

Discourse Analysis (LING 416/516)

Instructor: John Hellermann

Office: 235 EH

Time & Place: 2-3:50 T/Th

Telephone: 725-8732

Office Hours: T/Th 4-5, W 11-1 & by appointment

e-mail: jkh@pdx.edu

Blackboard: <http://psuonline.pdx.edu>

Description of the Course:

'Discourse Analysis' is often described by linguists as the analysis of language above the level of the sentence. The term, however, is used by researchers in many other fields which have influenced discourse analytic research in applied linguistics. This course offers an overview of several of the major theoretical and methodological frameworks for doing discourse analysis in applied linguistics.

With the presentation and discussion of each theoretical and methodological approach to discourse analysis that we have in class, students will have the opportunity to try out different methods for the analysis of discourse using the different theoretical perspectives and methodologies. In doing such analyses of written and spoken language, you will try to make arguments for particular interpretations of the language you analyze using the appropriate terminology and methods to allow the data to support your argument.

Finally, in our discussions and in your analyses of discourse, you will be asked to think about applications of the theories and methods to the world outside the university.

Course Requirements:

Reading:

-Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis*. 2nd edition. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

-virtual 'packet' of readings available on Blackboard (Bb)

All readings should be prepared for the class date on which they are listed. Readings marked with an * are recommended but not required.

Class participation:

Class meetings will consist of some lecture and discussions of readings assigned for class. Along with the discussions, we will be doing in-class analysis of data which are relevant to the issues in the readings. Although graduate students will be assigned to be discussion leaders, all students are expected to participate in class discussions and analysis.

It is important to note that 'participating' in discussion means both speaking and facilitating the participation of others by active listening. I will try ensure that a range of voices are heard. Please help me in that endeavor.

In-class work and homework will be graded periodically. If you cannot make it to class for some reason, please let me know beforehand and you will be excused from graded in class work.

Assignments:

Homework

When assigned homework, print out answers and bring them to class. Often, we will work with these assignments in class and sometimes I will ask you to hand them in.

Analysis papers: Graduate students (2); Undergraduates (3)

These papers are write ups of shorter analyses in which you try out a different analytic method discussed and practiced in class. You will be given data to analyze. The papers should be approximately 3-4 pages in length, double-spaced, 12-point font, and conform to the standards of academic writing. They should make an argument, be coherent, and include a short introduction and conclusion.

Final project paper (graduate students)

Graduate students will develop a final analysis paper connecting theoretical and methodological concepts from the readings, discussions, and first papers to an new or expanded analysis of data you collect. Start thinking about this early on so you can begin to collect some data. You should include references to several publications (at least 6). The paper should be about 8-10 pages in length. You may collaborate on this paper (the requirements on page length, number of examples and citations will increase accordingly). A detailed handout will explain details for doing the paper.

Final Exam (undergraduates)

For undergraduates, there will be a final examination in which you will be expected to display an understanding of the major issues relevant to discourse analysis as discussed in class.

Graduate student discussion leading

Graduate student groups will be assigned to lead class discussions on readings and key concepts. In your planning for this, be sure to read and understand the main ideas of the reading and to work to include everyone in a small group discussion. Contact me beforehand if you have questions about the readings

or would like ideas for leading a discussion. You should prepare a 1-2 page summary of the readings you are assigned to submit to me.

Data Sessions

Weekly conversation analysis data sessions will be held (TBA). All students are invited to attend. Graduate students should attend at least one session if your schedule allows. More information on provided later in class.

Organizing assignments

Keep all of your submitted work (all drafts) together in a folder and submit that entire folder with each assignment.

A note on plagiarism

As information accumulates and bombards us from all quarters these days, it is extremely important that we are careful about citing words and ideas that we get from others. This is how Portland State deals with plagiarism (from PSU's student conduct code): "Acts of academic dishonesty may result in one or more of the following sanctions: a failing grade on the exam or assignment for which the dishonesty occurred, disciplinary reprimand, disciplinary probation, loss of privileges, required community service, suspension from the University for a period of up to two years, and/or dismissal from the University.

Questions regarding academic honesty should be directed to the Office of Student Affairs, 433 Smith Memorial Student Union".

If you have any questions about what constitutes academic dishonesty (plagiarism) please ask me.

Academic accommodations:

If you have a disability and are in need of academic accommodations, please notify me immediately to arrange needed supports.

If you are a student with a documented disability and registered with the Disability Resource Center, please contact me immediately to facilitate arranging academic accommodations.

Weighting of work for you grade	416	516
Class prep/in class work	10	10
Analysis paper 1	20	25
Analysis paper 2	25	25
Analysis paper 3	30	--

Discussion leading	--	10
Project	--	30
Final exam	15	--

Plan for classes

This may change. You are responsible for changes to the scheduled that are announced in class.
1-9/29

Introduction to the course

2- 10/1

Defining discourse analysis: Texts and Genres

Readings: Ch 1 & pp. 181-185; Swales, 1990, pp 117-126; *Macbeth, 2003

HW: discussion questions 1.7, 1.8

Week 2

3-10/6

Genre analysis

Readings: Swales, 1990, pp. 127-166

HW: analyze the introduction to the Wortham article; bring to class with the article

4-10/8

Units of discourse

Reading: ch. 3, pp. 76-91

HW: transcribe a short excerpt of talk using a system that makes sense for you. Bring it to class for analysis. Be prepared to discuss what choices you made in doing the transcription and why you made them

Week 3

5-10/13

Narrative

Readings: Labov & Waletzky, 1967; ch. 3, pp. 92-101

HW: make a rough analysis of the transcript

6-10/15

Conversation Analysis (CA)

Readings: Schegloff, et al, 2002; ch. 3, pp. 101-112

Week 4

7-10/20

Practice CA analyses

Readings: Goodwin & Heritage, 1990

HW: 3.16, 3.18

8-10/22

Cohesion, Theme, Given/New

Readings: ch. 3, pp. 113-127; Hawes & Thomas, (1996)

Week 5

9-10/27

Spoken versus written language

Coherence

Readings: ch. 6; Thompson & Mulac, 1991

Paper 1 due (CA, Genre/Rhetorical, Narrative)

10-10/29

Register and genre

Readings: ch. 5, pp. 162-181; Conrad, 1996; *Lethem, 2007

Week 6

11-11/3

Discourse and World, Linguistic relativity

Readings: ch. 2, pp. 32-53; *Slobin, 1996

12- 11/5

Discourse and Ideology, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Readings: ch. 2, pp. 53-75; *vanDijk, 1993

Grad Students: Proposals for final project

Week 7

13- 11/10

CDA

Readings: **CHAPTER FROM NEW BOOK**; *Billig, 1999; *Schegloff, 1999

14- 11/8

Social roles, discourse roles

Readings: ch. 4; *Goffman, 1979

Week 8

11/17

Social Roles-Discourse Roles

HW: 4.11

Paper 2 due (SFL/Cohesion/Coherence, register/linguistic features)

11/19

Classroom Discourse

Readings: Wortham, 1996

HW: 4.12

Week 9

11/24

Classroom Discourse

Different research methods for different questions

Readings: Hellermann, 2006

11/26

Holiday

Week 10

12/1

Discourse analysis and language teaching

Undergraduates: Paper 3 due (method not used in previous papers)

12/3

Wrap up

Final exam: Monday, December 7th, 10:15-12:15

Graduate Student final projects due Monday, 12/7 by 5:00

Readings (required)

Conrad, S. (1996). Investigating academic texts with corpus-based techniques: An example from biology. *Linguistics and Education*, 8, 299-326.

Hawes, T. & Thomas, S. (1996). Rhetorical uses of theme in newspaper editorials. *World Englishes*, 15, 159-170.

Hellermann, J. (2006). Classroom interactive practices for literacy: A microethnographic study of two beginning adult learners of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 377-404.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 453-484.

Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts; proceedings of the 1966 annual spring meeting*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Schegloff, E., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 3-31.

Swales, J. (1990). Part of chapter 7: Research articles in English (p. 117-166). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Thompson, S. A., & Mulac, A. (1991). The discourse conditions for the use of the complementizer *that* in conversational English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 15, 237-251.
- Wortham, S. E. F. (1996). Mapping participant deictics: A technique for discovering speakers' footing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 331-348.

Optional readings(on Bb also):

- Billig, M., 1999a, "Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis", *Discourse and Society*, 10, 543-558.
- Goffman, Erving. (1979). Footing. *Semiotica*, 25, 1-29.
- Macbeth, D. (2003). Hugh Mehan's *Learning Lessons* reconsidered: On the differences between the naturalistic and critical analysis of classroom discourse. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(1), 239-280.
- Schegloff, E.A., 1997, "Whose text? Whose context?", *Discourse and Society*, 8, 165-187
- Schegloff, E.A., 1998, "Reply to Wetherell", *Discourse and Society*, 9, 413-416.
- Schegloff, E.A., 1999, "'Schegloff's texts' as 'Billig's data': a critical reply", *Discourse and Society*, 8, 558-575.
- Slobin, D. I. (2000). Verbalized events: A dynamic approach to linguistic relativity and determinism. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (Eds.), *Evidence for relativity* (pp. 107-138). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Thompson, G. (1996). Chapter 6: Organising the message: the textual metafunction: Theme. *Introducing functional grammar* (pp.117-144). London: Arnold.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 4(2), 349-283.
- Wetherell, M., 1998, "Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue", *Discourse and Society*, 9, pp.387-412.

On reserve at library

- Cook, G. (1992). The discourse of advertising. London: Routledge.
- Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (1992). Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. London: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). Discourse analysis: Theory and method. London: Routledge.
- Hatch, E. (1992). Discourse and language education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994) An introduction to functional grammar. London: Edward Arnold.
- Riggenbach, H. (1999). Discourse analysis in the language classroom. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Schiffirin, D. (1994). Approaches to discourse. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Swales, J. (1990). Genre analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Some other resources

- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). Structures of social action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chafe, W. (1994). Discourse, consciousness, and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). Using language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (CUP)
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (Eds.). (1996). Prosody in conversation. Cambridge: CUP.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1992). Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, J. A., & Lampert, M. D. (Eds.). (1993). Talking data: Transcription and coding in discourse research. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fairclough, Norman. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Longman.

- Ford, Cecilia E. (1993). Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations. Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, Cecilia E. (2008). Women Speaking Up: Getting and Using Turns in Workplace Meetings. New York: Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). Studies in ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. (1981). "Footing" in Forms of talk. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 124-159.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers. New York Academic Press.
- Goodwin, C and Goodwin, M.H. 1992. Context, activity and participation. In The contextualization of language. P. Auer and A. di Luzio (Eds.). Amsterdam: Benjamins. 77-99.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1990). He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). Discourse strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978) Language as social semiotic. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications. Cambridge: Polity.
- Jefferson, G. (1978) Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), Studies in the organization of conversational interaction. (pp. 219-248). New York: Free Press.
- Kitzinger, Celia. 2000. Doing feminist conversation analysis. *Feminism & Psychology* 10(2) 163-193.
- Labov, W. 1972. The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation. New York: Academic Press.
- Malone, M. J. (1997). Worlds of talk: The presentation of self in everyday conversation. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Moerman, M. (1988). Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis. Philadelphia: University of Penn. Press.
- Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A. and Thompson, S.A.(Eds.) (1996). Interaction and Grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). Lectures on conversation. (Vol. I-II). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Streeck, J., & Hartge, U. (1992). Previews: Gestures at the transition place. In P. Auer & A. di Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualisation of language* (pp. 135-157). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1982a). Analyzing discourse: Text and talk. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1982b). Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1997a). Discourse as social interaction. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1997b). Discourse as structure and process. London: Sage.