Gunta Rozina
University of Latvia, Latvia

SOCIAL INTERACTION IN CONTEXT OF MULTILINGUALISM: FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

Summary. During the last decade, research interest in multilingualism has increased immensely. As a result, the present paper explores certain aspects of growing understanding and commitment to the linguistic diversity, which are considered to be some of the factors that underlie a successful interaction in a multilingual society nowadays. The theoretical framework of the study is designed considering the latest contributions of sociolinguistic ethnography in the area of multilingualism, relating the notion of multilingualism to the notion of multicompetence. The current situation demonstrates that multilingualism having developed from sociolinguistically-bound research distinguishes its own social, institutional and individual dimensions. They are associated with the practices that are linked to the use of the language for instrumental purposes in order to communicate with confidence in a socially and culturally diverse society. Consequently, researching multilingualism moves away from the analysis of coexisting language systems to a more critical approach that situates appropriate language practices in relevant social and/or political contexts. The empirical part of the study investigates one example of pop-culture, i.e., the language originated, used and constantly updated by the Starbucks – world famous coffee manufacturing industry. The study concludes that the language users are expected to possess multilingual competence to interact appropriately in social settings nowadays.

Keywords: multilingualism, multilingual competence, language of pop culture, semantic meaning, pragmatic meaning.

Introduction

The study covers several theoretical and functional aspects of specific use of the English language being applied in social interaction in a multilingual context. In view of this, the analysis explores selected characteristic features of multilingualism from a theoretical perspective and offers some insights into the new linguistic repertoires developed by the globalized world. To analyse some of the latest contributions of the Anglo-American applied linguistics that concern multilingualism, the study has posed the following research question: *What characterises the language use in a social interaction in a multilingual context?*

In order to answer the research question, the study has set its goal to examine the selected aspects of multilingualism via the analysis of the language

use in social interaction. The enquiry is approached from a qualitative research perspective, and it bears the nature of a case study.

Thus, the present research was conducted at two levels: the area of multilingualism was explored taking into account the theoretical contributions of sociolinguistic ethnography; the empirical study was conducted by examining the language of pop culture. At this point, the nature of the pop language was investigated specifically. Besides, the paper studied how the pop language creates its literal and implied meaning.

Considering the above-stated, the empirical part of the paper deals with the investigation of the language known as *Starbuckian.* It analyses the language being originated and constantly renewed by *Starbucks* – the world-wide known coffee manufacturing industry. It should be admitted that the present real-life situation reports on a growing tendency of *Starbucks* outside the United States. This has resulted in a newly emerging type of the language. Being a means of social interaction, *Starbuckian* features its own semantic (literal) and pragmatic (implied) characteristics, thus fulfilling the communicative purposes of interaction in and beyond the brand loyal consumers' setting worldwide. As a result, to understand the language practices in the globalized communicative environment, the language users are expected to comprehend how the linguistic phenomena are applied in communication. On the other hand, they are supposed to possess the multilingual competence and awareness of the language application in specified communicative contexts: from the global to the local language use.

Multilingualism: theoretical perspective

To discuss the concept of multilingualism, the theoretical framework of the study is designed considering the latest contributions of sociolinguistic ethnography in the area of multilingualism. The research on multilingualism has altered enormously over the past two decades because globalization has introduced immense changes in socio-cultural values, in linguistic diversity, and in understanding communication worldwide. According to Blommaert (2010),

processes of globalization have resulted in new strategies and patterns of language use in situational contexts, known as *superdiversity*, which 'stretches the limits for understanding multilingualism and dynamism of language change' (Blommaert, 2010, p. 8). Blommaert states that several social factors characterize superdiversity, such as ethnicity of language users, development of social classes and groups of language use, economics, mobility and alike. Thus, current global tendencies have built up well-established linguistic repertoires in which local and lingua-franca strategies and approaches are combined. Heller (2011) considers it to be an 'intensified and compressed circulation of people, goods and information' (Heller, 2011, p. 20). Similarly, Fairclough (2006) recognizes that globalization makes available new resources for local action, and they include new discourses and language paradigms.

Thus, in order to understand the new linguistic repertoires in the globalized world, language users are expected to think about the phenomena from the global to the local and 'examine the new challenges in terms of new trans-contextual networks' (Martin-Jones, 2012, p. 6). Martin-Jones remarks that 'these are the networks that pose the greatest challenge to a sociolinguistics of multilingualism to integrate the new practices in day-to-day communication' (ibid.)

Consequently, to make the language learners sustainably multilingual, the present time foresees the following: a) teaching language by linking it to its cultural context; b) teaching the 21st century skills, such as ways of thinking (creativity and innovation, critical thinking, decision making), ways of working (communication, collaboration), tools for working (ICT literacy), and living in the world (citizenship: local and global, cultural empathy).

Language of pop culture: mixing and blending

It is generally accepted that functioning of every language system is based on a potential of the multilingual competence, thus, current theoretical contributions relate the notion *multilingualism* to the notion *multicompetence.* Assuming that multilingualism conveys the language users' ability to demonstrate regular use

of several languages in day-to-day interactions, multicompetent individuals or social groups of language users are expected to possess the knowledge of an extended linguistic repertoire, which enables them to apply an appropriate language variety for an appropriate purpose and in a relevant context. Blommaert (2010) points out that mixing and blending processes in languages worldwide are the factors that require new ways of conceptualization, and 'we need to develop an awareness that is not necessarily the language you speak, but it is the awareness how you speak it and to whom it matters' (Blommaert, 2010, p. 196). Therefore, as a result of ethnic, cultural and economic contacts between different nations and languages, English, being a lingua franca, is under a strong influence of other languages and other cultures, pop culture including. It, to a certain extent, elevates the impact on the world-wide use of English in multinational communication.

As concerns the theoretical writings which characterise popular forms of communication varieties, they admit that pop culture is 'a culture that is everywhere' (Danesi, 2012, vii); it has existed since *Herodotus* (circa 485–425 BCE). Pop culture as a phenomenon has replaced the common understanding of what the traditional folk culture and lifestyles of people of the present millennium are. Thus, pop culture retains its own features and manifestations in different social settings, the terms *pop culture* and *pop language* requiring for further commentary.

Considering the origins and evolutionary tendencies, it should be admitted that the term *pop culture* reveals 'non-traditional form of culture in its sense' (Danesi, 2012, p. 2). Since the 1950s, several authors (e.g., Danesi, Savan) have presented their understanding of new tendencies underlying different cultures, such as:

a) new life styles of people (e.g., *the hippie era*),

b) new trends in music (e.g., *the disco era*, *the hip-hop era*),

c) new tendencies in the political area (e.g., *the Kennedy era*, *the Nixon era*, *the Obama era*), and

d) new advancements in the area of technologies (e.g., *the Facebook era*).

According to the Polish-born anthropologist Malinowski (in Danesi, 2012, p. 3), 'cultures originated to provide creative strategies for solving basic physical and moral problems'. Consequently, it should be admitted that from the perspective of language users, pop culture stands out as *a typical* phenomenon: 'it is culture by the people for the people' (Danesi, 2012, p. 4). If so, pop culture has always been appealing to common people. It has functioned to reveal the ever-changing tastes and it has always presented the values and beliefs of one generation after another. The world's traditional folk cultures are ritualistic (e.g., the pre-midsummer night event known as *Līgo* in Latvia). Pop culture bears its own characteristic features, for example, its recreational nature (i.e., it is designed to appeal to creative individuals, e.g., writers, artists, musicians). It is a commodity culture; its value is timeless and its appeal is universal, e.g., jazz music performed by *Lois Armstrong*, *Chanel* perfumes, *the Beatles*, *the Discovery Channel* on TV, and alike. However, pop culture is not only performed, it also represents a spoken channel of communication; it employs the linguistic instrumentation to convey the message, thus, pop culture disseminates information through its own language, which is known as the pop language.

Pop language: nature

Without any doubt, neither the TV and Facebook generation nor the cyber generation has invented the pop language. Every era has introduced its words that projected certain images. It is generally known that the English language has the largest vocabulary due to the Norman invasion, impact of the German language and its Latin base. Thus, it can be assumed that English has the largest pop vocabulary, the U.S. being the place with the most exported pop culture: *OK* and *cool* are among the most recognized words in the world. In 1997, for example, *Newsweek* published 'a list of 3,500 foreign words that cannot be used in schools, governmental offices or in companies, for example, *hit, hot, cool, cheeseburger, stress, brainstorming, air bag, log on'* (Savan, 2005, p. 33). At this point, the French struggle against *le weekend, le sandwich, e-mail,* and *money* should be mentioned.

The term *pop language* was introduced by a journalist Savan in 2005. It was extensively used to characterise 'a conversational style, which seems to carry with it a built-in applause sign or laugh track' (in Danesi, 2012, p. 217). To support this view, the author mentions such phrases as, *Get a life, It doesn't get any better than this, I hate it when that happens*, and a sneering *I don't think so*, which have originated from television sitcoms and popular films. Further, Savan states that the above-characterised language has its own characteristics, such as:

a) it is mostly applied by ordinary people,

b) it emanates from popular media,

c) it is perceived as *hip*, and

d) it is light, self-conscious, highly ironic, replete with put-downs, catchy phrases and exaggerated inflections (e.g., *Whatever!*) (ibid.).

Presumably, the pop language is a modern-time version of the language that is used currently to enlighten the seriousness of a serious talk produced for serious purposes, such as business talk, bureaucratise, or talk in an academic setting. According to Lear (2011), the pop language has its own etymology, for example:

a) Shakespeare brought into usage such slang terms as *hubbub* (i.e., a mixture of loud noises, especially a lot of people talking at the same time), *to bump* (i.e., to hip or knock against something), *to dwindle* (to become smaller gradually).

b) The 1920s and its jazz culture introduced catchphrases and buzz-words into daily discourses of interactants, including such words as, for example:

• *hip* (i.e., doing things according to the latest fashion; currently a number of new word formations have been derived from the word *hip,* such as the interjection *hip, hip, hooray* used as a shout of approval, *hip hop,* a popular dance with a regular heavy beat and spoken words included, *hippie*, someone opposed to the traditional standards of society, and

• *cool* (i.e., fashionable).

c) The 1940s introduced such words as *pot* (an old fashioned word for marijuana) and *marijuana*, which represented a part of a secret criminal jargon

and which became everyday words in the 1960s when hippies spread the words through their recordings.

d) The film of the early 1980s *Animal House* (1978) introduced the terms, such as, a *wimp* used for someone who has no courage, *brew* used for beer. The words are still employed in the present time communication.

e) The film of the 2004 *Mean Girls* spread a new form of pop speech used by young females across North America, with words such as *plastic,* meaning fake girls who look like Barbie dolls, *fetch* with its abbreviation of *fetching* to characterise someone who is trendy (Lear, 2011, pp. 18–89).

Like pop music, the pop language evolves to appeal to as large audience as possible. The pop language seems to bear its specific slangy roots; it is colourful and 'signals the rise of images over words' (Savan, 2005, p. 37). The pop language is a *word-as-image* language, for example, the word combinations such as *politically correct, moral values, culture of life, get used to it, get over it, flip-flop, and spin* function as a word-as-image language. In addition, it should be marked that the pop language and slang are two different phenomena. The major difference between the two phenomena is the following: speaking slang requires universal linguistic competence, but speaking the pop language depends on certain social conditions and a variety of social factors and contexts. The linguist McWhorter states that 'slang is used everywhere over the world; the pop language is infused with media and marketing' (in Savan 2005, p. 42). Dazell states that

a) with slang, the situation creates a need for a word or expression, which then gets coined and spread and used again,

b) pop even begins with slang, it is more top down,

c) slang includes jargon, which is huge and is constantly coined, and

d) pop vocabulary is smaller in number, but it is repeated more often by more people (in Savan 2005, pp. 43–47).

As a result, the present study admits that the conversational style and vocabulary used in fiction magazines, in lyrics of pop songs, in marketing and in the mass media have established a certain standard of popular discourse that exhibits its linguistic features.

Pop language: creating meaning

So far, the paper has revealed the general features of the pop language which characterise it as an established discourse. However, one proposition still addresses an additional research interest: how the literal and implied meaning of the pop language is created. Taking into account a number of theoretical contributions that deal with examining the semantic and/or pragmatic meaning of a statement, it is to be admitted that two linguistic areas, i.e., semantics and pragmatics, study the communication of meaning. Semantics pertains to the literal meaning of words and sentences, and it focuses on linguistic expressions. The units of analysis in semantics are propositions, which describe the states of affairs. The s*emantic meaning* (known also as *sentence meaning* or *linguistic meaning*) is studied by semantics and involves a purely linguistic knowledge. The semantic meaning establishes the abstract meaning of words and phrases and it is considered to be the linguistic meaning. It is the context that helps the language user narrow down the word meaning.

Pragmatics, in its turn, pertains to the meanings of utterances or to the speaker meaning. The *pragmatic meaning* (known also as *contextual meaning*) is the central point of studies in pragmatics. Pragmatics takes the interlocutors, the speaker and the hearer, as the focus of attention. It studies the ways and approaches of how hearers add *contextual information* to the semantic structure and how they draw *inferences* from what is said. Pragmatics serves a significant role in context perception, both the linguistic and situational context, in context meaning perception in a certain discourse. Consequently, the pragmatic meaning or the contextual meaning is the central point of studies in pragmatics, it 'is labelled as utterance meaning' (Thomas, 1995, p. 18).

The pragmatic meaning, according to Cicourel's (1980) model, is determined by the con-text (i.e., linguistic and paralinguistic features, such as grammatical and lexical cohesion, paralinguistic variables, such as prosody) and the context being determined by the contextual factors at the expansion level (in narrower contexts, e.g., the intended meaning of the language user, his/her

background knowledge to interpret the meaning; in broader contexts, the knowledge of habits of the culture, for example).

With regard to the above stated and within the framework of the present study, it can be asserted that the semantic meaning of the pop language retains the following features:

a) it is usually presented across the spoken mode of communication;

b) it might bear certain features of slang, however, in a number of instances, the slang and the pop language not only coexist but also overlap, for example:

- the use of *like* as a linguistic instrument to indicate hesitation: *it's like late, you know*?,

- the use of *like* to indicate an indirect citation: instead of 'Tom said, *What are you writing?*', the pop language tends to use the form 'Tom was like, *What are you doing?'* (it should be mentioned that the *Oxford English Dictionary* explains the use of *like* as 'in a way to speak', for example, *I'm, like, so in the mood*)*,

- the use of *like* as a quantifier to replace words such as *nearly, approximately, very*, for example*, It's like cold, you know?*;

c) it does not necessarily imply only a verbal interaction because it often roots in writings (e.g., Shakespeare's works);

d) it can be identified by stylistic markers typical of speech, for example, the contracted forms, a frequent use of 1st and 2nd person pronouns to express direct address and/or personal reference;

e) it demonstrates specified discourse varieties displaying features of orality, for example, the media slang often employs hedging devices to present the characteristics of adult language, such as *yeah, uh, uhm, uh-huh, well* (e.g., used by jazz musicians), *yeah right* (it functions as a means for conveying sarcasm and is considered to be a synonymous word combination for *Tell me something I don't know*).

Thus, it can be stated that from the perspective of the semantic meaning, the pop language represents a form of orality. It is often spontaneous, and, as a rule, informal. From the perspective of the pragmatic meaning, the

spoken verbal interaction fulfils primarily the interpersonal function. It is used to establish and/or maintain the human relationship being referred to as *phatic communication*. The pop language aims to achieve comity as opposed to conflict and is a non-goal oriented language. Considering the above discussion, the following interim conclusions can be drawn: the pop language displays its meaning via such linguistic features as

a) hesitations and voiced pauses (e.g., *uuhh, ahhh, ehmmm*),

b) fillers (e.g., *I mean, you know*),

c) self-correction and repetition,

d) grammatical errors (e.g., non-agreement between the subject and the verb),

e) use of slang and/or jargon (e.g., slang for 'coffee': *java, jamoke, sludge, silt, bilge, murk, mud, a shot-in –the-arm*),

f) heavy reliance on deictics (e.g., personal pronouns, temporal and spatial references),

g) choice of simple lexis (often of Anglo-Saxon origin) as opposed to Latinate roots,

h) marked prosody (e.g., contrastive stress, intonation),

i) in a narrower sense, the intended meaning of the language user is conveyed via the interpersonal language function to communicate the discourse-related issues, for example, to inform, to characterise, to order, to request a product or a service, and

j) in a broader sense, the knowledge of habits, traditions of a traditional culture or of a speech community is essential to understand the situational context of the language used.

Pop language: semantic meaning analysis

The study examines the pop language and investigates the language originated and constantly renewed by *Starbucks* – the worldwide known coffee manufacturing industry. The growth of *Starbucks* outside the United States has resulted in emerging a new type of the language known as *Starbuckian.* Being a

means of social interaction, *Starbuckian* features its own semantic and pragmatic characteristics, thus fulfilling the communicative purposes of interaction in and beyond the brand loyal consumers' setting. In naturally occurring communicative situations, interlocutors are expected not only to comprehend the literal meaning of a word/statement but also to draw inferences: the implicit meaning often goes beyond what has been said literally. As a result, the language users should possess the multilingual competence to interact appropriately in multilingual social settings because successful inferencing requires complex reasoning processes that are based on the linguistic competence and on extra-linguistic features of communication, such as background knowledge, pragmatic principles that underlie communication and alike.

Consequently, the empirical part of the present study analyses the selected aspects of the pop language and its use in the communication that is established by the 21st century coffee house discourse community. The present analysis is based on the study of the pop language use in the contemporary American and European culture. For this purpose, the study examines how the meanings of new words/word combinations are created and how the existing words or word combinations take a new meaning in the situational context of their use.

To examine the selected aspects and the contextual use of the basic Starbuckian, promotional writings such as advertisement leaflets and coffee type specifications have been considered as the source material for the analysis. In 2001, the BBC on-line service *h2g2*, which "explains life, the universe and everything else", noted the growth of Starbucks, and interest in the brand in the United States and beyond was rocketing. As a result, the BBC published a guide to the rituals of ordering in the coffee shops of the chain. The paper drew the audience's attention to a specific pop language being established and extensively used at Starbucks' chain stores all over the world. It came up with generalizations as to what this language "sounds and is like". For, example, the BBC on-service line offered a growing list of terms to describe the coffee, such as the coffee offered at Starbucks can be *bitter, bland, bright, caramelly, chaffy*

(a taste reminiscent of sawdust), *chocolaty, dry, earthy, grassy* (an aroma and flavour reminiscent of a freshly cut lawn), *muddy* (thick and dull), *rioy* (starchy like pasta water), *soft, shallow, thin*.

Taking into account the individual experience gained in the Starbuckian coffee shops not only in the United States but also in other countries, Latvia including, the author of the study has observed an extended use of adjectives employed by Starbucks to characterise the specific features of the product offered, such as *dirty* (a mustiness reminiscent of eating dirt), *delicate*, *sharp*, *snappy*, *sour*, *spicy*, *sweet*, *tangy*, *turpeny* (turpentine-like), *vibrant*, *watery*, *wild*, *winey*.

The language applied to reveal the top qualities of the Starbuckian coffee and to promote its world-wide recognition is selected very carefully not only to draw consumers' attention to the particular taste but also to state that the Starbuckian coffee is an excellent value for the money. Even more, the language used supports the idea that the coffee offered has not only its market value but it also represents a sentimental value. It might evoke coffee consumers' nostalgic and lingering memories and bring back the time spent in the United States or in any other European country when the Starbuckian coffee was tasted or tried.

The present time situation demonstrates that the Starbuckian brand coffee houses outnumber not only in the United States but they are also widely known in Europe, Latvia including. Due to this fact, a culture has appeared that is known as the traditional *bar culture,* and this culture has adopted its own language, i.e., *Starbuckian.* The term *Starbuckian* (known also as: *Starbucksian*, *Starbuckese*, *Starbonics*) is used to describe both the language used in the Starbucks' coffee chains and the culture of the rituals of Starbucks worldwide. Today, Starbucks has spread on all sides of the Atlantic Ocean. To exemplify, the actor Steve Martin in the film *L.A. Story* (produced in 1991) orders a *half double decaffeinated half-caf with a twist of lemon* (*caf*, i.e., caffeinated coffee)*.* To add, Latvia, for example, experiences a deep cult of coffee and, without any doubt, the specified bar culture fosters the use and development of the bar language.

In order to analyse the selected aspects of Starbuckian being a representative of the pop language in this millennium, the present study examines how the semantic and pragmatic meaning is established in the discourse under analysis. At the level of the semantic meaning formation, the study considers the use of such word-formation patterns in the context of Starbuckian as borrowing, blending, compounding and the use of metaphor as an instance of semantic shift in meaning (Veisbergs, 2013, p. 7).

According to Veisbergs, 'Borrowing comes as a result of contact between languages' (Veisbergs, 2013, p. 50). Borrowing bears the features of one language and incorporates them into another language. Linguists agree that lexical borrowing is a widespread phenomenon in the world's languages. Thomason et al. (1988) admit that 'borrowing is the incorporation of foreign features into a group's native language by the speakers of that language' (Thomason, 1988, p. 37). It was Bloomfield (1933) who acknowledged that two types of borrowings exist, i.e., dialect borrowings, 'where the borrowed features come from within the same speech area in a dialect' and cultural borrowings, 'where the borrowed features come from different language' (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 444).

As regards Starbuckian, it employs a surprisingly vast number of cultural borrowings from the Italian language to characterize the product, such as *latte* (milky coffee), *cappuccino* (an espresso coffee topped with foamy milk or cream), *crappuccino* (poorly made but expensive coffee drink), *schizo* (a cup of coffee made with equal parts of caffeinated and decaffeinated coffee) *mocha* (chocolaty coffee), *espresso* (small volume of coffee) *americano* (espresso coffee mixed with hot water), *solo* (a single shot of espresso: compare *doppio* (two shots), *triplo* (three shots), *macchiato* (a Starbucks drink that is mostly milk foam, with a shot of espresso), *lungo* (a stretched espresso having twice as much water as usual run through the espresso machine), *ristretto* (a short shot of espresso). Some borrowings from the French language can be observed; however, they constitute a very limited number of the active vocabulary of the Starbuckian, for example, *coffee noir* (black coffee), *eau de caffeine, café au lait* (coffee served with hot milk).

'Blending is a word building-pattern where two separate elements of words merge to produce a new term (Veisbergs, 2013, p. 46). The present study has identified several instances of blending in the Starbuckian discourse as well, for example, *jamoke* (a blend of java + mocha coffee), *biodiversity* (a blend of biological + diversity: many types of coffee mixed in one cup), *lattenomics* (a blend of latte + economics; the term is created by the Starbucks' chain stores to measure the valuation of world currencies based on the relative price of a Starbucks *latte* in various countries. The notion *Starbucks* is also used to identify a measure of economic success of the country, known as the *Starbucks Index*. However, blending being a typical word formation pattern of the English language is not widely applied in Starbuckian. Despite this, the pattern displays inbuilt tendencies of the language use in communicative situations and reveals marked tendencies that display how the terms are coined in the discourse, therefore, the language users are expected to know both the language culture and the professional culture of the speech community to understand the new blends used in situational contexts.

"Compounding is the joining together of several words, which occur separately in a language to produce a new single form" (Veisbergs, 2013, p. 30). According to the author, compounds can be categorized as *proper compounds* (e.g., wallpaper), *derivational compounds* (e.g., high-minded), *compound phrases* (e.g., last-minute change) and *reproductive compounds* (e.g., hush-hush). The present analysis of Starbuckian demonstrates that the advertising leaflets under study make use of the following categories:

a) proper compounds, such as, *eggspresso* (an egg scrambled by an espresso machine without oil or butter), *hammerhead* (espresso mixed with brewed coffee), *addshot* (the word used by espresso bartenders, known as *barristas,* to express an order that requires an additional shot of espresso), *frappuccino* (a coffee drink made in a blender, developed by Starbucks, combining coffee, milk, sugar, ice);

• open compounds (a subcategory of proper compounds), for example, *split shot* (a half-caf espresso shot), *vanilla steamer* (steamed milk with vanilla syrup, sold exceptionally by Starbucks), *quad jammer* (four shots of espresso),

big brew (24-ounce infusion of caffeine with room space left at the top of the cup to add cream or to prevent spills);

- compounds with linking elements (a subcategory of proper compounds), such as, *shot and dry* (the phrase used to express the request for minimizing the amount of milk relative to coffee in *latte* or in *cappuccino*);

b) derivational compounds, such as *no-fun* (latte made with decaf coffee and non-fat milk), *double-cupping* (putting one paper cup into another to protect a tender's fingers from hot coffee), *no-whip* (coffee with no whipped cream), *double-double* (double cream, double sugar), *shot-in-the-dark* (regular coffee with a shot of espresso in it), *high-test* (a cup of regular, not decaffeinated coffee);

c) compound phrases, such as, *estate-grown coffee* (coffee from a particular estate, dedicated to one type of coffee), *cake-in-a cup* (double cream, double sugar), *full-city roast* (very dark roast), *bird-friendly coffee* (coffee that is grown under canopies of native trees that provide sustenance for migrating birds), *fair-traded coffee* (collected in smallholder farms and traded at a fair price), *short-in-the-arm coffee* (old diner slang for coffee).

Any vocabulary of any language can be also enriched by the semantic word formation, apart from the morphological types of word formation, as a result, 'conceptual metaphors construct our thinking and behaviour' (Veisbergs, 2013, pp. 76–79). Starbuckian applies numerous collocations, in which words used in a specified context acquire additional meaning if compared to their literal meaning. The present study demonstrates that the conceptual metaphors used in the discourse under analysis reflect peculiarities of human mind and thinking, thus constructing our understanding of ideas expressed contextually and contributing to displaying the linguistic behaviour of a language user. Rozina (2013) notes that metaphor fulfils the cognitive function of the language applied in professional contexts (Rozina, 2013, pp. 52–58). Following the typology of the metaphor by Galperin (Rozina, 2013, pp. 54–55), metaphors fall into two types, i.e., *genuine metaphor* (created solely for the purposes of the domain and might be strikingly unknown to the domain outsiders) and *trite metaphor* (its figurative meaning can be perceived by the language users who are not the members of

the given speech community). Analysis of Starbuckian demonstrates that the language employs genuine metaphors in the majority of cases, for example, *cause coffee* (any coffee tied to a political or environmental cause), *black eye* (espresso mixed with brewed coffee), *skinny coffee* (latte or other drink made with skimmed milk), *a speed ball* (a regular coffee with a shot of espresso in it; also known as *shot-in the-dark*), *virgin coffee* (decaffeinated coffee), *thunder thighs* (a double *mocha* made with whole milk and topped with extra whipped cream), *split shot* (a half-caf espresso shot), *vanilla steamer* (coffee with steamed milk accompanied by vanilla syrup, mainly produced and offered only in Starbucks), *double down* (call in which the second order is identical to the one preceding), *java jacket* (a paper sleeve that is slipped onto a hot paper cup of brewed coffee).

Pop language: pragmatic meaning analysis

The 21st century communication, which is established in specified situational contexts, demonstrates that coffeehouse as the language community has created its own linguistic instrument used for interactional purposes. As it was stated above, the language meaning assigned by the Starbucks' product consumers is conveyed via the semantic meaning of words used in the contextual discourse. The utterance meaning (known as the pragmatic meaning) is expressed via the implied meaning communicated by the language users. The qualitative analysis of the pragmatic meaning of Starbuckian indicates that its pragmatic meaning is expressed via the illocutionary meaning of the statement. It is the effect that the statement has created on the information recipient, such as the communicative intention of interlocutors to order, to inform, to require, to instruct and alike. Besides, multicompetence is directly related to implicatures, which generate from Grice's maxims of conversation. Moreover, the multilingual advantage is gained via the language users' pragmatic ability. The philosopher Grice (1989) has determined that communication is established successfully if certain conversational expectations of a speaker and a hearer are met. To paraphrase, speakers construct their utterances according to a set of

conversational principles and hearers calculate speakers' meaning considering the situational context, background knowledge and other text external factors. In many communicative situations, the Gricean maxims benefit considerably to comprehend the meaning of the utterance.

Besides, the present time situation demonstrates that the multilingual competence is more than only the linguistic competence because diversity in language use creates new discourses of language use. These changing conditions often create a tension between language and culture as a means of authenticity. Consequently, researching multilingualism moves away from the analysis of coexisting language systems to a more critical approach that situates appropriate language practices in relevant social and/or political contexts.

Conclusions

The analysis of Starbuckian has proved that much linguistic, societal and cultural understanding is required these days to communicate appropriately in appropriate contextual situations. New realities identify that the multilingual communicative practices go beyond the one-state-one-nation-one-culture-one-language framework. Even more, the global present time communication demonstrates that the language applied for instrumental purposes does not straightforwardly refer to one idea. Vice versa, the language users are expected to demonstrate their multilingual competence in order to employ the linguistic resources in complex ways to perform multiple discursive practices in which they are engaged in order to adjust to wide socio-economic and cultural changes.

References

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The Sociolinguistics and globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language.* Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

Cicourel, A. (1980). *The Models of discourse analysis: the role of social structure*. *Discourse Process*, Volume 3, pp. 101–132.

Danesi, M. (2012). *Popular culture.* New York: Rowman.

Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and globalization*. London: Routledge.

Grice, H. P. (1986). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard: Harward University
Press.

Heller, M. (2011). *Paths to post-nationalism: critical ethnography of language
and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lear, J. (2011). *A Case of irony*. Harward: Harward University Press.

Martin-Jones, M. Blackledge, A. and A. Creese (2012). *The Routledge handbook
of multilingualism*. London: Routledge.

Rozina, G. (2013). *Banking and finance discourse: towards metaphor in use.*
Riga: University of Latvia Press.

Savan, L. (2005). *Slam drums and no-brainers*. New York: Knopf.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*.
London: Longman.

Thomason, S. and Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization and
genetic linguistics.* Los Angeles: California University Press.

Veisbergs, A. (2013). *English and Latvian word formation compared.* Riga:
University of Latvia Press.

Gunta Rozina
Latvijos universitetas, Latvija; rozina.gunta@inbox.lv

SOCIALINĖ INTERAKCIJA DAUGIAKALBYSTĖS KONTEKSTE: NUO TEORIJOS IKI PRAKTIKOS

Santrauka. Pastaraisiais dešimtmečiais nepaprastai išaugo tyrėjų dėmesys daugiakalbystės problemoms. Neatsitiktinai šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjami tam tikri vis didėjančio supratimo ir įsipareigojimo lingvistinei įvairovei aspektai, kuriuos galime laikyti vienu iš daugelio sėkmingą bendravimą šiandieninėje daugiakalbėje visuomenėje grindžiančių veiksnių. Teorinį tyrimo pagrindą sudaro naujausių sociolingvistinės etnografijos tyrimų įžvalgos daugiakalbystė srityje, akcentuojančios daugiakalbystės sąvokos sąsajas su daugiafunkcine kalbine kompetencija. Esama situacija rodo, kad galima išskirti tris daugiakalbystės, kuri susiformavo kaip sociolingvistikai artima tyrimų sritis, dimensijas: socialinę, institucinę ir individualią. Šios dimensijos susijusios su kalbos panaudojimo instrumentiniais tikslais praktika, siekiant efektyviai komunikuoti socialiai ir kultūriškai įvairiapusiškame kontekste. Todėl dažnai daugiakalbystės tyrimų laukas persikelia iš greta egzistuojančių kalbų analizės į atitinkamas kalbines praktikas aktualiuose socialiniuose ir (ar) politiniuose kontekstuose nagrinėjančią tyrimų erdvę, pasitelkiant kritinės analizės metodą. Empirinėje tyrimo dalyje analizuojama pasaulyje žinomos Starbucks kavos gamybos tinklo sukurta, vartojama ir pastoviai atnaujinama

populiari kalba kaip vienas iš šiuolaikinės pop-kultūros pavyzdžių. Tyrimas daro išvadą, kad norėdami sėkmingai bendrauti šiuolaikinėje socialinėje erdvėje, kalbos vartotojai turi įgyti daugiakalbę kompetenciją.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: daugiakalbystė, daugiakalbystės kompetencija, pop kultūros kalba, semantinė prasmė, pragmatinė prasmė.