

## COHERENCE IN LOGICAL THINKING: A CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

**Azwar Abidin**

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kendari  
*azwar.iainkendari@gmail.com*

***Abstract,** This article examines the extent of the individuals' coherence in logical thinking and the way the concepts or ideas are linked together and bringing consistence in maintaining meaning-make sense in live interview session. The scope of this article is restricted to the identification of logical thinking pattern in conversation. The analysis is limited to the particular individuals with particular topics in conversation. The coherence is identified through the concepts that link one another which maintain the logical pattern of stored information. It may result projection of linking concepts that are maintained along the conversation and the way language use may trick someone.*

***Keywords :** Coherence, Logical Thinking, Conversational Analysis, Live Interview*

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Conversation, or the state where people talking with each other, is one of the most commonplace of all human activities. Despite its prevalence in human interaction, the study of conversation as a serious disciplinary endeavor only began in the 1960s based on the concepts and principles of speech act theory. Prior to that time, the discourse on conversation was primarily written texts that described how one should speak rather than how they actually did speak. Conversation occurs when any people talk with each other and can be used to indicate any activity of interactive talk, regardless of its purpose (ten Have, 1999:4).

This writing is trying to bring issue of investigating coherence in logical thinking while it is expressed into verbal communication. But the focus of this

investigation is language use that may be very tricky and requires lots of attention to maintain focus on detail information from conversation input. This investigation comes into necessity to predict coherence in someone's logical thinking while he is speaking. It investigates the following issues; how could the interlocutors lose their focus? or how the unconnected ideas or concepts may result sudden forgetting? During a conversation, people introduce and sustain different topics. Strong conversational cohesion is a sign of cooperation, showing that the members of the group share similar interests and are motivated to sustain a common discussion, rather than each person attempting to redirect the topic (Bonvillain, 106). To participate actively in a conversation, a wide range of verbal and nonverbal abilities are needed. A person must

engage in joint attention, take the perspective of another and, thereby, choose an appropriate topic. One must have an organized set of concepts from which to draw topics and the vocabulary to express those concepts. Moreover, one must be able to retrieve those words and formulate sentences and connected language to initiate and ultimately maintain conversation. This conversational circle requires a complex set of linguistic conceptual skills (e.g., phonology, morphology and syntax, semantics), as well as an awareness of the social-cognitive or pragmatic rules that govern the interaction. Conversation is the social context in which all of these skills are both learned and used.

Moreover, when people have weaknesses in attention, memory, and retrieval, they may be seen to have difficulty knowing how to maintain a conversation, may lose track of what is being said, and may have difficulty connecting the ideas or concepts. Any or all of these issues may make them seem awkward, disinterested, or frustrated. Due to limited auditory attention or short-term memory skills, they may appear to be inattentive when others are talking and, thus, may not maintain topics well. If they are challenged with riddles or tricks, they may miss key parts of what being asked, clue, or directions. They are often uncomfortable asking for clarification. Deficits with working memory or executive function may result in difficulty planning and knowing how to begin a conversation. The larger effect than the previous phenomena, individuals may avoid social situations because they feel hesitant and confused. They may not be able to keep up with the flow of the interaction. Along

with difficulties with attending to, and remembering information some individuals may experience challenges retrieving or recalling words from long-term memory. They may know names or a fact, but not be able to produce it in the moment. The interviewees, for instance, may answer for some riddles that are being asked by the interviewer and feel confident with the answers, but when they asked to clarify the logical thinking coherence of what have been answered, they may not be able to explain the unconnected ideas or concepts. These individuals complain that they have studied and think they know information, but they blank out in test situations. When interviewees in conversation lose focus, have difficulty knowing how to connect concepts, or have difficulty retrieving ideas, the interviewer may give them some clues. Such language games, in real definition, may stimulate logical thinking and tickle curiosity to learn more about language use (Searle, 1979).

After all, since the conversation is considered as a discourse, it should be best analyzed through Discourse Analysis. The primary modes of discourse are talk and text. Spoken discourses such as conversations, debates, meetings, and lawyer–client, teacher–student, designer–client interactions are among the kinds of discourse to be studied (Mazur, 2012:1075). Words, gestures, sounds, and body language are the observable aspects or expression of discourse. Expression is symbiotic with language use, and attention to the phonological (sound) or haptic (gesture) features of spoken language, for example, can be key to understanding the structure of the discourse. Intonation may

denote a question, signal a change of speaker, or close a segment of dialogue. Those material expressions are indeed relevant in Discourse Analysis but what about the mental cognition, is it possible for Discourse Analysis to work over human cognition? Talk and text as expression of language use are also expressions of the knowledge of the speaker or writer. Knowledge as represented in mind is both a mental and a cultural phenomenon. Psychological dimensions of knowledge and skills are processes and representations stored in memory and play out in talk about thoughts and beliefs. Cultural and social dimensions of knowledge play out as shared meanings, judgments, and understandings of those expressed thoughts and beliefs (Amann and Knorr-Cetina, 1989:6). Thus, investigations of discourse also yield insight into the structure and process of cognition. The early cognitive theories of discourse were based in other fields such as text linguistics (Halliday and Hasan, 1976; van Dijk, 1977;), artificial intelligence (Shank and Abelson, 1977), and pragmatics (Grice, 1975; Searles, 1969). Early work in the cognitive context of discourse analysis focused on determining the extent to which the structure and function of texts could account for experimental psychological findings. As the theory base and methods evolved, discourse analysis shifted to investigation of text comprehension and production and away from studies of spoken conversation (Grasser, Gernsbacher, & Goldman, 1997).

However, the focus analysis in this Discourse Analysis will be Conversation Analysis. Conversation analysis is an

appropriate tool to deal with this phenomenon of identifying coherence in logical thinking. The term conversation analysis can be construed in a broad sense to mean any study of people talking together in oral communication or language use. However, as a sub-discipline of discourse analysis, Conversation Analysis refers to a tradition of analysis founded by Harvey Sacks and his colleagues, including Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson in the 1960s (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990:283). The central purpose of CA is to investigate the norms and conventions that speakers use in interaction to establish communicative understandings. Based on the previous background, problem statement was formulated into a question as follows: to what extent does the individuals' coherence in logical thinking when they involve in conversation?

## **II. METHODS**

This article employs a conversational analysis to identify cohering devices in live interview session. Prince William and Kate Middleton full interview session with Tom Bradby was chosen based on random unmotivated selection. The clip of this session can be found on Youtube.com under the title Prince William and Kate Middleton – Full Interview<sup>1</sup>. The interview was transcribed into two extracts; Extract I and Extract II. The elements of sentences were analyzed by employing a number of marks such as (?) to refer to questions or (=?) to refer to answers of particular questions. Other marks identify direct cohering devices such as *Connectives* or *Conjunctions*. Those marks determines the consistency of the cohering

devices to be later judged as whether the sentence is logical or not.

### ***The Concept of Coherence***

The Online Free Dictionary defines coherence as the quality or state of cohering, especially a logical, orderly, and aesthetically consistent relationship of parts (2012). Coherence can be reserved for the conceptual relationships that comprehenders use to construct a coherent mental representation accommodated by what is said in the discourse (Louwerse and Graesser, 2005:2). Later, Donath and Vieges (1999) stated that coherence refers to the way things flow and function together, how they are connected and whether they are consistent. In a conversation, coherence refers to the way the participants cooperate to maintain a reasonably focused thread of conversation.

Coherence is a pattern that permeates our human minds. Coherence is associated to logic and mathematics and also philosophy. There is even coherence in our human religions. There is also coherence in our own personal way of living. Because our mind that is consciousness, thoughts, memory even imagination, originates in the brain, which is made of matter and physical processes (neurons, synapses, electrical and chemical signals), the coherence permeating our mind is no doubt of physical constitution and as such integral part of Nature (Searle, 1990).

The organization that hearers associate with a discourse is not simply a matter of the linguistic structure that appears. Rather, on a more fundamental level, it is a reflection of how the content comes together and is stored in the mind. The forms of language that the speaker uses certainly play

a part in this, but psychological article shows that the way hearers understand, store, and remember a discourse corresponds only partially with what was actually said (Paivio and Begg, 1981:194). Other things that go into the hearers' *Mental Representation* of a discourse are their prior knowledge of the way things happen in the real world and their expectations of what the speaker means to say. Obviously, this prior knowledge and expectation is based heavily on culture specific experience. Hearers may bring as much to their understanding of a discourse as they get from what the speaker actually says; "discourses ... force us to draw upon all we know about our culture, language, and world" (Everett, 1992:19).

To understand mental representations, it is important to know more than discourse content plus cultural knowledge and expectations. There is also need to recognize some general processes of human cognition, e.g., how people perceive, store, and access information. Although these processes may not be directly observable, they are reflected in how discourse is put together and how that organization is signaled. Mental representations and related psychological notions will serve as a major theme integrating the discussion. In return for this, they will be expected to "pay their way" by helping explain what we find in actual language data.

### ***The Coherence in Logical Thinking***

A logical thinking is said to be coherent if, for a certain hearer on a certain hearing, he or she is able to fit its different elements into a single overall mental representation. A conversation comes with the presumption of coherence; that is, if a

speaker is presenting a topic in his talk, the hearer is entitled to assume that it will yield a coherent interpretation and will direct his or her efforts accordingly (Brown and Yule, 1983:199). If the speaker processed it as coherent, and if the hearer tried to process it as coherent, then both of participants were acting on this presumption, which is foundational to logical communication.

The state of coherence in logical thinking, as mentioned before, has the following characteristics of rational, orderly, consistent, and connected and functioned together. Those absolute characteristics of coherence must be found in what being talked in on going conversation between the interlocutors. The cognitive concepts or ideas that are expressed into material expressions in conversation here becoming objects of identification. The following points will be identified to develop a state of coherence in logical thinking:

**a. Questions**

Stanfield (2012:3) mentioned four types of question; objective, reflective, interpretive, and decisional. Objective questions begin with data, facts, and external reality such as “*What did you actually see?*” Reflective questions evoke immediate personal reactions, internal responses, sometimes emotions or feelings, hidden images, and associations with the facts such as “*What was your gut level reaction?*” Interpretive questions draw out meaning, values, significance, and implication such as “*What new insight did you get from this?*” The last is Decisional questions which bring the conversation to a close, eliciting resolution and enabling the group to make a decision about the future such as “*What do*

*you think we should do?*” All types of questions as mentioned need answers of what are coherent with the purpose of the questions. If the answers are relevant with the purposes of the questions, the communication is then considered as coherent.

**b. Connectives**

Logical connectives are those words and short phrases that serve as linkages between ideas in discourse. Hence the word 'and' is obviously one since it is so often used to join ideas. In language education, it has been found that to restrict the notion of connectives to just 'logical operators' in the language, that is, 'and', 'not', 'or', 'if... then', etc, is too restrictive. Linkage can also occur in a number of other ways. A central general idea might be expanded on by linking it to particular ideas that are subsumed within it; hence the term 'for example' can be used as a connective. When trying to show the complexity of an idea one might state a key component, but qualify this with another. These ideas could be connected with 'on the other hand'. They belong to three different word classes:

- Coordinating Conjunctions: *but, and, or*
- Subordinating Conjunctions: *if, because, until, etc.*
- Adverbs: *therefore, nevertheless, then, meanwhile, etc.*

Below is list of most frequent logical connectives found by Gardner (1982):

Broad Meaning	Connective Adverbs and Phrases	Conjunctions
Addition	<i>also, too, similarly, in addition,</i>	<i>and, as, like</i>

	<i>even, indeed, let alone</i>	
<b>Opposition</b>	<i>however, nevertheless, on the other hand, in contrast, though, alternatively, anyway, yet, in fact, even so</i>	<i>but, or, although, whereas, while</i>
<b>Reinforcing</b>	<i>besides, anyway, after all</i>	
<b>Explaining</b>	<i>for example, for instance, in other words, that is to say, i.e., e.g.</i>	<i>in that</i>
<b>Listing</b>	<i>first(ly) ... second(ly), first of all, finally, lastly, for one thing ... for another, in the first place, to begin with, next, in sum, to conclude, in a nutshell</i>	<i>and</i>
<b>Indicating result</b>	<i>therefore, consequently, as a result, so, then</i>	<i>because, since, as, for, if, unless, now (that), so (that), in case, provided</i>

		<i>(that), whether.....or .....</i>
<b>Indicating time</b>	<i>then, meanwhile, later, afterwards, before (that), since (then), meanwhile</i>	<i>when, before, after, since, until, till, while, as, once, whenever</i>

**c. Reasoning**

There are two basic types of reasoning, inductive and deductive. Semin (1998) defined induction as the process of reasoning in which conclusions are based on experimentation or experience. When using induction, a conclusion is made about a situation after observing results, analyzing experiences, citing authorities, or presenting statistics. The future experiences are predicted by extending patterns seen in present experiences. Inductive reasoning is the process of determining a general conclusion by examining individual cases or particular facts. It can show there is a good chance that the conclusion is true, but it will not be absolutely certain. For example, if the first ten people someone meets at a new school are very helpful and friendly, he or she might generalize that the people at the school are really nice. However, the next person he or she meet might be extremely hostile. On the basis of the first ten people, his or her conclusion seemed true. However, the 11<sup>th</sup> person disproved his or her conjecture. When reasoning inductively, one has to make sure that there are a sufficient number of facts or specific cases to warrant a conclusion. Scientists, for example, repeat experiments

many times before making conclusions. Again, a good inductive argument only gives a high probability that a statement is true or an action should be performed.

Moreover, Semin mentioned deduction as the process of reasoning in which conclusions are based on accepted premises. These premises are usually articles of faith, laws, rules, definitions, assumptions, or commonly accepted facts. The conclusions are reached either explicitly or implicitly contained in the premises. A deductive argument is a series of statements consisting of premises and a conclusion. The premises are the statements of evidence from which the conclusion is drawn. In deductive arguments, the premises are usually written as conditional statements. Arguments may take many different forms. One of the common forms is the syllogism. The basic syllogism consists of two statements or premises, and a logical conclusion drawn from them. According to Aristotle, "A syllogism is a discourse in which, certain things being posited, something else follows from them by necessity." In this chapter, we discuss three types of syllogisms: hypothetical syllogisms, affirming the antecedent, and denying the consequent.

#### **d. Semantic Relations**

Relations between concepts, senses or meanings should not be confused with relations between the terms, words, expressions or signs that are used to express the concepts. It is, however, common to mix both of these kinds of relations under the heading "semantic relations" (Schwarz 1996), why synonyms, homonyms etc. are considered under the label "semantic relations" in a broader meaning of this

term. Strack, Schwarz, and Wanke (1991) divided semantic relationships into antonym, synonym, class inclusion, part-whole, and case relationships. Carrol and Casagrande (1958) provided a list of 31 semantic relationships that are broken into categories similar to the above. Winston et al. (1995) presented taxonomy of relationships dealing with objects and their components, and other concepts related to the part-whole or meronymic relationship. Some important kinds of semantic relations are:

- Active relation, a semantic relation between two concepts, one of which expresses the performance of an operation or process affecting the other.
- Antonymy such as cold is the opposite of warm.
- Associative relation, a relation which is defined psychologically that people associate concepts such as A is mentally associated with B by somebody. Often are associative relations just unspecified relations.
- Causal relation, such as Scurvy is caused by lack of vitamin C.
- Homonym, two concepts, A and B, are expressed by the same symbol.
- Hyponymous relationships, or a generic relation; a hierarchical subordinate relation. Such as A is kind of B or A is subordinate to B.
- Instance-of relation, designates the semantic relations between a general concept and individual instances of that concept for example: Copenhagen is an instance of the general concept 'capital'.
- Locative relation, a semantic relation in which a concept indicates a location of a

thing designated by another concept for example: Minorities in Denmark.

- Meronymy, a partitive relation or part-whole relation; a relationship between the whole and its parts (A is part of B). Meronymy is opposite to holonymy (B has A as part of itself).
- Passive relation, a semantic relation between two concepts, one of which is affected by or subjected to an operation or process expressed by the other.
- Paradigmatic relation, a semantic relation between two concepts that is considered to be either fixed by nature, self-evident, or established by convention. Examples: mother / child; fat /obesity; and a state /its capital city”.
- Polysemy, a polysemous (or polysemantic) word is a word that has several sub-senses which are related with one another. Such as A1, A2 and A3 shares the same expression.
- Possessive, a relation between a possessor and what is possessed.
- Related term, a term that is semantically related to another term. Related terms may, for example express antagonistic relations, active/passive relations, causal relations, locative relations, paradigmatic relations.
- Synonymy as in A denotes the same as B; A is equivalent with B.
- Temporal relation, a semantic relation in which a concept indicates a time or period of an event designated by another concept, for example: Second World War, 1939-1945.
- Troponymy, is defined as the semantic relation of being a manner of does something.

### **Conversation Analysis**

Conversation analysis (CA) is the dominant contemporary method for the analysis of social interaction. Originating at the University of California during the 1960s (Sacks, 1992), the field has a broad interdisciplinary reach, and is used to study interaction in many languages on an effectively worldwide basis.

Conversation Analysis begins from the notion that conversational interaction involves 'doing things with words,' and that, for example, describing, questioning, agreeing, offering and so on are all examples of social actions that we use words to perform. It developed from social science perspectives that recognized the fundamental nature of human action and interaction in the formation and management of personal identity, social relationships, and human institutions. These perspectives stress four main features of actions that pose immensely challenging issues for the systematic analysis of social life. Conversation Analysis was developed specifically to deal with these four issues:

#### **1. Human actions are meaningful and involve meaning-making.**

Human actions (whether spoken or otherwise) are meaningful. Unlike the processes of the physical universe, they are goal-directed and based on reasoning about the physical and social circumstances that persons find themselves in. This reasoning involves knowledge, socio-cultural norms and beliefs, and a grasp of the goals and intentions of others. Because goals, intentions, and the 'state of play' in interaction can change rapidly, this knowledge and reasoning is continuously



updated, during the process of interaction itself. Social interaction also involves meaning-making. Actions, no matter how similar or repetitive, are never identical in meaning. Each of them is singular, if only because it takes place in a new and singular situation.

For example, the actions making up even the most routine of medical visits conducted by an experienced primary care physician are never identical: they involve unique meaning-making by particular human beings in a situation that has its own singular history and context. Somehow this is all being managed, for the most part, through spoken interaction.

**2. Actions are meaningful and make meaning through a combination of their content and context.**

Self-evidently most spoken actions embody specific language content, describe specific circumstances, and implement specific actions just by virtue of the creative power of language. However to this creativity of content must be added the creative power of context. The meaning of even the most formulaic of actions (such as "okay," "mm hm" and so on) is in fact, differentiated by their context.

Analysis of action cannot avoid this contextual variation without appearing superficial and irrelevant, not least because human beings exploit context in the construction of action. 'Context' is complex and layered. It embraces the immediately preceding action (someone just said or did something you have to respond to), through medial (for instance, that someone is an older patient), to distal (for instance, that

this must all be accomplished within a new managed care regime).

**3. To be socially meaningful, the meaning of actions must be shared (or intersubjective). This sharing may not be perfect, but it is normally good enough for the participants to keep going.**

Human actions are socially meaningful only to the extent that their meaning is shared by the actor, the recipient(s) of the act, and (sometimes) other observers. Absent this and actions will be unintelligible to others and will fail to achieve their desired objectives. The shared meaning of actions is made possible by the common use of methods for analyzing actions-in-context.

As persons construct interaction on an unfolding sequence of moves, they will also have to keep score of 'where they are' in the interaction and of the interaction's 'state of play.' Like 'context,' shared (or 'intersubjective') meaning is also layered on a gradient from the most public (I asked you a question and you replied "No"), to less public but available to some observers (your response betrays the fact that you are not an expert on that condition), to more private (your "No" is rationalizing an unstated anxiety, or reflects a private promise you made to someone else).

**4. Meanings are unique and singular. Actions function in particular ways to create meanings that are also particular.**

Implicit in the first three principles is the idea that actions and their meanings are highly particularized. A key to this working can be glimpsed in the contrast between the

number of colors that are perceptible to the average human (around 7.5 million) and the basic color terms used by the average speaker of a language (between 8 and 11). Somehow all that particularity is being conveyed by very general descriptive terms (red, yellow, etc.). The key to the process is that most description takes place in plain sight of the colored object ("the guy in the red sweater," "the blue humming bird") and the color term can do its job by being amplified and particularized by its context ("this red would work better than that one").

The four features of action described so far have been discussed within the fields of anthropology and sociology for about 150 years, where they have mainly been considered as potential constraints on, or obstacles to, a natural science of society. Nonetheless, these are the characteristics that a conception of interaction must come to terms with. Social participants somehow manage their interactions in daily life while coping with, and in fact actually exploiting, these characteristics of human conduct. Conversation analysis is a discipline that was developed to come to terms with, and model, these capacities.

## II. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with article findings and discussion.

### A. Findings

*Extract I:*

Tom Bradby : People are obviously very curious about you, (Connective1) *so* let's start with the obvious. Prince William, (?1) *where* did you propose, (?2) *when*, (?3) *how*,

(Conjunction1) *and* Kate, (?4) *what* did you say?

Prince William : It was about (=?2) *three weeks ago* on holiday in (=?1) *Kenya...*

(1) *We had a little private time away together* with some friends (Conjunction2) *and* I just decided that it was the right time really...

(2) *We had been talking about marriage* for a while (Connective2) *so* it wasn't a massively big surprise. (=?3) (3) *I took her up somewhere nice* in Kenya (Conjunction3) *and* I proposed.

Miss Middleton : (=?4) (General Conclusion) *It was very romantic* (laughs). There's a true romantic in there.

Tom Bradby : (?5) (Connective3) *So* you said yes, obviously?

Miss Middleton : Of course, (=?5) yes.

Tom Bradby : (?6) (Conjunction4) *And* you knew you were going to do this from day one of the holiday (Conjunction5) *or* you waited until the end?

Prince William : (≠?6) I'd been planning it for a while (Conjunction6) *but*, as any guy out there will know, it takes a certain amount of motivation to get yourself going. I was planning it (Conjunction7) *and* (Connective4) *then* it just felt really right out in Africa. (4) *It was beautiful at the time*. I had done a little bit of (5) *planning to show my romantic side*.

Tom Bradby : Kate, you'd been on holiday a while (Connective5) *so* (?7) did you see this coming?, (?8) was he getting a bit nervous (Conjunction8) *and* jumpy?

Miss Middleton : (=?7) No, not at all because we were out with friends (Conjunction9) *and* things so I really didn't expect it all.

(≠?8) I thought he might have maybe thought about it (Conjunction10) *but* no. It was a total shock when it came, (Conjunction11) *and* very excited.

There are two types of questions found in this conversation, objective and reflective. Objective questions are proposed to obtain data, facts, or external reality such as in (?1), (?2), (?3), (?6), and (?7). All answers for the objective questions proposed in this conversation are coherent with its questions except the objective question (?6). The question is supposed to identify a specific moment but the answer is leaning to the process of how the moment was flowing. In addition, the answer for (?1) is not properly in order. The objective question (?1) is asked first but it is then answered in the second order. The other type of question is reflective question, it is proposed to evoke immediate personal reactions, internal responses, sometimes emotions or feelings, hidden images, and association with the facts as in (?4), (?5), and (?8). The answers for the reflective questions (?4) and (?5) are coherent with its questions but the reflective question (?8) is incoherent with its question. The reflective question (?8) is supposed to investigate a particular reaction of nervous and jumpy but the answer indicated general reaction and excitement.

The logical connectives and conjunctions also play an important role to indicate the state of coherence of a conversation. There are many types of logical connectives and conjunctions found in this conversation. There are two types of logical connectives used in this conversation, *so* and *then*. Both *so* and *then* are, according to Gardner (1982), indicating result of what

being talked about. All logical connectives *so* as in (Connective1), (Connective2), (Connective3), and (Connective5) through this conversation are indicating results. The (Connective1) indicated curiosity because of obvious things, the (Connective2) indicated a non-massive surprise because it is already preceded by talk about marriage, the (Connective3) indicated agreement of Kate Middleton for Prince William's proposal, and (Connective5) indicated prediction of future events in the Prince William and Kate Middleton holiday. The logical connective *then* in (Connective4) is used only once in this conversation and it indicated readiness of Prince William's plan so the use of logical connectives *then* in this conversation bring the state of coherence between the two ideas it linked. Moreover, the state of coherence in this conversation is also identified through the using of Coordinating Conjunction of both *and* and *but*. According to Gardner (1982) Coordinating Conjunction *and* indicated addition and Coordinating Conjunction *but* indicated opposition between two or more ideas. The use of *and* as in (Conjunction1), (Conjunction2), (Conjunction3), (Conjunction4), (Conjunction5), (Conjunction7), (Conjunction8), (Conjunction9), (Conjunction10), and (Conjunction11) and *but* as in (Conjunction6) are all used appropriately according to their function.

This conversation can also be considered rational since it is assuming inductive reasoning throughout the conversation. From the statements (premises) of (1) *we had a little private time away together*, (2) *we had been talking about marriage*, (3) *I took her up somewhere nice*,

(4) *It was beautiful at the time, and* (5) *planning to show my romantic side*, it is supporting a general conclusion of *Prince William and Kate Middleton really had a romantic moment*.

Moreover, under the circumstance of semantic relation to maintain the state of coherence in this conversation, the interlocutors seem to have a good attention to the topic that they had been talking about. The use of *coordinating conjunction* in the sentences they uttered draw an active relation in which two concepts are related semantically where one performance of the first performance affected the second or the other. Prince William also used pronoun *we* that indicated *associative relation* in which he defined Kate Middleton as his future bride and exclude his other friends. In addition, Prince William consciously indicated *locative relation* in which he mentioned Kenya and pointed it as somewhere nice in Africa. The whole conversation, generally show the state of coherence where the interlocutors consistently relating the concepts precisely one another.

*Extract II:*

Tom Bradby : (Conjunction12) And (?9) produced a ring there and then?

Miss Middleton: (=?9) Yes.

Prince William : (=?9) I did, yes. I had been carrying it around with me in my rucksack for about three weeks (Conjunction13) before that (Conjunction14) and I literally would not let it go. Everywhere I went I was keeping hold of it (Conjunction15) because I knew this thing, (Conjunction16) if it disappeared, I would be in a lot of trouble

(Conjunction17) and, (Conjunction18) because I'd planned it, it went fine. You hear a lot of horror stories about proposing (Conjunction19) and things going horribly wrong - it went really, really well (Conjunction20) and I was really pleased (Conjunction21) when she said yes.

Tom Bradby : (?10) It's a family ring?

Prince William : (=?10) It is a family ring, yes. It's my mother's engagement ring (Connective6) so I thought it was quite nice (Conjunction22) because obviously she's not going to be around to share any of the fun (Conjunction23) and excitement of it all - this was my way of keeping her close to it all.

Tom Bradby : I guess we'd better have a look at it. (?11) What kind of ring is it?, (12?) are you an expert?

Prince William : (=?12) I'm not an expert. I've been reliably informed (=?11) it's a sapphire with some diamonds. (Conjunction24) But I'm sure everyone recognises it from previous times.

Miss Middleton: It's beautiful.

Tom Bradby : Kate, you're going to be the envy of many.

Miss Middleton : Well, I just hope I look after it. It's very, very special.

There is only one type of question that the interviewer used in this *Extract II*, objective question. The objective question (?9) tended to make clear the process of proposing a marriage from Prince William to Miss Middleton and the answer was coherent with its question. The objective question

(?10) was asked to clarify whether the ring is a family ring or not and it was answered precisely as it was asked. The objective question (?11) was asked to clarify what type the was and the objective question (?12) was asked for confirmation. The answers for both objective questions are relevant with their questions unless they were not properly in order. The objective question (?11) should be answered first but Prince William, in fact, answered it in the second order.

Indeed, the state of coherence in the *Extract II* is dominantly shown in the use of conjunctions and logical connectives. There are two types of conjunction in this *Extract II*, Coordinating Conjunction and Subordinating Conjunction. Coordinating Conjunction *and* was used frequently as in (Conjunction12), (Conjunction14), (Conjunction17), (Conjunction19), (Conjunction20), and (Conjunction23) while Coordinating Conjunction *but* was used only once in (Conjunction24). Besides, there were also Subordinating Conjunctions such as *before* in (Conjunction13), *because* in (Conjunction15), (Conjunction18), (Conjunction22), *if* in (Conjunction16.), and *when* in (Conjunction21). However, all conjunctions were used appropriately according to their function. In the other hand, there was also logical connective *so* in (Connective6) which indicated excitement of Prince William because his proposal ring was his former engagement ring of his mother.

In addition to the state of coherence in *Extract II* conversation, there was also a general conclusion of inductive reasoning that Prince William would never lose his engagement ring. The conclusion was based on these premises (1) *I had been carrying it*

*around with me*, (2) *I literally would not let it go*, (3) *Everywhere I went I was keeping hold of it*, and (4) *If it disappeared, I would be in a lot of trouble*. Based on this, under the circumstance of logical reasoning, the ideas/concepts in the conversation of *Extract II* are coherent each other.

*Extract III:*

Tom Bradby : It's a massive thing you are going into now, obviously marriage is a big thing for everyone, but it's in such a public way, (?13) excited? (?14) A little bit terrified?

Prince William : (= ?13)  
Massively excited, quite happy (Conjunction25) when the interview's over, (Conjunction26) but, no, we are hugely excited (Conjunction27) and we are looking forward to spending the rest of our lives together (Conjunction28) and seeing what the future holds. (≠ ?14)

Tom Bradby : Kate, you've had a long time to contemplate this moment.

Miss Middleton : It's obviously nerve-wracking, (Conjunction29) because I don't know the ropes really. William is obviously used to it, (Conjunction30) but I'm willing to learn quickly (Conjunction31) and work hard.

Tom Bradby : A lot of opportunities obviously within the family, a huge ability to change people's lives (Conjunction32) for the better. I guess that's something you must have contemplated (Conjunction33) as well.

Miss Middleton : Yes, well, I really hope I can make a difference, (Connective7) even in the

smallest way. I am looking forward to helping (Conjunction34) as much (Conjunction35) as I can.

In contrast to *Extract II*, *Extract III* contained only reflective questions. As stated before, reflective questions evoke immediate personal reactions, internal responses, sometimes emotions or feelings, hidden images, and associations with the facts such as in (?13) and (?14) which clarified the feeling of Prince William at the time he proposed a marriage to Miss Middleton. The reflective question (?13) was answered coherently but the question (?14) was not. Prince William did not answer the reflective question (?14).

The use of Subordinating Conjunctions in this *Extract III*, as in *Extract II*, was dominant. The Subordinating Conjunctions *when* as in (Conjunction25) indicated time in which Prince William specifically pointed to the time when the conversation was over. The Subordinating Conjunction *because* as in (Conjunction29) indicated result of unknowing state, *as* as in (Conjunction33), (Conjunction34), (Conjunction35) indicated result of capabilities, and *for* as in (Conjunction32) indicated result of changing people lives. There were also Coordinating Conjunctions in this *Extract III* as *and* in (Conjunction27), (Conjunction28), and (Conjunction31) which indicated addition or combination of ideas, and *but* in (Conjunction26) and (Conjunction30) which indicated opposition between two or more ideas. It was found in this *Extract III* a logical connective *even* as in

(Connective7) which indicated addition for more ideas that may come next.

Explicitly, it was not found any logical reason in this *Extract III* but implicitly the conversation indicated a semantic *associative relation*. The ideas of (1) *change people's lives for the better* and (2) *I am looking forward to helping as much as I can* were semantically related to the ideas of responsibility that a bride of a prince must carry out. Moreover, the idea of *marriage is a big thing for everyone* also brought an *associative relation* to the concept of *excitement* and responsibility. In the other hand, the concept of performing engagement or marriage semantically indicated an *active relation* in which it caused Prince William and Miss Middleton must be together for the rest of their lives.

## **B. Discussion**

Generally, the conversation can be considered coherent based on certain elements in the conversation fit each other into a single overall mental representation. The mental representation of those elements was uttered in a well form of speech in which the interlocutors consistently maintained the cohesiveness of the elements through the using of appropriate logical connectives, logical reasoning, and semantic relation. The whole conversation in fact, semantically implied temporal relation in which the conversation took place at the moment before the wedding ceremony of Prince William and Kate Middleton. This must be considered as an important piece of fact which may strengthen the state of coherence of this conversation.

However, the connected ideas which were identified in this conversation must be

taken into consideration. There is a bias that questions the state of coherence of this conversation. This was a planned interview where the interviewer arranged the questions properly before they were proposed and the interviewees may anticipate the possibility of those questions. So this may be considered as a formal conversation in which it might take a good preparation before the conversation took place. Besides, this conversation was carried out by a popular TV program. It brings an assumption of broadcasting events might follow the scripts and the recordings of this conversation might be edited before they were presented to public consumption. Moreover, this conversation involved two high-level status figures of the British Empire, a prince who will claim the next throne and his bride. The recordings might be watched carefully to protect those two figures.

### **III. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

The conversation between Tom Bradby, a presenter of ITV program, and Prince William and his bride, Miss Middleton can be considered coherent based on the following:

1. From the 14 questions proposed, only 2 of them did not match their answers and 2 other questions are answered in inappropriate orders.
2. The interlocutors in this conversation used about 35 conjunctions and 7 connectives in which all of them were used properly according to their functions.
3. This conversation used at least 2 forms of logical inductive reasoning.
4. The interlocutors in this conversation maintained the topic well and related the ideas in appropriate manner to gain a consistent meaning and references throughout the conversation.

Based on the study and findings in this article, it is suggested that:

1. Future analysis of conversation analysis should be applied to various types of text both oral and written to support previous findings on conversation analysis articles.
2. The concept of coherence in conversation analysis required further reconstruction. The current articles on coherence in logical conversation lack of a well-constructed concepts of coherence in conversation analysis.

### **REFERENCES**

- Amann, K., & Knorr-Cetina, K. 1989. *Thinking through talk: An ethnographic study of a molecular biology laboratory*. Knowledge and Society: Studies in the Sociology of Science Past and Present, 8, 2–26.
- Bonvillain, Nancy. 1993. *Language, culture and communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Carroll, J.B., & Casagrande, J.B. (1958). *The function of language classifications in behavior*. In E.E.Maccoby, T.M.Newcomb, & E.L.Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (pp. 18–31).

- New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Donath, J., Karahalios, K., & Vieges, F. (1999). *Visualizing conversation*. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 4(4). [www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol4/issue4/herring.html](http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol4/issue4/herring.html).
- Everett, Daniel L. 1992. *Formal linguistics and field work*. Notes on Linguistics 57.11–25.
- GARDNER, H. (1982). *The birth of literary imagination*. In H. Gardner (Ed.), *Art, mind and brain*. New York: Basic books.
- Goodwin, C. and Heritage, J. 1990. *Conversation Analysis*. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. Vol. 9:283-307.
- Graesser, Arthur C., Morton A. Gernsbacher, and Susan R. Goldman. 1997. *Cognition in Discourse Studies: a multidisciplinary introduction*. Vol. 1: *Discourse as structure and process*, ed. by Teun A. van Dijk, 292–319. London: Sage.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics*. Vol. 3. *Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. Ruqaiya Hasan, *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1976
- Louwerse, M.M. & Graesser, A.C. (2005). *Coherence in discourse*. In Strazny, P. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of linguistics*. (pp. 216-218) Chicago, Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Mazur, J. M. 2012. *Conversation Analysis for Educational Technologies: Theoretical and Methodological Issues for Articling the Structure, Processes, and Meaning of On-Line Talk*. University of Kentucky.
- Paivio, Allan, and Ian Begg. 1981. *Psychology of language*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Sacks H. (1992) [1964-72]. *Lectures On Conversation*. (2 Vols.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Schank, Roger C., and Robert P. Abelson. 1977. *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schwarz, N. (1996). *Cognition and communication: Judgmental biases, article methods, and the logic of conversation*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Searle, J. (1990). *Collective intentions and actions*. In P. Cohen, J. Morgan, & M. Pollack (Eds.), *Intentions in communication* (pp. 401–416). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J.R. (1979). *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Semin, G.R. (1998). *Cognition, language, and communication*. In S.R. Fussell & R.J. Kreuz (Eds.), *Social and cognitive approaches to interpersonal communication* (pp. 229–258). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.



- Stanfield, Brian. 2012. *The Art of Focused Conversation*. ICA Associations Inc., Canada.
- Sternberg, R. J. 2009. *Cognitive Psychology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Strack, F., Schwarz, N., & Wanke, M. (1991). *Semantic and pragmatic aspects of context effects in social and psychological article*. *Social Cognition*, 9, 111–125.
- ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1977. *Text and context*. London: Longman. \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 1997. *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction*. Vol. 1: *Discourse as structure and process*. London: Sage.
- Winston, E. (1995). *Spatial mapping in comparative discourse frames*. In K. Emmorey and J. Reilly (Eds.), *Language, gesture and space*. Cambridge: LEA