

A Critical Pragmatic Exposition of Stigmatization

¹Fareed Hameed Al-Hindawi, ²Siham Mohammed Hasan Alkawwaz, ³Maha Al-Mohammed

¹Department of English/College of Education/Islamic University/Najaf/Iraq, fareedhameed3@gmail.com

²Department of English/College of Languages/University of Kufa/Najaf/Iraq, siham.alkawwaz@uokufa.edu.iq

³Department of English/College of Arts/ Imam Ja'afar Al-Sadiq University/Najaf/Iraq,
maha_alm12@yahoo.com

Abstract

Granted that language suffices the basic needs of social communication, it is known to be governed by certain factors (ethnicity, religion, gender, status) that in one way or another crystalize societal attitudes. Case in point, a stigma is a verbalized social attitude in the sense that it transmutes opinions into authoritative motives, ideals, and ideologies. With its negative reputation, a stigma unfairly smears its designated target creating a life-long scar of classificatory abuse. Moreover, as a socially empowering tool of alienation, stigmatization basically implies the disclosure of abnormality by marking with a permanent label, i.e., a stigma. The paper is a preliminary exposition of stigmatization from a linguistic vantage point, with focus on the usage of stigmas and their ideological quality. The investigation of stigmatization takes on a critical stance with a general reflection and examination of some dangerous power-driven stigmas that are ruling societal discourses. For this purpose, the paper formulates and uses a special set of concepts, bearing on the very essence of pragmatics, to dissect the very nature of stigmatization. Findings sustain that as an indicant of deviance, stigmatized discourse disseminates prejudicial discrimination into societal conductance.

Keywords: stigmatization; stigmatized discourse; critical pragmatics, power; ideology; proposition; truth-conditionally; truth-functionally.

I. INTRODUCTION

Conceptualizing the notion of stigma, which is the situation of the individual who is disqualified from full social acceptance, from a linguistic frame of reference is a fairly fresh advancement since all previous attempts were more or less in the fields of psychology (B. Wright), sociology (E. Lemen), and even clinical studies (F. Macgregor et al, 1953). For this reason, the paper is initiative in presenting a set of pragmatic hypotheses on the topic of stigmatized discourse; theses hypotheses which are to be further explored and empirically validated, aim at grounding the foundations for a critical analysis.

In this introduction, after briefly defending the legitimacy of a critical pragmatic approach of stigmatization, a working definition for stigmatized discourse is proposed, where stigmatized discourse is truth-conditionally and truth-functionally doubted or denounced within a given culture or society. In section 2, a detailed description is presented of the meanings, theories, features, and criteria that best designate stigmatized discourse. Then, section 3 discusses the typology of pragmatic strategies involved in discursive stigmatization and how they are reflected and dealt with in the realm of language use. Within a pragmatic framework, section 4 delineates a critique to stigma infested discourse. In section 5, probable alternatives and

suggestions are put forth in the treatment of language indisposition from any stigmatizer.

1.1. Stigmatization Conceptions and Assumptions

The Greeks, who were apparently strong on visual aids, originated the term stigma to refer to bodily signs designed to expose something unusual and bad about the moral status of the signifier. The signs were cut or burnt into the body and advertised that the bearer was a slave, a criminal, or a traitor; a blemished person, ritually polluted, to be avoided, especially in public places. Later, in Christian times, two layers of metaphor were added to the term: the first referred to bodily signs of holy grace that took the form of eruptive blossoms on the skin; the second, a medical allusion to this religious allusion, referred to bodily signs of physical disorder. Today the term is widely used in something like the original literal sense, but is applied more to the disgrace itself than to the bodily evidence of it. Furthermore, shifts have occurred in the kinds of disgrace that arouse concern (Goffman, 1963: 11).

As Goffman implies (1990), a stigma discloses abnormality, not normalcy. Therefore, it may be deduced that internalization is the opposite of stigmatization. Significantly, internalization is seen as the process of sedimentation and familiarity, which contrasts with stigmatization, the insolent process of alienation.

1.2. A Working Definition

It is necessary to provide an axiomatic working definition of prototypical stigmatization, rather than explore the complexity of the intuitive notion attached to the word. Thus, we need to address stigmatization as a phenomenon, and not concern ourselves with the semantic content of the lexical item 'stigmatization'. The following working definition of stigmatization is set within a hypothetical deductive framework:

A working definition: A stigmatized discourse is a discourse produced in order to limit or label an addressee using a set of generalized propositions with appropriate strategies.

With regards to the characteristics of the propositions conveyed by stigmatized discourse, they are posited as truth-conditionally or, better, truth-functionally defective. The latter implying that they are roughly wrong in some way: false,

unlikely, doubtful, inaccurate, inconsistent with the common ground; and therefore should be rejected by the hearer under normal circumstances.

1.3. Stigmatization within a Linguistic Framework

In the literature of social psychology, a wealth of good work has been done on stigma. Goffman (1963), for one, reviews work on stigma to see what it can yield for sociology by describing the structural preconditions of stigma. Basically, the term stigma is used by Goffman (1963: 13) to "refer to an attribute that is deeply discrediting" and is the product of a "special kind of relationship between attribute and stereotype".

As a special type of derogatory language, stigmatization in the linguistics has been studied alongside colonization (Perier, 2016), discrimination (), inequality (),

From the perspective of critical sociolinguistics, stigmatization has been studied alongside discrimination and acceptance as forms of socially less accepted varieties of language (Beljić, 2015). The study observes the interaction between society, language and cultural models, such as language ideologies, and the relationship between language and social power. Ultimately, stigmatized varieties of Serbian and Spanish were found to be associated with various beliefs, prejudices, negative attitudes, stereotypes and linguistic judgments.

1.4. Stigmatization as a Type of Language Use

Any researcher approaching the field of stigmatization, be it in linguistics, discourse analysis, psychology, sociology or political science, is aware of the semantic complexity and the lack of clear-cut definition for the concept stigmatization. This is especially true when it applies to a specific behavior towards other individuals, and to a type of linguistic and communicative behavior in particular.

Literally, to stigmatize is to shame or brand a person in a more symbolic way (to characterize or brand as disgraceful or ignominious according to the American Heritage Dictionary), and sometimes to label a person to a set of unwanted characteristics that form a stereotype. By comparison, the word stigmatization, when

applied to stigmatized discourse, seems to be a kind of lexicalized metaphorical derivation. It is about using a device or strategy without which the speaker would not be able to change the addressee's or listener's beliefs and behavior.

Therefore, stigmatization of an individual or group is directly related to applying labeled constraints, particularly those which one is not directly aware of. These constraints act on the process of information treatment and are built up with more or less efficient and sophisticated strategies and which aims at alienating the target in a way or another. In effect, the commitment of the addressee to the propositions conveyed by the stigmatized discourse must be sincere, while in fact the propositions expressed are problematic at several levels. Likewise, freedom of thought, or at least the illusion of it, is a necessary condition for stigmatization.

1.5. Stigmatized Discourse

Even more complex is the notion of stigmatized discourse. Concerning its definition, two options are available. First, stigmatized discourse can be a type of discourse, therefore identifiable through formal features. Second, stigmatized discourse can be a type of language use. If stigmatized discourse is a discourse type, like narration, then either some linguistic forms can be found only in stigmatized discourses, or stigmatized discourse may be sustained by a unique type of structure, for example specific argumentative structures. In both cases, these particularities would provide a formal ground for stigmatized discourse identification.

Although stigmatized discourse is not officially a discourse type according to purely linguistic criteria, yet some formal features may be more present in stigmatized discourses than in non-stigmatized discourses, none. One of the main criteria to judge by is the intention on the part of the speaker, an intention which is not cooperative in the Gricean sense (regarding the maxim of quality and quantity). The speaker aims at giving manifestness to a certain number of assumptions to the hearer and have him consent to them, provided that they would be rejected under normal conditions.

Therefore, stigmatized discourse is ultimately a pragmatic problem. It is a type of usage of natural language, and can be identified only through notions like goals, intentions, and broader aspects of pragmatic processing, which,

in turn, explain the quantitatively and qualitatively high presence of some formal features (some types of argument schemes and fallacies, some semantically loaded expressions, some connotative words etc.) because they are of some help in achieving the speaker's goal. Accordingly, one of the core problems of stigmatization in language resides in the identification by the hearer of stigmatized intention through formal and non-formal features; when this detection fails, stigmatization is rendered effective and influential.

In short, there is no deny that linguistic structures and formal phenomena taking place in stigmatized discourse are provided by the speaker in order to trigger specific pragmatic processing. In other words, even if some linguistic elements are statistically frequent in stigmatized discourse, these linguistic elements/structures aim at weighing on the pragmatic level, in order to affect the mental state of the hearer. Thus, stigmatization is not about using metaphors, or some particular syntactic structure, or some specific semantic feature of quantifiers, but about making them play a particular role at the pragmatic level.

Turning now to the problem of the propositional content of stigmatized utterances, it is noticed that stigmatization is often regarded as a sort of exaggeration or even rumor. Moreover, it is argued that sometimes the person doing the act of stigmatizing actually believes in the proposition expressed himself. In such cases the stigmatization in fact always entails a kind of content which is not fully adhered to by the speaker.

2. Theorizing the Social Stigma

By all means, social stigma is the disapproval of, or discrimination against, a person based on perceivable social characteristics that serve to distinguish them from other members of a society. Generally, social stigmas can occur in many different form with the most common dealing with culture, gender, race, intelligence, and health. Those being stigmatized usually feel different and devalued by the society.

Likewise, Jacoby et al. (2005) claim that stigma may also be described as a label that associates a person to a set of unwanted characteristics that

form a stereotype. It is also affixed. Once people identify and label one's differences, others will assume that is just how things are and the person will remain stigmatized until the stigmatizing attribute is undetectable.

2.1. Main Theories

French sociologist Émile Durkheim was the first to explore stigma as a social phenomenon in 1895 stating that "society has the power to judge and punish" (Durkheim, 1982). More importantly, it was Erving Goffman who pioneered in the description on stigma in his distinctive theory of social stigma (1963).

In Goffman's theory of social stigma, a stigma is an attribute, behavior, or reputation which is socially discrediting in a particular way: it causes an individual to be mentally classified by others in an undesirable, rejected stereotype rather than in an accepted, normal one. Goffman defined stigma as a special kind of gap between virtual social identity and actual social identity:

While a stranger is present before us, evidence can arise of his possessing an attribute that makes him different from others in the category of persons available for him to be, and of a less desirable kind—in the extreme, a person who is quite thoroughly bad, or dangerous, or weak. He is thus reduced in our minds from a whole and usual person to a tainted discounted one. Such an attribute is a stigma, especially when its discrediting effect is very extensive [...] It constitutes a special discrepancy between virtual and actual social identity. (Goffman 1963:3).

Goffman (1963) divides the individual's relation to a stigma into three categories:

1. the stigmatized are those who bear the stigma;
2. the normals are those who do not bear the stigma; and
3. the wise are those among the normals who are accepted by the stigmatized as "wise" to their condition.

In Link and Phelan's stigmatization model, they propose that stigma exists when four specific components converge (Link & Phelan, 2001):

1. Individuals differentiate and label human variations.

2. Prevailing cultural beliefs tie those labeled to adverse attributes.

3. Labeled individuals are placed in distinguished groups that serve to establish a sense of disconnection between "us" and "them".

4. Labeled individuals experience "status loss and discrimination" that leads to unequal circumstances.

Subsequently, in this model, the term stigma is applied when labeling, stereotyping, disconnection, status loss, and discrimination all exist within a power situation that facilitates stigma to occur.

2.2. The Stigmatized and the Stigmatizer

Goffman (1963) emphasizes that the stigma relationship is one between an individual and a social setting with a given set of expectations; thus, everyone at different times will play both roles of stigmatized and stigmatizer (or, as he puts it, "normal"). Basically, the stigmatized are ostracized, devalued, scorned, shunned and ignored. In spite of the fact that the experience of being stigmatized may take a toll on self-esteem, academic achievement, and other outcomes, many people with stigmatized attributes have high self-esteem, perform at high levels, are happy and appear to be quite resilient to their negative experiences (Dovidio et al., 2000).

From the perspective of the stigmatizer, Crocker (2000) maintains that stigmatization involves threat, aversion and sometimes the depersonalization of others into stereotypic caricatures. Stigmatizing others can serve several functions for an individual, including self-esteem enhancement, control enhancement, and anxiety buffering, through downward-comparison; comparing oneself to less fortunate others can increase one's own subjective sense of well-being and therefore boost one's self-esteem.

2.3. Six Dimensions of Stigma

The "Six Dimensions of Stigma" were developed to augment Goffman's two levels: the discredited and the discreditable. Goffman considered individuals whose stigmatizing attributes are not immediately evident. In that case, the individual can encounter two distinct social atmospheres. In the first, he is

discreditable, in other words, his stigma has yet to be revealed but may be revealed either intentionally by him (in which case he will have some control over how) or by some factor, he cannot control. Of course, it also might be successfully concealed; Goffman called this passing. In this situation, the analysis of stigma is concerned only with the behaviors adopted by the stigmatized individual to manage his identity: the concealing and revealing of information. In the second atmosphere, he is discredited, in other words, his stigma has been revealed and thus it affects not only his behavior but the behavior of others. Jones et al. (1984) added the "six dimensions" and correlate them to Goffman's two types of stigma, discredited and discreditable.

1. Concealable – the extent to which others can see the stigma
2. Course of the mark – whether the stigma's prominence increases, decreases, or disappears
3. Disruptiveness – the degree to which the stigma and/or others' reaction to it impedes social interactions
4. Aesthetics – the subset of others' reactions to the stigma comprising reactions that are positive/approving or negative/disapproving but represent estimations of qualities other than the stigmatized person's inherent worth or dignity
5. Origin – whether others think the stigma is present at birth, accidental, or deliberate
6. Peril – the danger that others perceive (whether accurately or inaccurately) the stigma to pose to them.

2.4. Stigmatization & Deviance

Stigma occurs when an individual is identified as deviant, linked with negative stereotypes that engender prejudiced attitudes, which are acted upon in discriminatory behavior. Goffman illuminated how stigmatized people manage their "Spoiled identity" (meaning the stigma disqualifies the stigmatized individual from full social acceptance) before audiences of normals. He focused on stigma, not as a fixed or inherent attribute of a person, but rather as the experience and meaning of difference (Shaw, 1999).

Gerhard Falk expounds upon Goffman's work by redefining deviant as "others who deviate from the expectations of a group" and by categorizing deviance into two types (Falk, 2010):

1. Societal deviance refers to a condition widely perceived, in advance and in general, as being deviant and hence stigma and stigmatized. "Homosexuality is, therefore, an example of societal deviance because there is such a high degree of consensus to the effect that homosexuality is different, and a violation of norms or social expectation".
2. Situational deviance refers to a deviant act that is labeled as deviant in a specific situation, and may not be labeled deviant by society. Similarly, a socially deviant action might not be considered deviant in specific situations. "A robber or other street criminal is an excellent example. It is the crime which leads to the stigma and stigmatization of the person so affected."

2.5. Stigma Properties

Any ideological attitude communicated via language, affiliated to certain people, and spread across societies is certainly a composite of distinguishable qualities. For an accurate classification of stigmas, it is important that they first possess the following properties:

- a. Publicity: the quality of being open to public view and serving to let people know about something.
- b. Practicality: concerned with actual use rather than theoretical possibilities and making good sense.
- c. Directness: the quality of being honest and straightforward in attitude and speech.
- d. Boldness: the trait of being willing to undertake risk as well as the quality of standing out strongly and distinctly.
- e. Subjectivity: referring to judgments and attitudes based on individual personal impressions, feelings, and opinions rather than external facts.
- f. Biasness: inclination to a particular side; one-sidedness.
- g. Generalizability: the capacity of being generalized to more people or cases.

h. Specificity: the capacity of restricting to a certain group or case.

i. Concision: the property of briefness or brevity; short and to the point.

2.6. Stigma Types

Stigmatization as a social phenomenon has its unique features and dimensions that need to be made explicit before it could be approached linguistically and pragmatically. With regards to type, Goffman (1963: 14) indicates that there are three grossly different types of stigma. First there are abominations of the body - the various physical deformities. Next there are blemishes of individual character perceived as weak will, domineering or unnatural passions, treacherous and rigid beliefs, and dishonesty, these being inferred from a known record of, for example, mental disorder, imprisonment, addiction, alcoholism, homosexuality, unemployment, suicidal attempts, and radical political behavior. Finally there are the tribal stigma of race, nation, and religion, these being stigma that can be transmitted through lineages and equally contaminate all members of a family.

In Unraveling the contexts of stigma, authors Campbell and Deacon describe Goffman's universal and historical forms of stigma as the following (Campbell & Deacon, 2006):

- Overt or external deformities – such as leprosy, clubfoot, cleft lip or palate and muscular dystrophy.
- Known deviations in personal traits – being perceived rightly or wrongly, as weak willed, domineering or having unnatural passions, treacherous or rigid beliefs, and being dishonest, e.g., mental disorders, imprisonment, addiction, homosexuality, unemployment, suicidal attempts and radical political behavior.
- Tribal stigma – affiliation with a specific nationality, religion, or race that constitute a deviation from the normative, i.e. being African American, or being of Arab descent in the United States after the 9/11 attacks.

It is commonly believed that to be stigmatized means to bear a negative moral scar on yourself which as a result of prejudice makes you different from the majority. Although this is the usual case, uniquely and in a general classification, stigmas are seen as either:

- Positive stigma (socially legitimized stigmatization)

- Negative stigma (socially discriminating stigmatization)

On another basis, studies of stigmatization may be approached according to different factors resulting in:

- Linguistic stigmatization
- Territorial stigmatization
- Sexual stigmatization
- Appearance stigmatization

2.7. Rudiments of Stigmatization

There are several key concepts affiliated to the notion of social stigmatization that are in need of elaboration. Such concepts are of great importance to any linguistic and pragmatic analysis of social ideologies.

- Power

Significantly, Link and Phelan (2001) emphasize the role of power (social, economic, and political power) in stigmatization. While the use of power is clear in some situations, in others it can become masked as the power differences are less stark.

- Inequality

According to Victor & Paul (1990), philosophical questions about social ethics and the desirability or inevitability of inequality in human societies have given rise to a spate of ideologies to address such questions. We can broadly classify these ideologies on the basis of whether they justify or legitimize inequality, casting it as desirable or inevitable, or whether they cast equality as desirable and inequality as a feature of society to be reduced or eliminated. Stigmatization is most certainly related to the former type where it is ideologically legitimized by those in power and authority.

- Dominance

As a result of discrimination and behavioral asymmetry, achieved via verbal or non-verbal (signaled) labelling, stigmatization may lead to dominance and oppression in any society. Needlessly, dominance is the result of power over others and can only be fought back through the resilience of empowerment (Shih, 2004).

3. Stigmatization from a Pragmatic Perspective

By basically understanding that words matter and that the choices one makes have a certain effect on the listener, there is no deny that stigmas are effective verbal ideologies that can be best studied within the realm of linguistics, the scientific study of language. More accurately, the matter is left in the hands of pragmatist who seek to analysis language in its context of use. Accordingly, the following subsections target the pragmatic strategies, functions, and theories which account for the usage value of stigmatization in societal discourse.

3.1. Pragmatic Strategies in Discursive Stigmatization

Admittedly, several pragmatic strategies can be fulfilled in using stigmatization as an ideology. The strategies used by the stigmatizer are of two general kinds: local strategies and global strategies. The former are those used to constraint the interpretation at the level of utterance processing. The latter, global strategies, are those used to create adequate social and psychological conditions to obtain irrational consent. Both the local and global strategies can be linguistic and non-linguistic. The following table illustrates the two types of stigmatization strategies with the processes employed in each.

Table 1. *Stigmatization strategies*

Local strategies		Global strategies	
<i>Linguistic</i>	<i>Non-linguistic</i>	<i>Linguistic</i>	<i>Non-linguistic</i>
Blaming	Implying rudeness	Forcing domination	Implying fear
Belittling	Implying sexism	Indicating racism	Implying Hate
Indicating irony	Implying narcissism	Indicating pride	Implying blame
Bullying	Implying embarrassment	Indicating prejudice	Implying shame

3.2. Pragmatic Functions in Discursive Stigmatization

Stigmas play a multitude of roles on the personal as well as social level. These roles occupy certain functions on the linguistic level some of which are classified and illustrated below:

Table 2. *Stigmatization functions*

Personal level	Social level
Self-esteem enhancement	Social oppression
Control enhancement	Social stereotyping
Anxiety buffering	Social threats

3.3. Accounting for Pragmatic Theories

The following section will detail a few well-known pragmatic theories that may be used in the critical analysis of stigmatization as a language ideology. Due to space limitation, speech acts, reference, impoliteness, co-operative principle, and implicature and explicature have been selected as the appropriate pragmatic issues through which stigmatization is best augmented and conveyed in language use. These pragmatic phenomena represent the most common theoretical tools that best signify a stigma and analyze its form and function in order to account for its intention and propositional content.

3.3.1. Speech Acts

Speech Act Theory, which was originally proposed by J. L. Austin and then developed significantly by John Searle, argues that, in producing an utterance, we are performing an action. It was first introduced in Austin's (1962) distinction between constative utterances and performative utterances. However, the distinction was rejected by Austin in favor of a more general framework of speech act analysis, according to which every utterance performs a speech act and this act itself can be seen as consisting of component acts that are of three types: a locutionary act (the act of verbally saying something), an illocutionary act (the intended act behind saying something), and a

perlocutionary act (the effect of an illocutionary act). The proposal of the tripartite analysis gives recognition to the fact that language users, rather than language per se, perform acts, and they often do so via the use of language.

Language use is assumed to fall within a limited number of types of speech act. On the basis of John Austin's classification, John Searle (1969) proposes a taxonomy of five types, namely representatives (or assertives), directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations, on the basis of the following criteria:

- a. Illocutionary point
- b. Direction of fit between words and the world
- c. Propositional content
- d. Psychological state expressed

Sometimes it is possible to perform one illocutionary act indirectly while performing another act, which gives rise to what are termed indirect speech acts. An indirect speech act can be seen as consisting of a primary illocutionary act (indirect force) and a secondary illocutionary act (literal force).

It is worthy of note that both Austin and Searle have largely ignored that speech acts are forms of social actions that are constituted, operated, and constrained by social factors. Different social agents, such as individuals and institutions, may enact the same speech act quite differently. Moreover, the performance of speech acts may vary across registers.

3.3.2. Reference

According to Yule (2013), "words themselves do not refer to anything, people refer". Reference, as the act of the speaker/writer using a linguistic form to enable a listener/reader to identify something, depends on the speaker's intentions and on the speaker's beliefs. Therefore, since successful reference does not only depend on the speaker but also on the listener, it is necessary to include the notion of inference, which denotes the process of decoding the pragmatic meaning of an utterance. In order to do so, the listener uses additional knowledge to make sense of what has not been explicitly said.

Basically, the ability to identify intended referents depend on two environments:

- The linguistic material of the environment (Co-text)
- The physical environment (Context)

The discussion of reference includes a handful of referential markers including deixis, inference, anaphora, cataphora, and even presupposition.

3.3.3. Impoliteness

It is worth noting that interpersonal communication is not just about politeness, as it can also involve the issue of impoliteness. As a result of studies such as Culpeper (1996, 2011), Bousfield (2008) and Bousfield and Locher (2008), it has been found that impoliteness, though closely related to politeness, is not always its antithesis. According to Culpeper (2011), impoliteness may include the following (in order of predominance): patronizing, inconsiderate, rude, aggressive, inappropriate, and hurtful. Furthermore, he also finds that impoliteness has its own set of conventionalized impolite formulae.

The issue of (im)politeness is crucial in critical pragmatics. Basically it is argued that the proper use of politeness is an important indicator of pragmatic harmony and civilization, which is open to positive critical analysis; by contrast, the use of impoliteness deviates from pragmatic harmony and civilization and is thus amenable to negative critical analysis.

3.3.4. Co-operative Principle

The Co-operative Principle is the collective name for Paul Grice's four conversational maxims which enable effective and cooperative conversation. Paul Grice came up with these not as a set of prescriptive rules that people should follow in conversation, but as a means of describing and analyzing the way people convey meanings in real life interactions (Grice, 1975):

- The Maxim of Quantity: giving only the necessary amount of information - not too much or too little.
- The Maxim of Quality: only speaking the truth - not knowingly giving false information.

- The Maxim of Relation: Being relevant to the current topic of conversation.
- The Maxim of Manner: Avoiding ambiguity or obscurity in your speech.

Much pragmatic research goes into instances when these maxims are broken which can be done in one of two ways, both of which are done to achieve something in the course of the conversation:

- Flouting - overtly (obviously) breaking a maxim.
- Violating - covertly (secretly) breaking a maxim.

By all means, the act of stigmatizing is prone to various types of flouting or violating of the Gricean conversational maxims, some of which inadvertently lead to implicature.

3.3.5. Implicature and Explicature

For starters, a distinction must be drawn between the concepts of implicature and explicature. The former is Grice's (1975) key term that captures what is implied and communicated (in addition to the linguistic meaning of words), and the latter, 'explicature', refers to Wilson & Sperber's (Relevance Theory) term for intentionally communicated (mostly) explicit content of utterances.

As a language oriented ideology, stigmatization is at most times an explicature due to its directness in expression. From the pragmatic perspective, there is reason to believe that what is explicitly stated may at times entail or presuppose even broader generalizations. At other distinct cases, stigmas may be implied rather than frankly stated. Keeping in mind that implicature is defined as "the implied meaning generated intentionally by the speaker" (Culpeper and Schauer, 2009). These meanings are often made covertly hidden using politeness strategies.

The implicature in which recourse is made to in stigmatized discourse is conversational, conventional and nonconventional. Keeping in mind that conversational implicature may yield certain tropes like metaphor, metonymy, hyperbole, personification, or the like (Grice, 1975). On account of such implications, a whole new set of stigma types may be noted in a communicative event, to name just a few:

- explicit stigma
- implicit stigma
- metaphorical stigma
- metonymic stigma
- hyperbole stigma
- personified stigma

4. Critique of Stigmatized Discourse

By definition, of course, we believe the person with a stigma is not quite human. On this assumption we exercise varieties of discrimination, through which we effectively, if often un-thinkingly, reduce his life chances. We construct a stigma theory, an ideology to explain his inferiority and account for the danger he represents, sometimes rationalizing an animosity based on other differences, such as those of social class. We use specific stigma terms such as cripple, bastard, moron in our daily discourse as a source of metaphor and imagery, typically without giving thought to the original meaning (Goffman, 1963: 15).

Stigma may affect the behavior of those who are stigmatized. Those who are stereotyped often start to act in ways that their stigmatizers expect of them. It not only changes their behavior, but it also shapes their emotions and beliefs (Major & O'Brien, 2005). Members of stigmatized social groups often face prejudice that causes depression (i.e. deprejudice). These stigmas put a person's social identity in threatening situations, such as low self-esteem. Because of this, identity theories have become highly researched. Identity threat theories can go hand-in-hand with labeling theory (Cox et al., 2012).

Stigma, though powerful and enduring, is not inevitable, and can be challenged. There are two important aspects to challenging stigma: challenging the stigmatization on the part of stigmatizers and challenging the internalized stigma of the stigmatized. To challenge stigmatization, Campbell et al. (2005) summarize three main approaches.

1. There are efforts to educate individuals about non-stigmatizing facts and why they should not stigmatize.

2. There are efforts to legislate against discrimination.

3. There are efforts to mobilize the participation of community members in anti-stigma efforts, to maximize the likelihood that the anti-stigma messages have relevance and effectiveness, according to local contexts.

5. Stance and Reproduction to Stigmatization

With regards to the point of view or position which people adopt in saying and interpreting the propositions they make, Van Dijk (2001: 353) clarifies that in the processes of speaking and hearing, certain views and perspectives are spelt out presenting the speaker's and hearer's ideological position. Stances may differ according to the person and what has been stated or expressed. Revealing a stigmatizer's own attitude and opinion in relation to the proposition asserted is an important part of any critical pragmatic analysis. In this way, it will become evident how and why particular linguistic choices have been selected. Ultimately, such a stance can be either explicit or implicit; conscious or unconscious (Bloor and Bloor, 2007: 33).

When a critical pragmatist takes a stance towards a phenomenon in society, then the next advance is to make a critique of what is not accepted or of what has long been accepted as natural and then attempt to reproduce it. Obviously then, after revealing a particular stance, a critical pragmatist has the task of introducing a reproduction of what has been stated in order to complete the picture. It is a reproduction of unequal power and of existing language uses which have been taken naturally. Attempting a reproduction of stigmas is an encouraging strive to reduce racist acts, harassment, victimization, dehumanization, and social exclusion. It may also serve as a solution to cases like political incorrectness, which is the use of expressions or actions that can be perceived to exclude or marginalize or insult groups who are socially disadvantaged or discriminated against.

6. Conclusions

Summing up, the following points may be stated in conclusion to this critical pragmatic exposition of stigmatization:

- A stigma is a verbalized social attitude in the sense that it transmutes opinions into authoritative motives, ideals, and ideologies.
- As an indicant of deviance, stigmatized discourse disseminates prejudicial discrimination into societal conductance.
- A stigmatized discourse is defined as a discourse produced in order to limit or label an addressee using a set of generalized propositions with appropriate strategies.
- Regarding the characteristics of the propositions conveyed by stigmatized discourse, they are posited as truth-conditionally or, better, truth-functionally defective.
- The commitment of the addressee to the propositions conveyed by the stigmatized discourse must be sincere, while in fact the propositions expressed are problematic at several levels.
- Likewise, freedom of thought, or at least the illusion of it, is a necessary condition for stigmatization.
- Stigmatized discourse is ultimately a pragmatic problem. It is a type of usage of natural language, and can be identified only through notions like goals, intentions, and broader aspects of pragmatic processing.
- The strategies used by the stigmatizer are of two general kinds: local strategies and global strategies. The former are those used to constraint the interpretation at the level of utterance processing. The latter, global strategies, are those used to create adequate social and psychological conditions to obtain irrational consent.
- Both the local and global strategies can be linguistic and non-linguistic.
- Several pragmatic theories may be utilized in the critical analysis of stigmatization as a language ideology. These include speech acts, reference, impoliteness, co-operative principle, and implicature and explicature.

- In order to critically analyze stigmatization, the critical pragmatist makes recourse to three consecutive moves in any critical analysis, chiefly, the critique, stance, and reproduction.

Reference

- [1] Al-Hindawi, F. H., Mohammed, M., & Sahib, W. (2018). Towards an Analytical Model in Critical Pragmatics. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* Volume, 9.
- [2] Austin, L., & Renaud, C. (2012). Linguistic Stigmatization and the Enregisterment of an Internet Standard.
- [3] Beljić, I. (2015). The construction of linguistic identities: the case of Andalusian variety of Spanish and southern varieties of Serbian. *Verba Hispanica*, 23(1), 87-105. <https://doi.org/10.4312/vh.23.1.87-105>
- [4] Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. (2007). Positioning and point of view. In *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- [5] Bohman, J. (2002). How to make a social science practical: pragmatism, critical social science and multiperspectival theory. *Millennium*, 31(3), 499-524.
- [6] Campbell, C., & Deacon, H. (2006). Unravelling the contexts of stigma: from internalisation to resistance to change. *Journal of community & applied social psychology*, 16(6), 411-417.
- [7] Campbell, C., Foulis, C. A., Maimane, S., & Sibiya, Z. (2005). "I have an evil child at my house": Stigma and HIV/AIDS management in a South African community. *American journal of public health*, 95(5), 808-815.
- [8] Cap, P. (2010). Pragmatics, Micropragmatics, Macropragmatics, *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 6(2), 195-228. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10016-010-0011-0>
- [9] Chen, X. R. (2013). Public discourse from the perspective of critical pragmatics. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- [10] Christman, J., & Zalta, E. N. (2015). The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. Autonomy in Moral and Political Philosophy [internet]. Edward N. Zalta ed.
- [11] Cox, W. T., Abramson, L. Y., Devine, P. G., & Hollon, S. D. (2012). Stereotypes, prejudice, and depression: The integrated perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(5), 427-449.
- [12] Crocker, J., Quinn, D. M., Heatherton, T. F., Kleck, R. E., Hebl, M. R., & Hull, J. G. (2000). The social psychology of stigma.
- [13] Culpeper, J. and Schauer, G., (2009). 'Pragmatics'. In: Culpeper, J., Katamba, F., Kerswill, P., Wodak, R. and McEnery, T., (eds) *English Language: Description, Variation and Context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 202-220.
- [14] Dovidio, J. F., Major, B., Crocker, J., Heatherton, T. F., Kleck, R. E., Hebl, M. R., & Hull, J. G. (2000). The social psychology of stigma. *Stigma: Introduction and overview*, 1-28.
- [15] Durkheim, É. (1982). The rules of sociological method (S. Lukes, Ed., WD Halls, Trans.).
- [16] Falk, G. (2010). *Stigma: How we treat outsiders*. Prometheus Books.
- [17] Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- [18] Grice, P., (1975). 'Speech Acts'. In: Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds) *Logic and Conversation In Syntax and Semantics*. New York: Academic Press. Reprinted in *Studies in the Way of Words*, ed. H. P. Grice, pp. 22-40. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (1989).
- [19] Jacoby, A., Snape, D., & Baker, G. A. (2005). Epilepsy and social identity: the stigma of a chronic neurological disorder. *The Lancet Neurology*, 4(3), 171-178.
- [20] Jones, E. E. (1984). *Social stigma: The psychology of marked relationships*. WH Freeman.
- [21] Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual review of Sociology*, 27(1), 363-385.
- [22] Macgregor, F. C., Abel, T. M., Bryt, A., Lauer, E., & Weissmann, S. (1953). Facial deformities and plastic surgery; a psychosocial study.
- [23] Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 56, 393-421.
- [24] Perier, C. (2016). The linguistic stigmatisation : The example of the Aboriginal English.
- [25] Shaw, L. L. (1991). Stigma and the moral careers of ex-mental patients living in

- board and care. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 20(3), 285-305.
- [26] Shih, M. (2004). Positive Stigma: Examining Resilience and Empowerment in Overcoming Stigma. *Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science - ANN AMER ACAD POLIT SOC SCI*. 591. 175-185. 10.1177/0002716203260099.
- [27] Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). 18 Critical discourse analysis. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 352.
- [28] Victor, G., & Paul, W. (1990). *Ideology and social welfare* (2nd edition). Routledge.
- [29] Yule, G. (2013). *Referential communication tasks*. Routledge.