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1. **Introduction** 
   1. **Definition of discourse analysis**

**Discourse**

Discourse analysis may, broadly speaking, be defined as the study of language viewed communicatively and/or of communication viewed linguistically. Discourse" is here understood to mean only a specific communicative event, in general, and a written or oral form of verbal interaction or language use, in particular. In the broader, "semiotic" sense, discourses may also feature nonverbal expressions such as drawings, pictures, gestures, face-work, and so on the sociosemiotic approach views language as the embodiment of the social process in a society.

**Discourse analysis** (DA), or **discourse studies**, is a general term for a number of approaches to analyzing written, vocal, or sign language use or any significant Semiotic event.

The objects of discourse analysis is discourse, writing, conversation, communicative Symbolic\_interactionism —are variously defined in terms of coherent sequences of sentences, propositions, speech acts, or turn takings. Contrary to much of traditional linguistics, discourse analysts not only study language use 'beyond the sentence boundary', but also prefer to analyze 'naturally occurring' language use, and not invented examples. The essential difference between discourse analysis and text linguistics is that it aims at revealing socio-psychological characteristics of a person/persons rather than text structure.

Discourse analysis has been taken up in a variety of social science disciplines, including linguistics, education, sociology, anthropology, social work, Cognitive psychology, Social psychology, International\_relations, human geography, communication studies, and translation studies each of which is subject to its own assumptions, dimensions of analysis, and methodologies.

It is difficult to give a single definition of discourse. Different scholars gave different definitions for discourse. Some of them are the following:

*1. discourse is language use in speech and writing- as a form of ‘social practice’, describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discourse event and the situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s) which frame it. A dialectical relationship is a two-way relationship: the discursive event is shaped by situations, institutions and social structures, but it also shapes them. To put the same point in a different way, discourse is both socially constitutive as well as socially shaped: it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive both in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997:258).*

1. *Discourse refers to the use of language in social contexts (Seidlhofer, 2003:133).*
2. *Discourse is shaped by culture/setting, language, participant, prior discourse, medium, and purpose (Johnstone, 2000:124-6). “Discourse is both the source of knowledge (people’s generalizations about language are made on the basis of the discourse they participate in) and the result of it (people apply what they already know in creating and interpreting new discourse)” (Ibid: 2008: 3). Unlike traditional linguistics, discourse analysts focus on language use 'beyond the sentence boundary' by 'naturally occurring' talks or signs, and not made-up examples. Gumperz (1997:40) affirms that “discourse consists of more than the sum of component utterances.”*
3. *Johnstone (2000:103) says discourse is ‘language in use’.*
4. *Fairclough, after Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics, established that discourse contributes to the construction of social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and meaning (Wodak, 2002: 17; Jorgensen, and Phillips, 2002:67; Blommaert, 2005:23). Hence, discourse has three functions: an identity function, a ‘relational’ function and an ‘ideational’ function. This three dimensional discourse which Fairclough (1995) has constructed is a useful framework for the analysis of discourse as social practice (Jorgensen, and Phillips, 2002:64). “I see discourse as a complex of three elements: social practice, discursive\practice (text production, distribution and consumption), and text, and the analysis of a specific discourse calls for analysis in each of these three dimensions and their interrelations” (Fairclough, 1995:74).*
5. *Van Dijk offers a more thorough-going theoretical base for socio-cognitive analysis (O’Halloran, 2011:449). Van Dijk gives special attention to the role of cognition to understand and interpret texts and discourse. Macrostructure and microstructure of Van Dijk is also an important framework for discourse analysis. Macrostructure “is used to account for the various notions of global meaning, such as topic, theme, or gist. This implies that macrostructures in discourse are semantic objects” (Van Dijk, 1980: 1). Related to Macro and Micro structure of Van Dijk is what Gee calls “discourse” and “Discourse” (1999:7): the former refers to instances of language in use, actual speech events; the latter to (far more abstract) ways of using language.*
6. *The discourse-historical approach is associated with Ruth Wodak. Wodak emphasises on considering the wider context of discourse (Wooffitt, 2005:138). She gives importance on the contextualizing and historicizing of texts (O’Halloran, 2011:449).*
7. *Discourse “refers to socially shared habits of thought, perception, and behaviour reflected in numerous texts belonging to different genres” (Scollon and Scollon, 2001:538). According to Gumperz (1997:40), “discourse consists of more than the sum of component utterances.” This means there is more to discourse than to the linguistic repertoire of the discrete elements. In CDA, discourse is language use in speech and writing which is a form of ‘social practice’ (Wodak, 2002:7). Discourse means anything from history, narratives, text, talk, a speech, topic-related conversations; stretching the meaning of discourse from a genre to a register and to a code and language (Wodak and Meyer, 2009:3).*
8. *I see discourses as ways of representing aspects of the world — the processes, relations and structures of the material world, the `mental world' of thoughts, feelings, beliefs and so forth, and the social world. Particular aspects of the world may be represented differently, so we are generally in the position of having to consider the relationship between different discourses. Different discourses are different perspectives on the world, and they are associated with the different relations people have to the world, which in turn depends on their positions in the world, their social and personal identities, and the social relationships in which they stand to other people. Discourses not only represent the world as it is (or rather is seen to be), they are also projective, imaginaries, representing possible worlds which are different from the actual world, and tied in to projects to change the world in particular directions. The relationships between different discourses are one element of the relationships between different people — they may complement one another, compete with one another, one can dominate others, and so forth. Discourses constitute part of the resources which people deploy in relating to one another — keeping separate from one another, cooperating, competing, dominating — and in seeking to change the ways in which they relate to one another. (Fairclough, 2003:87)*
9. *People build identities and activities not just through language but by using language together with other ‘stuff’ that isn’t language. If you want to get recognized as a street-gang member of a certain sort, you have to speak in the ‘right’ way, but you have to act and dress in the ‘right’ way, as well. You also have to engage (or, at least, behave as if you are engaging) in characteristic ways of thinking, acting, interacting, valuing, feeling, and believing. You also have to use or be able to use various sorts of symbols (e.g., graffiti), tools (e.g. a weapon), and objects (e.g., street corners) in the ‘right’ places and at the ‘right’ times. You can’t just ‘talk the talk’ you have to ‘walk the walk’ as well. The same is true of doing/being a corporate lawyer, Marine sergeant, radical feminist, or a regular at the local bar. One and the same person might talk, act, and interact in such a way as to get recognized as a ‘street-gang member’ in one context and in another context, talk, act, and interact in quite different ways so as to get recognized as a ‘gifted student.’ And, indeed, these two identities, and their associated ways of talking, acting, and interacting, may well conflict with each other in some circumstances (in which different people expect different identities from the person), as well as in the person’s own mind. I use the term ‘Discourse’ with a capital ‘D’ for ways of combining and integrating language, actions, interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and using various symbols, tools, and objects to enact a particular sort of socially recognizable identity. Thinking about the different Discourses a piece of language is part of is another tool for engaging in language studies. (James Paul Gee, 1999: 20-21)*

So, discourse is:

* ‘...group of statements which provide a language for talking about…a particular topic at a particular historical moment…Discourse is about the production of knowledge through language...’ (Hall, 1992: 291).
* Anything can be discourse.
* More macro-level: Less focus on micro-level interactional issues.

A discourse is a language or system of representation that has developed socially in order to make and circulate a coherent set of meanings about an important topic area.

In the Social\_sciences, a discourse is considered to be an institutionalized way of thinking, a social boundary defining what can be said about a specific topic. Discourses are seen to affect our views on all things; in other words, it is not possible to escape discourse. For example, two distinctly different discourses can be used about various guerrilla movements describing them either as "freedom fighters" or "terrorists". In other words, the chosen discourse delivers the vocabulary, expressions and perhaps also the style needed to communicate. (Wikipedia)

Discourse is:

* discourse = a conversation or text
* discourse = collection of texts or conversations
* discourse = a shared way of talking or creating texts (code)
* discourses = codes, languages, ways of speaking of a topic

in sum, Discourse can be defined in three ways:

* Language beyond the level of a sentence
* Language behaviours linked to social practices
* Language as a system of thought

Discourse Analysis (DA) is a modern discipline of the social sciences that covers a wide variety of different sociolinguistics approaches. It aims to study and analyse the use of discourse in at least one of the three ways stated above, and more often than not, all of them at once. Analysis of discourse looks not only at the basic level of what is said, but takes into consideration the surrounding social and historical contexts. Discourse analysts will look at any given text, and this just means anything that communicates a message, and particularly, how that message constructs a social reality or view of the world.

Discourse analysis (DA), or discourse studies, is a general term for a number of approaches to analyze written, vocal, or sign language use, or any significant Semiotic event.

The objects of discourse analysis is discourse, writing, conversation, communicative event are variously defined in terms of coherent sequences of sentences, propositions, speeches or turns at talk.  Contrary to much of traditional linguistics, discourse analysts not only study language use 'beyond the sentence boundary', but also prefer to analyze 'naturally occurring' language use, and not invented examples.

A sub-discipline of DA is ‘Critical Discourse Analysis’ (CDA), and this looks at discourse from a politically motivated level. An analyst in this field will identify a topic for analysis, and then collect a corpus of texts, before finally analysing it to identify how language is used to reproduce ideologies in the text. A corpus is large, structured electronic database of texts, often used in linguistics. Using a corpus isn't the only method of analysis in CDA, as any method which provides an insight into ideology in discourse is accepted by researchers.

1. **Approaches to discourse analysis**

Among the different approaches to discourse analysis include:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rules and principles | • pragmatics (including speech act theory and politeness theory)  • conversation analysis |
| Contexts and cultures | • ethnography of communication  • interactional sociolinguistics |
| Functions and structures | • systemic-functional linguistics (SFL)  • Birmingham school discourse analysis  • text-linguistics |
| Power and politics | • pragmatic and sociolinguistic approaches to power in language  • critical discourse analysis |

* **Speech Act Theory**: the study of the activities performed by utterances and the investigation of the pre-conditions necessary for an utterance to be interpreted as a particular kind of act;
* **Interactional Sociolinguistics**: the analysis of the ways in which common grammatical knowledge may be mobilised by different social or ethnic groups, leading to misalignment in understanding, or the ways in which particular linguistic features are produced for particular settings and contexts. Interactional sociolinguistics is an approach that combines anthropology, sociology and linguistics as they focus on the interplay between language, culture, and society. As a discipline, it combines description and analysis of natural data with a method for developing and adjusting interpretations of the data.
* **The Ethnography of Communication**: a broadly anthropologically oriented approach which investigates communicative competencies specific to different cultures;
* **Pragmatics**: the branch of linguistics which studies language use, as opposed to the structure of language;
* **Conversation Analysis**: the analysis of the sequential organisation of interaction.

|  |
| --- |
| Quiz/Assignment I 10% |
|  |

* 1. **Discourse and pragmatics**
  2. **speech act theory**

Speech acts are acts done in the process of speaking. Speech act theory attempts to explain how speakers use language to accomplish intended actions and how hearers infer intended meaning from what is said. speech act studies are considered a sub-discipline of pragmatics. Philosophers like Austin (1962), Grice (1957), and Searle (1965, 1969, 1975) offered basic insight into this new theory of linguistic communication based on the assumption that “the minimal units of human communication are not linguistic expressions, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving directions, apologizing, thanking, and so on.”

The assumption is that every normal utterance has both a descriptive and an effective aspect: that saying something is also doing something. Austin (1962: 101) illustrates the distinction between these kinds of acts with the example of saying “Shoot her!,” which he trisects as follows:

Act (A) or Locution

He said to me “Shoot her!”

Act (B) or Illocution

He urged (or advised, ordered, etc.) me to shoot her.

Act (C) or Perlocution

He persuaded me to shoot her.

According to Austin’s theory, these functional units of communication have prepositional or locutionary meaning (the literal meaning of the utterance), illocutionary meaning (the social function of the utterance), and perlocutionary force (the effect produced by the utterance in a given context)

According to Austin's theory (1962), what we say has three kinds of meaning:

1.      locutionary or propositional meaning - the literal meaning of what is said

*It's hot in here.*

2.      illocutionary meaning - the social function of what is said

'*It's hot in here'*  could be:

- an indirect request for someone to open the window

- an indirect refusal to close the window because someone is cold

- a complaint implying that someone should know better than to keep the windows closed

3.      perlocutionary meaning - the effect of what is said

'*It's hot in here'* could result in someone opening the windows

**Classifying illocutionary speech acts**

Based on Austin's (1962), and Searle's (1969) theory, Cohen ( 1996) identifies five categories of speech acts based on the functions assigned to them.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Representatives | Directives | Expressives | Comissives | Declaratives |
| Assertions | suggestions | apologies | Promises | Decrees |
| Claims | Requests | complaint | Threats | Declarations |
| Reports | Commands | Thanks | Offers |  |

Searle (1975) has set up the following classification of illocutionary speech acts:

* **assertives** = speech acts that commit a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, e.g. reciting a creed
* **directives** = speech acts that are to cause the hearer to take a particular action, e.g. requests, commands and advice
* **commissives** = speech acts that commit a speaker to some future action, e.g. promises and oaths
* **expressives** = speech acts that express the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards the proposition, e.g. congratulations, excuses and thanks
* **declarations** = speech acts that change the reality in accord with the proposition of the declaration, e.g. baptisms, pronouncing someone guilty or pronouncing someone husband and wife
  1. **relevance theory**

Relevance theory focuses on the relationship between meaning and context, both text-external and text-internal context (the latter is sometimes called “co-text”)

|  |
| --- |
| **Quiz/assignment II 10%** |
| * + **What is relevance theory?** |

* 1. **Politeness theory**

Politeness theory deals with the concept of face, with acts which are potentially damaging to face, and with the linguistic stratagems used for limiting such damage, when it is unavoidable. It is informed not only by linguistic pragmatics but also by social psychology and linguistic anthropology.

**Politeness theory** is the theory that accounts for the redressing of the affronts to face posed by face-threatening acts to addressees. First formulated in 1978 by Penelope\_Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, politeness theory has since expanded academia’s perception of politeness. Face (self image)threats carried by certain face threatening acts toward another (Mills, 2003, p. 6). Another definition is "a battery of social skills whose goal is to ensure everyone feels affirmed in a social interaction". Being polite therefore consists of attempting to Face (self image) for another. Face is the public self image that every adult tries to protect. Positive Face refers to one's self-esteem, while negative face refers to one's freedom to act.

According to Brown and Levinson, positive and negative face exist universally in human culture. In social interactions, face-threatening acts are at times inevitable based on the terms of the conversation. A face threatening act is an act that inherently damages the face of the addressee or the speaker by acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the other. Most of these acts are verbal; however, they can also be conveyed in the characteristics of speech (such as tone, inflection, or in non-verbal forms of communication.

**Positive politeness**

Positive politeness strategies seek to minimize the threat to the hearer’s positive face. They are used to make the hearer feel good about himself, his interests or possessions, and are most usually used in situations where the audience knows each other fairly well. Politeness theory In addition to hedging and attempts to avoid conflict, some strategies of positive politeness include statements of friendship, solidarity, compliments, and the following examples:

* Attend to H’s interests, needs, wants

*You look sad. Can I do anything?*

* Use solidarity in-group identity markers

*Heh, mate, can you lend me money?*

* Be optimistic

*I’ll just come along, if you don’t mind.*

* Include both speaker (S) and hearer (H) in activity

*If we help each other, I guess, we’ll both sink or swim in this course.*

* Offer or promise

*If you wash the dishes, I’ll vacuum the floor.*

* Exaggerate interest in H and his interests

*That’s a nice haircut you got; where did you get it?*

* Avoid Disagreement

*Yes, it’s rather long; not short certainly.*

* Joke

*Wow, that’s a lie!*

**Negative politeness**

Negative politeness strategies are oriented towards the hearer’s negative face and emphasize avoidance of imposition on the hearer. These strategies presume that the speaker will be imposing on the listener and there is a higher potential for awkwardness or embarrassment than in bald on record strategies and positive politeness strategies. Negative face is the desire to remain autonomous so the speaker is more fitting to the listener, through distancing styles like apologies. Examples:

* Be indirect

*Would you know where Wollo University is?*

* Use hedges or questions

*Perhaps, he might have taken it, maybe.*

*Could you please pass the rice?*

* Be pessimistic

*You couldn’t find your way to lending me one thousand birr could you?*

* Minimize the imposition

*It’s not too much out of your way, just a couple of blocks.*

* Use obviating structures, like passives, or statements of general rules

*Spitting will not be tolerated.*

* Apologize

*I’m sorry; it’s a lot to ask, but can you lend me one thousand birr?*

* Use plural pronouns

*We regret to inform you.*

* 1. **conversational implicature**

Conversational implicatures have become one of the principal subjects of pragmatics. It refers to an inference that can be drawn from an utterance, as from one that is seemingly illogical or irrelevant, by examining the degree to which it conforms to the canons of normal conversation and the way it functions pragmatically within the situation, as when “The phone is ringing,” said in a situation where both speaker and listener can clearly hear the phone, can be taken as a suggestion to answer the phone. H. P. Grice (1913–1988) was the first to systematically study cases in which what a *speaker* means differs from what the *sentence* used by the speaker means. Consider the following dialogue.

Alan: Are you going to Paul's party?

Barb: I have to work.

According to Grice, utterance interpretation is not a matter of decoding messages, but rather involves

(1) taking the meaning of the sentences together with contextual information,

(2) using inference rules

(3) working out what the speaker means on the basis of the assumption that the utterance conforms to the maxims. The main advantage of this approach from Grice ’ s point of view is that it provides a pragmatic explanation for a wide range of phenomena, especially for conversational implicautres - a kind of extra meaning that is not literally contained in the utterance.

The following rules of conversation**,** which together constitute theCooperative Principle**:**

1. Quantity: give the right amount of information (not too little, not too much).   
2. Quality: try to say only what is true (don't say that for which you lack adequate evidence; don't say what you know to be false).   
3. Relevance: make what you say relevant to the topic at hand.   
4. Manner: be clear (avoid ambiguity, excessive wordiness, obscurity, etc.).

Implicatures arise from the interaction of the following 3 factors:

1. The proposition actually expressed in the utterance,   
   2. Possibly certain features of the context   
   3. The assumption that the speaker is obeying the rules of conversation to the best of their ability.

Example:

A: Will Sally be at the meeting this afternoon?

B. Her car broke down.

meaning: Sally won't be at the meeting.

Impliciture is to be distinguished from Grice’s (1967a) conversational *implicature*. In implicature one says and communicates one thing and thereby communicates something else in addition. Impliciture is a matter of saying something but communicating something else instead, something closely related to what is said. Part of what is communicated is only implicit in what is explicitly expressed.

According to Grice, conversational implicatures can arise from either strictly and directly observing or deliberately and openly flouting the maxims, that is, speakers can produce implicatures in two ways: observance and non-observance of the maxims.

* Ex. (1) Husband: Where are the car keys?
* Wife: They ’ re on the table in the hall.

The wife has answered clearly (manner) and truthfully (Quality), has given just the right amount of information (Quantity) and has directly addressed her husband ’ s goal in asking the question (Relation). She has said precisely what she meant, no more and no less.

**Quantity:**

* + Say no less than the conversation requires.
  + Say no more than the conversation requires.

**Quality:**

* + Don't say what you believe to be false.
  + Don't say things for which you lack evidence.

**Manner:**

* + Don't be obscure.
  + Don't be ambiguous.
  + Be brief.
  + Be orderly.

**Relevance:**

* + Be relevant.
  1. **cooperative principle**

A principle proposed by the philosopher Paul Grice whereby those involved in communication assume that both parties will normally seek to cooperate with each other to establish agreed meaning.

Grice’s Cooperative Principle is an assumed basic concept in pragmatics. Grice says that when we communicate we assume, without realising it, that we, and the people we are talking to, will be conversationally cooperative - we will cooperate to achieve mutual conversational ends. It is composed of four maxims (rules): quality, quantity, relation, and manner.

Grice's cooperative principle: set of norms expected in conversation. Grice proposes four maxims expected in conversation.

* quality: speaker tells the truth or provable by adequate evidence
* quanity: speaker is as informative as required
* relation: response is relevant to topic of discussion
* manner: speaker's avoids ambiguity or obscurity, is direct and straightforward
  1. **conversational maxims**

Grice's four maxims establish important norms of discourse that different genres and strategies work with.

|  |
| --- |
| **The conversational maxims** |
| Quantity: (quantity of information)   Give the most helpful amount of information. |
| Quality: (quality of information)   Do not say what you believe to be false. |
| Relation: Be relevant. |
| Manner: Put what you say in the clearest, briefest, and most orderly manner. |

* 1. **discourse in communication**
     1. **Context**

Context comes in various shapes and operates at various levels, from the infinitely small to the infinitely big. The infinitely small would be the fact that every sentence produced by people occurs in a unique environment of preceding and subsequent sentences, and consequently derives part of its meaning from these other sentences. The infinitely small can also pertain to one single sound becoming a very meaningful thing -- ‘yes’ pronounced with a falling intonation is declarative and affirmative; spoken with a rising intonation it becomes a question or an expression of amazement or disbelief. The infinitely big would be the level of universals of human communication and of human societies -- the fact that humanity is divided into women and men, young and old people, and so on. In between both extremes lies a world of different phenomena, operating at all levels of society and across societies, from the level of the individual all the way up to the level of the world system. Context is *potentially* everything and contextualization is *potentially* infinite. But, remarkably, in actual practice it appears to be to some extent predictable.

The knowledge that members of communities have of ways of speaking includes knowing when, where and how to speak, what to speak about, with whom, and so forth. The idea that we need, in addition to a theory of grammatical competence, a theory of *communicative* competence (Hymes, 1972) arises from this fact. Speakers need knowledge not only of what is grammatically possible but also of what is appropriate and typically done. Interactional sociolinguistics (Schiffrin, 1994; Gumperz, 2001) aims at “replicable analysis that accounts for our ability to interpret what participants intend to convey in everyday communicative practice” (Gumperz, 2001). It pays particular attention to culturally specific contextual presuppositions, to the signals – “contextualisation cues” such as code- and style-switching, and prosodic and lexical choices – which signal these, and to the potential for misunderstanding which exists in culturally complex situations.

**b. Types of Discourse**

* **by medium**: spoken, written, recorded, etc.
* **by (sub)genre**: literary, expository, academic, conversation, etc.
* **by register**: formal, informal, argotic, etc.
* **by context**: classroom, workplace, political, etc.
* **by way of obtaining**: solicited, unsolicited, etc.
* **by power context**: equal, unequal, open, hidden etc.
* **by illocutionary force**: persuading, concealing, etc.
* **by mode/semiotic system**: language, gesture, material goods, art

1. **literary and non-literary discourse/text**

The label “non-literary text”, as broad as it may seem, covers a wide range of texts from administrative, legal and other official documents, via economic and business texts, scientific, technical up to publicist texts.

As far as the language of non-literary texts is concerned, it is formal.

The most important feature of a literary work of art is that it is a bearer of an aesthetic function. Literary text comes into existence as a subjectively transformed reflection of the objective reality in tune with the aesthetic-emotional intent of the author: he/she endeavours to convey his/her ideas, thoughts and emotions, which is enabled by his/her orientation towards experience. From the point of view of the language resources choice, an immense lexical variability coupled with the uniqueness of expression

The substantial difference between the two is that whereas non-literary text is concerned with information, facts and reality, literary text comprises the world of the mind, *i.e.* ideas and feelings and is grounded on imagination.

While non-literary texts are primarily about objects from the extra-linguistic reality, literary texts usually revolve around fictitious characters, being ontologically and structurally independent from the real world.

Even though literary texts attempt to represent reality, they only imitate it at their best, which makes them mimetic in nature. This pre-determines some semantic specifics of these two text types under discussion: while non-literary texts are based on precision, reason and can be characterized by more or less logical argumentative progression, literary texts as the product of author’s imagination offer a breeding ground for vagueness of meaning, ambiguity and multiple interpretations.

Besides, non-literary texts are written to be skimmed or scanned, while literary texts are produced to be assimilated slowly or repeatedly and widely appreciated by readership. Non-literary texts, on the one hand, are expected to fulfill a certain pragmatic function while literary texts, on the other, are not intended for any specific purpose; they can convey a range of intentions (to inspire, offer advice or even shock), although they can gain their more specific and possibly individual pragmatic function during the reading process.

Further, in terms of lexical specificities, vocabulary of non-literary texts is based on a high degree of notionality, standardized language schemata and clichés with no register blending permitted. On the contrary, the lexical facet of literary texts cannot be squeezed into any sort of universal patterning, depending on author and his/her lexical richness it varies from text to text.

An important difference in lexis between the two textual genres also lies in the use of poetic language, so endemic to literary texts, abounding in metaphors, similes, personifications and other poetic devices which in a way make the language of literature truly specialized, too.

1. **Electronic discourse**

The concept of discourse has conventionally been thought of and taught in terms of written and spoken discourse. However, the advent and global use of information technology in the 20th century has seen the emergence of a new discourse – electronic discourse found in e-mails, Internet-relay chats (IRC), and homepages – which is used to communicate across time and geographical borders. electronic discourse is defined as language that is used to communicate in cyberspace, which Yates (2001: 106) refers to as the ‘imaginary space created by the Internet in which people interact and form social relationships’. While students seem to be very comfortable and adept at using this new discourse to communicate, teachers appear to be in awe and at times even intimidated by it. One of the reasons for this could be the difficulty in categorising this new kind of discourse because it is neither purely written nor spoken, but shares features of both types of discourse simultaneously. Researchers argue that electronic discourse is developing and becoming a new form of communication in its own right, and that teachers should be aware of it in the language classroom.

We cannot deny that the advent and global use of information technology has resulted in the emergence of a new discourse – e-discourse (e-discourse), as seen in e-mails, Internet-relay chats (IRC) and homepages – which is used to communicate across time and geographical borders.

Electronic discourse is use of language that has the immediacy characteristic of speech and the permanence characteristic of writing. e-discourse comes with hybridisation of new medium of communication. The term hybridisation is used to refer to the process whereby e-discourse emerges as a composite of features of spoken discourse, written discourse and features specific to e-discourse.

New technologies are constantly transforming traditional notions of language use and literacy in online communication environments. While previous research has provided a foundation for understanding the use of new technologies in instructed second language environments, few studies have investigated new literacies and electronic discourse beyond the classroom setting. This volume seeks to address this gap by providing corpus-based and empirical studies of electronic discourse analyzing social and linguistic variation as well as communicative practices in chat, discussion forums, blogs, and podcasts. Several chapters also examine the assessment and integration of new literacies.

* 1. **discourse connections**
     1. **Cohesion vs Coherence**

Very briefly, a text is **cohesive** if its elements are linked together, and **coherent** if it makes

sense. These are not necessarily the same thing. That is, a text may be cohesive (i.e. linked

together), but incoherent (i.e. meaningless). Here is one such text:

I am a teacher. The teacher was late for class. Class rhymes with grass. The grass is always greener on the other side of the fence. But it wasn't.

Each sentence is notionally linked to the one that precedes it, using both lexical and grammatical means, but the text is ultimately senseless.

The exact relationship between cohesion and coherence is a matter of some contention.

While it is true that a sequence of unlinked utterances **can** make sense, it is often the case

that some form of linking, e.g. with discourse markers such as ‘*and’, ‘but’* and *‘so’* (or the

more formal variants *‘moreover*’, *‘however’* and *‘consequently’*) makes it easier for the reader (or listener) to process and to make sense of what they read (or hear).

**Nevertheless**, a text which is poorly organised is not going to be made more coherent simply by ‘peppering it’ with discourse markers. The following text is an example of a text that is overloaded with discourse markers. It is somewhat typical of the kind of texts that many students produce as a result of an over-emphasis on linking devices at the expense of other ways of making texts cohesive, of which probably the most important is the careful use of vocabulary.

Louie rushed and got ready for work, but, when he went out the door, he saw the snowstorm was very heavy. Therefore, he decided not to go to work. Then, he sat down to enjoy his newspaper. However, he realized his boss might get angry because he did not go to the office. Finally, he made another decision, that he must go to work. So, he went out the door and walked to the bus stop.

**Put simply** then: cohesion is a formal feature of texts (it gives them their *texture*), while

coherence is "in the eye of the beholder" - that is to say, it is the extent to which the reader

(or listener) is able to infer the writer's (or speaker's) communicative intentions. Thus,

cohesion is objectively verifiable (you can actually see or hear it), while coherence is more subjective. A text may be coherent to you, but incoherent to me.

* + 1. **discourse markers**

A particle (such as *oh, well, now,* and *you know*) that is used in conversation to make discourse more coherent but that generally adds little to the meaning of an utterance.

In most cases, discourse markers are *syntactically independent*: that is, removing a marker from a sentence still leaves the sentence structure intact. Discourse markers are more common in informal speech than in most forms of writing.

**Functions of Discourse Markers**

According to this list, **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 effect an interaction or sharing between speaker and hearer,
* to bracket the discourse either cataphora or anaphora,
* to mark either foregrounded or backgrounded information
  1. **conversation analysis**
     1. **What is conversation analysis?**

**Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis**

There are many ways in which a particular approach in the social sciences can be introduced and explained. One of these is through explicative contrasts with somewhat similar approaches.

The term "conversation analysis" (CA) is by now quite firmly established as the name for a particular paradigm in the study of verbal interaction that was initiated in the 1960s by Harvey SACKS, in collaboration with Emanuel SCHEGLOFF and Gail JEFFERSON. In CA the focus is on the procedural analysis of talk-in-interaction, how participants systematically organize their interactions to solve a range of organizational problems, such as the distribution of turns at talking, the collaborative production of particular actions, or problems of understanding. The analysis is always based on audio or visual recordings of interaction, which are carefully transcribed in detail. The research should be "data-driven"—in the sense that concepts and hypotheses should be based on careful consideration of the data, recordings and transcript, rather than drawn from theoretical preconceptions or ideological preferences. While originally conceived from a sociological perspective, CA gained a wide-spread reception in many parts of the world by researchers from a range of disciplinary backgrounds, including: psychology, anthropology, communication studies and a variety of linguistic sub-disciplines.

The term "discourse analysis" is much less clear than "conversation analysis," or rather, it is used in many different ways by different people, in different countries and in different contexts. On the one hand, it can serve as an overall blanket term for any and all efforts to analyze "discourse," texts, talk and so forth. But many people in the U.K., including the author of the book under review, use it to indicate one particular, although diversified, research tradition which, nowadays, finds its most prominent expression in a branch of social psychology which is called "discursive psychology" and is associated with people like Derek EDWARDS and Jonathan POTTER at Loughborough University in the UK. By in large, it is this kind of "discourse analysis" (DA) that WOOFFITT uses as a "sparring partner" for his discussion of CA. In later chapters, he also discusses "critical discourse analysis" (CDA), associated with people like Norman FAIRCLOUGH, Teun VAN DIJK and Ruth WODAK and what he calls "Foucauldian discourse analysis" (FDA), which represents a British approach more or less inspired by the writings of Michel FOUCAULT and Jacques DERRIDA.

|  |
| --- |
| **Quiz/Assignment III 10%** |
|  |

* + 1. **turn taking principles**

CA studies of institutional interaction examine how turn-taking patterns depart from those observed in informal conversational exchanges. CA research shows how participants display their orientation to the appropriateness of these distinctive turn-taking patterns. It thereby identifies participants’ sensitivity to the normative conventions which underpin these turn-taking arrangements. Departures from established sequential patterns, and the participants’ responses to, or ‘noticings of’ these departures are a useful methodological resource because they display their understanding of the significance of those departures. CA seeks to show how participants’ orientation to the relevance of the context (physical setting, topic, respective identities, etc.) demonstrably informs their talk.

* 1. **Modes of Discourse**

Discourse genres are separated into two broad categories: monologic (monologues) and interactive. Monologues, which do not require interaction, encompass a number of genres including descriptions, narratives, and procedural and expository discourse (Cherney, 1998). Descriptive discourse entails the attribution of features and concepts of a stimulus. Narratives involve storytelling, either through story creation or story retelling. Procedural discourse includes explanations of a series of actions to perform a task. Expository discourse informs a listener of a topic through facts or interpretation and draws upon higher-level thinking skills, such as comparison and contrast, cause and effect, and generalization. In contrast, conversational discourse is interactive with participants alternating roles as speaker and listener to exchange ideas, thoughts, and feelings.

In composition studies, the four traditional categories of written discourse are: narration, description, exposition and argumentation.

* 1. **Narrative discourse**

|  |
| --- |
| A narrative discourse is a discourse that is an account of events, usually in the past, that employs verbs of speech, motion, and action to describe a series of events that are contingent one on another, and that typically focuses on one or more performers of actions. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Features** | |
|  | * Events are organized chronologically. * forms are used. * The text is oriented around a specific agent or agents. |

* 1. **Expository Discourse**

|  |
| --- |
| A pedagogical term for any form of writing that conveys information and explains ideas:exposition.  As one of the four traditional modes, expository writing may include elements of narration, description, and argumentation, but unlike *creative writing* or *persuasive writing*, its primary goal is to deliver information about an issue, subject, method, or idea.  Expository discourse refers to factual academic language in classroom lectures, oral presentations and homework assignments, as well as on tests, in textbooks, and in other classroom materials. The types of expository discourse are comparison, cause/effect, collection/description, enumeration, problem/solution and procedural.  Comparison discourse compares advantages to disadvantages, pros and cons, favored views to opposing views, or similarities and differences. They often can be found in social studies lessons, where students may, for example, be asked to consider the similarities and differences of two geographic regions.  Cause-and-effect, or causation, discourse has an antecedent event and a consequent event and often is found in history lessons. Collection/description, used in a variety of subject areas, refers to a collection of facts describing a particular topic. Enumeration is a listing of examples and information related to a specific topic.  Problem/solution and procedural discourse are common in science classes and text. Problem/solution discourse poses a problem that may be resolved with one or more possible solutions. Procedural discourse lists steps on how to do or make something. For example, students must follow a certain set of directions in order to conduct a science experiment. Procedural statements are common in home and classes as well.  Students with speech and language difficulties often have significant difficulty comprehending expository language. Conversational and narrative discourse are often easier to understand and produce. Conversational discourse is more informal and offers opportunities to make repairs and seek clarification, and narrative discourse has a fairly predictable structure. However, as students progress through the upper elementary grades and beyond, they are confronted with more sophisticated, decontextualized language. |
|  |
|  |

* 1. **Argumentative discourse**

A course of reasoning aimed at demonstrating truth or falsehood. Argument is one of the traditional modes.

Forms of argument:

* Debate, with participants on both sides trying to win.
* Courtroom argument, with lawyers pleading before a judge and jury.
* Dialectic, with people taking opposing views and finally resolving the conflict.
* Single-perspective argument, with one person arguing to convince a mass audience.
* One-on-one everyday argument, with one person trying to convince another.
* Academic inquiry, with one or more people examining a complicated issue.
* Negotiation, with two or more people working to reach consensus.
* Internal argument, or working to convince yourself.
  1. **Descriptive discourse**

The descriptive writer's main task is the *selection* and verbal representation of information. You must choose the details that matter--that are important to the purposes you share with your readers--as well as a pattern of arrangement relevant to those mutual purposes.

**Two Types of Description: Objective and Impressionistic**

"*Objective description* attempts to report accurately the appearance of the object as a thing in itself, independent of the observer's perception of it or feelings about it. It is a factual account, the purpose of which is to inform a reader who has not been able to see with his own eyes. The writer regards himself as a kind of camera, recording and reproducing, though in words, a true picture. . . .  
  
"*Impressionistic description* is very different. Focusing upon the mood or feeling the object evokes in the observer rather than upon the object as it exists in itself, impressionism does not seek to inform but to arouse emotion. It attempts to make us feel more than to make us see. . . . "[T]he writer may blur or intensify the details he selects, and, by the clever use of figures, he may compare them to things calculated to evoke the appropriate emotion. To impress us with the dreary ugliness of a house, he may exaggerate the drabness of its paint or metaphor describe the flaking as *leprous*."  
(Thomas S. Kane and Leonard J. Peters, *Writing Prose: Techniques and Purposes*, 6th ed. Oxford Univ. Press, 1986)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **A procedural discourse** is a discourse that |
|  | * is used to tell the addressee how to do something * presents a series of steps leading to a goal, and * centers on events that are contingent one on another, rather than focusing on the performer of the events. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Features** | |
|  | Here are some features of procedural text: |
|  | * The steps of the procedure are often organized chronologically. * forms are usually used. * Text is not oriented around a specific agent. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Examples** | |
|  | * Directions on how to get somewhere * Instructions on how to make something * Recipes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parts** | |
|  | * Problem or need * Preparatory procedures * Main or efficient procedures * Concluding, often utilization procedures |

**Hortatory discourse**

Speech rhetoric or writing that urges or commands an audience to follow (or not follow) a particular course of action.

**Examples of Hortatory Speeches:**

* "I want you to get mad!  
    
  "I don't want you to protest. I don't want you to riot. I don't want you to write to your Congressman, because I wouldn't know what to tell you to write. I don't know what to do about the depression and the inflation and the Russians and the crime in the street.  
    
  "All I know is that first, you've got to get mad.  
    
  "You've gotta say, 'I'm a human being, goddammit! My life has value!'  
    
  "So, I want you to get up now. I want all of you to get up out of your chairs. I want you to get up right now and go to the window, open it, and stick your head out and yell, 'I'm as mad as hell, and I'm not going to take this anymore!'"  
  (Peter Finch as Howard Beale in *Network*, 1976)
* **Discourse as a Play: Narrative, Expository, and Hortatory**  
  "[A] metaphor that has proven particularly useful in several theoretical approaches to discourse and communication . . . is summarized as 'discourse is a play.' The idea is that a person who intends to communicate an idea is like the director of a play. The speaker has an image in mind, and uses linguistic tools to encourage some audience to create a similar image in their minds. . . . The scene may be an actual or fictional series of events occurring over time, in which case we may say that the discourse produced is narrative. Or the scene may involve a description of some concrete thing or abstract idea, in which case the speaker engages in Expository-Writing discourse. Sometimes a speaker will use language to describe ways the speaker would like the audience to behave. This would be called **hortatory discourse**."  
  (Thomas E. Payne, *Understanding English Grammar*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011)
* "In **hortatory discourse**, the composer of the discourse is especially likely to get involved with his subject matter and his audience and to urge on them a certain course of conduct by virtue of the prestige invested in this person."  
  (Robert E. Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse*, 2nd ed. Springer, 1996)

**Procedural discourse**refers to written and spoken discourse that guides people in performing a task—in other words, it is “how to” communication.

User’s guides for computer software, repair manuals for electronic equipment, booklets on assembling and using consumer products, online help systems, and oral instructions are all forms of procedural discourse. Often, technical communicators use the term “procedure” to designate a

discrete unit of procedural discourse, the instructions for performing a single task.

* 1. **Discourse and Thought**
  2. **The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis**

**Linguistic Relativity**

In linguistics, the **Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis** states that there are certain thoughts of an individual in one language that cannot be understood by those who live in another language.

• The hypothesis states that the way people think is strongly affected by their native languages.

• It is a controversial theory championed by linguist

Edward Sapir and his student Benjamin Whorf.

The structure of a language can strongly influence or determine someone’s **World View**

– A **World View** describes a (hopefully) consistent and integral sense of existence and provides a theoretical framework for generating, sustaining and applying knowledge

The **linguistic relativity** principle, or the **Sapir–Whorf hypothesis**, is the idea that differences in the way language encode cultural and cognitive categories affect the way people think, so that speakers of different languages will tend to think and behave differently depending on the language they use. The hypothesis is generally understood as having two different versions: (i) the *strong* version that language determines thought and that linguistic categories limit and determine cognitive categories and (ii) the *weak* version that linguistic categories and usage influence thought and certain kinds of non-linguistic behavior.

The idea was first clearly expressed by 19th century thinkers, such as Wilhelm\_von\_Humboldt who saw language as the expression of the spirit of a nation. The early 20th century school of American Anthropology headed by Franz Boas and Edward\_Sapir also embraced the idea. Sapir's student Benjamin\_Lee\_Whorf came to be seen as the primary proponent of the hypothesis, because he published observations of how he perceived linguistic differences to have consequences in human cognition and behavior. Whorf's ideas were widely criticized, and Roger Brown and Eric Lenneberg decided to put them to the test. They reformulated Whorf's principle of linguistic relativity as a testable hypothesis, now called the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis, and conducted experiments designed to find out whether Color perception varies between speakers of languages that classified colors differently. As the study of the universal nature of human language and cognition came in to focus in the 1960s the idea of linguistic relativity fell out of favor. A 1969 study by Brent Berlin and Paul\_Kay showed that color terminology is subject to universal semantic constraints, and the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis was seen as completely discredited.

From the late 1980s a new school of linguistic relativity scholars have examined the effects of differences in linguistic categorization on cognition, finding broad support for weak versions of the hypothesis in experimental contexts. Effects of linguistic relativity have been shown particularly in the domain of spatial cognition and in the social use of language, but also in the field of color perception. Recent studies have shown that color perception is particularly prone to linguistic relativity effects when processed in the left brain hemisphere, suggesting that this brain half relies more on language than the right one. Currently a balanced view of linguistic relativity is espoused by most linguists holding that language influences certain kinds of cognitive processes in non-trivial ways but

that other processes are better seen as subject to universal factors. Current research is focused on exploring the ways in which language influences thought and determining to what extent. The principle of linguistic relativity and the relation between language and thought has also received attention in varying academic fields from philosophy, psychology, anthropology, and it has also inspired and colored works of fiction and the invention of Constructed language.

* 1. **Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)**

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is more involved in the inner psychology of people. Van Dijk (2001:352) defined CDA as:

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context with such dissident research, critical discourse analysis take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality

CDA views `language as a social practice', and takes consideration of the context of language use as an important aspect (Wodak, and Meyer, 2001:1). Researchers who use CDA as a method can describe, interpret, and explain relationships among languages and other social factors (Rogers, 2004:1). As a critical theory, CDA aims at ‘demystifying’ or clarifying discourse. It is a problem-oriented approach. “Social problems are the items of research, such as “racism, identity, gender, social change”, which, of course, are and could be studied from manifold perspectives. The CDA dimension, discourse and text-analysis, is one of many possible approaches” (Wodak, 2005:2).

Language is a medium of control, and exercising power. CDA takes the point of view of those who suffer and critically analyze power as reflected through their language. Critical theory is reflective since it looks at discontents and dissatisfactions. Critical theory is there where there is contention and challenge over power and inequality through discourse (Wodak, 2002). Discourse indexes how power is exercised or challenged. Wodak (2002) defines CDA as follows:

CDA might be defined as fundamentally interested in not only analyzing opaque but also transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. In other words, CDA aims at investigating critically social inequality as it is expressed, constructed, legitimized, and so on, by language use (or in discourse).

CDA:

* aims to lay bare the “hidden effects of power,” the kind of effects which may stigmatize the vulnerable, exclude the marginal, naturalize privilege and, through the simple contrivance of presenting ideology as common sense, define the terms of reference of political debate and subvert resistance;

• draws on critical, poststructuralist, feminist and postcolonial theory, on Foucault’s anti-essentialist philosophy of knowledge/power and Bourdieu’s theory of symbolic capital, among others, as well as on various of the ways and means of discourse analysis listed above, especially SFL;

• concerns itself with issues of identity, dominance and resistance, and with seeking out evidence in text – especially (to date) media and advertising texts, and political documents and speeches – of class, gender, ethnic and other kinds of bias;

• distinguishes crucially between two senses of the word discourse: what Gee calls “discourse” and “Discourse”: the former refers to instances of language in use, actual speech events; the latter to (far more abstract) ways of using language: configurations of things that can (in particular cultural and institutional contexts) be spoken about, ways of thinking and speaking about them, and ways of behaving in relation to them.

CDA sees language as “everywhere and always” political (Gee, 1999, p. 1). By politics Gee means “anything and anyplace where human social interactions and relationships have implications for how ‘social goods’ are or ought to be distributed,” and by social goods “anything that a group of people believes to be a source of power, status or worth.” When we speak or write we “always take a particular *perspective* on what the ‘world’ is like. This involves us in taking perspectives on what is ‘normal’ and not; what is ‘acceptable’ and not; what is ‘right’ and not . . . But these are all, too, perspectives on how we believe, wish or act as if potential ‘social goods’ are, or ought to be distributed.”

CDA is a political enterprise in the additional and crucial sense that it is motivated by a particular political agenda – non-conformist, anti-elitist, neo-Marxist, anti-neo-liberal; it seeks not just to understand the social world, but to transform it.

* 1. **Communication and Culture**

Communication and culture are interconnected. Communication facilitates the creation and exchange of cultural meanings, and culture preserves communication (Klyukanov, 2005:10). Communication makes existence feasible (Williams and Pearce, 1978:3). Although it is difficult to split culture and communication since they are intertwined, it is possible to distinguish cultural patterns of communication in different speech communities (Condon and Yousef, 1975:34-35).

According to Williams and Pearce (1978:6), there are three basic components of culture. The first is language, a human communication system. The second is a story system, a socio-cultural factor. The third is a set of organizations with their functions in the construction, organization, and distribution of cultural knowledge. For Dodd (1995:10), culture is more than the three just mentioned. For him, culture is the sum of a group’s beliefs, norms, activities, institutions, and communication patterns reflected in thought, speech and action. Identifying its effect on communication is one reason to study culture (Dodd, 1995:10). The people who have developed the culture expect the members to live by them. The expectations of cultural rudiments are expressed through language (Dodd, 1995:34). Such people are identified as members of the same group. Members of own culture are an in-group and members of other’s culture are an out-group (klyukanov, 2005:11).

Language is a key component of cultural activity of people (Greenberg, 1971:78). Every culture has its own communication system (Dodd, 1995:44). There are countercultural communication systems and common codes in a speech group that has different cultural sub-groups in it. Some groups stand opposing the dominant group and develop a countercultural communication behavior. According to Dodd (1995:88), a common code is used to bind countercultural members. In many multicultural communities, countercultural communication is inevitable. The counterculture provides a comparatively different communication rules.

* 1. **Intercultural communication**

|  |
| --- |
| **Quiz/assignment IV 10%** |
| * + **What is Intercultural Communication?** |

* 1. **Discourse analysis**
     1. **discourse**

Discourse is a communicative event in which language plays a prominent role. It minimally requires a sender (writer, speaker), a receiver (reader, listener), and a message that is being communicated. This message is not just a concatenation of clauses; it forms a unified, coherent whole. Both the sender and receiver normally have the implicit agreement that the message being communicated is coherent.

Discourse Analysis (DA) emphasizes on the analysis of the internal cognition of a society’s practice as expressed through their language. It focuses on talk and texts as social practices (Potter, 1996:5). According to Potter (2004:3),

DA has an analytic commitment to studying discourse as texts and talk in social practice. That is, the focus is not on language as an abstract entity such as a lexicon and set of grammatical rules (in linguistics), a system of differences (in structuralism), or a set of rules for transforming statements. Instead, it is the medium for interaction; analysis of discourse becomes, then, analysis of what people do.

Discourse analysis is more than the analysis of the linguistic repertoire of a given language. Discourse commonly comprises a sequence of sentences, although it can be found even within a single sentence – for example, the connected sequence of eventualities (states and events). It is reasonable to associate discourse

(1) with a sequence of sentences,

(2) which conveys more than its individual sentences through their relationships to one another, and

(3) which exploits special features of language that enable discourse to be more easily understood.

Discourse: ‘...group of statements which provide a language for talking about…a particular topic at a particular historical moment…Discourse is about the production of knowledge through language...’ (Hall, 1992: 291).

* + 1. **Components of discourse analysis:**

In order to analyse discourse, it may be necessary to consider all aspects of language: the grammatical as well as the semantic and pragmatic.

* 1. **Cohesive devices**
* **Cohesion** - grammatical relationship between parts of a sentence essential for its interpretation;
* **Coherence** - the order of statements relates one another by sense.
* **Substitution**: in order to avoid repeating the same word several times in one paragraph it is replaced, most often by one, do or so. So and do in its all forms might also substitute whole phrases or clauses (e.g. "Tom has created the best web directory. I told you so long time ago".)
* **Ellipsis**: it is very similar to substitution, however, it replaces a phrase by a gap. In other words, it is omission of noun, verb, or a clause on the assumption that it is understood from the linguistic context.
* **Reference**: the use of words which do not have meanings of their own, such as pronouns and articles. To infer their meaning the reader has to refer them to something else that appears in the text (Tom: "How do you like my new Mercedes Vito?" - Marry: **"It** is a nice van, **which** I'm also thinking of buying".).
* **Conjunction**: specifies the relationship between clauses, or sentences. Most frequent relations of sentences are: addition ( vb AND, moreover e.g. "Moreover, the chocolate fountains are not just regular fountains, they more like rivers full of chocolate and sweets."), temporality ( afterwards, next e.g. "He bought her perfume at a local perfume shop and afterwards moved toward a jewelry store.") and causality ( because, since).
* **Lexical cohesion**: denotes links between words which carry meaning: verbs, nouns, adjectives. Two types of lexical cohesion are differentiated, namely: reiteration and collocation. Reiteration adopts various forms, particularly synonymy, repetition, hyponymy or antonymy (Collocation is the way in which certain words occur together, which is why it is easy to make out what will follow the first item.

Discourse is a level higher than that of the sentence. It includes all the other linguistic levels—sound, lexis, syntax. Just as there are rules for combination of words, there are certain relations between sentences and rules by which they may be related. These rules of sentence-connection create **cohesion** in the text. At the same time, these sentences are also utterances, i.e. they have a force which is vital for understanding their meaning, which are combined to create **coherence**. The following is an example of discourse which is both cohesive and coherent:

A : Can you go to Dire Dawa tomorrow?

B : Yes, I can.

The interchange is cohesive because the second sentence does not repeat the whole of the first sentence. Instead of the whole sentence: ‘I can go to Dire Dawa tomorrow’, B says only: ‘I can’, omitting the rest. This indicates that the second sentence is linked to the first in sequential order. It is also coherent because B has given an appropriate response to A from A’s request. However, in the following example:

A : Can you go to Hawasa tomorrow?

B : There is a general strike.

The two sentences are not cohesive because the second sentence is not linked to the first sentence in a grammatical sense. There is no repetition or obvious connection between the two sentences. But they are coherent, because B replies to A’s request in a sentence which gives some information implying that it may not be possible to go to Hawasa. Thus, this exchange is coherent but not cohesive.

* 1. **Mode, tenor and domain**

Apart from grammatical features, discourse is constituted of features which are particular to the mode, tenor and field or domain of that discourse. The mode may be spoken or written. The tenor of discourse refers to features relating to the relationship between the speaker and the addressee in a given situation—these features reflect the formality or informality, degree of politeness, a personal or impersonal touch. Thus, if the relationship is a polite one, there will be respectful terms of address, e.g. ‘Sir’, and indirect requests rather than commands. If the relationship is one of familiarity, the features will include terms of friendship e.g. ‘dear’, direct requests and imperatives. Lastly, field or domain of discourse pertains to the area of activity to which that discourse belongs, e.g. whether the discourse is in the field of religion, science, law, journalism, advertising. In each field, the discourse will be characterized by a particular kind of vocabulary and sentence structure, e.g. sports commentary uses present tense; advertising uses many.

**Discourse and Racism, gender**

discourse plays a central role not only in the text studies of the humanities, but also in the social sciences, and virtually all dimensions of the study of prejudice, discrimination, and racism also have an important discursive dimension.

Ethnic and racial inequality in all social, political, and cultural domains is multiply expressed, described, planned, legislated, regulated, executed, legitimated, and opposed in myriad genres of discourse and communicative events. Such discourse is not mere text and talk, and hence of marginal relevance. On the contrary, especially in contemporary information and communication societies, such text and talk are at the heart of the polity, society, and culture, and hence also in their mechanisms of continuity and reproduction, including those of racism.

Although discourse may seem just "words" (and therefore cannot break your bones, as do sticks and stones), text and talk play a vital role in the reproduction of contemporary racism.

This is especially true for the most damaging forms of contemporary racism, namely, those of the elites. Political, bureaucratic, corporate, media, educational, and scholarly elites control the most crucial dimensions and decisions of the everyday lives of immigrants and minorities: entry, residence, work, housing, education, welfare, health care, knowledge, information, and culture. They do so largely by speaking or writing, for instance; in cabinet meetings and parliamentary debates, in job interviews, news reports, advertising, lessons, textbooks, scholarly articles, movies or talk shows, among many other forms of elite discourse.

That is, as is true also for other social practices directed against minorities, discourse may first of all be a form of verbal discrimination. Elite discourse may thus constitute an important elite form of racism: Similarly, the (re)production of ethnic prejudices that underlie such verbal and other social practices largely takes place through text, talk, and communication.

In sum, especially in contemporary information societies, discourse lies at the heart of racism.

**Social Semiotics**

Social semiotics is a branch of the field of semiotics  which investigates human signifying practices in specific social and cultural circumstances, and which tries to explain meaning-making as a social practice. Semiotics, as originally defined by Ferdinand de Saussure, is "the science of the life of signs in society". Social semiotics expands on Saussure's founding insights by exploring the implications of the fact that the "codes" of language and communication are formed by social processes. The crucial implication here is that meanings and semiotic systems are shaped by relations of power, and that as power shifts in society, our languages and other systems of socially accepted meanings can and do change.

Social semiotics is thus the study of the social dimensions of meaning, and of the power of human processes of signification and interpretation (known as semiosis) in shaping individuals and societies. Social semiotics focuses on social meaning-making practices of all types, whether visual, verbal or aural in nature (Thibault, 1991). These different systems for meaning-making, or possible "channels" (e.g. speech, writing, images) are known as semiotic modes. Semiotic modes can include visual, verbal, written, gestural and musical resources for communication. They also include various "multimodal" ensembles of any of these modes (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2001).

Social semiotics can include the study of how people design and interpret meanings, the study of texts, and the study of how semiotic systems are shaped by social interests and ideologies, and how they are adapted as society changes (Hodge and Kress, 1988). Structuralist semiotics in the tradition of Ferdinand de Saussure focused primarily on theorising unchanging semiotic systems or structures (termed parole by de Saussure). In contrast, social semiotics tries to account for the variability of semiotic practices termed langue and parole. This altered focus shows how individual creativity, changing historical circumstances, and new social identities and projects can all change patterns of usage and design (Hodge and Kress, 1988). From a social semiotic perspective, rather than being fixed into unchanging "codes", signs are considered to be resources which people use and adapt (or "design") to make meaning. In these respects, social semiotics was influenced by, and shares many of the preoccupations of pragmatics and sociolinguistics and has much in common with cultural studies and critical discourse analysis.

|  |
| --- |
| **Quiz/Assignment V 10%** |
|  |

**Assessment criteria**

* Quiz/Assignments 50%
* Final written examination 50%
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