

Perspectives on Discourse Analysis:  
Theory and Practice



Perspectives on Discourse Analysis:  
Theory and Practice

By

Laura Alba-Juez

**CAMBRIDGE**  
**SCHOLARS**

---

P U B L I S H I N G

Perspectives on Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practice,  
by Laura Alba-Juez

This book first published 2009

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2009 by Laura Alba-Juez

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-0597-1, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-0597-1

*For Gustavo, Joaquín and Julian*



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	ix
Introduction .....	1
Chapter One..... Introducing Discourse Analysis	5
Chapter Two..... The Data	25
Chapter Three..... Pragmatics	45
Chapter Four..... Interactional Sociolinguistics	79
Chapter Five..... Conversation Analysis	109
Chapter Six..... The Ethnography of Communication	133
Chapter Seven..... Variation Analysis and Narrative Analysis	155
Chapter Eight..... Functional Sentence Perspective: Thematic and Information Structures	177
Chapter Nine..... Post Structuralist theory and Social Theory	207
Chapter Ten..... Critical Discourse Analysis and Positive Discourse Analysis	235

Chapter Eleven .....	265
Mediated Discourse Analysis	
Chapter Twelve .....	289
Further Issues in Discourse Analysis	
References .....	323
Key to Self-Evaluation Questions .....	347
Practice Key .....	355
Conceptual Index.....	393

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No present book on Discourse Analysis can boast of not having drawn on previous works on the subject. In this respect, I owe a special debt to all the authors whose work is cited or discussed in this book, and I hope not to have misrepresented any of them. In particular, my personal consultation with some of these researchers was of the greatest value and assistance. Thus my thanks go to:

- 1) Bruce Fraser, for generously sharing his work on discourse markers with me and for sending me his unpublished manuscripts.
- 2) Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, Robin Lakoff, Heidi Hamilton, William Labov, Wallace Chafe and John Gumperz for clarifying many of my doubts about their approaches to discourse while I was a Visiting Researcher in the Linguistics Department at Georgetown University (U.S.A.).
- 3) Angela Downing, for being such a good teacher, and for generously giving and discussing with me some of her articles on coherence, thematic progression, topicality and discourse markers.
- 4) JoAnne Neff, for her perennial openness and her willingness in sending me her articles on political discourse, as well as for shedding light on my understanding of Critical Discourse Analysis during our conversations and discussions.
- 5) Teun van Dijk, for clarifying many of my doubts about Critical Discourse Analysis and the topic of ideology, by gently answering all my questions after one of his talks at my university, the UNED.
- 6) Irene Madfes, for sending me her articles on medical discourse.

My students of Discourse Analysis along the years have helped me with their comments and suggestions to try to provide clearer and more detailed explanations of certain topics, as well as to include a wider variety of sample analyses of the different phenomena discussed in the book. My sincere thanks go to them too.

I am especially grateful to my friend and colleague Gretchen Dobrott, for her thorough, detailed and invaluable work in proof-reading the manuscript. María Teresa Gibert also revised the manuscript and I

profoundly appreciate her kindness and the time she took in doing it, as well as her wise and valuable comments and suggestions.

Also, this book owes much to the artwork (photography and drawings) of my art and computer wizard, Joaquín Armijo.

I would also like to thank *CNN International*, for granting me permission to reprint two fragments of the transcripts of one *Larry King Live* show. Likewise, I'm grateful to Lourdes Nafá, for giving me permission to reprint a fragment of her annotated corpus.

I also owe my friend and colleague Mónica Aragonés a debt of gratitude for reading and commenting on some of the chapters, as well as for her constant support and friendship.

Every effort has been made to contact the authors of the different fragments of discourse that are used for analysis in this book, and we would be glad to make any suitable arrangements with any copyright holders whom it has been impossible to contact.

Finally, but not less importantly, I would like to thank my husband, Gustavo, and my sons, Joaquín and Julian, for their understanding and unending help and support. The memory of my mother and the constant encouragement of my father, my sister and my two brothers have also been important forces accompanying me along the process of writing this book.

Needless to say, all deficiencies, mistakes and omissions are my own responsibility.

# INTRODUCTION

## 1. Aims of this book

The main aim of this book is to provide the student/reader with the basic theoretical knowledge and empirical tools of some of the most relevant approaches to the analysis of discourse. It has been mainly conceived of as a general (university) course on Discourse Analysis, but it can also be useful for any person or group whose main concern is to acquire the basic necessary knowledge and skills for analyzing any type of discourse. The subject matter of the book could not only be of use for linguists or prospective linguists: given its interdisciplinary character, its findings can be (and in fact are) used and applied by practitioners and scholars from different fields, such as sociology, psychology, medical science, computer science, and so on.

The following are the general objectives that the student/reader is expected to reach after reading and studying the material in this book:

- Identification of the different theories and approaches to analysis discussed.
- Analysis of different types of text and discourse, taking into account the different perspectives, units of analysis, strategies and functions outlined in the book.
- Practical application of such analyses, with specification of their positive contribution to the fields of linguistics and humanistic studies in general.

A desirable and anticipated effect of the study of discourse is also the development of an open and tolerant mind which will eventually lead to a better understanding of the different and varied manifestations of language, culture and communication in human society.

## 2. Content of this book

The present book is a completely revised and updated version of *Discourse Analysis for University Students* (by Laura Alba-Juez, Madrid:

UNED), which was originally published in 2005. In this new version I have added material, two new approaches (*Narrative Analysis* and *Positive Discourse Analysis*), and new examples throughout, and I hope to have also added greater clarity. Both the referenced works and websites have been updated, and a new section with self-evaluation questions has been included at the end of each chapter.

It would be unwise to think that this work presents a complete picture of all possible aspects of, and approaches to Discourse Analysis. The discipline is a broad one, and consequently it would be impossible to review all related studies in a work of limited scope like the present book. Nor would it be possible to do justice even to the approaches I discuss<sup>1</sup>. Nevertheless, I have chosen several perspectives that are especially relevant (because of their remarkable influence), and I have tried to present and discuss them in a pedagogical way, considering the main aim of the book.

The book is divided into 12 chapters. **Chapters 1** (*Introducing Discourse Analysis*) **and 2** (*The Data*) are general chapters which describe and explain the basic tenets of Text Linguistics and Discourse Analysis. They also contain some introductory considerations about *corpus linguistics*, and the most common techniques for data collection and annotation, taking into account the necessary ethics for the job.

**Chapters 3 to 11** cover the different approaches to be studied and compared, i.e., *Pragmatics* (Chapter 3), *Interactional Sociolinguistics* (Chapter 4), *Conversation Analysis* (Chapter 5), *The Ethnography of Communication* (Chapter 6), *Variation Analysis* and *Narrative Analysis* (Chapter 7), *Functional Sentence Perspective: Thematic and Information Structures* (Chapter 8), *Post-Structuralist Theory* and *Social Theory* (Chapter 9), *Critical Discourse Analysis* and *Positive Discourse Analysis* (Chapter 10), *Mediated Discourse Analysis* (Chapter 11).

**Chapter 12** (*Further issues in Discourse Analysis*) covers some other issues, key concepts and aspects to be considered within discourse studies, such as the problem of choosing a unit of analysis, the identification and characterization of different genres or types of discourse, the analysis of text cohesion and coherence, and the use of discourse markers.

At the end of the chapters we find an extensive bibliography (References), containing all the works cited. The last section of the book provides the answers to the self-evaluation questions (*Key to Self-*

---

<sup>1</sup> I have to acknowledge that I am very much influenced by the American and some of the European schools of Discourse Analysis, and consequently my views on the subject, as well as my choice of approaches, reflect this fact.

*evaluation Questions*), as well as the key to the practice tasks in each of the chapters (*Practice Key*). The students/readers are advised to do the tasks first, and then check their answers in this section. The solutions given are by no means the only possible ones, considering the wide scope of Discourse Analysis and the multiple perspectives from which discourse can be approached. These answers are thus to be used as a guide, but by no means should they be viewed as complete and final solutions to the problems presented.

### 3. Chapter organization

Each chapter contains both a theoretical and an empirical part. All of the chapters are introduced by a *Chapter Outline* (whose content is closely connected to the main objectives of each chapter) followed by the theoretical development of the topic (main ideas and concepts) in question. A sample analysis of data is always provided in order to clarify the ideas and concepts explained. Lastly, all the chapters have the following sections:

- *SUMMING UP* (containing a summary of the main points studied in the chapter).
- *SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONS* (containing multiple-choice questions which will assist the reader/student in studying the contents of each chapter. The answers to these questions are provided in the *Key to Self-evaluation Questions* section at the end of the book).
- *PRACTICE* (containing both open and semi-open activities whose main intention is to provide the student/reader with the opportunity to put all the theoretical knowledge into practice. The key to the semi-open tasks can be found at the end of the book in the *Practice Key* section).
- *FURTHER READING* (containing further references for those interested in studying the topics presented in the chapter in more detail).
- *USEFUL WEBSITES* (containing websites which might prove useful for doing further research on the subject matter of the chapter).

#### **4. Final remark**

I finally want to point out that this book does not claim originality in its content, in the sense that no new theory of Discourse Analysis is presented or outlined. The main aim in this respect has been to present a state-of-the-art description of some of the already existing approaches to the discipline, as well as its main issues or concerns. Notwithstanding, the general organization of ideas and approaches, the analysis of texts in the different chapters, as well as the pedagogical orientation and the practice exercises, intend to conform an original –albeit modest– contribution to the study of discourse.

# 1

## INTRODUCING DISCOURSE ANALYSIS



*“Anyone who thinks we are close to final answers, or that we know how to find them, must surely be mistaken.”*

**Wallace Chafe, *Discourse, Consciousness and Time.***

### Chapter Outline:

- Defining *text* and *discourse*.
- Defining *Text Linguistics* and *Discourse Analysis*.
- Evolution of Text Linguistics and Discourse Analysis through time.
- Approaches to the phenomenon of discourse.
- The job and interests of discourse analysts.

## 1.1 Defining *text* and *discourse*. What is Text Linguistics? What is Discourse Analysis?

To define and describe the scope of study of Text Linguistics and Discourse Analysis and to establish the differences between them both is not an easy task. Suffice it to say that the terms *text* and *discourse* are used in a variety of ways by different linguists and researchers: there is a considerable number of theoretical approaches to both Text Linguistics and Discourse Analysis and many of them belong to very different research traditions, even when they share similar basic tenets.

In everyday popular use it might be said that the term *text* is restricted to written language, while *discourse* is restricted to spoken language. However, modern Linguistics has introduced a concept of *text* that includes every type of utterance; therefore a text may be a magazine article, a television interview, a conversation or a cooking recipe, just to give a few examples.

Crystal (1997) defines Text Linguistics as “the formal account of the linguistic principles governing the structure of texts”. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) present a broader view; they define *text* as a *communicative event* that must satisfy the following seven criteria:

- 1) **Cohesion**, which has to do with the relationship between text and syntax. Phenomena such as *conjunction*, *ellipsis*, *anaphora*,

*cataphora* or *recurrence* are basic for cohesion.

- 2) **Coherence**, which has to do with the meaning of the text. Here we may refer to elements of knowledge or to cognitive structures that do not have a linguistic realization but are implied by the language used, and thus influence the reception of the message by the interlocutor.
- 3) **Intentionality**, which relates to the attitude and purpose of the speaker or writer.
- 4) **Acceptability**, which concerns the preparation of the hearer or reader to assess the relevance or usefulness of a given text.
- 5) **Informativity**, which refers to the quantity and quality of new or expected information.
- 6) **Situationality**, which points to the fact that the situation in which the text is produced plays a crucial role in the production and reception of the message.
- 7) **Intertextuality**, which refers to two main facts: a) a text is always related to some preceding or simultaneous discourse; b) texts are always linked and grouped in particular text varieties or genres (e.g.: narrative, argumentative, descriptive, etc.) by formal criteria.

In spite of the considerable overlap between Text Linguistics and Discourse Analysis (both of them are concerned with the notion of cohesion, for instance) the above criteria may help us make a distinction between them.

Tischer et al. (2000) explain that the first two criteria (cohesion and coherence) may be defined as *text-internal*, whereas the remaining criteria are *text-external*. Those approaches oriented towards ‘pure’ Text Linguistics give more importance to text-internal criteria, while the tradition in Discourse Analysis has always been to give more importance to the external factors, for they are believed to play an essential role in communication.

Some authors, such as Halliday, believe that *text* is everything that is meaningful in a particular situation: “By text, then, we understand a continuous process of semantic choice” (1978:137). In the “purely” text-linguistic approaches, such as the cognitive theories of text, *texts* are viewed as “more or less explicit epi-phenomena of cognitive processes” (Tischer et al., 2000: 29), and the *context* plays a subordinate role.

It could be said that the text-internal elements constitute the *text*, while the text-external ones constitute the *context*. Schiffrin points out that all approaches within Discourse Analysis view *text* and *context* as the two

kinds of information that contribute to the communicative content of an utterance, and she defines these terms as follows:

I will use the term “text” to differentiate linguistic material (e.g. what is said, assuming a verbal channel) from the environment in which “sayings” (or other linguistic productions) occur (context). In terms of utterances, then, “text” is the linguistic content: the stable semantic meanings of words, expressions, and sentences, but not the inferences available to hearers depending upon the contexts in which words, expressions, and sentences are used. [...] Context is thus a world filled with people producing utterances: people who have social, cultural, and personal identities, knowledge, beliefs, goals and wants, and who interact with one another in various socially and culturally defined situations. (1994: 363)



Text in context

Thus, according to Schiffrin, Discourse Analysis involves the study of both **text and context**. One might conclude, then, that Text Linguistics only studies the text, while Discourse Analysis is more complete because it studies both text and context. However, as has been shown, there are definitions of text (like de Beaugrande’s) that are very broad and include both elements, and that is why it would be very risky to talk about clear-

cut differences between the two disciplines. De Beaugrande's (2002) definition of Text Linguistics (hereinafter TL) as "the study of real language in use" does not differ from many of the definitions of Discourse Analysis (hereinafter DA) presented by Schiffrin within its functional approach, some of which are the following:

The study of discourse is the study of any aspect of language use (Fasold, 1990: 65).

The analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which these forms are designed to serve in human affairs (Brown & Yule, 1983: 1).

Discourse... refers to language in use, as a process which is socially situated (Candlin, 1997: ix).

Thus, we see that the terms *text* and *discourse* are sometimes used to mean the same and therefore one might conclude that TL and DA are the same, too. It can be said, nevertheless, that the tendency in TL has been to present a more formal and experimental approach, while DA tends more towards a functional approach. Formalists are apt to see language as a mental phenomenon, while functionalists see it as a predominantly social one. As has been shown, authors like Schiffrin integrate both the formal and the functional approaches within DA, and consequently, DA is viewed as an all-embracing term which would include TL studies as one approach among others.

Slembrouck points out the ambiguity of the term *discourse analysis* and provides another broad definition:

The term discourse analysis is very ambiguous. I will use it in this book to refer mainly to the linguistic analysis of *naturally occurring connected speech or written discourse*. Roughly speaking, it refers to attempts to study the organisation of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study *larger linguistic units*, such as conversational exchanges or written texts. It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with *language use in social contexts*, and in particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers. (2005:1)

Another important characteristic of discourse studies is that they are essentially multidisciplinary, and therefore it can be said that they cross the Linguistics border into different and varied domains, as van Dijk notes in the following passage:

...discourse analysis for me is essentially multidisciplinary, and involves

linguistics, poetics, semiotics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, and communication research. What I find crucial though is that precisely because of its multi-faceted nature, this multidisciplinary research should be integrated. We should devise theories that are complex and account both for the textual, the cognitive, the social, the political and the historical dimension of discourse. (2002: 10)

Thus, when analyzing discourse, researchers are not only concerned with “purely” linguistic facts; they pay equal or more attention to language use in relation to social, political and cultural aspects. For this reason, discourse is not only within the interests of linguists; it is a field that is also studied by communication scientists, literary critics, philosophers, sociologists, anthropologists, social psychologists, political scientists, and many others. As Barbara Johnstone puts it:

... I see discourse analysis as a research method that can be (and is being) used by scholars with a variety of academic and non-academic affiliations, coming from a variety of disciplines, to answer a variety of questions. (2002: xi)

As noted above, not all researchers use and believe in the same definition of *text* and *discourse*. In this book, we are going to adopt the general definition of DA as **the study of language in use**, and we shall follow Schiffrin in including both *text* and *context* as parts of discourse, in which case we will consider the term *text* in its narrow sense, not in the broad sense that could place it on a par with the term *discourse*.

## 1.2. Origins and brief history of Text Linguistics and Discourse Analysis

Parallel to the Chomskyan Generative School (whose starting point is considered to be the publication of *Syntactic Structures* in 1957), other schools emerged in different parts of the world that supported different and even opposing ideas to those of Chomsky’s.

All these new schools believed that a good linguistic description should go **beyond the sentence**, and pointed to the fact that there are certain meanings and aspects of language that cannot be understood or embraced if its study is limited to the syntactic analysis of sentences.

Thus, in the twentieth century, the following new disciplines emerged within the field of Linguistics:

- Functionalism (functional grammars)
- Cognitive Linguistics

- Sociolinguistics
- Pragmatics
- Text Linguistics
- Discourse Analysis

All these new disciplines are interrelated, and sometimes it is very difficult to distinguish one from the other, due to the fact that all of them have common denominators. Bernárdez (1999: 342) explains the basic tenets of these disciplines, which are summarized here as follows:

- a) Language only exists in use and communication. It always fulfils certain functions in human interaction.
- b) Language use is necessarily social.
- c) Language is not autonomous. It shares some characteristics with other social and cognitive phenomena.
- d) The description of language must account for the real facts of language. It should not postulate hidden entities only motivated by the needs of the formal system utilized.
- e) Linguistic structures should be closely linked to the conditions of language use.
- f) Language is natural and necessarily vague and inaccurate; therefore any prediction can only be probabilistic.

When performing DA, then, researchers may also engage themselves in Functional Grammar, Sociolinguistics, Pragmatics or Cognitivism, because all these fields are interrelated and have common tenets. As regards TL and DA, we may speak of a progressive “integration” of both disciplines, for, if we observe the evolution of language research through time, it will be noticed that many scholars have moved from TL into DA as part of the natural flow of their beliefs and ideas, as is the case with van Dijk, who, in his biographical article of 2002, explains how his research evolved from *Text Grammar* to *Critical Discourse Analysis*<sup>1</sup>. This author points out that the main aim of his studies in the 1970s was to give an explicit description of the grammatical structure of texts, and the most obvious way of doing so was by accounting for the relationship among sentences. A very important concept for Text Grammar at that time was the introduction of the notion of *macrostructure* (van Dijk, 1980).

---

<sup>1</sup> Another example can be found in de Beaugrande (1997: 68) when he comments on how his concepts of *text* and *discourse* evolved over a series of studies and expanded beyond the linguistic focus he first encountered.

Another fundamental notion was that of *coherence* and the idea that texts are organized at more global descriptive levels than that of the sentence. Later on, and under the influence of the cognitive theories, the notion of *strategic understanding* was developed, which attempted to account for what the users of a language really do when they understand a given text. Van Dijk also notes how several other new concepts were introduced in TL studies, such as *socio-cultural knowledge* and *mental models* (Johnson-Laird, 1983), as well as all the ideas and concepts coming from the field of *Pragmatics*. In his particular case, he took interest in the study of power and ideology, which places him within the DA stream-of-thought known as *Critical Discourse Analysis*<sup>2</sup>.

Thus, after the early and uniform stage of “Text Grammar”, TL went through a series of more open and diversified stages. The “textuality” stage emphasized the global aspects of texts and saw the text as a functional unit, larger than the sentence. This stage led into the “textualization” or “discourse processing” stage, where analysts “set about developing process models of the activities of discourse participants in interactive settings and in ‘real time’” (de Beaugrande, 1997: 61-62).

The current aim now in DA is to describe language where it was originally found, i.e. in the context of human interaction. In this respect, it is important to point out that this interaction often involves other media besides language. Examples of these other semiotic systems may be *gesture, dance, song, photography* or *clothing*, and it is also the discourse analyst’s job to explain the connection between these systems and language. In order to achieve these aims, different researchers have taken different approaches. We now turn to them.

### 1.3. Approaches to the phenomenon of discourse

Current research in DA, then, flows from different academic fields. This is one of the reasons why the terms *discourse* and *discourse analysis* are used to mean different things by different researchers. Schiffrin et al. note that all the definitions fall into three main categories:

- 1) Anything beyond the sentence
- 2) Language use
- 3) A broader range of social practice that includes non-linguistic and non-specific instances of language. (2001: 1)

---

<sup>2</sup> This approach is presented and discussed in Chapter 10.

Authors such as Leech (1983) and Schiffrin (1994) distinguish between two main approaches: 1) the formal approach, where *discourse* is defined as a unit of language **beyond the sentence**, and 2) the functional approach, which defines discourse as **language use**. Z. Harris (1951, 1952) was the first linguist to use the term *discourse analysis* and he was a formalist: he viewed discourse as the next level in a hierarchy of morphemes, clauses and sentences. This view has been criticized due to the results shown by researchers like Chafe (1980, 1987, 1992), who rightfully argued that the units used by people in their speech can not always be categorized as sentences. People generally produce units that have a semantic and an intonational closure, but not necessarily a syntactic one.

Functionalists give much importance to the purposes and functions of language, sometimes to the extreme of defending the notion that language and society are part of each other and cannot be thought of as independent (Fairclough, 1989; Foucault, 1980). Functional analyses include *all* uses of language because they focus on the way in which people use language to achieve certain communicative goals. Discourse is not regarded as one more of the levels in a hierarchy; it is an all-embracing concept which includes not only the propositional content, but also the social, cultural and contextual contents.

As explained above, Schiffrin (1994) proposes a more balanced approach to discourse, in which both the formal and the functional paradigms are integrated. She views discourse as “utterances”, i.e. “units of linguistic production (whether spoken or written) which are inherently contextualized” (1994: 41). From this perspective, the aims for DA are not only sequential or syntactic, but also semantic and pragmatic.

Within the category of *discourse* we may include not only the “purely” linguistic content, but also sign language, dramatization, or the so-called ‘bodily hexis’ (Bordieu, 1990), i.e. the speaker’s disposition or the way s/he stands, talks, walks or laughs, which has to do with a given political mythology. It can thus be concluded that discourse is **multi-modal** because it uses more than one semiotic system and performs several functions at the same time.



Bodily hexis

Wetherell et al. (2001) present four possible approaches to DA, which are summarized as follows:

1. The model that views language as a system and therefore it is important for the researchers to find *patterns*.
2. The model that is based on the activity of language use, more than on language in itself. Language is viewed as a process and not as a product; thus

researchers focus on *interaction*.

3. The model that searches for language *patterns* associated with a given *topic* or *activity* (e.g. legal discourse, psychotherapeutic discourse, etc.).
4. The model that looks for *patterns within broader contexts*, such as “society” or “culture”. Here, language is viewed as part of major processes and activities, and as such the interest goes beyond language (e.g. the study of racism or sexism through the analysis of discourse).

In spite of these categorizations, it would not be unreasonable to say that there are as many approaches to discourse as there are researchers devoted to the field, for each of them proposes new forms of analysis or new concepts that somehow transform or broaden previous modes of analysis. However, it would also be true to say that all streams of research within the field are related to one another, and sometimes it is difficult to distinguish among them. Precisely with the aim of systematizing the study of discourse and distinguishing among different ways of solving problems within the discipline, different traditions or schools have been identified. It would be impossible to embrace them all in only one work, and for that reason, in this book we are only going to concentrate on the main ideas and practices within some of the best-known schools, which are the following:

1. Pragmatics (Chapter 3)
2. Interactional Sociolinguistics (Chapter 4)
3. Conversation Analysis (Chapter 5)
4. The Ethnography of Communication (Chapter 6)
5. Variation Analysis and Narrative Analysis (Chapter 7)
6. Functional Sentence Perspective (Chapter 8)
7. Post-structuralist Theory and Social Theory (Chapter 9)
8. Critical Discourse Analysis and Positive Discourse Analysis (Chapter 10)
9. Mediated Discourse Analysis (Chapter 11)

A common characteristic of all these schools of thought is that they do not focus on language as an abstract system. Instead, they all tend to be interested in what happens when people **use** language, based on what they have said, heard or seen before, as well as in how they **do** things with language, such as express feelings, entertain others, exchange information, and so on. This is the main reason why the discipline has been called

“*Discourse Analysis*” rather than “*language analysis*”.

## 1.4 What do discourse analysts do?

Broadly speaking, discourse analysts investigate the use of language in context, thus they are interested in what speakers/writers do, and not so much in the formal relationships among sentences or propositions. Discourse analysis, then, has a social dimension, and for many analysts it is a method for studying how language “gets recruited ‘on site’ to enact specific social activities and social identities” (Gee 1999: 1).

Even when a discipline is hard to delimit, as is the case with DA, we can learn a great deal about its field of concern by observing what practitioners do. If we look at what discourse analysts do, we will find they explore matters such as:

- Turn-taking in telephone conversations
- The language of humor
- Power relationships in doctor/patient interviews
- Dialogue in chat rooms
- The discourse of the archives, records or files of psychoanalysts
- The conversation at a dinner table
- The scripts of a given television program
- The discourse of politicians
- The study of racism through the use of discourse
- How power relations and sexism are manifested in the conversation between men and women
- The characteristics of persuasive discourse
- Openings and closings in different types of conversations
- The structure of narrative
- Representations of black/white people (or any race) in the written media (magazines, newspapers, etc.)
- The strategies used by speakers/writers in order to fulfil a given discourse function
- The use of irony or metaphor for certain communicative aims
- The use of linguistic politeness
- The discourse of E-mail messages
- Legal discourse used in trials
- How people create social categories like “boy” or “immigrant” or “lady” as they talk to, about, or among each other
- And a long *etcetera*...

These are just a few examples reflecting the concerns of discourse analysts, but they are sufficient to demonstrate that researchers in DA are certainly concerned with the study of **language in use**. As students/readers progress through the different chapters of this book, they will encounter several other examples of possible DA areas of interest.

It is worth noting that, as Johnstone (2002) remarks, the discipline is called discourse *analysis* (and not, for instance, “discourseology”) because it “typically focuses on the analytical process in a relatively explicit way” (2002: 3). This analysis may be realized by dividing long stretches of discourse into parts or units of different sorts, depending on the initial research question, and it can also involve looking at the phenomenon under study in a variety of ways, by performing, for instance, a given set of tests.

Thus, discourse analysts have helped (and are helping) to shed light on how speakers/writers organize their discourse in order to indicate their semantic intentions, as well as on how hearers/readers interpret what they hear, read or see. They have also contributed to answer important research questions which have led, for instance, to the identification of the cognitive abilities involved in the use of symbols or semiotic systems, to the study of variation and change, or to the description of some aspects of the process of language acquisition.

In order to carry out their analyses, discourse analysts need to work with texts. Texts constitute the *corpus* of any given study, which may consist of the transcripts of a recorded conversation, a written document or a computerized corpus of a given language, to name a few possibilities. The use of corpora has become a very widespread practice among discourse researchers, and for that reason it is necessary for any discourse analyst to acquire some basic knowledge of how to handle the data and how to work with corpora. Chapter 2 is devoted to this enterprise.

## SUMMING UP... (CHAPTER 1)

1. The terms *text* and *discourse* have been –and still are– used ambiguously, and they are defined in different ways by different researchers. In this book we are going to use the term *text* to refer to the ‘purely’ linguistic material, and we are going to consider *discourse* in a broader sense, defining it as **language in use**, composed of **text** and **context**.
2. *Text Linguistics* and *Discourse Analysis* share some basic tenets and, while some authors make a distinction between them, others use both terms to mean the same. However, it may be said that “purely” **Text Linguistic studies** are more concerned with the **text-internal factors** (i.e. cohesion and coherence), while **Discourse Analysis** focuses its attention more on the **text-external factors**, without disregarding the text-internal ones. The history of these disciplines shows that research has evolved, in many cases, from the narrower scope of *Text Grammar* (and later, *Text Linguistics*) into the broader discipline of *Discourse Analysis*, and therefore both disciplines have merged. For this reason and for clarifying and practical purposes, we shall consider DA as a macro-discipline that includes several sub-approaches, among which the ‘purely’ text-linguistic ones can also be found.
3. In this book we are going to touch on the main theoretical and practical tenets of the following traditions identified within discourse studies: *Pragmatics*, *Conversation Analysis*, *Interactional Sociolinguistics*, *Ethnography of Communication*, *Variation Analysis* and *Narrative Analysis*, *Functional Sentence Perspective*, *Post-structural and Social Theory*, *Critical Discourse Analysis/Positive Discourse Analysis* and *Mediated Discourse Analysis*.
4. In order to learn about a given discipline, it is useful to look at what practitioners do. Discourse analysts explore the language of face-to-face conversations, telephone conversations, e-mail messages, etc., and they may study power relations, the structure of turn-taking, politeness strategies, the linguistic manifestation of racism or sexism, and many, many other aspects of **language in use**. The sky is the limit.
5. Discourse analysts are interested in the actual patterns of use in naturally-occurring texts. These natural texts, once transcribed and annotated, are known as the **corpus**, which constitutes the basis for analysis. Thus, discourse analysts necessarily take a corpus-based approach to their research.

## SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONS

**Choose the answer that best suits the information given in Chapter 1.**

1. Modern Linguistics has introduced a concept of *text* that...
  - a) is very restrictive.
  - b) includes all types of utterances.
  - c) includes only written discourse.
  
2. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981)...
  - a) view Text Linguistics from a broader perspective than that of Crystal's (1997).
  - b) define text in terms of three main criteria.
  - c) define text as a grammatical category.
  
3. According to Tischer et al. (2000), the first two criteria that define *text* (De Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981)...
  - a) are text-external.
  - b) belong only to "pure" Text Linguistics.
  - c) are text-internal.
  
4. The tradition in Discourse Analysis has always been to...
  - a) give more importance to the text-external criteria of *intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality and intertextuality*.
  - b) give more importance to the text than to the context.
  - c) consider context as playing a subsidiary role.
  
5. According to Schiffrin (1994) and other authors, Discourse Analysis...
  - a) involves only the study of context.
  - b) is devoted to the study of text.
  - c) includes the analysis of both text and context.
  
6. De Beaugrande & Dressler's (1981) definition of Text Linguistics...
  - a) differs widely from Schiffrin's (1994) definition of Discourse Analysis.

- b) does not substantially differ from Schiffrin's (1994), Fasold's (1990), Brown & Yule's (1983) or Candlin's (1997) definition of Discourse Analysis.
  - c) is exactly the same as Schiffrin's (1994).
7. The tendency in Text Linguistics has been to...
- a) present a more formal approach than that of Discourse Analysis.
  - b) present a more functional approach than that of Discourse Analysis.
  - c) be less formal than any other approach.
8. Functionalists see language...
- a) mainly as a mental phenomenon.
  - b) as a predominantly social phenomenon.
  - c) as an acoustic phenomenon.
9. Many discourse analysts, like Schiffrin or Slembrouck ...
- a) integrate both the formal and functional approaches in their study of discourse.
  - b) do not mix the formal with the functional approach.
  - c) prefer the formal to the functional approach.
10. Discourse studies are...
- a) restricted to the field of Linguistics.
  - b) devoted mainly to social phenomena.
  - c) essentially multidisciplinary.
11. Functionalism, Cognitive Linguistics, Sociolinguistic, Pragmatics, Text Linguistics and Discourse Analysis are...
- a) all relatively new disciplines which are interrelated.
  - b) completely different from one another.
  - c) very easily distinguished from one another.
12. Many scholars' studies, like those of van Dijk or de Beaugrande...
- a) have not changed substantially with time.
  - b) have evolved from Text Linguistics to Discourse Analysis.
  - c) do not show a natural flow of beliefs or ideas.
13. The current and main aim in Discourse Analysis is to...
- a) study the formal aspects of texts.
  - b) discover the functions of language.