

2014年度大连外国语大学学科建设专项经费资助项目

VALUE ASSESSMENT OF ENGLISH ORAL-INTERACTIONAL LANGUAGE FUNCTIONS

英语口语交际语言 功能价值评估

泰中华 著



上海交通大学出版社
SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

2014年度大连外国语大学学科建设专项经费资助项目

VALUE ASSESSMENT OF ENGLISH ORAL-INTERACTIONAL LANGUAGE FUNCTIONS

英语口语交际语言 功能价值评估

泰中华 著



上海交通大学出版社
SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

内容提要

本书作者以 Bachman 及 Palmer 交际语言能力理论下的语用能力概念、Bygate 的口语技能理论模式、O'Sullivan *et al.* 的口语语言功能模型及高校英语教学大纲为基础,以全国英语专业四级口语对话任务的真实语料为研究工具,结合大规模问卷调查系统地构建并且评估了中国大学生的英语口语交际语言功能。作者提出的口语交际语言功能评估模型具备可行性与科学性,有利于教师把握课堂环境下学生的英语口语交际特征与思维习惯,促进对口语交际能力的培养。研究结果发现了在测试环境下每项口语交际语言功能的相对价值,对细化英语教学大纲有借鉴意义。本书的读者对象为从事英语口语教学及评估的科研人员与专业研究生,也可供高等院校英语教师参考使用。

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

英语口语交际语言功能价值评估:英文/秦中华著.

—上海:上海交通大学出版社,2015

ISBN 978-7-313-12812-6

I. ①英… II. ①秦… III. ①英语—口语—研究

IV. ①H319.9

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2015)第 058585 号

英语口语交际语言功能价值评估

Value Assessment of English Oral-Interactional Language Functions

著 者:秦中华

出版发行:上海交通大学出版社

邮政编码:200030

出 版 人:韩建民

印 制:虎彩印艺股份有限公司

开 本:787 mm×1092 mm 1/16

字 数:261 千字

版 次:2015 年 4 月第 1 版

书 号:ISBN 978-7-313-12812-6/H

定 价:36.00 元

地 址:上海市番禺路 951 号

电 话:021-64071208

经 销:全国新华书店

印 张:11.75

印 次:2015 年 4 月第 1 次印刷

版权所有 侵权必究

告读者:如发现本书有印装质量问题请与印刷厂质量科联系

联系电话:0769-85252189

序

口语能力是英语学习者语言能力的重要组成部分,而交际能力更是口语能力的集中体现。对于口语交际能力的测评日益成为语言研究者和教学工作者关注的重点。传统口语测评标准多侧重于发音、流利等语言使用表征,而对口语语言使用的交际效果和语言符号在句子功能层面的输出特征关注较少,这在一定程度上导致学习者因过度重视自身的口语表达而忽略对实际交际过程的监控和管理,进而出现互动程度低、语言过分僵硬等问题。因此,如何制定一个全面、客观的英语口语交际能力标准量表是评估和解决上述问题的一个关键性课题。

本书在评估英语口语交际能力方面做出了创新式的尝试,研究结果富有成效。作者从功能语言学和测试学两个领域的视角审视了英语口语交际能力的实质;在大规模调研的基础上,指出英语口语交际能力可从语言功能的层面予以评估,并设计了英语口语交际语言功能(OLF)评估量表,以期建立口语交际语言功能理论模型。在全面分析和评估英语学习者在口语交际中析出语言功能特征的同时,作者调查了教师、专家对评估量表中每项功能的价值认同度,并通过比较和解析二者的异同,归纳出英语口语教学预期与学生实际习得成就间的关系特征。问卷调查显示了较高的信度和效度,表明模型假设成立。

本书具有以下特点:第一,文献理论的回顾与分析系统全面,对口语交际和语言功能的相关理论和最新研究做了全方位的梳理,为研究奠定了良好基础;第二,英语口语交际语言功能理论模型的测量维度划分合理,各维度间关系的界定清晰明确;模型不仅含有直接体现交际能力的互动功能维度,还包括体现语言输出能力的信息功能维度和体现策略能力的交际管理维度,因而,模型能够较为全面、客观地评价英语口语交际能力;第三,研究方法采用语料标注与问卷调查相结合的模式,数据使用客观准确,论证分析充分合理,研究结论真实可信、说服力强,体现了作者良好的科研素养和学术写作能力。

总言之,本书是一项质量较高的学术研究成果。作者提出的英语口语交际语言功能理论模型具备较好的科学性和可行性,对英语口语交际能力的系统评估及其完善具有理论借鉴意义,对完善高校英语口语教学和评估具有现实启示意义。

邹 申

上海外国语大学教授、博导

教育部高等学校外语专业教学指导委员会委员

英语专业教学分指导委员会副主任委员

2014年10月

前言

口语交际语言功能(OLF)是口语话语的重要特征,它的使用情况是口语能力的重要体现(见 Weir, 1993; O'Sullivan *et al.*, 2002 等)。然而,现有研究对于它的实际价值以及如何快速、有效地对其进行评估似乎鲜有涉及。

因此,本论文旨在提供一套口语交际语言功能模型以试图解决这一问题。该模型以 Bachman & Palmer (1996)交际语言能力理论下的语用能力概念以及 Bygate (1987)的口语技能理论框架为理论基础,以 O'Sullivan *et al.* (2002)的口语语言功能实证模型为实证基础,经过 7 个阶段的试验性应用、评估及修改设计而成。OLF 分为信息功能、互动功能和管理功能三个维度。信息功能包括提供个人/客观信息、表达个人观点、为观点提供理由、为观点提供例子、做比较、做推测、做总结、表达个人建议和表达个人喜好 9 项子功能。互动功能包括表达同意、表达不同意、询问对方观点/信息、坚持个人观点、修改个人观点、支持对方观点、试图说服对方、要求对方澄清、提供澄清和表示理解 12 项。管理功能包括发起谈话、寒暄、谈话过渡、协助展开谈话、改变话题和终止谈话 6 项。

基于 OLF 模型,本文通过平衡口语水平、性别及角色等影响因素选取 SWECCCL2.0 语料库中三年总计 240 篇字数约 15 万字的全国英语专业四级口试对话任务语料,并先后进行了模型编码与语料标注。标注教师间相关系数达到.982,标注教师内部相关系数达到.998,显示标注体系具有较高信度。之后,利用 SPSS 17.0 统计软件及 Antconc 3.2.1 检索软件,作者对标注语料分别进行了描述数据分析、*t* test 独立样本分析以及相关分析。结合语料样本,文章探讨了对话任务下中国大学生口语交际语言功能的使用特征,分析了口语水平、性别、角色及测试年份对语言功能产出的影响,阐述了可能相关的原因。本文指出该模型的建立弥补了除微观语言技能外的语言评估模式的缺失,为评估英语学习者的口语交际能力提供了基于实证的理论基础,使得实时评估口语交际能力成为可能。通过设立评判标准,文章提出口语交际语言功能模型下的三大功能,即,信息功能,互动功能和管理功能,分别反映口语交际的内容丰富性,互动程度与直接性。信息功能与互动功能总体表现反映交际的有效性。研究结果发现,各项 OLF 的产出频次差异较大,其中使用频率最高的功能有表达个人观点、为观点提供理由、询问对方观点/信息、谈话过渡等。在影响因素相关分析方面,不同口语水平、性别、角色及测试年份整体上未对 OLF 的产出显

著影响;但是,一些单项子功能的产出却出现显著性差异。尤其在口语水平方面,高水平组的考生显著较多使用互动功能。

与此同时,基于OLF模型,本研究设计一份教师问卷,参与教师180人,来自全国100余所高校。问卷主体部分讨论口语交际语言功能的重要性,采用里克特6点计分法。其中前2个项目与模型整体有关,其余27项对应模型中的27个单项子功能。该问卷旨在了解教师视角下每项OLF的使用价值。SPSS分析显示,问卷的Cronbach's Alpha达到.934,表明问卷具有较高信度;相关分析也显示了较好的效度。研究结果发现,27项功能均显示较高价值。然而,与信息功能和互动管理相比,互动功能的平均得分相对较低,这表明部分互动功能在教师看来在实际交际中使用较少。问卷分析表明教师对OLF的总体评价较高,肯定了其价值及重要性,但不同子功能的价值权重不同。

最后阶段,作者设计了一套转换公式,将考生使用OLF的实际表现与教师视角下OLF的价值评估放在同一纬度做相关分析。公式的设计主要基于OLF产出的相对频次差异。研究结果发现,教师与学生对OLF的价值评估的相关系数是.306,并不显著。这表明,教师对OLF的评估与学生对OLF的使用存在一定程度上的差异。差异主要集中在提供个人/客观信息、挑战对方观点、说服对方、坚持观点、举例子、总结、表示理解、展开对话8项功能上。差异的产生主要由测试任务的要求、测试时间的限制、考生的口语表达习惯以及教师的过高评等因素造成的。在文章的结尾,作者指出,把模型引入课堂可以使教师更准确地把握每位学生的口语交际及思辨习惯,有利于因地制宜地提高学生口语交际能力。另外,研究结果确定了每项OLF功能的相对价值,可写入教学大纲,细化并丰富其对口语交际功能的描述。

在本书撰写期间,笔者得到众多前辈和同行的指点和帮助。首先要特别感谢恩师上海外国语大学邹申教授。邹教授虽然日理万机,但在本书的选题、研究设计到撰写过程中她都给予了笔者无微不至的关怀和指导,为本书的成文打下了坚实基础。笔者在上海外国语大学读博期间,得到了诸多教授、同门及同学的帮助。陈坚林教授、梅德明教授、许余龙教授、Rod Ellis学者等专家的课程使笔者受益匪浅。非常感谢上海理工大学的刘芹教授和上海财经大学的刘宝权教授为实验前期间卷调查工作提供了宝贵的帮助。上海交通大学出版社为本书的出版提供了大力的支持。在此一并感谢。

笔者的家人在这几年来一直理解和支持笔者的研究工作,谨表示最崇高的敬意。

尽管本书经历了若干次的修改,但笔者才疏学浅,书中难免存在不妥和疏漏之处,恳请各位专家、同行批评指正。

泰中华

2014年10月于上海

Preface

As important features of oral discourse, oral-interactive language functions (shortened as OLF) play a substantial role in reflecting oral ability (See Weir, 1993; O'Sullivan *et al.*, 2002, etc.). However, their actual values and the methods and means by which to assess them have hardly been touched upon.

This dissertation attempts to provide a feasible solution to the above concern by establishing an OLF model. The model is designed on the theoretical basis of pragmatic competence description by Bachman & Palmer (1996) and Bygate (1987)'s oral skill theory, and on the empirical basis of O'Sullivan *et al.* (2002)'s practical model of oral language functions. After 7 phases of experimental application, modification and evaluation, the finalized version comes into being. The OLF model is composed of three main functions: informational functions, interactive functions, and managing interaction. Informational functions refer to those language functions that convey information during oral interactions. It comprises 9 item functions, namely, providing personal/objective information, expressing personal opinions, justifying opinions, providing examples for opinions, comparing/contrasting, speculating, summarizing, expressing personal suggestions, and expressing personal preferences. Interactive functions refer to those language functions that make conversations interactive during oral interactions. It includes 12 item functions, namely, agreeing, disagreeing, asking for opinions/information, insisting on personal opinions, modifying personal opinions, supporting, challenging opinions, persuading, asking clarification, providing clarification, checking understanding, and providing understanding. Managing interaction refers to those language functions that manage and control the progress and direction of conversations during oral interactions. It covers 6 item functions, namely, initiating conversation, greeting, transitioning, developing, changing topic, and terminating conversation.

Based on the OLF model, this dissertation selected 240 pieces (around 150,000

words) of the transcriptions of the role-playing task of TEM 4 oral test samples from the corpus SWECCCL after balancing the factors of oral proficiency, gender, and role of the test takers in three consecutive years. With proper encoding, the corpus samples went through two phases of trial tagging, the results of which have shown that the inter-rater reliability and intra-rater reliability reach up to .982 and .998 respectively, indicating that the tagging system is reliable. With the aid of software SPSS 17.0 and AntConc 3.2.1, the author has done descriptive, *t* test and correlation analysis separately on the tagged samples. Coupled with sample discourse analysis, this paper discusses the factor influence of oral proficiency, gender, role, and testing year on OLF elicitations, and expands on the most pertinent reasons accordingly. This paper points out that the establishment of the OLF model enriches modes of language assessment that are not micro-linguistic, and provides an empirically-based theory for assessing English learners' oral communicative ability, as well as makes it possible to assess such an ability in real time. Also, with a proper rating criterion in place, the three main functions, i. e. informational functions, interactional functions, and managing interaction are capable of reflecting oral richness, interactiveness, and directness respectively; the joint elicitation of informational functions and interactional functions mirrors the communicative effectiveness of oral interaction. The research has found that a significant variation exists in elicitation frequencies of different OLF item functions, among which the most frequently used include expressing personal opinions, justifying opinions, asking for opinions/information, transitioning, etc. In respect of factor influence, the differences of oral proficiency, gender, role and testing time do not exert any significant impact on OLF elicitations. Yet, *t* test shows that difference does exist on some OLF item functions, especially for the factor of oral proficiency. It has been found that higher-level groups use significantly more interactional functions than lower-level groups.

Also, an OLF-based teacher questionnaire is designed. With the aid of several experts, the questionnaire receives two revisions before being sent out. The survey involves 180 teachers from more than 100 colleges and universities across China. The main part of this questionnaire including 29 questions, relates to the importance of OLF. The first 2 questions pertain to the value of OLF as a whole while the rest 27 ones correspond to the 27 item functions in the OLF model. The choices for each question adopt the 6-point Likert scale. This questionnaire is aimed at finding out the

use values of OLF from teachers' perspective. SPSS analysis shows that the questionnaire's Cronbach's Alpha reaches .934, indicating a rather high reliability, and desirable correlation coefficients indicate satisfactory validity. Research findings display that all of the 27 OLF item functions register relatively high values. Yet, compared with the mean scores of informational functions and managing interaction, that of interactional functions is relatively low, indicating that interactional functions are less often used in real communication from teachers' standpoints. Questionnaire analysis indicates that the values and significance of OLF are clearly confirmed by the teacher and different OLF item functions exhibit different value weightings.

Towards the end of the research, the author designs a system of conversion formulae and attempts to correlate students' OLF elicitation patterns with teachers' OLF evaluations by putting them on the same rating scale. The design of the formulae is based primarily on the difference of actual OLF elicitation frequencies. The research results discover that the correlation coefficients between students' and teachers' OLF value assessment amounts to .306 which is not significant. This finding indicates that some degree of difference exists between the two sides' assessment on OLF values, which is intensively manifested in 8 item functions: providing personal/objective information, challenging opinions, persuading, insisting on opinions, providing examples for opinions, summarizing, providing understanding, and developing. The difference is mainly caused by test task requirements, test time restraints, candidates' oral expression habits, teachers' over-evaluation, etc. At the end of this dissertation, the author highlights that introducing the OLF model into classroom help teachers know students' oral communicative and critical thinking habits better, thus contributing to the enhancement of students' oral communicative ability. Besides, the relative weighting of each item OLF can be penned into teaching syllabus, enriching its descriptions on oral communicative functions.

The present book takes the author's doctoral dissertation as a basis. During the process of writing, I have received help and guidance from a number of professors and fellow researchers. First and foremost, my heartfelt gratitude naturally goes to Professor Zou Shen at Shanghai International Studies University (SISU), who has inspired me into carrying out this project and given me instructive advice and suggestions on research design and manuscript writing, which helped lay a solid foundation for the current book. My gratitude also goes to Professor Chen Jianlin,

Professor Mei Deming, Professor Xu Yulong, and Professor Rod Ellis among other professors, from whose lectures I benefited a lot during my three years of doctoral study at SISU. My appreciation particularly goes to Professor Liu Qin at Shanghai University of Science and Technology (USST) and Professor Liu Baoquan at Shanghai University of Finance and Economics (SHUFE), who have rendered me great help in the implementation of pre-stage questionnaire survey. Besides, professors and my fellow Ph. D candidates at SISU always lent me a hand without hesitation. Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press offered substantial support for the publication of this book. All the above deserve my sincere gratitude.

Finally, I am deeply indebted to my family for their constant support, encouragement, and endurance throughout these years.

Though the present book has undergone several modifications, it is far from perfect. Any suggestion or criticism is welcome.

Tai Zhonghua

Shanghai

October, 2014

List of Acronyms

AC	asking clarification
ACTFL	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
AF	interactional functions
AG	agreeing
AO	asking for opinions or information
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference
CET	College English Test
CET 4	Band 4 of CET
CET 6	Band 6 of CET
CET - SET	Spoken English Test of CET
CO	challenging opinions
CT	changing topic
CU	checking understanding
DG	disagreeing
DV	developing
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EO	providing examples for opinions
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
FCE	First Certificate in English
GT	greeting
IC	initiating conversation
IF	informational functions
IO	insisting on personal opinions
JO	justifying opinions
MA	Master of Arts
MI	managing interaction

MO	modifying personal opinions
OC	observation checklist
OLF	oral-interactive language functions
OPI	Oral Proficiency Interview
PC	providing clarification
PD	persuading
PI	providing personal or objective information
PO	expressing personal opinions
POLF	patterns of OLF
PP	expressing personal preferences
PS	expressing personal suggestions
PU	providing understanding
SM	summarizing
SO	supporting
SOPI	Semi-direct Oral Proficiency Interview
SP	speculating
SWECCCL	Spoken and Written English Corpus of Chinese Learners
TC	terminating conversation
TEFL	Teaching English as a Foreign Language
TEM	Test for English Majors
TEM 4	Band 4 of TEM
TEM 4-Oral	Oral Test of TEM 4
TR	transitioning
UCLES	University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate
VOLF	values of OLF
VS	comparing or contrasting

Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction	1
1.1	Study background	1
1.1.1	Oral interaction	2
1.1.2	Language function	2
1.1.3	Oral test tasks	4
1.1.4	Role-playing task of TEM 4 oral test	4
1.2	Study objectives and significance	5
1.2.1	Study objectives	5
1.2.2	Study significance	5
1.3	Study configuration	6
1.4	Summary	7
Chapter 2	Literature Review	8
2.1	The definition of oral-interactional language functions	8
2.1.1	The main theories and researches related to OLF	8
2.1.2	Critical thinking and initial definition of OLF	22
2.2	The reasons for the study on OLF	27
2.2.1	Requirements from teaching syllabus	27
2.2.2	Feedback from teachers	29
2.2.3	Feedback from students	30
2.2.4	Theoretical supports	31
2.3	Reasons for choosing pair work	32
2.4	Summary	36
Chapter 3	The OLF Theoretical Model	37
3.1	Model construction bases	37
3.1.1	Theoretical basis	37
3.1.2	Empirical basis	39
3.2	Model development process	40
3.3	Model makeup and interpretation	48

3.4	Definitions of OLF within the model	50
3.4.1	Informational functions	50
3.4.2	Interactional functions	51
3.4.3	Managing interaction	53
3.5	OLF characteristics	54
3.6	Model applicability and explanative force	55
3.6.1	Model applicability	55
3.6.2	Model explanative force	56
3.7	Summary	57
Chapter 4	Study Design	59
4.1	Study questions	59
4.2	Study plan and methodology	60
4.3	Corpora analysis	61
4.3.1	Corpora collection and classification	61
4.3.2	Corpora encoding and tagging	62
4.3.3	Data processing	69
4.4	Questionnaire survey	70
4.4.1	Questionnaire design	70
4.4.2	Data processing	73
4.5	Summary	74
Chapter 5	Corpora Analysis on the Patterns of OLF	75
5.1	Tagging reliability	75
5.2	Distribution features of OLF	76
5.2.1	General features	76
5.2.2	Local features	84
5.3	Factor-based OLF elicitation correlations	99
5.3.1	OLF elicitation correlation with regard to the testing year	99
5.3.2	OLF elicitation correlation with regard to oral proficiency	100
5.3.3	OLF elicitation correlation with regard to gender	101
5.3.4	OLF elicitation correlation with regard to the factor of role	101
5.4	Discussion	102
5.5	Summary	104

Chapter 6	Questionnaire Survey on the Values of OLF	106
6.1	Questionnaire reliability	106
6.2	Questionnaire validity	107
6.3	Distribution features of VOLF	112
6.4	Discussion	115
6.5	Summary	117
Chapter 7	Correlation Study between POLF and VOLF	118
7.1	Correlation analysis	118
7.2	Discussion	122
7.3	Summary	123
Chapter 8	Conclusions	125
8.1	Value assessment results	125
8.2	Implications and recommendations	126
8.2.1	Toward oral English teaching syllabus design	126
8.2.2	Toward oral English classroom teaching	128
8.2.3	Toward oral English testing	128
8.2.4	Toward oral English learning	130
8.3	Limitations	130
8.4	Research orientations	131
8.5	Summary	132
Bibliography		134
Appendix I		147
Appendix II		149
Appendix III		150
Appendix IV		151
Appendix V		155

Chapter 1



Introduction

“Language ability in general includes five aspects of listening, speaking, reading, writing and translating, among which speaking is an important component and plays the most essential role in inheriting and developing a language.” (Zhao, 2012: 39) Its significance can be illustrated by Yalden’s claim that “a language lives only when it is spoken.” (1987: 53) Speaking as an important skill for any second language learner has drawn great attention from both the field of foreign language education and society in China. However, according to the assessment results of two major large-scale oral tests, the Spoken English Test for College English Test and the Spoken English Test of TEM 4, “the oral proficiency of Chinese college students is far from satisfactory”. (Liu, 2010: 2) Even though the oral rating criteria have room to be polished, some common problems remain the same, like low accuracy, insufficient fluency which mostly belong to micro-linguistic skills in line with rating criteria and teaching requirements. Yet, the fostering and assessment of macro-linguistic skills or patterns have been largely ignored, which lead to the missing of the aspects of interactional effectiveness and way of communication. In this regard, O’Sullivan *et al.* (2002) firstly broached the viewpoints of taking language functions as oral ability on an empirical basis. Then, what are the values of oral language functions in judging interactional effectiveness and way of communication under testing environments? Since teaching has impacts on learning, teachers’ viewpoints on these functions as macro-linguistic skills will be reflected in their teaching. The values of these functions need to be figured out by comparing students’ performance with teachers’ evaluations on them to enhance understanding of oral language ability as well as to establish a link between teaching, testing and learning of oral English.

>>>> 1.1 Study background

In conjunction with the concerns as indicated by the title of this dissertation, this

section unfolds itself through four major phases of defining some basic concepts, namely, the introduction and definition of oral interaction, language function, oral test tasks, and the role-playing task of TEM 4 oral test.

1.1.1 Oral interaction

Tepper (1978) suggests that oral interaction may be simply defined as the transmission and reception of thoughts, ideas, feelings and attitudes by verbal and nonverbal means, between two or more individuals. This term distinguishes itself from any written form of communication with regard to the way of output, but in the meantime “both of them include two linguistic activities: encoding and decoding” (Liu, 2010: 13). The other aspect worth noting is the feature of interaction, which as commonly recognized involves two or more speakers. It means that such oral activities as monologue, public speech, or a typical lecture cannot be labeled as an oral interaction, but rather a one-way oral output. This type of oral activity is fixed to some extent in duration, pace or well predictable due to the definite purpose set beforehand. In contrast, a dialogue or group discussion as typical types of oral interaction can only be predicted or judged as it draws to an end, and the participants involved in the interaction have to draw on their impromptu abilities or strategic communication skills to maintain or develop it. In this sense, oral interactions are more effective than monologues in mobilizing or eliciting the whole aspects of oral ability.

1.1.2 Language function

Language function does not sound like an academic term, but people's awareness of it may well date back to as early as when language research begins. As a matter of fact, in the early period of 20th century, an increasing number of researchers like linguists, psychologists, or critics put forward a variety of theories on the definition or classification of language function, most of them believing in the multi-function of a language. Among them are several prominent experts like Buhler (1934), German psychologist, Jakobson (1960), American linguist, Richards (1929), British literary reviewer, Lyons (1977), British linguist, and Halliday (1985), British linguist, whose theories have exerted a great influence upon the language research in the later years.

Buhler (1934) describes language in terms of representational function, expressive function, and vocative function, briefly defined as the function of stating events, of showing the speaker's characters, and of exerting influence upon the listener respectively. According to Buhler, representational function plays a primary role among the three functions. Likewise, Jakobson (1960) also believes in the existence of difference with respect to importance among various language functions. In his work entitled “Linguistics and Poetics”, language functions are generally divided into six