evidence for some underlying conversation/interaction “rules”.

1 Unnoticeably problematic discourse

Example 1. From the Galantucci and Roberts [2014] “crossed conversations” paper: parts of Pair A were swapped with parts of Pair B.

Participants in this study are put in one of two groups. 50% of participants are put in the No-Crossing Group. If we put you in the No-Crossing Group then all the messages you received came from your partner. The other 50% of participants are put in the Crossing Group. If we put you in the Crossing Group then some of the messages
you received came from a different participant who intended them for someone else and did not know that they would come to you. Which group do you think you were in? Note: If you are correct, you will win $3!


2 Noticeably problematic discourse

2.1 “Too much said”

Example 3. Photo by me or family member from the Cornell RPCC dining hall.

Example 4. Photo by me or family member from a store in California in an area with many native Chinese speakers.
Example 5. https://xkcd.com/630/ (hat tip to Language Log)

Hover text: “She also starts every letter with ‘Dear Future ⟨Your Name⟩’”

2.2 “Not enough said”

Example 6.

Link is now defunct, but the URL was: https://plus.google.com/112461005502186454902/posts/EVveG719D11

Clouseau: Does your dog bite?

Hotel Clerk: No.

Clouseau: [bowing down to pet the dog] Nice doggie.

[Dog barks and bites Clouseau in the hand]

Clouseau: I thought you said your dog did not bite!

Hotel Clerk: That is not my dog.

Example 8. Example from Grishman [1986, pg. 157].

A1: Do you know when the train to Boston leaves?

B1: Yes.

A2: I want to know when the train to Boston leaves.

B2: I understand.
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