UVM Honors College Senior Theses   Undergraduate Theses

2020

"Yes, You Know a Dog Person When You See One, Don't You?": A Pragmatic Exploration of Dog-Related Speech

Alexander V. Benevento
University of Vermont

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uvm.edu/hcoltheses

"Yes, You Know a Dog Person When You See One, Don't You?": A Pragmatic Exploration of Dog-Related Speech

Alexander Benevento
Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics
Honors College Thesis
University of Vermont
Spring 2020

1. Abstract

In this thesis I investigate the pragmatics of dog-related speech (DRS), or the ways in which people use language when speaking around dogs. I will focus on several varieties of speech that are directed to or through a dog but are in fact intended for another human present. In particular, I look at a phenomenon that I will refer to as "interactive dogcourse" where members within the ingroup of "dog people" interact with one another in a ritualized structure of language, specific to speech with dogs, that characteristically takes on a playful, and often teasing, undertone. I argue that the structure of dogcourse in relation to speech act theory, speech acts, audience design, and politeness theory allows for a distinct environment within which people effectively communicate with one another and accomplish a variety of different social functions. I analyze both how and why people utilize DRS and interactive dogcourse to communicate with others by analyzing the form taken by such speech events, the function of dog-mediated speech, and the power/effect of the language itself.

2. Previous Work

While DRS is itself not well-studied, there are several theoretical frameworks that can provide tools for analyzing the interactions in the data I have collected. The current literature on politeness theory, speech act theory and speech acts, and audience design focuses on communication between people in everyday life, analyzing the importance of our public self image, the forms taken and the actions performed by language, and the ways in which we cater our speech to an audience. The work done with respect to child-directed speech focuses on the ways in which the register is simplified in order to better the child's development of the

language, and there has even been some research on the similarities and differences between

dog-directed speech (DDS) and child-directed speech, although this work centers around what

speech with dogs can tell us about speech with children and does not investigate the properties

and functions of the DDS itself. More recent work, though, has analyzed DRS, looking

specifically at the ways in which family members utilize speech with the family dog as a way to

facilitate different interpersonal interactions.

2.1. Politeness Theory

Brown and Levinson's (1987) work on politeness theory outlines the concept of face—a

person's public self-image—as a crucial aspect in conversation in that it is something upheld by

each interlocutor and which can be enhanced, lost, or maintained. Furthermore, it is a feature that

has a constant influence on interactions between interlocutors, where it is typically most

beneficial for each participant to maintain one another's face. Brown and Levinson break up the

notion into two main categories, positive face and negative face, and classify each as types of

desires or "wants" for interlocutors. Positive face addresses a person's positive self-image, and

importantly includes a desire that this image be accepted and approved of—that their wants are

desirable to others. Negative face focuses instead on one's freedom from both action and

imposition, and refers to a person's want for their actions to be unimpeded by others.

Any act of communication (verbal or non-verbal) has the potential to threaten an

interlocutor's face, whether positive or negative. These acts are coined face-threatening acts by

Brown and Levinson and are defined additionally as what is intended to be done as a result of

that communication. Face-threatening acts can be directed at either the speaker (such as

expressing thanks and accepting offers) or at the addressee and can take various different forms. Acts that threaten the positive face of the addressee suggest a lack of caring on the speaker's part for the addressee's feelings and wants. This can be seen when the speaker presents criticisms, complaints, disapproval, disagreement, and other similar acts that go against an addressee's positive face, such as the absence of expected affiliative behavior, as in unexpected formality. On the other hand, acts that threaten the negative face of an addressee are those that indicate no intention to maintain the addressee's freedom of actions. These are seen with requests, suggestions, warnings, reminders, and other acts that impede upon one's independence.

In these cases, as a way to counter the possible damage of face-threatening acts, interlocutors can appeal to the face of others in ways that demonstrate that there is no intention or desire for such a threat. This type of language is what Brown and Levinson call redressive action: action that gives face to the addressee either through appealing to their positive face (positive politeness) or their negative face (negative politeness). Importantly with redressive action, the speaker recognizes and takes into account the wants of the addressee's face and makes it clear that he/she wants them to be achieved as well.

Often when appealing to the face of others (particularly when appealing to one's negative face) the language takes an indirect form so as to avoid imposing on the addressee and to provide them with a certain degree of freedom. Brown and Levinson refer to the idea of directness and indirectness as going on record or off record, respectively. When going off record (indirect acts), it is common for one's message to still be clearly communicated through the illocutionary force.

2.2. Speech Act Theory and Speech Acts

The concept of illocutionary force draws from Austin's (1962) book *How to Do Things With Words* and is one of three main components of a speech act under his speech act theory. First there is locution, what is actually said. This includes both the form of the words and what they mean literally. The locution can be viewed as the surface meaning of the words and grammar themselves. Second is illocutionary force, the function of the words and the implied purpose that the speaker has with respect to what they have said. This goes beyond the surface level and delves deeper into a more indirect realm, addressing the speaker's intent when analyzing what they have said. The last component is the perlocutionary effect, the result of the words and the effect that they have on the other interlocutor(s).

Searle (1969) has expanded upon Austin's speech act theory and proposes five distinct categories of speech acts: commissives (promises, threats), directives (commands, requests), declarations (blessings, marrying), expressives (thankings, apologies), and representatives/assertives (assertions, descriptions). Commissives are speech acts where the speaker commits themselves to some action, while directives are those where the speaker attempts to get a hearer to do some action. Declarations are cases where the speaker does something in the world simply by saying the utterance itself, and expressives are where the speaker expresses their attitudes about things in the world, such as objects and actions. Representatives, or assertives, are speech acts where the speaker commits themselves to the belief of an utterance that represents how things are in the world.

Dore (1979) suggests a different method for classification, expanding upon similar main categories: requestives, assertives, performatives, responsives, regulatives and expressives. Importantly, he breaks each one down and provides specific examples for a variety of different

subsections for each overarching group. In total, Dore identifies 38 different codes, each

describing what he calls a conversational act: an utterance that both conveys information and

communicates an attitude in relation to that information. A key component with this thesis is

determining whether or not what is said on face-value matches the speaker's intention, and to

inspect the motives behind and the qualities of the speech for cases where the two do not match.

This type of analysis circles back to Searle's work in that each individual utterance can

be further divided and identified as either direct or indirect. In cases where the locution and

illocution are the same, and the speaker means exactly what they have said, the utterance is

classified as a direct speech act. On the other hand, if the locution and illocution are mismatched

and the speaker's intention differs from what they have physically said, it constitutes an indirect

speech act (Searle, 1969).

As such, this thesis is particularly interested in those instances where the language is

being used to accomplish work very much disjointed from the semantic meaning (locution) of

the information conveyed. In other words, I will focus on cases where the speaker and the

listener must understand not only what is actually said but also what is implied by the words in

addition to the context in which those words are said. It is worth noting that this package is rather

complex and includes not only the physical context, but also other aspects as well, such as the

syntax/structure, the phonology, and the intonation, for example. A large part of the indirectness

addressed in this thesis is connected to the fact that when a person speaks to a dog, their speech

must be understood by the addressee and then also inferred that the speech is not meant for the

dog, but rather for another person present. This concept is further explained in the following

section.

2.3. Audience Design

Allan Bell (1984) identifies two main axes of intraspeaker variation in his article *Language Style as Audience Design:* the responsive axis, where a speaker alters their style as a result of the extralinguistic situation, and the initiative axis, where a speaker redefines an existing situation. Bell's theory of audience design falls under the responsive axis. He argues that when speakers interact with other people, they take into account the different potential hearers that are present and alter their speech accordingly. He divides the participants in a speech event into five categories, or rather into the speaker and four types of hearer. The speaker is the first person and is the one who designs their own speech and caters it to the other interlocutor(s), who make up the audience. The members of this group (which consists of addressee, auditor, overhearer, and eavesdropper) and their respective rank can be distinguished based on whether or not they are known, ratified (acknowledged), or addressed by the speaker (Bell, 1984). Closest to the speaker is the addressee, who is known, ratified, and addressed. Second closest is the auditor, who is both known and ratified, though not addressed. Third is the overhearer, who is known but not ratified nor addressed. And last is the eavesdropper, a person who is not known, ratified nor addressed by the speaker.

These roles often correlate with the physical distance of interlocutors, ranging from closest (addressee) to farthest (eavesdropper). For example, if two people are seated at a restaurant and one person (the speaker) is ordering food, the addressee is the waiter/waitress, who is closest next to the speaker and to whom the speech is addressed. The auditor is the other person across the table from the speaker, who is still relatively close, and who is acknowledged

by the speaker. An overhearer might be the person one or two booths over (that the speaker is aware of but not acknowledging) who is farther away than both the waiter/waitress and the friend of the speaker. Lastly, an eavesdropper would be any person within earshot of (but whose presence is not known to) the speaker. This might be, for example, a bartender or a customer waiting to be seated, both of whom are farthest away and neither is acknowledged by the speaker. With this ranking, each position has the potential to influence a speaker's style, with the exception of the eavesdropper, who by definition cannot affect the speaker's language (Bell, 1984).

Taken together, exploring audience design alongside politeness theory, speech act theory and speech acts allows for an analysis of not only how and/or why people design their speech for a particular audience (in this case, on the surface, dogs), but also of what form and function the language takes in any given situation.

2.4. Child-Directed Speech

The previous work on child-directed speech focuses on both the form it takes as well as the function of the speech—in most cases, to help guide or prepare the child for proper language development. Ferguson (1975) refers to this type of speech as "baby talk" and explores the ways in which it constitutes a simplified register. He analyzes several key aspects that set baby talk apart from adult speech, addressing the structure of baby talk (including simplifying processes, clarifying processes, and expressive and identifying processes), variation within baby talk registers, the use of baby talk, and the connection between baby talk and language acquisition. Ferguson finds that baby talk is a simplified register that is used with people that are felt to be

unable to use or understand normal adult speech, and that this simpler, clearer register aids the child in their development of language.

In terms of being simpler, baby talk varies in semantics, phonology, syntax, choice of vocabulary, and forms of discourse, and Ferguson examines cross-cultural examples as evidence. He addresses the universality of baby talk as a result of its effectiveness in language socialization, and because it communicates certain social roles including age, sex, and kin. Many of the simplification processes look more closely at explicit changes in the different components of language structure previously mentioned, and while the specifics are less important for this thesis, it is worth noting the reasons as to why the speech is simplified, or clarified, in these ways. Ferguson concludes that baby talk stems from the need to use a type of speech that is easier to understand when speaking with a person that has a limited ability to communicate normally. Thus by simplifying the speech itself in a variety of ways, the register becomes a less-complicated, easier-to-understand version of adult speech that is deemed more appropriate when conversing with children. It is worth noting here that this is not necessarily limited only to speech with children as it can also be found, for example, with other simplified registers such as foreigner talk (Ferguson, 1981).

Ferguson adds that using baby talk allows for self expression in that an adult can facilitate their expression of emotions in a certain way to the child through this particular speech. At the same time, he postulates that the simplified structure of the speech aids in accelerating mother tongue acquisition, as though baby talk were a foundation upon which the child could build the rest of the (proper) adult speech grammar and lexicon. He addresses non-linguistic functions of socialization in which the child can learn important social roles within their society

with respect to age, sex, and kin. Lastly, Ferguson proposes that baby talk allows for an assignment of the society's values by means of its lexicon: a child learns what is "good", "bad", or "pretty", for example, based on what their caretaker qualifies/labels as "good", "bad", or "pretty".

Along the lines of analyzing the reasons for this type of speech, Hirsh-Pasek and Treiman (1982) explore CDS through a comparison with what they call "doggerel" (language that is used when speaking to dogs) by looking at the forms of each register as a way to identify the function of that language, focusing primarily on that of CDS. This particular study is used as a way to draw attention to the reason why certain elements of CDS emerge in the contexts they do, utilizing doggerel as a comparative register that can help shed light on this question. They argue, for example, that the well-formedness of CDS is not a result of the language being designed to be highly grammatical but rather that it arises as a result of the shortened utterance length that is characteristic of the register. To support this claim, they refer to their findings on doggerel, whose well-formedness was also found to be an artifact of utterance length.

Another example relates to the similarities found between the two registers: because both share so many features (shorter utterances; less declaratives and more imperatives and questions; more present-tense verbs; more repetition; more grammatical language; simpler sentences with few sentence-nodes; more tag questions) the data suggests that CDS is not elicited in response to the linguistic or cognitive level of the child because if this were true, CDS should be significantly different than doggerel due to the difference in linguistic level between children and dogs (Hirsh-Pasek and Treiman, 1982). The one feature that did in fact differ between these two registers is an increase in the use of deixis (the use of words whose meanings rely on the context

in which they are located), which was found to be prevalent in CDS but absent in doggerel. This difference is a functional one in that with CDS, deixis is used in a teaching fashion by means of identifying objects and establishing new words and notions, as can be seen with the utterance "This is a ball", for example (Hirsh-Pasek and Treiman, 1982). Overall, this study found social responsiveness to be a commonality shared between dogs and children, an aspect that even when lacking other linguistic or cognitive cues seems to allow for the use of CDS (Hirsh-Pasek and Treiman, 1982).

2.5. Framing Pets as Interactional Resources in Family Discourse

While there is relatively little work done on DRS itself, Tannen (2004) proposes that dogs are used as interactional resources within family discourse, identifying the ways in which people buffer criticism, offer praise, frame the dog as a conversational participant, integrate the dog as family, buffer a complaint, and bring about an apology by means of speaking as, to, or about a dog. She looks specifically at some of the different ways in which people use speech with a pet dog to communicate and interact with other family members that are present in the situation. Tannen additionally addresses the concept of ventriloquism, in which a person speaks on behalf of a nonverbal third party while that party is present, and she later extends the definition to any instance in which a speaker frames their utterances as representing another's voice (Tannen, 2010). This is particularly interesting with dogs as they are a nonverbal party that will never be able to communicate in such a way, unlike children, for example, who will eventually become competent users of the language and could, presumably, benefit from the interaction directed to or through them.

I hope to expand upon this research by exploring the specific context in which these cases of DRS occur, and by examining the structure and framework of the speech itself that allows for such interactions between people. In particular I will analyze the utterances of my data against the backdrop of some of the classic foundational theories of pragmatics. Additionally, I will progress beyond the family setting into both the workplace and an interview setting, providing a more in-depth breakdown of the language itself that draws from the research on speech act theory, speech acts, audience design, and politeness theory.

3. Procedures/Methods

I collected the majority of my data through two methods: direct observational data and interview data. For the first, I gathered data at a local doggy-daycare where I recorded conversations among employees working within a pack of 20-60 dogs. In total, I transcribed and analyzed 10 recordings (of which six were included in this study) of varying lengths up to 20 minutes from my work data. For the second method, I reached out to families in my neighborhood to hold interviews with a set of questions to ask them while in the presence of their dog(s). The interviews consisted of 14 questions, some with several follow-up parts. I recorded, transcribed, and analyzed six interviews (of which five were included in the current study) that were between 20 minutes and an hour long. One was excluded as it did not contain any instances of speech with the dog on the interviewee's part. My intention behind these interviews was not only to retrieve a bit of qualitative data but also to possibly elicit instances of in-the-moment DRS that were not planned (and were thus more natural) as a result of people potentially

including and talking to their dog(s) while answering the questions presented. I conducted the majority of the work data during the summer of 2019, and I held the interviews in October 2019.

When transcribing the recordings, I listened to them completely and looked for two main things: a) any instance where the interviewee(s) talked about or reflected on their own speech with their dog, and b) any instance of DRS. The recordings (work and interview combined) resulted in 39 pages of transcriptions, and I manually marked time stamps for each question that I asked in the interviews as well as any specific parts that I found important. When analyzing these transcriptions, I entered each utterance of DRS into a google spreadsheet with up to 13 columns that consist of: the token (utterance), the locution, the illocution, the conversational act type for the locution (drawing from Dore 1979), the conversational act type for the illocution (drawing from Dore 1979), the perceived intended meaning of the utterance, the perlocutionary effect (if there was one), the directness (either direct or indirect), the type of DRS (DDS or ventriloquism), the style (either narrative or conversation), the speech event (interview or work), the politeness theory aspect (if any), and the type of politeness theory.

I divided the "DRS type" into two overarching categories: DDS utterances and ventriloquisms. I further broke down each one as follows:

a. Dog-directed speech (DDS), which is speech directed to a dog.

b. Ventriloquism, which is speaking on behalf of a dog/voicing for a dog to another audience.

   i. Bare ventriloquism, which is when the speaker says an utterance as though they were the dog.

ii.   Prefaced ventriloquism, which is when the speaker voices for the dog after a short

preface such as "She's like," or "He goes,".

In order to better analyze my data and search for possible patterns, I created additional separate

google spreadsheets for both main categories (DDS and ventriloquisms). I further isolated

possible areas of interest, making separate sections for bare ventriloquisms, prefaced

ventriloquisms, as well as any interactions involving perlocutionary effect, in which I included

cases where a DDS utterance or a ventriloquism triggered another DRS utterance.

When coding my utterances for the "conversational act type" categories, I utilized the

coding scheme outlined by Dore in his chapter *Conversational Acts and the Acquisition of*

Language. In total, he presents 38 different codes under seven different categories, which are

similar to the categories proposed by Searle. Dore's seven main groups are: 1) requestives solicit

information or actions (e.g., "Is this an apple?"), 2) assertives report facts, state rules, convey

attitudes, etc (e.g.,"He can't do it."), 3) performatives accomplish acts and establish facts by

being said (e.g., "Watch out!"), 4) responsives supply solicited information or acknowledge

remarks (e.g., "It fell."), 5) regulatives control personal contact and conversational flow (e.g.,

"Hey!"), 6) expressives nonpropositionally convey attitudes or repeat others (e.g., "Oh!"), and 7)

miscellaneous codes (e.g., a nonverbal response). When analyzing my own data I utilized

individual codes from all seven groups except for the last one: miscellaneous codes.

4. Interactive Dogcourse

This paper focuses primarily on expanding upon the contexts that Tannen addresses in

her work on dogs as interactional resources in a family setting (Tannen, 2004), specifically those

in which people utilize a dog to not only mediate their speech and interactions with others but also to express ideas and identities and manage interpersonal relationships. As such, I hope to analyze similar interactions to those from Tannen's work, and to further isolate the context in which they are found as well as identify how that context impacts and influences the speech that is produced. I propose that these forms of communication constitute a unique genre of discourse that I will refer to as interactive dogcourse. While there are similarities to child-directed speech, I suggest that both the form and the function of dogcourse mark it as its own distinct register of language, using the concepts of speech act theory, speech acts, audience design, and politeness theory as the foundation for addressing that which sets dogcourse apart. The framework of this type of speech enables people to perform in a ritualized way of talking, specific to speech with dogs, that possesses at its core a playful and less serious undertone. Dogcourse is enacted within the ingroup of "dog people" and allows members of that group to interact and express themselves in novel and original ways that are separate from adult-directed speech (ADS) communications. Within this section, I look at some of the major concepts and theories of pragmatics in relation to dogcourse, exploring the ways in which this ritualized speech form allows speakers to accomplish the things that they do in social situations under different contexts.

4.1. Speech Act Theory, Speech Acts, and Dogcourse

In dogcourse, the intention behind the speech is often presented in an indirect manner. As a whole, mediating speech through a dog inherently adopts a certain degree of indirectness in that the intended addressee of an utterance has to infer that the speech directed at the dog is

actually intended for them. Looking more closely at the utterances themselves, however, it can be seen that the language used within dogcourse is often indirect in nature as well, drawing from the previous work done on locution, illocution, and perlocution. Keeping Austin's breakdown of the three parts of a speech act in mind, alongside Searle's categorization and Dore's further, more specific codification of speech acts, this section will look at direct and indirect speech acts, outline how utterances are categorized in relation to dogcourse, and inspect ways in which different types of DRS interact with one another with the intention of setting the stage for the sections that follow.

4.1.1. Direct Speech Acts

A direct speech act is one where the locution of the utterance is the same as the illocution, as seen with example 1:

[1] Sydney (to dog): Come here!

Here the face value (locution) is a command, where the speaker requests that the dog come to her. Her intention behind the speech (illocution) is exactly the same, that the dog come to her. In line with this is the fact that the stated addressee is the same as the functional addressee—the speaker directs her speech to the dog and also expects the dog to respond to that speech. As such, the speaker has no underlying intention that differs from the locution. In other words, she does not intend to imply anything other than what she has said—calling the dog over—and as a result the speech act is said to be direct.

4.1.2. Indirect Speech Acts

As opposed to direct speech acts, indirect speech acts are those where the locution and illocution differ. Example 2 was produced because the interviewee's dog was sniffing my coat.

[2] Eric (to dog): You smell his dogs, don't you?

Although the question is addressed to the dog, the speaker does not expect a response from the animal herself. In this case, the locution of the utterance is a yes or no question, but the illocution accomplishes a rather different set of functions. For one, his speech indirectly takes the form of an assertive, informing me that the dog was sniffing my coat, an action that could potentially be viewed as intruding upon my personal space. He also could be providing a reason as to why the dog was sniffing my coat: because she smelled my dogs on it. By asking a question to the dog, Eric indirectly draws attention to the dog's behavior. Additionally, the illocution could also take the form of a different yes or no question than the one presented in the locution, something along the lines of "Is it alright that she is smelling your coat?" In this case, his speech that is directed to the dog is actually intended for me instead, asking me if I am okay with the current behavior of his dog at that moment. This communication exemplifies not only the complexity of indirect speech acts, but also the role that implication and inference play when determining what the speaker means or hopes to communicate with any given utterance.

4.1.3. Speech Act Classification

Referring back to example 1, the command Sydney gives her dog is classified as a requestive, and more specifically, an Action Request (RQAC) in Dore's classification of conversational acts. Because the illocution of the utterance is the same, it is again classified the same way. But, for cases where the locution and illocution are different, separate classifications are required. The yes or no question in example 2 falls under the category of requestives as well, this time with the code: Choice Question (RQCH). The illocution of that yes or no question can be assigned different codes, depending on which intention is analyzed/examined. For example, it could be classified as an Assertive Description (ASDC) in which Eric draws attention to the dog's behavior simply by describing what she is doing. He also might be providing an explanation for the dog's behavior, in which the corresponding code would be an Assertive Explanation (ASEX). Furthermore, if his intention is to ask me whether or not I am okay with the dog sniffing my coat, the illocution would take the form of a Choice Question (RQCH). This type of classification as a whole is particularly useful with this thesis due to the overwhelming amount of indirect language in my data, and it helps to examine more carefully the different possible intentions that a speaker might have with respect to any given utterance.

4.1.4. Perlocutionary Effect: Following Suit

A common pattern found in my data is connected to the interactiveness of dogcourse and has to do with an utterance of one type of DRS triggering the response of another DRS utterance. This does not include cases where a DRS utterance follows an ADS utterance as with those instances, the DRS does not seem to be triggered by the ADS. Rather, the DRS is used to initiate dogcourse in response to a signal on the dog's part, such as a particular behavior, action, or

characteristic of the dog. Example 3 outlines one such instance, where Sophie's speech appears

to be in response to the dog's weight, and not to the preceding ADS utterance. In this way,

Sophie uses a quality of the dog in order to initiate dogcourse:

[3] Researcher (to Sophie, about dog): She's putting on the pounds.

Sophie (to researcher): She really is.

Researcher (to Sophie, pointing at dog's stomach): You see, like right here.

Sophie (to dog): That's probably why you don't feel good. 'Cause you're getting fat.

Because of this, I excluded analyzing similar cases for this section and instead focused

only on those where one type of DRS is clearly selected with the intention of responding to a

previous DRS utterance. What follows is an exploration of each combination of such triggers.

DDS Triggering Ventriloquism:

[4] Sophie (to researcher): Imagine if Troy and Heather had puppies.

Researcher (to dogs): Yeah you guys would make a good match then.

Sophie (for dog(s)): "We'd have the cutest little babies."

This example was gathered at my work, in which Sophie and I were working a yard

together. Her comment referred to two dogs, Troy and Heather, that are not otherwise related,

and she prompted me, in ADS, to imagine what it would be like if they had puppies together. My

response was directed at the dogs, instead of at Sophie, and in this case the initiation into

dogcourse was received and accepted by Sophie as can be seen by her response in DRS—a

ventriloquism voicing the dog(s). It is worth addressing the fact that in this case, my DDS

utterance caused Sophie to switch registers completely from ADS in her first utterance to DRS (a

ventriloquism) in her second utterance.

DDS Triggering DDS:

This combination of DRS was not very common in my data, but one instance can be seen

with the following example when Eric responds to my DDS utterances with his own DDS.

[5] Eric (to interviewer, then for dog): She's giving you the side eye right now. "I'm not being scratched
anymore."
Interviewer (to dog): Hey, you left me. I was giving you the scratches.
Eric (to dog): Are you ready to go out now? Do you need to go outside? Do you want to chase some squirrels?

When looking at the reason behind why my DDS utterances might have triggered Eric's response

in DDS (as opposed to ADS or ventriloquism, which he started with), it is important to note that

Eric's original utterance was rather accusatory, stating that my failure to continue scratching the

dog was the reason for the dog's displeasure. Because his speech ventriloquized the dog, I

accordingly responded by addressing the dog when providing a reason as to why I had stopped

scratching her. Eric's switch to DDS perhaps indicates his desire to distance himself from his

previous accusation in hopes of maintaining a positive relation with me, framing the dog as the

accuser instead of himself. By matching my DDS, he then sides with me against the original

face-threatening utterance, subsequently appealing to my positive face instead of threatening it

by agreeing indirectly that there was some other reason as to why the dog left my side. His

questions to the dog serve to demonstrate his intention to "find out" what that reason might be.

His last question could even be interpreted as an attempt to lighten the mood, as the concept of

the dog wanting to chase squirrels is a humorous one.

Ventriloquism Triggering DDS:

[6] Mia (to Sophie, about dog): Isn't it funny how she does better in here? Like the threat of the big dogs just like puts her in her place a little bit.

Sophie (for dog): It's like, "Man, maybe I'm not tough shit."

Mia (to dog): You're not that tough, are you?

Some important background information for this interaction is that it was collected at my

work, where we have different yards set up for different groups of dogs. In general, there is a

yard for smaller dogs and a yard for larger dogs. When Mia refers to "in here", she is talking

about the yard for larger dogs, and how the dog in question was previously misbehaving in the

small-dog yard but did much better when moved to the large-dog yard. Mia's ADS was followed

by a ventriloquism from Sophie, which then, interestingly, triggered a DDS utterance from Mia.

Sophie's speech accomplishes several things: it agrees with Mia's original utterances, it provides

a possible further explanation for the dog's good behavior, and it expresses humor through the

voicing of a potential thought the dog might have. In response to this ventriloquism, Mia shifts

registers from ADS to DDS, matching the register for dogcourse initiated by Sophie. Her

utterance of "You're not that tough, are you?" plays into the humor set up by Sophie while also

agreeing with her ventriloquism. Even in a short interaction like this one, it is clear that the

initiation of dogcourse triggered a change in register on Mia's part, shifting from ADS in her first turn to DDS in her second, where she directs her speech to the dog as though the dog had actually said what Sophie ventriloquized.

Ventriloquism Triggering Ventriloquism:

[7] Interviewer (to Anna, then for dog): That's Scarlett, that's what Scarlett does. She curls up and she's like "I'm staying right here."
Anna (for dog): "Can't push me."

Looking at this example, Anna responds to my ventriloquism with a ventriloquism of her own, voicing the same dog. In this case, it is clear that Anna uses her utterance to express agreement, but interestingly she does not agree with what I said per se, but rather she communicates an understanding of the situation or feeling that I was attempting to convey: the slight annoyance of when a dog decides to situate themselves in an inconvenient place and then refuses to budge. Anna additionally attributes a sense of arrogance or smugness to the dog through this speech, making the utterance a humorous one.

4.1.5. Perlocutionary Effect and the Optionality of Overt Participation

While many of the examples of dogcourse involve the participation of multiple interlocutors, this is not always the case. The structure of this type of speech allows for one-sided interaction as well, in which a speaker interacts with another person without direct participation on that person's part. Again, while this kind of interaction also takes up a jocular tone, it still

allows interlocutors the possibility to accomplish different things with their speech. Below I

outline two cases: in 8 the speech does not have any perlocutionary effect, while in 9 it does.

[8] Sophie (to dog): Rawr rawr rawr are you a little monster? You're a little gremlin.

[9] Sophie (to dog): Freddie, you better not do that. You can flirt, you can't hump.

Example 8 presents an example of language that might otherwise be considered unsuitable

without the pretext of dogcourse. Calling a dog a monster or a gremlin generally would be

viewed as inappropriate due to the connotations that come with each term, yet when within the

scope of dogcourse, these utterances are completely acceptable as a result of the humorous mood

they take on. I argue that despite Sophie's speech not eliciting a specific response on my part, it

still constitutes dogcourse with respect to Bell's concept of audience design in which even a

person that is not the direct addressee of an utterance can potentially influence the speaker's

speech. In this case, Sophie's speech was not intended solely for the dog, but rather she designed

it intentionally knowing that I was present, able to hear her utterances, and able to understand

that they were in fact intended for me and not just for the dog. As a result, while the language

provides me the option of participating directly or not, Sophie's intention importantly is still

geared towards me in some way, for example to elicit laughter, or to present to me an opinion of

hers about the dog.

      Example 9, on the other hand, does have a perlocutionary effect, which in this case

translates to the decision of involvement on my part as the intended addressee of her speech.

This example is taken from my work setting, a doggy daycare, where I work with a coworker in

a yard maintaining control of a pack of dogs. Our goal is to make sure that the dogs are behaving

and playing well. In particular, we promote play between dogs but break up anything too aggressive, including humping. By addressing the dog, Freddie (who was behind me and out of my view at the time of Sophie's utterance), and saying "you can flirt, you can't hump" Sohpie was indirectly alerting me to the dog's behavior, and also providing me with a warning: "Freddie's playing right now, but it looks like he might start humping. Be aware of his behavior and intervene if he does start humping." In this way, by enacting dogcourse, Sophie's speech takes on a joking tone that reduces the severity of the implied command, and she avoids giving me direct orders while still successfully communicating the same idea. Additionally, her speech provided me the opportunity to participate, and it indeed did result in my involvement: I received her warning and kept an eye on Freddie, prepared to intervene if necessary.

In both example 8 and example 9, the speech assumes the same qualities of interactive dogcourse that I have mentioned previously, the only difference being the lack of direct involvement of another interlocutor. However, both examples are designed specifically with the intention that another person present will hear and understand the speech. In sum, these utterances still allow for the possibility of involvement because they neither require nor forbid the other person present from responding to the speech, and they can even invite participation in other non-verbal ways.

4.2. Audience Design and Dogcourse

In this section, I will set the groundwork for the different types of DRS that will be further analyzed in this paper. Additionally, I draw attention to two important distinctions with respect to DDS and ventriloquism in relation to the concept of audience design. The first

difference has to do with the roles of the dog and the person for whom the speech is actually intended in DDS utterances. Under Bell's concept of audience design, the dog would be the addressee and the person would be an auditor (known and ratified, but not addressed). I propose that in these cases where people direct their speech to a nonverbal party such as a dog, that dog does not constitute a proper addressee because the speaker does not expect the dog to understand or comprehend their speech. Additionally, in the case of DDS utterances under the umbrella of dogcourse, the other person present (for whom the speech is intended) is treated quite differently than Bell's role of "auditor" in that the speech is designed completely for that person—not for the dog. Bell's work focuses on cases in which the auditor or overhearer affects the speaker's speech, and that the speaker modifies their speech accordingly because they know that person is present. But, in those cases, that modified speech is still intended for the addressee. With examples of DDS used in dogcourse, however, the speech is not intended for the dog (who is the addressee) as it is instead meant for the other person present. Because of this difference, I propose a new category or role for the theory of audience design: that of "pseudo-addressee". In my thesis, this role is fulfilled by the dog in examples of DDS, where the dog is simply used as a medium through which the speech is transmitted to the other person, who then constitutes the intended addressee.

The other distinction is related to the speech used with ventriloquisms, where although the language is mediated through the dog, the addressee is still the person for whom the speech is intended. In this way, ventriloquisms differ from DDS utterances because each respective type of DRS has a fundamentally different addressee. While the addressee is not affected by ventriloquisms, the speech is still inherently indirect due to a detachment of the speech from the

speaker that is reframed through the dog. Similar to the above concept of "pseudo-addressee", I suggest that ventriloquisms make use of a "pseudo-speaker" role that is connected to audience design. This role, again, is fulfilled by the dog in the cases presented in my thesis, where the dog is used as a way to present the speech in a way that is slightly distanced from the speaker themself.

Despite the difference in the role of the dog in each type of DRS, it is worth noting that the atmosphere of dogcourse still has the same effect on both DDS and on ventriloquisms. The speech in almost all cases adopts the same qualities of dogcourse, such as the playful and less serious tone. Additionally, while the way in which the speech is delivered may differ, the intention behind the speech remains the same: to communicate or accomplish some thought or action to another person present. Below is an outline of each type of DRS, with examples of both the "pseudo-addressee" and "pseudo-speaker".

4.2.1. Dog-Directed Speech and Pseudo-Addressees

In all instances of DDS, the addressee (necessarily) is the dog. But, because dogcourse is a genre of discourse between people, every utterance of DDS is taken to be indirectly directed to another person present. One example of this type of speech is the following:

[10] **Sydney (to dog):** Yes, you know a dog person when you see one, don't you?

Here, Sydney uses "you" and "a dog person" to refer both to her dog and to me (as the interviewer) respectively. This is an example of DDS in the context of dogcourse because her

speech is addressed to the dog, but actually intended for me. A further analysis of this example can be found in section 4.3.2., but it is worth noting here that Sydney's speech was modified specifically for me as the intended addressee, where the dog took on the role of a pseudo-addressee. In other words, the fact that I was present directly affected the speech that Sydney used, and she designed her speech for me with the goal of establishing a good first impression by appealing to my positive face.

4.2.2. Ventriloquism and Pseudo-Speakers

I take the term "ventriloquism" from Tannen (2004, 2010) and explore its function under the scope of dogcourse. A ventriloquism is any case in which a speaker voices for another party present, although this thesis focuses only on those in which a speaker voices a dog. Looking at example 11, for instance, Anna ventriloquizes her dog who is sitting next to her.

[11] Anna (to interviewer): Look at that, she's looking at you right now like "I want to be loved."

This example also outlines the concept of a "pseudo-speaker" and how the ventriloquized speech is much more distanced from herself than her ADS utterances are. It is in this way that the role of a pseudo-speaker is important, because it keeps the speech indirect in nature, which is conducive to other strategies, particularly with respect to politeness theory.

Interestingly, while the dog ventriloquized very often is physically present, there are cases in which this is not so:

[12] Interviewer (to Anna): You should see him after he gets a bath. I don't know what it is after a bath, but he just, like, can't handle it, and he's got no collar so I like, I try and dry him off as best I can, and then he like, sprints around the house. It's like overload, I'm like oh man.
Anna (for dog): "I gotta re-smell!"

In this case, I was explaining to Anna the behavior of one of my own dogs after he receives a bath. While the dog was not present at the time of my utterance, Anna still was able to successfully ventriloquize my dog, and in doing so communicates a range of different things (for further analysis see section 4.3.1.). Even in this case, the dog (though absent) fulfills the role of the pseudo-speaker through whom Anna presents her speech. In both examples of ventriloquisms, the addressee of Anna's speech was myself as the interviewer, and not the dog. While her speech was modified as being presented through the dog, it was still addressed directly to me.

4.3. Dogcourse and Politeness Theory

As dogcourse is specific to interactions between people, politeness theory plays an important role with respect to the ways that people go about accomplishing the things that they hope to accomplish through DRS. The predominant indirectness of the register is a natural avenue for the pragmatic strategies that are a part of politeness theory, in which, generally, interlocutors aim to maintain one another's face (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Politeness theory is especially prevalent in combination with certain speech acts, particularly those that in some way or another threaten the addressee's face (such as requests and complaints, for example). It is in these cases that dogcourse creates a safe and mutually-accepted environment through which

people can successfully perform these face-threatening acts by reducing the threat to face

through a variety of different pragmatic strategies. This section will focus on the role that

dogcourse plays with respect to appropriateness, relationships, and identities through the lens of

politeness theory strategies.

4.3.1. Appropriateness

Dogcourse allows people to communicate things that might normally be considered

strange, risky, or inappropriate in a way that is more socially acceptable, using a specific tone

that is more playful and less serious[1]. This can be seen when looking back at example 12, where

I was explaining the behavior of one of my dogs (not physically present at the time) after he

received a bath. Anna's response is atypical for regular ADS in that the verb "re-smell" doesn't

seem to quite make sense within the context unless the verb is understood as "to make oneself

smelly again", which seems to be her intention, rather than the more standard definition of "to

smell something again". If we look at how she might have conveyed this same idea in ADS, it

could take two forms: a) "He had to make himself smelly again!" or b) "He had to re-smell!"

both of which feel a bit awkward or unusual. In this way, Anna's usage of the playful tone

incorporates her novel use of the verb better than if she had stated it as ADS. Additionally, if she

had responded in ADS, it could have potentially indicated that she did not agree with the

sentiment I was attempting to express, which might even threaten my positive face because the

---

[1] I am grateful to Emily Manetta for pointing out the particular importance of utilizing dogcourse to express otherwise inappropriate information in the current COVID-19 crisis, as seen with DDS utterances such as "Let's go to the other side of the road to make sure we stay socially distant!" when passing a person on the street in order to avoid the face-threatening act of directly reminding that person to distance themselves from others.

sentiment behind my speech was to express a funny phenomenon, not to ask why that phenomenon might be occurring.

But, within the context and with the form of a ventriloquism, this utterance is perfectly acceptable and in fact accomplishes a variety of different things, including some that the ADS utterances would not. While voicing for the dog does provide a possible explanation for the dog's behavior, Anna is more so communicating comprehension of what I had said. She acknowledges the frantic state of the dog by framing his want to re-smell as a need ("I gotta…"); by doing so she both understands my story and provides additional pertinent information that contributes to the interaction in a meaningful way. When looking at the ADS equivalent utterance of either "He had to make himself smelly again!" or "He had to re-smell!", the focus is more only on the explanation of the dog's behavior and lacks the same sense of solidarity. Additionally, these examples of ADS would be more distant from the appeal to positive face—an important feature with respect to creating a feeling of connectedness—than is the case with the DRS utterance because of the shift in focus to an explanation as opposed to a communicated understanding. Speaking on behalf of the dog in this ritualized, specific manner allows Anna to adopt a jocular tone that draws the focus away from simply providing an explanation and instead emphasizes her alignment with my speech.

On a similar note, dogcourse can also be used to manipulate speech in a way that indirectly presents information about oneself that in other contexts might be considered strange or against the norm. Example 13 shows a situation where Sydney uses both a ventriloquism and DDS to provide information to me about herself as a dog owner that is not readily available, and that would normally threaten my face as an addressee.

[13] Sydney (to interviewer, about dog): He is living the good life. Yeah, he's like, "What's not to like?" You don't get as many treats as you'd like, that's what's not to like.

In this example Sydney poses a hypothetical question by voicing for her dog, and then continues on to respond to her own question with a DDS utterance. She plays off of a well-known trope that no matter how many treats a dog might have, they will always want more. As such, when she responds to the question "What's not to like?" with "You don't get as many treats as you'd like" she is indirectly providing insight into her relationship with her dog, showcasing who she is as a dog owner. In this case, she is presenting herself in a very positive light, implying that the only thing the dog might not like about his life is that he doesn't have enough treats, which, when considering the mutual understanding that all dogs will always want more treats no matter how many they may have, suggests that he is well taken care of and that he has no issues with any other area of his life. This again ties into politeness theory because if Sydney were to have boasted directly about her competence as a dog owner, it would have threatened my positive face as an addressee in that it might seem as though she was putting herself above me. Instead, dogcourse allows her to circumvent this face-threatening action by successfully presenting the same information indirectly by means of speech directed both through and at her dog. Lastly, by utilizing DRS in this case, Sydney successfully presents the information that she takes good care of her dog without her speech coming across as a brag. In fact, if she were to boast directly, her statement would lose much of its credibility and would fail to be as successful as it is when used under the scope of dogcourse. It is worth mentioning, too, that because dogcourse is conducted among those considered "dog people", her implication that she treats her dog well might take on

less of a boasting nature and more of an admirable sense of pride as a dog owner that is successfully doing her job—keeping her dog safe and happy.

4.3.2. Relationships and Identity

I propose that dogcourse authorizes the members within its ingroup to create, strengthen, and maintain both relationships and identities in a way separate from regular ADS interactions. I will begin by exploring cases in which the members performing this type of speech did not previously know each other, in order to highlight the different ways in which dogcourse pairs with politeness theory to allow for relationship building and identity enacting that are not typically available when using ADS. Looking back at example 10, the utterance was produced at the start of an interview I conducted with a neighbor I had not previously met before. I had just entered her house and sat down, and was giving her dog scratches while he sat next to me.

[10] Sydney (to dog): Yes, you know a dog person when you see one, don't you?

Here Sydney's speech takes the form of a question directed at the dog, whose structure provides a statement "you know a dog person when you see one," followed by the tag-on ending of "don't you?" In this case, she explicitly calls me a "dog person," implying that I am good with dogs, although the compliment is buffered slightly as it is mediated through her speech with her dog: in order for me to understand her utterance as a compliment to me, I would have to first understand that her speech directed at the dog was actually intended for me. As this was the first time that Sydney and I had met, her praise could be taken as an offer to begin our relationship together in a positive way. But in order to best present that information without explicitly stating it (which

would be rather strange and uncharacteristic of everyday speech), Sydney elects to utilize the

dog in such a way so that she can praise me in a more socially acceptable manner. This ties in

with the concept of politeness theory in terms of what might be considered socially acceptable

and what might be considered awkward; as it is, offering a compliment in a direct manner

actually threatens an addressee's negative face in that it restricts the addressee's independence.

In other words, if she had complimented me directly instead of indirectly through the dog, she

would have threatened my negative face by means of telling me who I am/how I am as a person.

At the same time, it is possible that a direct compliment of this nature, especially because of the

fact that we had not interacted with each other much at all when she said this utterance, could be

interpreted as too straightforward or even as insincere; for example, if she hadn't used DDS and

instead said "You are good with dogs" one might think that she was simply saying that to be nice

without having proper evidence to back it up. Her utterance as is, though, presents the

compliment through the dog, qualifying as evidence for the claim because it comes not from her

own perspective but rather from her dog's. In this case, the compliment is better supported by the

dog's point of view because he had come up to me right away and let me pet him. In this way, it

becomes much more difficult to disagree with the compliment because the disagreement would

be with the dog, then, as opposed to the speaker of the utterance.

While example 10 occurred between people who did not previously know each other

well, I have found that dogcourse is also utilized between people with existing relationships,

even those in a romantic relationship. The following example shows a back and forth interaction

between a young couple that is mediated entirely to or through their dog.

[14] Eric (to dog): Hey, what are you doing? What are you doing, is that comfortable? Are you getting a good

stretch?

Anna (for dog): "Back off, this is great."

Eric (for dog): It's like, "Shut up, dad."

Anna (for dog): "Don't make him stop!"

With this example, Eric presents a string of questions all directed at the dog asking her

what she is doing at a particular moment. His intention does not seem to be solely to criticize the

dog—there would be no reason to present such a criticism to the dog because she will never be

able to intellectually understand the indirect criticism through a series of questions. If his

intention were to reprimand the dog for doing something wrong, his speech would have been

much more direct and certainly would not have adopted any playfulness. As a result, Eric's

speech here must have some other intention: likely to draw attention to the dog's behavior in a

joking manner. In this case, the dog had stretched off of the couch so that her front legs were on

the ground but her back legs were still on the couch, resulting in the dog staying in that stretched

position. Anna's utterance of "Back off, this is great" indirectly presents a) a statement that the

dog can do what she wants and b) a request that he stop bothering the dog so much for her

action. But, importantly, within the context of dogcourse these components are lessened and the

teasing (in this case almost flirtatious) aspect of the interaction is prioritized, presenting another

option: c) a teasing criticism of Eric's "correction" of the dog's behavior. With this, the

interaction becomes a way in which the couple can strengthen their relationship by means of

joking and laughing together. The structure of dogcourse here allows for a mitigation of threat to

face and instead highlights the teasingness of the speech. In this case, it does not appear that

Anna's intention is actually to criticize her boyfriend's questioning of their dog. Instead, she addresses his questioning in a lighthearted way that undermines any negative aspects of her speech and repositions them in a teasing manner—while the locution of the imperative "Back off, this is great" is rather harsh, the framework of dogcourse casts it in a new, less serious light. This banter is then further continued with Eric's response "It's like 'Shut up, dad'" so that the exchange becomes interactive, where each interlocutor plays off of the other's speech.

In this ventriloquism, Eric refers to himself as "dad" from the dog's point of view, using dogcourse to enact that particular identity. It is worth noting that he did not say "It's like, 'Shut up, owner'" or "It's like, 'Shut up, Eric'" and instead opts to take on a parental role for the dog. In this case, he also hints at the fact that Anna would then be the mother, in that they both take care of the dog in a familial sense, breaking away from the concept of the dog as simply a pet. This distinction is further supported by the inclusion of the dog through the use of dogcourse: by including the dog as a part of the conversation, they are treating her as an interlocutor and as a family member rather than just an animal. This links back, once again, to the strengthening of their relationship as a couple: by adopting the identity of a mother and a father caring for a child, they frame their relationship as a particularly healthy and positive one.

Under the umbrella of dogcourse it is still possible for the speech to have a perlocutionary effect, that is, to solicit an action from a particular audience. For example, Anna's utterance of "Don't make him stop!" is a ventriloquism for the dog that on face value is directed at Eric but is indirectly meant for me, the interviewer (the "him" in her speech referred to me). In this case, while the dog was in the stretched out position, I was giving her scratches. By saying "Don't make him stop!" Anna was requesting that I continue scratching the dog. It is important

to note that all speech of this kind (such as requests, complaints, and criticisms, for example) that is directed either to or through the dog inherently reduces the threat to negative face because it distances the speech from the intended addressee. At the same time, this type of speech can also appeal to the positive face of the interlocutors, through means of establishing a relationship among those within the ingroup. When Anna requests indirectly that I (the interviewer) don't stop petting the dog, she also importantly includes me as a part of the dogcourse—and as a part of the friendly banter between her and her boyfriend—both making sure that I don't feel excluded from the interaction while also expressing her own willingness to create a closer relationship with me.

4.3.3. Integration of Pragmatic Strategies

Despite the breakdown of sections within this thesis, it is worth noting that dogcourse often encompasses multiple categories at once, accomplishing a variety of different things at the same time. Example 15 demonstrates strategies from each of the above categories, where within the first few minutes of the interview Eric posed the following question to his dog:

[15] **Eric (to dog):** Are you already falling asleep? Hey!

Eric's utterance is directed at his dog, and it draws attention to the dog's behavior at the time. In this case, she had lain down and closed her eyes, resting while I began asking questions of the interview. Following Dore's classification, the locution of this speech is a yes or no choice question (RQCH), although the illocution (Eric's underlying intention) is an assertion of internal report, stating the importance of my interview to him (ASIR). As the locution and illocution are

different, this is an example of an indirect speech act. This is further supported by the theory of audience design with the addition of the role I presented earlier: the dog is the pseudo-addressee through whom the speech is mediated, with the intended addressee being another person (myself as the interviewer).

Eric's speech additionally appeals to my positive face as he suggests that he cares about something that I care about—the interview. But, if he had simply said "I care about your interview" the sentiment would seem out of place or inappropriate given the context. Instead, he implies the same sentiment in a more appropriate manner by expressing it indirectly. Inviting me to participate in the same dogcourse is another way in which Eric appeals to my positive face, because he expresses his willingness to engage in this ritualized speech form with me, through which he highlights the importance of the situation to him. Additionally, by presenting the speech as directed to the dog, the utterance takes on a humorous tone, and the framework of dogcourse highlights this joking aspect and draws the utterance away from a serious accusation of the dog. At the same time, because Eric employs DDS, he also includes the dog as a part of the conversation, implying that the dog should be awake because she is a part of the interview. In this way he assigns the identity of interviewee to the dog herself, while enacting the identity of being a good interviewee himself (by means of showing his involvement and commitment to the interview as contrasted with the dog's "disinterest" in the interview). The "Hey!" at the end of his utterance is very reminiscent of a parent scolding a child for doing something they shouldn't be doing. In this way it is also possible that through Eric's gentle reprimand of the dog he assigns to her the role of "child" and enacts for himself that of "parent". It is worth noting that this

speech takes on the underlying playful and teasing tone that is characteristic of dogcourse, which helps better implement these pragmatic elements.

Ultimately, my intention with the different sections of dogcourse is to highlight some of the many things that people accomplish within this unique discourse genre, and to examine the ways in which people utilize different pragmatic strategies through speech with dogs in order to effectively communicate with others. One point worth drawing attention to is that the types of pragmatic strategies themselves are not new in and of themselves; the goal of this thesis is to examine instead the ways in which these strategies are applied to newer contexts such as that of dogcourse. In this way, people assert a great degree of flexibility through their capacity to adapt to the situation at hand by incorporating existing strategies to successfully communicate and interact with others.

5. Prefaced and Bare Ventriloquisms

In my data I collected a total of 44 unique instances of ventriloquisms: 25 prefaced and 19 bare. I define a prefaced ventriloquism as when a person introduces their ventriloquism through the use of words such as "She's like…" or "He goes…" On the other hand, a bare ventriloquism is when a person does not use a preface for their speech and instead just speaks as though they were the dog. While both types of ventriloquisms are used to present a potential thought that the dog might have, or to present something the dog might say if it were possible for the dog to do so, this section will address the differences between the two, proposing that each is selected for a specific function and that the context of the utterance helps determine which type is used.

5.1. Differences Between Ventriloquism Types

	Bare	Prefaced
Narrative	3	14
Conversation: Initiate Dogcourse	6	8
Conversation: Respond to DRS	10	3

Figure 1: Ventriloquism types and their corresponding functions

Of the 19 bare ventriloquisms that I collected, three were used in narrative speech (such as Tessa's ventriloquism in example 16) and 16 were used in conversation. Among those in conversation, six were used to initiate dogcourse (see Mia's ventriloquism in example 17), and 10 were used in response to a previous DRS utterance (see Eric's ventriloquism in example 18, a continuation of example 15) as shown in Figure 1. When looking at the prefaced ventriloquisms, 14 were used in narrative speech as a method to describe a succession of events, as seen with example 19, and 11 were used in conversation. Of those 11, eight were used to initiate dogcourse (example 20), and only three were used in response to another type of DRS (Figure 1). Even among those three examples, one instance was broken up by an ADS utterance (example 21), and another was used in response to a speaker's own DDS (example 22).

[16] Tessa (to interviewer, then for dog): We'll sit on the floor, we'll lay on their bed and it's funny. She'll kick me off of hers. "It's mine."

[17] Sophie (to researcher and Mia, about dog): Look at his leg. It looks like a turkey.

Mia (for dog): "It's stuck like this guys, I can't move it."

[18] Eric (to dog): Are you already falling asleep? Hey!

Interviewer (for dog): "It's too early."

Eric (for dog): "I need my morning nap."

[19] Sydney (to interviewer): There were always some people that had treats in their pockets, for dogs. And they would say "sit down" and so he would like, "Okay, sit. Oh you want me to sit? I'll sit."

[20] Researcher (to Mia, about dog): He did the same thing to me. He shoved his head under and flipped it up.

Mia (for dog): He's like, "That's my move. I know when I like to be petted."

[21] Lucy (for dog): "Take me."

Sophie (to Lucy, about dog): Gabe doesn't know what to do now. He's like, "I don't know what I'm doing."

[22] Mia (to dog): Let's talk about being quiet. [Dog ran away and started barking]

Mia (for dog): She's like "I gotta go bark!"

It seems, then, that the prefaced ventriloquism is used predominantly in narrative speech, and for those cases that were used in conversation, almost all were used to initiate dogcourse. In my data, bare ventriloquisms were used both to initiate dogcourse and in response to a previous

DRS utterance. These findings indicate that there is a distinction between the two, where prefaced ventriloquisms are used mostly in narration to explain a series of events, and when used in conversation, the preface serves to initiate dogcourse; importantly, they are very rarely used to respond to previous DRS utterances. While bare ventriloquisms were also used to initiate dogcourse, they were found much more often in response to a previous DRS utterance (such as the cases explored in section 4.1.4. on perlocutionary effect) in which dogcourse had already been initiated.

Prefaced ventriloquisms were almost never used in response to previous DRS utterances, and even those instances that were have certain qualities that set them aside as unusual. For example, looking again at example 22, Mia's prefaced ventriloquism is in response to her own DDS utterance, and the ventriloquism only arose due to the dog running away and barking. In this case, it seems very likely that Mia took the dog's actions as a conversational turn, where her ventriloquism of "I gotta go bark!" is used as an excuse or explanation for the dog's behavior. It is even possible to say that Mia took the dog's actions as a face-threatening act against her positive face in that the dog disregarded Mia's original request, indicating that the dog did not care about Mia's feelings or wants. In conclusion, my data shows that there is a clear distinction between when people use prefaced ventriloquisms and when they use bare ventriloquisms.

6. Conclusions

In this thesis, I have investigated the phenomenon of dogcourse, a structured framework in which people utilize speech with dogs alongside a range of pragmatic strategies to accomplish an assortment of different functions. I have examined and analyzed the ways in which people

incorporate aspects of speech act theory, speech acts, audience design, and politeness theory when speaking to others indirectly through speech with a dog.

The work on speech acts and their breakdown into three separate parts of locution, illocution, and perlocution proves useful when examining how people use dogcourse to interact socially with others. By means of identifying speakers' intent (illocution) and examining the effect (perlocution) that their speech has, I found that dogcourse often consists of a back-and-forth interaction between members where the first speaker initiates dogcourse either through a DDS utterance or a ventriloquism of the dog, and the second speaker then follows suit and responds accordingly with a DRS utterance themselves. While this type of exchange was very common, my data also further provides evidence that dogcourse permits one-sided interaction as well—instances where there was no overt participation on the hearer's part. Even in these examples, dogcourse still allowed for the speakers to effectively communicate ideas as well as perform certain speech acts by inviting the hearer to participate in alternative non-verbal ways.

In this paper I have examined dogcourse through the lens of audience design, in which a speaker modifies their speech depending on the other people that are present, and I propose the addition of two new roles to Bell's existing theory: that of pseudo-addressee and pseudo-speaker. These are of particular importance when looking at the role that the dog plays in both DDS and ventriloquisms. In DDS, the dog takes on a role similar to an addressee, although the speech is not actually meant for the dog but rather for another person present. As such, the dog in these cases takes on the role of pseudo-addressee, through whom the speech is mediated and transmitted to the other person—the intended addressee. In ventriloquisms, on the other hand, the

addressee of the speaker's speech is the other person present, and not the dog. Yet by speaking on behalf of the dog, the speech is still presented indirectly in that the speaker projects their speech onto the dog, who acts as a pseudo-speaker. In doing so, the speaker distances themselves from the speech, creating an indirect delivery of the message they intend to communicate.

The concept of politeness theory is notably relevant in dogcourse with respect to analyzing the ways in which interlocutors achieve the things they set out to achieve, looking particularly at those cases involving face-threatening acts and subsequent appeals to positive and negative face. Often by mediating speech through the dog, speakers reduce the face to threat in that the dog acts as a way to distance and buffer the threat. The ways in which speakers utilize politeness strategies to accomplish things with their speech was outlined in this thesis, specifically addressing how dogcourse interacts with expressing otherwise inappropriate speech as well as how people create and build both relationships and identities. In particular, the playful and less serious tone of dogcourse allows for speakers to articulate sentiments that in other cases (such as in ADS) might not be fully appropriate. Appealing to both positive face and negative face was found to be a valuable method for establishing and maintaining relationships, and speech with a dog plays an important role in communicating a speaker's willingness to strengthen relationships with hearers. Additionally, speech with dogs was found to be a useful way of assigning and enacting identities, especially within the ingroup of "dog people".

Lastly, I conducted an analysis of the use and the function of the two different types of ventriloquisms: bare and prefaced. My data suggests that in narrative speech, the preface for ventriloquisms helps to introduce a shift in register from ADS to DRS, and that in conversation, the preface helped to initiate dogcourse. Bare ventriloquisms were also found to initiate

dogcourse, but, unlike the prefaced version, bare ventriloquisms were found to be very common as a response to a previous DRS utterance in cases where dogcourse had already been initiated beforehand.

In conclusion, this study provides a valuable analysis of the ways in which pragmatic strategies drawn from the classic work in the field are interwoven and utilized in dogcourse, demonstrating that people are able to use and interpret these strategies in a range of different ways in order to better communicate and interact socially. Furthermore, in this thesis I highlight the importance of the dog in such interactions, outlining both how and why speakers benefit from the role of the dog as well as from the framework of dogcourse as a whole, looking specifically at how it allows for speakers to effectively communicate and accomplish the things that they do in different social situations. Future work with respect to my particular thesis could focus on specific differences between the two types of data I collected, both from my work setting and from my interview setting. This work could also explore the possible importance of the context in which the language with dogs is found, potentially comparing the framework of dogcourse to other higher-stakes ritualized speech forms (see Abu-Lughod, 1996; Ahearn, 1998). It would also be worth investigating the effect of or the purpose behind the higher-pitched voice that is often associated with DRS utterances. Additionally, a cross-cultural analysis would prove useful in examining whether people in different cultures enact in a similar discourse genre as dogcourse, and if they do, examining if similar pragmatic strategies are utilized. Lastly, the work in this thesis provides a strong foundation upon which speech with other animals could be explored.

References

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1996. Veiled Sentiments. Berkeley: UC Press.

Ahearn, Laura M. 1998. "A Twisted Rope Binds My Waist": Locating Constraints on Meaning in

      a Tij Songfest" Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 60-86.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard

      University Press.

Bell, A. (1984). "Language Style as Audience Design." *Language in Society*, 13(2),

      145-204. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4167516

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language*

      usage, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Dore, J. (1979). *Conversational Acts and the Acquisition of Language* (Elinor Ochs, Bambi B.

      Schieffelin, Ed.) Academic Press, NY.

Ferguson, C. A. (1975). *Baby talk as a simplified register*, Stanford, CA: Univ., Committee on

Linguistics.

Ferguson, C. A. (1981). 'Foreigner Talk' as the Name of a Simplified Register. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *1981*(28). doi: 10.1515/ijsl.1981.28.9

Hirsh-Pasek, K., & Treiman, R. (1982). Doggerel: motherese in a new context. *Journal of Child Language*, *9*(1), 229–237. doi: 10.1017/s0305000900003731

Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, D. (2004). "Talking the Dog: Framing Pets as Interactional Resources in Family Discourse." *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 37(4), 399-420. doi:10.1207/s15327973rlsi3704_1

Tannen, D. (2010). Abduction and identity in family interaction: Ventriloquizing as indirectness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *42*(2), 307–316. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2009.06.002

Appendix A

Sample Spreadsheet

Note: any text in italics in this spreadsheet indicates something that I as the interviewer said that was important to

keep, such as if my speech triggered another DRS utterance or was pertinent to understanding the interviewee's

utterance. I did not analyze nor draw conclusions from my own utterances.

Token	Conversational Act Type (Locution)	Conversational Act Type (Illocution)	Meaning	Direct / Indirect	DRS Type	Style	Speech event
I said the word, sorry			Explaining dog's behavior	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Sorry Lilly, I love you	ASIR	ASIR	Self-correction of her last comment; informing me that she loves both her dogs		DDS	Conversation	Interview
Yeah, and someone listened!	EXAC / ASID	EXAC / ASID	Praising dog for listening	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Good boy!	EXCL	EXCL	Praising dog for listening	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
You're not Lilly however	ASID	ASID	Expressing error on dog's part; he came even though the other dog was called for	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Come here Steve	RQAC	RQAC	Calling dog over	Direct	DDS (command)	Conversation	Interview
Good boy...Good job, good job!	EXCL	EXCL	Praising dog for listening	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
You gotta stay seated	ASRU	ASRU	Expresses disappointment; puts blame on dog	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview

Uh-huh, and you love Steve	ASAT	ASAT	Explaining why the other dog was following us	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Go home, Elsie	RQAC	RQAC	Expression of annoyance	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
And we go, "Op, there's upside-down dog!"			Addressing dog's behavior	Direct	QDDS - higher pitch maintained	Conversation	Interview
and we'll go "Oh, just airin out ma belly"	ASEX	PFJO / ASAT	Explaining dog's behavior	Indirect	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview
And we'll go, "Did you break your leg, Steve?"	RQCH	PFJO / RQAC / RQPR	Addressing/pointing out dog's position	Indirect	QDDS - higher pitch maintained	Conversation	Interview
Well, I was runnin around playing with Lilly...	RSPR	RSPR	Dog thought/attempt to be funny	Indirect	Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview
I say, "I love you, you're so cute"	ASIR / ASAT	RSCH	Response to question	Indirect	QDDS - higher pitch maintained	Conversation	Interview
How was your day?	RQPR	RSCH	Response to question	Indirect	QDDS - higher pitch maintained	Conversation	Interview
Are you tired?	RQCH	RSCH	Response to question	Indirect	QDDS - higher pitch maintained	Conversation	Interview
Like "How was your day?"	RQPR	RSCH	Response to question	Indirect	QDDS - higher pitch maintained	Conversation	Interview
What did you do today?	PQPR	RSCH	Response to question	Indirect	QDDS - higher pitch maintained	Conversation	Interview
Did you sleep all day?	RQCH	RSCH	Response to question	Indirect	QDDS - higher pitch maintained	Conversation	Interview

It's mine	PFCL	ASAT / PFJO / ASEV	Dog thought: expressing possible response dog might have	Direct	Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview
he's like "Oh yay, the more the merrier!"	ASEV	ASAT / PFJO / ASEV	Dog thought: expressing possible response dog might have; attempt to be funny	Direct	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview
So he's definitely my goofy guy, huh?					DDS	Conversation	Interview
Right Lilly?	RQCH		Request for approval	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Back me up girl.	RQAC		Expressing closeness between her and her dog; Statement: girls should stick together	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Right, we're the girls	ASID		Expressing a special relationship between her and her female dog	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Are you already falling asleep?	RQCH	ASDC / RQAC	Addressing dog's behavior/drawing attention to dog	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Hey!	ODAG	RQAC	Attempt to change dog's behavior (wake her up/make her pay attention)/Indicating that what I was doing (the interview) was important to him, despite the fact that the dog was resting	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview

It's too early

I need my morning nap	ASEX	ASEX / ASAT / PFIN	Dog thought/Explanation for dog's behavior	Direct	Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview
I gotta re-smell!	ASEX	RSAG / PFJO / PFIN	Agreement	Direct	Ventriloquism for non-present party	Conversation	Interview
She's like looking right now kinda "Wait, am I supposed to...?"	ODCQ	ASAT / ASEX	Dog thought/Provide explanation for dog's behavior	Indirect	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview
Mm, Scarlett was great too, cause as soon as I had any treats she was like "I'm your friend, I'm right over here"	ASID	ASAT / PFJO / RSAG	Dog thought/Response to what I had said	Direct	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview
We do baby talk, like we definitely do the higher pitch voice when we're trying to get her to play, like "Oh good job!"	EXCL	RSCH	Explaining that they talk in a different way to their dog	Indirect	QDDS - higher pitch maintained	Conversation	Interview
You smell his dogs, don't you?	RQCH	RQCH / ASEX	Addressing dog's behavior and providing an explanation for it	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
I smell dog on this!	*ASIR*	*RSCH / ASAT / PFIN*	*Saying the dog's behavior is okay*	*Indirect*	*Ventriloquism*	*Conversation*	*Interview*
I'm gonna rub myself all over it	ASIR	ASEX / ASAT / PFJO / PFIN / PFWA	Dog thought/Explanation for dog's behavior/attempted humor/saying "okay, it's good you're okay with her smelling your jacket because she's going to rub all over it"	Direct	Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview

Look at that, she's looking at you right now like "I want to be loved"	ASIR	RQAC / ASAT	Dog thought/Express possible want of dog	Direct / Indirect	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview
Yeah it's like "Daddy's taking forever!"	ASDC	RQAC / PFTE			QDDS		
Yeah, yeah I go "Oh Daddy's taking forever."	ASCD	RQAC / PFTE					
Yeah not you	RSAG		Confirms previous statement and includes dog in conversation	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
No, you're not allowed over here	ASRU	ASRU / RQAC	Informs me the dog was not allowed on certain parts of couch and perhaps requests that I do something to move her	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Go back on your blanket	RQAC	RQAC	Informs me the dog was not allowed on certain parts of couch	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
She loves her belly rubbed. She's like "Yup"	RSAG	RSAG / ASAT / ASEX	Dog thought	Direct	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview
Yes, are you pampered?	RQCH	ASAT	The dog is pampered	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
She curls up and she's like "I'm staying right here"	*ASIR*	*ASAT / PFJO*	*Dog thought*	*Direct*	*Prefaced Ventriloquism*	*Narrative*	*Interview*
Can't push me	PFJO	PFJO / RSAG	Dog thought	Direct / Indirect	Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview
Really Lilly?	RQCH / EXCL	ODRQ / EXCL	Addressing dog's behavior	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview

What are you doing?	RQPR	RQPR / RQAC / ODRQ	The dog's behavior isn't normal/usual for her	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Hey, hey Layla, what are you doing right now?	EXPR	RQAC / ODRQ	The dog's behavior isn't normal/usual for her	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Hey, what are you doing?	EXPR	RQAC / ODRQ	The dog's behavior isn't normal/usual for her	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Is that comfortable?	RQCH	RQCH / ASEV / ASEX	The dog's behavior isn't normal/usual for her	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Are you getting a good stretch?	RQCH	RQCH / ASEV / ASEX	The dog's behavior isn't normal/usual for her	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Back off,	RQAC	RQAC / PFPR / PFIN	The dog is allowed to do what she wants/Don't bother her so much about it	Direct	Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview
this is great	ASEV	ASAT					
It's like "Shut up, dad"	RQAC	RSAG / ASAT / RSCO / PFAP	Agreeing with his girlfriend	Direct	Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview
Don't make him stop!	RQAC	RQAC / ASAT / RSAG	Dog thought/Request for me to continue scratching Lady/Agreement with her boyfriend	Direct / Indirect	Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview
Or at least know when a dog doesn't want to see you. Cause she'll still go up to a dog that doesn't want to see her, and the dog will be like "Grrr…" and then she's like "Okay, whoops"	EXCL	EXCL / ASEV / ASAT	Dog thought/Recognition	Direct	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview

I'm not being scratched anymore	ASDC	RQAC / ASEX / PFCO	Dog thought/Explaining dog's behavior/apparent attitude	Indirect	Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview
Hey you left me, I was giving you the scratches	*ASEX*	*ASEX*	*Explaining why I wasn't giving dog scratches anymore*	*Indirect*	*DDS*	*Conversation*	*Interview*
Are you ready to go out now?	RQCH	ASEX / RSAG / PFAP	Expressing possible need of dog/Expressing possible explanation for dog's behavior	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Do you need to go outside?	RQCH	ASEX / RSAG / PFAP	Expressing possible need of dog/Expressing possible explanation for dog's behavior	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Do you want to chase some squirrels?	RQCH	ASEX / RSAG / PFAP	Expressing possible want of dog/Attempt to be funny	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
I want that			*Dog thought/Response to video I was shown*	*Direct*		*Conversation*	*Interview*
I got it yesterday, why am I not getting it now?	RQPR	ASAT / PFCO	Dog thought/Agreeing with me that the dog wanted the treat	Direct	Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview
She won't leave some nights. We're like "Let's go home." And she just like plops in the corner and is like dead weight like "No, she gives me better treats here"	RQSU	RQAC		Direct	QDDS	Conversation	Interview

She won't leave some nights. We're like "Let's go home." And she just like plops in the corner and is like dead weight like "No, she gives me better treats here"	ASDC	ASDC / ASEX			Prefaced Ventriloquism		
Yes, you know a dog person when you see one, don't you?	RQCH	ASAT	Telling me that I am a dog person and that I am good with dogs / Addressing dog's behavior (he came right up to me and let me scratch him)	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
And he was just minding his own business, you know. He was just like "Where did this come from?"	RQPR	ODRQ	Saying that her dog was not aggressive and did not do anything to cause an attack	Indirect	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview
There were always some people that had treats in their pockets, for dogs. And they would say 'sit down' and so he would like, "Okay, sit"	RSCO	RSCO / ASAT	Dog thought possible response to people who would try to make him sit with treats	Indirect	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview
Oh, you want me to sit?	RQCH	RQCH / ODCQ / ASAT	Dog thought possible response to people who would try to make him sit with treats	Indirect	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview
I'll sit	RSCO	RSCO / ASAT	Dog thought possible response to people who would try to make him sit with treats	Indirect	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview

Okay, I can do this	ASIR	ASAT	Dog thought possible response to people who would try to make him sit with treats	Indirect	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview
This is easy!	ASDC	ASDC / ASAT / PFJO	Dog thought possible response to people who would try to make him sit with treats	Indirect	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Narrative	Interview
You know. "You don't have to keep following me around the house all day long"	RQSU	RSPR	Response to interview question	Indirect	QDDS	Conversation	Interview
Come sit with me?	RQCH	RQCH / RQAC	Seeing if dog wanted to sit next to her (calling dog over)	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
You gonna come sit?	EXRP	EXRP	Seeing if dog wanted to sit next to her (calling dog over)	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
You've got a shaky leg	ASDC	ASDC / RQAC	Addressing dog's behavior	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Come here	RQAC	RQAC	Calling dog over	Direct	DDS (command)	Conversation	Interview
Come here	RQAC	RQAC	Calling dog over	Direct	DDS (command)	Conversation	Interview
Come here	RQAC	RQAC	Calling dog over	Direct	DDS (command)	Conversation	Interview
Yes, downward dog	ASID	ASID / RQAC / PFJO	Addressing dog's behavior	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
a little upward dog	ASID	ASID / RQAC / PFJO	Addressing dog's behavior / Attempt to be funny	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
a little this	EXRP	EXRP	Addressing dog's behavior / Attempt	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview

			to be funny				
a little of that	EXRP	EXRP	Addressing dog's behavior / Attempt to be funny	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Come on bud	RQAC	RQAC	Calling dog over	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
You're being interviewed,	ASDC	PFIN	Attempt to be funny / Including dog as interlocutor	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
did you know that?	RQCH	PFJO / PFIN	Attempt to be funny / Including dog as interlocutor	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
Something good to say?	RQCH	PFIN	Expressing her want to be helpful with the interview		DDS	Conversation	Interview
And so if we're in the kitchen sometimes and I'm on the high stools I'll just say "No, yeah you have to go lay down"	ASRU	RSCH	Response to interview question	Indirect	QDDS	Conversation	Interview
No I'm not gonna hold you right now	RSCH / ASRU	RSCH / ASRU	Response to interview question	Indirect	QDDS	Conversation	Interview
So sorry,	PFAP	ASIR sarcasm	Response to interview question	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview
you have to be a dog	ASRU	ASRU / ASAT	Response to interview question / Expressing idea that the dog is not a dog (implies that he is a family member, or that her relationship with him is stronger than simply a being a pet)	Indirect	DDS	Conversation	Interview

Sometimes I say "You have to be a dog now"	ASRU	ASRU / ASAT	Response to interview question / Expressing idea that the dog is not a dog (implies that he is a family member, or that her relationship with him is stronger than simply a being a pet)	Indirect	QDDS	Conversation	Interview
He is, aren't ya?	RQCH	RQAG / PFIN					
He is living the good life. Yeah, he's like "What's not to like?"	RQPR	ODRQ	Dog thought / Expressing that her dog is living a good life and doesn't have much to dislike	Indirect	Prefaced Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview
You don't get as many treats as you like	RSPR	RSPR / ASAT	Attempt to be funny / Saying that the only thing "not good" in his life is that he doesn't get enough treats	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
that's what's not to like	RSAG / RSPR	RSPR / ASAT	Attempt to be funny / Saying that the only thing "not good" in his life is that he doesn't get enough treats	Direct	DDS	Conversation	Interview
He's like "I've made my decision."							
If daddy would walk me, then maybe I would feel differently but he doesn't so...	ASEX	RSAG / ASEX	Explanation for why the dog is "her dog" and not "her husband's dog", and for why the husband has been unsuccessful in trying to win the dog over	Indirect	Ventriloquism	Conversation	Interview