Discourse Analysis (ENG523)

MCQs [Answer]

Short Questions [Question related to]

Long Questions [Question related to]

VIRTUAL UNIVERSITY OF PAKISTAN

Lecture-01 Introduction to Discourse Analysis

INTRODUCTION TO DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

A Brief Historical Overview

Discourse analysis as a whole is the work of text grammarians, working mostly with written language. Text grammarians see texts as language elements pass into together in relationships with one another that can be defined. Linguists have made a significant impact in this area. Its most important contribution has been to show the links between grammar and discourse. Discourse analysis has grown into a wide-ranging and various disciplines which find its unity in the description of language above the sentence and an interest in the contexts and cultural influences which affect language in use. It is also now, increasingly, forming an environment to research in Applied Linguistics, second language learning and teaching in particular.

British discourse analysis was greatly influenced by M. **A.** K. Halliday's functional approach to language (e.g. Halliday 1973), which in turn has connections with the Prague School of linguists. Halliday's framework emphasizes the social functions of language and the thematic and informational structure of speech and writing. Also important in Britain were Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) at the University of Birmingham, who developed a model for the description of teacher-pupil talk, based on a hierarchy of discourse units. Other similar work has dealt with doctor patient interaction, service encounters, interviews, debates and business negotiations, as well as monologues. Novel work in the British tradition has also been done on intonation in discourse. The British work has principally followed structural-linguistic criteria, on the basis of the isolation of units, and sets of rules defining well-formed sequences of discourse.

American discourse analysis has been dominated by work within the ethno methodological tradition, which emphasizes the research method of close observation of groups of people communicating in natural settings. It examines types of speech event such as storytelling, greeting rituals and verbal duels in different cultural and social settings **(e.g.,** Gumperz and Hymes 1972). What is often called ***conversation analysis*** within the American tradition can also be included under the general heading of discourse analysis. In conversational analysis, the emphasis is not upon building structural models but on the close observation of the behavior of participants in talk and on patterns which persist over a wide range of natural data. The work of Goffman (1976; 1979), and Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) is important in the study of conversational norms, turn taking, and other aspects of spoken interaction. Alongside the conversation analysts, working within the sociolinguistic tradition, Labov's investigations of oral storytelling have also contributed to a long history of interest in narrative discourse. The American work has produced a large number of descriptions of discourse types, as well as insights into the social constraints of politeness and face-preserving phenomena in talk, overlapping with British work in pragmatics.

Form and Function

According McCarthy (1991), discourse analysis describes the language above the sentence: its context and the cultural influence, which affect language in use. A discourse carries much more than its form, it also carries its own particular function, which means that there is not necessarily one-to-one relationship between a given supra-segmental choice and a meaning, hence form and function might be analyzed separately in order to depict the real meaning of a discourse. According to Halliday (1970), intonation plays a crucial role in conveying meaning. If the intonation of a sentence is changed, its meaning will also be changed. Thus, the particular way the sentences are produced and carry their individual meaning, and the analysis must go far beyond sentences forms in order to be possible to depict the real meaning of the spoken interaction.

The famous British comedy duo, Eric Morecambe and Ernie Wise, started one of their shows in 1973 with the following dialogue:
Ernie: Tell me about the show.
Eric (to the audience): Have we got a show for you might folks!
Have we got a show for you! (Aside to Ernie) Have we got a
Show for them?

This short dialogue raises a number of problems for anyone wishing to do a linguistic analysis of it; not least is the question of why it is funny (the audience laughed at Eric's question to Ernie). Most people would agree that it is funny because Eric is playing with a grammatical structure that seems to be ambiguous: 'Have we got a show for you!' has an inverted verb and subject. Inversion of the verb and its subject happens only under restricted conditions in English; the most typical circumstances in which this happens is when questions are being asked, but it also happens in exclamations (e.g. Wasn't my face red!). So Eric's repeated grammatical ***form*** clearly experiences a change in how it is ***interpreted*** by the audience between its second and third occurrence in the dialogue. Eric's inverted grammatical ***form*** in its first two occurrences clearly has the ***function*** of an exclamation, *telling* the audience something, not asking them anything, until the humorous moment when he begins to doubt whether they do have a show to offer, at which point he uses the *same* grammatical form to ask Ernie a genuine question. There seems, then, to be a lack of one-to-one correspondence between grammatical form and communicative function; the inverted form *in itself does* not inherently carry an exclamatory or a questioning function. By the same token, in other situations, an' uninverted declarative form (subject before verb), typically associated with 'statements', might be heard as a question requiring an answer.
Eric and Ernie's conversation is only one example (and a rather crazy one at that) of spoken interaction; most of us in a typical week will observe or take part in a wide range of different types of spoken interaction: phone calls, buying things in shops, perhaps an interview for a job, or with a doctor, or with an employer, talking formally at meetings or in classrooms, informally in cafes or on buses, or closely with our friends and loved ones. These situations will have their own formulae and conventions which we follow; they will have different ways of opening and closing the encounter, different role relationships, different purposes and different settings. Discourse

analysis is interested in all these different factors and tries to account for them in a difficult fashion with a separate set of descriptive labels from those used by conventional grammarians. The first fundamental distinction we have noted is between language forms and discourse functions; once we have made this distinction a lot of other conclusions can follow, and the labels used to describe discourse need not clash at all with those we are all used to in grammar. They will in fact complement and enrich each other. Chapters 2,3 and 4 of this book will therefore be concerned with examining the relationships between language forms (grammatical, lexical and phonological ones), and discourse functions, for it is language forms, above all, which are the raw material of language teaching, while the overall aim is to enable learners to use language functionally.

Reader Activity 1

Form and function

Can you create a context and suggest an intonation for the forms in the left-hand column so that they would be heard as performing the functions in the right-hand column, ***without changing their grammatical structure?***

1. Did I make a fool of myself	(a) question	(b) exclamation?
2. You don't love me	(a) question	(b) statement
3. You eat it	(a) statement	(b) command
4. Switch the light on	(a) command	(b) question

Text and Interpretation

Markers of various kinds, i.e., the linguistic signals of semantic and discourse functions (e.g., in English the –ed on the verb is a marker of pastness), are very much concerned with the surface of the text. Cohesive markers are no exception: they create links across sentence boundaries and pair and chain together items that are related (e.g., by referring to the same entity). But reading a text is far more complex than that: we have to interpret the ties and make sense of them. Making sense of a text is an act of interpretation that depends as much on what we as reader bring to a text as what the author puts into it. Interpretation can be seen as a set of procedures and the approach to the analysis of texts that emphasizes the mental activities involved in interpretation can be broadly called procedural. Procedural approaches emphasize the role of the reader in actively building the world of the text, based on his/her experience of the world and how states and events are characteristically manifested in it. The reader has to activate such knowledge, make inferences and constantly access his/her interpretation in the light of the situation and the aims and goals of the text as the reader perceives them. The work of De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) is central to this approach. If we rake a text which is cohesive in the sense described

Above, we can **see** that a lot more mental work has to go on for the reader to make it coherent:

The parents of a seven-year-old Australian boy woke
me find a giant python crushing and trying to
swallow him.
The incident occurred in Cairns, Queensland
and the boy's mother, Mrs. Kathy Dryden
said: 'It was like a horror movie. It was a hot

> **night and Bartholomew was lying under a**
> **mosquito net. He suddenly started screaming.**
> **'We rushed to the bedroom to find a huge**
> **snake trying to repress him. It was coiled**
> **around his arms and neck and was going down**
> **his body.**
> **Mrs. Dryden and her husband, Peter, tried to stab**
> **the creature with knives but the python bit the**
> **boy several times before escaping.**

This text requires us to activate our knowledge of pythons as dangerous creatures which may threaten human life, which strangle their prey and to whose presence one must react with certain urgency. More than this we make the cognitive link between 'a hot night' (this is implicit in the text). The boy's screaming must be taken to be a consequence of the python attacking him (rather than, say, prior to the arrival of the python). The 'creature' must be taken to be the Python rather than the boy (which 'creature' could well refer to in another text) since parents do not normally stab their children in order to save their lives.

Another level of interpretation which we are involved in as we process texts is that of recognizing ***textual pattern.*** Certain patterns in text reoccur time and time again and become deeply embedded as part of our cultural knowledge. These patterns are manifested in regularly occurring functional relationships between bits of the text. These bits may be phrases, clauses, sentences or groups of sentences; we shall refer to them as textual segments to avoid confusion with grammatical elements and syntactic relations within clauses and sentences. A segment may sometimes be a clause, sometimes a sentence, sometimes a whole paragraph; what is important is that segments can be isolated using a set of labels covering a finite set of functional relations that can occur between any two bits of text.

An example of segments coinciding with sentences is these two sentences from a report on a photographic exhibition:

> **The stress is on documentary and rightly so.**
> **Arty photographs are a bore.**

The interpretation that makes most senses is that the relationship between the second sentence and the first is that the second provides a *reason* for the first. The two segments are therefore in a *phenomenon reason* relationship with one another.

TYPES OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Spoken Discourse

One influential approach to the study of spoken discourse is that it was developed at the University of Birmingham, where research initially concerned itself with the structure of discourse in school classrooms (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975). The Birmingham model is certainly not the only valid approach to analyzing discourse, but it is a relatively simple and powerful model which has connections with the study of speech acts. At the same time, it tries to capture the larger structures, the 'wholes'.

A characterization of spoken discourse requires a specification of the very different contexts of utterance which obtain in the production and reception of spoken and written discourse. These configurations largely motivate the different properties of spoken and written discourse, even allowing for equivalence of register and formality. Speech prototypically involves face-to-face interaction between two or more participants who share a spatio-temporal environment.

This, together with a common cultural and personal background in the case of conversationalists who know each other well, provides a rich contextual common ground allowing the speaker to avoid having to verbalize a number of aspects of his or her message. Simultaneously, this common ground enables the discourse participants to rely to a large extent on non-verbal signaling, in side with and even, on occasion, in place of, the verbal textualization of a given utterance. Planning time, as well as "understanding" time, is naturally minimal and at a premium – and a great many features of spontaneous speech flow from this key factor. Moreover, both speech and writing are normally designed by the user so as to be readily understood by the addressee (cf. the notion of "recipient design").

Indeed, according to Clark (1996) and other linguists, conversation and communication in general is a fundamentally joint activity, involving the active participation of the interlocutors and the coordination of their actions (verbal as well as non-verbal). What I have just (very briefly) characterized is of course the prototypical instance of spoken interaction. There are obviously other less prototypical types of spoken discourse: for example, speaking on the telephone, where the participants share a time frame (adjusting for time zone differences when the call is international), but not a spatial one, where only two participants are involved, and where the communication is 'ear-to-ear' rather than face-to-face (no non-vocal gestures or visual percepts are possible): see Drummond & Hopper (1991) for a discussion of miscommunication over the telephone; and speaking in a formal situation (a speech, lecture and so forth) in front of a group of people in circumstances where convention does not normally allow for verbal exchange and interaction.

Written discourse, on the other hand, there is by definition has no common spatiotemporal ground between the writer and their reader(s). Since this is the case, and since inevitably there will be little or no opportunity to use non-verbal signals, the text used will need to be relatively explicit - since the textual input is confined to the verbal content, in conjunction with punctuation and various graphic devices. The much greater availability, in principle, of planning time allows the writer to review and to amend their written production.

The context of spoken discourse, the distinction between text and discourse, and their roles in understanding

It is useful in analyzing spoken (as well as written) discourse understanding to draw a three-way distinction between the dimensions of text, discourse and context.

Text, discourse and context Text: the connected sequence of verbal signs and non-verbal signals in terms of which discourse is co-constructed by the participants in the act of communication. Discourse: the hierarchically structured, situated sequence of indexical, propositional, utterance and illocutionary acts carried out in pursuance of some communicative goal, as integrated within a given context.

The context is subject to an ongoing process of construction and revision as the discourse unfolds. It is through the invocation of a relevant context (which is partly determined by the nature of the co-text at issue, as well as by its genre) that the hearer or reader is able to convert the connected sequence of textual cues that is text into discourse. (Extract (slightly amended) from Cornish, 2003:3).

The notion of text is close to what Gumperz (1992: 234) calls “contextualization cues”. The discourse partners make use of this record (a dual-track one, according to Clark, 1996), in conjunction with their invocation of a relevant context in cognitive terms, in order to create discourse.

Discourse, on the other hand, refers to the hierarchically-structured, mentally represented product of the sequences of utterance, propositional, illocutionary and indexical acts which the participants are carrying out as the communication takes place. The crucial point about this distinction is that discourse is a (re-)constructive, and therefore highly probabilistic enterprise:

from the addressee’s perspective, it is by no means a question of simply directly decoding the text in order to arrive at the fully fledged message originally intended by the addressor. Indeed, the addressee actively contributes both to the text and to the discourse via their phatic signals, indications of (mis)understanding, and other reactions to the speaker’s moves. ‘Meaning’ does not lie “in” the text, it has to be constructed by the addressee (and the speaker!) via the text and an appropriate context (cf. Coupland et al., 1991: 5). In any case, the text is often, if not always, both incomplete and indeterminate in relation to the discourse which may be derived from it in conjunction with a context.

Written Discourse

With written texts, some of the problems associated with spoken transcripts are absent: we do not have to contend with people all speaking at once, the writer has usually had time to think about what to say and how to say it, and the sentences are usually well formed in a way that the utterances of natural, spontaneous talk are not. But the overall questions remain the same: what norms or rules do people adhere to when creating written texts?

Are texts structured according to recurring principles, is there a hierarchy of units comparable to acts, moves and exchanges, and are there conventional ways of opening and closing texts? As with spoken discourse, if we do find such regularities, and if they can be shown as elements that have different realizations in different languages, or that they may present problems for learners in other ways, then the insights of written discourse analysis might be applicable, in specifiable ways, to language teaching.

Later on, in the lesson of "discourse analysis and grammar", we shall consider some grammatical regularities observable in well-formed written texts, and how the structuring of sentences has implications for units such as paragraphs, and for the progression of whole texts. We shall also look at how the grammar of English offers a limited set of options for creating surface links between the clauses and sentences of a text, otherwise known as cohesion. Basically, most texts display links from sentence to sentence in terms of grammatical features such as pronominalization, ellipsis (the omission of otherwise expected elements because they are retrievable from the previous text or context) and conjunction of various kinds (see Halliday and Hasan 1976).

The resources available for grammatical cohesion can be listed finitely and compared across languages for translatability and distribution in real texts. Texts displaying such cohesive features are easy to find, such as this one on telephones:

Activity

If you'd like to give someone a phone for Christmas, there are *plenty* to choose from. *Whichever* you go for, if *it's* to be used on the BT [British Telecom] network, make sure *it's* approved - look for the label with a green circle to confirm *this*. Phones labelled with a red triangle are prohibited. (Which? December 1989: 599)

The italicized items are all interpretable in relation to items in previous sentences. Plenty is assumed to mean 'plenty of phones'; you in the first and second sentence are interpreted as the same 'you*; whichever is interpreted as 'whichever telephone'; it is understood as the telephone, and this as 'the fact that it is approved'. These are features of grammatical cohesion, but there are lexical clues too: go for is a synonym of choose, and there is lexical repetition of phone, and of label.

Notice that, when talking of cohesion in the telephone text, we spoke of interpreting items and understanding them. This is important because the cohesive items are clues or signals as to how the text should be read, they are not absolutes. The pronoun it only gives us the information that a non-human entity is being referred to; it does not necessarily tell us which one.

It could potentially have referred to Christmas in the phone text, but that would have produced an incoherent reading of the text. So, cohesion is only a guide to coherence, and coherence is something created by the reader in the act of reading the text. Coherence is the feeling that a text hangs together, that it makes sense, and is not just a jumble of sentences (see Neubauer 1983: 7).

The sentences 'Clare loves potatoes. She was born in Ireland.' are cohesive (Clarelshe), but are only coherent, if one already shares the stereotype ethnic association between being Irish and loving potatoes, or is prepared to assume a cause-effect relationship between the two sentences. So cohesion is only pan of coherence in reading and writing, and indeed in spoken language too, for the same processes operate there.

What is Meant by Discourse Analysis and What to Analyze in a Written Discourse?

As McCarthy, M. (1991) summarized, when most linguists' major concerns were still with analyzing the structure of sentences, Zellig Harris published his paper entitled Discourse Analysis in 1952, in which he showed interests in the linguistic element's distribution in extended texts. Although what he studied was different from the discourse analysis studied today, more and more scholars, either of linguistics or of other disciplines, began to involve themselves in relevant studies.

It was from all those studies in 1960s and 1970s, that that discourse analysis, which "is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used" (McCarthy, M. 1991P5), developed into "a wide-ranging and heterogeneous discipline, which finds its unity in the description of language above the sentence and an interest in the contexts and cultural influences which affect language in use" (McCarthy, M.1991 P7). In addition to M.A.K. Halliday's functional approach to language, Sinclair and Coulthard at the University of Birmingham were as important and influential to the development of Discourse Analysis in Britain (McCarthy, M.1991). Michael Hoey also contributed his own understanding of discourse. He roughly summarized discourse as any stretch of spoken or written language, longer than one sentence, which is self-contained in a reasonable way. Therefore, Hoey argued that "discourse analysis is the area of linguistics that concerns itself with the study of these multiutterance acts of communication." (Hoey, M.1991)

Larger Pattern in Text

The clause-relational approach to text also concerns itself with larger patterns which regularly occur in texts. If we consider a simple text like the following, which is pretend for the sake of illustration, we can see a pattern emerging which is found in hundreds of texts in a wide variety of subject areas and contexts:

Activity

Most people like to take a camera with them when they travel abroad. But all airports nowadays have X-ray security screening and X rays can damage film. One solution to this problem is to purchase a specially designed lead-lined pouch. These are cheap and can protect film from all but the strongest X rays.

The first sentence presents us with a situation and the second sentence with some sort of complication or problem. The third sentence describes a response to the problem and the final sentence gives a positive evaluation of the response. Such a sequence of relations forms a problem-solution pattern, and problem-solution patterns are extremely common in texts.

These larger patterns which may be found in texts (and indeed which may constitute the whole text) are the objects of interpretation by the reader, just as the smaller clause-relation were, and in the same way, are often signaled by the same sorts of grammatical and lexical devices such as subordination and parallelism. In our concocted text, we have a conjunction (but) indicating an adversative relation backward lexical reference to 'this problem' (damage caused by X rays)-land a forward reference to the solution (lead-lined pouches k) , Both reader and writers need to be aware of these signaling devices and to be able to use them when necessary to process textual relations that are immediately obvious and to compose text that assists the reader in the act of interpretation. The larger patterns such as the problem-solution pattern are culturally ingrained, but they are often realized in a sequence of textual segments which is not so straightforward as our concocted text suggests.

The sequence situation-problem-response-evaluation may be varied, but we do normally expect all the elements to be present in a well-formed text; where the sequence is varied, signaling plays an even more important part in signposting the text, that is, showing the reader a way round it. We have seen in this chapter that discourse analysis is a vast subject area within linguistics, encompassing as it does the analysis of spoken and written language over and above concerns such as the structure of the clause or sentence. In this brief introduction we have looked at just some ways of analyzing speech and writing and just some aspects of those particular models.

Lecture-02 Two Strands of Discourse Analysis

SPOKEN LANGUAGE-I

Spoken language is a vast subject, and little is known in hard statistical terms of the distribution of different types of speech in people's everyday lives. If we list at random a number of different types of speech and consider how much of each day or week, we spend engaged in each one, we can only roughly guess at some level of frequency ranking, other than to say that casual conversation is almost certainly the most frequent for most people.

The rest will depend on our daily occupation and what sorts of contacts we have with others. Some different types of speech might be:

Telephone calls (business and private)
Interviews (jobs, journalistic, in official settings)

Classroom (classes, seminars, lectures, tutorials)
Rituals (church prayers, sermons, and weddings)
Monologues (speeches, stories, jokes)
Language-in-action (talk accompanying ***doing:*** fixing, cooking,
Assembling and demonstrating, etc.)
Casual conversation (strangers, friends, intimates)
Organizing and directing people (work, home, in the street)

Adjacency pairs

An **adjacency pair** is a unit of conversation that contains an exchange of one turn each by two speakers. The turns are functionally related to each other in such a fashion that the first turn requires a certain type or range of types of second turn.
Pairs of utterances in talk are often mutually dependent; a most obvious example is that a question predicts an answer, and that an answer presupposes a question. It is possible to state the requirements, in a normal conversational sequence, for many types of utterances, in terms of what is expected as a response and what certain responses presuppose.
Some examples might be:

Utterance function	***Expected response***
Greeting	greeting
Congratulation	thanks
Apology	acceptance
Inform	acknowledge
Leave-taking	leave-taking

Pairs of utterances such as greeting-greeting and apology-acceptance are called adjacency pairs. Adjacency pairs are of different types. Some ritualized first pair-parts may have an identical second pair-part (hello - hello, happy New Year – happy New Year), while others expect a different second pair-part (congratulations - thanks).

Equally, a second pair-part such as thanks will presuppose quite a wide range of first pair-parts (offers, apologies, informing moves, congratulations, commiserations, etc.). We can segment the polite refusal of the invitation into ***appreciation*** ('thanks very much'), ***softener*** (I'm afraid'), ***reason*** ('I'm booked up') and ***face-saver*** ('what about ... '). This pattern 'would typically be found between adult friends, colleagues, etc. in informal but polite situations.

More friendly situations may well omit the 'softener'. Each of these elements will have several possible realizations, and these can be practiced in language learning in a systematic way. Different roles and settings will generate different structures for such adjacency pairs, and discourse analysts try to observe in natural data just what patterns occur in particular settings.

Similarly, it seems that native speakers usually preface ***disagreement*** second pair-parts in English with partial agreement ('yes, but...) and with softeners (Pearson 1986). This sort of observation has direct implications for the design of role play and similar activities and what linguistic elements need to be pre-taught, where learners are instructed to behave in ways specified by the activity and where the goal is a simulation of 'real life' discourse.

The principle of adjacency pairs and how they are realized in natural speech point to the importance of creating minimal contexts in the teaching of common communicative functions and the limited value of teaching single utterances. We have seen once again that the structure and elaboration of the adjacency pair is determined by role and setting, and that the functions of its component utterances depend on the co-presence of both parts. **Exchanges**

An **exchange** is a sequence of **discourse** moves by at least two speakers that forms a topical (or sub topical unit). A minimal **exchange** comprises an initiating move plus a contribution by another speaker.

There are two classes of exchanges; boundary exchanges and teaching exchanges (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1992, pg.25). Boundary exchanges contain two moves, framing and focusing moves. The only three principals of teaching exchanges described by Sinclair and Coulthard are informing, directing, and eliciting exchanges (1992, pg.26-27). Sinclair and Coulthard state that, “A typical exchange in the classroom consists of an initiation by the teacher, followed by a response from the pupil, followed by feedback, to the pupil’s response from the teacher…” (1992, pg.3).

Let us have a look the teaching exchanges separately to illustrate how each one is structured.

- **Information Exchange**

Informing exchanges take place when the teacher needs to tell his/her students about new information, facts, or just simply say something to them. The opening move will therefore begin with an informative act but does not necessarily need to be followed by a reply by the students (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1992, pg.26). For instance,

A group of people used symbols to do their writing. They used pictures Instead of, as we write, in words. (Willis, 1992, pg.112)

Response from the student is optional, and therefore Sinclair and Coulthard label the structure of this exchange as I(R), whereas the aspect in brackets is optional, meaning there is an option for a response but not any feedback (1992, pg.26).

- **Directing Exchange**

A directing exchange is “…designed to get the pupils to do but not to say something” (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1992, pg.26). Therefore, the response from the students is the ‘doing’ part, which will most likely but not always be a non-verbal response. Even though it is non-verbal, the students respond to the direction the teacher has given.

- **Eliciting Exchange**

The most common exchange in the classroom is an eliciting exchange (Willis, 1992, pg.113). These exchanges begin with the teacher asking a question (usually one they already know the answer to). An answer is then given by the student, and finally a follow-up evaluation by the teacher. (Hellermann, 2003, pg.80). Here is an example from the study done by Sinclair and Coulthard.

Teaching exchanges can be further divided into eleven sub-categories; six 'free' and five 'bound' exchanges (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 49). Bound exchanges are tied to previous free exchanges, which they refer back to. These sub-categories can be defined below, which are based on Raine (2010, p. 7).

Table 1: Sub-categories of free exchange

Sub-class of exchange	Structures	Function of exchange
Teacher inform (Inform)	I (R)	to convey information to the pupils
Teacher direct (Direct)	I R (F)	to elicit a non-verbal response from the pupils
Teacher elicit (Elicit)	I R F	to elicit a verbal response from a pupil
Check (Check)	I R (F)	to discover how well students are getting on and identify any problems
Pupil elicit (P-Elicit)	I R	to elicit a verbal response 8 from the teacher
Pupil inform (P-Inform)	I F	to convey information to the teacher.

Table 2: Sub-categories of bound exchange

Sub-class of exchange	Structures	Function of exchange
Re-initiation (i) (Re-initiation)	I R Ib R F	to induce a response to a previously unanswered question

Re-initiation (ii) (Re-initiation)	I R F (Ib) R F	to induce a correct response to a previously incorrectly answered elicitation
Listing (Listing)	I R F (Ib) R F	to withhold evaluation until two or more responses are received to an elicitation
Reinforce (Reinforce)	I R Ib R	to induce a (correct) response to a previously issued directive
Repeat (Repeat)	I R Ib R F	to induce a repetition of a response

Turn-taking

A **turn** is the time when a speaker is talking and **turn-taking** is the skill of knowing when to start and finish a **turn** in a **conversation**. It is an important organizational tool in spoken **discourse**. One way that speakers signal a finished **turn** is to drop the pitch or volume of their voice at the end of an utterance.
The rules regarding turn-taking in formal situations can differ markedly than between people who are speaking casually together.

Etiquette calls interrupting someone else rude behavior and unfitting for people in refined society. Emily Post's book of etiquette goes beyond this to describe the importance of listening and responding to the correct topic as being part of good manners when participating in any form of conversation. "By waiting your turn to speak and avoiding interrupting another person, you not only show your desire to work together with the other members of your society, you also show respect for your fellow members."

There are two guiding principles in conversations:

1. Only one person should talk at a time.
2. We cannot have silence.

The transition between one speaker and the next must be as smooth as possible and without a break. We have different ways of indicating that a turn will be changed:

- Formal methods: for example, selecting the next speaker by name or raising a hand.
- Adjacency pairs: for instance, a question requires an answer.
- Intonation: for instance, a drop in pitch or in loudness.
- Gesture: for instance, a change in sitting position or an expression of inquiry.
- The most important device for indicating turn-taking is through a change in **gaze direction**.

Interruptions in a conversation are violations of the turn-taking rule.

- Interruption: where a new speaker interrupts and gains the floor.
- Butting in: where a new speaker tries to gain the floor but does not succeed.
- Overlaps: where two speakers are talking at the same time.

Responses such as mmmm and yeah are known as **minimal responses**. These are not interruptions but rather are devices to show the listener is listening, and they assist the speaker to continue. They are especially important in telephone conversations where the speaker cannot see the listener's eyes and hence must rely on verbal cues to tell whether the listener is paying attention.

SPOKEN LANGUAGE-II

Transactions and topics

A **transactional** encounter is one where you're going through the motions to get the task or the **discourse** done. Talk as transaction refers to situations where the focus is on what is said or done. The message and making oneself understood clearly and accurately is the central focus, rather than the participants and how they interact socially with each other.

In such transactions, Jones suggests, "Talk is associated with other activities. For example, students may be engaged in hands-on activities (e.g., in a science lesson) to explore concepts associated with floating and sinking. In this type of spoken language students and teachers usually focus on meaning or on talking their way to understanding." *(Jones 1996:14)*

Examples of talk as transaction are:

- Classroom group discussions and problem-solving activities
- A class activity during which students design a poster
- Discussing needed computer repairs with a technician
- Discussing sightseeing plans with a hotel clerk or tour guide
- Making a telephone call to obtain flight information
- Asking someone for directions on the street
- Buying something in a shop
- Ordering food from a menu in a restaurant

Burns (1998) distinguishes between two different types of talk as transaction. The first type involves situations where the focus is on giving and receiving information and where the participants focus primarily on what is said or achieved (e.g., asking someone for directions). Accuracy may not be a priority, as long as information is successfully communicated or understood. The second type is transactions that focus on obtaining goods or services, such as checking into a hotel or ordering food in a restaurant.

The main features of talk as transaction are:

- It has a primarily information focus.
- The main focus is on the message and not the participants.
- Participants employ communication strategies to make them understood.
- There may be frequent questions, repetitions, and comprehension checks, as in the example from the preceding classroom lesson. There may be negotiation and digression.
- Linguistic accuracy is not always important.

Some of the skills involved in using talk for transactions are:

- Explaining a need or intention
- Describing something
- Asking questions
- Asking for clarification
- Confirming information
- Justifying an opinion
- Making suggestions
- Clarifying understanding
- Making comparisons
- Agreeing and disagreeing

Transaction is part of a conversation which can achieve certain communicative functions or topics. Class conversation, business conversation, telephone conversation, etc. can be divided into several transactions according to different purpose and development, such as lecture transaction, business transaction, telephone transaction, etc. In addition, students can be divided into groups or pairs to play roles in telephone conversation, visiting conversation and business conversation, etc. For more complicated transaction training, students could narrate or comment according to different structures of text, such as, narrate (personal experience, tales, and jokes, etc), descript(subjects), exposit (how to operate), persuade (not smoking) and argue.

Interactional and transactional talk

When you talk to people, are you focused on the **transaction** or your **interaction**? A **transactional** encounter is one where you're going through the motions to get the task or the discourse done. ... **Interaction** occurs when two people are engaged in a dialogue or actively participating in the process. **Interactional language** is the **language** we use to build and maintain relationships. It can be compared to **transactional language**, which normally carries a message and is the **language** used to get things done, to maintain **interaction**, speakers use **interactional** strategies.

In the linear model, the sender communicates to the receiver. It is a one-way channel. The examples **in the** book are radio and television broadcasting. **In the transactional model** there are two people communicating to one another simultaneously.
Small talk and conversation are examples of interactional talk, which refers to communication that primarily serves the purpose of social interaction. Small talk consists of short exchanges that usually begin with a greeting, move to back-and-forth exchanges on non-controversial topics, such as the weekend, the weather, work, school, etc. and then often conclude with a fixed expression, such as *See you later*. Such interactions are at times almost formulaic and often do not result in a real conversation. They serve to create a positive atmosphere and to create a comfort zone between people who might be total strangers.

Skills involved in mastering small talk include:

- Acquiring fixed expressions and routines used in small talk.
- Using formal or casual speech depending on the situation.
- Developing fluency in making small talk around predictable topics.
- Using opening and closing strategies.
- Using back-channeling. Back-channeling involves the use of expressions such as *really, mm, is that right? yeah,* etc., nodding of the head, and, very commonly, short rhetorical questions, such as *Do you? Are you?* or *Did you?* Such actions and expressions reflect the role of an active, interested and supportive listener.

One of the most important aspects of conversation is managing the flow of conversation around topics. Whereas topics are only lightly touched on in small talk, as we noted above, conversation involves a joint interaction around topics and the introduction of new topics that are linked through each speaker's contributions. The skills involved include: □ Initiating a topic in casual and formal conversation.

- Selecting vocabulary appropriate to the topic. □ Giving appropriate feedback responses.

Providing relevant evaluative comments through back-channeling.

- Taking turns at appropriate points in the conversation.
- Asking for clarification and repetition.
- Using discourse strategies for repairing misunderstanding.
- Using discourse strategies to open and close conversations.
- Using appropriate intonation and stress patterns to express meaning Learners need a wide range of topics at their disposal in order to manage the flow of conversation, and managing interaction and developing topic fluency is a priority in speaking classes. Another important communication skill is the ability to use English to accomplish different kinds of transactions. A transaction is an interaction that focuses on getting something done, rather than maintaining social interaction. (In communicative language teaching, transactions are generally referred to as *functions*, and include such areas as requests, orders, offers, suggestions, etc.) A transaction may consist of a sequence of different functions. Two different kinds of transactions are often distinguished. One type refers to transactions that occur in situations where the focus is on giving and receiving information, and where the participants focus primarily on what is said or achieved (e.g. asking someone for directions or bargaining at a garage sale). The second type refers to transactions that involve obtaining goods or services, such as checking into a hotel or ordering food in a restaurant. Talk in these situations is often information- focused, is associated with specific activities and often occurs in specific situations.

The following are examples of communication of this kind:

- Ordering food in a restaurant.
- Ordering a taxi.
- Checking into a hotel.
- Changing money at a bank.
- Getting a haircut.
- Buying something in a store.
- Borrowing a book from the library.

The skills involved in using English for transactions include:

- Selecting vocabulary related to particular transactions and functions.
- Using fixed expressions and routines.
- Expressing functions.
- Using scripts for specific transactions and situations.
- Asking and answering questions.
- Clarifying meanings and intentions.
- Confirming and repeating information.
- Using communication strategies.

Idea Theory of Meaning

"Story" refers to the actual sequence of events of events in a **narrative**; discourse refers to the manipulation of that **story** in the presentation of the **narrative**. These terms refer; then, to the basic

structure of all **narrative** form. It's important in your own communications with members to subtly refer to different elements in the **community narrative**. A **narrative** is a powerful tool that unites communities. It creates shared experiences, establishes agreed norms, and helps us make sense of the context/content of current actions.
The story consists of events (things that happen) and so-called existents the characters that makes things happen or have things happen to them and the setting, meaning the place where things happen. Events can be either brought about actively, in which case they are called actions (one character kills another one), or they just happen (someone dies of a heart-attack).

An **anecdote** (pronounced an-ik-doht) is a very short story that is significant to the topic at hand; usually adding personal knowledge or experience to the topic. Basically, anecdotes are stories. Like many stories, anecdotes are most often told through speech; they are spoken rather than written down. The term “anecdote” originally comes from the Greek phrase *ἀνέκδοτα* , meaning “things unpublished.” Types of Anecdotes can be presented in an endless number of forms.

There are several typical types of anecdotes and some are given below.

Humorous is an anecdote that adds humor to the topic at hand. **Reminiscent** a story that remembers something general about the past or a specific event, expressed in ways such as “that reminds me of…”, “when I used to…”, “I remember when…”, and so on. For example, a child asks her grandmother for $2 to buy candy at the store, and the grandmother says, “You know back in my day, all you needed was a penny to go to the candy shop! My grandmother would give me a nickel and I’d be a happy clam!” **Philosophical** is an anecdote expressed in order to make others think more deeply about the topic at hand. **Inspirational** is an anecdote that is told in order to inspire hope or other positive emotions. They are often about not giving up, achieving goals or dreams, making the impossible possible, and so on. **Cautionary** Stories are warning others about the dangers or negative consequences surrounding the topic at hand.
At the End, anecdotes are valuable literary devices because of their **diversity** in style, tone, and utility—they can be used by almost any person, in any situation, in any genre. Like any story shared with others, anecdotes serve countless purposes and make situations more interesting for both the characters and the audience. An anecdote is a timeless device that is used across literature, film, television and theater, and has been benefiting storytellers for centuries.

WRITTEN LANGUAGE-I

Text Types

The notion of text type is an abstract category designed to characterize the main structure of a particular text or one of its parts according to its dominant properties. It is intended to integrate common features of historically varying genres (novella, novel, short story, etc.) and therefore to reduce the complexity of the many overlapping kinds of texts to distinct textual phenomena. In virtue of narratology's traditional focus on time, these phenomena are semantic properties that constitute the temporal character of the text (passage). Consequently, the text type 'narrative' is defined by the property 'change of state' of concrete objects and the text type 'description', accordingly, by the property 'is about states' of concrete objects.

'Text type', could be restricted to the characterization of texts according to pragmatic properties (e.g., the speaker's purpose). Therefore, any text may be used to persuade somebody. The most appropriate text type in this case (or the text type most often used in connection with the purpose to persuade) may be the text type 'argument'. The persuasive mode of discourse can be instantiated by any text type, depending on pragmatic concerns. The notion 'mode of discourse' is thus context-sensitive; that of 'text type' is not.

Another **category** that is closely related to the notion of text type is 'genre'. However, text type and genre should be kept strictly apart from each other as well. Unlike the numerous historically generated subclasses of genre (such as novel, sonnet, recipe, homepage) that have evolved by chance, typologies of text type include a limited number of different items and aim at a complete set of all possible types that can make up any text.

One important consequence that follows from this definition is that narrative as a genre is distinguished from the text type 'narrative'. The text type 'narrative' derives from the prevailing quality of texts considered to be prototypical for the genre narrative or fiction, members of which are often not pure narratives in the sense of text type. While any text that is called, say, a novel belongs to the genre narrative, probably no novel is contains only the text type 'narrative'. Usually, novels exhibit all text types.
However, any experimental literary text that is called a novel belongs to the genre narrative, even if it is mainly characterized by the text type 'description'. The problem of equivocation (one term denoting different notions) occurs in every case. This can be avoided when another term is available: thus, the term 'emphases denote a descriptive genre whereas 'description' denotes the text type usually dominating emphasis. Yet 'description' is by no means restricted to this latter use, and the term 'emphases mainly refer to literary descriptions depicting pieces of visual art (Henkel 1997; Klarer 2005).

There are many varying classifications and typologies, each including different types (Georgakopoulou 2005). The text types 'description' and 'narrative', though, seem to be part of almost all typologies (except for Fludernik 2000; see below, § 3.2). For example, in addition to those mentioned in the definition above, exposition and instruction are discussed as text types by Werlich (1976), van Dijk (1980) adds scientific inquiries to the list of text types, and de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) include didactic texts. Sometimes, the notion of text type is meant to characterize entire texts, sometimes not; some authors focus on semantic features, others on pragmatic features.

Heinemann's (2000) survey of the notion of text type in linguistics shows that the linguistic typologies of texts follow the application of different criteria: grammatical properties of texts, semantic properties of texts, situational context, function, etc. This practice has brought about a huge variety of heterogeneous concepts. There is no agreement on which notion should satisfy which criteria. And, what is more, even the use of particular terms is not regular. Thus, linguists often use our term in the sense of what above was called a genre. For an extremely fine-grained classification with hundreds of genres, termed "text types," see Görlach (2004: 23–88).

Units in Written Discourse

Discourse analysts do what people in their everyday experience of language do instinctively and largely unconsciously: notice patterning's of language in use and the circumstances (participants, situations, purposes, outcomes) with which these are typically associated. The discourse analyst's particular contribution to this otherwise mundane activity is to do the noticing consciously, deliberately, systematically, and, as far as possible, objectively, and to produce accounts (descriptions, interpretations, explanations) of what their investigations have revealed.

The sentence is more obvious as a grammatical unit in writing, although certainly not in all kinds of writing: signs and notices, small ads, notes, forms, tickets all contain frequent examples of non-sentences (lists of single words, verb less clauses, etc.).

The internal construction of the sentence has always been the province of grammar. We argued that a number of things in clause and sentence grammar have implications for the discourse as a whole, in particular, word order, cohesion, and **tense** and aspect. For the purposes of our discussion of these discourse features, the sentence will have no special status other than as a grammatical and orthographic unit which can be exploited where desired for pedagogical illustration, just as the clause can.

It is possible to devise interactive activities which involve decisions on word order, cohesion and sequences of tenses in discourse such as the 'text-jigsaw' activity. It has been used successfully with groups at widely different levels to focus on bottom-up choices of these kinds. In this activity, a text is read in class, and any other desired activities carried out on it. When its content is familiar, it is then presented in jigsaw format, divided up into its individual sentences (or indeed groups of sentences or paragraphs; the decision is purely a practical one).

What this means is that one group or individual gets the text with sentences (or paragraphs) 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, etc. and has to recreate sentences 2,4, 6, 8, etc. in their own words from their familiarity with the content. The other group or individual gets sentences 2, 4, 6, 8, etc. and has to recreate the odd-numbered ones. When all the new sentences are ready, the sentences originally provided are discarded, the two sets of created sentences are put together to see if they make a coherent and cohesive text, and the pair or group together make any changes needed until they are satisfied with the finished product. The activity produces interesting results, as with this group of advanced learners of English.

Clause Relations

Clause-relational approach to written text stressed that the units of written discourse, rather than always being co-extensive with sentences (though they sometimes are), were best seen as functional segments (of anything from phrasal to paragraph length) which could be related to one another by a finite set of cognitive relations, such as cause-consequence, instrument-achievement, temporal sequence, and matching relations such as contrasting and equivalence. Individual segments of texts combined to form the logical structure of the whole and to form certain characteristic patterns (such as problem-solution). The sequencing of segments and how the relations between them are signaled were viewed as factors in textual coherence (see Winter **1977;** Hoey **1983).**

In fact, the problems which could be subsumed under the notion of cohesion by conjunction in the last reader activity can also be viewed from a clause-relational standpoint, in that inappropriate use of conjunctions creates difficulties for the reader in relating segments of the text to one another coherently. It is also noted that the borderline between how conjunctions signal clause relations and how certain lexical items do the same is somewhat blurred, and that conjunctions such as and, so and because have their lexical equivalents in nouns, verbs and adjectives such as additional, cause (as noun or verb), consequent, instrumental, reason, and so on. Therefore, as well as activities that focus on conjunction and other local cohesive choices, activities aimed at the lexicon of clause-relational signals may also be useful. Segment-chain activities can be used for this purpose. An opening segment (which could be a sentence or more) and a closing segment of a text are given to a group of four or five students, and each individual is given the start of a segment containing a different lexical clause signal. Individuals complete their own segment with as much text as they feel necessary, and then compare their segment with everyone else's in order to assemble the segments into a coherent text. This involves not only being satisfied with the individual segments but deciding on an appropriate sequence for the chain of clause relations that will lead logically to the given closing segment, and making any changes felt necessary to improve coherence.

WRITTEN LANGUAGE-II

Patterns and the learner

Learning **patterns** were originally developed in order to support **learning** of university students; however, we think it can be applied to any learners in various situations like engineering, business, science, and everyday life due to the abstract descriptions of the **pattern** language.

McCarthy (1993) states that, written discourse analysis is not a new method for teaching languages, rather it is “fundamentally different way of looking at language compared with sentence-dominated models" (p. 170). Written text (in this case, English written text) is naturally organized into several types of patterns.

Written text conforms to rules that most successful writers unconsciously follow and native readers unconsciously expect to find. Some of the characteristic patterns in written discourse analysis are the Problem/Solution structure, discussed in Hoey (1994), the Claim/Counterclaim structure covered in McCarthy (1993), and the General/Specific structure discussed in Coulthard (1994).

There could be several overall textual patterns as pointed out by Holland and Lewis (1997: 27), McCarthy (1996: 157), and Mikulecky and Jeffries (1996:295-296), prevailing studies have reported three types of common patterns that are broadly classified as ***problem-solution, claimcounterclaim,*** and ***general-specific***. The problem-solution pattern, identified by Hoey (cited in Holland and Lewis 1997:12), consists of four basic elements: *situation* (within which there is a complication or problem), *problem* (within the situation, requiring a response), *response* or *solution* (to the problem), and *evaluation* or *result* (of the response /solution).

The claim-counterclaim pattern is one where a series of claims and contrasting counterclaims is presented in relation to a given issue (Holland and Lewis 1997: 23). The pattern similar to the *hypothetical-real* (see McCarthy 1996: 80) is reported to relate to the problem-solution pattern in that “instead of presenting the ‘facts’ of a situation, it presents a ‘hypotheses about the likely facts or situation” (Winter 1998: 62). The general-specific pattern, on the other hand, is one in which a generalization is followed by more specific statements, perhaps exemplifying the generalization which analyzing and raising students’ awareness resembles the ***preview-detail relation*** of Hoey (cited in McCarthy and Carter 1994:57), and the *Listing* pattern of Mikulecky and Jeffries (1986: 103 - 137, and 1996:103 - 131).

Overall pattern is associated with certain words known as *discourse-organizing* [or *signaling*] *words* whose job is to organize and structure the argument (McCarthy 1996: 75), and to help a reader to locate the pattern in written text. Lists of signaling words are reported for the problemsolution pattern by Holland and Lewis (1997: 16), and McCarthy (1996: 79); for the claimcounterclaim, by Holland and Lewis (1997:26), Jordan (cited in McCarthy 1996: 80), and Winter (1998: 62 - 63); and for the general-specific, by Coulthard (1998: 7), and Mikulecky and Jeffries (1986:103, and 1996: 103).

Culture and rhetoric

"Culture is a system of beliefs, values, and assumptions about life that guide behavior and are shared by a group of people. It includes customs, language, and material artifacts. These are transmitted from generation to generation, rarely with explicit instruction." And "**Rhetoric** is the art, practice and study of human communication."

The convergence of rhetoric, culture, and communication has led to the development of two predominant areas of study within the field of communication: **intercultural rhetoric** and **comparative rhetoric**. **Intercultural rhetoric** illustrates how culture-based arguments are constructed by advocates during intercultural interactions and how the arguments make sense within a particular cultural frame or worldview. Rhetorical practices are seen as emerging from the beliefs and values of distinctive cultural communities, and the convergence of intercultural communication and rhetoric becomes evident when people act rhetorically and their diverse cultural assumptions gradually or suddenly become apparent during intercultural interactions.

Comparative rhetoric focuses on the cross-cultural study of rhetorical traditions, past or present, in societies around the world. Comparison of (rather than interaction between) the rhetorical practices of two or more cultures is often the focus of comparative rhetoric studies. Comparison helps in the identification of rhetorical features in one culture that might not be evident otherwise, to unearth what is universal and what distinctive in any rhetorical tradition, including that of the West. Intercultural rhetoric and comparative rhetoric share some conceptual and methodological features; both fields are characterized by similar beginnings and some shared debates. However, they also have distinct characteristics, challenges, and historiographies.

For intercultural rhetoric, approaching intercultural contexts and situations utilizing theories and concepts from rhetorical studies affirms non-Western modes of reasoning and encouragement. Recent methodological developments have allowed critics to more comprehensively represent rhetorical traditions and to discover novel ways to understand intercultural conflicts and mediate cultural differences. Conceptualizing rhetorical situations as intercultural dialogues suggests the ways in which intercultural rhetorical theorists need to be mindful of the multifocal quality of social discourses.

Rhetorical interpretation of texts benefits from a comparative approach that allows for speculation with respect for and grounding in another culture's history, as well as reflection on the cultural outsider's motive and assumptions. It is useful for the quest of meaning not to be limited to the standpoints within each disparate culture; pragmatically, they must have a dialogue since comparative rhetoric allows the analysis of different discourses, the discovery of common grounds of engagement, and the revelation of cultural assumptions.

Discourse and the reader

Discourse and reading in fact follow consistently from what we have said in this lesson and in earlier ones: we cannot explain discourse patterning at the macro-level without paying due attention to the role of grammar and lexis; by the same token, we cannot stand-in good reading without considering global and local reading skills simultaneously.
In recent years, questions of reading pedagogy have centered on whether bottom-up (i.e. decoding of the text step-by-step from small textual elements such as words and phrases) or topdown (using macro-level clues to decode the text) strategies are more important.

The debate seems to have settled, quite sensibly, on a compromise between local and global decoding, and there is ‘general agreement that efficient readers use top-down and bottom-up processing simultaneously (e.g., Eskey 1988). The best reading materials will encourage an engagement with larger textual forms (for example through problem-solving exercises at the whole-text level) but not neglect the role of individual words, phrases and grammatical devices in guiding the reader around the text (e.g., Greenall and Swan 1986, who achieve a balance of both ingredients).
But at both the micro- and macro-level, attentiveness in how to introduce the discourse dimension is called for. In the case of cohesion, for **example**, the precise relationship between cohesion and coherence is unclear, and focusing on cohesive devices for reading purposes may not guarantee any better route towards a coherent interpretation of the text (see Steffensen 1988). At the macro-level, much has been made in recent years of schema theory, that is, the role of background knowledge in the reader's ability to make sense of the text.

The theory is that new knowledge can only be processed coherently in relation to existing knowledge frameworks, and that the efficient reader activates the necessary frameworks to assist in decoding the text being read. The frameworks are not only knowledge about the world (e.g. about natural phenomena, about typical sequences of real-life events and behavior), but also about texts, how texts are typically structured and organized, consequently enabling us to talk about two kinds of schemata: content and formal, respectively. The theory in itself seems conceivable enough; the more we are locked into the world of the text, the easier it is to absorb new information. It is often held that the teacher's job is to help the reader to activate the appropriate schemata. While we have already tested the value of predicting what textual patterns a given text may be going to realize in reader activity, as an awareness activity for constructing patterns in writing, it is not at all certain whether activating the right formal schema for reading can help much if the right content schema is lacking.

If the teacher's job, then becomes one of supplying the appropriate content schemata for a possibly vast number of textual encounters, then we are out of the world of discourse as such and firmly in the realm of the teaching of culture, and we are not necessarily teaching the learner any skill that will be subsequently productive. What we have already said, and what may be repeated now, is that listening and reading have in common a positive and active role for the receiver, and, if any insight is to be taken seriously on board from discourse analysis. It is good that listeners and readers are constantly attending to the segmentation of the discourse, whether by intonational features in speech, or by orthographical features in writing, or by lexicogrammatical signals in both.

What is also clear is that good listeners and readers are always predicting what is to come, both in terms of the next few words and in terms of larger patterns such as problem-solution, narrative, and so on. This act of prediction may be in the form of precise prediction of content or a more diffuse prediction of a set of questions that the author is likely to answer. For this reason, interpreting the author's signals at the level of grammar and vocabulary as to what questions he/she is going to address is as useful as predicting, for **example**, the content of the rest of a given sentence or paragraph. This will mean paying attention to structures such as split sentences rhetorical questions, front-placing of adverbials and other markers, and any other discourse-level features. The reading text will be seen simultaneously as an artifact arising from a context and a particular set of assumptions of world knowledge, and as an unfolding message in which the writer has encoded a lot more than just content, with signposts at various stages to guide the reader around.

Lecture-03 Discourse Markers and Conversation

DISCOURSE MARKERS

Language

The production of coherent discourse is an interactive process that requires speakers to draw upon several different types of communicative knowledge that complement grammatical knowledge of sound, form, and meaning per se. Two aspects of communicative knowledge closely related to one another are *expressive* and *social*: the ability to use language to display personal and social identities, to convey attitudes and perform actions, and to negotiate relationships between self and other. Others include a *cognitive* ability to represent concepts and ideas through language and a *textual* ability to organize forms, and convey meanings, within units of language longer than a single sentence.
Discourse markers – expressions such as *oh*, *well*, *y'know*, and *but* – are one set of linguistic items that function in cognitive, expressive, social, and textual domains. Although there were scattered studies of discourse markers in the early 1980s, their study since then has abounded in various branches of linguistics and allied fields.

Functions of Discourse Markers " Laurel J. Brinton (1990) pointed out that discourse markers are used:
- to initiate discourse,
- to mark a boundary in discourse (shift/partial shift in topic),
- to preface a response or a reaction,
- to serve as a filler or delaying tactic,
- to aid the speaker in holding the floor,
- to affect an interaction or sharing between speaker and hearer,
- to bracket the discourse either cataphorically or anaphorically, - to mark either foregrounded or back grounded information."

Schiffrin's analysis of discourse markers (1987) was motivated by several concerns. From a sociolinguistic perspective, Schiffrin was interested in using methods for analyzing language that had been developed by variation theory to account for the use and distribution of forms in discourse. This interest, however, was embedded within a view of discourse not only as a unit of language but also as a process of social interaction (see Heller 2001; Schegloff, this volume). The analysis thus tried to reconcile both methodology (using both quantitative and qualitative methods) and underlying models (combining those inherited from both linguistics and sociology).

Unifying the analysis was the desire to account for the distribution of markers (which markers occurred where? why?) in spoken discourse in a way that attended to both the importance of language (what was the form? its meaning?) and interaction (what was going on – at the moment of use – in the social interaction?). Schiffrin's initial work defined discourse markers as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk" (1987a:31) – that is, nonobligatory utterance-initial items that function in relation to ongoing talk and text. She proposed that discourse markers could be considered as a set of linguistic expressions comprising members of word classes as varied as conjunctions (e.g., *and*, *but*, *or*), interjections (e.g., *oh*), adverbs (e.g., *now*, *then*), and lexicalized phrases (e.g., *y'know*, *I mean*).

Also proposed was a discourse model with different planes: a participation framework, information state, ideational structure, action structure, and exchange structure. The specific analyses showed that markers could work at different levels of discourse to connect utterances on either a single plane or across different planes. For **example**, *because* connects actions and ideas respectively. In *because* connects a request (to complete a task) and the justification for the request.

Meaning

Misunderstanding relayed information can lead to problems, big or small. Being able to understand understated subtext to be able to "read between the lines "or distinguish between factual reporting and fake news, editorials, or propaganda all rely on being able to interpret communication. Therefore, critical analysis of what someone is saying or writing is of ultimate importance. To go a step further, to take analyzing discourse to the level of a field of study is to make it more formal, to mesh linguistics and sociology. It can even be aided by the fields of psychology, anthropology, and philosophy.

The whole object and purpose of language is to be meaningful. Languages have developed and are constituted in their present forms in order to meet the needs of communication in all its aspects.

It is because the needs of human communication are so various and so diverse that the study of meaning is probably the most difficult and baffling part of the serious study of language. Traditionally, language has been defined as the expression of thought, but this involves far to narrow an interpretation of language or far too wide a view of thought to be serviceable. The expression of thought is just one among the many functions performed by language in certain contexts.

Lexical meaning is the most important component of sentence meaning is word meaning, the individual meanings of the words in a sentence, as lexical items. It is through lexical resources that languages maintain the flexibility their open-ended commitments demand. Every language has a vocabulary of many thousands of words, though not all are in active use, and some are known only to relatively few speakers.

Perhaps the commonest misunderstanding in considering vocabularies is the assumption that the words of different languages, or at least their nouns, verbs, and adjectives, label the same inventory of things, processes, and qualities in the world but unfortunately label them with different labels from language to language. If this were so, translation would be easier than it is; but the fact that translation, though often difficult, is possible indicates that people are talking about similar worlds of experience in their various languages.

Context

Discourse refers to information which can only be interpreted by reference to context. In interpreting discourse, we also infer contextual information which is part of knowledge about the world or a particular culture. Context is about the relationship between two speakers, or between the writer of a text and its audience, and both belong to a specific time and place.
Opinions on how to classify context vary from one to another. Some linguists divide context into two groups, while some insist on discussing context from three, four, or even six dimensions. I would like to divide context into linguistic context, situational context and cultural context.

Linguistic Context

Linguistic context refers to the context within the discourse, that is, the relationship between the words, phrases, sentences and even paragraphs. Take the word "bachelor" as an example. We can't understand the exact meaning of the sentence "He is a bachelor." without the linguistic context to make clear the exact meaning of this word.
Linguistic context can be explored from three aspects: deictic, co-text, and collocation. In a language event, the participants must know where they are in space and time, and these features relate directly to the deictic context, by which we refer to the deictic expressions like the time expressions now, then, etc., the spatial expressions here, there, etc., and the person expressions I, you, etc... Deictic expressions help to establish deictic roles which derive from the fact that in normal language behavior the speaker addresses his utterance to another person and may refer to himself, to a certain place, or to a time.

Situational Context

Situational context, or context of situation, refers to the environment, time and place, etc. in which the discourse occurs, and also the relationship between the participants. This theory is traditionally approached through the concept of register, which helps to clarify the interrelationship of language with context by handling it under three basic headings: field, tenor, and mode. Field of discourse refers to the ongoing activity. We may say field is the linguistic reflection of the purposive role of language user in the situation in which a text has occurred. Tenor refers to the kind of social relationship enacted in or by the discourse.
The notion of tenor, therefore, highlights the way in which linguistic choices are affected not just by the topic or subject of communication but also by the kind of social relationship within which communication is taking place. Mode is the linguistic reflection of the relationship the language user has to medium of transmission. The principal distinction within mode is between those channels of communication that entail immediate contact and those that allow for deferred contact between participants.

Cultural Context

Cultural context refers to the culture, customs and background of epoch in language communities in which the speakers participate. Language is a social phenomenon, and it is closely tied up with the social structure and value system of society. Therefore, language cannot avoid being influenced by all these factors like social role, social status, sex and age, etc. Social roles are culture-specific functions, institutionalized in a society and recognized by its members. By social status, we mean the relative social standing of the participants. Each participant in the language event must know, or make assumptions about his or her status in relation to the other, and in many situations, status will also be an important factor in the determination of who should initiate the conversation. Sex and age are often determinants of, or interact with, social status. The terms of address employed by a person of one sex speaking to an older person, may differ from those which would be employed in otherwise similar situations by people of the same sex or of the same age.

Discourse and Conversation

Background to conversation analysis

Conversation analysis is an approach to the analysis of spoken d. iscourse that looks at the way in which people manage their everyday conversational interactions. It examines how spoken discourse is organized and develops as speakers carry out these interactions. Conversation analysis has examined aspects of spoken discourse such as sequences of related utterances (adjacency *pairs)*, preferences for particular combinations of utterances (preference *organization)*, *turn taking, feedback, repair, conversational openings and closings, discourse markers* and *response tokens*. Conversation analysis works with recordings of spoken data and carries out careful and fine-grained analyses of this data.

Conversation analysis (CA) is an approach to the study of social interaction that emerged in the 1960s in the writings and lectures of the late sociologist Harvey Sacks and was consolidated in his collaborations with Emanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson in the later 1960s and early 1970s. CA is not a subfield of linguistics and does not take language as per its primary object of study. Rather, the object of study is the organization of human social interaction. However, because language figures centrally in the way humans interact, CA typically (though not necessarily) involves the analysis of talk. For all practical purposes, CA can be thought of as the study of talk in interaction and other forms of human conduct in interaction other than talk, for example, gaze, gesture, body orientations, and their combinations.
The boundaries of the field are not always completely clear. However, we can treat the application of the conversation analytic method as criteria to inclusion within the field. This method involves a series of steps beginning with what Sacks described as "unmotivated observation" of some stretch of recorded interaction (cop resent or telephone) with the goal merely of noticing something about it. Once a noticing has been made (e.g., some responses to yes-no questions are prefaced by "oh"), the researcher can then start assembling a collection of possible instances.

A collection constitutes the empirical basis upon which to develop an analysis of what distinctive work the phenomenon or practice initially noticed through unmotivated observation accomplishes this being independent of the contextual specifics of any particular instance. The method is therefore fundamentally qualitative in that it involves case-by-case study of each instance. However, though fundamentally qualitative in this sense, the method also involves looking across multiple instances in a collection of cases—it is this that allows us to see and to describe the generic, stable features of the practice that are independent of the particular contextual features of any given instance.
The scholarship within CA can be divided up in a number of different ways. One possible categorization distinguishes studies concerned primarily with the organization of talk itself and those concerned to use the methods of CA to investigate some other aspect of the social world.
Another possible categorization distinguishes studies of "ordinary conversation" from those of institutional interaction.

Transcription Conventions

A transcript is a technique for the fixing (e.g., on paper, on a computer screen) of brief events (e.g., utterances, gestures) for the purpose of detailed analysis. Transcripts are inherently incomplete and should be continuously revised to display features of an interaction that have been illuminated by a particular analysis and allow for new insights that might lead to a new analysis. (See Alessandro Duranti Linguistic Anthropology, Cambridge University Press, 1997: ch. 5, and References below).

Transcribed data extracts embody an effort to have the spelling of the words roughly indicate how the words sounded when produced. Often, this involves a departure from standard orthography.

In addition, the following symbols can be used to convey aspects of the talk that figure most frequently as design features of talk-in-interaction.

? ?	Arrows in the margin point to the lines of transcript relevant to the point being made in the text.
( )	Empty parentheses indicate talk too obscure to transcribe. Words or letters inside such parentheses indicate the transcriber’s best estimate of what is being said or who is saying it.
hhh .hhh	The letters
[	Left-side brackets indicate where overlaping talk begins.
]	Right-side brackets indicate where overlapping talk ends. Brackets should always appear with one or more other brackets of the same sort (left or right) on the line(s) directly above or below to indicate which turns are implicated in the overlap.
((coughs))	Words in double parentheses indicate transcriber’s comments, not transcriptions.

(0.8)(.)	Numbers in parentheses indicate intervals without speech in tenths of a second; a dot in parentheses marks an interval of less than (0.2).
becau-	A hyphen indicates an abrupt cut-off or self-interruption of the sound in progress indicated by the preceding letter(s) (the example here represents a self-interrupted “because”).
:::	Colons indicate a lengthening of the sound just preceding them, proportional to the number of colons.
Underlining	He says Underlining indicates stress or emphasis, proportional to the number of letters underlined.
?	An upward-pointing arrow indicates especially high pitch relative to preceding talk; a downward-pointing arrow indicates especially low pitch relative to preceding talk.
>talk	Right and left carats (or “more than” and “less than” symbols) indicate that the talk between them was speeded up or “compressed” relative to surrounding talk.
=	Equal signs (ordinarily at the end of one line and the start of an ensuing line attributed to a different speaker) indicate a “latched” relationship -- no silence at all between them. If the two lines are attributed to the same speaker and are separated by talk by another, the = marks a single, through-produced utterance by the speaker separated as a transcription convenience to display overlapping talk by another. A single equal sign in the middle of a line indicates no break in an ongoing spate of talk, where one might otherwise expect it, e.g., after a completed sentence.
°word°	Talk appearing within degree signs is lower in volume relative to surrounding talk.

WOrd	Upper case marks especially loud sounds relative to the WORD surrounding talk.
	Punctuation is designed to capture intonation, not grammar and should be used to describe intonation at the end of a sentence or some other, shorter unit. Use the symbols as follows: Question mark for marked rising intonation; . period for marked falling intonation; and , comma for a combination of slightly rising then slightly falling (or slightly falling and then slightly rising) intonation;

These notational conventions were developed by Gail Jefferson.

<u>Conversation analysis and Second Language Conversation</u>

While most studies in the area of conversation analysis have examined native speaker talk, in recent years attention has also shifted to non-native speaker talk. Markee (2000), for example, shows how conversation analysis can be used as a tool for analyzing and understanding the acquisition of a second language. He discusses the importance of looking at 'outlier' data in second language acquisition studies pointing out that, from a conversation analysis perspective, all participants' behavior makes sense to the individuals involved and must be accounted for, rather than set aside, in the analysis.
Storch (2001a, 2001b) carried out a fine-grained analysis of second language learner talk as her students carried out pair work activities in an ESL classroom. She found this analysis allowed her to identify the characteristics of the talk, and the nature of the interactions they engaged in that contributed to or impeded their success in the acquisition of the language items they were focusing on. She also found how the grouping of pairs in the class were important for the nature of their discourse and the extent to which the discourse was collaborative, and facilitated their learning or not (see Wong and Zhang Waring 2010 for a discussion of how conversation analysis can be drawn on in second language teaching and learning).

Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy locates itself at the node of research and practice, connecting the findings of conversation analysis (CA) to language teaching. In one sense, the text contributes to an existing, growing body of research that links CA to second language (L2) classroom interaction (e.g., Markee, 2000; Mori, 2002; Seedhouse, 2004; Waring, 2008). However, unlike most work in this vein, the authors are not attempting to describe verbal exchanges that occur in the L2 classroom. That is, rather than use CA to better understand how teachers and students talk.

Lecture-04

Discourse and Sociolinguistics

DISCOURSE SOCIETY

Discourse communities and speech communities

Discourse community is a group of people who share some kind of activity such as member of a club or association who have regular meeting. Or a group of students who go to classes at the same university. Members of a discourse community have particular ways of communicating with each other. They generally have shared goal and may have shared value and beliefs. Swales (1990) provides a set of characteristics for identifying a group of people as members of a particular discourse community, the group must have some set of shared common goals, some mechanisms for communication, and some way of providing the exchange of information amongst its member. The community must have its own particular genres, its own set of specialized terminology and vocabulary, and a high level of expertise in its particular area. These goals may be formally agreed upon (as in the case of clubs and associations) 'or they may be more tacit' (Swales 1990:24).

The ways in which people communicate which each other and exchange information will vary according to the group. This might include meeting, newsletter, casual conversations or a range of other types of written and/or spoken communications. That is, the discourse community will have particular ways for communicating with each other and ways of getting things done that have developed through time. Discourse communities also interact with wider speech communities. For example, the academic discourse community of students and academics also interacts with the wider speech community of the town or city in which the academic institution is located (Swales 1993). It is for these reasons that some people prefer the term communities of practice (Wenger 1998; Barton and Tusting 2005) to the term 'Discourse community'.

Speech communities and spoken and written discourse Speech community is a boarder term than the term discourse community. According to Richard Nordquist, speech community is a term in sociolinguistics and linguistics anthropology for a group of people who use the same variety of a language and who share specific rules for speaking and for interpreting speech. It includes discourse communities and the range and varieties of languages that members of the speech community use to interact with each other. Speech community is important for the discussions of spoken and written discourse. In linguistics, a speech community refers to any a group of people that speak the same language.

Defining a speech community there are some factors that make easier to define a speech community other than just language. Those are social, geographical, cultural, political and ethnic factors, race, age and gender. Not all of speakers always be full members of particular speech communities. For example, is in the case of second language setting. For example, a speaker may participate, only to a certain degree, in the target speech community. The degree to which occurs may be due to factors such as age to entry into the speech community, the speech community's attitudes and expectations towards the place of second language speakers in the speech community or other factors such as educational or occupational opportunities, limitations in the particular speech community.

Discourse and language choice Discourse and language choice is a variation of language when we interact with the other communities as explained by Holmes (2001) that the choice of language is being used in such as, with family, among friends, and in religious, educational and employment settings. Social factors such as who we are speaking to, the social context of the interaction, the topic, function and goal of the interaction, social distance between speakers, the formality of the setting or type of interaction and the status of each of the speakers are also important for accounting for the language choice that a person makes in these kinds of settings. "A speaker or writer may also be the speaker of a particular language variety but be using that variety to communicate with a wider speech community than just their own. The best seller Eats, Shoots & Leaves" (Truss 2003) for examples: Discourse, Social class and Social Networks Social Class and Social networks are the way we spoken or written with the other but we have to use the words or speech be right and polite such as when we speak or write something to family, we use the word be polite.

Discourse and language choice

When language is viewed as a system, we see it in terms of its component parts and how these interact. The three basic components are substance, form and meaning. Substance refers to the sounds the language uses (phonic substance), for example, its vowels and consonants, and the symbols used in writing (graphic substance). Next, we have three basic types of form: grammar, lexis and phonology. In the case of grammar, English forms include past-tense endings, modal verbs and prepositions, along with rules for putting these together (syntax). The lexical forms consist of words, which follow rules for vowel and consonant combinations, how they combine with other words in collocations, fixed expressions, etc. and how they interact with the grammar. Phonology gives us the forms for pronunciation, stress (the syllable with most intensity) and intonation (e.g., whether the voice rises or falls).

The third component, meaning, refers to what the combinations of form and substance signify (the semantics). In English, the form was speaking signifies past time, green and blue signify particular colors and rising intonation often signifies a question. If we reverse this perspective, meaning is what we intend to say, form is how we assemble the message using appropriate words, grammar and sounds (or written symbols), and substance is what we actually say or write. We find information on the system in reference grammars (for English, this includes reference grammars such as Biber et al. 1999; Carter and McCarthy 2006), in dictionaries (e.g., 3 Macmillan 2002; Hornby 2010), which usually give information on pronunciation. Works describing English intonation tend to be more specialised (e.g., Cruttenden 1997; Tench 2015).

Discourse ideology

The theory of ideology that serves as the framework for the present paper is multidisciplinary. It defines ideologies as a special form of social cognition shared by social groups. Ideologies thus form the basis of the social representations and practices of group members, including their discourse, which at the same time serves as the means of ideological production, reproduction and challenge (for details, see Van Dijk, 1998).

The theoretical complexities of this framework are considerable. So far we have more questions than answers. For instance, we have few explicit ideas about the internal structures of the mental representations of ideologies. And without such representations we are unable to detail the ways ideologies influence the underlying mental processes involved in discourse and other social practices.

As for the social dimension of the theory of ideology, we still ignore among many other things which social collectivities, and under what conditions, develop ideologies. Accordingly, examining the ways ideologies influence contextualization is one of the many puzzles that we face in such a complex theory that needs to bridge the gaps between discourse, cognition and society.

Ideologies as social beliefs rather trivially ideologies consist of a specific kind of ideas. In somewhat more technical jargon (in social psychology and political science), we would call them belief systems or social representations of some kind (Aebischer, Deconchy & Lipiansky, 1992; Augoustinos, 1998; Farr & Moscovici, 1984; Fraser & Gasket]. 1990). This means that they are not personal beliefs, but beliefs shared by groups, as is also the case for grammars, socioculturally shared knowledge, group attitudes or norms and values. Indeed, we assume that ideologies form the basis of the belief systems or social representations of specific groups (see also Scarbrough, 1990).

Knowledge, if ideologies control the social representations of groups, they also control the knowledge acquired and shared by a group. This is true, however, only for a specific kind of knowledge, namely what we shall call group knowledge. These are the social beliefs which a group holds to be true, according to its own evaluation or verification (truth) criteria, as is the case for scientists, members of a church or members of a social movement. Of course, for other groups, such beliefs may be mere opinions or false beliefs, and therefore not be called knowledge at all. The crucial, empirical and discursive, test to distinguish knowledge from other beliefs is that knowledge shared by a group tends to be presupposed by its members, and not asserted, in text and talk (except in pedagogical discourse, as well as in discourse directed at non group members). It is this group knowledge, then, that may be ideological based.

This formulation suggests that we should also speak of beliefs that are generally shared in society, across (ideological) group boundaries. That is, by definition this kind of cultural knowledge is non-ideological. There is no difference of opinion, no ideological struggle, and no opposition in this case. These are the basic beliefs of a culture, on which all others, also the ideological beliefs of groups, are based.

To stress this general, cultural basis of these beliefs, we may also call them **Cultural Common Ground.** This common ground is constantly changing. What is specific group knowledge today (e.g., within the scientific community), may be general knowledge and hence common ground tomorrow. And vice versa, what was generally thought to be true, may now appear to be false or merely an opinion of specific groups (typically so for Christian religion, for instance). Common ground is the socio-cognitive basis of our common sense, and is generally presupposed in public discourse, by members of culturally competent members of all groups (except children and members of other cultures). Note that the notion of (cultural) Common Ground used here is more general than the notion of common ground as shared knowledge between participants in conversation, which may also include personal knowledge and group beliefs (Clark, 1996; see also Smith, 1982).

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES

Sociolinguistics Responses to Language Ideology

As conceptual tools, ***language ideologies* and *language attitudes*** were created by researchers in the second half of the 20th century to provide a means of treating speakers' feelings and ideas about various languages and linguistic forms as a critical factor in understanding processes of language change, language and identity, and language in its socioeconomic context. But even though each of these concepts can be viewed as related to a common effort to bring linguistic subjectivity into research once exclusively dominated by objectivist frameworks that attempted to explain linguistic phenomena, without recourse to speakers' apparent understandings, the two concepts have complementary histories of development.

Definitions of both these concepts typically invoke speakers' feelings and beliefs about language structure or language use. But a close analysis of their distinctive histories and patterned distribution reveals that they have not only very different origins but also significant differences in the way they encourage researchers to focus on distinctive aspects of similar phenomena. In addition to their different histories and fields of focal concern, the two concepts are typically associated with very different kinds of methodologies.

Language attitudes, as a concept, are generally associated with an objectivist concern with quantitative measurement of speakers' reactions. This concern is surely related to its conceptual origins in social psychology, quantitative sociolinguistics, and educational linguistics. In contrast, the concept of language ideologies is associated with qualitative methods such as ethnography, conversational analysis, and discourse analysis, as will be exemplified in the various sections of this article. This methodological reliance on qualitative methods is certainly related to its association with linguistic anthropology, interpretive sociology, and systemic functional linguistics. Also, in contrast to the history of application for the concept of language attitudes, language ideologies in harmony with its anthropological origins has tended to emphasize how speakers' beliefs and feelings about language are constructed from their experience as social actors in a political economic system, and how speakers' often partial awareness of the form and function of their semiotic resources is critically important.

While students of language ideologies read them both from speakers' articulate explanations (e.g., in interviews or conversational interaction) and from comparatively unreflecting, habitual discursive practice, students of language attitudes tend to measure reactions through more standardized and objective forms of data collection (survey, extended interview, matched guise test, and the analysis of socio-phonetic samples). Apart from the social sciences, research in the humanities has also taken up language as a cultural phenomenon and has added a historical as well as an ideological dimension to the study of the emergence of awareness regarding the use of urban dialects and other local linguistic forms, perhaps as symbolic pushback to sociolinguistic globalization.

The Recruitment of Language to Political and Cultural Projects

Political culture is the set of attitudes, beliefs, and sentiments which give order and meaning to a political process and which provide the underlying assumptions and rules that govern behavior in the political system. It encompasses both the political ideals and the operating norms of a polity. Political culture is thus the manifestation in aggregate form of the psychological and subjective dimensions of politics. A political culture is the product of both the collective history of a political system and the life histories of the members of that system, and thus it is rooted equally in public events and private experiences.

Political culture is a recent term which seeks to make more explicit and systematic much of the understanding associated with such long-standing concepts as political ideology, national ethos and spirit, national political psychology, and the fundamental values of a people. Political culture, by embracing the political orientations of both leaders and citizens, is more inclusive than such terms as political style or operational code, which focus on elite behavior. On the other hand, the term is more explicitly political and hence more restrictive than such concepts as public opinion and national character.

More specifically, the concept of political culture was developed in response to the need to bridge a growing gap in the behavioral approach between the level of micro analysis, based on the psychological interpretations of the individual's political behavior, and the level of macro analysis, based on the variables common to political sociology. In this sense the concept constitutes an attempt to integrate psychology and sociology so as to be able to apply to dynamic political analysis both the revolutionary findings of modern depth psychology and recent advances in sociological techniques for measuring attitudes in mass societies. Within the discipline of political science, the emphasis on political culture signals an effort to apply an essentially behavioral form of analysis to the study of such traditional problems as political ideology, legitimacy, sovereignty, nationhood, and the rule of law. (For a theoretical analysis of the concept see Verba in Pye & Verba 1965, pp. 512–560.)

Intellectual curiosity about the roots of national differences in politics dates from the writing of

Herodotus, and possibly no recent studies have achieved the richness of understanding of such classic studies of national temperament as those by Tocqueville, Bryce, and Emerson. But the dynamic intellectual tradition which inspired political culture studies comes almost entirely from the studies of national character and the psychocultural analyses of the 1930s and 1940s. Benedict (1934; 1946), Mead (1942; 1953), Gorer (1948; 1953; 1955), Fromm (1941), and Klineberg (1950) all sought to utilize the findings of psychoanalysis and cultural anthropology to provide deeper understanding of national political behavior. A major objection to these studies was their failure to recognize that the political sphere constitutes a distinct subculture with its own rules of conduct and its distinct processes of socialization. The practice of moving directly from the stage of child training to the level of national decision making meant that crucial intervening processes were neglected.

Language Ideologies in Powerful Institutional Complexes

Language ideologies are always understood to refer to more than just language. They always entail local conceptualizations of social categories, social activities, and the phenomenological or experiential worlds associated with them. And for some scholar's language ideologies are also about the exercise of power, relations of domination, subordination, struggle, and transformation. From a slightly different point of view, what we readily recognize as "language ideologies" are actually often about something other than language culturally and occur in situations where language as a topic is ideologically appropriated by and put to use in larger political projects.

We have already encountered language ideologies about gendered speech in the United States as an example where language was recruited to feminist critique of male female relations in the Women's Liberation Movement. This language-oriented feminist critique had a great deal in common with other American social identity-based language oriented political critiques, for example, critiques of terms for ethnic minorities, the physically disabled, and the mentally disabled as pejorative and stigmatizing. At the heart of these critiques is the idea that by replacing pejorative terms with neutral or positive terms we will change people's attitudes and treatment toward the groups at issue.

The most influential and widespread political projects to which languages are ideologically recruited are those of nation-building (Blommaert 1999; Blommaert and Verschueren 1998; Inoue 2006; Irvine and Gal 2000; Philips 2000). Scholars both perceive people producing language ideologies to be engaged in nation-building and are themselves fascinated with the phenomenon of nation-building, one of the great global ideological projects of the current and past several centuries. One of the key appeals of the paper "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation" by Irvine and Gal (2000) is that it deals conceptually with social identity categories that orient to the nation state in ways that are widely shared among linguistic and cultural anthropologists. Group identity categories in analyses of language ideologies that have nation-states as a point of reference or a point of departure include: nation-states themselves, ethnic/linguistic minorities within nation-states, colonizers, and colonized in colonial nation-state formation projects and postcolonial newly independent nation-states. Regions, tribes, and villages are also understood as existing within nation-states in ways that impinge upon them politically, including in the form of the imposition of language ideologies.

Irvine and Gal also offer a rare broadly comparative perspective that enables comparisons to be made between and among ethnic minorities in Eastern European nations and tribes in African nations, and to find commonalities across nations in processes of the formation of language ideologies. Situations of language shift and the language ideologies associated with them are also typically understood in terms of nation-state formation and colonialism.

Moreover, the kinds of powerful institutional domains that generate language ideologies through their work, particularly law and education, are understood ideologically as arms of the state and as functioning in nation-state specific conditions. The third institutional domain that has yielded documentation of language ideologies, namely Christian religion, is generally also treated as occurring within a specific nation-state, even though its organization may be transnational.

CODE SWITCHING, IDENTITY AND GLOBALIZATION

Speech Community Identities

Speech community is a term in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology used to describe a group of people who share the same language, speech characteristics, and ways of interpreting communication. Speech communities may be large regions like an urban area with a common, distinct accent (think of Boston with its dropped r's) or small units like families and friends (think of a nickname for a sibling). They help people define themselves as individuals and community members and identify (or misidentify) others.

The concept of speech community plays a role in a number of social sciences, namely sociology, anthropology, linguists, even psychology. People who study issues of migration and ethnic identity use social community theory to study things like how immigrants assimilate into larger societies, for instance. Academics who focus on racial, ethnic, sexual or gender issues apply social community theory when they study issues of personal identity and politics. It also plays a role in data collection. By being aware of how communities are defined, researchers can adjust their subject pools in order to obtain representative sample populations.

Speech and Identity the concept of speech as a means of identifying with a community first emerged in 1960s academia alongside other new fields of research like ethnic and gender studies. Linguists like John Gumperz pioneered research in how personal interaction can influence ways of speaking and interpreting, while Noam Chomsky studied how people interpret language and derive meaning from what they see and hear.

Types of Communities

Speech communities can be large or small, although linguists don't agree on how they're defined. Some, like linguist Muriel Saville-Troike, argue that it's logical to assume that a shared language like English, which is spoken throughout the world, is a speech community. But she differentiates between "hard-shelled" communities, which tend to be narrow-minded and friendly, like a family or religious sect, and "soft-shelled" communities where there is a lot of interaction. But other linguists say a common language is too vague to be considered a true speech community.
The linguistic anthropologist Zdenek Salzmann describes it this way:

"People who speak the same language are not always members of the same speech community. On the one hand, speakers of South Asian English in India and Pakistan share a language with citizens of the U.S., but the respective varieties of English and the rules for speaking them are sufficiently distinct to assign the two populations to different speech communities." Instead, Salzman and others say, speech communities should be more narrowly defined based on characteristics such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and manner of speaking.

Nation- State Identities

National identity is a person's identity or sense of belonging to one state or to one nation. It is the sense of a nation as a cohesive whole, as represented by distinctive traditions, culture, language and politics. The nation-state “is one where the great majority is conscious of a common identity and share the same culture”. The nation-state is an area where the cultural boundaries match up with the political boundaries. The ideal of ‘nation-state’ is that the state incorporates people of a single ethnic stock and cultural traditions.
However, most contemporary states are polyethnic. Thus, it can be argued that the nation-state” would exist if nearly all the members of a single nation were organized in a single state, without any other national communities being present. The nation as we think of it today is a product of the nineteenth century. In modern times nation is recognized as 'the' political community that ensures the legitimacy of the state over its territory, and transforms the state into the state of all its citizens. The notion of 'nation-state' emphasizes this new alliance between nation and state. Nationality is supposed to bind the citizen to the state, a bond that will be increasingly tied to the advantages of a social policy in as much as the Welfare State wills develop.

The study of language and political economy emerged during the 1980s from parallel currents in several fields. Neo-Marxist scholars across the social sciences were increasingly interested in the symbolic and linguistic aspects of unequally distributed economic and political power. Where philosophers during the eighteenth century had posited an essential unity between language, nationality, and the state, twentieth- century studies viewed this unity as a product of ideology propagated by state institutions, among them publishing (Anderson 1983) and education (Bourdieu 1977).

These theoretical discussions of inequality resonated with empirical sociolinguistic research on the stratification of privileged linguistic forms along class, gender, or ethnic lines. Inspired by these connections, a new generation of scholars took as their subject the investigation of boundaries between linguistic and social groupings within the nation-state. According to Gal (1988), code-switching served in these analyses as a clear example of “systematic, linguistically striking, and socially meaningful linguistic variation” (245). Scholars in this tradition did not simply affirm the theoretical arguments advanced in social theory; rather, they viewed sociolinguistic research as providing an important corrective to some of the more grandiose claims circulating across academia. The strength of this tradition lies in its combined use of sociopolitical theory, conversational data, and detailed ethnography to understand language choice as an ideologically motivated and historically situated response to the state’s prioritization of certain language varieties over others.

Scholars of language and political economy seek to explain the ways that languages function in diverse settings both as markers and as constitutive elements of social structures. Identity is viewed as emerging within the stratifying systems of standardization associated with Europeaninspired models of nationalism. Where researchers in the earlier tradition deepened their investigation of identity as an interactional achievement, these scholars examined the historical contexts and political ideologies that made social identities inhabitable in the first place. Critical to this undertaking is the examination of everyday practice as a site for the production of social hierarchy. Language choice can reflect the understanding of "self" versus "other" within broad political, historical, and economic contexts, but it can also construct more localized groupings of ethnicity, gender, or social class within these larger contexts. We have chosen the term nationstate identities as shorthand for the treatment of subjectivity in this tradition.

Multicultural Identities

People who belong to more than one cultural group must navigate the diverse norms and values from each of their cultural affiliations. Faced with such diversity, multicultural individuals need to manage and organize their different and possibly clashing cultural identities within their general sense of self. The multicultural person, therefore, is not simply the one who is sensitive to many different cultures. Rather, this person is always in the process of becoming a part of and apart from a given cultural context. He or she is a formative being, resilient, changing, and evolutionary.

The 1990s was an explosive decade for the theorization of identity, as scholars began to challenge static understandings of selfhood that damaged a previous generation of research. This shift, which helped in nothing short of a sea change within linguistics in the way identity is viewed, can be attributed to a diversity of factors, only some of which can be recounted here. Postmodern challenges to the authoritative voice of the analyst matched with the rise of digital communication, multiculturalism, deconstructionism, and the poststructuralist valorization of discourse as the site for the production of subjectivity.

These developments all presented challenges to psychological understandings of the self as singular and unified. Critical gender theorists such as Butler (1990) advanced the idea that identity is performative: it produces itself a new by reiterating what is already discursively intelligible. For sociocultural linguists, this perspective forced closer attention to how subjectivity might emerge within the constraints and allowances of interaction. As Bucholtz and Hall (2004a, 2004b, 2005) suggest in their reviews of this period, identity began to be viewed as a discursive construct that is both multiple and partial, materializing within the binds of everyday discourse.

During the same decade, a growing body of research on the globalized new economy began to theorize identity as fragmented by processes associated with late modernity. The expansion and intensification of international exchange severed the connection between identity and locale that had been previously assumed. Whether discussed in terms of "detraditionalization" (Giddens 1991), "liquid modernity" (Bauman 2000), or "network society" (Castells 1996), identity had lost its deictic grounding in the temporal and spatial fixities that constituted an earlier era, including the nation-state. The full force of these theorizations did not surface in the codeswitching literature until after the millennium, but their reflexes can be seen in early sociolinguistic work on urban diasporic communities and minority groups constituted through transnational migration.

Noteworthy in this regard are two influential ethnographies published in the mid-1990s that launched quite divergent views of ethnicity as a social construct: Zentella's (1997) *Growing Up Bilingual* and Rampton's (1995) *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. Both perspectives are importantly informed by the discursive turn in social theory and offer highly contextualized discussions of identity as an interactional achievement, even if their conceptualization of ethnicity at the turn of the century differs. This ethnographically based generation of research offered renewed attention to the concern with language ideologies, advancing the idea that language contact brought about by global movement leads to heightened reflexivity toward the indexical links between language and identity.

SOCIAL LANGUAGES, CONVERSATIONS, AND INTERTEXTUALITY

Social Languages

The first tool of inquiry is "social languages." This tool acknowledges that people use different styles or varieties of language depending on the settings and purposes in order to recognize different identities and to engage in different building tasks. Thus, social languages are linguistic varieties that one employs depending on the social identity that one chooses based on the setting.
For example, I might say, "Hey, guess what? I really love talking about Hispanic culture and want to know more!" But, in a graduate school interview, I would say, "I have a great interest in Hispanic culture, and I would like to use this opportunity to do some more research about that ethnicity." In the first context, I would take the social identity of a friend in a very informal context while on the second one; I would be more formal and professional, as of a prominent student with academic interest. The research question could be, *"What is your identity in this context and which linguistic style do you employ?"* In research, I would observe one speaker in two or more different settings and compare linguistic varieties employed such as word choices, sentence structure, and usages. This tool helps us to recognize different social identities of each individual depending on different linguistic context.

All languages, like English or French, are composed of many (a great many) different social languages. Social languages are what we learn and what we speak. Keep in mind that "social languages" and "Discourses" are terms for different things. I will use the term "social languages" to talk about the role of language in Discourses. But as I said above, Discourses always involve more than language. They always involve coordinating language with ways of acting, interacting, valuing, believing, feeling, and with bodies, clothes, non-linguistic symbols, objects, tools, technologies, times, and places. Consider, for instance, the following case of an uppermiddle-class, Anglo-American young woman named "Jane," in her twenties, who was attending one of the courses on language and communication. The course was discussing different social languages and, during the discussion, Jane claimed that she herself did not use different social languages in different contexts, but rather, was consistent from context to context. In fact, to do otherwise, she said, would be "hypocritical," a failure to "be oneself."

The second tool is "Discourses," which include non-verbal communication elements: physical appearance, use of symbols, gestures, objects, and even timing. In class, as a student, I take my classroom-essential objects such as a binder, pencil, and a notebook; I write down notes from the lecture and raise my hand if I want to make a comment. But this same person, I, would act differently when I am at home talking with my parents in a dinner table. I would not take anything prepared with me but sit there and engage in a conversation without even raising my hand.
The question for this tool can be, *"What verbal and non-verbal elements do you use to build your identity and activities?* "and *"As whom do you want to be recognized and doing what?"* The analyst should, thus, observe and analyze not only the verbal elements but also the non-verbal elements in a conversation, and then take a step further to infer to the identity of the speaker. Also,

while discourse is a conversation or story, the Discourse involves other elements in addition to linguistic aspects.

Conversations

When talking with someone, it is helpful to know what type of conversation you are in. You can do so based on a conversation's direction of communication (a one-way or two-way street) and its tone/purpose (competitive or cooperative). If you are in a one-way conversation, you are talking at someone, rather than with someone. If you are in a two-way conversation, participants are both listening and talking. In a competitive conversation, people are more concerned about their own perspective, whereas in cooperative conversation participants are interested in the perspective of everyone involved. Based on direction and tone, I grouped conversations into four types: debate, dialogue, discourse, and diatribe.

Debate is a competitive, two-way conversation. The goal is to win an argument or convince someone, such as the other participant or third-party observers. **Dialogue** is a cooperative, twoway conversation. The goal is for participants to exchange information and build relationships with one another. **Discourse** is a cooperative, one-way conversation. The goal is to deliver information from the speaker/writer to the listeners/readers.

Diatribe is a competitive, one-way conversation. The goal is to express emotions, browbeat those that disagree with you, and/or inspires those that share the same perspective.
It is important to know which type of conversation you are in, because that determines the purpose of that conversation. If you can identify the purpose, you can better speak to the heart of that conversation. But, if you misidentify the conversation, you are in, you can fall into conversational pitfalls.
The "Conversations" include all the talks and writings that have been going in a particular society or a social group with a focus on a specific theme, debate, or motif that is unsettled or contested. In order to know about the Conversation and to engage, we should know about not only the issues and different opinions of each side of the debate but also who is on each side. For instance, let's imagine that one student at Calvin College says, "Christians should use less plastic silverware." Because of the fundamental Calvinistic CRC theology of Creation-FallRedemption-Restoration, we instinctively know that it refers to not simply the on-going conversation on environmental issues but also the theology that Christians should be restorers of the world as the stewards of Christ.
However, people on the other side may refute that plastic silverware can be rather a healthier and cleaner option—especially for sack lunch and in places like Johnny's—because then people can use new ones without sharing, and they are more portable. Hence, the research question could be, "*What is the on-going conversation in this social context?* "And *"Who are in each side of this discussion?"* In order to answer this, the analyst should be aware of the relevant conversation that

has been taken place in that particular linguistic society. Only by answering this, people can engage in the "conversation" knowing the implied message.

Intertextuality and Discourses as Tools of Inquiry

Definition: Intertextuality describes cases where one oral or written text directly or indirectly quotes another text or alludes to the text in more subtle ways.

Explanation: A single written or oral text can be in one social language or it can switch between two or more or even mix them together. Sometimes, however, a text spoken or written in one social language will accomplish a sort of switching by borrowing words from another text spoken or written in the same or a different variety of language. One text can directly quote another text, indirectly quote it, or just allude to what certain hearers or readers (with background knowledge) will realize are words taken from another source.

Operationalization: I would use this tool when a person's understanding of the meaning behind a text is dependent upon their knowledge of other texts in such a way that is of particular interest. To use this tool, I would search the text for instances where its register or diction or sentence structure deviates from the normal pattern. In cases of odd constructions, I would look up the phrases in order to determine where they came from and what they bring to the text. I would also ask an expert (or conduct research on the text) to familiarize myself with the community out of which the text arises so as to spot instances of intertextuality more easily. I would then analyze how the "insider" knowledge contributes to a person's understanding of the text, as well as how a lack of understanding changes a person's reading of the text.

Example: Professor Vanden Bosch is in the habit of incorporating phrases from the Bible into his utterances in class lectures. Each reference brings with it some meaning from its original context into its new context as in the statement "The dates in bold on the syllabus are either days off or days of reckoning." If I were to keep a running list of these sorts of utterances and write down some general impressions of them, and then look up any specific references, it would be interesting to see the difference between knowing something is from the Bible from how it sounds (and thus interpreting it as being more important or dramatic or serious) and knowing something is from a very specific part of the Bible, with a specific textual context containing all sorts of moral and ideological implications.

Lecture-05 Discourse and Speech

SPEECH ACTS AND DISCOURSE-I

Introduction to Speech Acts

The **speech act** theory considers language as a sort of action rather than a medium to convey and express thoughts. The contemporary **Speech act** theory developed by J. L. Austin a British philosopher of languages; he introduced this theory in 1975 in his well-known book of 'How do things with words. Later John Searle brought the aspects of theory into much higher dimensions. This theory is often used in the field of philosophy of languages. Austin is the one who came up with the findings that people not only use that language to assert things but also to do things. And people who followed him went to greater depths based on this point.

Theory: All sort of linguist communication is comprised of linguistic actions. Previously it was conceived that the very basic unit of communication is words, symbols, sentences or some kind of token of all of these, but it was speech act theory which suggested that production or issuances of words, symbols are the basic units of communication. This issuance happens during the process of performance of speech act. The meaning of these basic units was considered as the building blocks of mutual understanding between the people intend to communicate. ***"A theory of language is a theory of action"- Greig E. Henderson and Christopher Brown.***

The theory emphasis that the utterances have a different or specific meaning to its user and listener other than its meaning according to the language. The theory further identifies that there are two kinds of utterances, they are called constative and performative utterances. In his book of 'How do things with words' Austin clearly talks about the disparities between the constative and performative utterances. A ***constative utterance*** is something which describes or denotes the situation, in relation with the fact of true or false.

Example: The teacher asked Olivia whether she had stolen the candy. Olivia replies "mmmmmm". Here the utterances of Olivia describe the event in pact of answering her teacher whether the situation was true or false.

The performative utterances are something which does not describes anything at all. The utterances in the sentences or in the part of sentences are normally considered as having a meaning of its own. The feelings, attitudes, emotions and thoughts of the person performing linguistic act are much of a principal unit here.

Further Austin divides speech act into three different categories: They are,

1. **Locutionary act**: This is the act of saying something. It has a meaning and it creates an understandable utterly to convey or express.
2. **Illocutionary act**: It is performed as an act of saying something or as an act of opposed to saying something. The illocutionary utterance has a certain force of it. It well well-versed with certain tones, attitudes, feelings, or emotions. There will be an intention of the speaker or others in illocutionary utterance. It is often used as a tone of warning in day today life.
3. **Perlocutionary act** – It normally creates a sense of consequential effects on the audiences. The effects may be in the form of thoughts, imaginations, feelings or emotions. The effect upon the addressee is the main character ship of perlocutionary utterances.

Example: The locutionary act describes a dangerous situation, the illocutionary act acts as a force of the warning and perlocutionary acts frighten the addressee. Austin himself admits that these three components of utterances are not altogether separable. "We must consider the total situation in which the utterance is issued- the total speech act – if we are to see the parallel between statements and performative utterance, and how each can go wrong. Perhaps indeed there is no great distinction between statements and performative utterances." Austin.

Searle suggested that the basic unit of linguistic communication is speech act. It can be a word, a phrase, a sentence or a sound; it should fulfill the task of expressing the intention of the user.

Understanding the user's intention can lead to complete understanding of the speech act.

Kinds of Speech Acts

Types of Speech Acts

There are various kinds of speech acts, yet the following, classified by John Searle, have received particular attention:

Representatives commit a speaker to the truth of an expressed proposition.

- Paradigm cases: asserting, stating, concluding, boasting, describing, suggesting. ○ *I am a great singer*.
  - *Bill was an accountant*.

Commissive commit a speaker to some future action.

- Paradigm cases: promising, pledging, threatening, vowing, offering.
  - *I am going to leave you*.
  - *I'll call you tonight*.

(9) Directives are used by a speaker who attempts to get the addressee to carry out an action.

- Paradigm cases: requesting, advising, commanding, challenging, inviting, daring, and entreating. ○ *You'd better tidy up that mess*. ○ *Sit down*.

Declarations affect an immediate change of affairs.

- Paradigm cases: declaring, baptizing, resigning, firing from employment, hiring, arresting. ○ *We find the defendant guilty*. ○ *I resign*.

Expressive express some sort of psychological state.

- Paradigm cases: greeting, thanking, apologizing, complaining, congratulating.
  - *This beer is disgusting*. ○ *I'm sorry to hear that*.

Speech Acts and Discourse

(10) The use of language in communication goes beyond employing its formal units for the description of reality. There is much to be learned on what constitutes language and on how it works from the consideration of the way bits of language are employed for the performance of various acts in the course of written or spoken interaction. Starting from this conception, the theory of speech acts sees language as an instrument for the performance of social acts. It postulates that the smallest unit of human communication is not the sentence as a syntactic unit. Alternatively, it suggests entities, such as making statements, asking questions, giving orders, describing, etc. regardless of their linguistic form as basic communicative units.

These are labeled speech acts, whereby speakers do things in the real world. In the following account, the theory of speech acts, as laid down by its initiators, is depicted by sketching out its earliest model and tracing its subsequent developments. Further, given the focus of the speech act theory on the situated expression of meaning, the inclusion of this theory within the wider scope of discourse analysis is justified by clarifying the existing theoretical connections between them. Eventually, the paper highlights the applicability of the speech act theory insights in the analysis and description of written texts. On the whole, this account is meant to offer broad insights on the earliest versions of the theory, and it can be exploited as an introductory text on it.

Discourse analysis examines stretches of language in their linguistic and extralinguistic contexts. It seeks to uncover regularities which could not be accounted for at sentential level by connecting language bits to the adjacent bits on the one hand and to the external situation on the other. Among the theoretical lines that have been pursued in the treatment of discourse is the speech act theory. Although, at its inception this paradigm was not meant to be a model of discourse analysis, many analysts do make use of its findings to account for a number of issues that arise in the analysis of language use. McCarthy (1991), in a brief historical overview, specifies the streams that converge to form the realm of discourse analysis including SAT.

In line with this, Van Dijk (1985), presenting a thorough account of the history of discourse analysis, mentions the speech act paradigm and clarifies that this approach considers verbal utterances not only as sentences, but also as specific forms of social action. In other words, when sentences are used in some context, they should be allocated some extra meaning or function to be defined in relation to speaker intentions, beliefs, or evaluations, or relations between speaker and hearer. In this way, the systematic properties of the context could be accounted for, and the relation between utterances as abstract linguistic objects and utterances taken as a form of social interaction could be explained.

In attempting to locate the speech act theory within the domain of discourse analysis, Schiffrin (1994) pinpoints two aspects of the speech act theory which have a direct relevance to discourse studies: the way an utterance can perform more than one speech act at a time and the connection between context and illocutionary force of speech acts.

Arriving at a satisfactory linguistic scrutiny of any aspect of discourse is bound to considering carefully the context in which it is expressed. This becomes very glaring when the utterances that constitute discourse are viewed as performing social actions. Speech act theory addresses an important dimension of language, that is, language as a means of communication. The value of its insights lies in the fact that the meanings of utterances are accounted for not in terms of the linguistic system alone. Meaning, in the speech act paradigm, is rather extracted from the surrounding context through conventionalization of illocutionary usages. This important shift in the treatment of meaning raises questions about what native speakers really know about using their languages.

Indeed, what constitutes knowledge of one's native language (competence) encompasses more than a set of lexico-grammatical forms. Such forms may vary their functions in the course of communication. The speech act theory emerged as a theory within the philosophy of language to explain the ways language can be used, but since then speech act theory has been used within a broader context in linguistics and even in computational models. However, this wider use has now pointed out several problems that show that the older outlook of speech acts developed by Austin and Searle is no longer satisfactory to offer an account of language use. On this basis, the theory has witnessed recently sweeping advancements.

SPEECH ACTS AND DISCOURSE-II

Speech Acts and Society

Speech-act theory is a subfield of pragmatics concerned with the ways in which words can be used not only to present information but also to carry out actions. As introduced by Oxford philosopher J.L. Austin (*How to Do Things With Words*, 1962) and further developed by American philosopher J.R. Searle, speech-act theory considers the levels of action at which utterances are said to perform:

- Locutionary acts
- Illocutionary acts
- Perlocutionary acts

Speakers can mean to communicate more than they say. It is never possible to say what one means in so many words, speakers require hearer to work to a greater or lesser extent to drive their message from the words uttered. A special and interesting type of communication has been explored by the Philosopher Paul Grice under the label of conversational implicature, so called because what is implied is implicated by virtue of the fact that the speaker and hearer are cooperatively contributing to a conversation (Akmajian et al, 1995).

Searle's Five Illocutionary Points

"In the past three decades, **speech act theory** has become an important branch of the contemporary theory of language thanks mainly to the influence of [J.R.] Searle (1969, 1979) and [H.P.] Grice

(1975) whose ideas on meaning and communication have stimulated research in philosophy and in human and cognitive sciences. From Searle's view, there are only five illocutionary points that speakers can achieve on propositions in an utterance, namely: the ***assertive, commissive, directive, declaratory*** **and** ***expressive illocutionary points***. Speakers achieve the ***assertive point*** when they represent how things are in the world, the ***commissive point*** when they commit themselves to doing something, the ***directive point*** when they make an attempt to get hearers to do something, the ***declaratory point*** when they do things in the world at the moment of the utterance solely by virtue of saying that they do and the ***expressive point*** when they express their attitudes about objects and facts of the world.

Speech-Act Theory and Literary Criticism

Since 1970 **speech-act theory** has influenced in conspicuous and varied ways the practice of literary criticism. When applied to the analysis of direct discourse by a character within a literary work, it provides a systematic but sometimes cumbersome framework for identifying the unspoken presuppositions, implications, and effects of speech acts which competent readers and critics have always taken into account, subtly though unsystematically. Speech-act theory has also been used in a more radical way, however, as a model on which to recast the theory of literature in general, and especially the theory of prose narratives.
What the author of a fictional work--or else what the author's invented narrator narrates is held to constitute a pretended set of assertions, which are intended by the author, and understood by the competent reader, to be free from a speaker's ordinary commitment to the truth of what he or she asserts. Within the frame of the fictional world that the narrative thus sets up, however, the utterances of the fictional characters--whether these are assertions or promises or marital vows are held to be responsible to ordinary illocutionary commitments.

In **speech act theory**, the hearer is seen as playing a passive role. The illocutionary force of a particular utterance is determined with regard to the linguistic form of the utterance and also introspection as to whether the necessary felicity conditions not least in relation to the speaker's beliefs and feelings are fulfilled. Interactional aspects are, thus, neglected. However, conversation is not just a mere chain of independent illocutionary forces rather; speech acts are related to other speech acts with a wider discourse context. Speech acts theory, in that it does not consider the function played by utterances in driving conversation is, therefore, insufficient in accounting for what actually happens in conversation.

The cooperative principle and discourse

Cooperation is a term used in the linguistic literature to show the human behavior in a conversation (Davies, 2007). Pragmatics cannot work without realizing the figurative or hidden meaning in the conversational exchange. The conversational exchange works when we have the addresser and the addressee. If we have X and Y and they are participating in a conversation, X asks Y about something and he or she expects Y to be cooperative with him or her and answer his or her question or statement, which should be relevant to what X asks or says. Consequently, they attempt to communicate to each other. In other words, they cooperate with each other, but it generates what it is called by Grice; implicatures.

As humans we are social beings and when we talk, we usually talk with or to others (unless we do a monologue). Paul Grice, an English language philosophe, argues that speakers intend to be cooperative when they talk. For Grice, *cooperative* means that the speaker knows that each utterance is a potential interference in the personal rights, autonomy and wishes (a potential facethreatening act) of the other. That is why we have to shape our utterances in a certain way.
(9) Grice formulated the principle of cooperation that underlies conversation, as follows: *Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged* (Grice 1975:45) Grice's cooperative principle is a set of norms that are expected in conversations. It consists of four maxims; we have to follow in order to be cooperative and understood:

- **Maxim of quality:** As speaker we have to tell the truth or something that is provable by adequate evidence.
- **Maxim of quantity**: We have to be as informative as required, we should not say more or less.
- **Maxim of relation:** Our response has to be relevant to the topic of discussion.
- **Maxim of manner:** We have to avoid ambiguity or obscurity; we should be direct and straightforward.

Example

Yet, successful communication does not only depend on **WHAT** we are saying but also on **HOW** we are saying something!

Flouting the co-operative principle

Differences between flouting and violating maxims

Thomas (1995) and Cutting (2008) discuss differences between flouting and violating maxims. A speaker is flouting a maxim if they do not observe a maxim but has no intention of deceiving or misleading the other person. A person is 'violating' a maxim if there is likelihood that they are liable to mislead the other person. For example, 'Mummy's gone on a little holiday because she needs a rest' meaning 'Mummy's gone away to decide if she wants a divorce or not' violates, rather than flouts, the maxim of manner (39). Here, the speaker intends the hearer to understand something other than the truth, on purpose.

A speaker may also 'infringe' a maxim when they fail to observe a maxim with no intention to deceive, such as where a speaker does not have the linguistic capacity to answer a question. A speaker may also decide to 'opt out' of a maxim such as where a speaker may, for ethical or legal reasons, refuse to say something that breaches a confidentiality agreement they have with someone or is likely to incriminate them in some way (Thomas 1995; Cutting 2008).

According to Grice (1975), the purpose of cooperative principle is to get effective communication as informative as clearly. In a conversation a speaker and a hearer are supposed to respond to each other in their turn with the needed information that benefits both of them. By giving the required information, they can understand each other's utterances. By conforming to cooperative principle and its maxims, the speaker allows the hearer to draw assumptions about the speaker's intentions. Thereafter, cooperative principle is widely applied to exploiting both written and spoken texts. Nevertheless, people sometimes may not fulfill these maxims and seem to disobey them in a certain context. Grice (cited in Cutting, 2002, p. 40) says that when the speaker does not fulfill the maxims, the speaker is said to "violate" them.

Violation is a condition where the speaker does not purposefully fulfill certain maxims for some other purposes. Grice notices that violation of his maxims takes place when the speaker intentionally refrains from applying maxims in their conversation. Scholars have fully discussed diverse reasons of violation of maxims. Grice (1975: 49) underlines that when the speaker refrains from applying his maxims, the speaker is "liable to mislead'' their counterparts in conversation. Goffman (2008: 17) says that the speaker does not abide by Gricean maxims in order to save face. Chirstoffersen (2005) also argues that in real life situation, people violate the maxims for different reasons. Khosarvizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011: 122-123) say that the speaker violates Grice's maxims in order to cause misunderstandings on their participants' part to achieve some other purposes, for example to please counterpart, evade discussion, avoid unpleasant condition, and express feelings.

Until now, Grice's cooperative principle has been widely employed to do discourse analysis including movie dialogues, literature, legal documents, novel dialogues and business negotiation etc. Grice (1989: 26) clearly states "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged". Besides this requirement, other parameters in the field of ESP such as communication context, disciplinary requirements, professional practice and institutional culture also become crucial.

SPEECH ACTS AND DISCOURSE-III

Politeness, face and discourse

The notion of 'face' comes from Goffman's (1967) work on face and from the English 'folk' notion of face, which ties up with notions of being embarrassed, humiliated or 'losing face' (Brown and Levinson 1987). Politeness and face are important for understanding why people choose to say things in a particular way in spoken and written discourse. Politeness principles and cooperative principles, however, are often in conflict with each other. There are also situations in which one principle might become more important than another. In an emergency, for example, there is less need to be polite than, say, in a normal situation.

Involvement and independence in spoken and written discourse

Two further issues in discussions of face and politeness are the notions of *involvement* and *independence* (Scollon and Wong-Scollon 2001). The term involvement refers to the need people have to be involved with others and to show this involvement; that is a person's right and need to be considered a normal, contributing, supporting member of society; in other words, to be treated as a member of a group. We might show this involvement by showing our interest in someone, by agreeing with them, by approving what they are doing or by using in-group identity markers such as given names, or nicknames.

The independence part of face refers to a people right not be dominated by others, not to be imposed on by others and to be able to act with some sense of individuality, or autonomy. We do this, for example, by not presuming other people's needs or interests, by giving people options, by not imposing on other people and by apologizing for interruptions. In order to maintain social relationships people, acknowledge both of these aspects of a person's face at the same time. People thus aim to build up closeness and rapport with each other, while at the same time trying to avoid being a threat to each other's social distance; that is, maintaining each other's involvement and independence (Scollon and Wong-Scollon 2001).

Choosing a politeness strategy

We draw on a number of considerations when we decide on a choice of politeness strategy. We may consider how socially close or distant we are from our hearer. For example, are we close friends, is the hearer older than I am and are we 'social equals? We may consider how much or how little power the hearer has over us. For example, am I talking to my boss or to my employee, to a policeman, to a service employee or to a judge?

We may also consider how significant what I want is to me, and to the person I am talking to. For example, am I asking for change, for a loan or to borrow a car? We may consider how much emphasis both of us (in our culture or cultures) place on involvement and independence in circumstances like the one we are in. And we may consider whether both of us would have the same answers to these questions (Gee 1993).

Face and politeness across cultures

It is important to point out that the specific nature of face and politeness varies from society to society and from culture to culture. For example, in some cultures the idea of personal space and independence may vary. In some societies, parents have more right to interfere in the domestic affairs of adult children than in others. In some cultures, a bedroom is private and cannot be entered and in others it is not. In some cultures, refusal of an offer may be merely polite (even if to an English speaker a refusal may seem like refusing involvement) and in others the opposite may be true (Cook 1989).

Gu (1990) discusses politeness in relation to Chinese culture while Ide (1982) discusses politeness in Japanese. Gu sees politeness in Chinese not so much in terms of psychological wants, but rather in terms of social norms. Face is threatened he argues, not when someone's needs are not met, but when someone fails to live up to social standards.

(8) Ide sees politeness in Japanese as something which helps to maintain communication. In Japanese politeness is less strategic and more a matter of socially obligatory linguistic choices through which social harmony is achieved (Eelen 2001). It is important to remember, then, that the use of language will very often vary across cultures and in relation to the social realities of these cultures (Leech 2009).

Gift-giving is an example of a politeness strategy that varies across cultures. Brown and Levinson list gift-giving as a positive politeness strategy in English, or in Scollon and Wong-Scollon's (2001) terms an involvement strategy; that is, a strategy by which we show our closeness and rapport with someone else. We may spend a lot of time deciding what to buy for the gift, think about what the person receiving the gift will feel about what we have bought them and what their reaction to our gift might be. In Japanese culture, however, there are times when gift-giving may mean something quite different from this and be more of a social ritual rather than a positive politeness strategy. Japanese have many gift-giving occasions throughout the year that cover many events in Japanese life where gift-giving is more ritual, or an expression of duty. (10) The ways in which people express politeness also differs across cultures. On one occasion I asked a group of bilingual Japanese/English students how they would ask a friend to close the window if they were in the car with them and they were feeling cold. These students had all lived in an English-speaking country and were fluent in both English and Japanese.

Could you close the window for me?

Can I close the window?

Hey yo, close the window, would you?

This is what they said they would say in Japanese to a Japanese friend:

Isn't it a little chilly?

It's cold don't you think?

I wonder why it's so cold today?

In the Japanese examples none of the students actually mentioned the window. When the instructor asked them about this, one of the students told me that that in Japanese indirectness is a sign of intimacy and is often used between friends as a sign of mutual understanding and friendship. Indirectness, then, is often an involvement, or positive politeness, strategy in Japanese whereas in English it is often an independence, or negative politeness, strategy. The students also told him that in Japanese culture, involvement is much more important than independence. Thus, whereas in English a speaker may weigh up what they are saying in terms of both involvement and independence, a Japanese speaker may give much greater weight to what they are saying in terms of involvement, rather than independence (see Kadar and Mills 2011 for further discussion of politeness in East Asian cultures).

Face-threatening acts

Some acts 'threaten' a person's face. These are called *face-threatening acts*. Often, we use *mitigation devices* (Fraser 1980) in conversations to take the edge off face-threatening acts. One example is the use of a 'pre-sequence' as in the following invitation:

A: Are you doing anything after work? (a pre-sequence) B:

Why are you asking?

A: I thought we might go for a drink. (an indirect speech act) B:

Well, no, nothing in particular. Where would you like to go?

This example also uses an *insertion sequence* in the middle to take the edge off the face threatening act of 'inviting someone out'. We might also use an *off-record speech act* as in:

A: I'm dying for a drink (an off -record invitation)

B: Yes, it's really hot, isn't it? (An off -record rejection of the invitation)

Here, A never actually asked B to go for a drink so doesn't lose any face by being rejected. Equally, B hasn't rejected the invitation on record but simply 'commented' on the weather in their off-record rejection of the invitation.

A person may, equally, feel that their face has been threatened and make this clear to their audience. An example of this is when the US Secretary of State Hilary Clinton on a visit to the Congo in 2009 was asked by a student what her husband thought of the issue she was discussing. (The student actually meant Mr Obama but the translator had mistakenly said Mr Clinton.). In her response 'You want me to tell you what my husband thinks?' she makes it clear that her face had been threatened. She was in the Congo as the Secretary of State, not the wife of the former US president, and the question that she had been asked was inappropriate. This, of course, also led to loss of face for the student, having been reprimanded by the Secretary of State in such a public setting. After the event the student approached Hilary Clinton and explained the mistake. She smiled at the student, rather embarrassedly, and told him not to worry about it (Harnden 2009).

Lecture-06 Pragmatics and the Acquisition of Discourse

DISCOURSE AND PRAGMATICS

What is pragmatics?

Pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to the context in which a person is speaking or writing. This includes social, situational and textual context. It also includes background knowledge context; that is, what people know about each other and about the world. Pragmatics assumes that when people communicate with each other they normally follow some kind of cooperative principle; that is; they have a shared understanding of how they should cooperate in their communications. The ways in which people do this, however, varies across cultures. What may be a culturally appropriate way of saying or doing something in one culture may not be the same in another culture. The study of this use of language across cultures is called *cross-cultural pragmatics.*

Paltridge (2012) defines pragmatics as the study of how the meaning of spoken and written discourse is related to the context in which that speech and writing occurs. Context here is taken to be the particular social situation that the discourse takes place in, the other text or speech it is situated with, and any background knowledge that it relies upon.

One of the foundational concepts in pragmatics is *speech act* theory, which is the idea that words *do things* in the world. Words have a literal meaning that can be analyzed for its truth or falsehood. But words also can be used to effect change in the word, to perform actions. Searle distinguished between these two types of acts as *locutionary* and *illocutionary* acts. And the actual action that is caused by the words is the *perlocutionary* act.

One practical example of this is the act of saying “I do” in a marriage ceremony. The words have a literal meaning, and perform the action of becoming legally married. They are also tied to the social situation in which they occur, the marriage ceremony, their partner’s speech and the speech of the marriage official. This example also highlights how various conditions can influence whether a specific speech act works or not. Austin called these felicity conditions, which Searle interpreted somewhat rigidly as *rules*.

Cutting (2002) believes that pragmatics and discourse analysis have much in common in the sense that both investigate context, text and function. Both fields concentrate on the significance of words in communication and how interlocutors convey more than the words they utilized. Additionally, both of them study discourse and text focusing on how pieces of language become significant and integrated for their users. Furthermore, the two fields are interested in function. For instance, in order to interpret a piece of discourse such as we are not amusing, pragmatics and discourse analysis will take into consideration the fact that Queen Victoria had been in a long depression, resulted from the death of her husband. Her words were a reply to a joke which her courtiers had just made. Analysts will infer that her intention was to stop them attempting to make her laugh and lift her out of the depression (ibid: 1)

Similarly, Puig (2003) states that the two domains, pragmatics and discourse analysis, move behind the formal description of phrases and concentrate on upper components, for instance, speech acts and conversational turns. Moreover, both approaches investigate context and its structuring. Nevertheless, pragmatics exerts more effort to the identification of the speaker's intention in addition to the recovering of the covert ingredients which the hearer needs to access.

As for the divergence of pragmatics and discourse analysis, Coulthard (1985) says that discourse analysis examines how stretches above the sentence level are knitted together. Moreover, discourse analysis has to depict the construction of suprasentential text or social transaction through forcing a certain apparatus on the data either overtly or covertly.

Language, context and discourse

An understanding of how language functions in context is central to an understanding of the relationship between what is said and what is understood in spoken and written discourse. The *context of situation* means what someone says is, therefore, crucial to understanding and interpreting the meaning of what is being said. This includes the physical context, the social context and the mental worlds and roles of the people involved in the interaction. Each of these impacts on what we say and how other people interpret what we say in spoken and written discourse.

A conversation between two people in a restaurant may mean different things to the actual people speaking, something different to a 'side participant' in the conversation (such as someone sitting next to one of the speakers), and something different to a 'bystander' (such as the waiter) and again something different to someone who may be overhearing the conversation (Verschueren 1999). Equally, a student's assignment written for a law course takes on a different meaning if it is re-typed on the letterhead of a law firm and addressed to a client. The text then takes on the status and function of 'a piece of legal advice' and the reader's interpretation of the text is significantly different from the way in which it would have been read by the student's professor (Freedman 1989). The linguistic context in terms of what has been said and what is yet to be said in the discourse also has an impact on the intended meaning and how someone may interpret this meaning in spoken and written discourse.

There are, then, a number of key aspects of context that are crucial to the production and interpretation of discourse. These are the *situational context* in terms of what people 'know about what they can see around them', the *background knowledge context* in terms of what people 'know about each other and the world' and the *co-textual context* in terms of what people 'know about what they have been saying' (Cutting 2008: 5).

Background knowledge context includes cultural knowledge and interpersonal knowledge. That is, it includes what people know about the world, what they know about various areas of life, what they know about each other (Cutting 2008) and what they know about the norms and expectations of the particular *discourse community*, in which the communication is taking place. Contextual knowledge also includes social, political and cultural understandings that are relevant to the particular communication (Celce-Murcia and Olshtain 2000).

Cross-cultural pragmatics and discourse

The ways in which people perform speech acts, and what they mean by what they say when they perform them, often varies across cultures. One of the Japanese students complained, for example, that he had had work done by a local (English-speaking) builder that was unsatisfactory and no matter how much he pushed the matter he could not get the builder to apologize. On reflection, he realized that this was, in part, due to the different implications that might be drawn from an apology in English as opposed to an apology in Japanese. For the Japanese student, he expected the builder to apologize as a matter of course and he was very disturbed that the builder would not do this.

This did not mean for him, however, that the builder would be taking responsibility for the unsatisfactory work, or that, having apologized, he would then be obliged to do anything about it. In English, he discovered, the apology, for the builder, would mean that he was both taking responsibility for the faulty work and agreeing to do something about it a situation the builder was most likely keen to avoid given the financial, and other, implications this might have had for him. In Japan, the apology would not necessarily have had these implications.

Cross-cultural use of speech acts is commonly referred to as *cross-cultural pragmatics*. As Wierzbicka (2003) points out, different pragmatic norms reflect different cultural values which are, in turn, reflected in what people say and what they intend by what they say in different cultural settings. Wierzbicka gives the example of thanking in Japanese and English. The concepts encoded in the English word *thanks*, she argues, do not really fit Japanese culture. In English, she says, to thank someone means, roughly, to say we feel something good towards them because of something good they have done and we want them to feel good in return. But in Japanese culture with its stress on social hierarchy, moral duty and the repayment of favours, this situation is somewhat different.

Japanese speakers of English, further, may frequently say *sorry* when they mean *thank you,* leading to a completely different interpretation of what they mean, from what they intend to mean (Ide 1998). As Cameron (2001: 74) explains, the act of thanking is an expression of indebtedness in both English and Japanese. In the case of Japanese, however, ‘a debt not yet repaid calls for an apology from the debtor’. Apologizing, thus, for a Japanese speaker is one way of expressing indebtedness, and thanking someone.

Kim (2008) shows how the term *mainhada* can mean both *sorry* and *thanks* in Korean. *Mainhada* is used less often than *sorry* in English, however, as South Koreans often express an apology implicitly or nonverbally. Also, *mainhada* is not the only way of thanking in Korean. If the speaker thinks they are not able to return the benefit they have received from the person they are thanking, they will say *mainhada.* If they think they can return the benefit, however, they will say g *amsahada* . *Mainhada* is also used for requesting in Korean. It is used within a group when the speaker thinks fulfilling the request will be difficult. It is also used with people outside the group to incorporate them into the group but an honorific will be added to the word (i.e. *mainhabnida*) to show particular respect to that person.

THE ACQUISITION OF DISCOURSE

Language function

A **language function** refers to what students do with **language** as they engage with content and interact with others. **Functions** represent the active use of **language** for a specific purpose. **Language** forms deal with the internal grammatical structure of words and phrases as well as the word them. Students use language functions in order to express ideas, communicate with others, and show understanding of content in an academic setting.

In oral language some common functions may include:

- Giving instructions
- Making requests
- Defending an argument

In academic writing we use a range of specific functions in order to communicate ideas clearly. These include:

- Describing processes
- Comparing or contrasting things or ideas
- Classifying objects or ideas

Language forms deal with the internal grammatical structure of words and phrases as well as the word them. When one compares boy and boys, for example, or man and men, he or she is considering the relationship between different language forms or structures. Language forms also include cross curricular academic vocabulary - words or phrases frequently used across different content areas. Cross curricular academic vocabulary words typically describe or are related to academic processes and may include:

- Verbs (e.g., hypothesize, analyze)
- Complex prepositions, (e.g., in contrast to, as well as)
- Nouns (e.g., comparison, conclusion, analysis)

(4) While functions address what we do with language, forms are the language structures and vocabulary that are used to support those functions. Language learners need to acquire both the functions (uses/purposes) and the forms (structures + cross-curricular vocabulary) that make up the English language in order to reach higher levels of proficiency. Teachers also need to understand the language demands of a task as they relate to both function and form in order to best support students' language development.

Productive Rules

It means a **discourse** in which the participants pay close attention to and understand the other perspective, and respond to the other side by providing pieces of evidences rather than ignoring them. I believe that for a discourse to be "productive", the people involved in the discourse need to be respectful of each other's ideas and listen to what the participants have to say. A productive discourse does not mean that the participants have to come to an agreement.

It also means that a discourse is productive when the participants pay close attention and understand the other perspective, and respond to the other side by providing pieces of evidences rather than ignoring them. Moreover, a debate is productive when the participants are not sidetracked by misunderstandings. I think that when a discourse is taking place, participants need to choose their words carefully to clearly explain their position. Instead of trying to personally attack the other side, the participant should work to build a strong argument to prove their point.

Discourse if often seen as unproductive because people get carried away by emotions or do not respect the other participants. Instead of trying to understand the other side, people focus more on themselves to prove their own argument. Additionally, many people believe that in a discourse, people should come to an agreement. They think that one side has to win another. However, this is not true for a productive discourse. There does not have to be a consensus reached and a resolution does not represent a productive debate.

Second Language Acquisition

Discourse refers to the set of norms, preferences and expectations relating language to context, which language users draw on and modify in producing and making sense out of language in context. Discourse knowledge allows language users to produce and interpret discourse structures such as verbal acts (e.g., requests, offers), conversational sequences (such as questionanswer), activities (such as storytelling and arguing), and communicative styles (such as women's speech). Competent language users know the formal characteristics of these structures, the alternative ways of forming particular structures, and the contexts in which particular discourse structure are preferred and expected. For example, competent communicators know the range of linguistics structures which can use to ask for thing's particular social circumstances.

Discourse knowledge relates language to psychological as well as social contexts. Competent language users vary language according to their perception of cognitive states of interlocutors.
Every language has linguistic structures which elicit others' attention (or heighten attention to something expressed) and which distinguish old from new information (information interlocutors presume their addresses do not know). Address terms, emphatic particles, pitch, voice quality and repetition are attention getting devices. Similarly, certain determiners, pronouns and word order mark old and new information.

Psychological context includes perceived emotion. Language throughout the world has linguistic resources for converting emotion. In Thai and Japanese, for example, passive voice indicates negative affect towards a proposition. In other languages, affixes, particles, quantifiers, tense aspect marking, word order and intonation carry emotional meaning. Competent language users know which structures convey affective meaning and norms, preferences and expectations otherwise surrounding their use.

In the course of experiencing language in context, children come to know how language varies with context, how it sometimes reflects context and sometimes creates contexts. They come to know how to use language as a tool to elicit attention, to establish relationships and identities, to perform social actions and to express certain stances. All this the part of what constitutes being a speaker of a language. Acquiring a second language entails discourse knowledge surrounding the use of that language. In many cases, second language acquisition may be grammatically competent but their discourse competence pauses, as acquirers map norms, preferences and expectations surrounding their first language on to second language situations. Second language acquisition may have different norms from native speakers for greetings, asking, essay-writing, interviewing, storytelling, instructing or arguing; for displaying interest, fear, concern, pleasure or emotional intensity. Discrepancies between non- native and native discourse competence have both personal and economic consequences when interlocutors misunderstand the contextual meanings of one another's language behavior.

Social Acts. All children come to know that language is a tool for not only representing the world but constituting and changing the world as well. Children use linguistic structures as resources for carrying out a range of tasks such as asking questions and making requests, offers and promises. They also develop understandings of what others are trying to accomplish with their words and adjust their subsequent linguistic acts accordingly, e.g. accepting/rejecting offers, assessing announcements, agreeing/disagreeing, with assertions, satisfying/dissatisfying requests, and answering questions.

Affect. Affect is expressed emotion, including displays of moods attitudes, dispositions and feelings. As noted earlier early in their development, children display affect and interpret the affective displays of others. Before using words, children vary intonational contours and voice quality to indicate affect. At the single word stage, children perform a variety of affect loaded speech acts, such greetings, begging, teasing, cursing and refusing; and in certain speech communities, use affect- marked pronouns and affixes, morphological particles and respect vocabulary to display sympathy, anger, deference among

CHILD DISCOURSE

Placing Child Discourse in a Tradition

In the years since Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan published the first book on child discourse (Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan 1977), the field has moved through a series of changes. By turning to a discourse-centered approach, researchers have been able to shift focus, placing the child's learning process and productive pragmatic use at the center of their concern.

The early discourse approach developed as a counter to traditional language acquisition studies, which centered on discovering how children could overcome the limitations of their incomplete grammatical system. Such studies made judgments of the child's ability to approximate to the adult norm based on direct elicitation in experimental settings. The impact of *Child Discourse* (Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan 1977), along with *Developmental Pragmatics* (Ochs and Schieffelin 1979), began a movement toward situationally embedded activities as the domain of child language studies. Researchers' interests began to turn away from exclusively psycholinguistic concerns with factors underlying the development of formal structures to concentrate on contextually situated learning. 3

The discourse focus looked at children in naturally occurring settings and activities, and paid attention to their speech and communicative practice in everyday situations (Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz 1976). This research went beyond linguistic competence to what became known as the child's acquisition of communicative competence, which is seen as the knowledge that underlies socially appropriate speech. This approach was influenced by ethnography of communication (which saw communicative competence as a contrastive concept to the Chomskyan notion of linguistic competence), and involved theories of sociolinguistics, speech act usage, and conversational analysis. Although little conversational analytic work was done at that time, by the late 1970s and 1980s there was a growing interest in children's conversational competence (McTear 1985; Ochs and Schieffelin 1979).

The ethnographic approach to acquisition served to refocus studies of children's acquisition to the problem of how language learners are able to be participating members of a social group by acquiring social and linguistic skills necessary for interaction. The term *language socialization* came to represent this new focus. As Schieffelin and Ochs (1986), who provided one of the first collections to address these concerns, commented: language socialization involves "both socialization through language and socialization to use language" (1986: 2). The focus on language-mediated interactions as the mechanism of production–reproduction is the unique contribution of language socialization to the core problem of how societies continue. In research taking this perspective (e.g., Heath 1983), both the sociocultural contexts of speaking, and the ways of speaking within specifically defined speech events of a social group or society, became primary research sites. In contrast to earlier studies of language acquisition, which focused on the acquisition of grammatical patterns, and later studies, which looked at children's speech acts, the new approach looked at speaking embedded in specific interactive situations and at the communicative, as distinct from linguistic, competence that these practices revealed (Hymes 1962).

Child discourse studies have also broadened to encompass institutional settings and culturally heterogeneous settings. Second, child discourse studies began to address the question, what does it mean socially and psychologically for the child to have an ever-increasing linguistic control over her or his social environment and self-awareness? With a rising interest in Conversation Analysis (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974) in the past 15 years or so, this question has become refocused somewhat. Rather than looking only for linguistic markers of children's developing reflexivity and self-awareness, child discourse studies now also look at speakers' multimodal *displays* of affect and attention in the moment, including those of the children themselves, and how these displays become integrated into (and themselves influence) unfolding sequences of adult-child interaction (e.g., Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin 2012).

Thirdly, child discourse studies had come to focus on sociolinguistic practices and on events that were meaningful from children's own point of view, such as games, teasing rituals, and pretend play routines. They explored children's developing competence in their own peer world. In the past 10 years or so, there has been a proliferation of studies of children socializing children, many of these in culturally and linguistically heterogeneous settings resulting from transnational movements and postcolonial societal changes (e.g., seeGoodwin and Kyratzis 2007, 2012, 2014; Kyratzis 2004 for prior reviews).

We will review some of the most relevant studies in two main situational domains: adult–child discourse and child–child discourse. Under adult–child discourse, we review studies in pragmatics of family life, personhood, and self-identity (where space is made for the child to begin to reflect on her or his own experience), and morality in the talk of everyday life (such as dinner-table narratives, politeness routines, and other adult–child exchanges). Under child–child discourse, we review studies of disputes, teasing, and gossip events among older children and of pretend play among younger children.

Adult–Child Discourse

The world of the family, with its often-subtle distinctions of power and authority, provides children with their earliest learning experiences of how verbal communication can affect interpersonal relationships. By participating in family life, children gain practical experience of family dynamics and how talk is used to control, to persuade, or to conceal real intentions. Family discourse, particularly at mealtimes and on other ceremonial occasions, provides the essential testing-ground where children hone their skills as communicators. It is in the family group that children listen to and learn to construct narratives, tales that reflect past and future events (Heath 1983).

And it is through the pragmatic conventions of daily conversations that the relative positioning of family members is constructed as part of daily discursive practice. In family discussion, children are able to observe how talk reflects, and at times constructs, status relationships of gender, age, and power by the ways people talk to each other and about each other. It is also through family discussion that children first become aware of relationships in a world beyond the family.
Ervin-Tripp, focusing on the pragmatic conventions of family talk, provides important insights into the linguistic means by which interpersonal relationships are negotiated through the daily activity of family talk. Her analysis concentrates specifically on the speech acts or activities, such as requests, directives, greetings and politeness expressions, jokes, and complaints that demonstrate control of one person over another. In a paper on "Language and power in the family," Ervin-Tripp, O'Connor, and Rosenberg (1984: 119) point out the need to distinguish between effective power, "the ability in a face-to-face interaction to get compliance from an addressee," and esteem, "as the right to receive verbal deference."

In other words, there is not a direct correspondence between descriptors of status and everyday verbal behavior. Rather, by looking at everyday discourse, we become aware of the variety of factors of context, interact ants, social position, and/or emotional involvement, as well as activity scene, that all enter into choices of verbal strategies, and on a situation-specific basis determine pragmatic choice.

Child–Child Discourse

As noted, Child Discourse (Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan 1977) along with Developmental pragmatics (Ochs and Schieffelin 1979) began a new movement in child language research, one of looking at situationally embedded activities organized by children themselves as the domain of child language studies and studies of the acquisition of communicative competence. Several studies noted the ingenuity of children in making use of repetition, sound play, and other aspects of "attuned poetic performance" (Cekaite *et al*. 2014: 7; de Le´on 2007; Garvey 1977) in their play and games.

However, as described by Schieffelin and Ochs (1996), in addition to looking at "children's skill to use language," the research began to focus on "relating children's knowledge and performance to the social and cultural structures, and ideologies that give meaning and identity to a community" (1996: 252), in this case, to children's "own peer- [or sibling-kin] group communities" (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012: 381). Several influential *ethnographic* studies of children's peer group interactions (e.g., Corsaro 1985; Eckert 1987; Eder 1995; Goodwin 1980, 1990, 2006; Rampton 1995; Thorne 1993) began to be conducted in this vein and illustrated how groups of children and teens in neighborhoods, school yards, and classrooms used social practices within such genres as arguments, songs, rhymes, pretend play, gossip stories, teasing, ritual abuse, jokes, and riddles, and also sanctioning of one another (Goodwin 2006: 22–3; Opie and Opie 1959), to negotiate belonging, inclusion, shared norms and meaning, and social hierarchy within the peer group. Many additional ethnographic studies followed, especially from the 1990s onward.

Many studies of older children, middle school-aged and beyond, have looked at disputes, teasing, and gossip events among peers, as these provide a means for children to negotiate alignments and hierarchy within the peer group. Younger children use pretend play and song games as venues to negotiate inclusion and peer group hierarchy. Studies of children's' and teens' disputes, teasing, gossip stories, song games, and pretend play have been reviewed recently in two large literature reviews (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012, 2014), to which the reader is referred. However, we present a review of a small number of these studies here, and then draw some conclusions about what recent child discourse research tells us about how children participate in the negotiation of norms and moral order across both adult–child and child–child interactions.

Lecture-07 Discourse: Gender, Racism and Religion

DISCOURSE AND GENDER

Gender Differences as Discursive Strategies

The study of discourse and gender is an interdisciplinary endeavor undertaken by scholars in linguistics, anthropology, communications, social psychology, education, literature, and other disciplines. At its heart is a focus on, first, the linguistic resources individuals draw on to present themselves as gendered beings in relation to other aspects of the self within the constraints of their communities, more or less conforming to or resisting these constraints; and, second, the discursive construction of gender and its many components through words and images. Given the complexity of gender as a social phenomenon, the study of gender and discourse requires attention to cultural influences that favor gendered ways of speaking and of negotiating both connection and power; the fluidity of gender as a performance and the societal constraints on gender performances; and the multiple interrelations among gender, discourse, and social meaning.

The early focus on women's speech, sex discrimination through language, and unequal power relations was maintained in two influential edited volumes: McConnell-Ginet, Borker, and Furman's *Women and Language in Literature and Society* (1980) and Thorne, Kramarae, and Henley's *Language, Gender and Society* (1983). However, several chapters in these volumes represent another major strand of research in discourse and gender, influenced by anthropological linguist John Gumperz and sociologist Erving Goffman. Ethnographic work influenced by Goffman explores gender and discourse as a component of social interaction. Drawing on

Goffman's (1967) concept of face the individual's public "image of self," which consists of "approved social attributes" that must be constantly maintained and protected and Lakoff's (1973) theory of politeness. Brown (1980) claim that women are more polite because they are "culturally demoted to an inferior status relative to men".

Identity and Discourses of Gender

Discourse is usually defined as the relationship between language and its real-world context. Many researchers and theorists relate discourse specifically to power structures in a given society, and this is the area where there is the most overlap between gender and discourse. Approaches to gender and discourse research may analyze the way language reflects or influences gender stereotypes, or they may discuss the differences between how men and women use language.

Much use of the word discourse in the late 20th and early 21st centuries was influenced by the work of the French philosopher Michel Foucault, who defined the use of language and other sign systems as a means to control people's actions. Drawing on Foucault's theories, many researchers have analyzed gender in relation to existing social and cultural power structures. Some theorists argue that the way language is used re-enforces existing power structures, while others claim that discourse simply reflects the existing state of affairs. The relationship between power and discourse may also be viewed as cyclical or mutually re-enforcing: social structures influence language, and language influences social structures. Foucaultian approaches to gender and discourse tend to focus on the relationship between gender and power.

Some research focuses on the difference between how men and women are portrayed in discourse. For instance, some studies of gender and discourse analyze the way men and women are viewed in public communication, such as advertising or TV. The goal of such analysis is often to reveal the unspoken assumptions about gender interactions and the underlying power structures that these interactions reveal.

On the other hand, a significant portion of gender discourse studies analyzes the difference between how women and men themselves use language. These types of studies almost always concentrate on a particular culture or sub-culture. For example, one study of Malagasy-speaking people revealed women's speech to be more direct in that cultural context, while men's speech was more round-about. This study provoked debate about the types of power wielded when each style of communication was used.

Across many different cultures, women's speech styles are often found to have power within domestic circumstances, while men's speech is believed to be more powerful in public settings. Most theorists believe that this difference is due primarily to the way boys and girls are socialized from a young age, rather than from innate biological differences between the sexes. They may disagree, however, about whether these differences constitute a form of societal oppression of women. Those who identify as gender-egalitarian or gender-liberal may argue that these differences should not exist. On the other hand, some people, such as difference feminists, would respond that although the power assigned to women in society is of a different type than that assigned to men, it is not an inherently unequal system.

Language and Gender Online

Many of the themes addressed in research focusing on women's and men's spoken discourse have been identified in computer-mediated discourse. Other patterns of gender and discourse are emerging in this context as well. Scholars in the field of language and gender were among the first to examine Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC). Susan Herring was a innovator in this area and, together with her students and colleagues, has continued to be the major researcher in it. In an overview of CMC research published between 1989 and 2013, Herring and Stoerger (2014) demonstrate that widespread predictions that gender would be invisible online, and therefore gender-related differences and inequalities would disappear, were not borne out.

Summarizing the findings of early research on discussion lists and newsgroups which considered the quantity of talk and the stances that males and females take up in relation to their debaters, they note that women have a habit to post shorter messages and were more likely to "qualify and justify their statements, apologize, express appreciation, support others, and in general, adopt an 'aligned' stance toward their debaters". In contrast, men have a habit to post comparatively longer messages, were more likely to "begin and close discussions in mixed-sex groups, assert opinions strongly as 'facts', challenge others, use simple language and in general adopt an argumentative stance toward their debaters".

The prediction indeed, the hope that CMC would be gender-neutral grew out of the assumption that it would be anonymous. The trend, however, has been in the opposite direction. Recent research has continued to document that online discourse tends to replicate gender related patterns that had previously been observed in spoken interaction, as well as the important insight that gender-related patterns vary by context. It is essential, therefore, to pay attention to the type and purpose of online discourse in order to get an accurate understanding of the relationship between gender and online discourse.

For example, the early question of who talks more, women or men, was answered differently depending on whether one examined what Tannen (1990) dubbed private or public speaking: women were found to talk more at home but less at meetings. Just so, Herring and Stoerger report that researchers looking at online discourse have observed that gender differences in participation vary by online context: women outnumber and are more active than men on social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter etc. While men participate more frequently on music-sharing sites, the professional social networking sites LinkedIn, and the social news website.

Furthermore, just as studies of spoken conversation found that men's contributions at meetings are more often taken up by the group, Kelly (2012) found that men's tweets are retweeted more often than women's, especially by men, even though women post more on Twitter, and Herring *et al.* (2004) found that men's blogs are linked to and reported on in the mass media more often than women's blogs. This is not to say that men's online discourse always receives more attention; women may receive more attention, but, unfortunately, of a less desirable kind: Harding (2007) observes that women receive respectively more online harassment, while Marwick (2013) notes that they are subjected to more threatening language when they speak up on social media sites.

DISCOURSE AND RACISM

Concepts of "Race" and "Racism"

In attempting to define "race", Dobzhansky (1946) states that:

"Races are defined as populations differing in the incidence of certain genes but actually exchanging or potentially able to exchange genes across the boundary (usually geographic) that separates them." Race is considered as a biological, genetically determined concept.

However, this scientific concept has been increasingly challenged. First, it has been argued that the continued use of the term 'race' intensifies the problems of racism. As a result, some African Americans want to substitute color or 'colorism' because skin color is the most obvious sign of difference. Second, others challenge race from the perspective of the increased 'hybridity' (Bhabha, 1994) or racial mixing brought about by increasing globalization and the migration of people. In this context identity becomes very subjective especially because racism rejects such people their white parentage or heritage. Since mixed race persons are defined by their darker skin color not their ethnicity the concept of 'race' loses much of its validity. Lastly, the most important challenge to the use of the concept of race is, however that it is not biological difference as such that creates racism but its social construction.

Despite these challenges the concept of race is still useful mainly because it promotes racism which is what the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC) and anti-racists the world over is trying to control. 'Race' is a biological reality which leads to the perception of difference which leads to racism. The theoretical foundations of the relationship between race and the construction of racism are complex and have important policy implications.

Types	**Manifestations**
Individual	Attitudes; everyday behavior
Institutional/systemic	Policies and practices of an organization; rules woven into a social system
Cultural/ideological	Values embedded in dominant culture

(From Henry, Tator, et. al. The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society. 2002, Harcourt, Toronto. 3rd edition in press)

We consider racism to be discrimination against racialized social groups or racialized imagined communities. Racism includes the following practices and processes in which discourse plays a crucial role.

- Two types of differences, that is, natural and cultural differences, are marked and stereotypically generalized, as well as polarized, in order to construct homogenous groups or communities of persons (marking of natural and cultural differences, group internal homogenization, and polarization).

These two types of differences are connected via the naturalization of cultural differences. This implies that fictitious or real, usually visible, more or less unchangeable features are linked as allegedly natural traits with social, cultural, or mental characteristics (naturalization of cultural differences).

- This naturalizing social construction is accompanied by the hierarchization and negative evaluation of the racialized other (hierarchization and negative evaluation).
- Naturalized hierarchization and negative evaluation subsequently serve to justify and legitimize power differences, (economic) exploitation and various practices of social as well as political exclusion (Priester 2003).

Socio-cognitive approach to racism

Discourse Studies as a cross discipline emerged in all the humanities and social sciences 50 years ago in the USA and various European countries, but initially focused mostly on formal aspects of text and talk: text grammar, semantic coherence and narrative and argumentation structures. A more sociopolitical orientation, Critical Discourse Studies (CDS), focused on forms of discursive power abuse, was initiated only in the 1980s, but since then has become very popular, for instance in the study of political discourse, media discourse and phenomena such as racism and sexism. Most forms of CDS establish direct links between discourse structures and social structures.

In a **socio-cognitive approach** this relation is mediated by cognitive structures, the only way heterogeneous discourse structures and social structures can be theoretically linked, for instance, by personal mental models and socially shared knowledge, attitudes and ideologies. Hence, a critical study of discourse must be based on such a socio-cognitive theory in order to be able to describe and explain the discursive reproduction of social domination, as well as the resistance against this domination.

Since the 1980s, social cognitive models have remained the most dominant and influential accounts of racial bias. These have their origins in Gordon Allport's seminal work, *The Nature of Prejudice (1954)*. Allport's definition of prejudice as "an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization" (1954) about a social group and its members, emphasizes the role that social categorization and stereotyping play as perceptual-cognitive processes that underlie racial bias.

Categorizing people into their respective group memberships (such as race, gender, age) is seen to be driven primarily by our limited cognitive capacity and thereby our need to simplify the overwhelming amount of stimulus information we receive and need to process quickly and efficiently.

This group-based or category-based perception is seen as distorting reality because people are not viewed as individuals in their own right but rather as prototypical group members. In turn, this leads to stereotyping, which recent social cognition research suggests can occur automatically and outside conscious awareness (Nosek, Hawkins & Frazier 2011). Stereotyping of course is just one step away from prejudice literally prejudging someone based solely on their group membership. This inextricable relationship between categorization, stereotyping and prejudice therefore is central to social cognition models of prejudice. Social cognition models have been criticized for normalizing prejudice and racism as inevitable products of our cognitive hard-wiring. Critics have also argued that by treating racial categories and racial categorization as natural rather than social and ideological constructs, social cognition models themselves reproduce subtle and implicit racism in psychology (Hopkins, Levine & Reicher, 1997).

Prejudices and stereotypes

Prejudice is defined as a form of social cognition shared by the members of dominant in-groups. This interdisciplinary problem is discussed against the background of recent developments in cognitive psychology, social psychology and microsociology about the nature of social information processing and the cognitive representation of groups, intergroup episodes and social conflict. The cognitive analysis of social representations is carried out in terms of strategies for the management of social information about groups, and presupposes a distinction between on, the one hand situation models and on the other hand more general group schemata (attitudes) in memory.

Strategies are the processes that use these beliefs in a flexible and context-sensitive way, both in understanding and in the planning and execution of prejudiced discourse and interaction. It is shown that large part of the cognitive processes involved have a social nature. In particular ethnic prejudice, formulated in terms of attitude schemata about minority groups, is categorically organized in terms of their major social functions: dominance, differentiation, distance, diffusion, diversion or displacement, depersonalization, and the various forms of daily discrimination.

This functional organization of ethnic attitude schemata also displays other forms of information ordering, such as local and global coherence, hierarchical relations, and differentiation into relevant social domains. It is assumed that ethnic groups are strategically represented according to a number of relevant prototypical characteristics: origin and/ or appearance, socio-economic position, cultural norms and values, typical actions and interactions, and attributed personal properties. Besides the contents and the organization of ethnic group schemata, especially the cognitive strategies for the manipulation of these cognitions appear to be crucial for prejudiced social information processing in concrete situations. These strategies include: irrelevant participant categorization, actualization and use of (negative) prototypical properties of minority members and the evaluation of their actions in terms of these group properties, favoritism in ambiguous situations of in-group members, negative macro proposition formation, confirmation of negative group schemata from incidental models of experience, negative information spreading and displacement across models and group schemata, and in general negative information retrieval.

It is shown that these cognitive strategies correspond to, and are the basis for, social strategies of everyday discrimination (as in discourse, selective negative attention and derogatory treatment, negative attribution, negative expectations, and the maintenance of distance and power). Finally, it is shown how everyday talk exemplifies many of these cognitive and social strategies of prejudice, and how discourse serves various functions in the social diffusion of ethnic attitudes, the sharing of experiences and the formulation of social precepts for the interaction with minorities.

DISCOURSE AND RELIGION

Religious Language

The term "religious language" refers to statements or claims made about God or gods. Here is a typical philosophical problem of religious language. If God is infinite, then words used to describe finite creatures might not adequately describe God. The ambiguity in meaning with respect to the terms predicated of God is the “problem of religious language” or the “problem of naming God.” These predications could include divine attributes, properties, or actions.

Religious discourse contains stories, supernatural characters, myth, attractive images and sometimes difficult logic. Therefore, religious texts are filled with metaphor. Metaphors differently interpret the text, “Christ is God and man,” The metaphor is constructed to be interpreted in one way rather than another. Relations among words give to fuzziness. Metaphors lead to additional layers of meaning.

Multiplicity of meaning is encoded in the religious texts. Ambiguity is often found in religious texts. The word “God” has many meanings. God is benevolent, or malignant, kind, or cruel, a person or a symbol, etc. Religious contexts can be revealing Ritual speeches as display a degree of repetition mysterious vocabulary, unusual intonation mark the discourse.

John Du Bois (1996) identified some of the features of Religious language:

- Use of rituals
- Archaic elements
- Euphemism and metaphor
- Semantic opacity
- Unusual fluency
- Magic words

Religious discourse has already been enlightening for us in a narrower sense. Much work on the topic of discourse and religion has focused on the linguistic and discursive characteristics of such practices as rituals, prayers, liturgies, trance, divination, spells, mantra, speaking in tongues, and other clearly delineated verbal genres. These practices typically involve deliberate and sometimes spectacular departures from "ordinary" communication, and these departures have been used to address issues of general linguistic concern.

Religion as a Cultural System

Geertz (1966) looks to define religion through a cultural lens in an attempt to advance the anthropological study of religion. Geertz observes, and believes, that the anthropological study of religion is stagnant due to a narrow focus on "supreme numbers" such as Freud, Durkheim and Weber. Attempting to trigger off of the great theories of the past Geertz wants to explore the "cultural dimension of religious analysis."
Geertz has to further explain what he means by "culture" and "religion." Culture is defined as "a historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols," which is used by humans to "communicate, perpetuate and develop their attitudes toward life." Religion is then defined as a special system of symbols that does four different things. **Religion:**

- Establishes powerful "moods and motivations" in people
- Formulates a "general order of existence"
- Makes these "conceptions appear as fact"
- Makes these moods and motivations seem "uniquely realistic"

Discourse and religion exploit the extremes of religious practice to unsettle linguistic commonplaces and sharpen understandings of general linguistic and semiotic processes. Narrowing discourse and religion to the study of the characteristics and peculiarities of discursive practices carries risks, however. We too often take for granted what makes these practices religious, which means that we prematurely delimit our object of study and neglect to explain how these practices come to be seen as 'religious' and for whom they are so seen. It is now well appreciated that we cannot presume the governess of religion as a category (Asad 1983, 1993; Masuzawa 2005; Tambiah 1995) and simply place discursive practices in it, as if their religious provenance were self-evident and left unchallenged by social actors.

This review addresses two major issues. The first is a fundamental problem for religious practitioners themselves, that of how to communicate with agents, such as gods, spirits, and ancestors, who are immaterial. All sorts of discursive resources, from registers to reported speech, are mobilized in an effort to materialize these agents. The second issue is equally fundamental but often neglected by analysts: it concerns the manner in which discourse gets separated out as 'religious' in relation to the secular.
(10) A curiosity of this topic is that the literature is both small – few researchers on discourse would describe what they do as that of "language and religion" or "discourse and religion" – and large. Large, because a massive literature does exist, but this literature is not preoccupied with language use and is scattered across disciplines, not to mention the globe, and has a formidable

time depth. After all, all the major religious traditions familiar to us have had deep and abiding concerns with language, as evidenced by such immense works.

Materializing the Immaterial

Discourse and religion often address a cardinal problem: How does one communicate with incorporeal agent's spirits, gods, ancestors who cannot speak back and make themselves present to allow for "mutual monitoring", intention-reading, and the rest, without which interaction would seem impossible? How are linguistic and discursive resources including relatively marked uses of language mobilized to address this "problem of presence", that of communicating with immaterial interlocutors? As Keane has argued, this problem of presence is fundamental, at least for understandings of religion that turn on the existence of an "invisible order" of experience. This problem has tended to inspire "highly marked and self-conscious uses of linguistic resources" dramatic departures from the way people ordinarily speak. Consider the problem of responsiveness.

Addressivity, as Bakhtin sweepingly put it, means an utterance's "quality of being directed to someone," and as Conversation Analysis (CA) has appreciated, this is fundamental to human interaction. The CA notion of "recipient design" refers to the "multitude of respects in which the talk by a party in a conversation is constructed or designed in ways which display an orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are the coo-participants", but what can one do when the co-participants aren't sensorially *there*? One may hail and entreat a deity or ancestral spirit with the aid of a proper name, reverential epithet and address term, vocative case marker and the like but how can one demonstrate, to others and even to oneself, that one is "communicating" and that one has received a response?

One basic solution is to resolve the participant role of "speaker" into multiple roles, so that one can play many parts, as it were.

For this feat represented speech is indispensable. In reporting someone else's speech, one distinguishes (minimally) the "animator" role (the one who physically produces the message) from "author" (the one responsible for composing the message). Innumerable other roles can be distinguished, too, including what called "principal" (the one committed to the truth of the message), and the "target" (the addressee for whom the message is ultimately meant; on participant roles.

Lecture-08 Political Discourse and the Role of Multimedia in Discourse Analysis

POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Representation: Metaphor

One of the central concerns of political discourse is the question of how the world is presented to the public through particular forms of linguistic representation. For example, how is language used in attributing meaning to individuals and groups with reference to the performance of their social practices? How are actions and events perceived and described? Which modes of reference are used to signify places, objects and institutions within particular positive or negative frames? The claim is that "reality" is not simply given to us through language; rather it is mediated through different forms of language representation.

An interesting view has recently arisen in cognitive science concerning the nature of mental representation. This view is exemplified by the following passages:

- Most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is persistent in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature.
- The basic-level metaphors allow us to comprehend and draw inferences about these [emotion] concepts, using our knowledge of familiar, well-structured domains. In short, the locus of metaphor is not in language at all, but in the way we conceptualize one mental domain in terms of another.
- Human cognition is fundamentally shaped by various poetic or figurative processes.

As these quotations indicate, some researchers in cognition and language have argued that mental representation is at least in part metaphoric. Rather than seeing metaphors as being solely or even primarily a linguistic phenomenon, they have proposed it as a mode of representation and thought.

The reasoning behind this is that certain aspects of our knowledge are difficult for people to represent: They are overly abstract and complex, and therefore they are represented in terms of easier-to-understand domains, that is, metaphorically. Therefore, when we think about abstract ideas such as inflation, the mind, or anger, we use more concrete concepts, a process which "allows us to refer to it [an abstract concept], quantify it, identify a particular aspect of it and perhaps even believe that we understand it" (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980).

The argument for metaphoric representation is often made as part of an argument for Cognitive Linguistics as championed by Lakoff and his colleagues. However, I believe that the issue of metaphoric representation is an interesting and radical idea which deserves attention in its own right.

Lakoff (1987) and Johnson (1980) present the use of metaphor in thought as just one part of a predominant theory of the nature of the mind. But their arguments about "objectivist metaphysics," generative approaches to linguistics and other controversial ideas may have drawn attention away from this specific claim. Therefore, in this article I will examine metaphoric representation as a theory of conceptual structure. I will not be addressing most of the other views of its proponents. Of those views, metaphoric representation has probably had the most direct influence on psychological research, through theories of idiom and metaphor comprehension. That said, however, it will be impossible to avoid mentioning other views expressed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) or Lakoff (1987), because some of them are used to provide support for the notion of metaphoric representation.

One **disadvantage** in discussing metaphoric representation is that it is necessary to discuss verbal metaphor. And as is well known, metaphor is one of the most difficult and intransigent problems in language. Indeed, even defining metaphor is by no means an easy task. For the present purposes, then, a minimal description will have to serve. In **verbal metaphor**, there are usually two explicit parts: a topic, which is the entity being talked about, and the vehicle, which is the metaphoric material being predicated of the topic. (Some authors refer to these as the target and source, respectively.) For example, in Lee is a block of ice, Lee is the topic, and block of ice is the vehicle. The implicit connection between the two is often referred to as the ground. In this case, the ground is that blocks of ice have a cold temperature, and this is interpreted in terms of emotional unresponsiveness.

More generally, the relation between temperature and emotion provides the ground. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) do not provide a detailed theory of verbal metaphor; their discussion seems to accept this kind of view. That is, in insisting that representations are metaphoric or metonymic, they are contrasting them with a more straightforward relation (called direct understanding). Since the metaphoric relation is not direct, some kind of mapping is necessary. And in fact, much of Lakoof and Johnson and Kovecses (1986) consist in spelling out the mappings behind various conceptual metaphors.

Things turn "Critical"

In the late 1970s theorists suggested that the surface realization of language represented the transformation of an underlying reality (Wilson 1990). The work was based, mainly, on Halliday's (1985) functional linguistic theory, which viewed language as a "social fact." In this view social and cognitive aspects become reflected within grammar. Politics and ideology were seen as

displayed through grammatical structure, and analyzing language in this way was referred to as "Critical Linguistics." This approach has since been expanded, both in methodology and theory, and is now seen as part of the broader analytic program known as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Wodak and Meyer (2009) moving the "linguistic" to a
"multi- disciplinary and multi-methodological level"; although grammar remains a central tool in explaining how ideology, power, and domination become constituted through linguistic structures.

Van Dijk argues that CDA should not be seen as a method but as a form of critically driven theory and practice operationalized by politically concerned discourse analysts, whose aim is to use a variety of methods in the study of power abuse and inequality within society. Such an approach has been criticized for its own internal politicization, since it seems to begin with the assumption that certain data sets produce power abuse and then sets off to find and describe such abuse. Consequently, it is suggested that critical analysts are in danger of confirming what they already believed from the start. Further, CDA has been criticized for its claim to use linguistic analysis to confirm forms of power abuse. Widdowson (1995) argues that because of its critical orientation CDA "essentially sociological or socio-political rather than linguistic." And it is also possible that the political critique of political discourse for political purposes becomes a form of political discourse itself.

In the past 20 years the "critical" approach to language and to political discourse in particular, has been one of the fastest-growing areas of applied linguistic research. Many of the scholars writing on CDA have also been leaders in the field of political discourse; for example, Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak, and Teun van Dijk. The critical analyst sees political discourse as the use of words and phrases, syntactic processes, and discursive positioning, to either hide or distribute responsibility in certain ways, or designate specific individuals or groups as belonging to categories that may serve particular political purposes.

Political Sounds

In studies of political discourse there has been relatively little attention given to how politicians make use of phonetic, phonological, or supra-segmental features of language for political purposes. Sociolinguistic research indicates that the way we sound has an impact on how people perceive us, and this can range from our attractiveness and intelligence to our trustworthiness and employability.

We know that Margaret Thatcher modified her speech to make herself more attractive to voters, and that UK Prime Minister David Cameron's upper-class accent "turns off" some voters. In the United States recent work has suggested that ex-Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice adopts selected African American speech forms in specific speech contexts and Hall-Lew, Coppock, and Starr (2010) claim that American politicians' production of "Iraq's" second vowel marks "political conservatism" when produced as /æ/ but political liberalism when produced as /a:/.

In studies of prosody within political interviews, politicians reflect a very fluid and positive style, with only short pauses in syntactically appropriate positions. It has also been claimed that the sounds of politicians' own names, along with the rhythmic patterns they project, can also assist, or hinder, a politicians' aim of attracting voters (Smith 1998). Duez (1997) has attempted to correlate aspects of acoustic patterning with degrees of political power. Duez suggests that aspects of acoustic delivery within the speeches of ex-French President Franc¸ois Mitterrand were affected by whether Mitterrand was in the role of challenger or opponent, as opposed to holder of the position of president. While in the role of president, Mitterrand made use of a slower articulation rate, but when in the position of challenger, or opponent, the articulation rate was much more rapid. Hence, Duez suggests that temporal organization could reflect relative distance from "power."

A number of studies have also attempted to integrate the prosodic level of language with discursive and pragmatic levels. Braga and Aldina Marques (2004), argue that supra-segmental features may be harnessed and used in correlation with syntactic, lexical, and pragmatic features to achieve specific political effects. In a study of political debates, politicians focused on a set of prosodic features, including pitch, emphasis, and focus and noted that particular patterns were found to match argumentative goals such as assertiveness, irony, emotion, and hyperbole. While the study of sounds and sound patterns involves a variety of technical forms of analysis, it is nonetheless an important component of the consideration of political discourse.

DISCOURSE AND MEDIA

Approaches to Media Discourse

Media discourse refers to interactions that take place through a broadcast platform, whether spoken or written, in which the **discourse** is oriented to a non-present reader, listener or viewer. Though the discourse is oriented towards these recipients, they very often cannot make instantaneous responses to the producer of the discourse, though increasingly this is changing with the advent of new media technology, as we shall explore. Crucially, the written or spoken discourse itself is oriented to the readership or listening/viewing audience, respectively. In other words, media discourse is a public, manufactured, on-record, form of interaction. It is not ad hoc or spontaneous (in the same way as casual speaking or writing is); it is neither private nor off the record. Obvious as these basic characteristics may sound, they are crucial to the investigation, description and understanding of media discourse.

The three main approaches to the study of media discourse can be characterized as

- Discourse analytic
- Sociolinguistic
- Nonlinguistic

Discourse **analytic approach** is the primary focus of scholars in the study of media discourse. Discourse analytic approaches that underlie a great deal of the research on media can be characterized as hybrids of existing frameworks of pragmatics, conversation analysis, variation, narrative analysis and interactional sociolinguistics optionally interlaced with sociological content analysis. For example, the approach can be "critical" in the sense of looking at social impact or inequality or concern political economy in the sense of the social value of language without necessarily bring into line with a major tradition, such as discourse analysis or media studies. **"Discourse analytic"** paradigm, which addresses discourse-level matters related to larger stretches of talk and text beyond the word or sentence level, including questions of participant, topic, function, and discourse structure, as well as a range of topics that includes news interviews, quotation and reported speech, register issues, politeness, positioning and framing.

The term **"sociolinguistic"** for work that involves variation and style in the media or a similar close analysis of language. Sociolinguistic insights, either to characterize some dimension of media language, such as variation and style, or to inform related discourse level work, such as genre and register. The **"nonlinguistic"** research involves work in political science, media studies, or communication studies paradigms and, to some degree, in cultural studies. Nonlinguistic domains are referred to by media discourse researchers perhaps more than in any other topical area of discourse analysis.

Narrative Structure

Journalists write stories, and accordingly, research into story structure or narrative becomes relevant to account for their motivations. Frameworks that have been successfully applied to other domains of talk, such as Labov's (1972) narrative framework have also been applied to news discourse. For example, Bell (1991) uses Labov's framework to examine the global narrative structure of news across local and national news boundaries, while van Dijk (1988) outlines a "theory of discourse schemata," which includes the traditional Labovian narrative schema as well as a more elaborated "news schema" a "series of hierarchically ordered categories" that helps define the discourse (van Dijk 1988: 49). Bell (1991, 1994, and 1998) has long compared the structure of news stories to personal narratives, noting their similarities and divergences, and using the Labovian framework as a point of departure.

The discursive elaboration and alteration of time elements in the news narrative is another feature distinctive to media discourse. Linear chronology is not important in a news story to the extent one would think: "Perceived news value overturns temporal sequence and imposes an order completely at odds with the linear narrative point" (Bell 1991). In their manipulation of sequential elements, reporters are not stenographers or transcribers; they are storytellers and interpreters. This point about a reordered "news chronology," constrained by the norms of text and content that underlie news discourse, comes up again in the work of media researchers Manoff and Schudson (1986).

Ultimately, the researchers are trying to determine what the placement of these profession bounded informational elements means in the context of news structure and discourse organization. The surface simplicity of the writing rules (which are standard across newswriting textbooks) and the complexity of their outputs (which varies across presentation domains) have only begun to get the attention they deserve. Bell (1991), for instance, notes the common practice in news-story construction of embedding one speech event into another. For example, a quotation from an interview is surrounded by information from a press release, but on the surface it is realized as a unified, coherent "story." Likewise, Cotter (1999a, in press), in discussing the progress of a story through time, and Knight and Nakano (1999), in delineating the "press release reality" that informed reporting of the historic 1997 Hong Kong handover, elaborate on the role of multiple texts and multiple authors in the production of news. This multiparty/multi-element infrastructure has been remarked on by other researchers (such as van Dijk 1988), who draw a range of conclusions, depending on their research focus.

Audience Consideration

Attention to audience is the first step away from text-focused analyses of media, and many researchers are aware that a theoretical position of media discourse that includes the audience is desirable. Different linguists or theorists offer different conceptualizations of the audience and its role in the construction of media realities. In the approaches, which are being addressed here, the audience is conceived of as part of the discourse mechanism. This is in contrast with more conventional assumptions about mass communication which rely on the active sender–passive receiver "conduit" model, which is now contested. The position of the audience may be one of the more salient differentiating features of the various research paradigms.

A great deal of the research (from within discourse analysis and sociolinguistics and outside of it) either casts the audience as individuals who do not have much choice in resisting media power, or credits the audience's role with more equality in the relationship: as being both active and acted upon. There are different ways to explore the concept of audience agency or interaction in media discourse. Goffman's frame analysis of radio talk (1981) was one of the first to articulate and apply the insight that the relationships among the different interlocutors determine the nature of the speech event and the talk that is appropriate to it. Similarly, in Bell's view (1991), which builds on Goffman's categories of participant roles, the media audience takes on multiple roles: that of speaker, addressee, auditor, overhearer, and eavesdropper. As mediasavvy participants in the larger culture, we recognize audience roles and embedded points of view and are conscious when an interviewee – or an interviewer – departs from a prescribed position.

Meinhof's work on the visual and textual double messages in television news, which she argues have cross-cultural implications, is consciously predicated on a focus away from "text-internal readings, where readers are theorized as decoders of fixed meanings, to more dynamic models, where meanings are negotiated by actively participating readers" (Meinhof 1994: 212). Her own three-part taxonomy of communication, which circumvents the sender–receiver model and is briefer than Goffman's and Bell's characterizations, includes actors, activities or events, and the affected, the effect, or outcome.

The audience is considered from cognitive perspectives, as well. Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983) led the early work on the cognitive factors in the processing of information that influence comprehension of texts by readers. They establish that hierarchical relations exist among discourse strategies; that information comes from many sources within text and context; and that “forward” and “backward” interpretation strategies operate on the local level to specify the meaning and constrain interpretation – insights that background many current assumptions about audience interplay with text. In comprehension research such as this, the audience and its range of innate psycholinguistic abilities are assumed and essentially backgrounded in the discussion of other issues. This stands in contrast to the work by investigators who incorporate the tenets of reception analysis in their investigation of media discourse, a blend of methodologies that has received little attention by linguists (Richardson 1998).

In Richardson’s work, the audience is foregrounded as a key element in the production of discourse meaning both through the researchers’ emphasis on audience comprehension of texts, and by the audience’s response to texts in the data-eliciting process itself. Bell (1984, 1991) has worked to articulate a framework for considering the role of the audience on the sociolinguistic level, using phonological, lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic evidence to construct a theory of “audience design.” Major insights of the framework involve the role of style, which in different ways can either be responsive to the linguistic norms of an audience, or refer in some way to a “third party, reference group or model” outside of the speech community (Bell 1991: 127).

Style strategies, thus, can be seen as playing an essential role in redefining and renegotiating the media’s relationship to the audience. Finally, Cotter (1993, 1999a) attempts to characterize the nature of the relationship between the news community and the “community of coverage” it serves. This work focuses on the interactive properties of the “pseudo-dyadic” relationship that exists between the two communities, as well as on the dynamic of “reciprocal transmission” – “the interplay of texts, creators, and audience” which allows the media to engage on the social or phatic level, at the same time providing content that “captures facts about our social worlds” (Cotter 1999a: 168).

ADVERTISING AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Advertising Messages as Samples of Social Interaction and Activities

Advertising is a means of communication with the users of a product or service. Advertisements are messages paid for by those who send them and are intended to inform or influence people who receive. **Ads** are wonderful examples of the diverse roles discourse can fulfill in society. To consider them as discourse types can prove very enlightening about the ways people communicate and relate to each other within the different spheres where they perform their daily activities. This exemplary character is basically connected with the very nature of ads: **advertising** is one of the liveliest and most representative forms of discourse when it comes to displaying its own inner functioning, since it not only enhances its status as a linguistic form of communication but also foregrounds the need for context when it comes to the full understanding of the overall message which is the cornerstone of discourse analysis as a method of discursive interpretation (Cook, 1992).

As a discourse type, **advertising** has always suffered the consequences of a perceived marginal status, at different levels. This marginality has to do with the very nature of ads. In fact, one of the outstanding characteristics of this relatively young form of discourse is its ability to search successfully desirable elements from other, more clearly defined discourses in order to borrow credibility from others or enhance some of its own features (Williamson, 1978). The resulting restlessness and ambiguity contribute to a feeling of mistrust towards it: its features are not its own and ad discourse might even threaten to replace others, which are more firmly established, because of this ability to draw inspiration from all possible sources (Freitas, 2010), even when ads are able to incorporate criticism to themselves as useful material for creation (Myers, 1999). On account of not enjoying the status of a fully established discourse, advertising has consistently been a target for attacks aimed at its lack of essential and defining characteristics (Geis, 1982). This elusiveness would then account for the difficulty of establishing boundaries on which to base effective standards for assessing and evaluating this form of communication.

Advertising has also been denied seriousness of purpose on the grounds of its ultimate commercial aims (Myers, 1999). Broadly speaking, these aims would include the sales promotion of a given product or service, the firm establishment of the presence of a given brand in the public's mind, or even the reassurance of the public as to the quality of the product in the event of rebranding strategies (Brierley, 1995, Wells et al, 1998, Yeshin, 2006). This kind of socially oriented criticism attacks advertising on moral grounds: the hidden agenda behind advertising discourse introduces a financial element in this communication process that taints it and causes it to be seen as less worthy of serious attention (Freitas, 2010). After all, ads consist in messages that are paid for, conveyed in a space or time.

Examining Ads in Context: advertising seen through the eyes of discourse analysis

Advertising is referred to as a form of discourse in the sense that it has influenced not only the structure of language and the modality of lifestyle, but also the content of routine daily acts of communicative exchanges. The messages of advertising have permeated the entire cultural landscape. Printed advertisements fill the pages of newspapers and magazines. Commercials interrupt TV and radio programs constantly. As Beasley and Danesi (2002) pointed out, "brand names, logos, trademarks, jingles, and slogans have become part and parcel of the 'mental encyclopedia' of virtually everyone who lives in a modern- day society" (See Wodak, 2006a, 2006b; Wadak, 2007). **Advertising** has progressed beyond the use of simple techniques for announcing the availability of products or services. It has expressed into the domain of persuasion, and its rhetorical categories have become universal in contemporary social discourse. Because of the growing effectiveness of its persuasion techniques, advertising has become entrenched into social discourse by virtue of its wide spread diffusion throughout society.

Everywhere one turns, one is bound to find some ad message designed to persuade people to buy a product. All this leads to the inescapable conclusion that advertising has developed, since the first decades of the 20th century, into a privileged form of social discourse that has unparalleled rhetorical force. With the advent of industrialization in the 19th century, style of presentation became increasingly important in raising the persuasive efficacy of the ad text. Accordingly, advertising started to change the structure and use of language and verbal communication. Everything from clothes to beverages was being promoted through resourceful new techniques. As the 19th century came to a close American advertiser in particular were, as Dyer (1982) points out, using more colloquial, personal and informal language to address the customer and also exploiting certain effective rhetorical devices to attract attention to a product. So persuasive had this new form of advertising become that, by the early decades of the 20th century, it started becoming a component of social discourse, starting to change some of the basic ways in which people communicated with each other and in which they perceived commodities and services.

From the 1920s onwards, advertising agencies sprang up all over, broadening the attempts of their predecessors to build a rhetorical bridge between the product and the consumer's consciousness (See Sayer, 2006; Saussure & Schulz, 2005).

The **language of advertising** has become the language of all, even of those who are critical of it. As Twitchell (2000) puts it "language about products and services has pretty much replaced language about all other subjects". It is no exaggeration to claim that today most of our information, intellectual stimulation, and lifestyle models come from, or are related to, advertising images. Positioning and image creation have become the primary techniques of what has come to be known as the era of persuasion in advertising.

This is an era in which **advertising messages** have moved away from describing the product in itself to focusing on the consumer of the product, creating product imagery with which the consumer can easily identify (Woodward and Denton, 1988). Ads and commercials now offer the same kinds of promise and hope to which religions and social philosophies once held exclusive rights: security against the hazards of old age, better positions in life, popularity and personal prestige, social advancement, better health, and happiness.

Lack of clear discourse boundaries: multimodality and overall coherence in advertising messages as addressed by discourse analysis

Ads are good examples of why communication processes should be analyzed in a global manner. Although a complete analysis that encompasses every element is not possible for the reasons mentioned above, analysis should strive, nonetheless, to take as much as possible into account: 'Actual analyses, of course, develop in detail only a small part of the full picture. However, any discourse analysis needs, at least, to give some consideration, if only as background, to the whole picture' (Gee, 2005).

In the specific case of multimedia advertising campaigns, the 'whole picture' should doubtlessly be the main focus of analysis. This is where the message effectively lies, since 'each medium presents its own obvious advantages for advertisers, but also some disadvantages. Multimedia campaigns offer one way of compensating for the weaknesses of one channel by using the strong points of others' (Freitas, 2004). In that manner, the intended 'advertising pressure' can be exerted upon the viewers (Brochand et al., 1999), guaranteeing that, in one way or another, they will be exposed to at least a part of the divulgation effort.

A possible way of undertaking the analyses of such a campaign is by bearing in mind a number of building tasks and discourse analysis questions that are at pale when we assess any sample of 'language in use': they have to do with

(1) the significance that a piece of language can lend to certain situations and the way this happens;
(2) what situations this piece of language is creating in such a way that they are recognized by the others. Another important issue is related to the establishment of
(3) specific identities and

(4) relationships by means of this language sample (Gee, 2005). A given piece of language will also indicate some sort of
(5) assessment on social values, will
(6) establish connections with other utterances, making them relevant to the present one, as well as
(7) attribute prevalence to a given sign system over others (Gee, 2005).

Discourse Analysis of Telecom Ads:

It can be seen that the ad has used different font sizes and colors to grab the attention of the audience. It is also noticed that the information regarding the conditions that apply in availing the promoted product or services are given at the bottom of the layout in fine prints. People hardly read that part because it is written in very small fonts. People tend to ignore the information not deliberately but unconsciously, which are written in small font as it does not attract people as much as the big colored fonts. It is tactics followed by the ad makers to make the audience not to notice all the written information.

Lecture-09 Approaches and Methodologies in Discourse-I

DISCURSIVE PSYCHOLOGY AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Principals of Discursive Psychology

Discursive psychology is an approach that addresses psychological matters in terms of how they figure in discourse in conversations over family mealtimes, in therapy sessions, in witness statements. It begins with psychology, as it confronts people as they live their lives.

Discursive psychology is usefully understood as working with three fundamental observations about the nature of discourse. Discourse is:

- Oriented to action
- Situated sequentially, institutionally and rhetorically
- Constructed and constructive

These observations' structure analytic work in DP. We will take them in turn.

Discourse is action orientation

DP starts with a focus on discourse as a central resource for performing action. These may be comparatively discrete actions, which have speech act verbs associated with them invitation, complaint, say or they may be complex, institutionally fixed practices where no speech act verb exists using questions to give 'person centered' advice, perhaps. Often actions are done indirectly, via descriptions of some kind that provide a different kind of accountability for the speaker than an 'on-the-record' speech act. The key point is that discourse is studied for how action is done rather than treated as a medium for access to putative mental objects (intentions, dislikes). This is a very different start-point from that of cognitive psychology, which was largely born out of an engagement with linguistics, and more specifically out of a concern with grammatical structure and abstract semantics (Potter and te Molder, 2005).

Discourse is situated

A central recognition of DP is that actions are **situated**. The most profound way that action is situated is in terms of the here and now of conversational sequence. Talk is occasioned. This point is at the heart of discursive psychological research practice. When we move from language as an abstract system that has a static and abstract relation to the world and to mental organizations to an action-focused approach, we are immediately considering the way events unfold in real time. A **second** major way in which an action is situated is **institutionally**. DP does not adopt a position of contextual determinism; it does not treat all interaction in a doctor's surgery, say, as intrinsically medical. Nor does it treat institutional talk as organized into coherent, conceptually organized discourses, such that medical settings will implicate a medical discourse or register.

A **third** major way in which an action is situated is **rhetorically**. This came out of the early engagement with Billig's (1996) rhetorical psychology. It highlights the way that descriptions are often organized to counter actual or potential alternatives and organized in ways that manage actual or possible attempts to undermine them (Potter, 1996). A major theme in DP is the way epistemic issues are managed using a wide range of conversational and rhetorical resources (Potter and Hepburn, 2008).

Discourse is constructed and constructive

Discourse is constructed from a range of resources words, categories, rhetorical commonplaces, grammatical structures, repertoires, conversational practices and so on, all of which may be delivered in real time, with prosody and timing, or is built into documents with specific layouts, fonts and so on. These resources, their use and their conditions of assembly can become topics of DP study. They are both resources for action and challenges that may require management in order for one to work round their specific affordances.

Methodological Procedures of Discursive Psychology

Although there are some differences of emphasis, contemporary DP draws heavily on the methods and approach of conversation analysis. A typical DP study will work with a set of audio or video recordings collected in some setting. Recent work has used phone calls to neighbor dispute mediation service, calls to a child protection helpline, video records of family mealtimes. Researchers often draw on more familiar sets of mundane records of phone interaction to do primary or comparative work.

Such materials will be digitized and often copied in one pass by a transcription service that is meant to capture the basic words and speaker transitions. This can facilitate searches through material for particular themes or events of interest. Often these are generated through data sessions in which a number of researchers engage with a single example, with repeated viewings or listening's and this stimulates introductory ideas that lead to a search for new examples. Such a search can start to build a introductory body of examples. These are typically transcribed using the system developed by Gail Jefferson (2004), which captures features of delivery that are oriented to by participants overlap, volume, prosody in a way that makes them visible on the page.

Analysis and data sessions, however, typically work with both video/audio and transcript; the latter is not planned to replace the prior. Unlike in more traditional social psychological work, specific research questions are rarely developed prior to the research; rather, the research often takes the setting as the key driver of questions (what kind of practices go on in a neighbor mediation helpline?) or works with a broad orientation to materials (in what sense can we find practices of advice giving in these helpline calls?).

A study will commonly work with a flexible corpus of examples. As analysis develops, the corpus will be refined. Some examples will be uncontrolled and new examples will be recognized, and therefore included in the corpus. The corpus will often start with standard cases and try to clarify them, and then consider different or counter cases, which may provide further specification of the phenomena.

With interactional materials the orientations of the participants themselves are a primary analytic resource, as these display their understanding of what is going on in its most basic way. Heritage (2004) suggests that participants turn towards interaction in at least three ways. **First**, they address themselves to immediately preceding talk. **Second**, they set up the conditions for the action or actions that will come next. **Third**, in the production of next actions, participants show a set of understandings of the prior action: that it is complete, that it was addressed to them rather than someone else, what kind of action it was and so on. This atmosphere provides for the intelligibility of interaction that is crucial for participants and offers an extraordinarily rich resource for analysts.

Studies in Discursive Psychology

Intention: institutions and practices

Ideas of intention have had a range of different roles in the social sciences. One of the most influential is probably in the field social cognition, where the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) has been associated with more than a thousand articles in the last two decades. This theory treats intentions as the product of a number of different elements, which work in combination to affect behavioural outcomes. Intention is treated as a kind of mental push that will result in the person engaging in the actual behaviour, unless something intervenes to prevent it.

Some philosophers have criticized this kind of approach to intentions by offering a conceptual analytic picture of intentions as a language game for making distinctions between different kinds of actions (e.g., Austin, 1961).

Rather than engage in such conceptual analysis, Derek Edwards (2008) opts for an approach that considers intentions through considering the practical use of attributions of intention, of the term intention, and of intentional language more broadly. He notes that actually there is a very wide range of semantic and grammatical resources that can be used to denote that something was intended or done intentionally.

Attitude: caring and closing

One of the major areas of historical and contemporary social psychology is the study of attitudes. Indeed, attitudes are a commonplace of work from across the social sciences. The discursive psychological critique of the way attitudes was conceptualized was developed right from the start (Potter and Wetherell, 1987, 1988; Potter, 1998). It emphasized that evaluations were part of practices embedded in interaction, where they played particular roles. And it emphasized that evaluations are often produced by constituting the 'attitudinal object' in particular ways rather than by claiming a personal psychological position.

Another feature of this developing critique of attitude work is that it starts to break up the idea of a single underlying attitudinal dimension in favor of considering the way different kinds of evaluations can be produced for different purposes. **For example**, Wiggins and Potter (2003) highlighted the different roles of 'objective' and 'subjective' food evaluations – 'that pasta is lovely' vs 'I love that pasta.'

INTERACTIONAL SOCIOLINGUISTICS AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

What is Interactional Sociolinguistics?

Interactional sociolinguistics (IS) studies the language use of people in face-to-face interaction. It is a theoretical and methodological perspective on language use with eclectic roots in a wide variety of disciplines such as dialectology, ethnomethodology, conversation analysis, pragmatics, linguistic anthropology, micro-ethnography and sociology. Basically, IS starts from the finding that, when people talk, they are unable to say explicitly enough everything they mean. As a result, to appreciate what is meant, they cannot simply rely on the words that are used but must also depend on background knowledge, to discover what others assumed the relevant context was for producing words in.

In fact, people can get very angry when they are put to the test and asked to explain precisely what they meant. Imagine telling a colleague that you had a flat tire while driving to work, after which that colleague replies: 'What do you mean, you had a flat tire?' Or suppose you ask an acquaintance: 'How are you?', and you are being asked in return:
'How am I in regard to what? My health, my finance, my school work, my piece of mind, my… In both cases you might experience surprise or confusion because you feel no extra explanation is necessary. You may even consider such questions improper and angrily retort: 'Look! I was just trying to be polite. Frankly, I don't give a damn how you are!'

Such reactions indicate that people expect each other to treat talk as incomplete and to fill in what is left unsaid; but also, that people trust each other to provide a suitable interpretation of their words, that is, they expect one another to be aware of the social world that extends beyond the actual setting and of the norms for the use of words that apply there. Put in another way, IS holds that, because of the incompleteness of talk, all language users must rely on extracommunicative knowledge to infer, or make hypotheses about, how what is said relates to the situation at hand and what a speaker possibly intends to convey by saying it.

Interactional sociolinguists in principle try to describe how meaningful contexts are implied via talk, how and if these are picked up by relevant others, and how the production and reception of talk influences subsequent interaction. As the examples above show, misinterpreting or failing to make hypotheses frustrates others' expectations that you may be willing to share the same view on what background knowledge is relevant, and this may cost you a friend. Below, we will see that misinterpreting may result in even greater social damage, but before we go into this it is necessary to take a closer look at how speakers' flag, or index, meaningful contexts by using only a limited but suggestive set of tools. If talk is incomplete, interact-ants need to do completion work. They have to find out what unstated context a certain word flags or points at for it to be made sense of. Consequently, words can be said to have indexical meaning, and it is this meaning that interact-ants need to bring to bear when they interpret talk.

This is obvious with terms such as 'this', 'there', 'you' or 'soon', terms that have been traditionally called indexical or 'deictic' in linguistics: every 'this' and 'soon' points at the specific context in which it is used, where each time one has to complete its new and specific meaning. But other words can be considered indexical as well. If this makes you wonder how people manage to make the right inferences at all, it is necessary to know that much talk is quite conventional, or that it tends to produce typical sequences of words and appropriate contexts for producing them in. There aren't dozens of ways of casually greeting one another, so you can be safe to assume that 'how are you?'

In sum, making inferences on the basis of talk is inextricably bound up with evaluation and identity in an unequally rewarding social world. We've already seen that there are social repercussions when misunderstandings occur: one may be found unintelligible or impolite. These repercussions only magnify when interact-ants find themselves in unequal social positions (imagine saying 'How am I in regard to what?' to your boss's friendly greeting) and in stressful situations such as job application interviews. Things start to look even bleaker when interact-ants Interactional sociolinguistics and discourse analysis have culturally different inferencing habits or contextualization styles, in other words when they interpret cues differently or produce cues that the other party does not pick up. It is with such recipes for disaster that a number of classics IS studies have been concerned with, and I turn to these in the next section.

How do you make an IS analysis?

If you want to make an IS analysis, you will need first-hand data that are as rich as possible. This usually implies doing long-term ethnographic fieldwork in one setting during which you familiarize yourself with the local communicative ecology, appreciate how it is related to broader social structures and assemble as much commentary from participants as possible. Without this ethnographic knowledge, it will be difficult to pick up the background knowledge that interactants in that setting only display via subtle references. Recordings (digital or otherwise) of naturally occurring speech are a must-have, since it is next to impossible to reconstruct interactions from memory in the amount of detail you need in order to discover their moment-tomoment organization. It is not always easy to make recordings, but, once you have them, they will allow you to revisit the recorded scene as much as you like so as to check hypotheses. Making a transcript of your recordings is the following indispensable and quite time-intensive step.

Which extracts are important clearly depends on your research goals? But it is typical for ethnographic research that these may sometimes slightly shift focus when you arrive at the scene. For these purposes, the researcher Rampton (1995), initially expected to find adolescents from different ethnic backgrounds playing around with each other's heritage languages and finding an interactional common ground in spite of their ethnic differences (cf. Rampton, 1995). But such behavior was hard to find, and instead he (Rampton) noticed that ethnic minority students dominated the classroom floor and silenced most other voices by excelling in what they called ‘doing ridiculous’, that is, slowing down and parodying the lesson (and later on also research interviews) in not entirely unruly ways. Furthermore, in spite of the fact that these students are widely noted in Belgium as incompetent or unwilling speakers of Dutch, it turned out that they regularly switched from one Dutch variety to another for special effect, and Rampton (1995) felt that bringing out such versatile language skills would help me to rub against common stereotypes. Therefore, he started identifying all occasions in the data where such playful behavior could be found and then categorized them according to variety (examples of playful Antwerp dialect, Standard Dutch, mock English, mock Turkish, etc.).

Why is Interactional Sociolinguistics important?

Interactional Sociolinguistics is important because it draws our attention to the existence of subtle cultural differences in the systematic combination of verbal and non-verbal signs which signal contexts and construct meaning, differences that are often hard to pin down by those who use them. IS can claim credit for having shown in great detail that disastrous consequences may follow if such different styles remain hidden and lead to miscommunication in gatekeeping encounters: applicants do not only fail to get a job or admission to a course, but often find their personal and ethnic background targeted as the cause for communication failure. IS has thus managed to uncover meaning and reason behind communicative styles that are regularly identified as inarticulate and incoherent, and the social relevance of this cannot be underestimated. It has shown that seemingly unintelligible job applicants or uninterested children are in fact sensible and involved if you (are willing to) read their contextualization cues in an appropriate way or you are prepared to accept their different cueing habits.

IS has also illustrated that technically differing styles do not necessarily lead to miscommunication, just as miscommunication itself does not automatically lead to conflict or stereotyping. As mentioned above, a readiness for observing and acknowledging differences can overcome even seriously diverging communication styles, or, conversely, the absence of difference does not always prevent negative identification or willful misunderstanding from taking place. These findings invite us to look beyond the actual interactional setting and observe how interact-ants approach and evaluate one another as differently positioned social beings who may, depending on the circumstances, see each other as problematically or delightfully different. Even when the odds are unfavorable, interact-ants may find other identities, qualities or actions of a person valuable that may overrule communication difficulties and the effect of stereotyping (a talented football player’s almost non-existent English will be passed over much more easily than that of an illegal refugee, who in her turn may find that her English is found cute and perfectly acceptable by her neighbors for whom she does babysitting). In other words, IS shows that communication is irrevocably a social happening where identities and relations matter, and which as such stands in close connection with wider social patterns and conventions that are also affected by it. This brings us to a third reason why IS is important.

IS offers an excellent tool for analyzing the tension between here-and-now interaction and more established discursive practices. In putting a microscope on interaction, IS makes clear that communication can never be taken for granted but always involves collaboration, collusion and negotiation. As the discussion in section ‘How do you make an IS analysis?’ illustrated, traces of these processes can be extremely subtle and may go unnoticed when looked at from a further distance, or their relevance may not be fully appreciated when discussed in isolation from the established practices that facilitated their production. IS, on the other hand, is well capable of attending to such subtle traces and to the accompanying perspectives of ‘participants who are compelled by their subordinate positions to express their commitments in ways that are indirect, off-record and relatively opaque to those in positions of dominance’ (Rampton, 2001). Consequently, IS can help to pinpoint those moments when established frames are called into question, reconfigured or otherwise transformed, and in this way, it can also indicate when creative restructurings give rise to emergent and potentially habitualzing social configurations. In short, IS can contribute to our understanding of larger social evolutions.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY

Physical Anthropology

Anthropology is a unique academic discipline that operates at the crossroads of the physical sciences, social sciences and humanities to examine the diversity of human experience across cultures and over time. Anthropologists in our department study everything from human evolution to prehistory to life in a globalizing world. Because of this breadth of focus, anthropology is highly relevant to understanding and living in a rapidly changing world.

Basic tenets of physical anthropology:

Holism: Holism means that a part of something can only truly be understood if examined within relation to the whole of it. For anthropologists, this means that they try to understand humankind through the interrelationships of all aspects of human existence for example, human biology has to be examined within the context of human cultures and vice versa. In addition, all of this must be examined within the context of the environment and historical processes. In an effort to be holistic, anthropology is often an interdisciplinary field that crosses over into other fields such as history, geology, and ecology.

Relativism: Relativism means that judgments, truths, or moral values have no absolutes, and can only be understood relative to the situation or individuals involved. For anthropologists, this means that they accept that all cultures are of equal value and must be studied from a neutral point of view.

A good anthropologist must disregard their own beliefs, morals, and judgments when examining another culture. They must, instead, examine each culture within the context of its own beliefs.

Universalism: Universalism means that whatever the theoretical principle is, it's equally applicable to all. For anthropologists, universalism means that we believe all humans are equal in intelligence, complexity, etc. This is in contrast to ethnocentrism, which is the belief that some peoples are more important or culturally/biologically better than other peoples.

Culture: All humans have culture. Culture is the set of learned behaviors and knowledge that belong to a certain set of people. This is different from genetically hardwired behaviors (such as reflexes) in that they aren't biologically inherited. The most important thing to remember is that culture is learned.

This may differ from linguistic anthropology because linguists will focus more on the way words are formed, for example, the phonology or vocalization of the language to semantics and grammar systems. For example, linguists pay close attention to "code-switching," a phenomenon that occurs when two or more languages are spoken in a region and the speaker borrows or mixes the languages in normal discourse. For example, when a person is speaking a sentence in English but completes his or her thought in Spanish and the listener understands and continues the conversation in a similar way. A linguistic anthropologist may be interested in codeswitching as it affects the society and evolving culture, but will not tend to focus on the study of code-switching, which would be more of an interest to the linguist.

Cultural Anthropology

Culture is the patterns of learned and shared behavior and beliefs of a particular social, ethnic, or age group. It can also be described as the complex whole of collective human beliefs with a structured stage of civilization that can be specific to a nation or time period. Humans in turn use culture to adapt and transform the world they live in.

Cultural anthropologists study the diversity of human cultures and societies around the world and the processes by which people construct local, regional and global forms of social relationships. Several anthropologists in our department study the processes by which people construct particular social identities, worldviews, and forms of community in a changing, globalizing world. In the contemporary world, much ethnography addresses the manner in which people in local communities orient themselves to global networks and institutions.

Anthropologists, in general, are more concerned with what discourse structuring might reveal about culture at large: 'In every moment of talk, people are experiencing and producing their cultures, their roles, and their personalities' (Moerman 1988: xi). The sequential organization of discourse, and conversational features such as overlapping patterns, breaks, silences, repairs and the like, can inform an understanding of both individual intention and cultural order. The genealogy of this technique of paying very close attention to discursive form, often also called 'conversational analysis', also traces back to the ethnomethodology of the 1960s and 1970s.

Cultural studies, takes discourse more globally to refer to particular areas of language use. This approach blurs together three levels of meaning: discourse is the act of talking or writing itself; it is a body of knowledge content; and it is a set of conditions and procedures that regulate how people appropriately may communicate and use that knowledge. Rather than the elemental structures of conversational interaction, this second approach to discourse pursues the connections between orders of communication, knowledge and power.

Cultural anthropology maintains relations with a great number of other sciences. It has been said of sociology, for instance, that it was almost the twin sister of anthropology. The two are presumably differentiated by their field of study (modern societies versus traditional societies). But the contrast is forced. These two social sciences often meet. Thus, the study of colonial societies borrows as much from sociology as from cultural anthropology. And it has already been remarked how cultural anthropology intervenes more and more frequently in urban and industrial fields classically the domain of sociology.

There have also been fruitful exchanges with other disciplines quite distinct from cultural anthropology. In political science the discussion of the concept of the state and of its origin has been nourished by cultural anthropology. Economists, too, have depended on cultural anthropology to see concepts in a more comparative light and even to challenge the very notion of an "economic man" (suspiciously similar to the 19th-century capitalist revered by the classical economists). Cultural anthropology has brought to psychology new bases on which to reflect on concepts of personality and the formation of personality. It has permitted psychology to develop a system of cross-cultural psychiatry, or so-called orthopsychiatry. Conversely, the psychological sciences, particularly psychoanalysis, have offered cultural anthropology new hypotheses for an interpretation of the concept of culture.

Linguistic Anthropology

Linguistic anthropology is the interdisciplinary study of how **language** influences social life. It is a branch of **anthropology** that originated from the endeavor to document endangered languages, and has grown over the past century to encompass most aspects of **language** structure and use. As a field of **anthropology**, **linguistic anthropologists** are concerned with how language influences culture. This can include how **language** impacts social interactions, beliefs, cultural identity, and other important aspects of culture.

Linguistic anthropologists have ventured into the study of everyday encounters, language socialization, ritual and political events, scientific **discourse**, verbal art, language contact and language shift, **literacy** events, and **media**. So, unlike linguists, linguistic anthropologists do not look at language alone, language is viewed as interdependent with culture and social structures.

According to Pier Paolo Giglioli in **"Language and Social Context**," anthropologists study the relation between worldviews, grammatical categories and semantic fields, the influence of speech on socialization and personal relationships, and the interaction of linguistic and social communities. In this case, linguistic anthropology closely studies those societies where language defines a culture or society. For example, in New Guinea, there is a tribe of indigenous people who speak one language. It is what makes that people unique. It is its "index" language. The tribe may speak other languages from New Guinea, but this unique language gives the tribe its cultural identity.

Linguistic anthropologists may also take an interest in language as it relates to socialization. It can be applied to infancy, childhood, or a foreigner being en-cultured. The anthropologist would likely study a society and the way that language is used to socialize its young.

In terms of a language's effect on the world, the rate of spread of a language and its influence on a society or multiple societies is an important indicator that anthropologists will study. For example, the use of English as an international language can have wide-ranging implications for the world's societies. This can be compared to the effects of colonization or imperialism and the import of language to various countries, islands, and continents all over the world.

Lecture-10 Approaches and Methodologies in Discourse-II

ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

What is EAP?

English for Academic Purposes (EAP) is usually defined as teaching English with the aim of assisting learners' study or research in that language. In this sense it is a broad term, covering all areas of academic communicative practice such as pre-tertiary, undergraduate and post-graduate teaching, classroom interactions, academic publishing and curriculum issues, as well as research, student and instructional genres (e.g., Hyland, 2009a). The emergence of EAP in the 1980s, as a response to growing numbers of second language (L2) students in university courses and in a framework informed by English for specific purposes, originally produced an agenda concerned with curriculum and instruction rather than with theory and analysis.

EAP was then largely a materials and teaching-led movement focusing on texts and on the search for generic study skills, which could be integrated into language courses to make students more efficient learners. EAP has **emphasized** the rich diversity of texts, contexts and practices in which students must now operate. While it continues to be heavily involved in syllabus design and it needs analysis and materials development, EAP has moved away from purely pedagogic considerations to become a much more theoretically grounded and research informed innovativeness.

The **role** of EAP has therefore changed in response to changing conditions in the academy. The huge expansion of university places in many countries, together with an increase in full feepaying international students to compensate for cuts in government support, has resulted in a more culturally, socially and linguistically diverse student population than ever before. **In addition**, students now take a broader and more heterogeneous mix of academic subjects. In addition to traditional single-subject or joint-honors degrees, we now find complex modular degrees and emergent 'practice-based' courses such as nursing, management and social work. These new course configurations are more discoursally challenging for students who have to move between genres, departments and disciplines. Further, while in the past the main vehicles of academic communication were written texts, now a broad range of modalities and presentational forms confront and challenge students' communicative competence.

As a result, EAP has assumed greater prominence and importance in the academy, forcing it to evolve and to ask new questions. Instead of focusing on why learners have difficulties in accessing academic discourses, EAP now addresses the influence of culture and the demands of multiple literacies on students' academic experiences. These questions, moreover, accompany new challenges, which Centre on the increased concern with the English language skills of nonnative English-speaking academics. The ability to deliver workshops in English, to participate in meetings, to make presentations at international conferences and, above all, to conduct and publish research in English are all demanded as part of such lecturers' competence as academics. This group's needs are now beginning to be noticed and analyzed, and programs are emerging which cater to their particular requirements.

Current EAP **aims**, therefore, at capturing thicker descriptions of language use in the academy at all age and proficiency levels, incorporating and often going beyond immediate communicative contexts to understand the nature of disciplinary knowledge itself. It employs a range of interdisciplinary influences for its research methods, theories and practices to provide insights into the structures and meanings of spoken, written, visual and electronic texts, into the demands placed by academic contexts on communicative behaviors, and into the pedagogic practices by which these behaviors can be developed. It is, in short, specialized English language teaching grounded in the social, cognitive and linguistic demands of academic target situations and informed by an understanding of texts and of the constraints of academic contexts. Discourse analysis is a key resource in this research agenda and has made an enormous contribution to our understanding of academic communication.

What has discourse analysis told us about EAP?

Discourse analysis is a collection of methods for studying language in action, looking at texts in relation to the social contexts in which they are used. Because language is an irreducible part of social life, connected to almost everything we do, this broad definition has been interpreted in various ways across the social sciences. In **EAP** it has tended to be a methodology which gives greater emphasis to actual texts than to institutional social practices, and has largely taken the form of focusing on particular academic genres such as the research article, the conference presentation, and the student essay.

Genre analysis can be seen as a more specific form of discourse analysis, which focuses on any element of recurrent language use, including grammar and lexis that is relevant to the analyst's interests. As a result, genre analysis sees texts as representative of wider rhetorical practices and so has the potential to offer descriptions and explanations both of texts and of the communities that use them. Genres are the recurrent uses of more or less conventionalized forms through which individuals develop relationships, establish communities and get things done using language.

Genres can therefore be seen as a kind of tacit contract between writers and readers, which influence the behavior of text producers and the expectations of receivers. By focusing on mapping typicality, genre analysis thus seeks to show what is usual in collections of texts, and so it helps to reveal underlying discourses and the preferences of disciplinary communities. These approaches are influenced by Halliday's (1994) view of language as a system of choices that link texts to particular contexts through patterns of lexico-grammatical and rhetorical features (Christie and Martin, 1997) and by Swales' (1990) observation that these recurrent choices are closely related to the work of particular discourse communities, whose members share broad social purposes.

Perhaps the most **productive application of discourse analysis in EAP** has been to explore the lexico-grammatical and discursive patterns of particular genres in order to identify their recognizable structural identity. Analyzing this kind of patterning has yielded useful information about the ways in which texts are constructed and the rhetorical contexts in which such patterns are used, as well as providing valuable input for genre-based teaching.
Academic discourse analysis research has also pointed to cultural specificity in rhetorical preferences (e.g., Connor, 2002). Although 'culture' is a controversial term, one influential interpretation regards it as a historically transmitted and systematic network of meanings that allow

us to understand, develop and communicate our knowledge and beliefs about the world. Culture is seen as inextricably bound up with language (Kramsch, 1993), so that cultural factors have the potential to influence perception, language, learning and communication. Although it is far from conclusive, discourse analytic research suggests that the schemata of L2 and L1 (first language) writers differ in their preferred ways of organizing ideas that can influence academic writing (e.g., Hinkel, 2002).

An example analysis of an EAP genre

Discourse analyses of academic texts takes a variety of forms, tending towards the textual, the critical or the contextual, but there have been two main ways of studying interactions in writing. Researchers have examined the actions of individuals as they create particular texts (Bosher, 1998), or they have studied the distribution of different genre features to see how they cluster in complementary distributions (Biber, 2006).

One **example** of this is a study of self-mention, which concerns how far writers want to interrupt into their texts though use of 'I' or 'we', or avoid it by choosing impersonal forms. The use of self-mention is a rather annoyed issue in academic writing and remains a perennial problem for students, teachers and experienced writers alike; the extent to which one can reasonably assert one's personal involvement remains highly controversial. While claims have to be warranted by appropriate support and reference to existing knowledge by fitting novelty into a community consensus, success in gaining acceptance for innovation also involves demonstrating an individual contribution to that community and establishing a claim for recognition for academic priority. To some extent this is a personal preference, determined by seniority, experience, personality and so on (Hyland, 2010), but the study illustrated here shows that the presence or absence of explicit author reference is a conscious choice by writers to adopt a particular community-situated authorial identity (Hyland, 2001b).

In all disciplines, writers' principal use of the first person was to explain the work that they had carried out by way of representing their unique role in constructing a reasonable interpretation for a phenomenon. In the hard knowledge corpus and in the more quantitative papers in the soft fields, this mainly involved setting out methodological procedures so that **self-mention** helped to underline the writer's professional credentials through a familiarity with disciplinary research practices. In addition, it acts to highlight the part the writer has played in a process that is often represented as having no agents at all, reminding readers that, in other hands, things could have been done differently.

In more theoretically oriented articles writers sought less to figure as practical agents than as builders of coherent theories of reality. Explicit self-mention here establishes a more personal form of authority, one based on confidence and command of one's arguments.

It has to be said that the relationships between knowledge, the linguistic conventions of different disciplines and personal identity are ambiguous and complex. Yet it is equally true that these broad differences suggest that self-mention varies with different assumptions about the effects of authorial presence and rhetorical intrusion in different knowledge-making communities. These are issues worth addressing and exploring further with students, for only by developing a rhetorical consciousness of these kinds of features can they gain control over their writing in academic contexts.

CORPUS APPROACHES TO DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

What is corpus and design of Corpora

Before discussing corpus-based approaches to discourse analysis it is necessary to define what a corpus actually is. It is generally assumed that a corpus is a collection of spoken or written authentic texts that is representative of a particular area of language use, by virtue of its size and composition. It is not always the case, however, that the corpus is representative of language use in general, or even of a specific language variety, as the data set may be very specialized (such as material collected from the internet) and it may not always be based on samples of complete texts. The data may also be only of the spoken or written discourse of a single person, such as a single author's written work. It is important, then, to be aware of the specific nature and source of corpus data so that appropriate claims can be made from the analyses that are based on it (Kennedy 1998, Tognini-Bonelli 2004).

A corpus is usually computer-readable and able to be accessed with tools such as concordances which are able to find and sort out language patterns. The corpus has usually (although not always) been designed for the purpose of the analysis, and the texts have been selected to provide a sample of specific text-types, or genres, or a broad and balanced sample of spoken and/or written discourse (Stubbs 2004).

> ***"Corpus studies draw on collections of texts that are usually stored and analyzed electronically. They look at the occurrence and re-occurrence of particular linguistic features to see how and where they occur in the discourse. They may look at words that typically occur together (collocations) or they may look at the frequency of particular items. Corpus studies may look at language use in general, or they may look at the use of a particular linguistic feature in a particular domain, such as spoken academic discourse, or use of the item in a particular genre, such as university tutorial discussions."***

Corpora may be general or they may be specialized. A general corpus, also known as a reference corpus: "Aims to represent language in its broadest sense and to serve as a widely available resource for baseline or comparative studies of general linguistic features." (Reppen and Simpson

2004). A **general corpus**, thus, provides sample data from which we can make generalizations about spoken and written discourse as a whole, and frequencies of occurrence and co-occurrence of particular aspects of language in the discourse. It will not, however, tell us about the language and discourse of particular genres or domain of use (unless the corpus can be broken down into separate genres or areas of use in some way). For this, we need a ***specialized corpus.***

A **specialized corpus,** as Hunston (2002) explains is:
"A corpus of texts of a particular type, such as newspaper editorials, geography textbooks, academic articles in a particular subject, lectures, casual conversations, essays written by students etc. It aims to be representative of a given type of text. It is used to investigate a particular type of language." **Specialized corpora** are required when the research question relates to the use of spoken or written discourse in particular kinds of texts or in particular situations. A specialized corpus might be used, for example, to examine the use of hedges in casual conversation or the ways in which people signal a change in topic in an academic presentation. It might look at an aspect of students' academic written discourse and compare this with use of the same features in published academic writing, or it may look at discourse features of a particular academic genre such as theses and dissertations, or a discourse level aspect of dissertation defenses.

Design and Construction of Corpora

There are, thus, a number of already established corpora that can be used for doing corpus-based discourse studies. These contain data that can be used for asking very many questions about the use of spoken and written discourse both in general and in specific areas of use, such as academic writing or speaking. If, however, your interest is in what happens in a particular genre, or in a particular genre in a setting for which there is no available data, then you will have to make up your own corpus for your study.

Hyland's (2002) study of the use of personal pronouns such as *I*, *me*, *we* and *us* in Hong Kong student's academic writing is an example of a corpus that was designed to answer a question about the use of discourse in a particular genre, in a particular setting. The specific aim of his study was to examine the extent to which student writers use self-mention in their texts 'to strengthen their arguments and gain personal recognition for their claims' in their written discourse, as expert writers do (Hyland 2005). His question was related to issues of discourse and identity, and the place of this writing practice in a particular academic and social community.

Harwood (2005) also compiled his own corpus for his study of the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in journal research articles. For his study, Harwood selected research articles from electronic versions of journals as well as manually scanned articles and converted them to text format. His analysis of his data was both quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative analysis examined the frequency of writers' use of *I* and *we* in the texts and the disciplines in which this occurred. The qualitative analysis examined the use of *I* and *we* from a functional perspective; that is, what the function was of these items in the texts, as well as possible explanations for their use.

He then compared his findings with explanations of the use of *I* and *we* in published academic writing textbooks.

A further example of a researcher-compiled corpus is Ooi's (2001) study of the language of personal ads on the World Wide Web. Ooi had to make up his own corpus to see how people use language in this particular genre. A large-scale corpus of language use on the world wide web, in general, would not have told him this. 'Off the shelf' corpora and custom-made corpora, then, each have their strengths, and their limitations.

The choice of which to use is, in part, a matter of the research question, as well as the availability, or not, of a suitable corpus to help with answering the question. It is not necessarily the case, however, that a custom-made corpus needs to be especially large. It depends on what the purpose of collecting the corpus is. As Sinclair (2001) has argued, small manageable corpora can be put together relatively quickly and can be honed to very specific genres and very specific areas of discourse use. They can also be extremely useful for the teaching of particular genres and for investigating learner needs.

Issues to Consider in Constructing a Corpus

There are a number of issues that need to be considered when constructing a corpus.

- The first of these is what to include in the corpus; that is, the variety or dialect of the language, the genre(s) to be included, whether the texts should be spoken, written or both and whether the texts should be monologic, dialogic or multi-party.
- The next issue is the size of the corpus and of the individual texts, as well as the number of texts to include in each category. The issue is not, however, just corpus size, but also the way in which the data will be collected and the kinds of questions that will be examined using the data (McCarthy and Carter 2001). Even a small corpus can be useful for investigating certain discourse features.
- The sources and subject matter of the texts may also be an issue that needs to be considered.
- Other issues include sociolinguistic and demographic considerations such as the nationality, gender, age, occupation, education level, native language or dialect and the relationship between participants in the texts.

Authenticity, representativeness and validity of the corpus

Authenticity, representativeness and validity are also issues in corpus construction, as well as whether the corpus should present a static or a dynamic picture of the discourse under examination; that is, whether it should be a sample of discourse use at one particular point in time (a static, or sample corpus) or whether it should give more of a 'moving picture' view of the discourse that shows change in language use over a period of time (a dynamic, or monitor corpus) (Kennedy 1998 ; Reppen and Simpson 2002).

Kinds of texts to include in the corpus

A key issue is what kind of texts the corpus should contain. This decision may be based on what the corpus is designed for, but it may also be constrained by what texts are available. Another issue is the permanence of the corpus; that is, whether it will be regularly updated so that it does not become unrepresentative, or whether it will remain as an example of the use of discourse at a particular point in time (Hunston 2002).

Size of the texts in the corpus

The size of texts in the corpus is also a consideration. Some corpora aim for an even sample size of individual texts. If, for example, the corpus aims to represent a particular genre, and instances of the genre are typically long, or short, this needs to be reflected in the collection of texts that make up the corpus.

The **representativeness of the corpus** further depends on the extent to which it includes the range of linguistic distribution in the population. That is, different linguistic features are differently distributed (within texts, across texts, across text types), and a representative corpus must enable analysis of these various distributions.

A corpus, then, needs to aim for both representativeness and balance, both of which, as Kennedy (1998) points out, are in the end matters of judgment and approximation. All of this cannot be done at the outset, however. The compilation of the corpus needs to take place in a cyclical fashion with the original design being based on theoretical and pilot study analyses, followed by the collection of the texts, investigation of the discourse features under investigation, then, in turn, revision of the design (Biber 1994). As Reppen and Simpson (2002) explain 'no corpus can be everything to everyone'. Any corpus in the end 'is a compromise between the desirable and the feasible' (Stubbs 2004).

POLITICS AS USUAL: INVESTIGATING POLITICAL DISCOURSE IN ACTION

Politics on 'backstage'

It is much more difficult to explore the 'backstage', the everyday life of politicians, than the staging of 'grand politics. Once we enter the backstage, for example in the European Parliament (see below), we encounter the routines of political organizations that are at first sight nontransparent and seem as chaotic as in any organization. Hence, ethnographic research is needed, such as participant observation in organizations, in-depth and narrative interviews, shadowing of insiders, and so forth to be able to grasp the processes of political strategizing and decision-making. Focusing only on typical front-stage activities (such as political speeches, for example) does not suffice to understand and explain the complexity of 'politics. This is why the organizational contexts (structures, rules, regulations, and constraints) have to be accounted for in detail.

Issues of power, hegemony and ideology have been reconceived as central to social and linguistic practices in all organizations, since all organizational forms can be translated into language and communication and because, as Deetz (1982: 135) concluded, talk and writing 'connect each perception to a larger orientation and system of meaning'. The distinction between structure and agency is useful, since it moves us away from a preoccupation with individual motivations and behaviors to the discursive practices through which organizational activity is performed in ritualized in ever new ways. Four prominent linguistic–discursive approaches have proven particularly influential in organizational research to date: ethno-methodology; conversation analysis (CA); sociolinguistic analysis; and (critical) discourse analysis (CDA).

Ethnomethodology, whilst technically rooted in sociology, emphasizes the conditions that have to be satisfied for certain actions to be perceived as signifying a recognized sanction (Garfinkel et al., 1981). Conversation analysis (CA) identifies the very detailed aspects of members' turntaking strategies that are critical to performance and membership (Schegloff, 1987; Drew and Heritage, 1992) and deals with relatively short stretches of interaction as being revealing and representative of, the organizations' interactional principles. Sociolinguistic analysis has a basis in the tradition of correlating sociological parameters (e.g., age, class and gender) with variations in organizational discourse (Bernstein, 1987). Interactional sociolinguistics has its origins in symbolic interactionism (Goffman, 1959) and is further developed in the broad domain of discourse studies, and responds to the criticism that the first approach underplays the effect of context on organizational discourse.

Studies in this domain are not only labor-intensive due to the required ethnography, but they are usually organized as case studies that are not easy to generalize from. Nevertheless, Holzscheiter's investigation into decision-making procedures about legal requirements of child protection on the UN level allows important insight into the debates of NGOs and their impact on government officials (2005). Duranti's participant observation of a US senator's election campaign trail raised awareness about the many discursive practices and persuasive devices required to keep on track such a huge campaign and related persons (2006). Decision-making processes involving both written materials (such as minutes, statements and programs) and debates in committees lie at the core of qualitative political science research into Israeli community centers (Yanow, 1996) and of text-linguistic and discourse analytic investigations into EU committees such as the Competitiveness Advisory Group (Wodak, 2000a, b; Wodak et al. 2011).

The interdependence of front-stage and backstage becomes truly apparent in these studies; moreover, it becomes obvious how much is decided on backstage and how negotiations and compromises are staged and enacted thereafter on front-stage.

Pragmatic–linguistic expertise becomes salient in the discourse analysis of daily (political) interactions: much knowledge is regularly presupposed in every interaction (Goffman, 1981; Wodak, 2009a: 45ff.). Misunderstandings occur when presuppositions or other indirect pragmatic devices either are not available or differ significantly. Sharing presupposed and inferred meanings and hence including or excluding others in strategic ways is, I believe, constitutive of political power play and of achieving one's aims in the political arena (Jäger and Maier 2009).

The discourse-historical approach

DHA provides a vehicle for looking at latent power dynamics and the range of potential in agents, because it integrates and triangulates knowledge about historical, inter-textual sources and the background of the social and political fields within which discursive events are embedded. Moreover, the DHA distinguishes between three dimensions that constitute textual meanings and structures: the topics that are spoken/ written about; the discursive strategies employed; and the linguistic means that are drawn upon to realize both topics and strategies (e.g. argumentative strategies, topoi, presuppositions – see below for an extensive discussion).

Systematic qualitative analysis in the DHA takes four layers of context into account: the intertextual and inter-discursive relationships between utterances, texts, genres and discourses; the extra-linguistic social/sociological variables; the history and archaeology of texts and organizations; and institutional frames of the specific context of a situation (the specific episodes under investigation). In this way we are able to explore how discourses, genres and texts change due to socio-political contexts, and with what effects (see Wodak, 2001).

Furthermore, two concepts are salient for analyzing the backstage of politics: inter-textuality refers to the linkage of all texts to other texts, both in the past and in the present. Such links can be established in different ways: through continued reference to a topic or to its main actors; through reference to the same events as the other texts; or through the reappearance of a text's main arguments in another text. The second important process is labeled contextualization. By taking an argument, a topic, a genre or a discursive practice out of context and restating/realizing it in a new context, we first observe the process of de-contextualization, and then, when the respective element is implemented in a new context, of contextualization. The element then acquires a new meaning, because, as Wittgenstein (1967) demonstrated, meanings are formed in use.

Politics as usual: perspectives and limitations

Common sense supposes that politicians are very well organized, in spite of the many urgent and important events they must deal with, which have an impact on all our lives. We all have cognitive models (event models, experience models, context models: van Dijk, 2008), which quickly and automatically update, distinguish, comprehend and store such events. From this we might assume that politicians also regularly access their own set of cognitive models for 'doing politics' in order to respond rapidly, in a rational and quite predictable way, to the various events they encounter.

However, this is in fact not the case as the everyday life of politicians is as much filled with accident, coincidence and unpredictability as it is filled with well-planned, strategic and rational action. Chaotic situations are a necessary feature of 'politics as usual'; experienced politicians simply know how to cope with them better thus there is 'order in the disorder' (Wodak, 1996, 2009), established inter alia through routines, norms and rituals. Politicians have acquired strategies and tactics to pursue their agenda more or less successfully. The 'successes depend on their position in the field, on their power relations and, most importantly, on what I label knowledge management: much of what we perceive as disorder depends on inclusion in shared knowledge or exclusion from shared knowledge.

Hans provides some important answers to the questions posed above which, again, could be generalized to other political realms. Hans employs both strategic and tactical knowledge when trying to convince various audiences of his political agenda. These discursive strategies and tactics also structure his day, which might otherwise seem totally chaotic from the outside, or much ritualized and bureaucratic oriented, for **example**, solely towards the drafting and redrafting of documents. Hans knows the ‘rules of the game’, he hesitates between a range of communities of practice in very well planned and strategic ways, he employs a wide range of genres suited to the immediate context in order to push his agenda, and thus possesses a whole repertoire of genres and modes which he applies in functionally adequate ways for the range of multimodal modes employed in bureaucracies and political institutions.

In sum: I argue, is how politics works; that is, how politicians work. Hans, as a small-scale policy entrepreneur, does political work; however, as citizens are excluded from the backstage and the many communities of practice where Hans implements his strategies and pushes his agenda these activities and practices remain invisible. Of course, this is not only the case for one MEP; this is generally true for the field of politics as a whole. To challenge the democratic deficit, at the very least, information about daily political work would need to be made more publicly accessible to a certain degree.

Lecture-11 Discourse and Phonology

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND PHONOLOGY

Pronunciation and rhythm

Under the heading of phonology in this chapter we shall take a brief look at what has traditionally been thought of as 'pronunciation', but devote most of our attention to intonation. This is partly because the most exciting developments in the analysis of discourse have been in intonation studies rather than at the segmental level (the study of phonemes and their articulation) and partly because intonation teaching, where it has taken place, has proceeded on the basis of assumptions that are open to challenge from a discourse analyst's viewpoint.

Traditional pronunciation teaching has found its strength in the ability of linguists to segment the sounds of language into isolated items called phonemes which, when used in the construction of words, produce meaningful contrasts with other words (e.g. the phonemes **/p/** and **/b/** in English give us contrasts such as pump and bump, pat and bat, .etc.), The position and manner of articulation of phonemes in a language like English are well described and can be presented and practiced in language classes either as isolated sounds, in words, in contrasting pairs of words or in minimal contexts.

Such features will probably long remain the stock-in-trade of pronunciation teaching and, if well done, can undoubtedly help leaners with difficulties. When words follow one another in speech, phonemes may undergo considerable changes. Good advanced learners of English use assimilations and elisions naturally, but a surprising number of quite advanced learners continue to articulate the citation-form phonemes of English words in casual, connected speech.

This will not usually cause problems of communication but is undoubtedly a contributing factor in 'foreign accent', and there may be a case for explicit intervention by the teacher to train students in the use of the most commonly occurring assimilations and elisions by practicing pronunciation in (at least minimal) contexts. Alternatively, the answer may be to tackle the problem simultaneously from a 'top-down' and 'bottom up' approach, on the premise that articulation, rhythmically (see below) and intonation are inextricably linked, and that good intonation will have a wash-back effect on articulation in terms of reduced and altered articulations of individual phonemes, alongside the specific teaching of phonemes and the most common altered and reduced forms.

When we listen to a stretch of spoken English discourse, we often feel that there is a **rhythm** or regularity to it, which gives it a characteristic sound, different from other languages and not always well-imitated by foreign learners. The impression of rhythm may arise out of a feeling of alternation between strong and weak 'beats'. **Traditionally, rhythm** has been considered an important element in the teaching of spoken English. This is probably due to two main factors. **Firstly**, there does seem to be rhythmically in varying degrees in long stretches of speech, especially carefully considered deliveries such as broadcast talks, fluent reading aloud, speeches and monologues, as well as some ordinary conversation. Secondly, the concept of English as a stress-timed language, deeply rooted in theoretical and applied linguistics, has dominated approaches to the teaching of rhythm.

Word stress and prominence

At this point, it is useful to change our terminology slightly and introduce the term prominence. Syllables which stand out in the flow of talk will be referred to as prominent syllables. It is because the speaker has uttered them with relatively greater intensity, or duration, or pitch variation compared with surrounding syllables (and our perception of this phenomenon will usually be due to a variety of such features). It is helpful to have this special term, prominence, so as not to confuse word stress, which words bear in their citation forms (sometimes called their isolate pronunciations), with what concerns us most here: the choice of the speaker to make certain words salient by giving prominence to syllables. This is therefore a more precise use of the term prominence than is found in some sources (e.g. Cruttenden 1986).

Word stress, as it is traditionally understood, and **prominence**, as we shall use it here, are two distinct levels. Where they overlap, of course, is in the fact that prominences may not be distributed just anywhere in the word, but may only fall on certain syllables. Where two prominences can occur in the same word, as is often the case with a whole class of words such as IApanESE, UNiVERsal, conGRAtuLAtions, etc., the second will always be the stronger.

Stress is a large topic and despite the fact that it has been extensively studied for a very long time, there remain many areas of disagreement or lack of understanding. So, it is important to consider what factors make a syllable count as stressed. Stress is basically a prominence of syllable in terms of loudness, length, pitch and quality and all of them work together in order to make a syllable stressed. As discussed above, two types of stress are important. Firstly, stress on a syllable within a word (the lexical stress) which changes the grammatical category of a word (compare **in**sult with in**sult**) and also change meaning among other things. On the other hand, stress on a word or certain words in a phrase or sentence. This type of stress (on word(s) within sentences) is called sentence level or prosodic stress. This is, in fact, a change or modification to word level stress in a sentence which is basically a change of 'beat' on certain words in a sentence. Remember that, we create 'rhythm' in spoken language on the basis of stress. Analyze the following examples (stressed words are shown in bold):

Mary's *younger* ***brother*** *wanted* ***fifty*** *chocolate* ***peanuts.***

So, what is happening here in this sentence is about the distinguishing degree of emphasis which is used for creating contrast in sentences or lines of verse. The question is: why do we create this difference? This takes place in order to differentiate in environment – superimposition of intonation (degree of prominence) and it is also the part of the formality of a language.

For the learner of English, information about which syllables may be prominent is useful; it is a natural part of the lexical competence of native speakers. In this regard, the traditional distinction between primary stress and secondary stress (see above) may be misleading, and it may .be more helpful simply to indicate to the learner which syllables are prominent. Otherwise, the learner may be misled into thinking that primary and secondary stress must be maintained at all costs.

Intonational units

Intonation units are an important component of American English pronunciation and speech. An **intonation unit** is a segment of speech. It can be as small as a single word, or as long as a sentence. Two sentences with identical grammatical structure may be comprised of differing numbers of intonation units when spoken, based on the intent or emotional state of the speaker. It's important to learn to distinguish these units because they give subtle meanings and help organize a conversation. There is no single determiner as to where intonation units begin and end or how many a single sentence contains, but there are clues. Generally, intonation units:

- begin with faster speech, and end with slower speech
- include a single pitch word
- end with a pitch boundary

Intonation units and emotion

Individual speakers alter the number of intonation units they use. Some of this is based on individual patterns and habits, but speakers also alter intonation units based on emotion. A faster speaker will generally use fewer intonation units and may be seen as being more urgent, frantic, excited, and anxious. A slower speaker may have more intonation units and may be perceived as being more emphatic, determined, and insistent. Of course, these are the extremes, and most people normally speak somewhere in the middle range.

Elements of intonation units

Sentences can often be broken up into multiple intonation units. Each intonation unit usually has a single pitch word and ends in a pitch boundary. Each pitch word conveys information to the listener, and each pitch boundary helps organize how speakers take turns speaking.

Similar sentences can have a different number of intonation units. The end of each intonation unit is marked with a hash (/) and the pitch words are bolded. Notice that the speaker with fewer intonation units spoke faster, with fewer pauses, and with fewer changes in pitch during the statement. The sentence with more intonation units sounds more emphatic and deliberate about what is being said. More intonation units can cause the entire conversation to occur more slowly. Speakers tend to match each other's English rhythm, so if one speaker has a more emphatic rhythm, it is likely that other speakers will mirror it.

Brown and her associates are concerned with how speakers manage large stretches of interaction, in terms of turn-taking and topic-signaling and how speakers use pitch level to interact. For instance, there seems to be a direct correlation in English between the beginning of a new topic in speech and a shift to a higher pitch.

Turn-taking is another important aspect of pitch level in this view of intonation. The speaker can signal a desire to continue a speaking turn by using non-low pitch, even at a point where there is a pause, or at the end of a syntactic unit, such as a clause. Equally, a down-step in pitch is often a good turn-yielding cue. The intonational cues interact with other factors such as syntax, lexis, non-verbal communication and the context itself, and are typical of how the different levels of encoding have to be seen as operating in harmony in a discourse-oriented view of language (Schaffer 1983).

HALLIDAY'S SIX IDEATIONAL METAFUNCTION

Michael Halliday, the founder of systemic functional linguistics, calls these three functions the **ideational**, **interpersonal**, and **textual**. The **ideational** function is further divided into the experiential and logical. For this reason, systemic linguists analyze a clause from three perspectives. In Halliday's SFL, language as a social phenomenon is functional .i.e. it is concerned with the mechanism of text structure, function and meaning of language. It begins an analysis of language in social context where a particular lexico-grammatical choice is constructed under the influence of the social and cultural context.

Ideational and Experiential Function

Ideational Meta-function: Ideational meta-function provides grammatical resources at clause rank to construe the inner and outer experience or 'goings-on' of the word, as the domain of functions and meanings of the world through the systems of transitivity. It has two components of logical and experiential functions.

- **The concept of Transitivity:**

In traditional grammar, transitivity was developed as the concept of transitive or intransitive verb (Halliday, 1976) whether the verb takes an object or not, but in SFL it functions to link grammar to the meta functions; however, in Halliday's terms, transitivity as a major component in experiential function of the clause deals with the "transmission of ideas "representing 'processes' or 'experiences': actions, events, processes of consciousness and relations" (1985). It is a semantic system to analyze representations of reality in a linguistic text and create the same experience through various lexico-grammatical options influenced by different mind styles or authorial ideology. (Fowler, 1986).

It manifests how certain choices encode the author's certain ideological stance affected by social and cultural institution because according to Fowler these linguistic codes cannot reflect reality neutrally and definitely embody ideologies. (1986) It also functions as a rich analytic tool utilized in critical discourse analysis, dealing with “who or what does what to whom or what?” where actor, action and goal as affected are highlighted. Transitivity with inter-related options to represent different types of process or experience investigated from above, below, and around consists of process, participant with different labels such as Actor, Goal; Sensor, Phenomenon; Carrier, Attribute; and circumstance including Cause, Location, Manner, Means and Instrument. Process refers to a semantic verb (doing, happening, feeling, sensing, saying, behaving, and existing) and anything that it expresses like event, relation, physical, mental or emotional state when sorted in the semantic system of the clause is classified into material, relational, mental, verbal, behavioral, and existential processes. (Halliday, 1976)

- **Material Process**

Classified into intentional or spontaneous performance of an animate or inanimate, material processes, externalized and concrete embody an action verb of doing or happening, a doer is labeled as Actor and optional Goal, affected by the process and circumstance that provides details of the verb in terms of place, time, manner, condition, etc.

- **Mental Process**

Classified into three categories of cognition, perception and affection, mental processes, internalized and consciousness type, are concerned with participants labeled as Sensor and Phenomenon. Mental processes can be viewed from:
'From above', it construes perception, cognition and affection
'From below', it includes Process + Sensor + Phenomenon
'From around', it manifests the content of consciousness such as a thought

- **Relational Process**

Classified into intensive, attributive, identifying, circumstantial, and possessive, Relational processes are concerned with the processes of description regarding the abstract relations. Irreversible attributive process assigns a quality, or adjective to a participant titled as Carrier realized by a noun or a nominal phrase. Reversible Identifying process consists of two nominal phrases as participants, a Token holder and a Value meaning, referent, and status (Halliday,1985) that can be turned into passive voice.

- **Verbal Process**

5th Slide: A verbal process of direct or indirect report, standing on the border of mental and relational processes, relates “any kind of symbolic exchange of meaning’ (Halliday, 1985:129) or the ideas in human consciousness with their linguistic representation of Sayer, the addressee labeled as Target, and Verbiage.

- **Behavioral Process**

The behavioral Process standing between material and mental processes relate the physiological and psychological behaviors such as ‘breathing; coughing; smiling; dreaming; and staring.’ (1985)

- **Existential process**

These processes are processes of existing with a there and to be with no representational function. An Existent can be an entity, event or action.

Impersonal and Logical Function

Grammatically, **interpersonal meta-function** at the clausal level enjoys Mood. Mood is concerned with the topic of information or service and whether it is giving or demanding and the tenor of the relationship between interact ants. Tenor deals with gender or status-based power. Muir (1972:92) and Halliday (1981:30) define Mood parallel to interpersonal communication which embraces three grammatical categories of speech function, modality and tone. The interpersonal meta-function concentrates on social roles and relations through formality degree, pronouns, clausal mood (whether declarative, imperative or interrogative), etc.

In interpersonal meta-function, the degree of intimacy or distance and the type of the relationship between the writer and reader or participants in a text through the type of modality can be explored; besides, the system of pronominal determination describes how a referent can be recognized through the stances of the referent regarding the speaker and listener.

The Mood element constituted by the Subject and the Finite (auxiliary or lexical verb) and the remainder of the clause as the Residue, determine the mood of a clause as verbal group. Hence, the order Subject+Finite establishes the mood as declarative, while the order Finite+ Subject establishes the mood as interrogative. In a system network, a clause can be declarative or interrogative with Wh or yes-no format including material, mental, verbal, relational, or existential processes.

In terms of finite verb, subject and tense choice, SFL helps us express the speech functions such as persuading, enticing, motivating, demanding, inviting, ordering, proposing, recommending, confirming, persisting, and denying through a set of Mood clause systems. Through the scale of delicacy (level of detail and particularity) in the mood system, a clause can be indicative or imperative.
Indicative clauses are classified into interrogative and declarative; besides the element of tagging can be explored here.
(Sethe was sick) (Who is she? Is she a ghost in a body?) (He comes back, doesn't he?) (Listen to me, will you?) (Let's move out of this place, shall we?)

Speech-functional roles help meaning to be achieved through Mood such as statement or question requesting, commanding and offering. Semantic dimensions of functions such as declaration dealing with information exchange (statement), asking information (question), and demanding service (commands) are omnipresent in every language while the structure, organization, degree and realizations of delicate choices differ from one language to another. For every grammatical category, there are different realizations. Interact ants are involved in a conversation with indicating, demanding, and evaluating responses and information through the degree of probability. Metaphorically, a command can be regarded as a statement or a question. Sethe should/ must /will give her daughter freedom. Would she ask him to stay?

Textual function and References

Grammatically, textual meta-function at the clausal level enjoys Theme. Thematic structure is concerned with Theme, and Rhyme, or the old and new information structure or topic and comment where any component in a clause like Subject, Predicator, Complement or circumstantial Adjunct can be tropicalized and be placed in thematic position or the beginning of the clause which is more significant than other locations in a sentence. Muir (1972) proposes "the thematic element in a clause is the first element which results from choice. "According to Halliday (1981:330) theme includes the message in a text, indicating the identity of text relations. Topic comes first and after that Comment appears to expand, justify and provide additional information to preceding information.

The clause acts as a message in the thematic statuses of Theme and Rhyme in terms of the local and spatial position in a sequence where Theme takes the initial position whether marked or unmarked and rhyme the non-initial position. The information flows like a wave in a sentence from thematic top to thematic bottom which can be accompanied by rising or falling intonation. Theme slides toward Rhyme and given information toward New to reveal the location of information prominence. **Cohesion:**

Cohesion, the "non-structural text-forming relations" (Halliday and Hasan 1976) relates to the "semantic ties" or relations of meaning within text. The cohesive devices of referencing, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion were presented by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Bloor and Bloor (1995)

 Referencing

Classified into homophoric, exophoric and endophoric categories respectively referring to cultural shared information, immediate situation context, and textual information, referencing identifies presupposed information throughout the text. (Eggins 1994) Endophoric referencing divided into anaphoric, cataphoric, and esphoric respectively refers to the previously mentioned (preceding) information in text, information presented later in the text, the same nominal group or phrase following the presupposed item. (Halliday and Hasan 1976). There are also personal, demonstrative, and comparative references referring to speech situation noun pronouns like he, him or possessive determiners like mine and yours, this, here, there, then, same, equal, so, similarly, and otherwise.

 Substitution and Ellipsis

In Bloor and Bloor (1995: 96), substitution and ellipsis are used to avoid the repetition of a lexical item through grammatical resources of the language. The substitution and ellipsis can be nominal, verbal and clausal. Substitution words have the same function such as "one and ones" for nouns and "do" or "so" as in "do so" or "that and "it" for verbal, nominal, and clausal substitutions. Functioning at the level of deictic, enumerative, epithet, classifier, and qualifier, ellipsis as "substitution by zero" refers to a presupposed anaphoric item through structural link. **Lexical Cohesion**

Lexical cohesion is non-grammatical and refer to the "cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary" like reiteration where a lexical item directly or indirectly occurs through application of synonym, antonym, metonym, or hyponym or a super-ordinate and collocation where pair of same event or environment lexical items co-occur or found together within the text. When these lexical items are closer, the text enjoys higher degree of cohesion.

Lecture-12 Discourse, Vocabulary and Grammar

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND VOCABULARY-I

Lexical cohesion

In text, lexical cohesion is the result of chains of related words that contribute to the continuity of lexical meaning. These lexical chains are a direct result of units of text being "about the same thing," and finding text structure involves finding units of text that are about the same thing.

Bringing a discourse dimension into language teaching does not by any means imply an abandonment of teaching vocabulary. Vocabulary will still be the largest single element in tackling a new language for the learner and it would be irresponsible to suggest that it will take care-of itself in some ideal world where language teaching and' learning are discourse-driven. Therefore, in this chapter we shall look at research into vocabulary in extended texts in speech and writing and consider if anything can be usefully exploited to give a discourse dimension to vocabulary teaching and vocabulary activities in the classroom. Most are already in agreement that vocabulary should, wherever possible, be taught in context, but context is a rather catch-all term and what we need to do at this point is to look at some of the specific relationships between vocabulary choice, context (in the sense of the situation in which the discourse is produced) and co-text (the actual text surrounding any given lexical item). The suggestions we shall make will be offered as a supplement to conventional vocabulary teaching rather than as a replacement for it.

It is debatable whether collocation properly belongs to the notion of **lexical cohesion**, since collocation only refers to the probability that lexical items will co-occur, and is not a semantic relation between words. Here, therefore, we shall consider the term 'lexical cohesion' to mean only exact repetition of words and the role played by certain basic semantic relations between words in creating textuality, that property of text which distinguishes it from a random sequence of unconnected sentences. We shall consequently ignore collocation associations across sentence boundaries as lying outside of these semantic relations.

Lexical reiteration can be shown to be a significant feature of textuality, and then there may be something for the language teacher to exploit. We shall not suggest that it be exploited simply because it is there, but only if, by doing so, we can give learners meaningful, controlled practice and the hope of improving their text-creating and decoding abilities, and providing them with more varied contexts for using and practicing vocabulary.

Reiteration means either restating an item in a later part of the discourse by direct repetition or else reasserting its meaning by exploiting lexical relations. Lexical relations are the stable semantic relationships that exist between words and which are the basis of descriptions given in dictionaries and thesauri: for example, rose and flower are related by hyponymy; rose is a hyponym of flower.

1) Repetition

The most direct form of lexical cohesion is repetition of a lexical item; e.g., bear in sentence Algy met a bear. The bear was bulgy (Halliday, 1985). Here the second occurrence of bear harks back to the first.

2) Synonym or near – synonym

Synonym is used to mean ‘sameness of meaning’ (Palmer, 1981). Lexical cohesion results from the choice of a lexical item that is in some sense synonymous with a preceding one; for example, sound with noise.

3) Superordinate

Superordinate is term for words that refer to the upper class itself (Palmer, 1981). In contrary, term for words that refer to the lower class itself is hyponym. **For example:** Henry’s bought himself a new Jaguar. He practically lives in the car (Halliday and Hasan, 1976)
Here, car refers back to Jaguar; and the car is a superordinate of Jaguar. **4) General Word**

The general words, which correspond to major classes of lexical items, are very commonly used with cohesive force. They are on the borderline between lexical items and substitutes. Not all general words are used cohesively; in fact, only the nouns are when it has the same referent as whatever it is presupposing, and when it is accompanied by a reference item (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 280-1). **For example:** There’s a boy climbing the old elm. That old thing isn’t very safe (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 280). Here, the reiteration takes the form of a general word thing.

Textual aspects of lexical competence

Prior to undertaking the concept of lexical competence, it is worth defining what competence is and how it has been viewed so far. The term competence has generated substantial controversy in the field of general and applied linguistics (Chomsky, 1965; Hymes, 1972). The former regarded it as a pure grammatical competence, that is, “the speaker hearer’s knowledge of his language” and the latter observed that this competence was more related to communication: a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences not only as grammatical, but also as appropriate. He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner. In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishment by others (Hymes, 1972).

A somewhat different type of lexical relation in discourse is when a writer or speaker rearranges the conventional and well-established lexical relations and asks us, as it were, to adjust our usual conceptualizations of how words relate to one another for the particular purposes of the text in question. In one way or another, our expectations as to how words are conventionally used are disturbed. A simple example is the following extract from a review of a book on American military planning. Sometimes our expectations as to how words are conventionally used are disturbed when the writers arrange usual lexical relations for particular purposes of the text. Example the depressing feature of Allen’s documents is the picture which emerges of smart but stupid military

planners, the equivalent of America's madder fundamentalists, happily playing the fool with the future of the planet. (The Guardian, 13 November 1987) *The depressing feature of Allen's documents is the picture which emerges of smart but stupid military planners, the equivalent of America's madder fundamentalists, happily playing the fool with the future of the planet. (The Gwrdian, 13 November 1987)*
Here, two words, smart and stupid, frequently occurring in the language as antonyms, and therefore incompatible, are to be interpreted as compatible descriptions of the military experts. To do this we have to adjust our typical expectations of how the two words operate as a related pair. One reasonable interpretation would be that the -experts are clever ('smart') but morally reckless (stupid'); to interpret them as meaning 'intelligent but unintelligent' would clearly be a nonsense.

Vocabulary and the organizing text

A distinction is often made between grammar words and lexical words in language. This distinction also appears sometimes as **function words** versus **content words**, or **empty words** versus **full words**. The distinction is a useful one: it enables us to separate off those words which belong to closed systems in the language and which carry grammatical meaning, from those that belong to open systems and which belong to the major word classes of noun, verb, adjective and adverb. This, that, these and those in English belong to a closed system (as do the pronouns and prepositions) and carry the grammatical meaning of 'demonstratives'. Monkey, sculpture, noise and toenail belong to open-ended sets, which are often thought of as the 'creative' end of language. In between these two extremes is another type of vocabulary that has recently been studied by discourse analysts, a type that seems to share qualities of both the open and the closed-set words.

McCarthy and McCarthy and Carter introduce the concept of discourse-organizing words whose job in the text is to organize and structure the arguments, rather than answer for its content or field. Some of this discourse-organizing vocabulary consists of words that act as pronouns in the way that they refer in the text to some other part of the text. They include such words, as issue, problem, assessment, question, position, case, situation, etc.

Psychological correlate of a natural language is the notion of communicative competence as introduced by Hymes (1972). He explicitly states that communicative competence comprises "not only the ability to understand and interpret linguistic expressions, but also the ability to use these expressions in appropriate and effective ways according to the conventions of verbal interaction prevailing in a linguistic community". It seems natural to suppose that lexical competence, which could accordingly be defined as the ability to use words in appropriate and effective ways in verbal interaction, is part of communicative competence as defined above.
However, in current linguistic theory there has been an unfortunate tendency to concentrate on the particular analysis of lexical meaning in order to account for the structural properties of lexical items, while ignoring significant aspects of the use and behavior of lexemes in linguistic utterances.

The reasons behind this strategy may be the following:

From a purely grammar-designing perspective, all a linguistic model demands from the lexicon is the basic semantic and syntactic properties of lexical items which are necessary to use them in linguistic expressions. This has been captured in formal theories in standard lexical entries through thematic relations and predicate-argument structures, and, in FG, through classical predicate frames. Thus, from the point of view of the grammar system, many aspects of the meaning of a lexical item are simply irrelevant in the generation of a linguistic expression.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND VOCABULARY-II

Signaling larger textual patterns

Winter (1977) shows that the relationship between clauses can be signaled by three types of vocabulary: Vocabulary 1 such as subordination; Vocabulary 2 such as sentence connectors; and Vocabulary 3 such as lexical items. The last one, Vocabulary 3 is crucial to understanding text organization, although his main concern is the operation of lexical signaling at the level of the paragraph.

He expresses as follows;

> I have included the following five items which represent a larger clause relation in English. My reason for doing so is that these relations may sometimes exist as clause relations within the unit of the paragraph. The items are situation, problem, solution, observation, and evaluation. (Winter 1977)

Although he focuses on the function of vocabulary, this can also explain the structure of the text.

For instance, 'crisis' implies that a sentence including it suggests a 'problem,' which will be discussed in the text, and the word 'decision' implies a 'solution' to it. In this way, particular words in a text can act as a signal to identify textual patterns. In other words, L2 learners can reach text organization through an understanding of how vocabulary functions.

It is, however, necessary to understand that identifying textual patterns should be influenced by the vocabulary size of each L2 learner. A poor command of vocabulary cannot make it possible for L2 learners to recognize that a certain word can be a signal to a textual property. Moreover, not only learning the meanings of each word, but also learning the cohesive relations of words is important in raising learners' consciousness to identify textual patterns. It is this cohesive relationship between 'crisis' and 'problem' which makes it possible to recognize that a sentence, containing the word 'crisis,' should suggest a problem. As a result, lexical knowledge can be considered to be an essential element in identifying textual patterns.

Textual patterns

There are mainly three patterns of text organization (McCarthy 1991; Holland and Johnson 2000):

- Problem-Solution
- General-Specific
- Claim Counter-claim (or Hypothetical-Real)

Here, each pattern of text organization shall be discussed, although Problem-Solution and General-Specific c will be mainly used in the analysis. **Problem-Solution Pattern**

Hoey (1994) introduces the main stream of discourse analysis structure. According to him, any genre of text, such as the plots of fairytales, or the writing of scientists, includes 'the problemsolution structure' (Hoey 1994: 27). He explains this by breaking a short passage consisting of four sentences, and rearranging the sentences in proper order without any signaling expressing a time sequence.

General-Specific Pattern

The basic structure of this pattern is that text includes "an initial general statement, followed by a series of (progressively) more specific statements, culminating in a further generalization" (Holland and Johnson 2000: 21). In a typical case, a passage including a general statement is followed by another passage, which expands the generalization, such as exemplifying, explaining, and/or justifying. McCarthy offers diagrammatic representations:

General statement	General statement
↓	↓
Specific statement	Specific statement 1
↓	↓
Specific statement	Even more specific
↓	↓
Specific statement	Even more specific
↓	↓
etc	etc
↓	↓
General statement	General statement

(McCarthy1991)

Claim-Counter-claim Pattern

The third textual pattern consists of a series of claims and contrasting counterclaims, which is presented on a given topic: Claim 1 → Counter-claim 1 → Claim 2 Counter-claim 2 → This pattern can be found more frequently "in political journalism, as well as in the letters-to-the editor pages of newspapers and magazines" (McCarthy 1991), and also "the stock-in-trade of many a 'Compare and Contrast …' academic essay" (Holland and Johnson 2000: 23). For the purpose of identifying the textual pattern, lexical signals are very useful. For instance, through lexical items, such as claim, assert, truth, false, in fact, 'segments' containing them, can be identified as elements of the 'Claim-Counter-claim' structure.

Register and signaling vocabulary

In claiming that particular vocabulary items tend to cluster round certain elements of text patterns we are ignoring the important fact that register is closely tied to lexical selection. Among the signals of the problem element, we proposed problem, drawback and obstacle.

Clearly, we might not expect to find problem occurring in this way in a formal scientific report, nor perhaps come up with as a marker for response (develop would be a more predictable choice). Therefore, as in all matters, the relationship between vocabulary and register needs to be brought out when studying textual signaling.

Lexical choice within the identified clusters will depend on the context (textbook, magazine, news report, etc.), the author's assumptions about the audience (cultured/educated readers of the popular sensationalist press, etc.) whether the style is to be read as 'written' or 'spoken', and so on. Most of the texts we have looked at so far have been toward the 'written/formal/cultured' end of the spectrum. Mere are two more, this time with a more informal, colloquial tone. They are presented to illustrate the fact that discourse-signaling words need not necessarily be only rather ‘dry’ academic words taken from the Graeco-Latin vocabulary of English.

Idiomatic phrases are used as signals of the response and its occurrence after a previous negatively evaluated response (conventional treatments). Idioms are often a problem for the teacher insomuch as it is not always easy to find natural contexts in which to present them. Research by Moon (1987) suggests that writers and speakers use idiomatic phrases to organize their discourse and to signal evaluation, far more frequently than previous linguistic studies of idiomaticity have suggested. Idioms are good metaphors for the kinds of textual segments we have been looking at (problem/response, etc.).

Modality

The term modality‟ subsumes a range of concepts within the fields of philosophy, morphology, syntax, semantics, and discourse analysis. Philosophy deals with modality primarily as it applies to categories of logic and to logical reasoning, and while some of the terminology used in philosophical studies of modality is borrowed into other disciplines, these terms are not always used in the same ways or for the same purposes in other disciplines. As Sulkunen and Törrönen explain, for linguists, the logical treatment of modalities is too narrow, because it is centered on truth values of propositions. Linguistic analysis of modalities presents much more diversity in its problematic and approaches‟ (1997). For their part, linguistic studies of modality can be located in a variety of linguistic sub-disciplines.

Specifically, morphology describes the lexical forms in which modality is manifested in different languages, syntax describes the complex syntactic configurations in which modality may be manifested, and semantics identifies modal meanings and explores the variety of ways these meanings may be expressed morphologically, syntactically, phonologically, and pragmatically. This paper, however, takes a discourse analytic approach, specifically a critical discourse analytic approach, employing the concept of modality to characterize the political orientation of two sample texts.

Within critical discourse analysis, modality is understood as encompassing much more than simply the occurrence of overt modal auxiliaries such as ***may, might, can, could, will, would, shall, should, must, and ought.*** Rather, modality concerns the writer’s (or speaker‟s) attitude toward and/or confidence in the proposition being presented. In Halliday‟s system, modality is primarily located in the interpersonal component of the grammar and choices in this component are independent of grammatical choices in other components, for example, choices of transitivity in the ideational component (Halliday 2002a: 200).

Although there are broad categories of modality recognized by all scholars in the field, there are nevertheless differences in the ways in which modalities are classified and categorized. For example, linguist Otto Jesperson (1924) makes a broad division of modalities into two categories: those that contain an element of will and those that contain no element of will. Philosopher Georg von Wright (1951) postulates 4 modes: alethic (necessary, possible, contingent, impossible), epistemic (verified, undecided, falsified), deontic (obligatory, permitted, indifferent, forbidden), and existential (universal, existing, empty).

Palmer (1986) focuses on epistemic and deontic modalities, which corresponding roughly with Jesperson‟s two categories, while Palmer (2001) reorganizes categories of modality such that the first division is between Propositional modality on the one hand, encompassing both epistemic and evidential modality, and Event modality on the other hand, encompassing both deontic and dynamic modality. Propositional modality is concerned with the speaker's attitude to the truth value or factual status of the proposition, while Event modality refers to events that are not actualized, events that have not taken place but are merely potential (Palmer 2001).

Lesson 35

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND GRAMMAR-I

Reference

Reference items in English usually include pronouns (e.g.***he, she, it, him, they,*** etc.), demonstratives (this, that, these, those), and the article ***the***. For instance, Michael went to the bank. **He** was annoyed because **it** was closed.

In this sentence, he refers to Michael which will be treated as a anaphoric reference, and **it** refers to the bank which will also be treated as an anaphoric reference. In the above given examples, **Michae**l and **bank will be treated as cataphoric reference.** Hence, an anaphoric reference occurs when a word or phrase refers to something mentioned **earlier** in the discourse, whereas a cataphoric reference occurs when a word or phrase refers to something mentioned **later** in the discourse.

Brown and Yule (1983) see the nature of reference in text and in discourse as an action on the part of a speaker/writer. It describes what they are doing "not the relationship which exists between one sentence or proposition and another." McCarthy (1991) states that we must consider the notion of discourse segments as "functional units, rather than concentrating on sentence and to see the writer/speaker as faced with a number of strategic choices as to how to relate segments to one another and how to present them to the receiver." He adds that reference items can refer to Segments of discourse or situations as a whole rather than to any one specified entity in that situation. Fox (1987) claims that reference can be successfully made (for instance, through the use of pronouns) if the referent is "in focus, in consciousness, textually evoked or high in topicality" and where it "can be operationally defined in terms of the discourse structure."

To this end, referents are often realized through anaphoric (word or phrase referring backwards in a text), cataphoric (word or phrase referring forwards in a text), and exophoric (reference to assumed shared worlds outside the text) devices and can appear as functional units in discourse segmentation.

This implies the use of language to point to something. Reference therefore has the ability to point to something within or outside a text.

Halliday and Hassan (1976) states that co-referential forms are forms which instead of being interpreted semantically in their own right, make reference to something else for their interpretation. When the interpretation is within the text, this is an „endophoric" relation but in a situation where the interpretation of the text lies outside the text, in the context of situation, the relationship is „exophoric". However, exophoric relations play no part in textual cohesion. Endophoric relations on the other hand, form cohesive ties within the text. Endophoric relations are also of two types, those which look back in the text for their interpretation (anaphoric relations) and those which look forward to the text for their interpretation (cataphoric relations). For instance, the following sentences show the use of reference. Referring expressions help to unify the text and create economy because they save writers from unnecessary repetition.

Ellipsis and substitution

In English grammar, substitution (or an ellipsis-substitution) is the replacement of a word or phrase with a "filler" word (such as one, so, or do) to avoid repetition.

1. **Avoiding repetition of nouns in formal situation using 'THAT/ THOSE'** e.g.
   - There are people who support this idea just as there are **those** who are against it.
   - They perform **an essential function**: **that** of reminding us of the human cost when we get things wrong.
2. **Avoiding repetition of nouns in informal situation using 'ONE/ ONES'** 'One' is used instead of repeating a singular countable noun. e.g.
   - Can I get you a drink? It's okay, I've already got **one** (= a drink).
   - Is this your umbrella? No, mine is the big blue **one** (= umbrella).

'Ones' is used instead of repeating a plural noun. e.g.

- I think his best poems are his early **ones** (= poems).
- People who smoke aren't the only **ones** (= people) affected by lung cancer.

3. **Avoiding repetition of a verb and its object complement using 'DO SO'** e.g.
   - "Put the car away, please." "I've already **done so.**"(= put the car away)
   - She won the competition on 1997 and seems likely to **do so** (= win the competition) again this year.

In **Informal English we can use 'do it'** or **'do that'**. e.g.

- Mrs. Smith waved as she walked past. She **does it/ does that** every morning.
- Ray told me to put in a new battery. I **did it/ did that,** but the radio still doesn't work.

4. **Avoiding repetition of a that-clause after certain verbs (think, hope, believe, suppose, reckon, guess, be afraid) using 'SO'** e.g.

"Our team will win today's match." "Yeah, I hope so." (= that our team will win today's match)
"Is Alex here?" "I think **so**." (= that Alex is here)

5. **Joining two positive sentences which have different subjects using 'TOO/ SO'** e.g.
   - I love fishing. My brother loves fishing.
   - I love fishing and my brother does too.
   - I love fishing and so does my brother.
6. **Joining two negative sentences which have different subjects using 'EITHER/ NEITHER'** e.g.
   - I don't like reading books. He doesn't like reading books.
   - I don't like reading books and he doesn't **either**.
   - I don't like reading books and **neither** does he.

"**Ellipsis** is a special instance of substitution, in that it involves substitution by zero. Instead of one of the lexical items mentioned for substitution, no item is used, and the hearer/listener is left to fill in the gap where the substitute item, or the original item, should have appeared."

1. Leaving out words after auxiliaries (do, be, have, modals) e.g.

- I'll come and see you when I **can**. (= can come and see you)
- She says she has finished, but I don't think she **has**. (= has finished)

2. Leaving out to-infinitives

e.g.

- I wanted to come with you, I won't be able **to**. (= to come with you)
- "Let's go for a walk." "I don't want **to**." (=to go for a walk)

3. Leaving out articles, possessives, personal pronouns, auxiliaries at the beginning of sentences e.g.

- My wife's on holiday. => ***Wife's on holiday.***
- Have you seen Joe? => ***Seen Joe?***
- I couldn't understand a word. => ***Couldn't understand a word.***

The Differences between Reference and Substitution

"It is important to point out differences between reference and ellipsis-substitution. One difference is that reference can reach a long way back in the text whereas ellipsis and substitution are largely limited to the immediately preceding clause. Another key difference is that with reference there is a typical meaning of co-reference. That is, both items typically refer to the same thing. With ellipsis and substitution, this is not the case. There is always some difference between the second instance and the first. If a speaker or writer wants to refer to the same thing, they use reference. If they want to refer to something different, they use ellipsis-substitution (Halliday 1985)."

Conjunction

Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are nor primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meaning which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Hasan and Halliday (1976) adopt a scheme of just four categories, namely additive, adversative, causal, and temporal. According to Halliday (1985), conjunction is classified into ***elaboration, extention, and enchancement.***

1) Elaboration

Elaboration means one clause that expands another by elaborating on it (or some portion of it) by restating in other words, specifying in greater detail, commenting, or exemplifying (Halliday, 1985). There are two categories of elaborative relation, namely apposition and clarification.

Apposition

According to Kridalaksana (1993) apposition is a word or phrase which explains other preceding phrase or clause. In this type of elaboration some element is re-presented, or restated, either by exposition or example. Look at the example below:

Expository: in other word, that is (to stay), I mean (to say), to put it another way. Exemplifying: for example, for instance, thus, to illustrate.

 Clarification

Here, the elaborated element is not simply restated but reinstated, summarized, made more precise or in some other way clarified for the purposes of discourse:

- **Corrective**: *or, rather, at least, to be more precise*
- **Distractive**: *by the way, incidentally*
- **Dismissive**: *in any case, anyway, leaving that a side*
- **Particularizing**: *in particular, more especially*
- **Resumptive**: *as I was saying, to resume, to get back to the pint*
- **Summative**: *in short, to sum up, in conclusion, briefly*
- **Verifactive:** *actually, as a matter of fact, in fact*

2) Extension

Extension means one clause expands another by extending beyond it by adding some new element, giving an exception to it, or offering an alternative (Halliday, 1985). Extension involves either addition, adversative, or variation. **Additive** conjunction acts to structurally coordinate or link by adding to the presupposed item divided into positive (*and, also, moreover, in addition*) and negative (*nor*). **Adversative**t is conjunction which relates two clauses that state contras each other (Kridalaksana, 1993). It acts also to indicate contrary to expectation and signaled by *but, yet, on the other hand, however.* **Variation** includes replacive 'instead', subtractive 'except' and alternative 'or' types.

- **Replacive:** *on contrary, instead*
- **Subtractive:** *apart from that, except*
- **Alternative:** *alternatively*

3) Enhancement

Enhancement means one clause expands another by embellishing around it by qualifying it with some circumstantial feature of time, place, cause or condition (Halliday, 1985).

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND GRAMMAR-II

Theme and rhyme

Most learners, when learning the grammar of a foreign language, spend time assimilating the structure of clauses in that language, i.e., where subjects, objects and adverbials are placed in relation to the verb, and what options are available for rearranging the most typical sequences. Discourse analysts are interested in the implications of these different structural options for the creation of text, and, as always, it is from the examination of natural data that patterns of use are seen to emerge. Some of the structural options frequently found in natural data are ignored or underplayed in language teaching (especially those found in spoken data, which are often dismissed as degraded or bad 'style'), probably owing to the continued dominance of standards taken from the written code. If the desire is to be faithful to data, grammar teaching may have to reorient some of its structural descriptions, while others already dealt with in sentence level exercises may be adequately covered in traditional teaching and simply adjusted to discourseoriented approaches. English is what is often called an 'SVO' language, in that the declarative clause requires a verb at its center, a subject before it and any object after it. This is simply a labeling device which enables comparisons to be made with declarative realizations in different languages, some of which will be 'VSO' or 'SOV' languages.

There are in English a variety of ways in which the basic clause elements of subject, verb, and complement/object, adverbial can be rearranged by putting different elements at the beginning of the clause. These ways of bringing different elements to the front are called fronting devices.

In English the Theme, the ‘point of departure’ for the clause, is also one of the means by which the clause is organized as a message. Theme is the ‘glue’ that structures and binds the ideational and interpersonal meanings. In studies of Theme in children’s writing and in writing in the workplace, the choice and representation of Theme is seen as a crucial element related to the success of a text (Martin, 1985, 1992, 1993; Martin and Rothery, 1993; Berry, 1995, 1996; Stainton, 1996, amongst others). The belief that an understanding of the way in which Theme works can be usefully incorporated into pedagogy is the motivation behind this and many other studies of Theme.

Theme, then, is seen to play a crucial role in focusing and organizing the message and to contribute to the coherence and success of the message. Martin (1992) argues that the choice of what comes first is “a textual resource systematically exploited” to effect different patterns (Martin, 1992). Martin adds that the different patterns and meanings made by the choice of Theme can be manipulated and exploited, consciously or unconsciously, by the writer in order to convey their ‘angle’ or viewpoint. In more recent work, Martin (2000) and Martin and Rose (forthcoming) suggest that Theme and many other features in a text function to construe the writer’s viewpoint.
Rhyme is everything that is not Theme: it is the part of the clause where the Theme is developed (Halliday, 1994). A message structure in English is comprised of a Theme plus a **Rhyme**. There is an order to the structure: Theme comes first, followed by **Rhyme**, and whatever is placed in initial position is **Theme** (Halliday, 1994). In many instances **Rhyme** is related to New Information, while Theme is related to Given Information. Given refers to what is already known or predictable, while New refers to what is unknown or unpredictable.

Halliday elaborates the distinction between given and new as “information that is presented by the speaker as recoverable (Given) or not recoverable (New) to the listener” (Halliday, 1994). Martin (1992) also points out that **Theme** is equated with “what the speaker is on about” while New is the structure which is “listener-oriented” (Martin, 1992a:448). Halliday adds that although the two pairs of clause functions, i.e. **Theme/ Given** and **Rhyme/ New**, are similar, they are not the same thing. Theme realizes the ‘angle’ of the story and the New elaborates the field, developing it in experiential terms (Martin, 1992). Martin (1992) also adds that Theme is generally restricted to grounding the genre of the text, while the New is not restricted in this way and is far more flexible. As interesting as the interaction between these two pairs of concepts is, an investigation into Given and New is beyond the scope of the present study.

Tense and aspect

Tense is a term that refers to the way verbs change their form in order to indicate at which time a situation occurs or an event takes place. For finite verb phrases, English has just one inflectional form to express time, namely the past tense marker (-ed for regular verbs). Therefore, in English there is just a contrast between present and past tense. Needless to say, non-finite verb phrases (to infinitives and –ing forms) are not marked for tense. When occurring with modals, verb phrases are used in their base form, with no tense marker. Each tense can have a simple form as well as be combined with either the progressive or perfective aspect, or with both of them.

For instance,

- I work; I'm working; I have worked; I have been working (present)
- I worked; I was working; I had worked; I had been working (past)

Sentences can also be used in the passive voice (note that the perfect-progressive is not normally found in the passive):

- I am told; I'm being told; I have been told I was told
- I was being told; I had been told

Time and tense are not overlapping concepts. Though tense is related to time, there is no one-to one correspondence between the two. Tense is a grammatical category: rather than with "reality", it has to do with how events are placed, seen, and referred to along the past-presentfuture time line. Thus, a present tense does not always refer to present time, or a past tense to past time. Actually, the present and past tenses can refer to all three segments of the time line (past, present, and future).

Furthermore, the past tense can express tentativeness, often associated with politeness:

- Did you want to make a phone call?
- Were you looking for me?

Aspect is a grammatical category that reflects the perspective from which an action/situation is seen: as complete, in progress, having duration, beginning, ending, or being repeated. English has two aspects, progressive (also called continuous) and perfect (ive). Verbs that are not marked for aspect (the majority of them are not) are said to have simple aspect. In British English, the perfective aspect is much more common than in American English, since Americans often use the past simple where Britons use the present perfect.

Verb phrases can be marked for both aspects at the same time (the perfect progressive, however, is infrequent). The following combinations are possible: present progressive; past progressive; present perfective; past perfective; present perfective progressive; past perfective progressive:

- He's sleeping;
- He was sleeping
- He has slept
- He had slept
- He has been sleeping
- He had been sleeping

Usually, grammars contrast the progressive with the perfective aspect (and the simple, for that matter) on the basis that the former refers to an action/event as in progress, while the latter tends to indicate the completeness of an action, to see actions and events as a whole and a situation as permanent. This is certainly a useful distinction, which will not be questioned here; yet students must be aware that the above is an oversimplified view, as is demonstrated by the fact that the two aspects can combine within a single verb phrase. **Conclusion**

This chapter has taken a selection of grammatical concepts and has attempted to show how discourse analysis has contributed to our understanding of the relationship between local choices within the clause and sentence and the organization of the discourse as a whole. When speakers and writers are producing discourse, they are, at the same time as they are busy constructing clauses, monitoring the development of the larger discourse, and their choices at the local level can be seen simultaneously to reflect the concerns of the discourse as an unfolding production, with an audience, whether present or projected.

A discourse-oriented approach to grammar would suggest not only a greater emphasis on contexts larger than the sentence, but also a reassessment of priorities in terms of what is taught about such things as word order, articles, ellipsis, tense and aspect, and some of the other categories discussed here. If grammar is seen to have a direct role in welding clauses, turns and sentences into discourse.

At the end, Discourse and grammar often complement each other, each imposing a different set of constraints on speakers' utterances. Discourse constraints are global, pertaining to text coherence, and/or to interpersonal relations. Grammatical constraints are local, pertaining to possible versus impossible structures (within specific languages). Yet, the two must meet in natural discourse. At every point during interaction speakers must simultaneously satisfy both types of constraints in order to communicate properly.

It is also during conversational interaction that language change somehow takes place. This overview first explains and exemplifies how discourse constraints guide addressees in selecting specific grammatical forms at different points in the interaction (discourse 'selecting' from grammar). It then examines the relationship between discourse and grammar from a grammatical point of view, demonstrating how a subset of discourse patterns (may) turn grammatical (grammar 'selecting' from discourse). The central theme is then that discourse depends on grammar, which in turn depends on discourse.

Lecture-13 The Nature of Reference in Text and Discourse

STAGING AND THE REPRESENTATION OF DISCOURSE STRUCTURE

Thematisation and Staging

According to Brown and Yule (1983), "**thematisation** is a discourse rather than simply a sentential process. What the speaker or writer puts first would influence the interpretation of everything that follows." Thus, a title would influence the interpretation of the text which follows it. The first sentence of the first paragraph would constrain the interpretation not only of the paragraph, but also the rest of the text. That is, we assumed that every sentence forms part of a developing, cumulative instruction which told us how to construct a coherent representation.

"Staging" was a more general, more inclusive, term than thematisation (which refers only to the linear organization of texts). Every clause, sentence, paragraph, episode and discourse were organized around a particular element that is taken as its point of departure. It was as though the speaker presents what he wants to say from a particular perspective. Clements (1979) suggested that "staging is a dimension of prose structure which identifies the relative prominence given to various segments of prose discourse." This definition opened the door to far more than processes of linearization, and permits the inclusion within "staging" of rhetorical devises like lexical selection, theme and rhyme, alliteration, repetition, use of metaphor, markers of emphasis, etc. It meant different structure or word construction would determine what the word which has prominent position in a sentence. We should use "staging" not as a technical term, but as a general metaphor to cover the exploitation of such varied phenomena in discourse.

The notion of "relative prominence" arising from processes of thematisation and "staging" devices has led many researchers, particularly in psycholinguistics, to consider staging as a crucial factor in discourse structure, because they believe, the way a piece of discourse is staged, must have a significant effect both on the process of interpretation and on the process of subsequent recall (Yule, 1983). Regarded with this, staging is the sentence arrangement that signals how the word, sentence is arranged in clause. The arrangement would influence the intended meaning of sentence. As Davidson states in Brown and Yule (1986), “the more marked the construction, the more likely that an implicated meaning will be intended utterance to convey.”

In discourse analysis, the term of staging is used to show how an idea is represented. The first sentence of a text or the first word of a sentence will influence the interpretation of everything that follows. Actually, in a sentence there is a particular word that called as foregrounded and another one is back-grounded. Other themes used in staging were theme and rhyme.

Thematic organization appears to be exploited by speakers / writers to provide a structural framework for their discourse, which relates back to their main intention and provides a perspective on what follows. In the detective story cited in (8), the writer shuttles about, commenting on the activities of a number of different individuals, located in different parts of England and Europe within the space of two pages. The coherence of structure is imposed, partly at least, because locally within the text the author is meticulous in relating events to each other in time. Each new adverbial phrase marks the fact that the scenario has shifted.

Titles and Thematisation

We argued in this Chapter that the 'title' of a stretch of discourse should not be equated with 'the topic' but should be regarded as one possible expression of the topic. We now wish to propose that the best way of describing the function of the title of a discourse is as a particularly powerful thematisation device. In the title of extract the topic entity was thematised, or, to express the relationship more accurately, when we found the name of an individual thematised in the title of the text, we expected that individual to be the topic entity. This expectation-creating aspect of thematisation, especially in the form of a title, means that thematised elements provide not only a starting point around which what follows in the discourse is structured, but also a starting point which constrains our interpretation of what follows.

For instance, Rocky slowly got up from the mat, planning his escape. He hesitated a moment and thought. Things were not going well. What bothered him most was being held, especially since the charge against him had been weak. He considered his present situation. The lock that held him was strong, but he thought he could break it.

The topic-entity of this fragment is the individual named 'Rocky' and, because of the thematised expression in the title, we can read this text with the interpretation that Rocky is a prisoner, in a cell, planning to break the lock on the door and escape. In an exercise which the researchers conducted using this text after which subjects were asked to answer several questions, we found that there was a general interpretation that Rocky was alone, that he had been arrested by the police, and that he disliked being in prison.

When the researchers presented exactly the same questions to another group who read the following text, (17b), they received quite different answers.

(17b) A Wrestler in a Tight Corner

Rocky slowly got up from the mat, planning his escape. He hesitated a moment and thought. Things were not going well.

What bothered him most was being held, especially since the charge against him had been weak. He considered his present situation. The lock that held him was strong, but he thought he could break it.

In answering questions on this fragment, subjects indicated that they thought Rocky was a wrestler who was being held in some kind of wrestling 'hold' and was planning to get out of this hold. Rocky was not alone in a prison cell and had had nothing to do with the police. By providing different 'starting points' in the thematised elements of the different titles, we effectively constrained the way in which the piece of text was interpreted. (Anderson et al. (1977) discuss the different possible interpretations of the one piece of text (without titles) presented in (17a) and (17b) in terms of knowledge structures or 'schemata' which are activated for the interpretation of texts.

Extracts (17a) and (17b) provide a particularly dramatic illustration of the effect of thematisation. There are, of course, many other easily recognizable thematisation devices used in the organization of discourse structure. Placing headings and sub-headings within a text is a common thematisation device in technical or public- information documents. It also occurs, you will have noted, in linguistics textbooks. What these thematisation devices have in common is not only the way they provide 'starting points' for paragraphs in a text, but also their contribution to dividing up a whole text into smaller chunks. This 'chunking' effect is one of the most basic of those achieved by thematisation in discourse.

Natural Order and Point of View

As Levelt (1981) remarks, it is natural to put the event that happened first before the event which followed it. A sequence of events in time, told as a narrative in English, will often be presented in the order in which they happened and, often, with an unspecified implication of a relationship in which the second event in some sense follows from the first (e.g. was caused by). This type of non-logical inference has been characterized by Horn (1973) as post hoc ergo propter hoc.

Consider the following passage. Just before it begins, a violent storm has broken, with torrents of rain:

> Between where I stood by the rail and the lobby was but a few yards, yet I was drenched before I got under cover. I disrobed as far as decency permits, and then sat at this letter but not a little shaken. (W. Golding, Rites of Passage, Faber & Faber, 1980)

It is not stated that the narrator is 'drenched' by the rain (rather than by, say, perspiration) or why he wishes to get under cover.

It is not made clear why he disrobes or why he finds himself 'not a little shaken'. The normal assumption of an English-speaking reader will be, however, that the series of events are meaningfully related to each other, and he will draw the appropriate inferences that the narrator is drenched by the rain, wishes to take cover from the rain, disrobes because his clothing has been drenched by the rain, and is 'not a little shaken' because of his immediately preceding experience in the violent storm. We stress that these inferences will be drawn by an Englishspeaking reader because it appears that in other cultures there are rather different bases for narrative structures (cf. Grimes, 1975; Grimes (ed.), 1978; Becker, 1980).
It is clearly the case that there are stereotypical orderings in genres other than those which obviously consist of a series of events in time. Thus Linde & Labov report that 97% of the subjects, in a survey in which subjects were asked to describe the lay-out of their apartments, described them in terms of 'imaginary tours which transform spatial lay-outs into temporally organised narratives' (i975 "• 9 2 4)

The narrative tour in each case begins at the front door, just as it would if the interviewer were to arrive for the first time at the apartment. A similar alignment with the point of view of the hearer is taken by speakers who are asked to give directions in a strange town. They always begin, cooperatively, from the point where the enquiry is made and then attempt to describe the route as a succession of acts in time.

In each of these cases then, there is a 'natural' starting point and the description is an attempt to follow a 'natural' progression. Levelt suggests that by adopting the stereotypical pattern of the culture 'the speaker facilitates the listener's comprehension' (1981: 94) since both speaker and hearer share the same stereotype.

It seems very likely that there are other constraints on ordering in types of discourse which are not simply arranged as a sequence of events in time. Van Dijk (1977) suggests that descriptions of states of affairs will be determined by perceptual salience so that the more salient entity will be mentioned first. He suggests that 'normal ordering' will conform to the following pattern:
General - particular
Whole - part / component
Set - subject - element
Including - included
Large - small
Outside - inside
Possessor - possessed
(van Dijk, 1977: 106)

THE NATURE OF REFERENCE IN TEXT AND IN DISCOURSE-III

What is text?

In linguistics, the term **text** refers to:

1. The original words of something written, printed, or spoken, in contrast to a summary or paraphrase.
2. A coherent stretch of language that may be regarded as an object of critical analysis.

Text linguistics refers to a form of discourse analysis a method of studying written or spoken language that is concerned with the description and analysis of extended texts (those beyond the level of the single sentence). A text can be any example of written or spoken language, from something as complex as a book or legal document to something as simple as the body of an email or the words on the back of a cereal box.

In the **humanities**, different fields of study concern themselves with different forms of texts. Literary theorists, for example, focus primarily on literary texts novels, essays, stories, and poems. Legal scholars focus on legal texts such as laws, contracts, decrees, and regulations. Cultural theorists work with a wide variety of texts, including those that may not typically be the subject of studies, such as advertisements, signage, instruction manuals, and other ephemera.

"Discourse is sometimes used in contrast with 'text,' where 'text' refers to actual written or spoken data, and 'discourse' refers to the whole act of communication involving production and comprehension, not necessarily entirely verbal. The study of discourse, then, can involve matters like context, background information or knowledge shared between a speaker and hearer."

The concept of **texture** is entirely appropriate to express the property of 'being a text'. This characteristic of a text distinguishes it from something that is not a text. The fact that a text functions as a unity with respect to its environment derives from this 'texture'. If a passage of English containing more than one sentence is perceived as a text, there will be certain linguistic features present in the passage which can be identified as contributing to its total unity and giving it texture.

For example:

If we find the following instructions in the cooking book;

Wash and core six cooking apples. Put *them* into a fireproof dish.

It is clear that 'them' in the second sentence refers back to the 'six cooking apples' of if first sentence. This anaphoric function of *them* gives cohesion to the two sentences, so that we interpret them as a whole; the two sentences together constitute a text. So it is the texture which makes these two sentences a text.

Ties:

We need a term to refer to a single instance of cohesion, a term for one occurrence of a pair of cohesively related items. This is called a tie. The relation between *them* and *six cooking apples* in the above example constitutes a tie. We can characterize any segment of a text in terms of the number and kinds of ties which it displays. In the above example there is just one tie of the particular kind which we call reference.

Cohesion:

The concept of cohesion is a semantic one. It refers to relations of meaning that exist within the texts, and that defines it as a text. Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text.

Reference and Discourse Representation

Reference is an act of directing or indicating something by using some linguistic elements. Reference is a systemic relation. The reference is no way constrained to match the grammatical class of the item it refers to. Reference is a particular type of cohesion and its criteria is the specific nature of the information that is signaled for retrieval. In the case of reference, the information to be retrieved in the referential meaning' the identity of the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to; and the cohesion lies in the continuity of reference, whereby the same thing enters into the discourse for the second time.

Manners of Reference: on the basis of referring to a thing as identified in the context of situation or as identified in the surrounding text reference appears in two forms or manners.

- ***Exophora or Exophoric reference.***
- ***Endophora or endophoric reference***

Exophoric reference: Exophora is reference to something extra-linguistic, i.e., not in the same text. It signals that reference must be made to context of situation. For example; pronouns with words such as 'this' 'that' 'there' 'here' are often exophoric. ***Did the gardener water those plants?***

It is quite possible that 'those' refers to earlier mention of those particular plants in the discussion. But it is also possible that it refers to the environment in which the dialogue is taking place – to the context of situation; as It is called – where the plants in question are present and can be pointed to if necessary. The interpretation would be ''those plants there, in front of us. This kind of reference is called exophora. Since it takes us put side the text altogether.

Exophoric reference is cohesive, since it does not bind the two elements together into a text.
Example-
For he's a jolly good fellow and so say all of us.

This is an example of the context of situation where the text is not indicating who this 'he' is.
Endophoric Reference: Endophoric reference is the general name for within the text. Endophora is a term that means an expression which refers to something intra-linguistics i.e. in the same text. For example, in the sentence:

I saw sally yesterday, she was lying on the beach

Here, she is an endophoric expression because it refers to something already mentioned in the text i.e., *sally*. By contrast she was lying on the beach if it appeared by itself, has an exophoric expression; she' refers to something that the reader is hot told about. Without further information, there is no way of knowing the exact meaning of an exophoric term where endophoric expression lies within the text.

A theory of discourse interpretation that uses such an intermediate level of representation is ***Discourse Representation Theory (DRT)***, formalism proposed in the early 1980s by Hans Kamp. ***Discourse Representation Theory explain*** certain discourse phenomena, such as the interaction between indefinite noun phrases and (anaphoric) pronouns in texts shown before, the traditional account of considering meaning in terms of truth conditions turned out to be unsatisfactory. DRT adopts the rather `dynamic' view of natural language semantics, where the meaning of a sentence is defined in how it can change the context.

One of the striking features of DRT is that it, instead of working with first-order formula syntax, works with explicit semantic representations. Such representations are called ***Discourse Representation Structure (DRS)*** which describes the objects mentioned in a discourse and their properties.

Pronouns in Discourse

The pronoun is bound to the noun phrase when semantic rules and contextual interpretation determine that a pronoun is co referential with a noun phrase. A pronoun is free or unbound when it refers to some object not mentioned in the discourse.

Pronouns include three classes:

- Personal pronoun
- Possessive determiners
- Possessive pronouns

Personal Pronouns:

The speaker and the addressee of a communication situation are often marked linguistically by the first- and second-person pronouns. As already mentioned, the reference of the singular first- and second-person pronouns is very simple as the referents are normally the speaker and the addressee, whereas the reference of especially the plural first-person pronouns is more complex. Conventional typological studies have arranged personal pronouns into tables and used the terms 'first', 'second' and 'third person', and 'singular' and 'plural number'.

- **Examples:** *If the buyer wants to look the condition of the property, he has to have another survey. One carried out on his own behalf.*
- Here in the above example the use of personal pronoun 'he' or 'his' for 'buyer' and 'one' for 'survey' is a source of personal reference.

Possessive pronouns:

If possessive pronouns are used, they give two more notions other than speaker and addressee. They are that of 'possessor' and 'possessed'

- **Example:** *That new house is John's.*
- *I didn't know it was his.*

Here, in the above example the use of possessive pronouns 'his' for 'John' indicates the possessor and ''s' is for the possessed 'house' includes another source of personal reference. **Reflexive pronouns:**

Reflexive pronouns are a kind of pronoun that is used when the subject and the object of the sentence are the same.

Include *myself, ourselves, yourself, yourselves himself, herself, itself, themselves.*

Pronouns may be classified by three categories: person, number, and case. **Person** refers to the relationship that an author has with the text that he or she writes, and with the reader of that text. English has three persons (first, second, and third):

- **First-person** is the speaker or writer him- or herself. The first person is personal (*I*, *we*, etc.)
- **Second-person** is the person who is being directly addressed. The speaker or author is saying this is about you, the listener or reader.

- **Third-person** is the most common person used in academic writing. The author is saying this is about other people. In the third person singular there are distinct pronoun forms for male, female, and neutral gender.

THE NATURE OF REFERENCE IN TEXT AND IN DISCOURSE-II

Pronouns and Antecedent Nominals

A **pronoun antecedent** is a word that comes before a pronoun to which the pronoun refers. Following are definitions of antecedent as well as a review about the types of pronouns, information about the functions of an antecedent in a sentence, and examples of how to use in a sentence.

Defining a Pronoun Antecedent

The word **"antecedent"** means something that precedes something else. In language, it is the word that a pronoun refers back to. Since the pronoun replaces the noun, it has to agree in number. So, if the antecedent, or word that comes before, is singular, then the pronoun that takes its place must also be singular. It can be confusing if there are several words between the pronoun and its antecedent. These words or clauses have no bearing on the words and they need to be ignored.

Following are some special situations with examples of the correct way to have pronoun antecedent agreement.

Compound subjects can be a problem. If the subjects are joined by an **“and”** then the pronoun needs to be plural, as in "Bob and Paul took their books. If the subjects are joined by "or" or **“nor”**, then have the pronoun agree with the subject that is closer, or closest, to the pronoun. An example is "Either the actor or the singers messed up their performance.

If the pronoun is referring to one thing or a unit, like a team or a jury, then the pronoun needs to be singular. An example is: "The jury has reached its verdict."

Sometimes words sound plural and are not, like measles or the news. These would need a singular pronoun, as in: "Measles is not as widespread as it once was." This makes sense if you replace the word "measles" with "disease."

Indefinite Pronouns That Are Antecedents

There are several rules concerning the use of indefinite pronouns as antecedents and the pronoun antecedent agreement. The following indefinite pronouns are singular and need a singular pronoun: one, no one, someone, everyone, anyone, nobody, anybody, somebody, everybody, nothing, anything, and something, everything, each, either, neither. An example is "Everything here has its own box."

The plural indefinite pronouns: several, both, few, and many, need to have a plural pronoun, like in this sentence: "Several are there because of their looks."

Lastly, if there is an indefinite pronoun that is being modified by a prepositional phrase, then the object of the phrase will determine the agreement between the pronoun and its antecedent. These special indefinite pronouns are: some, most, all, any, or none. Look at these two sentences: "Most of the flour fell out of its canister" and "Many of the gems have lost their shine". If the object, like "flour" is uncountable, then the pronoun has to be singular (its). If the object is countable, like "gems", then the pronoun needs to be plural (their).

Pronouns and Antecedent Predicates

Subject-Predicate (Verb) Agreement Make sure you don't have subject-verb agreement problems in a complete sentence. Distractions within a sentence can make you misidentify subject and verb, leading to an agreement problem. Remember that a verb must agree in person and number with its subject, regardless of other elements in a sentence.

Locating the subject of a sentence

Your first job is to locate the subject of the sentence. To do this, find the verb, the action word or the state-of-being word, and then determine who or what is being talked about. Then ask yourself, Is the subject first person (I/we), second person (you), or third person (he, she, it/they)? Is the subject singular or plural? When you've answered these questions, you will know which form the verb should take. Singular subjects take singular verbs, and plural subjects take plural verbs.

Subject-verb agreement with a compound subject

In sentences with more than one subject (a compound subject), the word and usually appears between the elements.

Use a plural verb with a compound subject:

- Drinking a glass of milk and soaking in the tub help me fall asleep.
- ***NOT*** Drinking a glass of milk and soaking in the tub helps me fall asleep.

If each/every precedes a compound subject, treat the subject as singular.

- Each dog and cat is to be fed twice a day.
- Every house and garage have been searched.

Additive phrases

An additive phrase sometimes makes a sentence look as if it has a compound subject. Examples of these phrases are accompanied by, along with, as well as, in addition to, including, and together with. When you use one of these phrases, you are thinking of more than one person or thing. But grammatically these phrases aren't conjunctions like and. They are actually modifying the subject, rather than making it compound. Therefore, do not use a plural verb because of these modifying phrases.

- The President of the United States, accompanied by his advisors, was en route to Europe.
- ***NOT*** The President of the United States, accompanied by his advisors, were en route to Europe.

Phrases and clauses between subject and verb

Watch out for phrases and clauses that come between the subject and predicate in a sentence. To make sure you have the right person and number for the verb, mentally eliminate intervening phrases and clauses.

- The speech that provoked the demonstration and caused the closing of the university was filled with inaccuracies.
- ***NOT*** The speeches that provoked the demonstration and caused the closing of the university were filled with inaccuracies.

Subject-verb agreement

The conjunctions or, either …or, and neither …nor ask you to choose between things rather than add things. If both elements are singular, use a singular verb. If both elements are plural, use a plural verb. If one element is singular and one is plural, choose the verb that agrees with the element closest to it.

- The director or the assistant director is planning to be on location.
- ***NOT*** The director or the assistant ***director are*** planning to be on location.

Subject-verb agreement in relative clauses

Agreement problems can occur in relative clauses using which, that, or one of those who. The verb in a relative clause must agree with the relative pronoun's antecedent (the word the pronoun stands for). Always ask yourself what the relative pronoun refers to. He decided to write novels, which are his favorite form.

 NOT He decided to write novels, ***which is*** his favorite form.

Pronouns and 'new' Predicates

Pronouns may refer to predicate which are not mentioned previously. In discourse, the speaker may structure his massage in such a way that some **new** information is attached to 'given' elements (i.e., pronouns) intending the hearer to provide the given/ **new** interpretive procedure. However, the hearer may have to reverse that procedure and use the **new** information to decide what the given referent must have been.

A **predicate pronoun** is any pronoun that is part of the predicate. A predicate is the part of a sentence that includes the verb and the words following it that relate to that verb.

Explanation:
Examples:

- I **will call him.**
- The teacher **gave us a history assignment.** Mother **made lunch for them.** A

sentence may have more than one predicate;

For example:

- **Mother made lunch for them** and **set it on the picnic table.**

Slide13: A subjective pronoun can be part of a predicate when it is the subject of a clause,

For example:

- Mary **brought a cake she made for the party.**

A subjective pronoun is also used as a subject complement when it follows a linking verb;

For example:
The leaders right now are he and I.

Lecture-14 Doing Discourse Analysis

METHODOLOGY

Ethics

Proponents of discourse ethics reverse the order in which we normally address ethical uncertainties. Instead of starting with one theory or another and then taking it out into the world to solve problems, they start with a problem and try to create a moral structure to solve it. Ethical solutions become ad hoc, custom generated to resolve specific conflicts. It doesn't matter so much, therefore, that people come to an issue like bribery from divergent moral grounds because that difference is erased by the key element of discourse ethics: a foundational decision to cut away from old ideas and make new ones.

Discourse ethics (DE) has two aims: to specify the ideal conditions for discourse and to ground ethics in the agreements reached through the exercise of such discourse. Discourse ethics consequently instantiates the intuition that if people discuss issues in fair and open ways, the resulting conclusions will be morally binding for those appropriately involved in the conversation. Such a view of ethics has special relevance in a scientific and technological world characterized by expanding means of communication. DE may also arguably provide the best framework for understanding the ethics of scientists and engineers operating within their professional communities.

Theoretical Framework

Discourse ethics is primarily associated with the work of Karl-Otto Apel (1980) and Jürgen Habermas, who touches his own theory of communicative rationality and action (1981) with Apel's insights (Habermas 1983, 1989). Apel and Habermas root DE emphasis on the importance of moral self-sufficiency for both the individual and the moral community (Apel 2001) and in Aristotle's understanding of the importance of human community praxis as the container in which all theory must be tested. DE has deeply influenced not only philosophy and sociology but also, in keeping with its praxis orientation, such applied fields as business ethics (Blickle et al.

Habermas summarizes the basic intuition of discourse ethics with the statement that "under the moral point of view, one must be able to test whether a norm or a mode of action could be generally

accepted by those affected by it, such that their acceptance would be rationally motivated" (Habermas 1989).
To define such discourse more carefully, Habermas refines a set of rules first proposed by Robert Alexy (1978). According to Habermas (1990), these are:

1. Every subject with the competence to speak and act is allowed to take part in a discourse. 2a. everyone is allowed to question any assertion whatever.
2b. everyone is allowed to introduce any assertion whatever into the discourse.
2c. everyone is allowed to express his (or her) attitudes, desires, and needs.
3. No speaker may be prevented, by internal or external coercion, from exercising his (or her) rights as laid down in (1) and (2).

Discourse ethics thus intends to define the conditions of a free and democratic discourse concerning important norms that affect all members of a community. It aims to do so in ways that are directly practical for the real and pressing problems facing both local and more comprehensive communities. In this light, DE would seem well-suited for circumscribing discourse concerning pressing issues provoked by science and technology.

DE has further played both a theoretical and practical role in connection with the Internet and the World Wide Web. For example, DE has been used to structure online dialogues regarding important but highly controversial social issues such as abortion. These dialogues in fact realize the potential of DE to achieve consensus on important community norms, insofar as they bring to the foreground important normative agreements on the part of those holding otherwise opposed positions, agreements that made a pluralistic resolution of the abortion debate possible (Ess and Cavalier 1997). In 2002 DE served as the framework for the ethics working committee of the Association of Internet Researchers (AoIR), as they sought to develop the first set of ethical guidelines designed specifically for online research and with a view toward recognizing and sustaining the genuinely global ethical and cultural diversity entailed in such research. The guidelines stand as an example of important consensus on ethical norms achieved by participants from throughout the world.

Data Generation

As discourse analysis is concerned with what is accomplished in interaction, the most appropriate sources of data are those that contain some kind of interaction. This may be different from other qualitative methods as it means that conversations rather than stand-alone texts are preferable (although also acceptable). This nevertheless means that a wide range of data can be used to conduct discourse analyses including (but by no means limited to) ordinary conversations (e.g. Stokoe and Edwards 2006) media data, (including televised discussion programs, e.g.
Goodman 2010) and a range of 'institutional talk' (e.g. Lea and Auburn 2001 on the talk of convicted offenders).

Data should be generated (for example through interviews and focus groups) for the purpose of discourse analysis (Goodman and Speer 2015). Potter (1997) defines such data as ‘contrived’ and claims it is ‘subject to powerful expectations about social science research fielded by participants; and there are particular difficulties in extrapolating from interview talk to activities in other settings’ and instead favours ‘naturally occurring talk’ (1997: 148) which is data that has not been influenced in any way by the researcher. The examples listed in the previous paragraph would all meet this standard.
However, Speer (2002) has argued that data cannot clearly be split into these two types (‘naturally occurring’ and ‘contrived’). Speer claims that all situations can to some extent be seen as contrived and natural. Any institutional data can be viewed as contrived, equally, all data is also natural as it will involve real people speaking in real social situations, who will be ‘naturally’ generating action orientated talk. This is true even if that social situation has been constructed for the sake of research. Those who do not have a problem with, or who value, ‘contrived’ data may well generate data for analysis by conducting interviews (e.g. Leudar et al. 2008) and focus groups (e.g. Goodman and Burke 2010). There is no right or wrong response to this debate, just as long as the focus is on the interaction in the data, although it is good practice to (briefly) explain why the chosen approach has been used.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality refers to a condition in which the researcher knows the identity of a research subject, but takes steps to protect that identity from being discovered by others. Most human subject’s research requires collection of a sign consent agreement from participants, and thus researchers are aware of the identity of their subjects. In such cases, maintaining confidentiality is a key measure to ensure the protection of private information.

This Section of the Guide explores the various forms of discourse analysis including one area, conversation analysis, that used to be regarded as distinct from discourse analysis but is increasingly viewed as a form of discourse analysis. The term discourse analysis is thought to have first appeared in 1952 in the title of a paper by Zellig Harris. However, it was from the late 1960s that it emerged as a cross-disciplinary approach, coinciding in with the interest in semiotics, psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics.

Researchers employ a number of methods to keep their subjects' identity confidential. Foremost, they keep their records secure through the use of password protected files, encryption when sending information over the internet, and even old-fashioned locked doors and drawers. They frequently do not record information in a way that links subject responses with identifying information (usually by use of a code known only to them). And because subjects may often not be identified by names alone, but by other identifiers or by combinations of information about subjects, researchers will often only report aggregate findings, not individual-level data, to the public.

from a purely methodological point of view, it may sometimes be necessary to lower other scientific standards in order to ensure confidentiality. This applies in particular to the scientific ideal of verifiability (see also Research values). In principle, the need for verifiability means that the researcher must publish sufficient information to enable others to repeat the procedures and verify the results. The confidentiality requirement may, for example, mean that the results must be grouped, or names or values modified, in order to ensure that some data cannot be traced back to individuals or particularly vulnerable groups. Although this may affect the degree of verifiability, it is essential that confidentiality is respected. However, this potential conflict makes it important that the researcher has reflected in advance over what specific strategies should be aimed for to ensure an epistemic as well as ethical standard.

Researchers may also be faced with a dilemma with regard to maintaining confidentiality in other situations, where this type of methodological consideration is not involved. For example, some types of research, such as mapping insider trading or illegal immigration, may be of interest to business or to government policy. If researchers are served with a court order to reveal their source, when is it ethically correct to breach confidentiality for such reasons? A further source of confusion for the individual researcher may be that this is not purely a matter of conscience, but also a question of the possibility of doing further research. For further reading on researchers' notification requirement, see the article Duty of secrecy.

There are often no simple solutions in situations where ethical considerations are apparently in conflict with one another. One pertinent fact, however, is that in cases where it is conceivable that such a dilemma may arise, researchers must consider carefully in advance whether they should establish a confidential relationship with the person or persons concerned at all. It is never straightforward, and almost always wrong, under any circumstances, to establish a relationship based on deceit with persons upon whom one wishes to conduct research.

DOING DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Developing a Discourse Analysis Project

Discourse analysis is a useful tool for studying the **political meanings** that inform written and spoken text. Discourse Analysis is the **investigation of knowledge about language beyond the word, clause, phrase and sentence levels.** All of them are the basic building blocks of successful communication. In discourse analysis researchers have to **infiltrate language as a whole** beyond the micro level of words and sentences and look at the entire body of communication produced in a given / particular situation. Discourse analysis refers to attempts to **study the organization of language above the sentence** or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written texts (Stubbs 1983). However, Michael Stubbs redefines Discourse in his later work as **it is therefore more accurate to say that text and discourse analysis studies language in context: how words and phrases fit into both longer texts, and also social contexts** of use (Stubbs 2001).

There are a number of issues that need to be considered when planning a discourse analysis project. The first of these is the **actual research question**. The **key** to any **good research** project is a **well-focused** research question. It can, however, take longer than expected to find this question. Cameron (2001) has suggested that one important characteristic of a good research project is that it contains a **'good idea'**; that is, the project is on something that is worth finding. As Cameron and others have pointed out, deciding on and refining the research question is often the hardest part of the project. It is, thus, worth spending as much time as necessary to get it right.

Criteria for developing a discourse analysis project

In her book ***Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics,*** Johnstone (2000) lists a number of criteria that contribute to the development of a good and workable research topic. In her case, she is talking about research in the area of sociolinguistics. What she says, however, applies equally to discourse analysis projects. These criteria include

- A well-focused idea about spoken or written discourse that is expressed as a question or a set of closely related questions;
- An understanding of how discourse analytic techniques can be used to answer the research question you are asking;
- An understanding of why your question about spoken or written discourse are important in a wider context; that is, why answering the question will have practical value and/or be of interest to the world at large;

- Familiarity with and access to the location where your discourse analysis project will be carried out;
- Ability to get the discourse data that is needed for the research project;
- The time it will realistically take to carry out the discourse analysis project, analyze the results and write up the results of the project;
- Being comfortable with and competent in the ways of collecting the discourse data required by the project;
- Being competent in the method of analysis required for the project.

Choosing a Research Topic

Pragmatics, Discourse Analysis, and Critical Discourse Analysis are separate but related areas of linguistic inquiry. These are concerned with the constituents and structures of discourse (like words and phrases) as they are used in context to make meaning. Pragmatics often focuses on the social and generic constraints (like politeness conventions, relative social status, etc.) that shape communicative situations, while **discourse analysis** may foreground how discourse constructs social meanings, serves rhetorical purposes, or creates subject positions. **Critical discourse analysis** is particularly interested in the relationship between discourse and the preservation or subversion of power. Research in these areas may ask questions related to language-in-use and its meaning-making functions.

A good place to start in choosing a **research topic** is by drawing up a shortlist of topics that interest you. You can do this by speaking to other students, by asking colleagues, by asking teachers and by asking potential supervisors, as well as by looking up related research in the library. As Cameron (2001) points out, ***good ideas for research do not 'just spring from the researcher's imagination, they are suggested by previous research'.***

It is important, then, to read widely to see what previous research has said about the topic you are interested in, including what questions can be asked and answered from a discourse perspective. This reading will also give a view of what the current issues and debates are in the approach to discourse analysis you are interested in, as well as how other researchers have gone about answering the question you are interested in from a discourse perspective. It is important to remember, however, that a research question and a research topic are not the same thing.

A **research topic** is your general area of interest, whereas the **research question** is the particular thing you want to find out and which grows out of your research topic (Sunderland 2010). When deciding on a topic, there are a few things that you will need to do:

- brainstorm for ideas
- choose a topic that will enable you to read and understand the literature
- ensure that the topic is manageable and that material is available
- make a list of key words
- be flexible

- define your topic as a focused research question
- research and read more about your topic
- formulate a thesis statement

Be aware that selecting a good topic may not be easy. It must be narrow and focused enough to be interesting, yet broad enough to find adequate information. Before selecting your topic, make sure you know what your final project should look like. Each class or instructor will likely require a different format or style of research project.

Focusing a Research Topic

The next now, needed to focus on research topic. Often aspiring researchers start off with a project that is overly large and ambitious. Stevens and Asmar (1999) suggest that **'wiser heads'** know that a good research project **is 'narrow and deep'**. In their words, ***'even the simplest idea can flourish into an uncontrollably large project'.*** They highlight how important it is for students to listen to more experienced researchers in their field and to be guided by their advice in the early stages of the research. They suggest starting off by getting immersed in the literature and reading broadly and widely to find a number of potential research topics. This can be done by making heavy use of the library as well as by reading the abstracts of recent theses and dissertations, some of which are available on the World Wide Web (see Directions for further reading at the end of this chapter for some of these URLs).

Once the reading has been done, it is useful to write a few lines on each topic and use this as the basis to talk to other people about the research. Often one topic may emerge as the strongest contender from these conversations, not only because it is the most original or interesting but also because it is the most doable in terms of access to data and resource facilities, your expertise in the use of discourse analysis techniques, as well as supervision support. Here are some of the ideas my student interested in comparing Chinese and English writing started off with.

- **Topic 1:** A comparison of Chinese students' essay writing in Chinese and English written in their first year of undergraduate studies
- **Topic 2:** A comparison of students' Master's theses in Chinese and English
- **Topic 3:** An examination of newspaper articles in Chinese and English from an intercultural rhetoric perspective

Each of these questions is influenced by previous research on the topic. Each of them, however, has its problems. The **first topic** is an interesting one. It would be difficult, however, to get texts written by the same students in their first year of undergraduate studies in the two different settings. It is also not certain (or perhaps not even likely) that they will be asked to do the same or even comparable pieces of writing in the two sets of first-year undergraduate study. It is also not likely that a Chinese student who has completed an undergraduate degree in a Chinese university would then do the same undergraduate degree in an English medium university. There is also no suggestion in the first topic as to how the pieces of writing would be analyzed.

The **second topic** is more possible as some Chinese students do go on to do a degree that includes a thesis in English after having done a degree with a thesis component in Chinese. There would, however, be many more students writing coursework essays and assignments in English who had done something similar in Chinese. So there is a problem of gaining sufficient pieces of writing for the study. There is also the problem of gaining access to the students, and hoping the students will still have the pieces of writing that they did when they were students in China. It is, of course, possible to do both of these first two studies with writing done by different students, as most studies of this kind have done.
There is still, however, the problem of getting comparable pieces of writing so that the same, or at least similar things, can be compared.

The **third topic**, in some ways, solves the data collection issue as newspaper texts are publicly available as long as you have access to a library, or an electronic database where previous copies of newspapers are held. The theoretical framework in this topic, intercultural rhetoric, however, in the sense of cultural influences of ways of writing in one language on another, has not been used to examine newspaper articles as it is probably not very common that Chinese writers of newspaper articles are required to write a newspaper article in English. So, while the third topic is practical in many ways, the theoretical framework had not been used to approach it at this stage. My student who was working on this topic decided the notion of genre, rather than intercultural rhetoric, might be a better place to start. He still retained an interest in intercultural rhetoric, however, and wanted to include this in some way in his study. His refocused topic, then, became: **A contrastive study of letters to the editor in Chinese and English.**

DOING DISCOURSE ANALYSIS-III

Turning the Topic into a Research Question

Student had settled on his topic, but it still needed to be turned into a research question. A possible first attempt at this question might be,

- What are the differences between letters to the editor in Chinese and English?

This question however presupposes an outcome before the study has been carried out; that is, that there would indeed be differences between the two sets of writings. The question also does not capture anything of the theoretical models that might be used to answer this question.

The refocused set of questions that my student ended up with was:

1. In what ways are Chinese and English letters to the editor similar or different?
2. Can we use genre theory and intercultural rhetoric to understand these similarities and differences?

His question, hence, became more focused. It did not yet state exactly what aspects of genre theory he would draw on for his analysis, however. These became clearer as he read further on his topic and carried out trial analyses. He then decided to look at the generic structures in the two sets of texts and the typical rhetorical types (such as problem–solution, compare and contrast, etc.) present in the texts. He also decided to look at the use of logico-semantic relations (Martin 1992) between clauses in the two sets of texts as his reading had told him this was an aspect of writing, in some genres at least, that differs in Chinese and English writing.

His questions, therefore, were now worth asking and capable of being answered from a discourse analysis perspective. As he argued, most studies of Chinese and English writing either looked at Chinese, or English writing, but not at both. Also, few studies used the same textual criteria for the two sets of analyses. Many previous studies of this kind, further, focused on 'direct' or 'indirect' aspects of Chinese and English writing and did not go beyond this to explore how the various parts of the texts combine together to create coherent texts. So, what he was doing was theoretically useful, it was possible to collect the texts and he was capable of analyzing the data in the way that he proposed.

It is important, then, as my student did, to strike a balance between the value of the question and your ability to develop a discourse analysis project you are capable of carrying out; that is, a project for which you have the background, expertise, resources and access to data needed. It is also important to spend as much time as is needed to get the research question right as research questions that are well-designed and well-worded is key to a good research project (Sunderland 2010).

Connecting Data Collection, Analysis and Research Questions

Sunderland (2010) provides helpful advice on how to connect data collection and analysis with your research question(s). She suggests completing a table such as the one shown in Table 1.1 to do this.

Table 1.1: Connecting data collection, analysis and research questions (Sunderland 2010)

	Research Question	Data Needed	Data Collection	Data Analysis
1.				
2.				
3.				

However, that things are not always as neat as Table 10.1 might suggest. Sometimes one research question might require more than one set of data or you might be able to use one set of data to address more than one research question. What you will see, however, from your chart is whether there are any gaps that still need to be filled or data that still needs to be collected to address each of your questions (Sunderland 2010).

Kinds of Discourse Analysis Projects

There are a number of different kinds of projects that can be carried out from a discourse analysis perspective. A number of these are described below, together with examples of previous discourse projects and details of the data that were collected for each of these projects.

Replication of previous discourse studies

One kind of study to consider is a replication study. Indeed, there has been a resurgence of interest in these kinds of studies in recent years. The editor of the journal Language Teaching, for example, argues that:

> ***Such research should play a more significant role in the field than it has up to now and that it is both useful and necessary. (Language Teaching review panel 2008)***

As Santos (1989) points out, the findings of many studies are often not tested by further studies which follow the same methodology and a similar data set either at the same point in time or at some stage later when the findings may be different. Santos describes this lack of replication studies as a serious weakness in applied linguistics research. Such studies provide both the accumulation and consolidation of knowledge over time.

Samraj's (2005) study of research article abstracts and introductions is an example of a **replication study**. Her aim was to test the results of previous research into the discourse structure of research article introductions to see whether they apply to articles written in the area of conservation. She also wished to look at whether the discourse structure of the research article abstracts was as different from the discourse structure of research article introductions as previous research had claimed them to be. She analyzed her data using models that had been used in previous research on this topic, namely Swales' (1990) research into research article introductions and Bhatia's (1993) and Hyland's (2004) research on research article abstracts. Once she had compared her findings with the results of previous research, she then compared her two data sets with each other to examine the extent to which they were similar in terms of discourse organization and function, also the focus of previous research.

- **Using different discourse data but the same methodology**

A further way of using previous research is to carry out a study which uses different discourse data from a previous study, but the same methodology so as to be able to compare and contrast your findings with those of the original study. Yang's (1997) study of the opening sequences in Chinese telephone calls did this. She collected 80 Chinese telephone conversations made by three Chinese families living in Beijing. She analyzed the opening sequences of these conversations, then compared her findings with the findings of previous research into opening sequences in telephone calls in the United States and a number of other countries and, in particular, published claims about 'canonical' openings of telephone conversations in English.

- **Analyzing existing data from a discourse analysis perspective**

Channell's (1997) study of telephone conversations took already published data, a conversation supposed to be between the Prince of Wales and Camilla Parker-Bowles, and analyzed it to see in what way the speakers expressed love, what the effect of the telephone was on their talk and what features of the conversation mark it as being the talk of two people who are in a close and intimate relationship. She looked at topic choice and topic management, ways of expressing love and caring, the language of desire and the way in which the speakers said goodbye to each other. Her study confirmed previous work on telephone closings in that both speakers employed an elaborate set of pre-closings and continued repetitions (such as 'love you', 'love you forever' and 'love you too') before concluding their conversation. Anyhow, her study does show the value of taking already existing data to see how discourse analytic techniques can help to further understand already published data.

- **Analyzing discourse data from a different perspective**

Another possibility is to take data that has already been analyzed from one discourse perspective and analyze it from another. Orr (1996) did this in her study of arguments in a reality TV show. Her particular interest was in using conversation analysis as an alternate way of looking at data that had already been examined from a frame semantics perspective (Lee, 1997) to see what this other perspective might reveal about the nature of the interactions. Her study followed the philosophy of conversation analytic studies in that she started with the data and allowed the details of the analysis to emerge from her transcriptions. Through repeated listening's to the data she saw how the speakers challenged and countered each other's points of view in a series of cyclical moves until one or the other speaker accepted the point of the argument.

Focusing on unanalyzed genres

Another possibility is to focus on data that has not been analyzed before and describe characteristic features of the particular discourse. This could, for example, be an analysis of one of the many new genres that are emerging through the use of new technologies, or it may be examples of a genre that has not been analyzed before from a discourse perspective. Ooi (2001) looked at a new and emerging genre in his study of personal advertisements on the internet. His study was based on data collected from internet dating sites in the United States and Singapore. He broke his data up into three groupings based on three types. He then carried out a lexical analysis of the texts, looking at word frequency and collocations by gender and country of origin to see to what extent males and females differ in their expectations of each other, and the kinds of words and expressions they use to express these expectations.

Combining discourse and other research perspectives

Nakane and the Wang studies that have just been described drew on a number of different **discourse analysis** and other **research perspectives** to work towards answers to their research questions. When combining perspectives in this way, it is important to understand the basis of the perspectives being drawn on to appreciate what this placing together implies and, indeed, if it is possible to do this. People working in the area of **conversation analysis**, for example, would consider Nakane's combination of conversation analytic techniques and ethnography impossible as for a conversation analyst the evidence is in the data, and the closest an analyst is able to get to understanding an event is in the transcription and analysis of the data. For them, insiders' views are only intuitions and not, in their view, admissible in the analysis and interpretation of the data. My view, however, is that Nakane strengthened rather than weakened her study by combining perspectives in the way that she did.

Cameron (2005) discusses the problems associated with what she calls 'theoretical and methodological eclecticism'. She points out that sometimes this carries a high risk of superficiality as the researcher may be trying to do too many things at once and not end up doing any of them properly (which is not the case in either the Nakane or the Wang studies).

It is not impossible to mix discourse analysis and other methods. What this requires, however, is 'a clear rationale for putting approaches together, a sophisticated understanding of each approach, and an account of how the tensions between approaches will be handled in [the] study' (127).
A researcher can, then, combine an approach to discourse analysis with a non-discourse analytic perspective on the research, as both Nakane and Wang have done in their studies. Both Nakane and Wang have shown how doing this can provide more of an account of the issue they are examining than might have been possible with just the one, single discourse analysis (or other research) perspective. It is crucial, however, in the planning of this kind of project that each of the approaches are weighed up against each other, identifying what kind of information each approach can (and cannot) supply. By doing this the use of one approach to discourse analysis in

combination with another approach to discourse analysis or other approaches to research can be justified. Indeed, often an approach of this kind can provide a fuller and more explanatory perspective on the question under investigation than might be provided with just the one single perspective.

Lecture-15 Discourse Genre and Critical Discourse Analysis

Genre as social action

Discourse arises among people, in interaction, and it is part of the means by which people accomplish social actions. Meanings arise within the pragmatic unfolding of events and mediate the alignment of participants to perceptions of immediate situations and relevant contexts (whether fictive or non-fictive) called to mind by language. Language is crafted, deployed, and interpreted by individuals in the course of social participation, even when individuals use language in a personally reflective mode, considering one's own identity, commitments, and actions while using received language. Language users (with particular neurophysiological capacities and individual histories of language experience) in the course of interaction call upon the resources of language that are socially and culturally available and that have been typified through histories of social circulation; nonetheless, individuals construct meanings and consequentiality from their perception of particular novel situations and of their participant action in those situations.

- **The thinness of the written sign**

Slide3: In written language, these themes of situated alignment over meaning are both highlighted and obscured. Because written texts often communicate with people at a distance of time and space, the here-and-now existence of one's interlocutor is typically invisible at the moment of writing or reading. If our interlocutors come to mind, they appear as acts of imagination based on limited clues obtained from prior texts or interactions, rather than as embodied presences. Without immediate interactive response we cannot rapidly repair, modify, or expand the utterance to increase alignment. The communicative clues for a successful alignment over meanings and actions must be carried through the arrangement of the few letters of the alphabet in words, sentences, and larger units along with punctuation, graphic elements, and material-ties of the medium.

The thinness of the written signs and the distance from the receiver often leave the writer uncertain whether the produced artifact will evoke the desired meanings and effects. On the receptive side, the reader may struggle with interpretation of what precise meanings could have been intended by the author or other presenter of the signs. The problem of arrangement over limited clues is most distressing when the text is written in a hard-to-read script or in a language the reader has limited familiarity with. Then the reader may be left with just ink marks on paper that cannot be animated into meanings and intentions. Even if the reader is highly literate in the language, ambiguous words, unfamiliar references, novel ideas, difficult syntax, or complex arguments can make an act of reading an imaginative and interpretive challenge.

These thin symbols only interpretable in an approximate way, at a different time and in a different place, by a different person, with different motives and mental contents have proved remarkably robust in allowing communication of the complex thoughts of philosophy, accumulation of extensive interrelated knowledge and theories of science, planning and coordination of large architectural projects, and maintenance of large institutions such as legal systems and government bureaucracies. Meaning is not fully available and immanent in the bare spelled words. Interact ants' familiarity with domains of communication and relevant genres make the kind of communication recognizable: establishing roles, values, domains of content, and general actions that then create the space for more specific, detailed, refined utterances and meanings spelled out in the crafted words.

- **Typification, social organization, and social change**

Genre typifications result from a process of psycho-social category formation. The categories themselves have no permanent substance. Genre taxonomies, nonetheless, can be useful to map users' categories within a defined social historical space and to define widespread functional patterns in vigorous social systems. Further, though human neurobiological organization may favor certain patterns of cognition (such as episodic memory) and perception (such as organization and salience in visual fields), which may in turn lead to preferences for certain sequencing of statements or recognition of text structures, these still operate below the level of organized social utterance within coordinated activity. Even in the short run, major changes in social relations, economic conditions, governmental regulations, disciplinary goals, communicative technologies or other situational dimensions can lead to a rapid genre change. Indeed, the affordances of electronic search, rapid communication, and instantaneous access to wide ranges of information are currently changing genres in numerous social spheres vary rapidly, with further consequences for the social organization of activities, leading to further genre evolution.

What provides for communicative stability is not the genre in itself, but the system of activity that the genre is part of (Engestrom, 1987, 1990; Bazerman, 1994a; Russell, 1997). No matter how stabilized and defining genres may appear within some long enduring social systems, we must also remember that genre is a categorization of an utterance and is not a full account or description of any individual utterance itself and its meaning. Even if a text is widely and unproblematically attributable to a single genre (let us say, a bank cheque), it nonetheless carries out a specific communication in a specific context, identifying payer, payee, bank and account, and dates of transaction and will fail if there is some failure in these elements reported in the document.

Further, these documents can circulate to different situations as parts of different activities, even if the original context is recognized. In a court proceeding, this cheque (recognized as such) may turn into a piece of evidence of fraud (if it meets another very special set of criteria, drawn from legal rules of evidence). Fifty years from now it can become historical evidence of the financial dealings of a famous writer. That is, it may be viewed both variously and multiply in terms of genre. Genres facilitate interpretation of meaning or anticipation of interpretation, and may thereby guide production or reception, but they do not rule absolutely, nor do they displace local acts of meaning making that have evolutionary potential for the systems they are embedded in.

- **Implications for discourse analysis**

The perspective presented here has several clear implications for the analysis of discourse. **First**, discourse occurs within a social situation and should be understood and analyzed, as it operates meaningfully within that situation.

Second, discursive situations are understood by their participants as organized and structured so as to be meaningful and sensible to them. The mechanisms by which definitions of situation and action are shared among participants are at the heart of social systematicity and of the organization of discourse.

Third, the knowledge, thought, and meanings expressed within situated utterances then become part of the ongoing resources and definition of the situation for future utterances. Discourse is to be understood dynamically, within the construction of those situations and of the larger social activity systems within which those utterances occur.

Fourth, regularities of linguistic form usually accompany stabilizations of social groups and activities so, to look for linguistic orders, we should look to social orders; and, to look for social orders, and we should look to linguistic orders. While in the past geography may have been the dominant coverable of linguistic variation, with literacy and other communication at a distance technology the social variables of linguistic variation are increasingly tied to more extensive groupings such as social and cultural institutions, disciplines and professions, work organizations, and media audiences.

Fifth, linguistic entrainment into particular discursive practices goes hand in hand with socialization into activity networks and with cognitive development into the forms of thinking associated with interacting in those activity systems. Internalization of linguistic action transforms into dispositions and orientations.

Sixth, when discourse travels outside of its original ambit, the mechanisms for that wider travel are themselves topics of examination. This includes study of the genres within which such discourses arise, the genres in which they travel, and the genres into which they are received, as well as the processes that occur at the translation border between genres. Those discourses that seem to circulate freely among multiple situations also deserve investigation for the mechanisms by which they appear meaningful at multiple sites and for the differential ways in which they are integrated into different discursive systems and their genres.

In sum, utterances are parts of social life, and the discourses produced within our social life are to be understood within all the dimensions of life. The signs we study are only the residue of complex psychosocial cultural processes, in which they served as mediators of meaning. While we may study them as residues, for the regularities to be found in residues, their fundamental order is only to be found in their full animation as meaningful communication in the unfolding interactions of life. The orders of discourse are to be found in the dynamics of life processes.

DISCOURSE AND GENRE

One of the key ways in which people communicate with each other is through the participation in particular communicative events, or genres. A letter to the editor is an example of a genre. Other examples of genres are news reports, business reports, parliamentary speeches, summing up in a court of law and weather reports.

What is Genre?

Genres are ways in which people 'get things done' through their use of spoken and written discourse. Genres are activities that people engage in through the use of language. Academic lectures and casual conversations are examples of spoken genres. Newspaper reports and academic essays are examples of written genres. Instances of a genre often share a number of features. They may be spoken or written in typical, and sometimes conventional, ways. They also often have a common function and purpose (or set of functions and purposes). Genres may typically be performed by a particular person aimed at a particular audience. Genres change through time. This may, for example, be in response to changes in technologies or it may be as a result of changes in values underlying the use of the particular genre.

Genre analysis and English for specific purposes

The approach to genre analysis commonly employed in the teaching of English for specific purposes is based on Swales' (1981, 1990, 2004) analyses of the discourse structure of research article introductions. Swales use the notion of moves to describe the discourse structure of texts. In his book Genre analysis Swales (1990) argued that communicative purpose was the key factor that leads a person to decide whether a text is an instance of a particular genre or not. He has since, however, revised this view, saying that it is now clear that genres may have multiple purposes and that these may be different for each of the participants involved (Askehave and Swales 2001). Also, instances of a genre which are similar linguistically and rhetorically may have 'startling differences in communicative purpose' in the words of Swales and Rogers (1995). The communicative purpose of a genre, further, may evolve over time. It may change, it may expand or it may shrink (Swales 2004). Communicative purpose, further, can vary across cultures even when texts belong to the same genre category.

Rhetorical genre studies

Researchers in rhetorical genre studies describe genres as part of the social processes by which knowledge about reality and the world are made. Genres, in this view, both respond to and contribute to the constitution of social contexts, as well as the socialization of individuals. Genres, then, are more than just socially embedded; they are socially constructive.
Linguists such as Hasan (1989) have suggested that the crucial properties of a genre can be expressed as a range of possible textual structures. Martin (1992), equally, puts forward the view that genres can be defined in terms of similarities and differences in the discourse structures of the texts. While discourse structure is clearly a characterizing feature of some genres, it is not always the case that every instance of a particular genre will have exactly the same discourse structure (nor indeed the same communicative purpose) (Askehave and Swales 2000).

Communicative purpose is an important (although complex) criterion for deciding whether a text is an instance of a particular genre. That is, a text may be presented in an unusual way (for that particular genre) but still have the same communicative aim as other instances of the particular genre. In some cases, the text might be considered a 'best example' of the particular genre, and in others, it might be so atypical as to be considered a 'problematic' example of the genre.

The issue of genre identification is, thus, a complex one and requires a flexible rather than a static view of what it is that leads users of a language to recognize a communicative event as an instance of a particular genre. A key factor in this process lies in a perspective on genre based on the notion of prototype (Rosch 1978, 1983) rather than on sets of defining features. Genres are most helpfully seen as 'resources for meaning' rather than 'systems of rules' (Swales 2002).

Steps in Genre Analysis

Bhatia (1993) and Bawarshi and Reiff (2010) present steps for carrying out the analysis of genres, in their case written genres. It is not necessary to go through all the stages that they list, nor in the order in which they are presented. For example, we may decide to take a 'text-first' or a 'context-first' approach to the analysis of a particular genre (Flowerdew 2002, 2011). That is, we may decide to start by looking at typical discourse patterns in the texts we are interested in (a text-first approach), or we may decide to start with an examination of the context of the texts we want to investigate (a context-first approach). The steps, then, should be used flexibly and selectively depending on the starting point of the analysis, the purpose of the analysis, the aspect of the genre that we want to focus on and the level of prior knowledge we already have of the particular genre.

The first step, however, is to collect samples of the genre you are interested in. Bhatia suggests taking a few randomly chosen texts for exploratory investigation, a single typical text for detailed analysis, or a larger sample of texts if we wish to investigate a few specified features. Clearly, the more samples you can collect of the genre, however, the better you will be able to identify typical features of the genre.

The next step is to consider what is already known about the particular genre. This includes knowledge of the setting in which it occurs as well as any conventions that are typically associated with the genre. For information on this, we can go to existing literature such as guide books and manuals as well as seek practitioner advice on the particular genre. It is also helpful to look at what analyses have already have been carried out of the particular genre, or other related genres, by looking at research articles or books on the topic.

We next need to refine the analysis by defining the speaker or writer of the text, the audience of the text and their relationship with each other. That is, who uses the genre, who writes in the genre, who reads the genre and what roles the readers perform as they read the text?

We also need to consider the goal, or purpose, of the texts. That is, why do writers write this genre, why do readers read it and what purpose does the genre have for the people who use it?

A further important consideration is typical discourse patterns for the genre. That is, how are the texts typically organized, how are they typically presented in terms of layout and format and what are some language features that typically re-occur in the particular genre? Equally, what do people need to know to take part in the genre, and what view of the world does the text assume of its readers? That is, what values, beliefs and assumptions are assumed or revealed by the particular genre (Bawarshi and Reiff 2010)?

We should also think about the networks of texts that surround the genre and to what extent knowledge of these is important in order be able to write or make sense of a particular genre.

The social and cultural context of genres

An important stage in genre analysis, formerly, is an examination of the social and cultural context in which the genre is used. In the case of a written text, factors that might be considered Include:

- The setting of the text
- The focus and perspective of the text
- The purpose of the text
- The intended audience for the text, their role and purpose in reading the text

The relationship between writers and readers of the text; expectations, conventions and requirements for the text

- The background knowledge, values and understandings it is assumed the writer shares with their readers, including what is important to the reader and what is not The relationship of the text has with other texts.

These aspects of a genre, of course, are not as distinct as they appear in this kind a listing. As Yates and Orlikowski (2007) point out, they are deeply intertwined and each, in its way, has an impact on what a writer writes, and the way they write it.

These are the range of factors that impact on how the text is written, how it will be read and, importantly, how it will be assessed.

Setting of the text		The kind of university and level of study, the kind of degree (e.g., honors, master's or doctoral, research or professional)
		Study carried out in a 'hard' or 'soft', pure or applied, convergent or divergent area of study Becher and Trowler 2001)
Focus and perspective of the text		Quantitative, qualitative or mixed method research
		Claims that can be made, claims that cannot be made
		Faculty views on what is 'good' research
Purpose of the text		To answer a question, to solve a problem, to prove something, to contribute to knowledge, to display knowledge and understanding, to demonstrate particular skills, to convince a reader, to gain admission to a particular area of study

Audience, role and purpose in reading the text	• To judge the quality of the research • Primary readership of one or more examiners, secondary readership of the supervisor and anyone else the student shows their work to • How readers will react to what they read, the criteria they will use for assessing the text, who counts the most in judging the quality of the text
Relationship between writers and readers of the text	• Students writing for experts, for admission to an area of study (the primary readership), students writing for peers, for advice (the secondary readership)
Expectations, conventions and requirements for the text	• An understanding and critical appraisal of relevant literature • A clearly defined and comprehensive investigation of the research topic • Appropriate use of research methods and techniques for the research question • Ability to interpret results, develop conclusions and link them to previous research • Level of critical analysis, originality and contribution to knowledge expected • Literary quality and standard of presentation expected • Level of grammatical accuracy required • How the text is typically organized, how the text might vary for a particular research topic, • area of study, kind of study and research perspective • What is typically contained in each chapter • The amount of variation allowed in what should be addressed and how it should be addressed • The university's formal submission requirements in terms of format, procedures and timing
Background knowledge, values	• The background knowledge, values and understandings it is assumed students will share with their readers – what is important to their readers, what is not important to their readers • How much knowledge students are expected to display, the
and understandings	extent to which students should show what they know, what issues students should address, what boundaries students can cross

Relationship the text has with other texts	How to show the relationship between the present research and other people's research on the topic, what counts as valid previous research, acceptable and unacceptable textual borrowings, differences between reporting and plagiarizing

Lesson-45

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Critical discourse analysis explores the connections between the **use of language** and the **social** and **political** contexts in which it occurs. It explores issues such as **gender**, **ethnicity**, **cultural difference**, **ideology** and **identity** and how these are both constructed and reflected in texts. It also investigates ways in which language constructs and is constructed by social relationships. A critical analysis may include a detailed textual analysis and move from there to an explanation and interpretation of the analysis. It might proceed from there to deconstruct and challenge the text being examined. This may include tracing underlying ideologies from the linguistic features of a text, unpacking particular biases and ideological presuppositions underlying the text, and relating the text to other texts and to people's experiences and beliefs. **Critical discourse analysis** starts with the assumption that language use is always social and that discourse both 'reflects and constructs the social world' (Rogers 2011).

Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis

There is no single view of what critical discourse analysis actually is, so it is difficult to present a complete, unified view on this. Fairclough and Wodak (1997), however, describe a number of principles for critical discourse analysis which underlie many of the studies done in this area. These include

- Social and political issues are constructed and reflected in discourse
- Power relations are negotiated and performed through discourse
- Discourse both reflects and reproduces social relations
- Ideologies are produced and reflected in the use of discourse

Social and political issues are constructed and reflected in discourse

The first of Fairclough and Wodak's principles is that critical discourse analysis addresses social and political issues and examines ways in which these are constructed and reflected in the use of certain discourse strategies and choices.

Power relations are negotiated and performed through discourse

The next principle of critical discourse analysis is that power relations are both negotiated and performed through discourse. One way in which this can be looked at is through an analysis of who controls conversational interactions, who allows a person to speak and how they do this.

Discourse both reflects and reproduces social relations

A further principle of critical discourse analysis is that discourse not only reflects social relations but is also part of, and reproduces, social relations. That is, social relations are both established and maintained through the use of discourse.

Ideologies are produced and reflected in the use of discourse

Another key principle of critical discourse analysis is that ideologies are produced and reflected in the use of discourse. This includes ways of representing and constructing society such as relations of power, and relations based on gender, class and ethnicity.

Critical discourse analysis 'includes not only a description and interpretation of discourse in context, but also offers an explanation of why and how discourses work' (Rogers 2004).

Researchers working within this perspective are concerned with a critical theory of the social world, the relationship of language and discourse in the construction and representation of the social world, and a methodology that allows them to describe, interpret and explain such relationships. (Rogers 2011)

Doing critical discourse analysis

Researchers working within this perspective *are concerned with a critical theory of the social world, the relationship of language and discourse in the construction and representation of the social world, and a methodology that allows them to describe, interpret and explain such relationships. (Rogers 2011)*

A critical analysis, then, might commence by deciding what discourse type, or genre, the text represents and to what extent and in what way the text conforms to it (or not). It may also consider to what extent the producer of the text has gone beyond the normal boundaries for the genre to create a particular effect.

The analysis may consider the framing of the text; that is, how the content of the text is presented, and the sort of angle or perspective the writer or speaker is taking. Closely related to framing is the notion of foregrounding; that is, what concepts and issues are emphasized, as well as what concepts and issues are played down or back-grounded in the text. Equally important to the analysis are the background knowledge, assumptions, attitudes and points of view that the text presupposes (Huckin 1997).

At the sentence level, the analyst might consider what has been tropicalized in each of the sentences in the text; that is, what has been put at the front of each sentence to indicate what it is 'about'. The analysis may also consider who is doing what to whom; that is, agent-patient relations in the discourse, and who has the most authority and power in the discourse. It may also consider what agents have been left out of sentences such as when the passive voice is used, and why this has been done.

At the word and phrase level, connotations of particular words and phrases might be considered as well as the text's degree of formality or informality, degree of technicality and what this means for other participants in the text. The choice of words which express degrees of certainty and attitude may also be considered and whether the intended audience of the text might be expected to share the views expressed in the text, or not.
The procedure an analyst follows in this kind of analysis depends on the research situation, the research question and the texts that are being studied. What is essential, however? is that there is some attention to the critical, discourse and analysis in whatever focus is taken up in the analysis (Rogers 2011).

Critical discourse analysis, then, takes us beyond the level of description to a deeper understanding of texts and provides, as far as might be possible, some kind of explanation of why a text is as it is and what it is aiming to do. It looks at the relationship between discourse and society and aims to describe, interpret and explain this relationship. As van Dijk (1998) has argued, it is through discourse that many ideologies are formulated, reinforced and reproduced. Critical discourse analysis aims to provide a way of exploring this and, in turn, challenging some of the hidden and 'out of sight' social, cultural and political ideologies and values that underlie texts.

Discourse Analysis and Multimodality

Multimodal discourse analysis considers how texts draw on modes of communication such as pictures, film, video, images and sound in combination with words to make meaning. It has examined print genres as well as genres such as web pages, film and television programs. It considers how multimodal texts are designed and how semiotic tools such as colour, framing, focus and positioning of elements contribute to the making of meaning in these texts.

Much of the work in multimodal discourse analysis draws from Halliday's (1978, 1989) social semiotic approach to language, a view that considers language as one among a number of semiotic resources (such as gesture, images and music) that people use to communicate, or make meaning, with each other. Language, in this view, cannot be considered in isolation from meaning but needs to be considered within the sociocultural context in which it occurs. Multimodal discourse analysis, thus, aims to describe the socially situated semiotic resources that we draw on for communication. Halliday (2009) describes three types of social meanings, or functions that are drawn on simultaneously in the use of language. These are ideational (what the text is about), interpersonal (relations between participants) and textual meanings (how the message is organized). In multimodal texts these meanings are realized visually in how the image conveys aspects of the real world (the ideational, or representational meaning of the image), how the images engage with the viewer (the interpersonal, or modal meaning of the image) and how the elements in an image are arranged to archive its intention or effect (the textual, or compositional meaning of the image).

Jewitt (2009) describes four theoretical assumptions that underlie multimodal discourse analysis. The **first** is that language is part of an ensemble of modes, each of which has equal potential to contribute to meaning. Images, gaze and posture, thus, do not just support meaning, they each contribute to meaning. The **second** is that each mode of communication realizes different meanings and that looking at language as the principal (or sole) medium of communication only reveals a partial view of what is being communicated. The **third** assumption is that people select from and configure these various modes in order to make meaning and that the interaction between these modes and the distribution of meanings between them are part of the production of meaning. The **fourth** assumption is that meanings that are made by the use of multimodal resources are, like language, social. These meanings, further, are shaped by the norms, rules and social conventions for the genre that are current at the particular time, in the particular context.