**UNIT ONE- INTRODUCTION**

**Definitions of Discourse Analysis**

The term Discourse Analysis (DA) was first used by Zellig Harris in 1952 in a paper he published then. Harris was an American structural linguist, Harris did not use the term in the sense it is now commonly used. Later in the 1960s and 1970s, scholars started using the term to describe an approach to the study of social interaction. The earliest discourse analysts were ethnographers, anthropologists and sociologists. Discourse Analysis is the field of study analyses connected speech or writing beyond the limits of a single sentence at a time. Discourse analysts examine spoken, sign and written language, and may focus on any aspect of linguistic behavior, from the study of particular patterns of pronunciation, through word choice, sentence structure and semantic representation, to the pragmatic analysis of how we organize speech encounters (and any combination of these in spoken, written and signed discourse).

Before trying to define discourse analysis, it is important to define the term discourse. Originally the word 'discourse' comes from Latin '*discursus*' which denoted 'conversation, speech.' Discourse is generally seen as “language in use.” John stone (2002:2) defines discourse as “actual instances of communication in the medium of language.” Discourse can also be seen as a continuous stretch of spoke or written language larger than a sentence, often constituting a coherent unit (Pustejovsky 2006). It is also commonly referred to as connected speech or writing. The term discourse has several definitions. In the study of language, discourse often refers to the speech patterns and usage of language, dialects, and acceptable statements, within a community. It is a subject of study in peoples who live in secluded areas and share similar speech conventions.

Discourse analysis is generally viewed as language above the sentence or the clause. It is the aspect of linguistics that is concerned with how we build up meaning in larger communicative, rather than grammatical units. It studies meaning in text, paragraph and conversation, rather than in single sentence.

Brown and Yule (1983)) observe that DA examines "how addressers construct linguistic messages for addressees and how addressees work on linguistic messages in order to interpret them." From this description of DA by Stubbs, we can gather some important information about the discipline:

(a) DA studies naturally-occurring connected speech or written discourse

(b) DA studies language above the sentence or clause

(c) DA is concerned with language use in social context

Brown and Yule (1983) i.e. “.…the analysis of language in use…which is not to be restricted to the description of language forms independent of the purpose or functions which these forms are designed to serve in human affairs.” Hence, a discourse analyst will describe language forms as they are used in communication but will go further to explain the functions of these forms in real life situations. According to Adegbija (1999), a discourse analyst will answer the following questions:

* What is the conversation or discourse about? (focus on theme/subject matter of discourse)
* What comments are being made about the topic? (participation/contributions of participants)
* Who are the speakers and addressees and what are their roles and relationships? (relationships and how this is reflected in discourse)
* How is turn taking effected? What are the turn taking techniques? (does age, sex, status, etc affect it?
* How has the topic been linked from one speaker to another? Or how has coherence in discourse been achieved? (does a violation of rules, omissions etc communicate extra-sentential meaning)
* How is reference made to different objects, persons, things or places? Is it done backward, forward, within the text, or outside the text? (focus on content)
* How is meaning decoded from the discourse? (What contributions does the context of discourse make to the encoding and decoding of meaning?) (focus on context)
* What specific and overall functions do the different utterances in the discourse perform? (Interpretation of meaning).
* How is discourse terminated by participants?
* What specific function does the discourse perform in particular social/cultural context?

**Some Major Concepts in Discourse Analysis**

**1. Text**

Speech and writing are the primary medium of language use. A text is an instance of language in use. It ranges from a word to a large chunk of language. Sometimes, people associate text with just written language, but the text is any instance of language use. A text could be a statement, an utterance, a sentence, a paragraph, a whole chapter, a news item, a conversation, and so forth. One aspect of Linguistics that studies written text is called Text linguistics. Text linguistics tends to focus on the patterns of how information flows within and among sentences by looking at aspects of texts like coherence, cohesion, the distribution of topics and comments, and other discourse structures. Much like syntax is concerned with the structure of sentences, text linguistics is concerned with the structure of texts.

**2. Context**

The word context is a commonly used expression, which may mean different things to different people. Its general meaning is the set of facts that surround a particular event or situation. From the linguistic point of view, context is everything that surrounds the production of a piece of communication. These include the physical situation in which the communication takes place, the interactants or interlocutors, the knowledge of the communicators of their cultural norms and expected behavior, and the expressions that precede and follow a particular expression. All these features of context help language speakers to interpret meaning appropriately.

**3. Speech and Writing**

Speech and writing are the primary medium of language use. Speech, however, is the oldest form of language use and writing is said to be a derived form of speech. The fact that there are still a good number of languages that do not have any written form is a pointer to the fact that speech predates language in human history. Gestures are also forms of language, but they are seen by linguists as primarily complementing speech.

**• Approaches to Discourse Analysis**

The earliest studies of discourse analysis were done by people in other disciplines namely, sociologists, anthropologists and ethnologists. Their major concern was not language, but social interaction. They developed a method for investigating such interaction, which they called **Ethnomethodology**.

Other scholars who were inspired by Ethnomethodologists focused their attention on how the conversation is ordered and structured. Their method is called **Conversational Analysis**. They observe and describe the sequential patterning of conversation. The key figures in this school of thought are Emmanuel Schegloff, Harvey Sacks and Gail Jeffesons.

Much later, linguists who perceive language as a social phenomenon got interested in analyzing discourse from that perspective. They see Linguistics as a sub-branch of Sociology, as opposed to another school of thought, which sees Linguistics as a sub-branch of Psychology (The Transformational Generative grammarians). **The first major attempt to analyze discourse from the perspective of Linguistics was done by John Sinclair and Michael Coulthard of the University of Birminghan in the UK.** They analyzed the language used by teachers and pupils in secondary school and proposed a five-point discourse rank scale for analyzing discourse. After these scholars, other scholars in the Birmingham School have followed their theory.

Discourse Analysis is the approach to language that focuses on the use of discourse in society and the role context plays in the interpretation of discourse. Unlike earlier approaches before it, it examines naturally occurring texts, such as conversation and written texts. The goal is to bring out the salient discourse features in such texts. Though started by non-linguists, it has in recent times become a very popular approach in linguistic analysis. Its use is not only limited to linguists. Scholars in other disciplines also find Discourse Analysis relevant, since discourse is often seen as a social practice that exists in all facets of human endeavor.

The following topics are meant to discuss the approaches of discourse analysis. In these approaches, we are going to looks at one of the earliest approaches to discourse analysis. The discussions in this sup topic will help you to understand how the approach to language analysis, which you are studying, emerged. The earliest practitioners of discourse analysis were not linguists and in contemporary times, discourse analysis is fast adopting a multidisciplinary approach, which makes it relevant not only to linguists, **but also a sociologist, philosophers, psychologists, political scientists and other social scientists.** This discourse analysis approaches it will expose you to the earliest ways of studying discourse.

1. **Ethnomethodology**

Ethnomethodology is a blend of the words ethnography and methodology. It is a branch of Anthropology, which studies people in their environment. Methodology simply refers to the way of doing things. The major focus is the cultural behavior of the people and the methods involved in doing a particular thing. The term Ethnomethodology is a sociological term, which describes a discipline that **studies** **how people make sense of their world**. How they are able to understand one another to the extent that they are able to exist in an orderly social context. Ethnomethodological approach was developed by a sociologist named Harold Garfinkel. The approach looks at the organization of practical actions and reasoning, the organization of talk-in-interaction. Ethnomethodologists are concerned primarily with Ethnomethodology which is concerned with the how (the methods) by which social order is produced, and shared. One thing that is of central concern to ethnomethodologist is “context.” Their focus is always on the ways in which words are dependent for their meaning on the context in which they are used. **Ethnomethodology is concerned basically with the following**:

• The organization of practical actions and practical reasoning: This was the concern of the earliest ethnomethodologists.

• The organization of talk-in-interaction: This is known in modern times as a Conversational Analysis. We shall be looking at this late in this unit.

• Talk-in-interaction within institutional or organizational settings: this is basically concerned with interactional structures that are specific to particular settings.

• The study of work: The study of any social activity within the setting in which it is performed

**2. Language and the Social World**

Language is an essential part of the human social structure. Every day, we use it actively to create and shape the world through social interaction. Every language operates in a social world. Speakers, as part of a society, rely on a corpus of practical knowledge, which they assumed is shared, at least partly with others. This is why a group of linguists, generally referred to as Functionalists, see language as a social activity being performed in a social world. The primary concern of such linguists, who belong to the schools of Sociolinguistics, Systemic Functional Linguistics, Discourse Analysis, Text Linguistics, **Critical Discourse Analysis**, and so forth is that language is context-dependent and the general context is the world we live in, while the specific contexts are the contexts of a particular usage. The context here includes the knowledge of the speaker of his/her world, the culture, values, expectations and norms. One way in which language is believed to influence our understanding of social reality goes back to the ideas of Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf. The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis stresses that we view and perceive our world in terms of our language. It also stresses that the social reality we experience is unique to our language since no two languages/cultures share exactly the same social reality. This is why oftentimes terms for specific phenomena in languages do not have precise counterparts in other languages. What we have discussed in this section is really an important guiding principle for our approach to the analysis of discourse. We can only analyze any particular discourse effectively if we situate it within the social context or domain of its use. And this will take into consideration a lot of factors such as the interlocutors, their role relationships in discourse, the mode of discourse. All these are used to create the text that will fit appropriately into the social world of the language users.

In general, one of the earliest approaches to research in Discourse Analysis is Ethnomethodology. Though the study of discourse keeps undergoing changes from time to time, the use of this approach has remained one of the key approaches to investigating discourse. It presents a common ground for linguists studying discourse. This is particularly so because it emphasizes the importance of context in discourse analysis. The two major ways of collecting data in discourse analysis are really context-dependent. The use of a tape recorder as a data collecting method depends largely on the context of the discourse. This implies that the researcher has to be present at the setting to do his/her recording. The other method, which is emphasized in Ethnomethodology is the participant observation, which requires the researcher to be present in the community for a period of time.

**3. Pragmatics**

All other aspects of language (phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics) are all subordinate to pragmatics. Pragmatics the study of the choices one makes when he/she uses language, the reasons for those choices and the effects of those choices. Always ask why people choose one way rather than the other. There is always a reason for our choice of every aspect of language, which pragmatics allows us to answer. It approaches to uncover pragmatic meanings beyond the highest level of linguistic organization. Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics which studies language use, as opposed to the structure of language.

**4. Speech Act Theory**

Speech act theory is 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. Speech act theory treats an utterance as an act performed by a speaker in a context with respect to an addressee. Speech act theory attempts to explain how speakers use language to accomplish intended actions and how hearers infer intended meaning from what is said.

**5. Conversational Analysis**

Conversational Analysis (CA) is an approach to discourse analysis that is concerned with the study of talk in interaction. The major aim of CA is to describe how conversationalists achieve orderliness in their interaction. It studies how interactions are structured in a sequential manner. CA studies any instance of talk, which may include institutional discourse, such as, classroom discourse between the teacher and the students, doctor-patient interaction, antenatal classroom discourse, courtroom discourse. It also studies routine or casual conversation.

**2. 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.

* **Identifying Speech act theory, Relevance theory and Politeness theory**

***Identifying Speech act theory***

Every sentence we make is designed to perform certain functions. Such functions include, just informing people about something, warning, ordering somebody or a group of people to do something, questioning somebody about a fact, thanking somebody for a gift or an act of kindness, and so forth. When we utter statements, we expect our listeners to recognize and understand the functions such statements are meant to perform. For instance, when we ask a question, we expect our addressee to realize that we are requesting for information. If they failed to appreciate our intention, then we can say they have ‘misunderstood’ us. This is what is termed as a **speech act**. The theory of speech act, therefore, states that whenever we utter a statement, we are attempting to accomplish something with words.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Utterance  | Form  | Function |
| Did you see him yesterday? | Interrogative | Question |
| My son is a medical doctor. | Declarative | Statement |
| Shut the door, please. | Imperative | Command |

**Other examples of utterances that perform some speech act.**

1. pronounce you husband and wife (uttered by a pastor when joining a couple together)
2. I hereby sentence you to ten years in jail (uttered by a judge in a court)
3. I promise to pay you by month end (uttered by a debtor to a creditor)

**PERFORMATIVE VERBS**

Performative verbs are verbs used to indicate that certain acts are meant to be performed by the utterance. For instance, each of utterances 1–3 above has a performative verb – pronounce (1); sentence (2), and promise (3). There are several other verbs in English that can be considered as performative verbs. They include the following:

 *Appoint - I appoint you as the director of the institute.*

 *Thank - I thank you for your kind gestures.*

 *Warn - I warn you to desist from that act.*

 *Congratulate - I congratulate you on call to the Bar*

 *Announce - We hereby announce the death of our grandfather.*

 *Guarantee - I guarantee you that the product will last.*

 *Request - I hereby request for my transcript*

 *Offer - I offer you the job on a monthly salary of 10,000 birrs.*

**Three are components of speech act those are:** Iocutionary, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Acts

**Iocutionary:** acts are considered as acts of speaking – acts involved in the construction of speech. They include using particular words in conformity with the particular rules of a language and with certain senses and references as determined by the rules of the language from which they are drawn. What is actually said by a speaker is called locutionary. A locutionary act is a statement that is uttered with its normal sense. That is, an expression fulfills the locutionary if its meaning follows from the meanings of the individual words that make it up.

**Illocutionary** acts are acts done in speaking – acts that are the apparent purpose for using a performative utterance, such as promising, sentencing, guaranteeing, thanking, and so forth. What is verbally accomplished by what is said is called **Illocutionary.** Each time a speaker performs a locutionary act, he is also performing some illocutionary act such as stating a fact, making a promise, warning, betting, making a request, rendering an apology, etc. Put differently, the illocutionary act of an expression is the communicative purpose of the expression. The sentence: *I will be there tomorrow* is obviously a *promise* which puts one (the speaker) under obligation to be at the expected place. When a hearer, through the knowledge of the conventions of the language, grasps what one is saying then, there is *uptake* on his part of the illocutionary force of the utterance. Illocutionary by itself is classified intofour types.

1. Assertive- a statement for as how things are like informing about things.
2. Directive- the speaker tries to get someone to do something with any kind of invitation, command or persuasion.
3. Comissive- the speaker promise to do something. For example, I promise to do that.
4. Expressive- the speaker expresses his/her feelings.
5. Declarative- something that brings changes. For example, I now pronounce you husband and wife.

**Perlocutionary-** acts are the consequences or the by-product of speaking. They produce some effect upon the thoughts, feelings and actions of the addressee and the speaker. What hearer does in response to the utterance. **The perlocutionary intention** is what the speaker intends the listener to do in response to the utterance. The effect the illocutionary act has on the hearer is referred to as the *perlocutionary act*, such as persuading, deterring, surprising, misleading or even convincing. A request, for instance, has the illocutionary force of directing someone to do something. Its perlocutionary effect may be the doing of the thing the person directed.

**Felicity Conditions**

Felicity conditions are the conditions that have to be fulfilled before an utterance can be said to be successful. They are the conditions that have to be met before one can say that a speaker has made a sincere statement. For instance, for A to request B to shut the door, the following conditions must be met:

a. A must believe that B has the ability to shut the door.

b. A must have the desire that B should shut the door.

c. A must believe that B will shut the door, if requested.

d. A must have good reasons for B to shut the door.

**Direct and Indirect Speech Acts**

A direct speech act is one whose proposition is clearly represented in the utterance and understood by the addressee. For instance, the statement:

 *A) Please put on the fan*.

Is a direct speech act because it is clearly seen as a request that the addressee does something – *put on the fan*. Some speech acts are not this direct in their proposition, yet the addressee will still through inference and implicature understand the intention of the speaker. For example, the statement:

 *B) It’s hot in here.*

Maybe an indirect counterpart of A. The addressee will by inference to understand that being hot is uncomfortable. So the addressee will recognize the utterance as an indirect speech act that is making a request of him to put on the fan. Even though the utterance is a statement, its function is that of a command. It is also possible for the speaker to accomplish his intention by using the utterance:

 *C) Do we have to stay in this heat all day?*

This is a question, but still achieving the same purpose of indirectly requesting the addressee to put on the fan. The addressee would not have understood the speaker’s intention if he/she had taken A as a mere statement of fact or C as a Polar or Yes/No question.

In general, each time we make an utterance, we are using them to perform certain acts. Such acts may be directly stated by the speaker or indirectly stated. Certain verbs are used to explicitly signal that an utterance is meant to perform an act. They are referred to as performative verbs, while the utterances in which they occur are called performative utterance. For any utterance to be judged as sincere, it has to fulfill certain felicity conditions. The meaning of utterances is not always directly reflected in their surface forms. Some utterances have surface forms that differ from the intention of the speaker. These are called indirect speech acts.

**Relevance Theory**

Relevance theory offers valuable insights about how communication is interpreted,

• Interpreting a message involves linguistic coding, face-value semantics and context-based inference; these are used together in an inferential process.

• When information is expressed in a way that requires more than the minimum processing cost, readers or hearers are entitled to look for some kind of increased communicative payoff to justify their efforts.

• There are times when speakers and writers aim at suggesting an array of possible interpretations rather than specifying just one. This is especially true in figurative and poetic language.

What sort of things may be relevant? Intuitively, relevance is a potential property not only of utterances and other observable phenomena but of thoughts, memories and conclusions of inferences. In relevance-theoretic terms, any external stimulus or internal representation which provides an input to cognitive processes may be relevant to an individual at some time. According to relevance theory, utterances raise expectations of relevance not because speakers are expected but because the search for relevance is a basic feature of human cognition, which communicators may exploit.

In general, relevance theory is all about identifying what is relevant in the understanding utterance. It can be communication (the environment of the communication and preferences in producing an utterance), cognition (thoughts and memories etc) or comprehension (like nonverbal cases). If you identify what are the relevant things for the utterance, you will easily identify the utterance to give an accurate response.

**Politeness Theory**

Politeness is one of the most important factors in language use. Users of every language practice politeness in one form or the other. In our daily interactions, we have ways of speaking to and addressing people that shows that we have some form of respect for them. There are ways we speak to our friends and there are ways we speak to people we are not familiar with. We are more polite in our use of language in informal settings than in formal settings.

**Politeness is a kind of disposition we have towards other people that makes us not to want to hurt their feelings or do things that we know will make them feel unwanted**. When we speak to others, we try to be polite in the kinds of things we say to them by carefully choosing our words. We are tactful and nice in what we say, even when we do not sometimes mean it. We choose our words to fit the different occasions we experience every day. Even when we say things that are not too polite, especially when they are not said deliberately, we try to apologize. We are quick to recognize it when people are not polite in their speech because we have a sense of what it means to be polite when we address other people. For instance, respect is a form of politeness. In our culture, the greeting is considered as part of politeness, especially when we are meeting people for the first time in a day or after a very long time, or even people we have never met before. We are more polite with people we are meeting people for the first time that we are with people we are familiar with. We are also more polite in formal situations than in informal ones. We are more polite when we speak with people older than us than we are with people who are our contemporaries or people who are junior to us. It is important to note that what constitutes politeness differs from one culture to another. For instance, it is impolite for a child to speak where adults are speaking in the Ethiopia culture unless such a child was permitted to do so.

**Face and Politeness**

The most relevant concept in politeness is faced. Face refers to the respect an individual has for himself or herself. According to Brown and Levinson (1986), speakers develop politeness strategies to maintain their self-esteem. One’s face is one’s public self-image. Every person has an emotional sense of self that they want every other person to recognize. So when we are polite, we have shown awareness of another person’s face. If you say things that make people embarrassed or uncomfortable or something that threatens another person’s self-image, you are said to have employed a **face-threatening act (FTAs)**. Politeness strategies are developed to deal with FTAs. For instance, if one uses a direct imperative to demand something from somebody, the impression you are creating is that you are better placed socially than the person, ie, you have a more superior social power than the person. It is alright to use direct imperative for people who have lower social power than to use the same for people one is not socially superior to. To do the later is to use an FTA. On the other hand, when you say something that lessens the possible threat to another person’s face, you are said to be performing a face-saving act.

Everybody has what Brown and Levinson call a **negative face** and a **positive face**. A negative face is a tendency in a person to be independent and have freedom from imposition. When a speaker says *I am sorry to bother you* for instance to someone he is trying to make an inquiry from, then he/she has used a face-saving act that emphasizes the addressee’s negative face. A face-saving act that emphasizes the addressee’s positive face draws attention to a common goal, eg, such a person is likely going to make a statement such as *You and I have a common problem* or *We can do it together.*

**Politeness Strategies**

Brown and Levinson (1987) identified four major types of politeness strategies, namely

• Bald on record

• Negative politeness

• Positive politeness, and

• Off-the-record or indirect strategy.

**Bald on record** strategies are strategies that do not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer’s face. It is commonly used by speakers who know their addressees very closely. With the bald on record strategies, there is a direct possibility that the audience will be shocked or embarrassed by the strategy. For instance, a bald on record strategy might be to tell your brother to wash the car, by saying “it’s your turn today.”

**Positive politeness** will attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer's face. This strategy is most commonly used in situations where the interlocutors know each other fairly well. In many instances, attempts are made to avoid conflicts. For example, a positive politeness strategy might be the request such as, “I know you are very busy now, but could you please spare me five minutes.”

**Negative politeness** presumes that the speaker will be imposing on the listener. It is the desire to remain autonomous. For Instance, a speaker may request this way “I know you just paid your children’s school fees, but please can you lend me 1,000 birrs till the weekend?” The addressee is likely to acceed to the request if he/she has the means because the request shows a respect for their ability to maintain autonomy.

The final politeness strategy outlined by Brown and Levinson is an **indirect strategy**. Here the language is indirect, but the intention is usually clear from the context. For instance, a request can be made this way “Is there any eatery around the corner?” by someone who is hungry and wants to eat. This question insinuates that the speaker is hungry and would want to go and eat.

**Politeness Principle**

Politeness Principle is a set of maxims, just like the Cooperative Principle. These maxims were proposed by Geoffrey Leech. Leech observes that participants in social interactions try to interact in an atmosphere of relative harmony. Below are the maxims.

**Maxim of** **Tact**: minimize cost to others, maximize benefit to others. The first part of this maxim aligns with Brown and Levinson’s strategies of minimizing imposition, while the second part reflects the positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer's interests, wants, and needs. For example: “Can you spare me just two minutes please.”

**Maxim of Generosity:** Minimise benefit to self; maximize cost to self. This maxim makes it clear that to really express politeness in conversation, the speaker should put others first before him/her. For instance: “Don’t worry, it’s my pleasure to serve you.” Or “Never mind, I’ll do it.’

**Maxim of Approbation:** Minimize dispraise of others; maximize the expression of beliefs which express approval of others. This maxim implies that we should make others feel good by giving those compliments and we should not praise ourselves, but rather allow others to do so. This also implies that we should as much as possible avoid disagreement with others. For instance: “I know you are good at electronics, can you check what the matter is with this tape recorder?”

**Maxim of Modesty:** Minimize praise of self; maximize praise of others. We should find opportunities to praise others, while we dispraise self. For example: “I’m so stupid, can you imagine that I forgot my pen. Do you have an extra one for this exam? I will get one immediately after the test”

**Maxim of Agreement:** Minimize disagreement between self and other; maximize agreement between self and other. This is in line with Brown and Levinson’s positive politeness strategy. In expressing politeness in conversation, we should avoid disagreement with other people. For example: “I thought we agreed that you would have to call before setting out to see me.”

**Maxim of Sympathy:** Minimize antipathy between self and other; maximize sympathy between self and other. One way of expressing politeness is to identify with people by congratulating them, commiserating with them or expressing condolences when they are bereaved. This, according to Brown and Levinson shows that we are interested in the welfare of other people. For example: “I am sorry to hear about your mother’s demise.” not put so directly.

**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.

**Differentiating the discourse situation and the socio-semiotic approach**

Socio-semiotic studies human signifying practices in specific social and cultural circumstances and which tries to explain meaning-making as social practice. Ferdinard de Sasussure defines socio semiotic, as the science of the life of sign in society. It is the study of meanings from the social dimension. Socio semiotic focuses on social meaning-making practices of all types, whether visual, verbal or utterance.

On the other hand, discourse analysts are as concerned to examine the way in which meaning is constructed throughout the text and utterance, as with the way this is achieved at any relevant points in the text and utterance.

So, what makes discourse analysis and socio semiotic different is their way of approaching identifying meanings. As we said discourse analysis identify meanings from anything that is relevant to the utterance or text, but socio semiotic is only focused on the social signs that are assigned to give meanings. Discourse analysis a text or utterance from signs (comprehension), cognition and understanding (circumstances), but socio semiotic is restricted in socio a sign that gives meanings. In addition to that, discourse analysis conceder signs which can be social or any other signs, but in the case of socio semiotic is only focused on social signs.

**Discourse types: Identifying the Variety of Functions and Forms**

This subtitle introduces you to the kinds of discourse we have. The term discourse is widely applied that we need to delimit it and identify some of the kinds of discourse that discourse analysts are particularly interested in. Such types of discourse include spoken discourses, such as monologue, dialogue, multilogue, conversation, written discourse and interpersonal conversation.

**Spoken Discourse**

Spoken discourse is any discourse that is verbalized or spoken. It is also generally referred to as speech. Every language is spoken, so every social activity we are involved in where speech is used is referred to as spoken discourse. Some examples of spoken discourse are casual conversation, sermon, political campaign, symposium, public lecture, classroom discourse, doctor-patient discourse, telephone exchange, service encounter, sports commentaries, etc. Though a spoken discourse is essentially verbal, certain non-verbal behavior helps speakers to interpret the discourse. They include, our facial gestures, body movements and other sounds uttered that are not necessarily regarded as speech. Spoken discourse takes place in different forms. We have face-to-face discourse in which the speakers are together physically. Apart from this, we have distance communication, in which though the speakers are not necessarily together physically, they are still able to transmit.

**Monologue**

Monologue refers to a speech situation in which an individual is doing the talking for a long time either to himself or to other people who are not responding. The Wikipedia Dictionary defines monologue as “an extended, uninterrupted speech by one person only. The person may be speaking his or her thoughts aloud or directly addressing other persons, e.g. an audience, a character, or a reader.” Many times, we get carried away that we express our thoughts aloud even when they are not really addressing some specific people. The monologue is also used in drama to make the audience or readers to know the thought of a character. This is often referred to as dramatic monologue. However, a dramatic monologue is also called a soliloquy when it refers to a lengthy talk in which a character, alone on stage, expresses his or her thoughts aloud. Soliloquy is often used to reveal thoughts or feelings that are delivered by a character in a play to him or herself, or directly to the audience.

**Dialogue**

A general definition of dialogue is “a conversation between two persons” A dialogue is a discourse that involves two or more interlocutors. The roots of the word dialogue can be traced to the Greek "dia" and "logos" which means "through meaning." In a dialogue, there is an exchange of ideas by the participants. Dialogues have some socio-cultural characteristics, such as the participants listening while the person who has the floor is speaking, respect for differences, with the believe that everyone has an essential contribution to make and is to be honored for the perspective which only they can bring equality of perspectives, and minimization of interruption as much as possible. Dialogue is not just a situation in which two or more people are interacting, it is a skillful exchange or interaction between people with shared understanding based on their cultural practice and shared world-view. For two or more people to be involved in a dialogue successfully, they must be able to share some sort of understanding about the topic in focus.

**Multilogue**

Multilogue refers to a situation in which too many people are engaged in conversation at the same time. This may refer to the situation in which many conversations are happening at one time within a chat room. The term is also more commonly used to describe a situation in which many interactants communicate using the aid computer-mediated forms, such as online video, message boards, forums, etc.

**Conversation**

Conversation simply refers to the use of speech for the exchange of ideas by two or more people. A conversation may be formal or informal. This is determined by the kind of relationship that exists between the people involved. People involved in a conversation are referred to as conversationalists or to use a more technical term interlocutor. A conversation is built on certain conventions, such as:

• The people involved do share some common grounds, such as a culture, a belief or norm,

• Their conversation is guided by these culture, norms and beliefs

• The people know that ideas are being shared, so no one dominates, except they are allowed by convention or the conversationalists,

• The conversationalists respect one another’s views despite their differences

The whole idea of conversation is based on the understanding that turns have to be taken. We shall soon come to deal more extensively with the term turn-taking in conversation.

**Written Discourse**

Written discourse is any discourse in which the thoughts of the producer are represented graphically on a surface, such as paper and other media. Initially, in the study of discourse analysis, the written discourse was not considered. The attention then was on the spoken discourse. Written discourse as we have seen earlier is quite different from spoken discourse. It is more carefully constructed and gives a lot of room for correction and possible reconstruction.

Written discourse is organized in such a way that similar ideas are put together in sections of the writing called paragraph and each paragraph can usually be summarized in one sentence, which is generally called the topic sentence. Also, each paragraph is linked with the one directly before it and the one after, and all the paragraphs can be seen as a unified whole, which can also be summarized in a sentence.

**Interpersonal Discourse**

Interpersonal discourse is the kind of discourse that involves two or more person. One of the commonest forms of interpersonal discourse is a conversation. If you will remember, we earlier dealt with conversation. Interpersonal communication is not restricted to face to face communication; it may also be a feature of written or even distance communication, eg, telephone discourse, letters, communication through electronic media, such as e-mail, mobile phones, SMS texts and so forth. Interpersonal communication may not necessarily be verbal. They can also be non-verbal, using movements and body positions, such as kinesics, posture, gesture, eye gaze, etc. It is important that every human being possess the skills for interpersonal discourse. Such skills help them to build, manage and sustain intimate relationships with other people around them. Interpersonal discourse skills also help us to counsel, negotiate for prices in the market, teach or coach, mentor others and manage conflicts in our relationships and other people’s relationships.

**Everyday Language and Literary Language**

The question we need to answer in this section is what the difference between everyday language and literary language. Speaking in general, there is no difference between everyday language and literary language but in terms of using the language in creative way literary language is different from everyday language. As you know every day language is a language that we use in our day to day conversation or activity. But, literary language in short it is a language of literature. What makes literary language different from everyday language is it contains a lot of abstract thoughts and ideas and expressions which makes texts complex (this feature is called **vagueness**), literary language has multiple meanings beyond the dictionary meanings (this feature is call **ambiguity**), literary language deviates from everyday language and this gives aesthetic effects to language (this feature is called **deviations**) and literary language lets you to create new words and phrases (this feature is called **creativity**).

All in all, learning the ordinary language is a natural process but learning literary language needs more effort.

**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 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.

Change in language occurs, as change is natural. Language, as everybody knows, is dynamic. The advent of the Internet and the rapid development of electronic communication increase the rise of a new kind of language. It caused dramatic changes in the language used on the internet. The Internet is widely used in learning of the second language all over the world. E-discourse is a new variety of language that leads to significant variations in the written structure of language.

E-Discourse refers to text-based SMS, in which participants interact by means of the written word, e.g., by typing a message on the keyboard of one computer which is read by others on their computer screens, either immediately or at a later point in time. Electronic discourse” refers to written talk ‘‘writing that stands in place of voices. Electronic discourse found in e-mails, Internet-relay chats (IRC), and homepages which are used to communicate across time and geographical borders. Electronic discourse is defined as language that is used to communicate in cyberspace.

**Discourse connections/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 mange atopic. 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

**• Identifying Cohesion, Coherence and Rhetorical Structure Theory**

**Cohesion**

We know, for example, that texts must have a certain structure which depends on factors quite different from those required in the structure of a single sentence. Some of those factors are described in terms of cohesion, or the ties and connections which exist within texts. A number of those types of cohesive ties can be identified in the following text:

*My father once bought a Lincoln convertible. He did it by saving every* penny *he could. That car would be worth a fortune nowadays.*  *However, he sold it to help pay for my college education. Sometimes I Think I’d rather have the convertible.*

There are connections present here in the use of pronouns, which we assume are used to maintain a reference (via anaphora) to the same people and things throughout *father – he – he - he; my – my – I; Lincoln it.* There are lexical connections such as a *Lincoln convertible – that car – the convertible, etc.*

Cohesion is a term used to describe the relation of meanings that exist within a text. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 4), “cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another.” They went further to define cohesion as:

 A set of possibilities that exists in the language for making text hang together: The potential that the speaker or the writer has at his disposal… Thus, cohesion as a process always involves one item pointing to another; whereas, the significant property of the cohesive relation… is the fact that one item provides the source for the interpretation of another. (P.19)

 In order to create cohesion in text or utterance there are certain can be used those are; lexical cohesion (Lexical cohesion is the use of lexical items to connect and unify a text), reiteration (shows that two lexical items are related), synonymy (selecting a synonymous item to replace the one being referred to and to avoid so many reputation) and antonym (the use of relationship of oppositeness to signal cohesion in a text).

**Coherence**

Coherence works together with cohesion. Coherence refers to the continuity of ideas in a text and the relations between them. When sentences, ideas, and details fit together clearly, readers can follow along easily, and the writing is coherent, ie, the ideas tie together smoothly and clearly. A text is coherent when the ideas are seen to hang together and present the text as a united whole. Coherence goes beyond just the connection of the sentences, but that of the whole idea. The two terms, cohesion and coherence are the two primary ways of signaling textuality. Some ways of signaling cohesion in a text are through the use of pro-forms that indicate co-reference, definite articles, ellipsis, repetition, connectives or conjunctions, substitution and so forth.

**Rhetorical Structure Theory**

Rhetoric is the energy inherent in emotion and thought, transmitted through a system of signs, including language, to others to influence their decisions or actions. When we express emotions and thoughts to other people with the goal of influencing (persuading) them, we are engaged in rhetoric.

This section we will identify five distinguishing characteristics of rhetorical discourse, the marks the art of rhetoric leaves on messages. Rhetorical discourse characteristically is (1) planned, (2) adapted to an audience, (3) shaped by human motives, (4) responsive to a situation, and (5) persuasion-seeking. Not all writing or speaking that might meaningfully be termed rhetoric clearly satisfies all of these criteria, but the criteria will serve as a starting point for identifying, understanding and responding to rhetorical discourse. We begin by considering rhetoric's most fundamental quality.

**Rhetoric Is Planned**

Regardless of the goal at which it aims, rhetorical discourse involves forethought or planning. Thinking of rhetoric as planned symbol use directs our attention to the choices people make about how they will address their audiences. Issues that arise in planning a message include: Which arguments will I advance? Which evidence best supports my point? How will I order and arrange my arguments and evidence? What aesthetic resources are available to me, given my topic and audience?

**Rhetoric Is Adapted to an Audience**

The first concern for forethought or planning rhetoric points up a second characteristic of rhetorical discourse. Rhetoric is planned with some audience in mind. The audience should not be understood strictly in the traditional sense of a large group of people seated in rows of chairs in a large hall. Some audiences are of this type, many are not. When you speak to a small group of employees at work, they are your audience, and you may adapt your discourse to them. The author of a letter to the editor of the local paper also writes with an audience in mind, though the audience is not made up of people whom the author can see or know personally in most cases.

**Rhetoric Reveals Human Motives**

The third quality of rhetoric is closely related to the concern for the audience. In rhetoric we find people acting symbolically in response to their motives, a general term taking in commitments, goals, desires or purposes that lead to action. Rhetors address audiences with goals in mind, and the planning and adaptation processes that mark rhetoric are governed by the desire to achieve these goals. The motives animating rhetorical discourse include making converts to a point of view, seeking cooperation to accomplish a task, building a consensus that enables group action, finding a compromise that breaks a stalemate, forging an agreement that makes peaceful coexistence possible.

**Rhetoric Is Responsive**

Fourth, rhetorical discourse typically is a response either to a situation or to a previous rhetorical statement. By the same token, any rhetorical statement, once advanced, is automatically an invitation for other would-be rhetors to respond. Rhetoric, then, is both "situated" and "dialogic." What does it mean for rhetoric to be situated? Simply that rhetoric is crafted in response to a set of circumstances, including a particular time, location, problem, and audience**.**

**Rhetoric Seeks Persuasion**

Rhetorical discourse is usually intended to influence an audience to accept an idea, and then to act in a manner consistent with that idea. But, rhetorical also often seek other goals, such as aesthetic appreciation of language or clarity of expression. Greek writers noted more than twenty-five hundred years ago that rhetorical discourse sought persuasion, and today a rhetorical theorist like Joseph Wenzel can be found stating straightforwardly that "the purpose of rhetoric is persuasion. Most of the discourse referred to as rhetoric manifestly seeks to alter an audience's views in the direction of those of a speaker or writer. It may be useful, then, to examine more closely rhetoric's pursuit of persuasion.

**Unit Three: Conversation 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.

**• Identifying Turn-Taking Principles and Discourse Markers**

* **Identifying turn-taking principles**

Turn-taking is a general feature of conversation. It has been observed that people involved in a conversation do not just talk in a disorderly manner. A person speaks and after his turn, another person takes the floor. It is not normal in a conversation for one person to speak all the time while others just listen. It is also the case that people are aware of when it is their turn to speak. There are some clues to when a speaker’s turn has finished and when another speaker should commence talk. Turn-taking is a basic characteristic of any normal conversation. Speakers and listeners change their roles in order to begin their speech (Coulthard, 1985: 59). Turn-taking mechanisms may vary between cultures and languages. Scholars have identified a set of rules that govern turn-taking in discourse. These are:

• When the current speaker selects the next speaker, the next speaker has the right to and is obliged to commence the turn

• If the current speaker does not select the next speaker, any one of the speakers has the right to self-select and become the next speaker

• If neither the next speaker selects the next speaker nor the next speaker self-selects, the current speaker may resume his or her turn. Sacks, Schegloff and Jeffeson (1974:704)

There are signals to turn taking that are called **turn-eliciting signals**. We have the **Turn Construction Unit (TCU)**, which is the fundamental segment of speech in conversation. It describes pieces of conversation, which may comprise an entire turn. The end of a TCU, called a **Transition Relevance Place (TRP)**, which marks a point where the turn maybe goes to another speaker, or the present speaker may continue with another TCU. The change of turn occurs only in the TRP. TRP is the possible structural completion point of one-word, lexicon, phrase, clause or full sentence.

There are other signals to turn taking. The dominant referring tone, the interrogative functions of tones and phatic questions serve a role in turn taking. For instance, a speaker may use a rising tone rather than a fall-rise tone in ending a sentence to hold his turn by underlining his/her present status as the dominant speaker. This indicates that the speaker expects to be allowed to go on without interruption. Storytellers are fond of using this continuative rising tone (Brazil, 1997:93). Other signals are, the last speaker’s gaze direction, the last speaker calling the name of the next speaker, the last speaker aligning his body towards the next speaker, and so forth.

**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 beings 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 others speakers make use of this gap to start his/her turn.

**Narratives**

The narrative has been one of the major themes in humanistic and social-scientific thought since the mid-twentieth century. The essence of humanness, long characterized as the tendency to make sense of the world through rationality, has come increasingly to be described as the tendency to tell stories, to make sense of the world through narrative. In linguistics, the narrative was one of the first discourse genres to be analyzed, and it has continued to be among the most intensively studied.

The narrative is the recounting of a series of facts or events and the establishing of some connection between them. The word is commonly restricted to fiction, ancient epics and romances or modern novels and short stories.

**• Differentiating the structure of narratives and Narrative imagining**

Eachnarrative has two parts: a story (history), the content or chain of events (actions, happenings), plus what may be called the existents (characters, items of setting); and a discourse (discourse), that is, the expression, the means by which the content is communicated. So, when people take in a narrative, they go beyond the discourse to imagine the story behind it.

Narrative structure refers most simply to the shape of a story’s trajectory. Every story is projected from a state of rest by a force of some kind in an arc of rising tension until it reaches the apogee where it begins to fall towards a point of impact. This trajectory represents the ‘unity of action’ proclaimed by Aristotle to be the essential principle of tragedy, but also applicable to related genres, such as the epic. Most models of narrative structure start by assuming a previous state of rest or equilibrium or normality which is disturbed by an outside force of some kind. The condition initiated by this force gets worse until it reaches an extreme degree. At this point, another force comes to bear which reverses the process and allows for the gradual resumption of normality or the establishment of a new equilibrium.

So what makes them different is narrative structure is all about the development of the story, but narrative imagination is all about thinking beyond the structure to get sense out of the narrative structure.

 **Argumentation**

The act of “making” an argument and “having” an argument is now combined into a single discourse of argumentation and are composed of three components. First, discourse is a solution for carrying out disputes that require a process of definition and justification for a particular position. Second, arguers must fashion their claims on the basis of others, which requires social, contextual, and goal-oriented thinking. Even a solitary activity like writing requires an imaginary addressee, to whom the argumentation is directed. And third, the argument is part of daily thinking (Billig, 1987). Argument discourse includes counterargument and social practice involving ways to bring about joint thinking and interaction designed to converge opinions that are attempting to justify a particular view.

**• Identifying the Structure of Argumentation**

There are four key issues pertinent to the analysis of argumentation that is discourse based and rooted in the sequences of everyday interaction. The first is the matter of **the argument context**. This could be a discussion over coffee, a business meeting, and either a structured or an unstructured discussion. The overall function of these situations is always a key variable including participants, public goals, private goals, and other relevant contextual material. The second key issue for analysis is the **nature of the arguments and counterarguments**. These provide the substance of the discussion and can be directed at individuals or their positions. Analysis of arguments and counterarguments involves constructing claims to truth and seeking the most compelling position. A third component involves the **replies to counterarguments and responses to having one’s positions challenged**. Participants can increase the emotionality of the context by taking challenges personally or use replies to sharpen ideas. How these ideas are integrated into a speaker’s position is a continuing site for analysis including the loss of certainty that accompanies integration of other ideas into one’s own. Finally, there is **the matter of how one’s knowledge is revised**. This last issue challenges the notion of discussion that implies a zero-sum game between arguers in which the matter is resolved and one side wins or loses.

In addition to the above futures, we can also identify the structure of argumentation with the following features. **Lexical features** are used to identify verbs and adverbs which play an important role in identifying argument components. For instance, certain verbs like ‘believe’, ‘think’ or ‘agree’ often signal stance expressions which indicate the presence of a major claim and adverbs like ‘also’, ‘often’ or ‘really’ emphasize the importance of a premise. Modal verbs like ‘should’ and ‘could’ are frequently used in argumentative discourse to signal the degree of certainty when expressing a claim. **Indicators** are the other feature that used to identify an argument by discourse markers that indicate the components of an argument. For example, claims are frequently introduced with ‘therefore’, ‘thus’ or ‘consequently’, whereas premises contain markers like ‘because’, ‘reason’ or ‘furthermore’.

* **The pragma-dialectical approach**

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.

Pragma-dialectic perspective (pragma-dialectic) is that analyzes argument by characterizing argumentative discussion as critical and focusing on only those things those are responsible for moving opinions closer. Other aspects of discourse are ignored. This approach is more abstract and removed from the richness of the interactional sequences in which argument is embedded.

**Unit Four: Persuasion**

Persuasion is the act of persuading or seeking to persuade; the power of persuading; persuasive force; the state or fact of being persuaded or convinced. (March 2015) Overall persuasion is winning others over to see your side of a debate, on how to accomplish a goal, to buy-into a proposal. 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. Persuasive means of using language to produce an effect on the audience. Persuasion is the art of convincing someone to agree with your point of view.

**• Identifying Theories of Persuasion and Persuasive Tools**

An individual who is preparing to persuade others must be able to see the topic at hand from different angles and anticipate questions and concerns from others. A best practice for influencing or persuading others is to know your audience and put yourself in their shoes. According to the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle, there are three basic tools of persuasion: ethos, pathos, and logos.

Ethos is a speaker’s way of convincing the audience that she/he is a credible source. An audience will consider a speaker credible if she/he seems trustworthy, reliable, and sincere. This can be done in many ways. For example, a speaker can develop ethos by explaining how much experience or education she/he has in the field. After all, you would be more likely to listen to advice about how to take care of your teeth from a dentist than a firefighter.

**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.

**Pathos** is a speaker’s way of connecting with an audience’s emotions. For example, a speaker who is trying to convince an audience to vote for him might say that he alone can save the country from a terrible war. These words are intended to fill the audience with fear, thus making them want to vote for him. Similarly, a charity organization that helps animals might show audience pictures of injured dogs and cats. These images are intended to fill the viewers with pity. If the audience feels bad for the animals, they will be more likely to donate money.

**Logos** is the use of facts, information, statistics, or other evidence to make your argument more convincing. An audience will be more likely to believe you if you have data to back up your claims. For example, a commercial for soap might tell you that laboratory tests have shown that their soap kills all 7,000,000 of the bacteria living on your hands right now. This piece of information might make you more likely to buy their brand of soap. Presenting this evidence is much more convincing than simply saying “our soap is the best!” Use of logos can also increase a speaker’s ethos; the more facts a speaker includes in his argument, the more likely you are to think that he is educated and trustworthy.

**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.

* **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.

* **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).

* **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 are 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.

* **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.

**• 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.

**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.

**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.

* **The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis**

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.

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is generally regarded as an amalgamation of linguistic determinism, and a second proposition commonly referred to as linguistic relativity. Linguistic relativity posits that “there is no limit to structural diversity of languages”. It was under this hypothesis that both propositions were brought together. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis surmises that

1) We can only experience our world in terms of the categories and distinctions provided by our language

2) The categories and distinctions in each language are unique to it and cannot be measured with those of other systems.

As linguists and anthropologists, Edward Sapir, and his student Benjamin Whorf developed the hypothesis based on their study of American Indians in the 1930s. Sapir was of the view that the real world (a group’s social reality) is based on the language habits of the group. In other words, the language of a group predisposes the group to interpret the world in certain ways. Whorf further claimed that language conditions the way we view our world and different language groups view the world differently as dictated by their different languages. The significance of this observation is that language differences bring about cultural differences.

* **Critical Discourse Analysis**

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is an approach to discourse study that is largely interested in uncovering the relationship between language, society, power, ideology, values and opinions in a given discourse (Rahimi & Riasati, 2011). The primary tool to identify such links is language through which specific ideologies, identities, and culture of society are coded and communicated. So, choice of language participants in a discourse make hence is believed to be a manifestation of their intentions, beliefs and ideologies (ibid). However, a mere description of the linguistic choice doesn’t reveal the beliefs, attitudes and ideologies coded in it. Uncovering such mental phenomena rather requires the identification of the relationships between linguistic forms and societal conventions, beliefs and values which makes CDA a critical approach to discourse study In general, CDA takes a particular interest in the relation between language and power, text, discourse practice (social context), social practice, and cognitive dimension. In the field of critical discourse analysis, there are three scholars you should know about to know different perspectives of critical discourse analysis Norman Fairclough, Tuen Van Dijk and Wodaknd.

**Norman Fairclough**

Fairclough’s framework of CDA is generally shaped by his understanding of language as a representation of interactions and relations between and among participants in discourse and a marker of their roles and identities in society. So, he argues that this interpersonal nature of language suggests that discourse is a socially constituted phenomenon since languages in its interpersonal function consist of social subjects like identities, statuses, roles and relations of participants in discourse.

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.

The first justification for Fairclough to argue that language is a social phenomenon is people ’s adherence to societal rules and conventions of language use whenever they engage themselves in communicative activity. The second one is that language use affects social relationships in one way or another. People either damage or maintain the social ties they have with their interlocutors in their communicative endeavors. The first focus area in Fairclough’s three-part analytical model is text, seeing that choice of words participants make in a communicative event signals their ideological stances. The second major focus of analysis in Fairclough’s framework is discourse practice which refers to the production, distribution and consumption aspects of discourse. The third dimension of analysis in Fairclough’s model is the social practice, which covers societal circumstances, the economic situations, the ideological backdrops and the political systems that surround the communicative event.

**Tuen Van Dijk**

Tuen Van Dijk approach to CDA comes from three approaches which are the structure of discourse, social context and cognitive dimension of discourse. Structural is the first feature that deserves critical analysis in Dijk’s framework is the structure of a discourse which includes the analysis of morphological, grammatical, coherence and overall themes and rhetorical aspect of a text. The second focal point in Dijk’s model of critical discourse analysis is the social context that environs both the production and the consumption sides of a discourse. Social contexts according to Dijk, refers to different societal establishments and institutional norms, and the participants’ identities and roles in such social organizations which defines both the content and style of the discourse they produce. The third focal point in Dijk’s model is the cognitive dimension of discourse. He claims that: a social theory of discourse relating discourse structures to social situations and social structure should also feature various cognitive components, namely in terms of shared social cognitions (knowledge, ideologies, norms, values) in general, and the unique mental models of social members in particular.

**Wodak**

One of the fundamental premises of Wodak’s approach to critical discourse study emanates from her view that language use always demonstrates power relations and ideological orientations of participants. Language according to Weiss and Wodak, therefore, “indexes power, expresses power, is involved where there is contention over and a challenge to power….Language provides a finely articulated vehicle for differences in power in hierarchical social structures”(Weiss & Wodak, 2003, p.15).

* **Gender**

One of the most striking phenomena in language study in the 1970s and 1980s was the development of the field of research known as ‘language and gender’. This area of research continues to grow: the International Gender and Language Association was founded in 1999 and holds biennial conferences, and a new journal – Gender and Language – was launched in 2007, dedicated to the publication of research in this area.

The language and gender field consist of two main strands. The first developed as part of quantitative sociolinguistics: sociolinguists analyzing the co-variation of language and variables such as social class began to notice that their data also revealed gender differences. Peter Trudgill (1974, 1983), for example, examining the pronunciation of a wide range of speakers living in Norwich, UK, realized that women and men of the same social class patterned differently. Women on average used forms closer to Standard English, while male speakers used a higher proportion of vernacular forms. Trudgill’s analysis demonstrates that use of non-standard forms of language seems to be associated not only with working-class speakers, but also with male speakers, and thus with masculinity.

The second strand of language and gender focuses not on phonological, morphological, or lexical features of language but on language as a ‘concrete living totality’ (Bakhtin, 1981) in other words, on discourse.

The gender turn to discourse in sociolinguistics and in social psychology, combined with growing synergies with anthropological research, led to a huge creative burst in research and writing on language and gender. Researchers studied a wide variety of conversational data, encompassing talk in both mixed and single-sex groups and in both public and private contexts. Family talk, friendship talk, and workplace talk were all interrogated in the quest to understand how gender is constructed and maintained in everyday life.

* **Racism**

Discourse plays a crucial role in the creation and reproduction of racism. Racism, as both social practice and ideology, manifests itself discursively. On the one hand, racist attitudes and beliefs are produced and promoted by means of discourse, and discriminatory practices are prepared, promulgated, and legitimated through discourse. On the other hand, discourse serves to criticize and argue against racist opinions and practices, that is, to pursue anti-racist strategies.

**Discourse Analytical Approaches to Racism**

1. **Prejudices and Stereotypes as a basis of Racism**

Racism is based on prejudices and stereotypes. Uta Quasthoff was one of the first to study prejudiced discourse. She regards *prejudices* as mental states (normally) including negative attitudes toward social groups as well as corresponding stereotypic convictions. According to Quasthoff, a stereotype is the verbal expression of a certain belief directed toward a social group or an individual member of that group and shared to a high degree in a particular culture. It takes the form of an oversimplified and generalizing judgment that attributes or denies, usually with an emotionally biased tendency, particular qualities or behavioral patterns to a certain class of persons.

1. **The Socio Cognitive Approach to Racism**

The model of prejudice developed by Teun van Dijk is partially based on socio-psychological considerations similar to those of Quasthoff. According to van Dijk, prejudice is a socially shared form of social representation in-group members, acquired during processes of socialization and transformed and enacted in social communication and interaction. Such ethnic attitudes have social functions, e.g. to protect the interests of the in-group. Their cognitive structures and the strategies of their use reflect these social functions. Van Dijk focuses on the “rationalization and justification of discriminatory acts against minority groups” in much more detail than Quasthoff. He designates the categories used to rationalize prejudice against minority groups as “the 7 Ds of Discrimination.” They are dominance, differentiation, distance, diffusion, diversion, depersonalization or destruction, and daily discrimination. These strategies serve in various ways to legitimize and enact the distinction of “the other” – for example, by dominating minority groups, by excluding them from social activities, and even by destroying and murdering them.

1. **Collective symbols, Discourse strands, and Dispositive Supporting Racism**

Most of the studies in this approach focus on discourse semantics, and especially on the uncovering of “collective symbols” that are tied together in “discourse strands,” which are best explained as thematically interrelated sequences of homogeneous “discourse fragments.” These discourse strands appear on different “discourse levels” (i.e., science, politics, media, education, everyday life, business life, administration) and “collective symbols” function as “cultural stereotypes,”

* **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.

The term ‘intercultural’ literally means ‘between cultures’, and so, at one level, ‘intercultural communication’ could refer to all communication between members of two (or more) different social/cultural groups. This, in fact, is how the term has traditionally been used. The difference in nationality or mother tongue has typically been taken as the criterion for membership of different social/cultural groups, and communication between people of different nationalities or different mother tongues has then automatically been classified as intercultural. We are all simultaneously members of numerous other groups, such as regional, professional and religious, and so, if communication between members of different social groups is classified as intercultural, virtually all communication would thereby be defined as intercultural.

There are three-way divisions that intercultural discourse analysis focuses on those are (1) comparative analyses of two or more cultures, (2) analyses of interactions between speakers from different cultural backgrounds, and (3) the discursive creation of culture. In (1) comparative analyses, cultures are assumed to exist and then some interactional aspect of them is compared, a possibility running through all of the ways of approaching cross-cultural interaction. Interactional analyses, (2) are focused on studying the communication of different speakers who have come from different cultures. Finally, if (3) culture is assumed to be a construct, many studies look at how language is used to create and typify “a culture,” both in talk and writing.