

COMMUNICATION 6410

(Fall, 2010)

Discourse Analysis

Instructor & Class Information

Instructor: Dr. Karen Tracy	Office hours: T 12:15-1:45; Th 3:30-5, & by appt.
Class: 2-3:15 T & Th, 77 Hellems	Phone: (303) 492-8461
Office: 89B Hellems	E-mail: Karen.Tracy@colorado.edu
Home Page: http://comm.colorado.edu/tracy	

Seminar Overview

Discourse Analysis points to a family of approaches to inquiry and a substantive area of study. In Communication the substantive area of study is often referred to as language and social interaction, "LSI." This class attends to both substantive and methodological meanings, albeit tilting toward discourse analysis as a method for the study of social life. The seminar has two purposes, with each reflected in class activities and assignments. A first purpose of the seminar is to enable you to do a discourse analysis: To take instances of talk and text and arrive at interesting, persuasive claims. To accomplish this purpose, you will be practicing the technical and analytic skills that comprise discourse analysis (transcribing and being able to read transcripts; developing a vocabulary that enables you to comment on features of talk, language, and interaction; learning how to select excerpts for analytic focus; developing your ability to explicate inferences and make arguments; and building an insightful paper-length claim that contributes to your academic community's scholarly discussions. A second purpose of the seminar is to provide you a sense of the variety of discourse traditions and how each tradition differs from others. The first part of the class will involve assignments with common texts. Then, in the second part of the semester, students will work with talk or texts (institutional, interpersonal, on-line, written) in which you are interested to develop a discourse analytic research paper that would be suitable for submission to an academic conference.

Readings

- (1) Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- (2) Rapley, M. (2007). *Doing conversation, discourse, and document analysis*.
- (3) A set of journal articles and book chapters. These materials are available on CULearn and are identified by authors' last names plus the year if there is more than one piece by an author.

Course Readings

[those marked by asterisks are recommended; others are required]

- Agne, R., & Tracy, K. (2001). "Bible babble": Naming the interactional trouble at Waco. *Discourse Studies*, 3, 269-294.
- Antaki, C., Billig, M., Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (2002). Discourse analysis means doing analysis: A critique of six analytic shortcomings. *Discourse Analysis Online*, 1, 1-24.
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Bartesaghi, M. (2009). Conversation and psychotherapy: How questioning reveals institutional answers. *Discourse Studies*, 11, 153-177.
- Benthan, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity* Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press. [chapter 7:Virtual identities].
- Billig, M. (1999a). Critical discourse analysis and conversation analysis: An exchange between Michael Billig and Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 543-558.
- Billig, M. (1999b). Conversation analysis and the claims of naiveté. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 572-576.
- Billig, M. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: The case of nominalization. *Discourse & Society*, 19, 783-800.
- Billig, M., & MacMillan, K. (2005). Metaphor, idiom and ideology: the search for 'no smoking guns' across time. *Discourse & Society*, 16, 459-480.
- Bormisza-Habashi, D. (in press). How are political concepts "essentially" contested? *Language & Communication*.
- Bucholtz, M. (2007). Variation in transcription. *Discourse Studies*, 9, 784-804.
- **Burman, E. (2003). Discourse analysis means analysing discourse: Some comments on Antaki, Billig, Edwards and Potter "Discourse analysis means doing analysis: A critique of six analytic shortcomings." *Discourse Analysis Online*, 2
- Buttny, R., & Ellis, D. G. (2007). Accounts of violence from Arabs and Israelis on Nightline. *Discourse & Society*, 18, 139.
- Carbaugh, D. (1995). Ethnographic communication theory of Philipsen and associates. In D. P. Cushamn & B. Kovacic (Eds.), *Watershed research traditions in human communication theory* (pp. 269-297). Albany: State University of New York.

- Clayman, S. E., & Gill, V. T. (2004). Conversation analysis. In M. Hardy & A. Bryman (Eds.), *Handbook of data analysis* (pp. 589-606). London: Sage.
- Clayman, S. E., & Whalen, J. (1988/89). When the medium becomes the message: The case of the Rather-Bush encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 22, 241-272.
- Craig, R. T. (2008). The rhetoric of dialogue: Possibility/impossibility arguments and critical events. In E. Weigand (Ed.), *Dialogue and rhetoric* (pp. 55-67). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (2005). "The issue" in argumentation practice and theory. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *The practice of argumentation* (pp. 11-28). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. D. J. Heritage (Ed.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 1-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erickson, F. (2004). *Talk and social theory: Ecologies of speaking and listening in everyday life*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. [chapter 6—theoretical background on CDA]
- Fairclough, N. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: Reply to Michael Billig. *Discourse & Society*, 19, 811-819.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.
- García Gómez, A. (2010). Disembodiment and cyberspace: Gendered discourses in female teenagers' personal information disclosure. *Discourse & Society*, 21, 131-160.
- **Haspel, K., & Tracy, K. (2007). Marking and shifting lines in the sand: Discursive moves of ordinary democracy. In K. Tracy, J. McDaniel & B. Gronbeck (Eds.), *The prettier doll: Rhetoric, discourse, and ordinary democracy* (pp. 142-175). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America [chapter 1].
- Hicks, D. (2007). Darkness on the edge of town: On the interface between communicational and racial ideologies. In K. Tracy, J. P. McDaniel & B. E. Gronbeck (Eds.), *The prettier doll: Rhetoric, discourse and ordinary democracy* (pp. 103-141). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Hodges, A. (2008). The politics of recontextualization: Discursive competition over claims of Iranian involvement in Iraq. *Discourse & Society*, 19, 483-505.

- Kitzinger, C., & Frith, H. (1999). Just say no? The use of conversation analysis in developing a feminist perspective on sexual refusal. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 293-316.
- **Mautner, G. (2005). The Entrepreneurial University. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2, 95-120.
- **Mirivel, J. (2007). Managing poor surgical candidacy: Communication problems for plastic surgeons. *Discourse & Communication*, 1, 309-336.
- **Nilsen, M., & Makitalo, A. (2010). Toward a conversational culture?: How participants establish strategies for co-coordinating chat postings in the context of in-service training. *Discourse Studies*, 12, 90-105.
- **Nofsinger, R. E. (1989/90). "Let's talk about the record": contending over topic redirection in the Rather/Bush interview. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 22 273-292.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental Pragmatics* (pp. 43-72). NY.: Academic Press.
- **Philipsen, G., & Coutu, L. M. (2005). The ethnography of speaking. In K. Fitch & R. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 355-379). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pomerantz, A. (1989/90). Constructing skepticism: Four devices used to engender the audience's skepticism. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 22, 293-313.
- Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B. J. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 64-91). London: Sage.
- Pomerantz, A., & Mandelbaum, J. (2005). Conversation analytic approaches to the relevance and uses of relationship categories in interaction. In K. Fitch & R. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 149-171). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2007). Chairing democracy: Psychology, time, and negotiating the institution. In K. Tracy, J. P. McDaniel & B. E. Gronbeck (Eds.), *The prettier doll: Rhetoric, discourse and ordinary democracy* (pp. 176-202). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- **Roberts, F., & Robinson, J. D. (2004). Inter-observer agreement on "first-stage" conversation analytic transcription. *Human Communication Research*, 30, 376-410.
- Roca-Cuberes, C. (2008). Membership categorization and professional insanity ascription. *Discourse Studies*, 10, 543-570.
- **Schegloff, E. A. (1988/1989). From interview to confrontation: Observations on the Bush/Rather encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 22, 215-240.

- Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26, 99-128.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1999a). 'Schegloff's texts' as 'Billig's data': A critical reply. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 558-572.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1999b). Naiveté vs. sophistication or discipline vs. self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 577-582.
- Tracy, K. (2001). Discourse analysis in communication. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 725-749). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Tracy, K. (2005). Reconstructing communicative practices: Action-implicative discourse analysis. In K. Fitch & R. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 301-319). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tracy, K. (2008). Language and Social Interaction. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Communication* Vol. 6 (pp. 2645-2655). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Tracy, K., & Anderson, D. L. (1999). Relational positioning strategies in calls to the police: A dilemma. *Discourse Studies*, 1, 201-226.
- Tracy, K., & Craig, R. T. (2010). Studying interaction in order to cultivate practice: Action-implicative discourse analysis. In J. Streeck (Ed.), *New adventures in language and interaction* (pp. 145-166). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tracy, K., Martinez-Guillen, S., Robles, J. S., & Casteline, K. E. (in press). Critical discourse analysis and (US) communication scholarship: Recovering old connections, envisioning new ones. In C. Salmon (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 35*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Tracy, K., & Robles, J. (in press). Challenges of interviewers' institutional positionings: Taking account of interview content AND the interaction. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 4.
- Tracy, K., & Tracy, S. J. (1998). Rudeness at 911: Reconceptualizing face and face-attack. *Human Communication Research*, 25, 225-251.
- **van Dijk, T. A. (2008). Critical discourse analysis and nominalization: Problem or pseudo-problem? *Discourse & Society*, 19, 821-828.
- White, C., & Agne, R. (2009). Communication practices of coaches during mediator training: Addressing issues of knowledge and enactment. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 27, 83-105.
- Wilkerson, S. (2006). Analysing interaction in focus groups. In P. Drew, G. Raymond & D. Weinberg (Eds.), *Talk and interaction in social research methods* (pp. 50-62). London: Sage.

Wooffitt, R., & Widdicombe, S. (2006). Interaction in interviews. In P. Drew, G. Raymond & D. Weinberg (Eds.), *Talk and interaction in social research methods* (pp. 28-49). London: Sage.

Course Assessment

Major DA Research Paper (40%). The culmination of the semester's work is to be a discourse analysis that is similar in style, format, and scope to the published studies we will have read as exemplars. The paper is to analyze and advance an argument related to materials of your own choosing. It is assumed that most students will be working with audio or video data, but if you are interested in computer-mediated interaction or a kind of written text that is also fine. Given the time constraints of a semester, you will need to work with materials that are already collected or those that are publicly available. The research paper is expected to make a scholarly claim that builds on/uses relevant literature and analyzes discourse. Expected length is 25 typed double space pages (+/-5). More guidance will be provided later.

Brief Discourse Analysis Papers (20%). Focal discourse concepts are divided into those related to six questions about discourse posed in the Johnstone book. After every two questions, you will select one of the two kinds of class materials to analyze—the police calls or one citizen's public testimony in Hawaii's hearing about civil unions for same-sex couples—drawing on any of the discourse concepts developed in the unit. Papers will be 5-7 pages in length. There are 3 assignments; everyone is expected to do 2.

Data Analysis Session (10%). Students will run a data session (30 min.) in which they bring a segment of their data from their semester project (i.e., 5-10 min audio- or videotape; a set of written texts). The data session will begin with a 5-min. framing (no more!) of the key issue being investigated; then you will share your data segment with the class and class members will offer observations and reactions.

Participation & Homework (30%). This class is a seminar and your involvement is vital to make the class work well. Everyone is expected to come to class with questions and comments on the day's assigned readings. Some days I will give questions/issues for you to reflect about as you do the reading; other days I may ask you to act as a discussion leader. In addition, you can expect regular **written assignments**. The assignments have two purposes: (a) to give you experience with one or another DA practice/skill, and (b) to move you along in a timely fashion on the tasks that you will need to do to write a strong major research paper. Written feedback will be given on assignments, but a grade will be reserved for the end. If assignments are done thoughtfully, adhering to the timetable of the class, you can expect to receive a grade of A-. A higher grade is reserved for excellence in assignments and especially strong participation; late/perfunctory assignments or minimal discussion participation will result in a lower grade.

Miscellaneous Course Information

Equipment: The Communication Department has equipment that is available for students to checkout. Equipment includes laptops, digital VHS cameras, web cameras, wireless Internet cards, transcribers, tape recorders, and more. Please See Comm TAC (technology across the

curriculum) on the department website <http://comm.colorado.edu> for more information. Students outside of communication, will need my signature to check out equipment.

Tentative Schedule and Assignments

Unit I: Introduction to DA: Key Ideas and Examples	
Wk1 8/24-26	<p><u>Tuesday</u> Read Tracy 2001 and 2008</p> <p><u>Thursday</u> Read Rapley, chapters 1-5</p>
Wk2 8/31-9-2	<p><u>Tuesday</u> Read Rapley, chapters 6-10; Antaki et al. http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/v1/n1/a1/antaki2002002.html Recommended: Burman http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/003/burman2003003.html Transcript # 1 due (short segment of hearing)</p> <p><u>Thursday</u>: 2 analyses of same political exchange Read (1) Clayman & Whalen, (2) Pomerantz 1989, identified as Bush-Rather exchange Recommended: Nofsinger 1989, Schegloff 1989</p>
Wk3 9/7-9	<p><u>Tuesday</u> Read Johnstone Chapter 1, Bucholtz, Ochs Recommended: Roberts & Robinson Transcript # 2 due (police call)</p> <p><u>Thursday</u>: Analyses of police calls Read (1) Tracy & Tracy; (2) Tracy & Anderson</p>
Wk4 9/14-16	<p><u>Tuesday</u> Johnstone, chapters 2-3 DA mini-paper #1 due</p> <p><u>Thursday</u>: Example analyses of participation in public meetings Read (1) Potter & Hepburn (2) Hicks Recommended: Haspel and Tracy</p>
Wk5 9/21-23	<p><u>Tuesday</u> Read Johnstone, chapters 4-5, Pomerantz & Fehr DA mini-paper # 2 due</p>

	<p><u>Thursday</u>: Prior DA student analyses Read (1) Agne & Tracy; (2) Hodges</p>
<p>Wk6 9/28-30</p>	<p><u>Tuesday</u> Read Johnstone, chapters 6-8 DA mini-paper # 3 due</p> <p><u>Thursday</u> Sample studies working with newspaper/internet data Read: (1) Benwell & Stokoe, (2) Billig & MacMillan; Recommended Mautner; and/or Nilsen & Mäkitalo Due: 1-paragraph description of discourse data and likely question focus</p>
<p><i>Unit II Approaches to DA & Key Controversies</i> <i>Student Data Sessions — Each class day, Week 7 - Week 15</i></p>	
<p>Wk7 10/5-7</p>	<p>Issue: Interview Data in DA <u>Tuesday</u>: Issues and an example Read (1) Woofitt & Widdicombe, (2) Tracy & Robles;</p> <p><u>Thursday</u>: Focus groups Read Wilkerson</p>
<p>Wk8 10/12-14</p>	<p>Approach: Conversation Analysis (CA) <u>Tuesday</u>: overview (1) Clayman & Gill; (2) Roberts (2004) Kitzinger & Frith</p> <p>Thursday: CA in studies of institutional interaction Read Drew & Heritage Project Issue focus (1-2 sentences) + Bibliography (10-15 references)</p>
<p>Wk9 10/19-21</p>	<p>Approaches: CA (continued) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) <u>Tuesday</u>: CA-membership categorization analysis Read (1) Pomerantz & Mandelbaum; (2) Hester & Eglin, (3) Roca-Cuberes</p> <p>Thursday: CDA overview Read Fairclough & Wodak Overview of full talk/text materials for study and one sample unit (transcribed/written)</p>
<p>Wk10 10/26-28</p>	<p>Approach: CDA (continued) <u>Tuesday</u>: CDA overview/critique Read (1) Erickson and (2) Tracy, Martinez-Guillem, Robles, & Casteline</p> <p>Thursday CDA debate about nominalization</p>

	Read (1) Billig -2008; (2) Fairclough-2008 Recommended van Dijk
Wk11 11/2-4	Approach: Action-Implicative Discourse Analysis <u>Tuesday</u> AIDA overview Read (1) Tracy (2005) and (2) Tracy & Craig (2010) Mini-DA claim with your materials (3-4 pages) <u>Thursday</u> meta-communication analyses Read (1) Craig & Tracy (2005) and (2) Craig (2008)
Wk12 11/9-11	Approaches: Distinctive Communication DA studies <u>Tuesday</u> : Linked to multiple DA traditions Read (1) White & Agne, (2) Bartesaghi, (3) Buttny & Ellis <u>Thursday</u> : Ethnography of Communication — <i>Visit with Professor Boromisza-Habashi</i> Read (1) Boromisza-Habashi and (2) Carbaugh Recommended Philipsen & Coutu
Wk13 11/16-18	<u>Tuesday</u> <i>No class -- National Communication Association</i> <u>Thursday</u> Rough draft of DA paper due 2 student data sessions
Wk14 11/23-25	Thanksgiving break: Enjoy!
Wk15 11/30-12/2	<u>Tuesday</u> 2 student data sessions + discuss/return rough drafts <u>Thursday</u> : What is the role for quantitative analysis in DA? Read (1) Baker, (2) Schegloff (1993); (3) Garcia Gomez
Wk16 12/7-12/9	Final Reflections and Positioning Yourself <u>Tuesday</u> : Debate between CA and CDA (relative weight to give description vs. critique) Read: special issue (1999) Billig-a-Schegloff-a-Billig-b-Schegloff-b <u>Thursday</u> : Reprise—Reread Tracy (2001) and Tracy (2008) Be prepared to position yourself: What is your relationship to DA? Which DA commitments would you identify as your own?
Final	Tuesday, December 14, 2010, 4:30-7:00 PM—Snacks & drinks at my house.

	Presentation of semester papers and final paper due
--	---