

Unit One: Discourse Analysis

1. Introduction:

The term discourse analysis is very ambiguous. The term “discourse analysis” is polysemic. Discourse analysis does not presuppose a bias towards the study of either spoken or written language. On the one hand, it refers to the close linguistic study, from different perspectives, of texts in use. On the other hand, discourse refers to socially shared habits of thought, perception, and behavior reflected in numerous texts belonging to different genres.

Discourse is being extended at all areas as linguistics. It is the text linguistics perspective. Text linguistics as a different discipline has mainly been associated with written text. Discourse is the umbrella term for either spoken or written communication beyond the sentence. Any more detailed spelling out of such a definition typically involves reference to concepts of language *in use*, language *above or beyond the sentence*, language as meaning *in interaction*, and language in *situational and cultural context*.

1.1. Definitions of discourse analysis

Discourse analysis is defined as

1. Concerned with language use beyond the boundaries of a sentence/utterance,
2. Concerned with the interrelationships between language and society
3. And as concerned with the interactive or dialogic properties of everyday communication.

In linguistics *discourse* analysis is *naturally connected with speech or written discourse*. Roughly speaking, it 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. It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with *language use in social contexts*, and in particular with *interaction* or dialogue between speakers.

Discourse analysis is sometimes defined as the analysis of language 'beyond the sentence. In linguistics, the term “**discourse**” refers to a structural unit larger than the sentence. Discourse minimally involves more than one sentence, and the sentences must be contingent. Just as every string of words is not a sentence, not every sequence of utterances is considered a “**text**.” For discourse, there are requirements of relevance in form and especially in meaning. Texts can be created by more than one participant, as in conversation, or in various forms of monologue, most notably narrative and exposition.

Discourse analysis is part of applied linguistics; it is a *multi* disciplinary field, and highly diverse in the range of its interests.

(Jaworski & Coupland, 1999: 3) stated that discourse is not merely *beyond* “language use relative to social, political and cultural formations; language reflecting social order, but also language shaping social order and shaping individuals’ interaction with society.”

Jaworski & Coupland 1999: 1–7.)

1.2 Spoken and written discourse

Discourse has been traditionally divided into spoken and written discourse based on the medium used to convey information. Differences between spoken and written discourse:

Manner	Spoken	Written
1. Manner of production	<p>A) Due to the speed and manner of production, less forethought, planning and prior organization goes into speech.</p> <p>B) Spoken text is transient unless it is recorded. Therefore, it is imperfect and it is always possible to do on-line editing and negotiate meaning.</p>	<p>A) Writing is a slower activity, thus authors have the time to mould their ideas into a more complex, coherent and integrated whole using complicated lexical and syntactic devices.</p> <p>B) Written texts are relatively permanent and this enables them to be surveyed and consulted. These texts are the products of copious drafts, which involve extensive checking and editing. The relative permanence of written texts also allows them to be portable.</p>
2. Contextual features	<p>C) The interlocutors share the same spatio-temporal context. Communication thus shows an ‘on-line’ monitoring, which benefits from the addressee’s immediate feedback and the abundance of contextual cues (visual clues such as body language and gestures; auditory clues like variation in tone of voice, hesitations, pauses, etc).</p>	<p>C) Written texts are decontextualized or autonomous as they cannot depend on the addressee’s contributions or on other contextual clues. There is no common situation, as in face-to face interaction. The situation has to be inferred from the text. Also, the words need to convey all shades of meaning, which in spoken text are relayed by paralinguistic cues.</p>
3. Linguistic features	<p>D) The syntax in spoken language is typically less structured than that of written language; for example, spoken language contains incomplete sentences, fragments of speech, and little subordination.</p> <p>E) Rare use of metalingual markers. The markers seem to be replaced by fillers, such as ‘er’, ‘umm’, ‘hmmn’, and logical connectors like <i>and</i>, <i>but</i>, <i>then</i>, etc</p>	<p>D) In written language the sentences are complete, and better structured with embedded clauses.</p> <p>E) Extensive use of metalingual markers to mark relationships between clauses; for example, temporal markers like <i>when</i>, <i>while</i>; logical connectors such as <i>besides</i>, <i>moreover</i>, <i>however</i>, etc.</p>

1.3. Approaches to discourse analysis

Approach means the adoption of one or more combination of the ways to certain aspects of the total discourse reality.

Discourse Analysis can be categorized into internal and external approaches.

The internal approach focuses on: looking for internal rules that native speakers use to generate grammatically correct sentences. Isolated sentences, grammatically well-formed, without context and invented or idealized.

The external approach focuses on: asking how we use language to communicate, any stretch of language felt to be unified, achieving meaning, in context and observed.

In discourse Analysis there are varieties types of approaches developed from various sources.

These are analyzed under four main headings: rules and principles, contexts and cultures, functions and structures, and power and politics.

1.3.1. Rules and principles:

These include speech act theory, politeness theory and conversation analysis. Develop **speech acts** or the communicative functions of sentences in conversation. For example; using utterances to report events, make statements about the requested information or action, or to prohibit action. Adjust one's language to fit the social context of the conversation in keeping with cultural conventions and social roles. Emerge *conversational skill* in face-to-face verbal interaction.

These include knowing when and how to take a turn in conversation; how to initiate, elaborate, or terminate a topic, and how to respond to a speaker in keeping with the pragmatic constraints set by the preceding utterance. These involve issues of politeness, formality, and the age or status of one's listener in what have been called "**styles**" or "**registers**" of speech.

1.3.2. Contexts and cultures:

These are focused on ethnography of communication and interactional sociolinguistics.

In cultural differences ethnography of communication offers a framework for the study of speech events, seeking to describe the ways of speaking associated with particular speech communities and to understand the role of language in the making of societies and cultures.

It involves both (verbal and non-verbal) understanding of culturally specified ways of communicating and the various beliefs and attitudes.

Interactional sociolinguistics aims at replicable analysis that accounts for our ability to interpret what participants intend to convey in everyday communicative practice.

It pays particular attention to culturally specified contextual presuppositions, to the signals of “contextualization cues” such as code and style switching, and prosodic and lexical choices.

1.3.3. Functions and structures:

These are grouped as text models of language and grammar approaches to text in systemic-functional linguistics. It provides a comprehensive theory of text analysis.

Language is not seen as an autonomous system but as part of the wider socio-cultural context, as “social semiotic”; the aim is to look into language from the outside and specifically, to interpret linguistic processes from the standpoint of the social order.

Grammar is seen as meaning potential a “potential” that is functionally determined by the need of speakers and writers to simultaneously represent experience (the ideational function), manage their relationship with their co-participants (the interpersonal function) and produce dialogue or monologue, whether spoken or written, which is cohesive and coherent (the textual function).

1.3.4. Power and politics:

These approaches focus on critical analysis and necessarily share with the concern of Pragmatic and sociolinguistic approaches. Aims to lay the “hidden effects of power,” the kind of effects may stigmatize the vulnerable, exclude the marginal, naturalize privilege and, through the simple contrivance of presenting ideology as common sense.

Concerns with issues of identity, dominance, resistance, and with seeking out evidence in text especially to media and advertising texts, political documents and speeches of class, gender, ethnic and other kinds of bias.

1.4. Discourse as Action

In real life we do not produce and participate in the same kinds of discourse all the time. Our communication takes various forms to orient ourselves in different ways. All different activities are predictably associated with certain situations and speech events that is discourse structure, which exhibit conventional speech acts, settings, topics, participants’ purpose and other context features. Different speech events are associated with different topics. The more conventionalized speech act or event is the more expectations we seem to have about setting, participant role and internal structure within a given culture too; discourse structure varies in different social, professional, age, gender group, etc. The situational, social, and cultural varieties of speech acts and events have been mainly documented by sociolinguistic research on the expression of politeness theory.

1.4.1. Identifying Speech act theory:

Speech act is the smallest unit of meaning. Speech event is the larger social recognized of speech activity conversation, discussion and lecture. Speech in social interaction does not have just one function. The conceptual schema of speech act has different purposes or functions. The first category common to most schemes recognize that a speech act serves to express the speaker's personal state of mind or attitude.

The other function of speech act is to bring the participants in contact or in relationship each other; it maintains social contacts, or phatic communication. (Austin 2003: 4) describes distinctive performatives, i.e. utterances which are either true or false but which bring about a particular social effect being uttered for a performative function to have the desired effect; it has to meet certain social and cultural criteria, also called **felicity conditions**.

A **speech act** in linguistics and philosophy of language is an utterance that has performative function in language and communication. According to Kent Bach, "almost any speech act is really the performance of several acts at once, distinguished by different aspects of the speaker's intention: there is the act of saying something, what one does in saying it, such as requesting or promising, and how one is trying to affect one's audience." The contemporary use of the term goes back to J. L. Austin's development of performative utterances and his theory of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Speech acts are commonly taken to include such acts as promising, ordering, greeting, warning, inviting and congratulating.

Austin states a new distinction between three different "aspects" of an utterance against the background of generalized claim that all utterances are really performatives. This generalized claim is the key assumption of speech act theory (the theory of "how to do things with words") by making an utterance, language users perform one or more social acts. These are called '**speech acts**'.

The threefold distinction is that between different types of action. For instance, by speaking an utterance (**locution**), you may perform the social act of making a promise (**illocution** - what the speaker does by using the utterance) and as a result, convince your audience of your commitment (**per locution** - what the speaker's done, having made the utterance).

Locution: is personal style of speech.

Illocution: is the inherent function of speech act or an action performed by saying / writing something. The concept of an **illocutionary act** is central to the concept of a speech act.

Although there are numerous opinions regarding how to define 'illocutionary acts', there are some kinds of acts which are widely accepted as illocutionary, as for example promising, ordering someone, and bequeathing. The idea of an "illocutionary act" can be captured by emphasizing that "by saying something, we *do* something", as when someone issues an order to someone to go by saying "Go!".

Perlocution: is the effect of the act, whether intended or actual. The effects may be fighting, winning, playing and enjoying oneself or passing the time.

Generally, based on the purpose of utterances Speech act divided into six kinds.

- Assertive utterances
- Commissive utterance
- Phatic utterances
- Directive utterance
- Expressive utterance
- Performative utterance

1) Assertive utterance

In the assertive function speakers and writers use language to tell what they know or believe; assertive language is concerned with facts. The purpose is to inform. Assertive utterances are either true or false, and generally they can be verified or falsified not necessarily at the time of the utterance or by those who hear them, but in a general sense they are subject to empirical investigation.

2) Commissive utterance

Speech acts that commit a speaker to a course of action are called **commissive utterances**. These include promises, pledges, threats and vows. Commissive verbs are illustrated by *agree, ask, offer, refuse, swear*, all with following infinitives. They are prospective and concerned with the speaker's commitment to future action.

3) Phatic utterances

No one is likely to think that questions like "How are you?," "How're you doing?" are really meant to get information. We don't assume that statements such as "I'm glad to meet you" or "So nice to see you again" are necessarily expressions of deep feeling on the part of the speaker. The purpose of utterances like these, **phatic utterances**, is to establish rapport between members of the same society. Phatic language has a less obvious function than the six types discussed

above but it is no less important. Phatic utterances include greetings, farewells, polite formulas such as “Thank you,” “You’re welcome,”

They also include all sorts of comments on the weather, asking about one’s health, and whatever is usual, and therefore expected, in a particular society. Stereotyped phrases are common for conveying good wishes to someone starting to eat a meal, beginning a voyage, undertaking a new venture, or celebrating a personal or social holiday.

4) Directive utterance

Directive utterances are those in which the speaker tries to get the addressee to perform some act or refrain from performing an act. Thus a directive utterance has the pronoun *you* as actor, whether that word is actually present in the utterance or not. Three kinds of directive utterances can be recognized: commands, requests and suggestions. A **command** is effective only if the speaker has some degree of control over the actions of the addressee. A **request** is an expression of what the speaker wants the addressee to do or refrain from doing. A request does not assume the speaker’s control over the person addressed.

Suggestions are the utterances we make to other persons to give our opinions as to what they should or should not do.

5) Expressive utterance

Expressive utterances are thus retrospective and speaker-involved.

The most common expressive verbs (in the sense of ‘expressive’) are: acknowledge, admit, confess, deny and apologize.

6) Performative utterance

Speech acts that bring about the state of affairs they name are called **performative**: bids, blessings, firings, baptisms, arrests, marrying, declaring a mistrial. Performative utterances are valid if spoken by someone whose right to make them is accepted and in circumstances which are accepted as appropriate. The verbs include *bet, declare, baptize, name, nominate, pronounce*.

1.5.2. Relevance theory and Politeness theory

Politeness is described as a social norm, or a set of prescriptive social 'rules'. Many linguists have aimed to research politeness, including Brown and Levinson (1987), who developed their 'face theory' based on the principles of our desire to be liked and not to be imposed upon.

It is first important to understand the concept of 'face'.

Face is defined as the public self-image every adult portrays, which must be attended to in interaction.

There are two aspects of face: positive and negative.

- **Positive face** is the desire to be appreciated and liked.
- **Negative face** is the desire to have freedom and not to be imposed upon.

Politeness is defined as using communicative strategies to create and maintain social harmony. This can be done in various ways:

- being contextually appropriate
- following social and cultural norms
- being socially positive by addressing face needs

Our aim in conversation is generally cooperative, so the more 'dangerous' we perceive our Face threatening act to be the higher number strategy we use.

Unit Two: Discourse in communication:

People primarily and essentially communicate through combinations of language units that themselves constitute distinct units of expression; these are called combinations of language units or texts. The combination of speech, writing, gesture, posture and these whole integral linguistic organization and action can be defined as texts. The text that must be combinations of meaningful units derived from the rules of a specific language suggests the combination of sound (phonemes), form (morphemes), syntax and semantic of a language.

Notice: - the following combination of well formed sentences.

A: *Excuse me, could you tell me where forth street is?*

B: *Thank you, so much.*

Thank you so much is not the answer by any means; the answer you expect from stranger in the street when asking for direction in such context the combination of the sentence could not be meaningful. This leads us to a fundamental tenet of linguistics combination is not only say things with language, we also do things or we perform actions. Our sentence is not just grammatically complete units in isolation, but communicative units are used in context to perform functions.

2.1. Differentiating the discourse situation and the socio-semiotic approach

Language has supernatural power; when we speak or write we craft what we have to say to fit the situation or context in which we are communicating. But, at the same time, how we speak or write creates that very situation or context. It seems, then, that we fit our language to a situation or context that our language in turn helped to create in the first place.

We continually and actively build and rebuild our world not just through language, but through language use in tandem with actions, interactions, non-linguistic symbol systems, objects, tools, technologies, and distinctive ways of thinking, valuing, feeling, and believing. Sometimes what we build is quite similar to what we have built before; sometimes it is not. But language in action always and everywhere is an active building process.

Whenever we speak or write, we always and simultaneously construct five things or five areas of reality:

1. *The meaning and value of aspects of the material world:* give the material world certain meanings.

2. *Activities*: We talk and act in one way and we are engaged in formally opening a committee meeting; we talk and act in another way and we are engaged in “chit-chat” before the official start of the meeting.

3. *Identities and relationships*: we are speaking and acting as “chair” of the committee; the next moment we speak and talk in a different way and we are speaking and acting with peer/colleague to another.

4. *Connections*: we talk and act so as to make what we are saying here and now in this way we should admit more minority listeners connected to or relevant to what we said previously.

5. *Semiotics*: we talk and act what and how different symbol systems and different forms of knowledge count, so as to make the knowledge and language of lawyers relevant (privileged), or not, over everyday language.

There are also tools of inquiry relevant to how we build identities and activities and recognize the identities and activities that are being built around us. The tools of inquiry introduced here are most certainly caught up with all the other building tasks:

1. Situated identities: that is, different identities or social positions we enact and recognize in different settings.

2. Social languages: that is, different styles of language that we use to enact and recognize different identities in different settings and different sorts of things make certain sorts of meaningful connections in our experience.

3. Discourses: in which we humans integrate language with non-language *matter* such as different ways of thinking, acting, interacting, valuing, feeling, believing, and using symbols, tools, and objects in the right places and at the right times so as to enact and recognize different identities and activities.

4. Conversations: important themes that have been the focus of a variety of different texts and interactions.

2.2. Discourse types:

There are traditionally four different types of discourse, namely argument, narration, description, and exposition. Discourse is generally understood to encompass almost any type of communication whether written or oral, and there are some cases in which entire papers or speeches depend on just one style; most of the time, though, authors, writers, and speakers use two or more methods at once. Different types are usually better suited for different

circumstances, and there are usually some pretty distinguishable features of each. The goals tend to be different, as well. Most of the time writers and speakers will use the methods they think will be most effective at getting their points across and reaching their intended audiences.

2.2.1. Argumentation:

It is the process of supporting or ignoring arguer's views, theories and suggestions. Argumentative writing or speaking is when the writer or speaker is attempting to convince an audience that his or her opinion is correct, typically by using logic and appealing to the audience's sense of reason. Almost anything can use this form, from essays and lectures to sermons and political speeches. In an argument, the writer or speaker begins with a thesis, which is a clear, explicit statement of beliefs or opinions. Evidence must then be presented in a clear and orderly way. If a listener accepts the evidence, he or she should agree with the thesis.

In most cases argumentation is not the same as persuasion, though the two are commonly confused. The difference usually has to do with tactic, and many linguistic experts see persuasion more as a matter of style and voice than an actual level of discourse. Argument-driven writers or speakers present evidence to get the audience to logically agree with their point of view on a certain topic. Persuasion, however, is designed to get an audience to both accept a particular point of view and to actually act on that belief. For example, a successful argument might make the audience agree with a particular political candidate's stance on an issue, but successful persuasion should make the audience vote for that candidate.

2.2.2. Description:

It is presentation of how something looks like. When people use description, they generally rely on one or more of the five human senses to describe something so that it becomes instantly memorable and relatable.

It is usually used to help the audience visualize people and places, but it can also put the audience in a particular mood or create a certain type of atmosphere. The writer or speaker uses nouns and adjectives to give the readers and listeners a sense of what something is like materially.

2.2.3. Exposition

The tool known as “exposition” is designed to inform the audience about a particular topic that can extend into texts like essays, theses, summaries, etc. There are several different expository tools writers and speakers can use, including definition, analysis, compare and contrast, problem and solution and cause and effect. There are many strengths and weaknesses associated with each type of exposition, and each type has a completely different purpose. For example, giving someone the definition of a word provides one type of information, whereas comparing and contrasting two differing opinions often paints a really different picture.

2.2.4. Narration

The main goal of narrative writing or speaking is usually to tell a story, often in order to make the audience feel differently about a certain topic. Narratives might take the form of a play, novel, folk tale, memoir, or myth. This type of communication usually appeals to an audience’s humanity, often by drawing on common experiences or emotions that are easily relatable or by depicting circumstances that pique the imagination.

Narrative analysis is one of the best and extensively researched areas of the multidisciplinary study of discourse. It is the encoding of previous experience that took place at a specific point or over a specific interval in a past time story world. Narratives are associated with events that happened in the past. Narratives events are produced not in a vacuum, but as part of social instructions on specific situations, for specific goals and purposes. According to psycholinguistics point of view narrative is not a static mechanism, but it has the capacity to select the stored material and organized into meaningful patterns.

Narrative discourse comprises two major modes: Narrative and non-narrative modes.

1. Narrative discourse attempts to sweep narrator and audience into community of rapport to enhance intimacy and strength the bonds between participants. Narrative discourse touches upon our deep imaginative process, whereas non-narrative relies on rationalization.
2. Non-narrative discourse concerns with the need to convince, to prove and refute as well as to present information. Thus, the two modes have a distinction of prototypical function. The general features of narrative and non-narrative discourse mode description is given below:

No	Elements	Narrative discourse	Non-narrative discourse
1.	Ordering	Temporal sequencing	Multiple/ logical and temporal etc.
2.	Particularity	Particular events	Generic truth
3.	Normativity	Disruption & re-establishment of equilibrium	Stating (argument)
4.	Reference	Reconstruct events	Verifiable events
5.	Perspective	Personal	Impersonal
6.	Context	Impermanent	Permanent across contexts

2.3. Identifying the variety of functions and forms, everyday and literary language and electronic discourse

Of course, discourse production does not take place in a vacuum, but is an integral part of a communicative context. For speakers to be able to fit what they say into the context; they must have a memory representation of that context that is a *context model*. This model contains information about the speech participants and their goals, and about the type of social situation involved. The context model also controls style and content hence information must be retrieved from the situation model. Some topics are forbidden in some situations. Furthermore, communicative goals must be accomplished by the utterance of a discourse in a given context (e.g. assertion, threat, or accusation).

2.3.1. Form and Function

Form is concerned with syntactic structure up to the sentence level, i.e. the arrangement of morphemes and words into the larger units of group, clause, and finally, sentence. Form is also concerned with the relationship between words within clauses and sentences. For example, “I’m taller than you” is different from “You’re taller than I am”. Inverting “I” and ‘you’ around the comparative adjective changes the propositional meaning of the sentence. Function however, is concerned with the utterance’s purpose, i.e. what the utterance is meant to achieve. For example:

Father: Get the tools down off the shelf.

Son: You’re taller than I am!

The son uttered “You’re taller than I am” for the purpose of refusing to comply with a command. This is a very different function of than that of:

A: Which of us is taller?

B: You're taller than I am

Where, "You're taller than I am" functions to provide information to a question. Nothing about the form, that is the syntactic structure of the utterance itself, or the relation between the words within it, allowed us to predict its function.

Form is not *wholly* divorced from function. Hymes (1972) observes that '*how* something is said is part of *what* is said.' For example:

I. shut the door.

II. Can you shut the door?

The above clauses have the form-classifications of, **(I.)** imperative and **(II)** interrogative, but both could be assigned the functional classification of '**directive**'. The 'directive' function of the above stem from the verb 'shut' and whatever follows ('the door', 'the window' 'your mouth' etc.). While example **II** above looks like an **inquire** that could be paraphrased as "Are you willing to shut the door?" this *Can you* equals *Are you willing* paraphrase is faulty in For example, "Can you be quiet" does not equal "Are you willing to be quiet".

Yet, in the case of **II**, the grammatical items (forms) preceding 'shut' do have a purpose, namely, a 'politeness function'. This is what Searle (1975) calls an *indirect speech act*. That is, an utterance with an underlying base function performed *indirectly* by the performing of what, on the surface, could be another speech act (function) form.

In the case of **II**, a **directive** function is indirectly performed by an interrogative form, which are often used for **inquires** ('questions'), rather than directly by an imperative. Listeners interpret what a speaker functionally means or implies. According to Grice (1975), for an utterance the speaker fulfils four maxims:

1. Relation, i.e. make your contribution be relevant.
2. Quality, i.e. make your contribution truthful and sincere.
 - a) Do not say what you believe to be false
 - b) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence
3. Quantity, i.e. provide sufficient information.
 - a) Make your contribution as informative as is required
 - b) Do not make your contribution more informative than required
4. Manner, i.e. make your contribution brief, present it in an orderly fashion

- a) Avoid obscurity of expression
- b) Avoid ambiguity
- c) Be brief
- d) Be orderly

There are various conditions under which these maxims may be violated or infringed upon. One of these is instrumental to the explanation of how implicatures are being communicated.

2.3.2. Electronic discourse and literary language

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 which is **electronic discourse**. It is found in e-mails, Internet-relay chats (IRC), and homepages which are used to communicate across time and geographical borders. According to Yates (2001), electronic discourse refers to the ‘imaginary space created by the Internet in which people interact and form social relationships’.

In many so-called first world countries, accessing the Internet by means of a computer or a smart phone, etc. has become an everyday activity for many people. In only little more than twenty years of publicly accessible Internet access, the use of computer-mediated forms of communication has developed from primarily information websites and email exchanges to highly interactive and social forms of Internet use.

In Crystal’s (2011: 149) words, “the Internet is the largest area of language development we have seen in our lifetimes”. Similarly, Yus (2011) stated that, “in the past, Internet-mediated communication was basically text-based, and even nowadays the text typed by users is essential in virtual interactions”. As such, linguists started to study language use and by now we can look back on research from two decades. One of the reasons for this could be the difficulty in categorizing this new kind of discourse because it is neither purely written nor spoken, but shares features of both types of discourse simultaneously.

Literary language is a language which is used in literary criticism and general discussion on some literary works. Before the 18th century the language of literature was totally different from the language which was used by the common man in spoken or written. So literature was not easy to understand for a common man. Only highly qualified and educated people could enjoy the reading of literature. So literature was far away from the reach of the common people.

Since then the language of literature has changed a lot. In the modern time we find literature written in the languages which are really used by common people in their daily life. This is the reason why literature has become popular in our time. Now every literate person can enjoy the reading of literature of his or her choice because it is written in the language which he or she uses in daily life. So nowadays literature has become close to the people and so its readership has increased. On the part of writers it has now become a style to write in ordinary and common language.

2.4. Discourse markers

What are discourse markers?

Discourse markers are linking words or phrases used in speaking and writing that direct the flow of the conversation or discourse in various ways. In writing, they tend to be formal and used in academic writing. Whereas in speaking, they are informal and used for different functions such as directing our listener or showing interest.

Discourse markers are interesting because they have more function than meaning. They are often referred to as ‘sign posting’ language because they are used to order and sequence what we say, to start and end a conversation and to change or manage a topic. In this way, we help our listeners to follow what we are saying more clearly. Some of the discourse markers are: **Addition** (moreover, in addition...) **cause and effect** (as a result, because...) **comparison** (similarly, resembling...) **contrast** (although, however...) **generalization** (in general, on the whole...) **emphasis** (surely, especially...) **illustration** (for example, for instance...) **time makers and sequence** (first, previously...) **repetition** (in other words, to clarify...) **conclusion** (to summarize, to sum up...).

According to Laurel, Brinton (1990:47) justification, discourse markers are generally used

- To mark a boundary in discourse (shift/partial shift in topic),
- To serve as a filler or delaying tactic,
- To effect an interaction or sharing between speaker and hearer,
- To mark either foregrounded or backgrounded information.

The function of signaling a range of textual relations between units is shared by a wide and heterogeneous set of linguistic elements.

2.5. Identifying Cohesion, Coherence and Rhetorical Structure Theory

Speakers have to organize the structure and content of what they want to say (discourse) and express everything in a coherent way, as well as in accordance with what they suppose their listeners know or don't know. From the structural point of view, the focus of discourse analysis is on the explicit connections between sentences that create cohesion or on the elements of textual organization that are typical of different text types (storytelling, commentary, instructions, opinion expressing etc). Rhetorical Structure Theory argues that ideal relations are crucial to the effective functioning of the text as a whole. According to Rhetorical Structure Theory relation can be identified on more than one level. Structure refers to the force that keeps the sentence together in a certain configuration. It implies to the part-whole relations as they appear in the sentences and the limited number of possible configurations.

Cohesion is the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relations which link various parts of a text. These relations organize and, to some extent, create a text, for instance, by requiring the reader/listener to interpret words and expressions by reference to other words and expressions in the surrounding sentences. Cohesion is a surface relation and it connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see or hear. The five main cohesive devices in English are: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion.

- A. **Reference:** The term reference is traditionally used in semantics for the relationship that exists between a word and what it points to in the real world. As a cohesive device, instead of denoting a direct relationship between words and extra-linguistic objects, reference is limited to the relationship of identity which exists between two linguistic expressions. For example; *Mr Smith has resigned. He announced his decision this morning.* The pronoun *he* points to Mr Smith within the textual world itself. Reference in the textual sense occurs when the reader /listener has to retrieve the identity of what is being talked about by referring to another expression in the immediate context. The resulting cohesion lies in the continuity of reference.
- B. **Substitution and ellipsis:** unlike reference, they are grammatical rather than semantic relationships. In substitution, an item is replaced by another item: Example;
- A: Do you like movies?*
B: I do.

In the above example, *do* is a substitute for *like movies*. Items commonly used in substitution in English include *do*, *one*, and *the same*.

Ellipsis, involves the omission of an item. In other words, in ellipsis, an item is replaced by nothing. This is a case of leaving something unsaid which is nevertheless understood. We use ellipsis when zero element appears to link to a previous part of the text. Here is an example: *Joan brought some carnations and Catherine some roses.* (*brought* in the second clause is ellipped.)

C. **Conjunction:** involves the use of formal markers to relate sentences, clauses and paragraphs to each other. Unlike reference, substitution, and ellipsis, the use of conjunction does not instruct the reader/listener to supply missing information either by looking for it elsewhere in the text or by filling structural slots. Instead, it signals the way the writer/ speaker wants the reader / listener to relate what is about to be said to what has been said before. Conjunctions can be:

- a. additive: and, or also, in addition, furthermore, besides, for instance;
- b. opposing: but, yet, however, instead, on the other hand, nevertheless;
- c. causal: so, consequently, for, because, for this reason;
- d. continuative: now, of course, well, anyway, surely, after all.

D. **Lexical cohesion:** refers to the role played by the selection of vocabulary in organizing relations within a text. A given lexical item cannot be said to have a cohesive function, but any lexical item can enter into a cohesive relation with other items in a text. Lexical cohesion can be divided into two main categories: **reiteration** and **collocation**.

- Reiteration, as the name suggests, involves repetition of lexical items. A reiterated item may be a repetition of an earlier item, a synonym or near-synonym, a super-ordinate, or a general word. For example

There is a boy climbing that tree.

*The **boy** is going to fall if he doesn't take care. (repetition)*

*The **lad's** going to fall if he doesn't take care. (synonym)*

*The **child's** going to fall if he doesn't take care. (superordinate)*

- Collocation, as a subclass of lexical cohesion, covers any instance which involves a pair of lexical items that are associated with each other in the language in some way, like

beautiful woman, handsome-man, husband & wife and so on. Similarly, there are various kinds of opposites in lexical relations: e.g. boy/girl; love/hate; order/obey

- Part-whole relations: car/brake; body/arm; bicycle/wheel.
- Part-part relations: mouth/chin; brake/ wheel.
- Co-hyponymy: red/green (colour); chair/table (furniture).

Generally, people expect coherence from what is said or written, i.e. that it will make sense in terms of their normal experience of things. This “normality” of course depends on each individual or community. Since familiarity and knowledge are the basis of coherence, we tend to give a coherent interpretation even for texts that potentially do not have it. Our ability to arrive automatically at interpretations of what is unsaid or written (yet communicated) must be based on pre-existing knowledge structures. These structures function like familiar patterns from previous experience that we use to interpret new experiences. The most general term for a pattern of this type is a **schema**. A schema is a pre-existing knowledge structure in memory. If there is a fixed, static pattern to the schema it is called a **frame**. For example: a frame may contain knowledge about birds with slots containing knowledge on what they eat, how they procreate, etc...When more dynamic types of schemata are considered, they are more often described as **scripts**. A script is a pre-existing knowledge structure involving event sequences. For example, we have scripts for what normally happens in all kinds of events, such as going to a doctor’s office, a movie theatre, a restaurant, or a grocery store. We use scripts to interpret accounts of what happened. Thus, the concept of a script is simply a way of recognizing some expected sequence of action in an event. Because most of the details of scripts are assumed to be known, they are unlikely to be stated.

Generally members of the same culture share the same frames and scripts, but with members of different cultures there may be problems of communication. Schemata and scripts, like the maxims of the cooperative principle, the politeness strategies, the mechanism of turn-taking, etc. are all culturally determined, hence the necessity of *contrastive* and *cross-cultural pragmatics*.

Unit Three: Conversational analysis

Conversational analysis (commonly abbreviated as **CA**) is an approach to the study of social interaction, embracing both verbal and non-verbal conduct, in situations of everyday life. As its name implies, CA began with a focus on casual conversation, but its methods are subsequently adapted to embrace more task and institution-centered interactions, such as those occurring in doctors' offices, courts, law enforcement, help lines, educational settings, and the mass media. As a consequence, the term 'conversation analysis' has become something of a misnomer, but it has continued as a term for a distinctive and successful approach to the analysis of social interaction. Conversation Analysis studies naturally-occurring talk and shows that spoken interaction in systematically ordered in all its facets (Atkinson and Heritage 1984: 21-27). It is distinct from discourse analysis in focus and method.

1. Its focus is on processes involved in social interaction and does not include written texts or larger socio-cultural phenomena.
2. Its method is aimed at determining the resources that the *interactional participants* use and rely on to produce interactional contributions and make sense of the contributions of others.

Thus, Conversational Analysis is neither designed for, nor aimed at, examining the production of interaction from a perspective that is external to the participants' own reasoning and understanding about their circumstances and communication. Rather the aim is to model the resources and methods by which those understandings are produced.

3.1. Identifying turn-taking principles

In conversation, participants are constrained to issue their utterances in allocated turns, and enlist various mechanisms to obtain them. In multi-party conversation the mechanisms are found to be more complicated where 'current speaker selects next' is a possibility, and how frequently individual utterances are tailored for their turn 'sequential implicativeness'. The possibility of obtaining not only the next turn, but a series of turn (required for example in telling a joke or story) is documented in analyses of announcements and story prefaces. A certain economy in conversation could be located in the process whereby turns are allocated.

The common turn-taking principles are:

Turn allocational component: Getting a turn can be a serious issue especially in ordinary conversation. In our life we always have mechanisms to organize our activities by applying

sequential or alternating turns. The turn allocational component describes how participants organize their interaction by distributing turns to speakers. In daily conversation turns are locally and interactionally managed. Locally managed means that the participants themselves determine who shall speak next, including turn size, turn length, number of parties, and what parties say. Turn allocation is not determined before participants begin. Interactionally managed means that one participant affects what the others may acceptably do, that is, if the current speaker chooses who speaks next, the chance to other speakers is reduced. This is a participant-managed turn system.

The following are basic set of rules for determining who gets the next turn, as shown below.

1. For any turn, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn construction unit:
 - A. If the turn so far is constructed as to involve the use of a “current speaker selects next” technique, then the party so selected has the right and is obliged to take next turn to speak; no others have such rights or obligation, and transfer occurs at the place.
 - B. If the turn so far is constructed as not to involve the use of a “current speaker selects next” technique, then self-selection for next speakership may be instituted; first starter acquires rights to turn, and transfer occurs at that place.
 - C. If the turn so far is constructed as not to involve the use of a „current speaker selects next” technique, and then current speaker may continue, unless another self selects. It can be summarized that rule 1a deals with the „current speaker selects next”, rule 1b refers to “self select”, and rule 1c with the “speaker continuation”.

Turn constructional component (TCU): The turn constructional component describes basic units out of which turns are fashioned. These basic units are known as Turn construction unit or TCU. They are units that develop turn, and the types vary, such as, sentence, clause, phrase, or word. Turns also can be seen as an end boundary marked by turn claiming responses by participants. So turns in this sense refers to both utterances divided by speaker’s changes as well as opportunities for the speaker to take turn in interaction.

For example: Lexical TCU: “Yes”, “there”

Phrasal TCU: “In the basket” “out of here”

Clausal TCU: “When I am free” “if I get the job”

Sentential TCU: “I am working on my thesis” “he has got my car”

Adjacency pairs: Talk tends to occur in responsive pairs; however, the pairs may be split over a sequence of turns. Adjacency pairs divide utterance types into 'first pair parts' and 'second pair parts' to form a 'pair type'. There are lots of examples of adjacency pairs including Questions-Answers, Offer-Acceptance/Refusal and Compliment-Response.

Pre-sequences: A pair of turns may be understood as preliminary to the main course of action. For example, "Guess what!"/ "What?" as preliminary to an announcement of some sort, or "What are you doing?"/ "Nothing" as preliminary to an invitation or a request. Other collections include use of 'repeats', the elision of lexical forms, the use of temporal regulators in turns including, chuckles, 'uhm', 'you know', and 'right', the use of speech particles like 'uh', and 'oh', and other specifically short-syllabic devices that are consonant-prefaced like 'tih'.

Overlapping in turn-taking

When more than one person is engaging in a conversation, there is potential for overlapping or interruption while both or many parties are speaking at the same time. Overlapping in turn-taking can be problematic for the people involved. There are four types of overlap including terminal overlaps, continuers, conditional access to the turn, and chordal.

1. **Terminal overlaps:** occur when a speaker assumes the other speaker has or is about to finish their turn and begins to speak, thus creating overlap.
2. **Continuers:** are a way of the hearer acknowledging or understanding what the speaker is saying. Such examples of the continuer's phrases are "mm hm" or "uh huh".
3. **Conditional access to the turn:** implies that the current speaker yields their turn or invites another speaker to interject in the conversation, usually as a collaborative effort.
4. **Chordal:** consists of a non-serial occurrence of turns; meaning both speakers turns are occurring at once, such as laughter.

Gail Jefferson proposed a categorization of overlaps in conversation with three types of overlap onsets. Those are: Transitional overlap, recognitional overlap and progressional overlap.

1. **Transitional overlap:** occurs when a speaker enters the conversation at the possible point of completion. This occurs frequently when speakers participate in the conversation enthusiastically and exchange speeches with continuity.
2. **Recognitional overlap:** occurs when a speaker anticipates the possible remainder of an unfinished sentence, and attempts to finish it for the current speaker. In other words, the

overlap, arises because the current tries to finish the sentence, when simultaneously the other speaker 'think aloud' to reflect his understanding of the ongoing speech.

3. **Progressional overlap:** occurs as a result of a stoppage of speech fluency of the previous speaker when another speaker self-selects to continue with the ongoing utterance. An example would be when a speaker is retrieving an appropriate word to utter when other speakers make use of this gap to start his/her turn.

3.2. Narratives

3.2.1 Differentiating the structure of narratives and Narrative imagining

Theorists of narrative have long been in agreement that there are at least two levels in a narrative conversation: Something happens and this something is related in a certain way. There is, in other words, a **WHAT** (What is told?) to be considered and a **HOW** (How is it told?). These two levels have been given different names by different critics. In structuralism terminology the **WHAT** of the narrative is called **story**, the **HOW** is called **discourse**. These two levels are further subdivided & analyzed as follows:

1. **Story:** The story consists of **events** (things that happen) and so-called **existents**, the characters that make 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). Each of these elements can be approached with different tools of analysis (story/plot, character, space).
2. **Discourse:** Discourse is the category that comprises various elements of transmission. Strictly speaking, it is only discourse that is directly accessible to us, since we only learn about the story via discourse. Elements of discourse thus determine our perception of the story (what 'actually' happened). In the analysis of discourse one tries to determine how certain effects are achieved.

The focuses of analysis are questions such as: What is the narrative situation? Whose point of view is presented? Which narrative modes are employed? How are the thoughts of characters transmitted? How is the chronology of events dealt with? How is style used? These elements are always used to certain effects. For instance, how it is that the reader tends to identify with one character and not with another? The analysis of elements

of discourse reveals how the speaker is ‘manipulated’ into forming certain views about the story.

3.3. Argumentation

3.3.1 Identifying the notion of argumentation

Argumentation theory, or argumentation, is the interdisciplinary study of how conclusions can be reached through logical reasoning; that is, claims based, soundly or not, on premises. It includes the arts and sciences of civil debate, dialogue, conversation, and persuasion. It studies rules of inference, logic, and procedural rules in both artificial and real world settings. Argumentation includes debate and negotiation which are concerned with reaching mutually acceptable conclusions. Therefore, Argumentation theory studies the production, analysis and evaluation of argumentation with a view of developing adequate criteria for determining the validity of the point of departure and presentational layout of argumentative discourse.

It also encompasses eristic dialog, the branch of social debate in which victory over an opponent is the primary goal. This art and science is often the means by which people protect their beliefs or self-interests in rational dialogue, in common parlance, and during the process of arguing. Argumentation is used in law, for example in trials, in preparing an argument to be presented to a court, and in testing the validity of certain kinds of evidence. Also, argumentation scholars study the post hoc rationalizations by which organizational actors try to justify decisions they have made irrationally.

3.3.1. Identifying the structure of argumentation and the pragma-dialectical approach

Argumentation is a speech act complex aimed at resolving a difference of opinion. It is a verbal and social activity of reason carried out by a speaker or writer concerned with increasing (or decreasing) the acceptability of a controversial standpoint for a listener or reader.

Typically an argument has an internal structure, which comprises the following elements:

1. a set of assumptions or premises
2. a method of reasoning or deduction and
3. a conclusion or point.

An argument must have at least two premises and one conclusion. Often classical logic is used as the method of reasoning so that the conclusion follows logically from the assumptions or supporting premises. In its most common form, argumentation involves an individual and an interlocutor/or opponent engaged in dialogue, each contending different positions and trying to

persuade each other. Other types of dialogue in addition to persuasion are eristic, information seeking, inquiry, negotiation, and so on.

For example:

1. Socrates is a person.
2. All people are mortal.
3. Therefore, Socrates is mortal.

In a critical discussion, one language user (the 'protagonist') expresses a standpoint and another language user (the 'antagonist') expresses doubt with respect to this standpoint or advances a contradictory standpoint. The protagonist defends his standpoint by putting forward argumentation, and if confronted with critical reactions, further argumentation to support his prior argumentation. The difference of opinion is resolved when either the antagonist is convinced by the protagonist's argumentation and accepts the defended standpoint or the protagonist withdraws his standpoint as a result of the antagonist's critical reactions.

Pragma-dialectics is an approach to argumentation initiated by Frans van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst in the 1970s. Unlike the formal dialectical rules for generating rational arguments, the pragma-dialectical rules for resolving a difference of opinion are envisaged as representing necessary conditions for carrying out a critical discussion in argumentative discourse. Analytically, four stages are distinguished in the conduct of a critical discussion: defining the difference of opinion ('confrontation' stage), establishing the starting point of the discussion ('opening' stage), exchanging arguments and critical reactions in order to resolve the difference ('argumentation' stage), and determining the result of the discussion ('concluding' stage). At every stage of a discourse aimed at bringing about a critical discussion, specific obstacles may arise that can impede the resolution of the difference of opinion.

The pragma-dialectical rules are designed to prevent such obstacles from arising; they provide a definition of the general principles of constructive argumentative discourse. A crucial difference between the pragma-dialectical rules of formal dialectics is that the former are linked to ordinary discussions in everyday language. Their scope extends over all aspects of a critical discussion, inclusive of the logical inference relations between premises and conclusions. The rules cover all speech acts performed in all stages of a discourse aimed at resolving a difference of opinion.

Unit four: Persuasion

In many cases, speeches are simply used as a way of telling a story or to deliver a message. In this sense, if the speaker isn't careful, it's easy to make the speech feel one directional. However, when a speaker gives a speech of persuasion they intend to enact a response in the audience, or 'receiver of the message', creating multiple channels of communication. These types of speeches can range anywhere from a political debate to a simple sales pitch.

4.1. Discourse and cognition:

It is important to make some points clear to avoid some common misunderstandings.

To make sense of a moment, you have to recognize the identities and activities involved in it.

People engage in such work when they try to make visible to others (and to themselves, as well) who they are and what they are doing. People engage in such work when they try to recognize others for who they are and what they are doing. People engage in such work within interactions, moment by moment. They engage in such work when they reflect on their interactions later. They engage in such work, as well, when they try to understand human interaction as researchers, practitioners, theoreticians, or interventionists. This is what I call "recognition work." Sometimes such recognition work is conscious, sometimes it is not. Sometimes people have labels they can articulate for *whose* and *what's* they recognize, sometimes they don't. Sometimes they fight over the labels, sometimes they don't. And the labels change over time.

4.1.1. Identifying theories of persuasion and Persuasive tools

The common goal in persuasive speech is to influence the audience's view on a certain subject whether that means changing their opinion completely or simply strengthening already existing view. In order to accomplish this, speakers use a variety of arguments and strategies, most of which can be summed up into the three rhetorical appeals: **ethos**, **logos**, and **pathos**. When used effectively, these three appeals can be powerful tools for achieving a speaker's persuasive goal.

In a persuasive speech, it's not simply enough to capture our audience's attention; the speaker must also quickly establish their credibility. This can be done using the ethical appeal known as **ethos**.

Ethos is an appeal to credibility or character. Speakers or writers use ethos to convince audiences in case of reliable, honest and credible.

Ethos is related to the persona or reputation associated with the speaker. This persona is constructed based on the credentials and reliability of a speaker, and can often be established prior to a speech or presentation in situations where the speaker is widely known to the audience. Basically, ethos is what signifies to the audience that the speaker knows what they're talking about.

Here are 3 easy ways for a speaker to establish a favorable ethos:

1.) A speaker needs to do is convince the audience that they know what they're talking about. This includes knowing both sides of an argument and presenting each of them accurately. This helps assure the audience that you've at least done your research on the subject.

2.) A speaker understands the important issue for audience: By having this background knowledge the speaker can research their subject matter, and then tailor their message in a way that resonates with that specific audience.

3.) The speaker cites credible sources: For example, if you were trying to persuade your audience to use a certain pharmaceutical product, and you yourself were not a doctor or pharmacist, you might reference or quote known physicians. An audience can forgive the fact that you're not a certified expert on the subject that you're presenting, but they may not forgive you for not making an effort to provide an expert's opinion.

Logos is an appeal to logic or reason. The principal role or purpose of logos is to identify and simplify its means. Logos are clear and simple graphical elements. Logos provides visual perception and comprehension.

Pathos is an appeal to emotion. Speakers use pathos to evoke an emotional response of their audience. Sometimes it is a positive emotion such as happiness, an image of people may enjoy themselves. Some speakers use negative emotion such as pain. Pathos can also include emotions like, fear and guilty.

4.1.2. Identifying Modeling discourse production

Depending on a number of constraints, language users, so speak, read off relevant propositions from their situation models, and thus construct the semantic representations, or text base, that underlies a discourse.

According to (Butterworth, 1980) the major components of the theory of discourse production are: Context Model and Control System.

The Context Model: Of course, discourse production does not take place in a vacuum, but it is an integral part of a communicative context. For speakers to be able to fit what they say into the context, they must also have a memory representation of context that is a *context model*.

This model contains information about the speech participants and their goals, and about the type of social situation involved. The context model controls style and content hence *what* information may or must be retrieved from the situation model. Some topics are forbidden in some situations.

Hence, context models monitor the strategic searches through episodic memory (what models are relevant?) as well as within models (what information about the situation should be mentioned?)

The Control System: This system regulates the flow of information between short-term memory and long-term memory. It specifies what kind of models and scripts must be activated and which of their fragments must actually be retrieved for production. In addition, control system contains the kind of *speech act* and communicative goals which must be accomplished by the utterance of a discourse in a given context (e.g., assertion, threat, or accusation), both at the local level of individual speech acts, or at the global level of macro-speech acts that control a longer stretch of discourse.

4.1.3. Product and process analysis

Human language activity unfolds mainly along the two dimensions of the spoken and the written word. The former is commonly known as “conversation”; the latter comprises is often referred to as “literature.” Together, they constitute the principal ways in which humans produce text. In addition to the spoken, oral text, with its corresponding competence (often called “orality” or “oracy”); there are the written productions (mainly literary texts).

4.1.4. Processing and prior knowledge

In the literature about reading and writing the term prior knowledge plays a very central role. It is the conceptual knowledge that enables interactants to communicate with one another via the written or spoken text. Marr and Gormley (1982: 90) define prior knowledge as “knowledge about events, persons, and the like which provides a conceptual framework for interacting with the world.” Schallert (1982) further expands the notion to refer to everything a person knows, including tacit and explicit knowledge of procedures and typical ways of expressing information.

Alexander et al. (1991) develop a conceptual framework of knowledge including domain and discipline knowledge as part of general content knowledge, and knowledge of text structure, syntax and rhetoric as part of one's discourse knowledge.

Language is a dynamic process. So much of linguistic analysis has dealt with language in written form that there is a temptation to think of language itself as having the same static quality (Linell 1982). But language in action is better captured with the metaphor of a flowing stream.

There are, in fact, two streams, one a stream of **thoughts**, and the other of **sounds**. Sounds are easier for an analyst to deal with, because they are publicly observable. Thoughts are experienced within the mind, and for that reason are less tractable to objective research.

On the other hand thoughts enjoy a priority over sounds in the sense that the organization and communication of thoughts is what language is all about. The sounds exist in the service of the thoughts, and follow wherever the thoughts may take them. It is the thoughts that drive language forward. A basic challenge for discourse analysis is to identify the forces that give direction to the flow of thoughts.

A first step in discourse analysis can be to listen to a recording of a conversation with the goal of identifying topics, segments of discourse during which one or more of the speakers talk about "the same thing." Topics are identifiable from their content, but there are likely to be phonetic cues as well: sometimes, though certainly not always, a longer than normal pause before a new topic is introduced; sometimes heightened pitch, loudness, acceleration, or a new voice quality at the outset; sometimes a tapering off in these same prosodic features at the end.

The next step can be to reduce the flow of language to some written form. The word *reduce* is appropriate.

Ultimately the entire physical, social, and cognitive context in which it took place in which all these factors can be captured in any presently conceivable written form.

4.1.5. Aspects of processing,

One view of discourse processing is as an extension of sentence processing.

The basic aspect of discourse comprehension which has been emphasized in the psychology of discourse processing is the *predominantly semantic* nature of the processes involved. Understanding a text basically requires that a language user, i.e., a hearer or reader, assigns a semantic structure to the respective units of the text. In discourse comprehension, we also have a process of *global* interpretation. Such a global interpretation is necessary in order for the reader

to be able to establish the theme, topic or gist of a text or a passage of a text. When we read and understand a sequence of sentences of a text, we will know or try to know what the sequence, as a *whole*, is about. This kind of global interpretation is made explicit in terms of *semantic macro-structures*.

Such macro-structures are also sequences of propositions, but at another level of interpretation.

We try to *generalize* sequences of propositions in terms of one or more general proposition with the help of a super-concept.

We try to keep together propositional information which represents the various aspects or events of a socially well-known episode, and then substitute the various propositions by one proposition representing this episode as a whole.

4.1.6. Modeling discourse processing,

People create mental models based upon the discourse, the situation, and the purposes they have to serve. So, people trying to understand and create mental models of ponds, logs, fish, and turtles so that they can estimate where they are in relation to each other. According to (Just and Carpenter 1980, 1987) proposal, readers create mental models for each utterance; they read in order to help them parse and understand it. They can change the model if the next word is not what was expected in the model so far. Mental models begin, in effect, with the generic information represented in schemas, and add visual and spatial relationships to represent instantiations of a scene or event. Mental models can also represent dynamic events.

4.1.7. Metaphor in cognitive research

Cognitive psychology ought to be focused on the public uses of words and other symbolic devices that active people use to carry out all sorts of projects.

Some of the concepts appropriate for analyzing linguistic interactions, such as syntax and semantics, may have a metaphorical use in nonlinguistic contexts. “Conversation” can be given an extended role as the leading metaphor for making sense of those aspects of episodes that seem to be mediated by other symbolic devices. Since conversation is literally a subtle symbolic public activity, often but not always directed to some overt or covert end, and occurring within the bounds of certain conceptions of what is a possible conversation, it ought to serve as a model for all types of meaningful interpersonal Interaction.

4.2. Discourse and culture

Discourse analysis grows out of critical, socio-cultural, socio-logical, or historical analysis. In most analysis of discourse as text, the analysis seeks to position itself as well as the discourse being studied within a broader socio-cultural or historical context. Perhaps the central tenet of this line of thought is that social practice and discourse are mutually constitutive phenomena. That is, social practices are understood as being constituted in and through discursive social interaction while at the same time those social interactions are taken as instantiations of pre-existing social practices.

Through discourse, intercultural and cross-cultural communications are studied. There is sometimes an ambiguity in the use of the terms “intercultural” and “cross-cultural” communication.

We take “intercultural communication” to signal the study of distinct cultural or other groups in interaction with each other. That is to say, the comparative analysis of the groups between them arises in the framework as part of the interaction of members of different groups with each other, and the analyst’s role is to stand outside of the interaction and to provide an analysis of how the participants negotiate their cultural or other differences.

We take “cross-cultural communication” to signal the independent study of the communicative characteristics of distinct cultural or other groups.

That is to say, within the cross-cultural paradigm, the members of the distinct groups do not interact with each other within the study but are studied as separate and separable entities.

4.2.1. The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis

A. Sapir

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis proclaimed the influence of language on thought and perception. This, in turn, implies that the speakers of different languages think and perceive reality in different ways and that each language has its own world view. The issues this hypothesis raised not only pertain to the field of linguistics but also had a bearing on Psychology, Ethnology, Anthropology, Sociology, Philosophy, as well as on the natural sciences.

For Sapir, language does not reflect reality but actually shapes it to a large extent. Thus, he recognizes the objective nature of reality; but since the perception of reality is influenced by our linguistic habits, it follows that language plays an active role in the process of cognition. Sapir’s linguistic relativity hypothesis can be stated as follows:

- a) The language we speak and think in shapes the way we perceive the world.
- b) The existence of the various language systems implies that the people who think in these different languages must perceive the world differently.

The idea that a given language shapes reality resembles Humboldt's idea of the world view inherent in every language. Sapir realized that there is a close relationship between language and culture so that the one cannot be understood and appreciated without knowledge of the other. Sapir's views on the relationship between language and culture are clearly expressed in the following passage taken from his book "Language".

"Human beings do not live in the objective world alone or alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the real world is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group. We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation." (Sapir, 1929b: 207).

B. Whorf

Whorf's formulation of the linguistic relativity hypothesis is more radical than Sapir's but it is the one that is referred to as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. This hypothesis is not homogeneous as its name would indicate. Whorf stated that the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by the linguistic system in our minds. This would seem to make the objective world into something totally subjective for Whorf.

Whorf extended his master's (Sapir's) ideas, and went much further than saying that there was a predisposition in Whorf's view, the relationship between language and culture was a deterministic one.

The strongest Whorf statement concerning his ideas is the following:

"The background linguistic system (the grammar) of each language is not merely a reproducing instrument for voicing ideas but rather is itself the shape of ideas, the program and guide for the individual's mental activity, for his analysis of impressions, for his synthesis of his mental stock in trade. Formulation of ideas is not an independent process, strictly rational in the old sense, but is part of a particular grammar, and differs, from between different grammars. We dissect nature

along lines laid down by our native languages. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face ; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds. We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way an agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language.

The agreement is, of course, an implicit and unstated one, but its terms are absolutely obligatory; we cannot talk at all except by subscribing to the organization and classification of data which the agreement decrees.”

Whorf does not claim that a language completely determines the world-view of its speakers; he states that “[the close relationship between language and its speakers, world-view] is very significant for modern science. This means that no individual is free to describe nature with absolute impartiality, but is constrained to certain modes of interpretation even while he thinks himself most free. Those who find the Whorfian hypothesis attractive argue that the language a person speaks affects that person's relationship to the external world in one or more ways.

4.2.2. Critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analysis 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. Critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality.

CDA is not so much a direction, school, or specialization next to the many other approaches in discourse studies. Rather, it aims to offer a different mode or perspective of theorizing analysis, and application throughout the whole field. We may find a more or less critical perspective in such diverse areas as pragmatics, conversation analysis, narrative analysis, rhetoric, stylistics, sociolinguistics, ethnography, or media analysis, among others.

Crucial for critical discourse analysts is the explicit awareness of their role in society. Continuing a tradition that rejects the possibility of a “value-free” science, they argue that science, and especially scholarly discourse are inherently part of and influenced by social structure and produced in social interaction. Instead of denying or ignoring such a relation between scholarship

and society, they plead that such relations be studied and accounted for in their own right, and that scholarly practices be based on such insights.

Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 271–80) summarize the main tenets of CDA as follows:

1. CDA addresses social problems
2. Power relations are discursive
3. Discourse constitutes society and culture
4. Discourse does ideological work
5. Discourse is historical
6. The link between text and society is mediated
7. Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory
8. Discourse is a form of social action.

Since CDA is not a specific direction of study, it does not have unitary theoretical framework. Within the aims mentioned above, there are many types of CDA, and these may be theoretically and analytically quite diverse.

4.2.3. Gender

The study of discourse and gender is an interdisciplinary endeavor shared by scholars in linguistics, anthropology, speech communication, social psychology, education, literature, and other disciplines. The study of gender and discourse not only provides a descriptive account of male/female discourse but also reveals how language functions as a symbolic resource to create and manage personal, social, and cultural meanings and identities. Goffman (1967: 5) explores gender and discourse as an organizing component of social interaction. For example, women tended to use irony and rhetorical questions in place of direct criticism (Just why would you know how to sew? implying Of course you wouldn't), which both de-emphasized negative messages and emphasized in-group solidarity. Although both women and men used hedging particles in cases of genuine doubt, only women used them to hedge the expression of their own feelings. Goodwin (1978) points out that the girls can and do use the forms found in boys' play in other contexts (for example, when taking the role of mother in playing "house"), emphasizing that gender-related variations in language use are context-sensitive.

4.2.4. Racism,

Racism is a stigmatizing headword and political “fighting word” that seems to be on almost everyone’s lips today. Perhaps this is because the meaning of “racism” has become extraordinarily expanded and evasive. There is talk of a genetic, biological, cultural, ethnopluralist, institutional, and everyday racism at the top of an elite racism, racism in the midst of old and a new or neo-racism of a positive racism and differentialist racism.

The starting point of a discourse analytical approach to the complex phenomenon of racism is to realize that racism, as both social practice and ideology, manifests itself discursively. On the one hand, racist opinions and beliefs are produced and reproduced by means of discourse; discriminatory exclusionary practices are prepared, promulgated, and legitimated through discourse. On the other hand, discourse serves to criticize, delegitimize, and argue against racist opinions and practices, that is, to pursue antiracist strategies.

From a social functional point of view, “race” is a social construction. On the one hand, it has been used as a legitimating ideological tool to oppress and exploit specific social groups and to deny them access to material, cultural, and political resources, to work, welfare services, housing, and political rights.

From linguistics point of view, the term “race” has relatively documented in the thirteenth century. It has, at different times, entered different semantic fields, for example (1) the field of ordinal and classificational notions that include such words as “genus,” “species,” and “varietals”; (2) the field that includes social and political group denominations such as “nation” and “Volk” (in German), and, more rarely, “dynasty,” “ruling house,” “generation,” “class,” and “family”; and (3) the field that includes notions referring to language groups and language families such as “Germanen” (Teutons) and “Slavs”.

4.2.5. Intercultural communication

In most analysis of discourse as text, the analysis seeks to position itself as well as the discourse being studied within a broader sociocultural or historical context. At the same time, those broader studies of social practice are coming to ground themselves in the close analysis of concrete texts. That is, social practices are understood as being constituted in and through discursive social interaction while at the same time those social interactions are taken as instantiations of pre-existing social practices.

Intercultural communication and cross-cultural communication are problematical in relationship to discourse analysis in that they have developed out of a conceptually wider range of disciplines including anthropology, sociology, social psychology, speech communication, management or business communication, and even international political science. Key elements of intercultural communication are the production of complementary schismogenesis, contextualization cues, and the problematizing of reified cultures and other groups.

Bateson (1972) defines complementary schismogenesis as “the processes in social interactions by which small initial differences become amplified in response to each other through a sequence of interactional moves and ultimately result in a rupture in the social interaction.” Contextualization cues are the meta-communicative cues (especially paralinguistic and prosodic features such as tone of voice and intonation) by which primary communication is interpreted.