Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences ISSN: 2231– 6345 (Online)
An Open Access, Online International Journal Available at www.cibtech.org/sp.ed/jls/2015/02/jls.htm
2015 Vol. 5 (S2), pp. 1040-1048/Shabani and Dogolsara
Review Article

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE TRENDS IN DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: THEORY AND METHODS

***Gholamhossein Shabani and Shokoufeh Abbasi Dogolsara**
Department of English, Roudsar and Amlash Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudsar, Iran
**Author for Correspondence*

ABSTRACT
Owning to the fact that it concerns how language works to engage people with the world and the interactions people have with each other, and thereby the social, political, and cultural institutions in different societies to be created and shaped, discourse is looked upon as one of the most important concepts of modern thinking in disciplines across the humanities and social sciences. Applied linguistics views DA as the study of language in action within the social contexts in which it is used. But since language is connected to almost everything that goes on in this world, discourse is an overloaded term which covers a range of meanings. Therefore, different approaches to DA focus on specific parts of language in use. They, for instance, may focus on the analysis of speech and writing to reveal the dynamics and conventions of social situations, or the institutionalized ways of thinking that define our social lives. Discourse, in fact, can be considered to spread between two poles, giving more or less emphasis to concrete texts or to institutional practices, to either particular cases of talk or to how social structures are formed by it. This study aimed at investigating the features of text versus discourse, trends in academic discourse, classroom discourse, workplace discourse by bringing together a number of empirical studies that use a wide variety of approaches to study discourse patterns in spoken and written discourse.

Keywords: *Approaches to Discourse Analysis, Academic Discourse Analysis, Classroom Discourse Analysis, Workplace Discourse Analysis*

INTRODUCTION
Language plays an important role in the creation of the reality that surrounds us. As an interdisciplinary field of inquiry, discourse analysis (DA) tries to study language use and its role in human society. It follows that language, which is beyond the level of sentence, and that language is not merely an abstract set of rules, rather it is a means of social action. Thus, as Bhatia *et al.*, (2008) put it; DA has been an appealing field of linguists, applied linguists, sociologists, anthropologists, communication experts, organizational theorists, computer experts, business and legal specialists, and socio-political theorists.
There are generally various views toward DA which can be classified as Textual-oriented viewfocusing primarily on language patterns in the text, and Socially- oriented viewplacing primary focus on the purposes a text serves in the socio-cultural setting in which it occurs.
DA is the study of language in use- the relationship between language and the context in which it is used. Applied Linguistics views DA as the study of language in action within the social contexts in which it is used. Thus, discourse, in fact, can be considered " to spread between two poles, giving more or less emphasis to concrete texts or to institutional practices, to either particular cases of talk or to how social structures are formed by it" (Hyland & Paltridge, 2011).
DA should describe the language in use in terms of its components, the order of components, and the ways to combine the components into larger constructs, a structural description of language, the order of the sentences, the sequence of sentences, some of which are meaningful and some are not.So mere knowledge of language or grammar is not enough, and one needs to have a good command of the properties of the utterances, the rules governing their combination, their mutual relations, and also the conditions and constraints involved in dealing with sentences.
The history of DA goes back to school of linguistics that followed Ferdinand de Saussure's (1916) call to refocus language study on synchronic structure, and mostly attended to sounds, phrases, and clauses

rather than connected discourse. In 1960s, scholars began to coverage on two related idea about discourse:

Harris (1952) who was interested in the distribution of linguistic elements in extended texts and the link between the text and its social situation published a paper with the title Discourse Analysis. Harris (1952) was interested in examining language beyond the level of the sentence and the relationship between linguistic and non-linguistic behavior. Harris (1952) and Paltridge (2008) tried to provide a way for describing "how language features are distributed within texts and the ways in which they are combined in particular kinds and styles of texts". In the 1960s, Hymes (1964 as cited in Bhatia *et al.*, (2008) studied speech in social setting so as to provide a sociological perspective on discourse. Austin (1962), Searle (1969) and Grice (1975) embarked on the study of language as a social action. Halliday (1973) functional approach had profound influence on British DA. Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) model of Classroom Discourse Analysis or the Initiation, Response, Feedback (IRF) model based on a hierarchy of DA. American discourse trends namely Pike and other "linguists associated with the Summer Institute of Linguistics" developed a way of understanding sentences and discourse structures based on function, which they called *tagmemic grammar*.The emergence of variationist sociolinguistics bring DA into the purview of students of language change. In France, Marxist linguistics began to explore how ideology is constructed in and revealed through discourse.Linguists influenced by the *Birmingham-school social theory* brought forth a critical approach to discourse.

Review of the Literature

Text and Discourse

Text refers to the purely linguistic material.Discourse refers to language in use and is composed of text and context.Text Internal Elementsconstitute the text (linguistic material with a verbal channel, the stable semantic meaning of words, expressions and sentences), while Text External Elementsconstitute the context. Schiffrin (1994) points out that " context is a world filled with people producing utterances: people who have social, cultural, and personal identities, knowledge, beliefs, goals, and wants, who interact with one another in various socially and culturally defined situations" (p.363)

Thematicity

Discourse analysts are interested in how people organize what they say in the sense of what they typically say first, and what follows next and so on in a conversation or in a piece of writing.

According to Halliday (1994), theme is the element which serves as the point of departure of the message; it is that with which the clause is concerned. The remainder of the message- the part in which theme is developed- is called rheme.

The Concept of Thematic Progression (TP)

Thematic Progression (TP) is a method of development of a text created through the author's choice of theme. The choice of themes in a passage follows certain patterns.These patterns produce different types of Thematic Progression.Thematic Progression regards how utterances link up to one another and make the text progress. Thematic Progression contributes to the production of text convexity, Thematic Progression facilitates the reading process.Three types of Thematic Progression are theme reiteration/TP with continuous, constant theme, Simple linear TP/ A zig- zag theme pattern, TP with hypertheme and derived themes / multiple theme/rheme pattern

Spoken and Written Discourse

Written discourse analysis is differentiated in terms of some criteria, the most important are grammatical intricacy, lexical density, nominalization, explicitness, contextualization, spontaneity, repetition, hesitations, and redundancy. Written discourse is more structurally complex and more elaborate than spoken discourse. In other words, *sentences* in spoken discourse are short and simple, whereas they are longer and more complex in written discourse.Lexical densityrefers to the ratio of content words (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs) to grammatical or function words (e.g. pronouns, prepositions, articles) within a clause.Spoken discourse is less lexically dense than written discourse. Content words tend to be spread out over a number of clauses, whereas they seem to be tightly packed into individual clauses (Jalilifar, 2015).

Nominalization refers to presenting actions and events as nouns rather than as verbs. Written discourse has a high level of nominalization: i.e. more nouns than verbs. In addition, written discourse tends to have longer noun groups than spoken discourse. Writing is more explicit than speech (Paltridge, 2008).

Contextualization refers to the extent knowledge of context is needed to interpret a text. According to Paltridge (2008) and McCarthy (2001), writing is more decontextualized than speech: Speech is more attached to context than writing because speech depends on a shared situation and background for interpretation.Spoken discourse lacks organization and is ungrammatical because it is spontaneous, whereas written discourse is organized and grammatical. Spoken discourse contains more uncompleted and reformulated sentences. Topics can be changed. Speakers may interrupt and overlap rebuttal:Spoken discourse *is organized*, but it is organized differently from written discourse.

Spoken discourse contains more repetition, hesitations, and redundancy because it is produced in *real time* (i.e. on the spot). Spoken discourse has many pauses and fillers, such as 'hhh', 'er' and 'you know'.

McCarthy (2001) argued for a continuum view rather than simple, one-dimensional difference between spoken and written discourses.In other words, differences are viewed as being on a scale or a continuum.

Discourse Analysis (The shaper and the Shaped)

Discourse is shaped by the world and shapes the world.Discourse is shaped by language and shapes language. Discourse is shaped by participants and shapes participants. Discourse is shaped by prior discourse and shapes future discourse.Discourse is shaped by medium and shapes medium.Discourse is shaped by purpose and shapes purposes.

Discourse Analysis (Saying, Doing, and Being)

People can say things, do things and be things through language. It enables people to inform the others (saying), act upon different issues they are encountering in their daily life (doing), and express their identity(being). As illustrated by Gee (2011), discourse analysis is an enterprise to find out how people use language to say things, do things and be things.

Discourse Analysis as Tools of Inquiry

Gee (2011) introduced social languages, discourse, conversation, intertextuality, form-function correlations and situated meaning as tools of inquiry. They are called tools of inquiry in the sense that they lead discourse analysts to ask specific questions about the data under consideration.

Social Languages

People use different styles or varieties of language for different purposes. They use different varieties of language to enact and recognize different identities in different settings; they also use different varieties of language to engage in all the other building tasks discussed in the last chapter. I will call each such variety a "social language."

Discourses

People build identities and activities not just through language, but by using language together with other "stuff" that isn't language. If you want to get recognized as a street-gang member of a certain sort you have to speak in the "right" way, but you also have to act and dress in the "right" way, as well. You also have to engage (or, at least, behave as if you are engaging) in characteristic ways of thinking, acting, interacting, valuing, feeling, and believing. You also have to use or be able to use various sorts of symbols (e.g., graffiti), tools (e.g., a weapon), and objects (e.g., street corners) in the "right" places and at the "right" times. You can't just "talk the talk," you have to "walk the walk" as well (Jalilifar & Davaran, 2008).

Conversations

Sometimes when we talk or write, our words don't just allude or relate to someone else's words (as in the case of intertextuality), but they allude or relate to themes, debates, or motifs that have been the focus of much talk and writing in some social group with which we are familiar or in our society as a whole. These themes, debates, or motifs play a role in how language is interpreted. For example, how do you know that when I tell you "Smoking is associated with health problems" that I mean to say that smoking leads to health problems and not that health problems lead people to smoke because, say, their health problems are making them nervous and they are smoking in order to calm themselves down (the most probable

meaning for a sentence like "Writing a will is associated with health problems")? You know this because you are well aware of the long-running discussions in our society over the ill-effects of smoking (Tanskanen, 2004).

Intertextuality

When we speak or write, our words often allude to or relate to, in some fashion, other "texts" or certain types of "texts," where by "texts" I mean words other people have said or written. For example, Wired magazine once printed a story with this title: "The New Face of the Silicon Age: Tech jobs are fleeing to India faster than ever. You got a problem with that?" (February 2004). The sentence "You got a problem with that?" reminds us of "tough guy" talk we have heard in many movies or read in books. It intrigues us that such talk occurs written in a magazine devoted to technology. This sort of cross-reference to another text or type of text I will refer to as "intertextuality

Discourse Analysis as Building Tasks

Gee (2011) and Jalilifar (2010) named the concepts of significance, practices, identities, relationships, and policies, connections, and sign systems as building tasks. They are termed as building tasks in the sense that each is a task people take on when they use grammar of their language and speak or write beyond giving information.

Significance

There are things in life that are, by nearly everyone's standards, significant (for example the birth or death of a child). But for many things, we need to use language to render them significant or to lessen their significance, to signal to others how we view their significance). How is this piece of language being used to make certain things significant or not and in what ways?

Practices (Activities)

By a "practice" we mean a socially recognized and institutionally or culturally supported endeavor that usually involves sequencing or combining actions in certain specified ways. Encouraging a student is an action, mentoring the student as his or her advisor in a graduate program is a practice. Telling someone something about linguistics is an action (informing), lecturing on linguistics in a course is a practice. Sometimes the term "activity" is used for what I am calling a practice.

We use language to get recognized as taking on a certain identity or role, that is, to build an identity here and now. For example, I talk and act in one way and I am speaking and acting as "chair" of the committee; at the next moment I speak and talk in a different way and I am speaking and acting as one peer/colleague speaking to another. Even if I have an official appointment as chair of the committee, I am not always taken as acting as the chair, even during meetings. I have to enact this identity at the right times and places to make it work.

Relationships

We use language to signal what sort of relationship we have, want to have, or are trying to have with our listener(s), reader(s), or other people, groups, or institutions about whom we are communicating. We use language to build social relationships.

Politics (the Distribution of Social Goods)

We use language to convey a perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods, that is, to build a perspective on social goods. For example, if I say "Microsoft loaded its operating system with bugs," I treat Microsoft as purposeful and responsible, perhaps even culpable. I deny them a social good. If I say, on the other hand, "Microsoft's operating system is loaded with bugs," I treat Microsoft as less purposeful and responsible, less culpable. I am still denying them a social good, but I have mitigated this denial. If I say, "Like all innovative pieces of software, Microsoft's operating system has bugs," I grant Microsoft a social goods (being innovative) and even make the bugs a sign of this, rather than a problem. How I phrase the matter has implications for social goods like guilt and blame, legal responsibility or lack of it, or Microsoft's bad or good motives.

Connections

We use language to render certain things connected or relevant (or not) to other things, that is, to build connections or relevance.

Sign Systems and Knowledge

There are many different languages (e.g., Spanish, Russian, English). There are many different varieties of any one language (e.g., the language of lawyers, the language of biologists, the language of hip-hop artists). There are communicative systems that are not language (e.g., equations, graphs, images). These are all different sign systems.

Text, Discourse and Function

For the most part of the 20th century, linguists were concerned with analyzing sentences and with linguistic systems rather than the use of language (de Saussure, 1916; Bloomfield, 1914, 1933; Chomsky, 1964). Made-up sentences are relied on and they hardly ever occurred in a context or co text. In contrast, the study of discourse goes beyond the sentence and studies texts. As Stubbs (1983, p.12) pointed out, there has been "a gathering consensus, particularly since the mid-19600s, that some of the basic assumptions of Sasserean-Bloofieldean- Chomskyan linguistics must be questioned". Even during the heyday of Chomskyan linguistics, we find ideas sharply opposed to those represented in generative grammar in the British linguistic tradition. The importance of text and functions of language in context had been stressed already by Firth (1957); it was inspired by Malinowski's context of culture, and work on text and discourse has been taken further in the works of Halliday (1970, 1994) and Sinclair and Coulthard (1975).

Recent Trends in the Linguistic Study of Text and Discourse

Corpora provide a new and powerful tool for the text linguist. As Bondi (2004) points out, text and discourse studies can only be fully developed when close analysis of particular instances of communicative events is integrated with quantitative data from wider textual bases.

In recent years, corpora have been increasingly used as a tool for the interpretation of texts.They provide information about meaning which are not available through intuition and they can be used to study the use of language in different text types.Corpus linguistics has contributed to research in different ways, namely LLC,COLT,MICASE.

The Interface between Speech and Writing

A number of studies have looked at differences between speech and writing in the areas of *grammar* and *lexis*. There are interesting differences between speech and writing depending on the external circumstances under which we write or speak. Mailing-list texts, in recent years, has been the focus of many scholars namely Tanskanen (2004).

Academic Discourse

Academic discourse is a field with potential pedagogical applications. Research articles, lectures, abstracts, etc. Involved scientific procedures established by the social activity itself and are maintained by members of the professional community. Discourse patterns and discourse markers may also vary across a particular discipline or genre. Academic discourse refers to the ways of thinking and using languagewhich exist in the academy. Discourse is not just “language” itself; discourse is language use that represents a person’s existence in the world. Thus, what one has said and written are significant to academic community, which also shows that the institution cannot exist without academic discourse. Academic discourse does not only function as a tool to convey one’s thoughts but also influences one’s formation of social identity, values, and world knowledge. The common ways to present academic discourse are through textbooks, conference presentations, dissertations, lectures, and research articles.

Coherence& Cohesion in Spoken and Written Dialogue

Text linguistics has long been concerned with the principles of connectivity which bind a text together. Winter (1977) defined ‘clause relation’ as a cognitive process whereby we interpret the meaning of a sentence in the light of its adjoining sentences. Halliday and Hasan (1976) are concerned with different resources for text construction and cohesion. Halliday and Hasan’s ideas are further elaborated by Martin (1992), using systemic functional grammar to ask questions about text structure.Text coherence is attributed to rhetorical relations (Mann and Thompson’s, 1988) such as *contrast and sequenc*, which are mapped unto schemas rather than structures.These theories have lightened the road for later investigations of coherence and cohesion in written and spoken discourse.

Deixies and Non-verbal Communication

Discourse deixis, also referred to as text deixis, refers to the use of expressions within an utterance to refer to parts of the discourse that contains the utterance - including the utterance itself. For example, in

- This is a great story. "this" refers to an upcoming portion of the discourse, and in
- That was an amazing account. "that" refers to a prior portion of the discourse.

Distinction must be made between discourse deixis and anaphora, which is when an expression makes reference to the same referent as a prior term, as in Matthew is an incredible athlete; he came in first in the race.

Lyons points out that it is possible for an expression to be both deictic and anaphoric at the same time. In his example:

- I was born in London and I have lived here/there all my life. "here" or "there" function anaphorically in their reference to London, and deictically in that the choice between "here" or "there" indicates whether the speaker is or is not currently in London.

The rule of thumb to distinguish the two phenomena is as follows: when an expression refers to another linguistic expression or a piece of discourse, it is discourse deictic. When that expression refers to the same item as a prior linguistic expression, it is anaphoric

The Use of Corpora to Study Metaphor

In one study, Wikberg (2004) investigated metaphor and text, by focusing on English metaphors and their translation and highlighting the importance of context.

The available literature can indicate that very few, if any, studies have explored the animal metaphoric system in Iranian culture or in local varieties of several languages spoken in Iran. Such a gap provided strong motivation for Aliakbari and Faraji (2013) to investigate this are of research in an Iranian context.

Since metaphor usage and interpretation in Iranian society are culture-bound, it is open to take into account the metaphoric system of different languages spoken in different parts.

Classroom Discourse and its Impact

Classroom discourse (hereafter CD) is the oral interaction that occurs between teachers and students and among students themselves. Through their interaction with each other, teachers and students construct a common body of knowledge, understandings of their roles and relationships, and the norms and expectations for the involvement as members in their classrooms.

Hall (1995) stated that CD aims to investigate the nature and importance of instructional conversations in creating active learning communities.

Teacher-student and student-student discourse have an important role in the creation of effectual communities of learners and ultimately, in the shaping of individual learners' development in the target language.The kinds of linguistic and communicative environments the teachers create in their interactions with their students help shape the students' knowledge, skills, and abilities as learners and users of the target language.Communication practice in L2 classrooms has a profound effect on the creation of effective learning environments as well as on L2 learning process.

Approaches to Researching CD

There are some approaches to CD, the most notable of which are given as follows:

The Interaction Analysis Approach

Rooted in behavioral psychology, interaction analysis (IA) approaches have made important contributions to classroom discourse analysis. Many advocates of the "scientific method" argue that IA approaches are "objective" ways of analyzing classroom discourse (Chaudron, 1988; Walsh, 2006b). Using observation instruments, or real-time coding systems, researchers in this tradition propose that they are able to observe linguistic behaviors and establish objective and reliable classroom profiles through quantitative statistical procedures that are generalizable (Chaudron, 1988; Walsh, 2006b).

The Discourse Analysis Approach

Another framework used in classroom discourse analysis is referred to as discourse analysis (DA) approaches. Seedhouse (2004) proposes that most previous investigations on L2CD have implicitly or explicitly adopted what is fundamentally a discourse analysis approach‖ (p. 45). Following principles

from structural-functional linguistics, DA approaches analyze the structural patterns and functional purposes of classroom discourse. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) were among the earliest proponents of using DA approaches to classroom discourse. Unlike IA approaches, Sinclair and Coulthard pointed out that their purpose was to better understand the nature of classroom discourse by subjecting it to analysis and not necessarily to improve instructional practices, although they concluded that their study could have possible applications in educational contexts.

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) developed their model based on analyses of recorded classroom interactions, albeit the data were from primary-level British classrooms. Their model involves a discourse hierarchy (or discourse units) consisting of different levels, each level being composed of elements from the previous level: *Lesson Transaction ExchangeMove Act*. The highest discourse unit is the lesson, while the smallest unit is the speech act. Acts are described in terms of their discourse functions (e.g., cue, elicitation, evaluation). At the exchange level, Sinclair and Coulthard observed the following interaction characteristics: (1) question-and answer sequences; (2) pupils responding to teachers' directions; and (3) pupils listening to the teacher giving directions. Various combinations of these exchanges make up transactions. While they present an intricate description of classroom discourse, the question-and-answer sequence receives the most attention, which consists of three elements: (1) teacher question (or *Initiation*),(2) student answer (or *Response*), and (3) teacher's feedback/follow-up to the answer (or *Feedback/Follow-up*), otherwise known as the IRF structure5. An example from Sinclair and Coulthard (1975, p. 21) illustrates this exchange:

Teacher: Can you tell me why do you eat all that food? *Initiation* (I)
Pupil: To keep you strong. *Response* (R)
Teacher: To keep you strong. Yes. To keep you strong. *Feedback* (F)

The Conversational Analysis Approach

Conversation analysis (CA) has also contributed to our understanding of classroom discourse. Rooted in the tradition of Garfinkel's (1967) ethnomethodology, CA was developed by Sacks *et al.*, (1974) as an approach to investigate the sequential organization of talk-in-interaction (for a fuller account, see Drew & Heritage, 1992). The underlying principle of CA is the notion that social contexts are fluid and constantly being constructed by participants through their use of language in the interaction, and the ways in which turn-taking, openings and closures, sequencing of acts, adjacency pairs, and so on are locally managed (Walsh, 2006b). Heritage (2004) explains:

CA embodies a theory which argues that sequences of actions are a major part of what we mean by context, that the meaning of an action is heavily shaped by the sequence of previous actions from which it emerges, and that social context is a dynamically created thing that is expressed in and through the sequential organization of interaction.

Workplace Discourse

Naturally occurring talk in workplace environments are specifically analyzed in workplace discourse. While there is considerable variation in the types of spoken interaction occurring across different workplace, many interactions have similar goals, and can therefore be said to be instances of the same genre. Genre is a significant factor that influences the linguistic choices made by speakers, and it will explore key differences between some of the most common spoken workplace genre.

Approaches to Analyzing Workplace Discourse

- The role of context
- Quantitative and qualitative approaches to workplace discourse
  - Corpus linguistic methods
  - Qualitative approaches
  - Genre analysis in workplace discourse
  - Using methods of Genre analysis in workplace discourse
  - Goals, frames, and workplace genre

Workplace meetings are an important element of business management. Meetings enable you and your employees to communicate and share information, solve problems or resolve disputes, improve

performance, build teamwork and move projects forward. Workplace meetings can be formal or informal, and the number of participants can range from two to several hundred, depending on the size of your company. Your suppliers, customers and business partners may also participate in workplace meetings if your company has a policy of collaboration.

CONCLUSION

The central notion embedded in discourse is that when people take part in different areas of social life, the language they use to interact with one another is structured according to the different patterns their utterances follow, such as in medical and political discourse. It is the main concern of DA to study and analyze these patterns. Not only do the manners we talk reflect our world, identities, and social relations, but they also play an active role in creating and changing those (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). As Paltridge (2008) asserts, DA draws attention to the knowledge about language beyond the sentence level, as it is needed for successful communication. It probes for patterns of language across texts or speech along with taking into account the social and cultural contexts in which language is applied. The use of language can reveal different world views, understandings, the kind of relationships between participants', individuals' identities, and the effects the use of language can have on social relations and social identities.

REFERENCES

Aliakbari M and Faraji E (2013). Conceptualization of man's behavioral and physical characteristics as animal metaphors in the spoken discourse of Khezel people. *Linguistikonline* **59**(2) 3-41.
Bhatia VK (2004). *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-based View* (London: Continuum).
Bhatia VK, Flowerdew J and Jones RH (2008). *Advances in Discourse Studies* (New York: Routledge).
Bloomfield L (1914). *Introduction to the Study of Language,* edited by John Benjamins (New York: Henry Holt) Reprinted 1983.
Bloomfield L (1933). *Language* (New York: Henry Holt).
Bondi M (2004). The discourse function of contrastive connection in academic abstracts. In: *Discourse Patterns in Spoken and Written Corpora,* edited by Amjer K and Stenstrom AB (Amsterdam: John Benjamins) 139-156.
Chaudron C (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning* (New York: Cambridge University Press).
Chomsky N (1972). *Language and Mind,* 2nd edition (San Diego: Harcourt Brace).
Coulthard M (2002). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis* (London: Routledge).
Drew P and Heritage J (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In: *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings,* edited by Drew P and Heritage J (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press) 3-65.
Gee JP (2011). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* (New York: Routledge).
Hall J (1995). Creating our worlds with words: A sociohistorical perspective of face-to-face interaction. *Applied Linguistics* **16** 206-32.
Halliday MAK (1970). Language structure and language function. In: *New Horizons in Linguistics,* edited by Lyons J (Harmondsworh: penguin) 140-65.
Halliday MAK (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar,* 2nd edition (London: Edward Arnold).
Halliday MAK and Hasan R (1976). *Cohesion in English* (London: Longman).
Hyland K and Paltridge B (2011). *Continuum Campaign to Discourse Analysis* (New York Continuum: International Publishing Group).
Hymes D (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).
Jalilifar AL (2010). Writing titles in applied linguistics: A contrastive study of theses and research articles. *Taiwan International ESP Journal* **2**(1) 29 29-54**.**
Jorgensen M and Phillips L (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* (London: Sage Publications).
Mann WC and Thompson SA (1998). Rhetorical structure theory: A theory of text organization. *Text* **8**(3) 243-81.

Martin JR (1992). *English Text: System and Structure* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins).
McCarthy M (2000). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University press).
McCarthy M (2001). *Issues in Applied Linguistics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Paltridge B (2008). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction* (New York: Continuum).
Schegloff E (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse and Society* **8**(2) 165-87.
Schiffrin E (1994). *Approaches to Discourse Analysis* (Oxford: Blackwell).
Searle JR (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Seedhouse P (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective* (Malden, MA: Blackwell).
Sinclair J and Coulthard M (1975). Towards an analysis of discourse. *The English used by Teachers and Pupils* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Stubbs M (1983). Discourse Analysis. *The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language* (Oxford: Blackwell).
Tanskanen SK (2004). Dialogical coherence? Patterns of cohesion in face-to-face conversation and e-mail mailing list messages. In: *Discourse Patterns in Spoken and Written Corpora,* edited by Ajmer K and Stenstrom AB (Amsterdam: John Benjamins) 89-110.
Walsh S (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse* (London: Routledge).
Wikberg K (2004). English metaphors and their translation: The importance of context. In: *Discourse Patterns in Spoken and Written Corpora,* edited by Amjer K and Stenstrom AB (Amsterdam: John Benjamins) 245-66.
Winter EO (1977). A clause relational approach to English texts> A study of some predictive lexical items in written discourse. *Instructional Science* **6**(1) 1-92.