Arts, Linguistics, Literature and Language
Research Journal

STEREOTYPICAL MISUNDERSTANDING IN E-CONVERSATION

Débora Cristina Longo Andrade
`` Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie``
São Paulo – SP
http://lattes.cnpq.br/1649814261787989
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9810-9693

Abstract: In this work, we intend to detect the occurrence of stereotypical misunderstandings in online conversations (e-conversations). To this end, we selected two interactional segments made up of tweets, with the aim of observing, in light of the theoretical foundations of Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics, the organization mechanism of the discursive sequences in which this misunderstanding occurs, verifying its causes and, consequently, describe the procedures that participants use, in the negotiation and/or problem solution cycle, in the ongoing interaction. In the analysis, we found that the segments analyzed expose the same structural pattern that is revealed in face-to-face conversations, that is, the phenomenon of stereotypical misunderstanding manifests itself predominantly in the interval between the origin turn and the problem repair turn. We also observed that communicative partners tend to adopt metaformulative procedures in an attempt to clarify misunderstandings and, eventually, achieve (inter)understanding in their discursive practices in the digital context.
Keywords: e-conversation; tweets; misunderstanding; negotiation; (inter) understanding.

INTRODUCTION

Taking into consideration, the fact that comprehension problems can easily occur both in face-to-face conversations and in dialogical digital interactions, this work focuses, in comprehensive terms, on the study of linguistic misunderstanding.

Knowing that most research analyzes this phenomenon in spoken text interactions and that, with the arrival of new information and communication technologies, everyday communicative practices begin to occur, intensely, in the digital context, our intention in this work is to specifically focus on the occurrence of misunderstandings in conversations produced and broadcast on the digital social network Twitter.

Methodologically, we will develop the work according to the following topics: face-to-face conversation: brief principles; misunderstanding a conversational phenomenon; e-conversation: reframing concepts and functions and, finally, the stereotypical misunderstanding in tweets.

Finally, it is appropriate to mention that the reflections presented in this work correspond to a small excerpt from our doctoral thesis entitled **A study of misunderstanding in interactions on the digital social network Twitter**, located on the research line *Procedures for constituting the meanings of speech and text*, in which processes of typology, organization and articulation are studied, as well as strategies for understanding and interpreting texts and speeches, taking into consideration, textual materiality and interactive practices.

FACE TO FACE CONVERSATION: BRIEF PRINCIPLES

In this first moment, we will explain the notion of conversation, a fundamental principle that guides this work. To this end, we will adopt a stance towards the language proposed by the theoretical collaborations arising from the Bakhtinian circle, as they have shown themselves to be rich in the development of various notions and which also find an echo in different segments of studies, in particular, in Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics.

For Bakhtin (2011[1953]), conversation is a phenomenon that takes place in the interaction between speaker and listener, that is, it is constituted through enunciation or enunciations and can only be explained in relation to the concrete situation of production. In short, it is constituted by spontaneous verbal exchange and linked to

the sphere of everyday discourse, for example, a dialogue between friends.

As for its forms of implementation, the theorist (2011) makes it clear that statements are defined by the **alternation of subjects**. This implies the fact that the speaker finishes his utterance to pass the floor to the other. This principle of alternation is evident in the simplest and most classic form of discursive communication, real dialogue, in which the interlocutors' utterances alternate.

Another peculiarity of conversation concerns an active **responsive understanding**, the form of which is established through a response/reply to the other's utterance, that is, the construction of meanings always takes place in a dialogical way, so that any utterance is intrinsically a response to previous statements and, once achieved, it opens up to the response of future statements, in a continuous process of meaning and resignification.

Based on these concepts and also based on the theoretical-analytical principles developed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (2003 [1974]), it is possible to say that conversation consists of a structurally organized activity, of a regulated nature and subject to description and analysis. Among its processing particularities, we will focus our attention on the **shift taking and distribution system** considered as a central methodological resource for the investigation, since "[...] it describes the ordering of rules observed in the organization of speech-in-interaction from the point of view of the allocation of opportunities to speak" (FREITAS; MACHADO, 2008, p. 59).

In this sense, the conversation envisages a relay operation in which participants alternate in the roles of speaker and listener, with the forms of intervention or participation of each interlocutor occurring through **turns** of speech, the structure of which may correspond to sentences, prayers, phrasal phrases, isolated words or even prosodic resources (brief interventions with no informative value, as they function as listener monitoring signals, denoting attention, agreement, reinforcement, among other functions). Let us observe, below, this turn-taking system in the interactional segment, extracted from the Nurc/SP Project (Survey 343, line 2-5)[1]:

> **L1** Have you been going out lately... by car?
>
> **L2** ((laughs)) I do but you say get out... get out... get out
>
> Do you normally go to school like this?
>
> **L1** catch the city ()
>
> **L2** Well, I think I know little about the city, right?... for example, if I were to compare it with...

We can notice, in this excerpt, that the turn-taking system ensures each participant's turn to speak, that is, when [L1] constructs and presents his statement, he passes the word to [L2] who takes it over, displaying understanding that it had in relation to the previously produced shift. This systematic approach also leads us to another notion that is the basis of studies developed by conversation analysts, specifically, **sequentially**, whose concept is related to actions constituted by the use of language in social interaction, organized in sequences of utterances produced by different participants.

In other words, when a person speaks, they do not do so in a disordered way, as they always take into consideration, what the other person said previously.

Finally, we cannot fail to mention an important characteristic examined in detail by scholars Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (2003) regarding the **repair system organization**, understood as a set of practices

1. Type of inquiry: Dialogue between two informants: L1=man (26 years old); L2=woman (25 years old). Theme: The city, commerce. Available at:<https://drive.google.com/file/d/12f9TzpEdNHdvr-K6mG1-AdedyUBL0NcD/view>. Accessed on: May 2nd. 2020.

aimed at resolving errors and violations (conversational infraction), which operate in the organization and distribution of speaking turns, as well as problems of **production, listening and understanding**, pointed out by the participants throughout the interaction, that is, it is likely that, during the conversation, a participant may not hear well what their communicative partner has just said (listening problem), or may make a mistake when saying a word (problem of production) and/ or not adequately interpreting what the other said (problem of understanding), in short, all these difficulties can compromise the progress of the interaction, or better yet, put at risk the intersubjectivity of speech-in-interaction, leading the interlocutors to suspend the course of your actions to try to resolve them.

In view of the above, we further confirm the notion that language actions can be conceived as participatory actions that, in the interactional process, are integrated in order to constitute a **conjunct action** (CLARK, 1992, 1996), that is, it is the effort arising from the contributions of both parties (speaker/speaker and listener/interlocutor) that actually results in a successful interaction.

Furthermore, with regard to the repair system, we consider it relevant to deal particularly with a practice called **third position repair**, as it deserves to be highlighted in this work, as it constitutes a resource that participants in a conversation use to resolve the **misunderstanding** – the focus of our investigation.

According to Schegloff (1992, p. 1301-3), the "third position repair" consists of a sequence of actions in three positions: in the first turn [T1], the speaker produces his utterance. In the following turn [T2], the interlocutor produces an utterance. Through what is conveyed in [T2], the speaker of [T1] realizes that the interlocutor's understanding of [T2] is problematic. Thus, in the third turn [T3], the speaker repeats his initial turn, so that the problem is resolved.

Let's see how Dascal (2006, p. 329, emphasis added) illustrates this event: let's imagine that V – a dance therapist and a foreigner (from Israel) – arrives for a group therapy session at a psychiatric hospital in Berkeley (as an observer). It is not presented by the therapist who is leading the session. After some time of participation, a conversation develops between [V] and one of the patients [P]:

> P: How long will stay here?
>
> V: About two more months.
>
> P: Ah... /rising intonation expressing 'sympathetic understanding and pity'/. I'll only be here for two weeks.
>
> V: Oh no! I'm just here for this session.

Let us note that the misunderstanding of this example is centered on the term **here**. The therapist [V], when responding to the patient's utterance ("*Another two months*"), are you sure [P] is referring to the United States (or Berkeley) in your question ("*How long will stay here?*"). She only becomes aware that she made a mistaken interpretation, when she realizes that [P] refers to the **hospitalization** scenario, in which the period of hospitalization is equivalent to the severity of the disease. Soon after, she corrects her speech, informing that she was only there for that therapy session.

Based on this fragment, it is important to mention that Schegloff (1992) also considers the possible involvement of four shifts in a repair operation, that is, the first shift is the source of the problem of understanding that could last until the fourth shift., in which the repair takes place. In fact, when describing repair operations in third and fourth positions, the author points to them as the last frontier of intersubjectivity adjustment, that is, this statement implies the recognition that problems of understanding must be

negotiated as soon as they occur, since positions 3 and 4 still allow the negotiation of data from a sequence in progress or in completion.

As we noted, the work carried out by conversation analysts makes an important contribution to the study of **misunderstanding**, mainly with regard to investigating the organizational dynamics of the sequences in which the phenomenon occurs, is signaled and, consequently, resolved.

Having made these considerations, we present, below, the concept of linguistic **misunderstanding**, taking into consideration, the factors that characterize it, as well as the interactional procedures that contribute to resolving it.

MISUNDERSTANDING: A CONVERSATION PHENOMENON

Weigand (1999, p. 769-770) characterizes linguistic misunderstanding (ME) as "a form of understanding that is partially or totally divergent from what the enunciator intended to communicate and that can normally be corrected in the development of the dialogic action game". The author (Ibid., p. 769) calls, in particular, this type of occurrence as a standard case[2] among comprehension problems, which predominantly presents the following conversational pattern, mainly in face-to-face interaction situations: **position 1**– the speaker [A] formulates his utterance; **position 2**– the listener [B] presents his understanding of the statement produced by [A]; **position 3** – speaker [A] denounces the misunderstanding by stating that [B]'s response is not in accordance with what he intended to communicate, reformulating the source of the problem, giving it a more precise contextualization, so that

the misunderstanding is resolved and the interactional sequence can continue.

In this sense, we can state that, whatever the reasons for the occurrence of this phenomenon, the **stereotypical case of misunderstanding** It is only revealed when, during the interaction, the enunciator signals, through explicit intervention, that the listener's interpretation is divergent, that is, it does not satisfy the expectation expected by him (speaker).

And by recognizing that the unfolding of communicative action is subject to all kinds of turbulence in interpretation and understanding, the speaker adopts preventive strategies, normally of a linguistic-discursive nature, through which he takes up the problematic textual segment in order to give it a new meaning. formulation, with the aim of resolving the interpretative deviation. Among these metaformulative procedures, we highlighted the **paraphrases, sanitizing repetitions and corrections** (KOCH, 2009).

According to Hilgert (2015), the *paraphrase* recaptures, with other words, to a greater or lesser extent, the meaning of a previous statement (matrix). It means, therefore, the production of a linguistic segment, "which has a relationship of semantic equivalence" (Ibid, p. 258) in relation to another statement, with a view to ensuring intercomprehension, that is, the participant uses paraphrasing when is concerned with making the interlocutor understand the statement considered unclear or even directing the understanding of a term or expression according to its interactional purposes.

Marcuschi (2015) considers repetition as an activity of textual (re)formulation, which contributes to the discursive organization and monitoring of textual coherence. In general,

2. Weigand (1999, p. 768) allows us to characterize, in particular, the misunderstanding as a "standard case", translated by Dascal (2006, p. 315) as a "standard example" and presented by Hilgert (2005, p. 141), as "standard case". We suggest the expression "stereotypical case". Furthermore, it is important to mention that our interest lies in stereotypes, due to the fact that they are revealed on the linguistic surface and, in some way, can be managed and interactionally resolved.

this strategy consists of producing similar linguistic segments two or more times, within the same communicative event, motivated by the most diverse factors, whether cognitive, textual, syntactic or interactional. Still, for the author, repetition, in terms of understanding, strengthens intensification and clarification.

In short, correction is related to the production of a linguistic statement that reformulates a previous one, considered wrong in the eyes of one of the interlocutors. "Correction is, therefore, a clear process of retrospective reformulation" (FÁVERO et al., 2015, p. 243) and arises from the need for the speaker to resolve interpretation difficulties in the previously produced segment. Barros (2001) also points out that corrections generally have interactional objectives, that is, the interlocutors, when using such a procedure, appear attentive and interested in the good development of the conversation and, therefore, in the establishment of intersubjective or emotional bonds.

In fact, it seems clear to us that a certain dose of linguistic courtesy is also necessary when negotiating misunderstandings, as signaling them can represent a threat to the **image** (face) of the interlocutors.

In this direction, we are particularly interested in the reference works prepared by Goffman (1967) and Brown and Levinson (1987 [1978]). Such theorists assume that all members of society are endowed with a face or image, which they seek to defend and preserve in interactions, consisting of two poles: positive and negative. *By positive face*, we understand the image that the individual desires for themselves in interaction with others, that is, it represents the desire for approval, appreciation and individual recognition. The negative face consists of elements that promote and maintain the individual's autonomy within their scope of action; it is related to self-preservation, the desire not to impose or reserve personal territory. In a communicative interaction, these faces can be maintained or valued or they can also be threatened.

In the context of interactions on Twitter, we assume that, in the image work carried out in the actions of reporting and resolving the misunderstanding, both courteous behaviors (in general, politically correct) and statements formulated in an aggressive, rude and even brutal. In our opinion, such impolite reactions vary according to the importance that network users attribute to the nature of the relationship established with their interaction partner (distance/hierarchy), to the space-time separation, dictated by the communicative context and, finally, to the concern to enhance or, at least, maintain your own image to the detriment of the image of others.

Having made these considerations, we assume that the digital social network Twitter offers researchers an unprecedented opportunity to observe and analyze the socio-discursive behavior of communicative partners (in particular, the image work carried out in reporting actions and forwarding the solution to the problem). misunderstanding), in a contemporary communication scenario, in which it is possible to test hypotheses and efficiently recruit subjects from the most diverse profiles.

In the following section, we will briefly characterize the social network under study. Subsequently, we will list the main characteristics of online conversation, in particular, in the Twitter environment, verifying its ability to simulate, in many aspects, elements of face-to-face conversation. To this end, some concepts brought by the main scholars of Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) will be addressed, from the perspective of speech-in-interaction studies.

E-CONVERSATION: REFLAGING CONCEPTS AND FUNCTIONS

Generally speaking, Twitter is a social networking site where users can build profiles and post instant messages based on the question "*What is happening?*". In the words of Santaella and Lemos (2010, p. 66), this conversational environment serves as "a collaborative space in which questions, which arise from interests from the most microscopic to the most macroscopic, can be freely debated and answered". In addition to messages, users can also post photos or GIFs (*Graphic Interchange Format*), that is, small animations or color images compressed into a single file.

It is worth saying that the choice of this network, to the detriment of so many available on the web, consists, above all, of its popularity and audience reach, as it forms, in an online relationship platform, subjects from different regions of the world, of different age groups. and from all economic classes, with diverse interests. Furthermore, the study of interactions in this virtual interactive environment becomes, in our view, relevant, since the sharing of ideas and points of view tends to favor moments that require participants to try in negotiating conflicts and establishing some level of harmony in your digital conversations.

According to Recuero and Zago (2009), one of the main values of Twitter is related to its use for conversation, which, as already noted, consists of a routine linguistic activity, which involves at least interaction between two participants. At the same time, it is a structurally organized process and constantly negotiated by partners during the conversational unfolding, with a view to achieving intercomprehension. We agree with the authors' opinion, as, in our view, the constitutive characteristics of the organization of a face-to-face conversation (FFC) are also evident in the internet environment.

Let's see what Herring (2010) has to tell us about this last statement:

> In informal language, Internet users often refer to textual exchanges as conversations, using verbs such as 'spoke', 'said' and 'heard' rather than 'typed', 'wrote' or 'read' to describe their text activities. CMC. Even published authors sometimes refer, unconsciously, it seems to me, to 'speakers' rather than to digital 'writers', to 'conversation' rather than to 'typed exchanges', 'turns' rather than ' messages', and so on, when reporting to the CMC. This linguistic use attests to the fact that the experience of CMC users is fundamentally similar to spoken conversation, although CMC is produced and received in writing (HERRING, 2010, p. 1-2).[3]

Recuero (2012, p. 34-5) ratifies this point of view by arguing that "although digital technologies have not, for the most part, been built to simulate conversations, they are used this way, therefore building conversational environments", such as of social networks, mainly with regard to their structure and organization (shift management system). In fact, conventions are also created to textually supplement the elements of oral language, or rather, participants in the communicative exchange use a range of resources to adapt certain specific linguistic manifestations of speech to the process of writing on the network.

Let us observe, then, how the interaction between two subject-users takes place on Twitter, with regard to the allocation of opportunities to "talk":

---

3. Author's translation of the original excerpt: "In casual parlance, Internet users often refer to textual exchanges as conversations, verbs such as talked,' 'said,' and 'heard' rather than 'typed,' 'wrote,' or 'read' to describe their CMC activities. Even published authors sometimes refer, unconsciously, it seems, to 'speakers' rather than online 'writers', 'talk' rather than 'typed exchanges', 'turns' rather than 'messages,' and so forth, when reporting on CMC. This linguistic usage attests to the fact that users experience CMC in fundamentally similar ways to spoken conversation, despite CMC being produced and received by written means."

User A: "Is your father Aydano André Motta?" 06/05/2020, 12:14 pm. Tweet.

User B: "Stepfather" 06/05/2020, 1:29 pm. Tweet.

User A: "I understood! I saw him speaking this week in the Sportv newsroom about the issue of racism in sport and how he learned a lot at home with two incredible black women, today I discovered they were Flávia and Isabela!" 06/05/2020, 1:32 pm. Tweet.[4]

In this excerpt, we verify the structural organization of the conversation, which consists of the participation of two users around a certain subject: family – reference to the user's stepfather [B].

We also found that this conversational section is guided by *thematic focus* (that is, the participants deal with a specific theme – discursive topic – another basic characteristic constitutive of the conversation). We also observed the alternation in the turn of speaking, that is, there is a mechanism intrinsic to the system that organizes the contribution of each participant, enabling the interactive exchange to occur at a specific time, in a coordinated way, attesting similarities with oral conversation.

At this point, it is appropriate to say that interactions in the network can occur either in **synchronous** (interaction of participants in real time) as well as **asynchronous** (interaction in which two or more participants do not act at the same time), so that the temporal unit becomes elastic, as the interlocutors are not always present simultaneously in the conversation (RECUERO, 2012). In general, in so-called synchronous communications, we realize that it is very common for network users to use certain resources, for example, punctuation marks, abbreviations, repetition of letters, use of capital letters, onomatopoeia, emojis, in order to simulate prototypical aspects of orality, such as: intonation, rhythm, gestures, postures, looks, expression of emotions, among others, due to the need for real-time reaction.

This way, we consider that exchanges within the scope of CMC, in addition to consisting of elements of the written modality, are also constructed at a level close to orality, insofar as they recover prototypical elements of face-to-face conversation, that is, the different semiotic systems that constitute them (verbal, paraverbal and non-verbal material).

Regarding the use of *emojis (or emoticons)* in the network language, Seara et al. (2018, p. 346) argues:

> Digital writing, evidently, does not keep up with the speed of reasoning compared to oral communication. The need for time in exchanging synchronous messages, those that can take place in real time [...], can end up giving written conversation a counterproductive and/or uninteresting character. Therefore, reducing the waiting time between "written" conversation turns proves to be a necessity, with emoji being a strong ally in this sense.

Let's see how Twitter users' appropriate linguistic resources to adapt certain specific characteristics of speech in the process of writing on the network:

> **User A**: "Who would have thought that the boy from the outskirts of iAAA would give an interview for AAA AAA ESPN" 06/11/2020, 1:14 am. Tweet.

> **User B**: "Everything works together for the good that they serve God. <3" 1:16 am, 06/11/2020. Tweet. 06/11/2020, 1:16 am. Tweet.

---

4. To analyze conversational segments, we used, for "readability reasons", the tweet citation model proposed by the *Modern Language Association* (MLA), which contains information in the following order: Last name, first name (username). "Tweet in full." Date, time. Tweet. It is worth noting that the participants' names were replaced by the term User, followed by capital letters, in alphabetical order (User A, User B, etc.), in order to protect their identities. We inform you that the absence of personal data does not constitute an obstacle to the development of our analyzes.

We noted, in this fragment, the use of **capital letters** and/or the **repeating letters** in an attempt to transmit intonational changes, a prototypical characteristic of CFF. You can also check the keyboard character combination to symbolize a heart [<3].

Let's look at the second example:

User A: "I'm in a room at Clubhouse and Dani, from Jaú, spoke about the absurd increase in deaths due to Covid19. And here is the graph that Dr. Luis Fernando Correia sent me: Jaú's situation is very serious." 02/26/2021, 11:35 am. Tweet.

User B: "The entire Bauru region (which covers Jaú, Botucatu, Lins and several other cities) is in this situation." 02/26/2021, 11:56 am. Tweet.

User C: "Take care everyone!"

In this segment, we see that user [A] comments on the increase in deaths in the city of Jaú, due to the spread of the coronavirus. User [B] accepts this statement, indicating that not only Jaú was going through this very serious situation but also the entire region of Bauru, in the interior of the State of São Paulo. In the next turn, user [C] inserts an emoticon, consisting of a crying face [😢], usually representing the feeling of sadness, and then requests: *Take care everyone!"*. As you can see, more than relying exclusively on the dexterity of your fingers writing the message, the *emoticon* has the ability to synthesize a thought, a message in a single icon/symbol, as well as expressing the state of mind of network users in relation to their turn or the interlocutor, often difficult to express in words (SEARA et al., 2018).

Furthermore, it is appropriate to comment that the possibility of approaching the speech-writing relationship and its specificities in a broader context of socio-communicative practices, namely, in conversations on Twitter, enabled us to discard the dichotomous view of two poles and assume the perspective of the continuum, that is, we assume that the text produced and transmitted on the network, in particular, an interaction on Twitter, is of **oral conception** which, however, is carried out by **half written**.

In this sense, we sought, in the German authors Koch and Oesterreicher (1985, 2007[1990]), the theoretical basis to define the medial and conceptual criteria. For these theorists, it is understood by **medial** the graphic and phonic representations of texts and by **conceptual** the perception that language users have, within the scope of their social practices, of a genre being, based on its production and construction characteristics, oral or written in character, regardless of its medial expression (phonic or graphic).

> Briefly, it can be said that they understand conceptual as the perception that language users have, within the scope of their social practices, of a genre being, based on its production and construction characteristics, of an oral or written character, regardless of its medial expression. The more the genre evokes speech, the more it is perceived as conceptually spoken; the more its strokes resemble writing, the more it is recognized as conceptually written. From this perspective, the discursive genres practiced in a society are distributed in a *continuum* that extends from the pole of prototypical orality (for example, a random conversation) to the pole of prototypical writing (for example, a legal text) (HILGERT; ANDRADE, 2020, p 659, authors' emphasis).

Focusing, then, on a possible application of the conceptual and medial criteria, it seems appropriate to say that e-conversation is close to a "[...] conceptually spoken text, despite its configuration in the graphic medium", taking into that the language user perceives it, both in production and reception, as characterized by orality, a fact that leads us to the notion proposed by Hilgert (2000) of a "written spoken text" or, in simpler terms, of a " oralized writing", as proposed by Recuero (2012).

Using theoretical-practical investigations focused on the speech-writing relationship, particularly with regard to the interactions that occur on the network, it is appropriate to also mention the notion – proposed in studies carried out by Barros (2000; 2015, page: 21) of text that is defined by "complexity", that is, text that "[...] sometimes is more speech, although it is also written, sometimes it is mainly written, even though it maintains attributes of speech".

In this direction, Leite et al. (2010) argues that – when the study refers to conversation – there is often a need to address the specificities of both speaking and writing, as well as the complexity of the relationships that are established between these two modalities of language use, mainly in which concerns the texts produced and circulated on the network, which discard the dichotomous division between them and propose the idea of continuous.

Having gathered these reflections and established these theoretical dialogues, we are certain that the text on the network, in favor of e-conversation, manifests a *unique relationship between the processes of orality and writing, in addition to the overlap of other multimodal investments, which mutually constitute the meanings of the text*. Having said that, it would not be prudent, on our part, to complete a characterization of it, as the concepts highlighted are already quite clear and operational, allowing us to check, finally, how much this *object is multifaceted in its stylistic and organizational composition*.

Given these considerations, we then feel authorized to analyze the interaction through tweets as a "conversation" (installation of the simulacrum of face-to-face communication; alternation of turns and sequentiality; vocabularies and expressions typical of speech; graphic conventions that simulate effects of meaning of orality, among others)

and, therefore, to assume the theoretical categories of linguistic conversation analysis in guiding this study, as we agree with the position of Hilgert (2020, p. 32) when arguing that the scholar of Textual Linguistics or Conversation Analysis has as its object of study the text, the "product of enunciation" placed for consideration. "It contains the marks of orality that must be perceived and identified by the analyst, guided by its theoretical and methodological foundations."

Therefore, having concluded the explanations that underlie this work, we now move on to analyzing the researched object in the light of the chosen concepts.

THE STEREOTYPICAL MISUNDERSTANDING IN TWEETS

Based on the theoretical framework described, which we consider pertinent to elucidate the phenomenon of stereotypical misunderstanding, we will present, below, our reading of the set of data delimited for this work, seeking to observe the organization mechanism of the discursive sequences in which the problem occurs (highlighted in bold); the causes that trigger the phenomenon in the unfolding of the conversation and the explicitly interactional procedures, through which the interlocutors seek to clarify this misunderstanding. It is a fact that we will not fail to address the linguistic-social attitudes of the interlocutors when addressing misunderstanding; and, finally, particularities related to the speech-writing modalities in the conversational segments analyzed.

Let us analyze, below, the first conversational segment extracted from the social network Twitter:

> User A: "they must" [RT @username: do you have the courage to have a relationship with someone who just ended a relationship for years???] 07/09/2021, 12:03 pm. Tweet.

User B: "It's a trap" 07/10/2021, 1:11 pm. Tweet.

User A: "I'm not" 07/10/2021, 1:15 pm. Tweet.

User: "I didn't mean you, beloved. I would never say something like that 😌" 07/10/2021, 1:21 pm. Tweet.

In this interaction, we observed that user [A], through a retweet (RT)[5], It questions whether interlocutors have the courage to have a relationship with someone who has just ended a long relationship. Then, user [B] responds: "It's a trap" (the origin of the problem, or better, reference statement in first position). User [A] turns to [B] and responds: "I'm not" (turn in which the misunderstanding occurred, that is, statement revealing the problem in second position). User [B] then reports the misunderstanding, saying that he did not refer to user [A] when using the term trap and that he would never say something like that (turn to repair the misunderstanding, i.e., signaling statement and third position reformulator).

We note, therefore, that [A] and [B] attribute different referents to trap, that is, [B] indicates that the **situation** of having a relationship with someone who has just ended a long relationship is a "trap". In more colloquial terms, it is equivalent to saying: "*this situation is 'a cold one' or 'a "stolen"*".

However, [A] misinterprets [B]'s statement by understanding that the fact that someone has a relationship with **her** is that of "*fall into a trap*".

Furthermore, we observed, in the repair action, the repetitive use of negation adverbs. According to Barros (2006), user [B] uses these terms as an argumentative resource to emphasize [A]'s interpretative deviation and, furthermore, to facilitate a metaformulative construction, of corrective action: "*I didn't*

mean you, beloved. I would never say something like that [...]". In fact, the use of the term "beloved" still seeks to prevent – on [B]'s part – that [A]'s social image is put at risk. And the use of the emoticon [😌], with an expressive function, aims to reinforce user [B's] feeling of upset, since [A]'s interpretation is exaggeratedly different from the interpretation he imagined.

Let's look at the next example:

User A: "The Net is sui generis. It is offline for several hours every week. But the invoice never fails. They must put finance people in the technical part and vice versa. 07/14/2021, 8:14 am. Tweet.

User B: "Look, I called a technician here, it was too much. He said that my device is very defective. The guy was great, now he's great." 07/14/2021, 8:22 am. Tweet.

User A: "The technicians are not bad. It wasn't them I was referring to. The problem is being without internet several times a month and always paying the bill in full." 07/14/2021, 8:24 am. Tweet.

User B: "Yes. That was my case. I couldn't take it anymore. But what impressed me was that they knew that the device was very defective, they didn't replace it and they charged for a terrible service. The guy just tried to improve the situation." 07/14/2021, 8:28 am, Tweet.

This interaction involves two network users. The topic in focus is the service provided by NET – a Brazilian telecommunications company, recognized for offering residential services such as pay television, internet access and fixed telephony. In 1st position, user [A] comments on the frequent occurrence of failures and interruptions in the NET signal, however the charge is carried out rigorously. According to his opinion, the company must put qualified personnel from the financial department to work on the technical side.

5. Retweeting is the retransmission of information that the user considers relevant to their group of followers, with or without a personal comment. It is important to highlight that, when retweeting a message, the user gives due credit to the original author.

In 2nd position, user [B] highlights that the service performed by a technician who responded to his request was excellent. In 3rd position, user [A] explicitly denounces the misreading of [B], by commenting that he did not refer to specialized NET technicians when he stated "technical part", but to the fact that he was left without an internet signal and be charged in full. It is clear, based on the complaint made by [A], that this is – on the part of [B] – a misunderstanding of the target of the criticism.

While [A] said he focused on the internet access service provided by NET, user [B] interpreted it as being the operator's technical assistance service. It is also worth mentioning that, in the repair action, user [A] uses a paraphrastic activity, in order to make the information contained in the statement (in 1st position) more explicit and/or convincing for his interlocutor. We note that, in 4th position, user [B] accepts the repair shift, that is, he readily agrees with the complaint and explanation of his interlocutor, when he claims to have also experienced this inconvenience, due to the decoder (device) presenting defect and not be exchanged (feedback turn, that is, statement-response) and, thus, ends the interaction by reiterating the efficiency of the technical visit.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Given, therefore, the peculiarity of the selected corpus, it was expected that the **misunderstanding negotiation cycle in e-conversation**, specifically on Twitter, occurred in the way it reveals itself in face-to-face conversation, that is, the examples investigated present regularities in the structuring of conversational segments, with reporting and forwarding the solution of the problem in third position and, consequently, its registration in the second. It must also be noted that the second example brings a fourth position, in which the interlocutor accepts the repair turn. We could not fail to emphasize that this fact suggests, according to Hilgert and Andrade (2020), that this fourth position could perhaps be integrated into the standard structure for monitoring misunderstanding, at least as a trend, insofar as its occurrence indicates a convergent action between interlocutors in the process of building (inter) understanding. In fact, we consider that this *feedback* turn (statement-response) results from the care that interlocutors take to achieve mutual understanding.

Furthermore, we found the segments analyzed unfold, in most cases, in a short sequence of statements, in synchronous (real-time) and dyadic relationships.[6] We also observed particularities related to speech-writing modalities, or better yet, traits that evoke face-to-face dialogue and that, in a way, suggest the spontaneity and fluidity of spoken manifestations, such as: the high degree of expression of subjectivity and dependence on the immediate situational context for understanding to occur, everyday lexicon, spelling deviations, abbreviations, use of punctuation marks, emoticons, colloquial expressions or slang, among others. In fact, the long permanence of tweets on the network, the possibilities of recording and storing them, as well as the great extension of their communicational reach also give greater emphasis to some characteristics of the written text, which leads us to this theoretical place reserved for the speech and speech *continuum*. writing and, in this wake, the textual and discursive reconfigurations that it implies.

Furthermore, we noticed that users effectively behave as speakers, even producing the effect of a collectively constructed conversation, through alternation of turns.

6. Dyadic: "which is relative to a group of two people (e.g.: dyadic adjustment, dyadic interaction)". Priberam Dictionary of the Portuguese Language, 2008-2020. Available at: <https://dicionario.priberam.org/di%C3%A1dica>. Accessed on June 17, 2020.

In this sense, it is evident that an interaction on Twitter is very close to a CFF both due to the linguistic-discursive evidence inscribed in the text and the perception of orality that the language user has of it in their social practices. It is precisely for these reasons that we consider such interactions as conversations and, consequently, we assume the theoretical categories of linguistic analysis of conversation in guiding this study.

Regarding the discursive linguistic attitudes of the interlocutors, we observed that, when reporting a misunderstanding, users produce certain discourtesy effects, mainly when this signaling is made explicitly, for example, in: "*It wasn't them I was referring to.*" According to Barros (2008), in these circumstances, the user (recipient) casts doubt on the capacity of the person being addressed (recipient), presenting a negative image of him and his competence. However, we note that the interlocutors, when reformulating the statement that generated the misunderstanding, end up implicitly expressing interest in their interlocutor and, furthermore, by admitting their own error, they benefit their own image, since they are carrying out a behavior that is socially approved. This way, we see that interactions on the network are sometimes markedly controversial, sometimes more clearly cooperative, giving e-conversations the balance necessary for life in society.

In this direction, it is appropriate to mention that, in a work entitled Understanding misunderstandings in dialogues, Hilgert (2005, p. 146, emphasis added), when examining surveys from the NURC Project, finds that, in "standard" cases, or in In terms of this work, "stereotypical" cases, the denunciation of the interpretative error is carried out indirectly, implicitly, almost in

"[...] careful language, if not timid, as if 'asking for permission to disagree'". We assume that this type of attenuated manifestation occurs due to the nature of the conversation, since the interlocutors interact face to face and, therefore, tend to be more courteous. Already, in our corpus of analysis, we were able to observe that there is a tendency to denounce, directly and explicitly, the misunderstanding. We believe that this attitude is due to the fact that users not only feel protected by the computer screen, but also because they do not establish a close relationship with their interlocutor. However, when the latter apologizes for the interpretative mistake, justifies the deviation and/or recognizes it, he manages, according to Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2005), to partially neutralize the imposed act with reparative behavior and, more precisely, to modify the state of the relationship. interpersonal. Consequently, it restores the ritual balance of interaction and, more positively, achieves mutual contentment and understanding.

Finally, it is appropriate to comment that the questions that promoted our investigation, as well as those that could lead to new research, reveal that we have a lot to reflect on about the linguistic-interactional phenomena that emerge in the digital context. Furthermore, we agree with Paveau (2021, p. 194), in stating that this "intense presence of digital writings [...] is an object that is both necessary and exciting for linguists of text, discourse and interaction." In this sense, we hope that other investigations will develop, question, oppose or dialogue with our readings and understandings presented here, in order to make the experience of "talking", in the network environment, increasingly cooperative and enriching.

REFERENCES

ANDRADE, Débora Cristina Longo. **Um estudo do mal-entendido na rede social digital Twitter**. 2021. Tese (Doutorado em Letras) – Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, São Paulo.

BAKHTIN, Mikhail Mikhailovich. **Estética da criação verbal**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2011 [1953].

BARROS, Diana Luz Pessoa de. Entre a fala e a escrita: algumas reflexões sobre as posições intermediárias. In: PRETI, Dino (Org.). **Fala e escrita em questão**. São Paulo: Humanitas, 2000, p. 57-77.

_____. Procedimentos de reformulação: a correção. In: PRETI, Dino (org.). **Análise de textos orais**. 5. ed. São Paulo: Humanitas FFLCH/USP, 2001, p. 129-156.

_____. Procedimentos e recursos discursivos da conversação. In: PRETI, Dino (Org.) et al. **Estudos de língua falada**: variações e confrontos. São Paulo: Humanitas, 2006, p. 47-70.

_____. A provocação no Diálogo: Estudo da descortesia. In: PRETI, Dino (org.). **Cortesia verbal**, v. 9, Projetos Paralelos – NURC/SP. São Paulo: Humanitas, 2008, p. 89-124.

_____. A complexidade discursiva na internet. **CASA** (Unesp), v.13, n. 2, 2015, p. 13-31. Disponível em: < https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/casa/article/view/8028/5756>. Acesso em 26 abr. 2021.

BROWN Penelope; LEVINSON, Stephen C. **Politeness**: some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987 [1978].

CLARK, Herbert. H. **Arenas of language use**. The University of Chicago Press., 1992.

_____. **Using language**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

CRYSTAL, David. **Language and the Internet**. Madrid: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

DASCAL, Marcelo. **Interpretação e compreensão**. São Leopoldo/RS: Editora Unisinos, 2006

FÁVERO, Leonor Lopes; ANDRADE, Maria Lúcia C.V.O.; AQUINO, Zilda G. O. Correção. In: JUBRAN, Célia Spinardi (org.). **A construção do texto falado**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2015, p. 241-256.

FREITAS, Ana Luiza Pires de; MACHADO, Zenir Flores. Noções fundamentais: a organização da tomada de turnos na fala-em-interação. In: LODER, Letícia Ludwig; JUNG, Neiva Maria (orgs.). **Fala-em-Interação Social**: Introdução à Análise da Conversa Etnometodológica, 1. ed. São Paulo: Mercado de Letras, 2008, p. 59-94.

GOFFMAN, Erving. **Interaction ritual:** essays on face to face behavior. New York: Garden City, 1967.

HERRING, Susan C. Computer-Mediated Conversation, Part I: Introduction and Overview. **Language@Internet**, v. 7, artigo 2, 2010, p. 1-11. Disponível em: < https://www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2010/2801/herring.intro.pdf>. Acesso em 15 mar. 2020.

HILGERT, José Gaston. A construção do texto "falado" por escrito na internet. In: PRETI, Dino (org.). **Fala e escrita em questão**. São Paulo: Humanitas, 2000, p. 17-55.

_____. Entendendo os mal-entendidos em diálogos. In: PRETI, Dino (org.). **Diálogos na fala e na escrita**, v. 7, Projetos Paralelos – NURC/SP São Paulo: Humanitas, 2005, p.119-153.

_____. Parafraseamento. In: JUBRAN, Célia Spinardi (org.). **A construção do texto falado**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2015, p.257-278.

_____. Elementos para a discussão do conceito de gênero oral. **Revista Letras**. Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, 2020, n. 1, p. 15-34. Disponível em: < https://periodicos.ufsm.br/letras/article/view/38794/pdf>. Acesso em: 27 fev. 2021.

_____; ANDRADE, Débora Cristina Longo. A negociação dos mal-entendidos em interações no Twitter. **Desenredo - Revista do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras da Universidade de Passo Fundo**, v. 16, n. 3, p. 657-679, set./dez. 2020.

KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, Catherine. **Os Atos de Linguagem no Discurso**: teoria e funcionamento. Trad. de Fernando A. de Almeida e Irene E. Dias. Niterói: EDUFF, 2005.

KOCH, Ingedore Grunfeld Villaça. **Introdução à linguística textual**: trajetória e grandes temas. 2. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2009.

KOCH, Peter Von; ÖESTERREICHER, Wulf. Sprache der Nähe – Sprache der Distanz. Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte. **Romanistisches Jahrbuch**, 36. Berlim; Nova Iorque: Walter de Gruyter, 1985, p. 15-43.

_____ . **Lengua hablada en la Romania**: español, francés, italiano. Tradução de Araceli López Serena. Madrid: Gredos, 2007 [1990].

LEITE, Marli Quadros; BARROS, Diana Luz Pessoa de; DIAS, Ana Rosa Ferreira; SILVA, Luiz Antônio da. A Análise da Conversação no Grupo de Trabalho Linguística do Texto e Análise da Conversação da Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação em Letras e Linguística. In: BENTES, Anna Christina; LEITE, Marli Quadros (orgs.). **Linguística de texto e análise da conversação**: panoramas das pesquisas no Brasil. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010, p. 49-87.

MARCUSCHI, Luiz Antônio. Repetição. In: JUBRAN, Célia Spinardi (org.). **A construção do texto falado**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2015, p. 207-240.

PAVEAU, Marie-Anne. **Análise do discurso digital**: dicionário das formas e práticas. 1.ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2021.

RECUERO, Raquel. **A conversação em rede:** comunicação mediada pelo computador e redes sociais na internet. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2012.

_____; ZAGO, Gabriela. Em busca das "redes que importam": redes sociais e capital social no Twitter. **Líbero**, v. 12, n. 24, 2009, p. 81-94.

SACKS, Harvey; SCHEGLOFF, Emanuel A.; JEFFERSON, Gail. Sistemática elementar para a organização da tomada de turnos para a conversa. Trad. de Adriana Maria Soares da Cunha et al. **Veredas**, v. 7, n.1-2, jan./dez. 2003 [1974], p. 9-73.

SANTAELLA, Lúcia; LEMOS, Renata. **Redes sociais digitais**: a cognição conectiva do Twitter. São Paulo: Paulus, 2010.

SCHEGLOFF, Emanuel A. Repair after next turn: the last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. **American Journal of Sociology**, v. 97, n. 5, p. 1295-1345, 1992.

SEARA, Isabel Roboredo; MARQUES, Isabelle Simões; Sebastião, Isabel. Os emojis como marcadores discursivos nas redes sociais: análise contrastiva em português e em francês. **Colóquio Internacional Marcadores Discursivos: o Português como Referência Contrastiva**. Portugal: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto, dec. 2018, p. 343-364.

WEIGAND, Edda. Misunderstanding: the standard case. **Journal of Pragmatics**, v. 31, n. 6, 1999, p. 763-785.