Measuring the Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Method for Analyzing Interreligious Dialogues

Linda Bredvik

The aim of this article is to demonstrate how an emergent mixed methods analytical framework can be used to identify and understand multifaith speakers' use of metalinguistic indicators (or signs) in interreligious dialogues and how patterns of use of these signs can affect the conduct and outcome of the dialogue. The article also provides applied approaches for communicatively effective conversations between peoples of different faith practices.

Keywords: Interreligious dialogue, linguistic ethnography, discourse analysis, analytical framework, sociolinguistics

Religion and language are culturally patterned universals, elements of human societies worldwide. And yet the academic study of each rarely takes account of the other. Sociologist Robert Wuthnow made a plea in 2011 for scholars of religion to take "talk seriously."[1] Five years later, Frans Wijsen and Kocku von Stuckrad noted a "growing interest in the application of discourse analysis to the study of religion;" but they also observed that those instances still tended to be sporadic.[2] At the same time, the academic study of sociolinguistics has taken little account of religion and how people use language to talk about their beliefs and faith practices. This article will demonstrate how an emergent analytical framework can be used to measure and understand conversations about and between people's diverse beliefs and faith practices and how the results can be applied to other multifaith interactions.

This framework integrates typically distinct qualitative and quantitative methods to investigate, from a sociolinguistic perspective, multiparty interreligious dialogues comprised of participants with not only different faith backgrounds, but also different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.[3] It combines ethnographic fieldwork and semi-structured interviews with corpus-assisted discourse analysis to identify relevant metalinguistic indicators[4] (or semiotic signs)—uses of silence or fillers for example—and their patterns of use by participants in face-to-face interreligious dialogues. The researcher observes how people talk about their worldviews and faith practices with others who believe differently, records the conversations, and then examines

[1] Robert J. Wuthnow, "Taking Talk Seriously: Religious Discourse as Social Practice," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 50, no. 1 (2011), 1.

[2] Frans Wijsen and Kocku von Stuckrad, eds. *Making Religion: Theory and Practice in the Discursive Study of Religion.* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016), 2.

[3] Although developed for multilingual and multicultural conversations, it can easily be adapted to less heterogeneous settings.

[4] A metalinguistic indicator is a "sign, device, or strategy that functions in the Greek sense of both "along with" and "beyond" (Oxford English Dictionary 3rd ed.) the denotative value of an utterance" (Sauer Bredvik [2020], 12). It is an expansion of anthropologist and linguist John Gumperz's "contextual cues" that are "any feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signaling of contextual presuppositions." John J. Gumperz, *Discourse Strategies,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 131.

the resultant transcripts for identifiable patterns between sign forms, pragmatic functions, and indexical significance present in the dialogues.[5]

This approach is based on multiple linguistic theories which demonstrate that what a speaker means is not entirely contained within the grammar and lexicon of a language; meaning is also constructed by use of subconscious linguistic features that signal a speaker's meaning and invoke a frame of interpretation, or a context, that help hearers understand the utterance.[6] These are non-verbal, prosodic, or pragmatic cues that can serve as overt indicators of a speaker's subconscious cognitive processes and provide a window on how meaning is being discursively co-constructed. This is of particular importance in conversations about a speaker's religious beliefs and faith practices, which are presumed to be difficult to articulate as they "lie in the unconscious."[7]

What follows is a description of the methodology, the nuts-and-bolts of this analytical framework, and how it can be used to measure and understand the ways in which people of diverse faiths and no faiths talk about what they believe and how these beliefs inform their lives. It is also applied research that can better help practitioners of interreligious dialogues recognize and consciously use indicators that lead to more communicatively effective conversations.

Linguistic Ethnography

Linguistic ethnography utilizes a variety of data-collection strategies—participatory observation, field notes, recordings, and selected interviews—in an attempt to understand the relevance of the many resources present in the immediate communicative activity and situated social action of peoples' discursive strategies. "Ethnography's emphasis on close knowledge through first-hand participation allows the researcher to attend to aspects of lived experience that are hard to articulate, merely incipient, or erased within the systems of representation that are most regularly and reliably described."[8] In the particular context of interreligious dialogues, Wuthnow notes that "field investigations provide opportunities for observing talk in natural settings and for examining its role in social interaction."[9]

To identify these natural settings, one starts with an open-ended stance to research, rather than beginning the project with *a priori* assumptions. What type of interreligious dialogue will be investigated? Are there existing dialogues that might be fruitful for observation or does the research focus require a purposefully constructed dialogue group? Within those conversations, which metalinguistic indicators should be investigated and measured? One can see that while linguistic ethnography is complex and ordered, it is not linear. In theory, the researcher starts with the macro and moves to the micro, but in reality, there is a dialectic interplay of data

[5] Ben Rampton. "Drilling Down to the Grain in Superdiversity." In *Language and Superdiversity*, eds. by Karel Arnaut, Jan Blommaert, Ben Rampton and Massimiliano Spotti. (London: Routledge, 2016), 105.
[6] See, for example, the thinking of Gumperz, Rampton, and Blommaert—all cited above.
[7] Wuthnow, "Taking Talk Seriously," 6.
[8] Ben Rampton, Karin Tusting, Janet Maybin, Richard Barwell, Angela Creese, and Vally Lytra. "UK Linguistic Ethnography: A Discussion Paper." (UK Linguistic Ethnography Forum Coordinating Committee, 2004), 7.
[9] Wuthnow, "Taking Talk Seriously," 10–11.

collection and data analysis being sustained throughout the course of the research.[10] This dialectic ultimately creates a more robust analysis and nuanced understanding of the data as it is a means of continuing to refine the research in light of ongoing data collection and inquiry.

The researcher must also ask: how are religion and faith conceptualized and, from that, what counts as an interreligious or interfaith dialogue? In this study, religion, faith practices, worldviews or philosophies are used to indicate an individual's set of beliefs about the fundamental nature of Reality or God. An interreligious dialogue, notes Catherine Cornille:

> tends to be used to cover a wide range of engagements between religious traditions, from daily interaction between believers living in the same neighborhoods to organized discussions and debates between expert scholars, and from formal or casual exchanges between spiritual or institutional leaders to inter-religious activism around social issues. The goals of particular dialogues may differ—from peaceful coexistence to social change and from mutual understanding to actual religious growth.[11]

This definition identifies several factors that differ across dialogue typologies: is the conversation open to any adherent of a faith practice or is it restricted to religious and scholarly elites; is it practical or spiritual, is it a casual conversation or a concerted attempt to learn about the other? One of the most well-known classifications of religious dialogues lists four types of dialogue with no order of priority:

- Dialogue of life – people of different faiths striving to live in "an open and neighborly spirit;"
- Dialogue of action or *dialogue of hands* – faiths collaborate for "the development and liberation of all people;"
- Dialogue of theological exchange or *dialogue of the head* – "specialists seek to deepen their understanding of their respective religious heritages," and
- Dialogue of religious experience or a *dialogue of the heart* – people "rooted in their own religious traditions, share their …ways of searching for God or the Absolute."[12]

My own research follows Oddbjørn Leirvik, who argues for two types of dialogues—spiritual and necessary.[13] The former are entered into "based on personal motivation and are guided by an expectation of being enriched by other spiritual traditions," while the latter are "driven by a felt

---

[10] Karel Arnaut, Jan Blommaert, Ben Rampton, and Massimiliano Spotti, eds., *Language and Superdiversity* (New York: Routledge, 2016); Ruth Wodak, Michal Krzyżanowski, and Bernhard Forchtner, "The interplay of language ideologies and contextual cues in multilingual interactions: Language choice and code-switching in European Union institutions," *Language in Society* 41 (2012): 157–86; John J. Gumperz, "Interactional Sociolinguistics: A Personal Perspective," In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, eds. D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H.E. Hamilton (Malden, MA: Blackwell Reference Online, 2003).

[11] Catherine Cornille, ed., *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue,* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), xii.

[12] Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogues, *The Attitude of the Church Toward Followers of Other Religions: Reflections and Orientations on Dialogue and Mission* (Pentecost 1984). Pontifical Council website: https://www.pcinterreligious.org.

[13] Oddbjørn Leirvik, "Philosophies of interreligious dialogue: Practice in search of theory," *Approaching Religion*, no. 1 (2011): 16-24.

socio-political need" and organized by either government or civic/church actors. Both categories are broad enough to allow a variety of dialogues to fit under the umbrella, differentiated largely by the participant's motivation for participating—personal or professionally obligatory. The type of dialogue will also determine the particulars of what is a communicatively "effective" dialogue, although a complete lack of proselytizing is an absolute. Dialogues that fall within the broad parameters of collaborative or necessary will be more outcome-oriented—were the necessary funds raised for a community food bank, for example. Dialogues that are entered into for personal enrichment—those analyzed using this framework—are communicatively effective when there is non-contentious understanding (although not always agreement), when participants are heard on their own terms and not through the lens of the other's religious tradition, and when the participants leave with a better understanding of the beliefs and perspectives of other worldviews.

This framework can be used effectively with all categories of dialogue as long as the dialogues being compared—if the researcher is doing a comparative study—fall into the same category. My own research showed that linguistic practices and communicative behaviors between spiritual and necessary dialogues are too disparate for valid comparison, although different settings and types of dialogues within the spiritual category were effectively compared as they were all entered into for personal reasons with the expectation of gaining a better understanding of the other. This matrix can be equally helpful for studying one-off interactions or for a longitudinal study of an established, ongoing dialogue.

Once a dialogue type or specific group has been identified for study, the researcher must also identify which indicators or cues seem to be affecting dialogue conduct and outcome. The underlying linguistic theories direct a researcher to:

- Prosodic cues—unfilled pauses/silence, intonation, stress or accenting, and pitch register shifts,
- Paralinguistic signs—fillers/hesitation markers, disfluency, tempo, conversational synchrony (including latching or overlapping of speaking turns),
- Code-switching or code choice—this can be between different "languages" (Dutch, German, Chagga), it can be the use of languages associated with faith practices (Arabic, Sanskrit), it can be style-switching (standard variety of American English to a non-standard variety, e.g., Black English (BE) or "Pittsburghese"), and
- Choice of pragmatic markers and lexical forms (different words for the same item) or formulaic expressions.[14]

Different approaches to interreligious dialogues can and will make different metalinguistic indicators more or less relevant. Multilanguaging, for example, was significant in the initial dialogues analyzed using this framework where participants had 20 different L1s (sometimes called heritage languages or mother tongues). This would obviously be less important in more monolingual conversations where prosodic cues such as intonation and stress from a single standard language variety might play a bigger role than they did in these dialogues. Other linguistic phenomena can take on greater significance in the specific context of interreligious

[14] Gumperz, *Discourse Strategies,* 231.

dialogues. Silence (unfilled pauses) is so important in the conduct of a variety of religious rituals—during the *Tachanun* in a Jewish services, the daylight prayers (*Zuhr* and *Asr*) in Islam, or the Eucharistic liturgy in an Orthodox services—and can thus become a condensation symbol, a linguistic cue that carries more relevance and requires less processing effort than it would in other settings.

Field notes are an essential component of this framework, a systematic strategy to organize the linguist's observations. As already demonstrated, field notes have a two-fold function in the early stages of a project: to identify indicators for further investigation and groups or dialogue types that might be fruitful for later recordings. In the later stages of analysis, they can hold a surprising amount of explanatory capability. Because the research question and data gathering evolves in this research method, field notes allow the researcher to return later in the project and reconsider the original assumptions and questions with some distance and detachment.[15] Overall, field notes are useful in corroborating and contextualizing the researcher's analytical conclusions.

Once a dialogue group is identified or created and the researcher gains the necessary permissions, they begin recording using, if possible, *both* audio and video equipment.[16] The ability to link spoken data with speakers' gestures and facial expressions aids the researcher in identifying a speaker's intended meaning, particularly their uses of silence and some disfluency phenomena; it enables one to place an utterance within the broader semiotic ecology of that dialogue. It is necessary to continue taking field notes throughout the project, although a researcher's initial "wide-angled view"[17] may narrow over time to focus more intensively on specific linguistic behaviors or metalinguistic indicators.

If the researcher is doing a comparative study, they will need to identify additional dialogues for comparison. A comparative study between interreligious dialogues is a means to examine the local linguistic behavior of participants in broader dialogue and religious contexts. We assume as linguists that people use language in ways that vary systematically in co-occurrence with other dimensions of the social setting—i.e., age, gender, power relations—and their identities, in this case their religious identities.[18] By studying interreligious dialogues from the same or comparative categories across a variety of dialogue settings, one is able to gain a more thorough understanding of how dialogue participants use particular semiotic cues to create meaning in the setting of an interreligious dialogue. Such a comparison identifies links between

---

[15] Fiona Copland, and Angela Creese, *Linguistic Ethnography: Collecting, analysing and presenting data,* (London: Sage , 2015); Ben Rampton, Janet Maybin, and Celia Roberts, "Theory and Method in Linguistic Ethnography," In *Linguistic Ethnography: Interdisciplinary Explorations*, eds. Fiona Copland, Sara Shaw and Julia Snell (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).
[16] The presence of a researcher with recording equipment does mediate the data, a fact which all ethnographic researchers acknowledge. Most often, however, the researcher has also spent sufficient time observing the research setting so that they become "part of the social scene they are investigating" and their presence is familiar and ordinary (Juliet Langman and Peter Sayer, "Qualitative Sociolinguistics Research." In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics,* ed. Carol A. Chapelle. [London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2013], 4).
[17] Copland and Creese, *Linguistic Ethnography,* 40.
[18] Monica Heller, "Discourse and Interaction," In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, eds. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton, (Malden, MA: Blackwell Reference Online, 2003), 259.

local practices and wider social processes and dialogue outcomes,[19] making the results applicable for a wider range of dialogue typologies and participants.

Interviews yield an emic perspective of interreligious dialogues; they provide the participants' interpretation and understanding of the conversations. This "insider knowledge" is data that cannot be obtained only by observation or by recording the dialogues. Used in conjunction with field research, interviews yield a greater understanding of speakers' linguistic practices and how they understand themselves to be acting or speaking in the context of an interreligious dialogue. The key to interviews in this setting is that the researcher avoids, as much as possible, the role of a traditional interviewer. While a handful of semi-structured questions may be necessary to gain information the researcher needs, the key is to leave them as open-ended as possible so that respondents can provide the information they deem to be most relevant. This information frequently provides insights that help explain data and patterns of linguistic behavior that were previously confusing or unclear, a means to connect a single interactional moment with the overall data set.

Discourse Analysis

Recording the dialogues and then transcribing the collected interactional data is a practice that lies at the intersection of linguistic ethnography and discourse analysis. Fieldwork and semi-structured interviews serve to direct the researcher's attention to specific settings or dialogue groups as well as contextual cues that might be fruitful for investigation. Once dialogues have been recorded, the process of producing detailed transcripts from those recordings and the subsequent transcript analysis is a multi-step and labor-intensive process, a synergistic ballet between identifying data for transcription, the transcription process itself, analysis of the transcript, and further refinement of the model.

This method of discourse analysis—turning a strip of naturally occurring talk into writing for analytical purposes—is also inherently selective and interpretive. As Wijsen and von Stuckrad note: "analyzing discourse is itself a discursive practice that needs to be reflected upon from a meta-discursive perspective." [20] Researchers must first choose which dialogues to record and then which dialogue segments to transcribe and analyze, making their selections mindfully in light of the nature of the interactions and the theoretical frameworks from which their research questions arise. The goal is to select segments that are representative of the discourse in a particular dialogue setting or category and then transcribe those discourse events into a written medium in order to study how the moment-by-moment flow of speech displays the shifting interactional meanings that dialogue participants generate and attend to. The researcher takes the raw discourse and presents it in a way that reveals its living structure, knowing that "how we transcribe doesn't just reflect our theories of language, it also shapes them, drawing our eyes to some phenomena while leaving others in the shadow."[21]

---

[19] Sauer Bredvik, 175.
[20] Wijsen and von Stuckrad, *Making Religion*, 2.
[21] John W. DuBois, "Transcription Design Principles for Spoken Discourse Research," *Pragmatics* 1, no. 1 (1991): 71, 97.

This framework is designed to draw one's eyes to the metalinguistic indicators that are creating meaning in that particular conversation. What cues beyond the syntactical and semantic elements of an utterance are speakers and listeners noticing? The researcher starts by transcribing and annotating the indicators that were identified during initial fieldwork and early interviews. This early analysis most likely will show that certain metalinguistic indicators are not as relevant to dialogue conduct and outcome as initially hypothesized while others may be revealed to be more cogent or have different functions than originally expected, and the annotation methods will be changed accordingly.[22]

It is at this point that the researcher begins to employ more innovative means to examine the transcripts for patterns in speakers' use of the various indicators in a dialogue. Using a formula devised for this project, one first counts the total occurrences of an individual metalinguistic indicator in a recorded segment and then normalizes those raw numbers by calculating occurrences per minute (OPM). This is the total occurrence of a specific indicator divided by the total minutes of that transcribed dialogue segment. One dialogue from a group of multifaith, international counselors and chaplains, for example, contained 43 hedges (words like "maybe" or "perhaps") in 16.47 minutes of conversation, resulting in an OPM of 2.61 hedges for that dialogue:

$$43 \div 16.47 = 2.61 \text{ OPM}$$

Once those numbers have been calculated for all the dialogues (in the case of a comparative study), the researcher then calculates an average OPM for each indicator being investigated and compares the individual dialogues against the overall average. Individual dialogues with significantly above- or below-average uses of an indicator can then be examined further to understand if those differing characteristics are affecting the conduct or outcome of a dialogue. The researcher needs to ask which cues, or combination of cues, may be indicating hospitality and a willingness to learn from the other. What extralinguistic means are multifaith participants in a community improvement project using to display their search for common ground? Or what combination of metalinguistic indicators is turning a seemingly cooperative and effective dialogue into an uncooperative monologue?

In a few instances, this analyzation may not reveal distinct patterns between the OPM of an indicator and dialogue outcome when observation and field notes indicated a possible correlation. The researcher can create a corpus (a collection of texts for linguistic analysis) from the transcripts to conduct a keyword search and a concordance analysis.[23] Such an analysis can then instantiate or refute these observed patterns of influence; it can also reveal different patterns of relevant linguistic behavior. Because this is a "purpose-built" corpus, the researcher (who is typically also the corpus compiler) is able to look for "patterns that can be linked to pragmatically specialized uses within that particular context."[24] What this means, for example, is that if a

[22] The initial project that used this framework investigated multilanguaging, unfilled pauses/silence (differentiated by both pause placement and duration), filled pauses ("uh" and "um"), disfluency, back channeling, discourse markers, hedges, and stance markers.
[23] A "concordance analysis" tracks all occurrences in the corpus of a particular word in its immediate context (typically, one to three words on either side of the keyword).
[24] Almut Koester, "Building a small specialised corpus," In *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics,* eds. Anne O'Keeffe and Michael McCarthy, (New York: Routledge, 2010), 74.

specific form—the word "maybe"—rather than the entire category of cues—all hedges—is influencing the processes and outcomes of an interaction, it can be more readily identified using corpus methods. By identifying which words have a higher relative frequency (keyword search) and then using the concordancing function to look at those forms in context, the researcher is able to identify patterns of language use.[25]

This progressive triangulation of the data gives the researcher a much clearer picture of the myriad of cues dialogue participants are noticing and employing, and how these patterns of use impact that conversation. It is also a means to identify broader patterns across multiple dialogue settings. Within linguistics, each of the contextual cues analyzed in the initial project has been widely investigated on an individual basis. Entire dissertations have been written on the use of the discourse marker "well," for example, or speakers' use of the filler "uh." This framework instead provides a more all-encompassing analysis that examines the complex interactions between multiple metalinguistic and metapragmatic indicators in order to demonstrate how these interactions both index and create communicatively effective or ineffective dialogues. Because these cues are typically used and understood subconsciously, it is important to not only identify them but to recognize the variety of interactions between them.

Results from the initial project showed that different patterns of use of multiple indicators created different dialogue outcomes. For example, a speaker's use of monolingual linguistic resources had to be studied in conjunction with their use of fillers ("uh" and "um") and silence (unfilled pauses) to be able discern if their use of a single language (when others were available) was a cooperative move to enable understanding amongst participants with a lack of shared linguistic resources or intransigence in the face of conflict and disagreement.[26] In very concrete terms, practitioners of interreligious dialogues can create more communicative effective conversations by:[27]

- Being aware of how and where they pause. Shorter pauses (less than one second) between phrases seem to indicate a speaker's willingness to explore a topic with other interlocutors and to hear their input. Longer pauses (more than one second) at the end of a sentence can be used for power or to hold the floor.
- Similarly, fillers ("uh" or "um"), and repetition and repairs of one's own speech also indicate openness; this disfluency indicates speakers in an interreligious setting are seeking to choose their words with care. Contrariwise, fluent sentences worthy of a Ted Talk show that the speaker is convinced of their own position and largely unwilling to hear the other's viewpoint.
- In dialogues with multilingual speakers, use of multiple languages (including those typically associated with a faith practice, e.g., Arabic or Hebrew) tends to help participants find sites of narrative overlap, i.e., places where their multifaith lives have shared experiences or understandings, that lead to a broader comprehension of other beliefs and worldviews.

[25] Paul Baker, *Sociolinguistics and Corpus Linguistics,* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 21.
[26] Sauer Bredvik, 172.
[27] Sauer Bredvik, 172-174.

Conclusions

This framework and analytical process is an emergent approach within sociolinguistics that provides a nuanced understanding of how participants in interreligious dialogues conduct communicatively effective or ineffective dialogues. By using a measurement of occurrences per minute to link linguistic ethnography with corpus-based discourse analysis using, it provides a means to identify the latent linguistic behaviors of dialogue participants and to understand how those behaviors both create and reflect conversations between believers and adherents of different faith groups. In doing so, it answers Wuthnow's call to take religious talk seriously by creating a "well-codified procedure for analyzing and quantifying discursive information."[28]

The situated interpretation of any utterance is always a matter of inferences made by both the speaker and the listeners within the context of that interactive exchange which, in turn, is constrained by both what is said and how it is interpreted.[29] These interpretations are based on assumptions, often subconscious, that are socially and culturally patterned. Within an interreligious dialogue, these assumptions and inferences of meaning must take into account not only knowledge of a social and cultural context that may, or may not, be shared, but also religious knowledge that most often is not shared. In a setting where speakers' deeply held religious beliefs and practices (which may or may not encompass their cultural identity) are the basis for the conversation, the cues they use to make inferences and perceive meaning become even more relevant. They can reflect an interlocutor's desire to understand the other while still maintaining their own beliefs or they can reflect (even if only temporarily) the speaker's unwillingness to hear the other on their own terms. But without a conscious understanding of their usage patterns, it is often difficult for the participants themselves to know why a dialogue is communicatively effective or ineffective.

By combining the emic perspective from extensive fieldwork and ethnographic interviews, with the etic perspective gained from fine-grained transcription and corpus-assisted discourse analysis, the researcher is able to identify linguistic patterns of metalinguistic indicator use that cannot be identified by a single method. The functions of some indicators or what co-occurring patterns of usage mean can be detected in the observation stage but more nuanced results emerge when observation is combined with discourse analysis and the use of interview data. The functions of still other cues might remain unclear without further corpus analysis. This more complete and refined picture of the interaction between various metalinguistic indicators helps dialogue participants to be aware of their own linguistic practices and behaviors that lead to or hinder communicatively effective conversations.

If this analysis is applied to ongoing dialogues in one setting, it provides the participants insights into their own linguistic behavior, how their fellow interlocutors might be interpreting that behavior, and ways to consciously use relevant contextual cues to create more communicatively effective dialogues. If it is applied to dialogues in multiple settings and research sites, it enables the researcher to build a bridge from the aggregate results of multiple micro-studies to the wider social concerns of interreligious dialogues.[30] By making linkages between multiple interactions in a

---

[28] Wuthnow, "Taking Talk Seriously," 5.
[29] Gumperz, *Discourse Strategies,* 230.
[30] Jenny Cook-Gumperz, and John J. Gumperz, "Commentary: Frames and Contexts: Another Look at the Macro-Micro Link." *Pragmatics* 21, no. 2 (2011): 283.

variety of dialogue settings, it becomes possible to arrive at a more thorough understanding of the relevance of participants' linguistic behaviors for dialogue outcome.

ꟙ

Dr. Linda Sauer Bredvik researches at the intersection of language and interreligious encounters, investigating ways that sociolinguistics can inform interreligious understanding. Her current studies are in the digital sphere, focusing on differences between participants' online and in-person linguistic behaviors in interreligious dialogues and on digitally mediated experiences of the Divine during the Covid pandemic. She also teaches sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and methods of empirical research in the English Department at Heidelberg University, Germany. Her book, Discussing the Faith: Multilingual and Metalinguistic Conversations about Religion*, was recently published by De Gruyter (2020).*