

Thesis
5455

HOMOGENEITY AND HETEROGENEITY IN
DISCIPLINARY DISCOURSE: TRACKING THE
MANAGEMENT OF INTERTEXTUALITY
IN UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC LECTURES

NICHOLAS MARK ENDACOTT

A Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment
Of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
at the Faculty of Human Sciences,
University of Stirling

March 2005

05/07

USE OF THESIS

This thesis is the property of The University of Stirling. The author's literary rights must be respected. Any passage of findings from this thesis can be quoted or paraphrased only with the acknowledgement of the source. If a user intends to publish a paper or written work containing paragraphs or paraphrases from the thesis, action which could constitute an infringement of the copyright act, he or she must ask the author's written permission first.

ABSTRACT

Using a corpus of twenty-four lectures drawn from The BASE corpus¹, this study is an analysis and inter-disciplinary comparison of the management of Intertextuality in the genre of the undergraduate lecture. Theorising Intertextuality as central within the discursive (re-)construction of disciplinary knowledge, the investigation of Intertextuality is viewed as the investigation of the discursively-mediated interaction(s) of a current lecturer with original knowledge-constituting discourses, and with their agents too, of an academic community.

As there is no holistic and comprehensive methodology for assessing the management of Intertextuality in academic discourse both qualitatively and quantitatively, this study uses two further lectures to devise such a methodology. This involves segregating lecture discourse into consistent independent units and then coding each unit according both to its function in the discourse and the participant voice(s) behind it. Applying this comprehensive scheme shows that independent units in lecture discourse are classifiable under three broad functional areas, Intertextuality (units realising propositional input), Intratextuality (units realising the mechanics of text and discursive interaction), and Metatextuality (units realising unit-length evaluation of emerging discourse). These functional areas and the functions within them are manageable via different participant voice(s), the manifestations and pragmatic effects of which in discourse vary, meaning the

¹ The BASE (British Academic Spoken English) corpus is a corpus of authentic academic speech events currently being developed at the universities of Warwick and Reading in The UK with funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Board.

management of Intertextuality can be assessed qualitatively and quantitatively using the coherent, consistent and data-driven coding scheme derived from these analyses. This methodology, applied qualitatively and quantitatively to the corpus, reveals management similarities broadly between Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences lectures, typically a dialogic management, and management differences broadly between these two groupings and Physical Sciences lectures, typically a monophonic management. These management choices are understood as both constituted by and as reconstitutive of the social and epistemological landscapes behind lectures, meaning the management of Intertextuality is viewed as the dominant influence in shaping disciplinary discourse.

DECLARATION

I certify, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that this thesis does not: incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any institution of higher education; contain any material previously published and written by another author, except where due reference is made in the text; contain any defamatory material.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of conceiving, writing, rewriting and finalising a thesis is certainly a rich and rewarding one at times, and a disconcertingly unnerving one at others, and this is doubtless connected to the fact the deeper one becomes embroiled in a research area, the greater is the sometimes frightening realisation of how much more there is to find and how insufficient the current effort to change that amounts to. This thesis started its germination some time ago as I listened to a history documentary on BBC Radio 4, and noticed quite literally “different other voices” being used to read quotations from historical figures of the time under discussion and from authorities in the area under discussion. Little did I know it at the time, but this initial curiosity was set to become my working life for some years afterwards, as I started wondering how this process might take place in situation with only the one single speaker to achieve these “other voices”. At this point, under the initial guidance of Dr Hilary Nesi at The University of Warwick, I was fortunate to become involved in work on The BASE corpus, the primary content of which, authentic academic lectures, became the perfect material for launching an investigation into this very process. As such, I am very grateful to Dr Hilary Nesi for the initial opportunity to tackle this fascinating area, and very grateful too for the use of the BASE corpus in doing so.

The real work began however thanks to a three-year research scholarship funded by The Faculty of Human Sciences at The University of Stirling, and I am therefore very grateful to the members of the Faculty for their financial generosity that made this work possible, and thankful too for the general resources also necessary to

allow such work. Without this, I would certainly not have been able to set off on this path.

Research reports are nevertheless never written in isolation, and this thesis is no exception. I am therefore particularly grateful to my supervisor, Dr Daniel Robertson, for his encouragement, warm wit and invaluable assistance on the path to this thesis, and to Dr Richard Badger too, my first supervisor, for his help and input in the initial two years. At all times it was immensely reassuring knowing such expert and calm heads were with me in my efforts.

I would also like to mention the teachers in my life who first aroused my interest in education, and particularly Peter Jones, my French teacher from long ago at school, whose voracious vivaciousness at the chalkface first inspired a fascination in me for teaching language. And to Keith Richardson too, my English teacher at the same time, whose pugnacious humour and eloquent cynicism made school a far better place.

Words of appreciation and full thanks must also go to Andrea, Dimitra, Batool, David, Martin, Androulla and Pelham who kindly gave considerable stocks of their time and energy to help me ascertain that the coding typology used in this study was more than the product of my imagination. Finally, I would like to express my deep appreciation to my family and friends, whose support and patience has been greatly valued during the past four years as I worked towards the completion of this thesis. Thank you. And a special thanks to Lisa for being with me and an incomparably calming influence when I finally submitted!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

USE OF THESIS	i
ABSTRACT	ii
DECLARATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xv
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION: RESEARCH INTO LECTURES.....	1
1.1 Lectures and a Social View of Knowledge	1
1.1.1 Introduction	1
1.1.2 Conclusion	12
1.2 Lectures in Higher Education.....	13
1.2.1 Lecture Purposes	13
1.2.2 Lectures and Places in Curricula.....	15
1.2.3 Educational Theory and Lectures	16
1.2.4 Impact of ICT on Lectures.....	19
1.2.5 Conclusions.....	21
1.3 What are Lectures	22
1.3.1 Theories of Discourse.....	23
1.3.2 Lectures as Discourse.....	26
1.3.3 Lectures as Discourses	33
1.3.4.1 Theories of Genre.....	35
1.3.4.2 Variations in Genres.....	41

1.3.5	Conclusions.....	44
1.4	Lectures and Notions of Discipline	45
1.4.1	What is a Discipline	46
1.4.2	Disciplinary Differences.....	53
1.4.3	Conclusions.....	55
1.5	Research on Lectures from within Applied Linguistics	56
1.5.2	The Lecture Comprehension Process.....	57
1.5.3	Discourse Analysis of Lectures	59
1.5.4	Sociolinguistic and Sociocultural Aspects of Lectures	60
1.5.5	Conclusions.....	62
1.6	Conclusions	62
 CHAPTER 2: DIALOGISM AND INTERTEXTUALITY		69
2.1	Introduction	69
2.2	Dialogism and Intertextuality	74
2.2.1	Bakhtin	74
2.2.2	Bakhtin and Genre.....	86
2.2.3	Conclusion on Bakhtin and Dialogism.....	96
2.3	Intertextuality and Applied Linguistics	96
2.3.1	Fairclough.....	97
2.3.2	Fairclough and Constitutive Intertextuality	98
2.3.3	Fairclough and Manifest Intertextuality	107
2.3.3.1	Why Report?	109
2.3.3.2	Forms of Discourse Representation	115
2.3.3.3	Direct – Indirect Forms of Discourse Representation	116

2.3.3.4	Syntactic Forms of Discourse Representation in Academic Genres	120
2.3.3.5	Lexical Choices of Reporting Verb in Forms of Discourse Representation in Academic Genres	127
2.3.3.6	Tense Choices for Reporting Verbs in Forms of Discourse Representation	132
2.3.3.7	Conclusions on Manifest Intertextuality.....	137
2.4	Conclusions	138
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY		151
3.1	Introduction	151
3.2	Segregating the Data into Independent Units.....	152
3.2.1	Units of Direct Speech	153
3.2.2	Parenthetical Structures.....	155
3.2.3	Peripheral Elements, Non-clausal Units, Inserts.....	156
3.2.4	Conclusion.....	157
3.3	Participants in Lecture Discourse.....	159
3.3.1	Participants and Interactions in Lecture Discourse.....	159
3.3.2	Clear Participants in Lecture Discourse	164
3.3.3	Unclear Participants in Lecture Discourse	165
3.4	Participants as Textual Phenomena	170
3.5	Footing and Intertexts	172
3.5.1	Introduction to Footing.....	172
3.5.2	Footing and Intertexts.....	176
3.6	Descriptions of each Intertext.....	177

3.6.1	Lecturer Intertext.....	177
3.6.1.1	Summary of Lecturer Intertext.....	181
3.6.2	Disciplinary Intertext.....	182
3.6.2.1	Summary of Disciplinary Intertext.....	186
3.6.3	Audience Intertext.....	187
3.6.3.1	Summary of Audience Intertext.....	191
3.6.4	Conclusion.....	191
3.7	Functions of the Three Intertexts.....	195
3.8	Lecturer Intertext Functions.....	195
3.8.1	Commentary: Self.....	196
3.8.1.1	Commentary on actions/discursive performance.....	197
3.8.1.2	Commentary on mental actions/performance.....	197
3.8.2	Commentary: Discourse.....	197
3.8.2.1	Inter-lecture reference.....	198
3.8.2.2	Intra-lecture reference.....	198
3.8.2.3	Reformulations.....	198
3.8.2.4	Lexical reference.....	199
3.8.3	Macro Discourse structuring.....	199
3.8.3.1	Interrogative forms.....	199
3.8.3.2	Averred forms.....	199
3.8.3.3	Micro Discourse Structuring.....	200
3.8.4	Commentary – Message.....	201
3.8.4.1	Commentary: Message – Relational – Status.....	203
3.8.4.2	Commentary: Message – Relational – Origins.....	204

3.8.4.3	Commentary: Message – Epistemic – Degree of Difficulty.....	205
3.8.4.4	Commentary: Message – Epistemic – Truth Value (Reliability).....	205
3.8.4.5	Commentary: Message – Aesthetic.....	206
3.8.5	Propositional input	206
3.8.6	Typology of Lecturer Intertext Functions	207
3.9	Disciplinary Intertext Functions.....	210
3.9.1	Commentary: discourse.....	210
3.9.1.1	Inter-lecture reference	210
3.9.1.2	Intra-lecture reference	211
3.9.1.3	Scaffolding.....	211
3.9.2	Macro Discourse structuring.....	212
3.9.2.1	Interrogative forms.....	213
3.9.2.2	Averred forms	213
3.9.3	Propositional Input.....	213
3.9.3.1	Unmarked Units	213
3.9.3.2	Reporting Verb Units	215
3.9.3.3	Reporting Noun Unit.....	216
3.9.4	Typology of Disciplinary Intertext Functions	219
3.10	Functions of Audience Intertext	220
3.10.1	Hypothesised Propositional Input.....	220
3.10.2	Macro-discourse Structuring	222
3.10.3	Typology of Audience Intertext Functions.....	223
3.11	Other Units	224

3.12	Conclusion	225
3.13	A Comprehensive Typology To Illustrate Management of Intertextuality in Lecture Discourse	225
3.14	Genette and Transtextuality	226
3.15	The Typology for Use in This Study	227
	3.15.1 Intratextuality	227
	3.15.2 Metatextuality	228
	3.15.3 Intertextuality	228
	3.15.3.1 Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked Units	229
	3.15.3.2 Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Noun Units.....	231
	3.15.3.3 Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb Units	233
3.16	Conclusion	246
3.17	Summary	247
 CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSES.....		250
4.1	Introduction	250
4.2	The Data	250
4.3	The management of Intertextuality.....	256
	4.3.1 The management of Intertextuality in the Four Disciplinary Groupings	256
	4.3.2 The management of Intertextuality in Physical Sciences.....	260
	4.3.2.1 Conclusion on The management of Intertextuality in Physical Sciences	270
	4.3.3 The management of Intertextuality in Arts & Humanities.....	270

4.3.3.1	Conclusion on The management of Intertextuality in Arts & Humanities.....	294
4.3.4	The management of Intertextuality in Social Sciences & Social Studies	295
4.3.4.1	Conclusion on The management of Intertextuality in Social Sciences.....	313
4.3.5	The management of Intertextuality in Biomedical Sciences	314
4.3.5.1	Conclusion on The management of Intertextuality in Biomedical Sciences.....	334
4.3.6	Conclusion on The management of Intertextuality in Undergraduate Lectures	335
4.4	The Management of Intratextuality	349
4.5	The Management of Audience Intertextuality.....	350
4.6	The Management of Metatextuality.....	350
4.7	Summary	351

CHAPTER 5: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....		352
5.1	Overview	352
5.2	The Main Characteristics of the Study	352
5.3	Intertextuality	365
5.4	The Limitations of the Study.....	371
5.4.1	Academic Discipline as Unit of Analysis.....	371
5.4.2	Methodology.....	374
5.5	Recommendations for Further Research.....	378

BIBLIOGRAPHY380

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1	Table for Segregation of Data into Independent Units	480
Appendix 2	Table for Intertext Recognition & Classification.....	484
Appendix 3	Typology and Coding Scheme for Data Analysis.....	487
Appendix 4	The Corpus.....	491
Appendix 5.1	Summary of Study for Coding Reliability Test	493
Appendix 5.2	Coding Guidelines Table for Coding Reliability test.....	504
Appendix 5.3	Coding Heuristic for Coding Reliability Test.....	514
Appendix 5.4	Example Lecture Coding for Coding Reliability Test	516

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Becher's system of distinguishing between disciplines & examples	67
Table 2.1	Classification of Denotative Meanings of Reporting Verbs. Based on Thompson & Yiyun (1991)	145
Table 3.1	Clear Participants in Lecture Discourse	182
Table 3.2	Obscured Participants in Lecture Discourse.....	183
Table 3.3	Typology of Lecturer Intertext Functions	214
Table 3.4	Typology of Disciplinary Intertext Functions	237
Table 3.5	Typology of Audience Intertext Functions.....	240
Table 3.6	Uttering Sources in Reporting Verb Units	253
Table 3.7	Presentation of Report in Reporting Verb units.....	258
Table 3.8	Typology and Coding Scheme For Use on The Two Lectures The Labour Movement and Radiation Chemistry	263
Table 4.1	Broad Breakdown of Data	269
Table 4.2	The Data and Results for the Coding Typology Reliability Test.....	272
Table 4.3	The Management of Intertextuality across the Four Disciplinary Groupings	274
Table 4.4	The Management of Intertextuality in Physical Sciences Grouping.....	277
Table 4.5	The Management of Intertextuality in Arts & Humanities Grouping.....	288

Table 4.6	The Management of Intertextuality in Social Sciences & Social Studies Grouping.....	312
Table 4.7	The Management of Intertextuality in Biomedical Sciences Grouping.....	331
Table 4.8	Clusters of Lectures Identifiable via Analyses of the Management of Intertextuality.....	363

Chapter 1

Introduction: Lectures

In this chapter, I will examine the literature on lectures, and assess lectures in terms of five broad areas. Firstly, I will put forward a social view of knowledge, within which lectures will be situated for the purposes of this investigation. Secondly, I will examine lectures within, broadly, educational theory, looking at the purposes of lectures, including how they are conceptualised and evaluated by students, their places in curricula, and the impacts of contemporary technology on lectures. Thirdly, I will examine lectures within notions of discourse, discourses, and genre, and put forward an understanding of lectures located within the notion of genre. The fourth section meanwhile sees a review of theories of academic disciplines and links between these notions and lectures, before finally, in section five, I will review research into lectures from the broad field of applied linguistics, using this to locate this current study within this field.

1.1 Lectures and a Social View of Knowledge

Although an awareness of the social factors influencing knowledge production was first evidenced several centuries ago in Bacon's discussion of the most appropriate ways to textualise scientific research (Bazerman 1988), it was not until the earlier part of the twentieth century² that the formal study of knowledge production, in the shape initially of the Sociology of Science³ and then the (somewhat more radical) Sociology of Scientific Knowledge (SSK), emerged onto the disciplinary landscape as an academic area within its own right. Such studies, though initially rather

² See especially Merton (1970 & 1973).

³ See Bazerman (1983) for a thorough review of the Sociology of Science.

positivist in orientation, came to challenge not only the historic belief in the objectivity of knowledge and particularly of scientific thinking (Barnes 1977, Bloor 1976, Latour & Woolgar 1979) but also the corresponding belief in the transparency and neutrality of discourse as a medium (Foucault 1972, Derrida 1987), and questioned notions of scientific objectivity and of a value-free, non-rhetorical language which will lead to objective facts. As such, scientific discoursing, and for that matter any discoursing, as discursive practices (Halliday 1978, Halliday & Martin 1993, Martin & Veel 1998) are often no longer considered as neutral and objective but instead as shaped by a host of external factors. These include social factors (Bruffee 1986, Bloor 1976, Barnes 1974 & 1977); cultural practices (Kuhn 1962 & 1970, Lakatos 1978); disciplinary conventions (Bazerman 1988)⁴; material conditions (Latour & Woolgar 1979); and ideological commitments (Bloor 1976). An extreme post-structuralist approach even suggests that discourse in fact constructs that of which it speaks (Foucault 1972, Garfinkel 1967).

Although viewing science, or indeed any academic area, within the notion (broadly) of social constructionism (Bruffee 1986) is vulnerable to criticism for ignoring the apparently very powerful and productive nature of the scientific method⁵, it is hard nowadays to defend science or indeed any kind of 'knowledge' as a strictly neutral and objective enterprise, and necessary instead to consider it as consisting of culturally-embedded socially-derived knowledge-*constructing* rhetorical enterprises (Latour & Woolgar 1979, Knorr-Cetina 1981 & 1996), meaning questions

⁴ See for example Candlin & Hyland (1999: 15), who, discussing science as a discursive practice, describe textual conventions of scientific writers as "deeply embedded in writers' and readers' cultural and rhetorical assumptions about what constitutes appropriate topic, argument and format, and these assumptions may carry and maintain the power of institutional authority" (Candlin & Hyland 1999: 15).

⁵ See for example Gross & Levitt (1994), Slezak (1989 & 1991), and also, interestingly, Kuhn (1983).

concerning what 'knowledge' actually 'is' cannot be avoided. Within the bounds of this current investigation, such a view is for *methodological* considerations primarily⁶, as it enables the researcher to view all disciplinary discourse from the same perspective, specifically that discourse is a constitutive, as opposed to simply a reflective phenomenon, and that disciplinary characterisations, such as 'objectivity' in 'science', are textual effects constructed by disciplinary discoursing conventions, as opposed to phenomena pre-existing language (Potter 1996, Latour & Woolgar 1979, Woolgar 1988).

It is important too to recognise that a social theory of knowledge does not apply solely to science in the narrowest sense, but also to any other areas of human knowledge-making, many of which have in fact adopted the mantle of 'science', presumably due to its connotations of rigour, objectivity and so on (Bazerman 1987: 125). In this broader sense of science, social sciences particularly are often viewed as attempting to follow in science's footsteps (Bazerman *ibid*, Woolgar 1988).

Probably the most radical theorising within SSK of the social factors underlying knowledge production derive from Barnes (see especially Barnes 1974) and Bloor (see especially Bloor 1976), both at the forefront of a movement which became known as social constructionism⁷. Barnes (*ibid*) calls for a complete sociological account of the production of scientific knowledge, arguing that such an account should be above issues of whether the knowledge in question is 'true' or not, so that the social factors underlying the processes of knowledge production can be laid

⁶ Whether it be a 'true' *theoretical* perspective too is a much harder question which, is beyond the scope of this investigation.

⁷ See also Bruffee (1986) and Shapin (1982).

open to investigation⁸. For Barnes (ibid), knowledge produced within science should be understood as having no more certain or preordained a grasp on truth than any other form of knowledge, because all knowledge is culturally produced and culturally situated, whatever its source and however privileged that source may be. As such, Barnes (ibid) wanted to expose for investigation the conventions that result in beliefs as part of a cultural tradition being (socially) formalised as *knowledge* (as opposed to remaining merely as *beliefs*), thus implicitly questioning the roles played by various social mechanisms such as power and institutional structures in achieving such changes (e.g. Foucault 1972).

Bloor (see especially Bloor 1976) is almost as relativistic, and his well-known “Strong Programme” follows Barnes in arguing that models of understanding ‘belief’ in knowledge should be based on indifference to claims of truth, and instead that the social basis for all knowledge, and not just for ‘irrational’ beliefs, should be made clear⁹. Even a necessarily very brief look at this area indicates therefore that it would be naïve to view any kind of knowledge process as neutral or objective, but instead as social and contingent, leading to the use in this investigation of such terms as *construct*, *construction*, and *knowledge-construction* equally across all disciplinary discourse whatever its perceived truth status may be.

⁸ See also Collins (1975: 205): “it is as though epistemologists were concerned with the characteristics of ships (knowledge) in bottles (validity) while living in a world where all ships are already in bottles with the glue dried and the strings cut. A ship within a bottle is a natural object in this world, and because there is no way to reverse the process, it is not easy to accept that the ship was ever just a bundle of sticks” (Collins 1975: 205).

⁹ See also Rorty (1987: 42ff), who argues for the removal of the dichotomy between science and humanities, and their concomitant stereotypical dichotomies of objective / subjective, fact / opinion, and truth as correspondence to reality / truth as a term for well-justified belief. Instead, Rorty suggests the need for an epistemology which views objectivity as consensual solidarity, or as what he terms “inter-subjectivity” – in other words viewing objectivity and perceived truth as the outcome of social, and thus discursive, interaction. For Rorty, granting scientific belief the status of objective fact is wrong, and thus we should “give up the idea of Truth (sic) as something to which we were responsible. Instead, we should think of “true” as a word which applies to those beliefs upon which we are able to agree, as roughly synonymous with “justified”” (Rorty 1987: 45).

Research has also focussed on the roles of existing bodies of belief in knowledge construction. Ziman (1984) for instance emphasises the socially and discursively implicated nature of knowledge production, arguing that new scientific statements are based on, and thus partly derived from, current consensus and aim to be accepted into that consensus¹⁰. For Ziman (ibid), this is why citation plays such a significant role in knowledge-construction¹¹, building as it does for the skilled writer a discursive link between prior consensus and new knowledge statements, and better assuring the success (as judged in terms of their degree of acceptance) of the latter. Knowledge claims put forward in this manner are thus socially and discursively structured as much as epistemologically, with the aim that such a process will lead to acceptance of the claim into the current consensus. Thus, in seeking social acceptance, knowledge statements for Ziman (ibid) look backwards as much as they look forwards, and in doing so are again inherently social in their constitution and deployment. Latour (1983: 166) suggests a metaphor of rail transport as a neat manner of picturing the relationship between scientific knowledge and its context:

“Scientific facts are like trains, they do not circulate outside their rails. You can extend the rails and connect them but you cannot drive an engine through a field.” (Latour 1983: 166)

¹⁰ See also Duhem (1962) and Quine (1961), who examined the ways in which established bodies of theory can prejudice experimentation, leading to the concept of “Hesse nets”, named after the philosopher Mary Hesse (Hesse 1974 & 1980).

¹¹ See also Latour (1987) on using friendly citations as what he terms “allies”. For Latour (ibid: 60ff), the more complex knowledge-claims become, the more social they in fact also become, because of the larger number of ‘allies’ recruited to the cause of isolating the “dissenting reader” – “the more technical and specialised a literature is, the more ‘social’ it becomes, since the number of associations necessary to drive readers out and force them into accepting a claim as a fact increase ... this literature is so hard to read and analyse not because it escapes from all normal social links, but because it is more social than so-called normal social ties” (Latour 1987: 63).

This conceptualisation of the role played by previous bodies of knowledge in determining what is to be taken as ‘new’ fact and how that fact is embedded in a wider system was theorised to its highest degree by Kuhn (1962), who examined the ways in which “paradigms”¹² might prejudice scientific work via implicit sets of theoretical assumptions¹³. Kuhn (ibid) draws a comparison between what he terms conditions of “normal science” and conditions of “revolutionary science” – under conditions of the former, scientists carry out work which is heavily influenced by contemporary assumptions and beliefs about what constitutes science and how science should be ‘done’. The metaphor for describing the multiplicity of these shared assumptions is the term paradigm, a term which for Kuhn encompasses both those explicit understandings and, vitally too, those implicit understandings holding sway in a community and which pattern the shape and content of ‘new’ knowledge. A paradigm, or matrix as Kuhn later termed it (Kuhn 1977 & 1983), will determine, under conditions of normal science, the work scientists do, and how it is done¹⁴. When the assumptions underlying a paradigm start to dissolve however, and a

¹² See also Lakatos (1970 & 1978) and Lakatos & Musgrave (1970b) on “research programmes”. For Lakatos (1978), the so-called ‘hard core’ of a research programme is formed by a negative heuristic which identifies what research not to follow, this creating coherence and coordination for a community and delimiting the field of research, while the path through problems and anomalies within the delimited field of research is enabled by a positive heuristic, which in turn, while remaining within the delimited field identified by the negative heuristic, can evolve and thrive – or instead inconsistencies can mount up and result in what Lakatos refers to as problem shift. This shift and evolution is imperative for the survival of a research programme, and a research programme will continue for as long as it develops new problems and research questions for investigation, and for as long as anomalies do not add up to and result in scientists shifting to new research programmes. Thus for Lakatos, knowledge statements are embedded, conceptually and linguistically, within current consensus, and in turn knowledge must again be viewed to a significant extent as a social and cultural product.

¹³ See also Fleck 1979 (1935) on “thought collectives”.

¹⁴ See also Bazerman (1988: 161): “scientific writing ... in periods of normal science must be seen as the manifestation of the many particular habits of the time, such as typical modes of perception and problem definition, common formulations, earlier models of problem solutions, and styles of speculation ... moreover, because the shared features of a disciplinary matrix often lie below conscious articulation, writing within each discipline can only be fully understood by those who share the matrix” (Bazerman 1988: 161).

paradigm starts to break down due to irreconcilabilities, a period of so-called “revolutionary science” (ibid) will hold sway, until fresh paradigms are constructed. Thus for Kuhn, knowledge production is an inherently social and cultural affair at heart, determined by community consensus and existing theory¹⁵.

Bodies of knowledge also play a role in giving meaning(s) to discourse, specifically in the sense that it is within a canon (or paradigm for Kuhn (ibid)) that ‘knowledge’ takes form, suggesting strong relationships between knowledge and discourse¹⁶. In this sense, knowledge-construction as a discursive act is viewable as a form of knowledge deriving from genre-based “situated cognition” (Berkenhotter & Huckin 1995), meaning the knowledge produced is indexical (Garfinkel 1967), the product of the same activity and situations in which it is produced (Brown, Collins & Duguid 1989: 33 in Berkenhotter & Huckin 1995: 11). Existing bodies of knowledge thus exert broad and significant socio-cultural influences on knowledge-construction, illustrate the links between discourse and knowledge and thus intertextual relationships too, and as such constitute another reason why knowledge is most satisfactorily viewed as a social and cultural product, even if it does correlate with ‘reality’.

¹⁵ Curiously, although Kuhn himself has been centrally involved in bringing about deep questioning of science, he himself concedes that despite attacks on it, it does in fact function very well as an institutionalised practice (as is also the case too with Rorty). Although Kuhn (1983) says he shares “Hume’s itch”, the urge for “an explanation of the viability of the whole language game that involves ‘induction’ and underpins the form of life we live”, nevertheless he concedes that despite his own work, “merely psychological or sociological reasons” will not explain why science works (Kuhn 1983: 570).

¹⁶ See also Woolgar (1988: 48): “forms of logic, rationality and reason are then formal statements which reflect our acceptance of institutionalised practices and procedures. They are the vocabulary through and within which we reassert the primacy of consensual practice and institution” (Woolgar 1988: 48)

Subjectivity and objectivity in academic discourse are also understood in this study as outcomes of symbolic discursive acts rather than as pre-existing out-there entities preceding discourse (Potter 1996). Objectivity for instance, previously viewed as one of the pre-existing norms of science pre-existing scientific discoursing (e.g. Merton 1973), is viewed instead as an effect or function of discourse. An important area of investigation contributing to this view of the constitutive power of language derives from ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1967). Ethnomethodology theorised two important concepts in studies of language and its constitutive power, indexicality and reflexivity, both of which directly challenge the notion that discourse somehow simply represents reality and instead indicate that discourse-as-knowledge is best viewed as the consequence of shared social and discursive procedures for generating meaning in specific social contexts¹⁷. Gilbert & Mulkay (1984) also show how the objective nature of the ‘out-there-ness’ of science is constructed via language (i.e. as a “truth effect” Foucault 1972) through what they term “empiricist discourse”, a repertoire of constitutive tropes, grammatical forms and argumentative style used by discoursing scientists to formulate appropriate rhetorical perspectives in the construction of ‘appropriate science’. For example, scientific papers typically draw on grammatical forms which minimise the involvement of their authors¹⁸, present data as primary¹⁹ sources of proof, and constitute laboratory work as constrained by standardised rules and practices²⁰. Such effects though are the function of the empiricist repertoire²¹ as much as they are ‘reality’.

¹⁷ See also Wittgenstein (1953) and his concept of “language games”.

¹⁸ See also Halliday (1988, 1993 & 1994), and Lemke (1990 & 1995).

¹⁹ Cf. the notion that ideas determine data (Kuhn 1962 & 1970, Lakatos 1978).

²⁰ Cf. Knorr-Cetina (1981 & 1983) who argues there is a much more contingent situation in laboratory activity.

²¹ Gilbert & Mulkay (ibid) also recognise what they term a “contingent repertoire”, which acknowledges the social factors behind science, but which for Gilbert & Mulkay (ibid) scientists use, in shifting strategically between the two repertoires, as a means of social persuasion²¹. This is

From a similar perspective, Woolgar (1988: 72ff) highlights two phenomena that constitute 'out-there-ness' in science discourse, *preliminary instructions* (the announcement of the title and author of a scientific text creates the situation that the text is about something 'out-there') and *externalising devices* (broad grammatical styles, such as quasi passive voice, invocation of community membership, and the de-emphasising of the author's role, used to suggest discovery as a path of coincidences and as being outside human agency), and two phenomena that constitute linear rationality in science, *pathing devices* and *sequencing devices*. Such narrative devices produce the effect of logic in scientific texts, making it difficult to imagine alternate descriptions, again suggesting scientific knowledge-construction as a social, interactive process mediated within discourse, aimed at creating social effects in readers, specifically acceptance of the knowledge-claim²². Factivity itself is also another product of discourse (ibid: 71), constructed as a truth effect (Foucault 1972) through such discursive²³ choices as avoidance of agency, avoidance of reference to an agent's discursive action, and avoidance of reference to any antecedent circumstances bearing upon the agent's action (such as motives, interests and so on, what Potter (1996: 124) refers to as stake and/or interest invocation and/or inoculation).

recognised too by Collins (1983), who argues that such discourse is used to achieve closure in science, and also by Latour & Woolgar (1979).

²² See Myers (1990: 28) though who argues that while Woolgar gives good examples for each phenomenon, his devices are "a linguistic grab bag, hard to define in terms of signals in the text" (Myers 1990: 28). Nevertheless, what Woolgar (1988) succeeds in doing very well is challenging the 'natural' objectivity of scientific knowledge as it is presented, and helping view it instead as a discursive enterprise aiming at social acceptance of 'knowledge-claims'.

²³ Viewing language as a social resource for constructing social reality, and in particular as a social resource in constructing social roles and positions, is also of fundamental importance too in Critical Discourse Analysis. See Kress and Hodge (1979), Fowler et al (1979), Wodak (1989), and Fairclough (1992 & 1995). In CDA, syntax especially is viewed in terms of a resource for social action, helping remove the veil from language and demystifying its effects.

One of the most radically idealist notion of the links between discourse and knowledge however derives from Latour & Woolgar (1979/1986), who see the entire range of activities within a scientific laboratory as being reducible to a process of what they term a “process of inscription”²⁴, taking place in laboratories which in turn are “systems of literary inscription” (Latour & Woolgar: 1979: 52)²⁵. For Latour & Woolgar (ibid), the aim of the laboratory and its activities is for scientists to modify their inscriptions such that they are transformed from type 1 statements (heavily modalised, contingent and frequently subjective statements) into what they (ibid) term type 5 statements – these are the least modalised and thus the most objective statements possible, statements which have “ontological reference” (ibid) and can become decontextualised from the real specific physical and social situations of their production to become universal and non-time/place-specific ‘facts’ (ibid). Finally, for the original claim to reach full status as a ‘fact’, the statement must spread²⁶. Latour (1987) sees this last step as vital:

“The fate of the statement, that is the decision about whether or is a fact or a fiction, depends on a sequence of debates later on ... this essential point: the status of a statement depends on later statements. It is made more of a certainty or less of a certainty depending on the next sentence that takes it up” (Latour 1987: 27)

²⁴ “The function of literary inscription is the successful persuasion of readers, but the readers are only fully convinced when all sources of persuasion seem to have disappeared” (Latour & Woolgar: 1979: 76).

²⁵ See also Ziman (1984:66), who identifies very similar social processes at work in what he terms the “process of scientific accreditation”, a process which refers to the way in which a new knowledge claim moves over time from the initial status of ‘conjecture’ to the later status of ‘discourse community-approved fact’ – this process results in fundamental differences in the language used to ‘wrap’ or represent so-called facts as they change their truth status, one of which is the disappearance of the initial language of negotiation and claiming aimed at the initial negotiation of the acceptance of the fact.

²⁶ Bachelard (1934 in Tiles & Pippin eds. 1984) describes this process in terms of “projecting” science.

Latour & Woolgar (1979 & 1986), Latour (1987) & Woolgar (1988) therefore posit a very idealist conception of discourse and knowledge, seeing knowledge-construction as the outcome of the successful entextualisation of mediated social processes rather than as the successful ‘discovery’ of something. Indeed Latour & Woolgar (ibid) even see laboratory equipment as being reified forms of previous literature, suggesting that even the equipment used by science is at heart a material result of social negotiation and ratification processes²⁷.

Despite the richness and attractiveness of such theories as metaphors for explaining much scientific activity, Latour & Woolgar (ibid) steer a path very close to the relativism which sometimes engenders hostility from science communities²⁸. Viewing knowledge-construction in this idealist manner has also been attacked from outside science, for example by Button & Sharrock (1993 in Potter 1996), who argue that what such approaches do is simply reverse the direction of causality – from the direction of representations as a product of objects (as in empiricism), to that of objects as produced by representations. Button & Sharrock (ibid) also attack such accounts for, as they see it, failing to appreciate that objectivity is not, as constructionists would have it, the consequence of agreement achieved via discourse, but is instead the consequence of the rigorous application of standardised methods and formal criteria²⁹ for truth-testing.

²⁷ See also Bachelard (Tiles & Pippin eds. 1984) for a view of scientific equipment as reified theory, and likewise Knorr-Cetina (1981) for a view of scientific equipment as cultural capital in Bourdieu’s (1991) sense.

²⁸ See for example Gross & Levitt (1994).

²⁹ Rather ironically, this idea of a set of standardised methods is one of Woolgar’s (1988) “truth effects” of scientific discourse.

Nevertheless, despite their failure firstly to tackle the issue of the actual status of 'facts', 'reality' and the socially-derived constructions of the 'fact' and the 'reality', Latour & Woolgar's (ibid) accounts are rich for the way in which the fundamentally socio-cultural nature of knowledge production, and the fusion between discourse and 'fact', is opened up to inspection. In this way, knowledge can be conceptualised, almost regardless of whether it be 'true' or not, as the outcomes of social processes, outcomes which are mediated through and reproduced within discourse, itself a thoroughly social and constitutive phenomenon too. Such a view, informs this investigation from a methodological perspective, enabling as it does equality of perspective in this investigation's focus on the mediated interactions implicit within knowledge-construction.

1.1.2 Conclusion

In this section, I have briefly outlined a social approach to knowledge, to discourse, and to their inseparability in knowledge-construction, suggesting knowledge as a phenomenon heavily affected by a variety of socio-cultural factors, as a phenomenon constructed via social interactions mediated through discourse, itself a thoroughly social and constitutive phenomenon too, and as a phenomenon constructed specifically within discursively-mediated dialogic interactions between a writer, his audience, and the intertextual canons of a community. In this sense, I have also suggested an initial view of discourse as a social, dialogic (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986), constitutive phenomenon aimed strategically at audience persuasion, and such that both truth and disciplinary characteristics are considered as textual effects as opposed to pre-existing the discourses which conjure them up. From this perspective of knowledge as a negotiated inter-subjective symbolic social

product formulated by interaction mediated within discourse and a history of discourse, the concept of genre (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986) is a pivotal element, as the means by and within which the symbolic interactions seen as appropriate within the community in which the knowledge is produced are implicitly formalised. This will therefore be the subject of more detailed discussion later in this chapter.

1.2 Lectures in Higher Education

In this section, I will briefly assess the purposes of lectures, their places in curricula, how lectures correspond with contemporary educational theory, and the impacts of contemporary technology on lectures. This section will also include reports of how lectures are evaluated by students and lecturers.

1.2.1 Lecture Purposes

Research indicates that lectures play, or are expected to play, a number of broad roles in Higher Education, ranging beyond relatively simple and traditional ideas of the transmission of knowledge. Broadly speaking, these roles can be examined under broad social roles and more individually-oriented roles. Looking at the former of these firstly, social roles within societies are viewed as one very important area of broad lecture purposes, particularly regarding their contribution to economic and cultural development in emerging “knowledge societies” (UNESCO-CEPES 2003: 17, in Rott et al 2003). In this sense, Higher Education institutions are asked to base their long-term orientations on “societal aims and needs” (ibid: 29), assisting in the “sustainable development and improvement of society” (ibid: 29), developing “entrepreneurial skills and initiatives” as major concerns (ibid: 29), and providing opportunities for learning “throughout life” (ibid: 29).

Lectures however are also still expected to play perhaps more traditional and individual-oriented roles. Thus for instance, The Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) argue that lectures should assist in the development of students' intellectual and imaginative powers, their understanding and judgement, their problem-solving skills and their ability to communicate (Gibbs 1990: 1). Lectures in this sense are expected to contribute to the development in students of enquiring, analytical and creative approaches, while also developing independent judgement and critical self-awareness (ibid).

However, lecture purposes have also been investigated not only at a broad societal level, but also at a more local level too. Interesting ethnographic research by Sutherland & Badger (2004) for instance of lecturers' own ideas of the roles of their lectures indicates that in some subjects, particularly those which students were unlikely to have studied at school such as Economics, one of lecturers' main aims is to induct first year undergraduates into the ways of thinking and conceptual frameworks of the subject. The same research also shows that some lecturers in more Arts oriented areas such as Education, History and Religious Studies see their lectures as means by which students can be encouraged and trained to develop critical relationships to knowledge³⁰, while in similar subjects such as English and History, motivation is viewed as the main purpose of lectures. This shows a significant difference with more information-oriented subjects such as Accountancy, Business Studies and Biology, in which the transmission of information is viewed by lecturers as a primary aim (ibid).

³⁰ See also Ramsden (2000) and Flowerdew & Miller (1996) on lectures and the development of critical thinking skills.

Many of these findings above are echoed in other studies – for instance, Isaacs (1994) conducted a similar ethnographic study across a range of subjects at an Australian university, and after interviewing more than one hundred lecturers, Isaacs (ibid) sees seven main aims of lectures:

1. Making students think critically about a subject
2. Demonstrating the way professionals reason in a subject
3. Making students more enthusiastic about a subject
4. Giving students the most important factual information about a subject
5. Explaining the most difficult points of a subject
6. Demonstrating how to solve problems in a subject
7. Providing a framework for the students' private study

In terms of the purposes of lectures then, lectures are perceived both as playing broad societal roles in developing a workforce for the new “knowledge economies” and as playing more local roles in the development of the individual student and his/her relationship(s) with the “knowledge” of an academic discipline.

1.2.2 Lectures and Places in Curricula

Although there have been attacks on lectures as an inefficient or even unhelpful genre in Higher Education for some time now (e.g. Behr 1988, Bligh 1988), the undergraduate lecture nevertheless remains at the forefront of undergraduate higher education, both in The UK (Sutherland 2005) and at universities around the world (Johns 1981, Richards 1983, Flowerdew & Miller 1996), and lectures, the traditional teaching mode in higher education, are used extensively in disciplinary

curricula at most universities (Benson 1989 & 1994). Despite the criticisms of lectures noted earlier, this perception of lectures as central in curricula is commonly shared by both lecturers and students. Thus for instance Flowerdew & Miller (1996: 124), after ethnographic research focussing on lecturers and students, state that on being asked how important they felt the lecture medium was as compared with other forms of instruction such as tutorials, reading assignments, and laboratory practicals, lecturers and students alike were “almost unanimous” in regarding lectures as being “the most important medium”, with one lecturer for instance describing lectures as “the substance of the course” (ibid). Such research indicates therefore that although lectures as traditionally conceived may not fully correspond with more contemporary theories of education, to be reviewed briefly in the following section, nevertheless they are still central in curricula in Higher Education Institutions in The UK and indeed around the world.

1.2.3 Educational Theory and Lectures

In the traditional model of education, as encapsulated within lectures, the teacher or lecturer is the focus of learning, and as such stands before students in specific geographical positions (Goffman 1974) and transmits “knowledge”. Such an approach derives from the traditional view of knowledge as a phenomenon deriving only from experts and which can be transferred intact from one (expert) mind to another (inexpert) mind in such situations (Inglis et al 1999: 27). Milliken (1998) gives a good example of such situations and the problems they can potentially engender:

“A traditional marketing lecture used conventional approaches to deliver the course content. There were 130-150 students in each lecture drawn for several undergraduate programmes, which placed a strain on timetabling and room allocation. The lectures took place in a banked lecture theatre with fixed rows of benches, no natural light, temperamental heating and poor acoustics. Students had trouble in motivating themselves to attend for the extended session and appeared to be unable to maintain concentration for the full time. Interaction was very difficult and the students’ participation consisted largely of recording the lecture content”. (Milliken 1998: 8)

Such situations, reminiscent for many of Higher Education life, have however come under close scrutiny in more recent educational theory, particularly from the influence of constructivist theories of learning. Such theories of learning, deriving from cognitive and developmental psychology (e.g. Vygotsky 1978, Bruner 1990 & 1996), see knowledge not as a fixed immutable commodity to be transferred intact between people, but instead as a phenomenon derived through learners’ interaction with knowledge and its constituent language, which leads to learners not passively accepting knowledge but actively constructing their own understandings of knowledge. In such an understanding, knowledge is understood as being actively constructed through processes of reflection, facilitated by existing cognitive structures within learners (Bruner 1996).

Such an understanding of knowledge leads to the perceived need in contemporary Higher Education for a deeper approach to learning with a focus on reflection and interaction, both individually and together in group discussions (e.g. Entwistle

2003). As a result of this, it is sometimes argued that teaching methods and assessment should also be conducive to this end (e.g. Entwistle *ibid*, Johnston 1995), while the quality of learning and thus achievement is also viewed as depending on learners' abilities to develop autonomous approaches to learning, specifically suitable cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies (e.g. Niemi 2002).

Such ideas would therefore seem to challenge the efficacy and roles of lectures in contemporary Higher Education, and indeed initially may seem to point to the end of lectures as a means of education. However, research suggests that the opposite is probably in fact nearer the truth – thus for instance Hockings (2004) shows that while teaching approaches such as projects and group discussion do foster more active learning as opposed to the shallow learning of traditional lectures, nevertheless and importantly, there was “wide variation” between those who excelled in such a learning environment (mature students and high achievers) and those who did not, and in fact there were also some students who did not even enjoy such approaches (*ibid*).

Therefore, it would seem that suggestions of the demise of lectures in Higher Education are wide of the mark, and that instead what is more likely to happen is that lectures will change their identities to some degree, principally due to the advent and widespread availability of technology in Higher Education – and it is therefore to this area that we turn next.

1.2.4 Impact of ICT on lectures

Sutherland (2005) rightly questions whether in 2005, given the rate and availability of technological innovation such as e-learning, the possibilities of PowerPoint presentations of lectures online or video-presentations, and the increasing visual literacy of students from television, the traditional lecture should remain as the main means of education in universities. In a similar vein, Barker (1989) argues there are four important “change agents” (ibid) which he sees as changing the forms that lectures take in contemporary Higher Education – these are firstly, the availability of technology which facilitates the storage and sharing of information; secondly, the ease of access to interactive computer-based technologies which facilitate the retrieval of such information; thirdly, the ease with which electronic information can be assimilated for information presentation and display; and fourthly, the ease with which people can now communicate with each other using electronic means. The result of these four “change agents” (ibid) means that for Barker (ibid), many new, and possibly more effective, approaches to instruction can be devised. Thus for example a conventional lecture might be packaged as a PowerPoint presentation (e.g. Anderson 1997, Sutherland & Badger 2004), possibly complete with an accompanying audio narrative, and then perhaps distributed to learners using the internet (e.g. Benest 1997, Sutherland & Badger ibid) or maybe by means of compact-disc (e.g. Barker and Tan 1997), or a group or individual tutorial could also take place over the internet, perhaps via video-conferencing. Research by Barker (1998) suggests that students react favourably to the use of electronic systems in lectures, though with the curious caveat that hard copies of the materials be made available to them, with 61% of the target lecture group stating that they would prefer such approaches to the use for instance of overhead transparencies,

while a similar percentage reacted positively to electronic lectures too, saying they found them a more effective way of presenting course material in lectures – though again with the same caveat that paper-based copies of the materials as opposed to compact-disk copies be made available (77% of the students). Similarly favourable reactions are noted too by Milliken (1998), who reports high student satisfaction with computer-based lecture delivery with notes accessible on-line at all times.

An interesting and more interactive use of technology in lectures is suggested by Draper (2005), who advocates the use of key pad systems whereby students can actually respond to questions on their pads or vote on ideas as they come up on the main screen in a lecture theatre, an approach also suggested in Draper et al (2004) who propose a voting system in Logic lectures, while Huxham (2005) proposes the use of what he terms “interactive windows” in Evolution lectures, another innovation which was “highly rated” by students.

In conclusion however, although contemporary technology is likely to influence the traditional and questionable transactional format of lectures, and despite too the apparently favourable reactions to such technological innovations from both lecturers and students, thorough research is nevertheless required to ascertain just what benefits to learning processes such technology does actually bring to lectures, beyond issues of face validity and improved access to knowledge, and more importantly in the context of this particular study, thorough research is also required to ascertain what discursive changes such innovations bring to lectures as discursive events. However, it would seem likely that the quality of lectures can be improved through such technological innovations, and it is without doubt that such

innovations will continue to challenge the traditional transmissive style of traditional lecturing in universities, and continue to assist too in bringing about a more interactive approach to lectures, a feature consistently reacted to in favourable ways by students (e.g. Morell 2003, Maunder & Harrop 2003). As such, despite some of their shortcomings, despite too occasionally exaggerated claims that lectures for instance will soon be delivered on mobile-phone-sized computers in virtual universities (one lecturer in Sutherland & Badger 2004), and despite the undeniable fact too that lectures are often unpopular with students (Maloney and Lally (1998) for instance recorded a lecture absentee rate of 40% among third year students, while Sander et al (2000) found formal lectures were ranked amongst the least favoured teaching methods by their sample of psychology, medical and business studies students), lectures nevertheless are likely to remain at the forefront of Higher Education as they offer an economical means of teaching large groups of students, most of whom still remain campus-based, and even though their forms are likely to metamorphose in dialogue with technological innovations, lectures are likely to remain recognisable as 'lectures' for some time to come.

1.2.5 Conclusions

In this section, I have briefly discussed some of the purposes of lectures, their places in curricula, relationships between lectures and contemporary educational theory, how lectures are evaluated by students and lecturers, and the impacts of contemporary technology on lectures. Although lectures are sometimes criticised for being inefficient and for promoting passive learning practices in the light of contemporary theories of education and learning, and although their format is likely to change in dialogue with technological developments, nevertheless they remain at

the forefront of Higher Education, and are likely to do so for some time to come as a recognisable and distinct discursive form. Moreover, even if their format does change over time, as surely it will, it is nevertheless the case that lecturers, or howsoever they may come to be termed, will still need to reconstruct disciplinary knowledge, in the forms of disciplinary discourses and genres, to novice learners in one way or another and by what will still remain as discursive means, howsoever these means may evolve – meaning the exploration of how this is achieved in different disciplines will remain an essential task in Applied Linguistics research. And as the methodology to be devised and used in this current study for investigating this discursive achievement is applicable to any disciplinary genre, spoken or written, any change in lecture format is certainly not viewed as problematic but as a natural evolution of the genre, as happens in all genres (Bazerman 1988, Salager-Mayer 1999).

1.3 What Are Lectures?

In this section, I will briefly formulate the conceptualisation of undergraduate academic lectures as understood within this investigation, focussing on ideas of discourse, discourses, and genre. To do this, I will begin by discussing notions of *discourse* and *discourses* as observed in the literature, and then consider lectures under two consequent categories, firstly *lectures as discourse*, examining whether lectures are a spoken or written genre; and secondly, and briefly, *lectures as discourses*. I will then discuss notions of *genre*, as observed in the literature, and consider lectures under the category of *lectures as genre*. This will conclude with a discussion of how lectures are conceptualised in this investigation.

1.3.1 Theories of Discourse

“Discourse” is a term used across a wide variety of disciplines with a wide variety of meanings and implications, ranging from a relatively simple sense of language in use to notions of discourse as social practice and social action, each use suggesting different views as to the nature of language and the aims of studying it. Thus Potter & Wetherell (1987: 7) refer to discourse very generally as “all forms of spoken interaction, formal and informal, and written texts of all kinds”, while Harris (1952) refers to discourse as “language use beyond the sentence”, a view also echoed by Stubbs (1983: 1) who refers to discourse as “language above the sentence or above the clause”, entailing the study for example of cohesive devices, information structure, and turn-taking – within this formalist notion, discourse is viewed as a somewhat abstract entity and as a system, analysable in isolation from its social background.

The term discourse however is also used to refer to “language use in context”, the study of how people use language for particular purposes in particular social situations (Brown & Yule 1983, Schiffrin 1994), which suggests a broader notion of what discourse is. Also suggesting a functionalist turn, discourse is conceived of in terms of style, for example Allen (2000: 13) refers to discourse as “different ways of speaking and writing”. Van Dijk (1997) suggests another important aspect, that discourse should be understood as specific forms of language use and as interaction³¹ promoting action (Austin 1962, Searle 1969).

³¹ See also Scollon (1998).

Discourse viewed in these ways suggests the phenomenon as deriving from two distinct sources, firstly that of discourse-as-emanating-from-the-individual-psyche, as for example in cognitive psychology which tends to view discourse as the product of the speaking human subject and as an expression of fundamental human mental states such as beliefs, attitudes, and feelings and of human mental processes (Lemke 1995: 16); and secondly that of discourses as characteristic of cultures and communities as opposed to of individuals, as for example in cultural anthropology (ibid). This latter usage gives rise to notions of discourse-by-topic, for example, newspaper discourse, or advertising discourse, and also to discourse-by-group, for example disciplinary discourse (e.g. Hyland 2000).

The final conceptualisation of the term discourse, especially common among social theorists³², is one in which discourse takes on a stronger and broader sense, referring to language as social practice, a view in which discourses actually constitute the objects of which they talk – in this sense, discourse is “any systematic or disciplined way of constituting subjects, objects, and relationships within a linguistic practice” (Shapiro 1987: 365). Conceptualised in this way, as Foucault (1972: 44-5) argues “it is not enough for us to open our eyes, to pay attention or to be aware, for new objects suddenly to light up and emerge out of the ground”, instead discourse is a phenomenon which in and of itself constitutes the objects of which it speaks, and in doing so provides subject positions for both speakers and

³² See e.g. Foucault (1972), Fairclough (1992 & 1995).

addressees, and constitutes relations between these subjects³³ and the objects of knowledge of the discourse (Weedon 1987: 108)³⁴.

This third conceptualisation of discourse as “a particular way of constructing a subject matter” (Fairclough 1992: 127-8) allows theorists (see especially Fairclough 1992 & 1995, Foucault 1972, & Solin 2001) to talk of “orders of discourse”, meaning the totality of discourse practices, or discourses, associated with, and hence constituting, an institution. Scollon (2000b) talks of the competing or even conflicting situation one might thus face as different discourses meet in “orders of discourse”, while Fairclough (1989, 1992 & 1995) discusses similar issues under the notion of the colonisation of discourses by other discourses, particularly bureaucratic and advertising discourses. This notion of institutionally-located orders of discourse also allows theorists to analyse intertextuality in terms of interdiscursivity, or the different discourses and genres drawn upon by an order of discourse³⁵.

Evident immediately is a wide divide between, at a rather general level, linguistic and social science conceptualisations of the term, a divide tackled most famously by Pennycook (1994), who, in assessing reasons for the mutual incomprehension of a discussion of the term between himself and a colleague, identifies these two broadly different usages of the term as the cause of the misunderstanding (ibid: 115-6). As both conceptualisations of the term are in common usage, it is advisable therefore to

³³ See also Critical Discourse Analysis, for example Kress and Hodge (1979), Fowler et al (1979), Wodak (1989), and Fairclough (1992 & 1995).

³⁴ See also Pennycook (2001: 83): “discourses are indelibly tied to power and knowledge and truth, but they do not either represent or obfuscate truth and knowledge in the interests of pre-given powers (as in the case of many versions of ideology); rather, they produce knowledge and truth (they have knowledge and truth effects)” (Pennycook 2001: 83). See for example Fairclough (1992 & 1995), Solin (2001).

narrow down the usages of the term within this study, and in this sense, following Fairclough (1992: 127-8), discourse as an uncountable noun is used to refer to the general view of discourse as language in use beyond the sentence, while a discourse as a countable noun is used to refer to the view of discourse as a means of constituting reality. For Fairclough (ibid), both usages of the term are important, as they cannot in reality be easily distinguished from each other – instead Fairclough sees what he terms a ‘discursive event’ as being simultaneously a piece of text (allowing for the analysis of discourse-as-text), an instance of discursive practice (allowing for analysis of the processes of text production and consumption), and an instance of social practice (discourse-as-social-action, analysing for example the institutional circumstances of discourse and its constitutional effects on the institution and agents involved in the discourse). In this sense, academic lectures are analysable both as discourse-as-text, and as instances of social practice, and this investigation aims to assess the latter, lectures as social practice, as evidenced by analysis of the former, lectures-as-text.

1.3.2 Lectures as Discourse

Academic lectures seem to be neither a specifically written or spoken form of discourse, but a curious blend of features of both (e.g. Flowerdew 1994b). As such, this section will briefly examine differences between the two forms as observed in the literature on the subject, so as to formulate a notion of lectures as spoken or written discourse, which in turn will later help to inform the methodology for this study.

Investigations into written and spoken discourse suggest significant differences between the two forms, due primarily to the differences in the respective production processes of speaking and writing (Biber et al 1999). One of the most important of these is the speed of production. Chafe (1994) for instance claims that speech is produced ten times more quickly than writing (although how this might be verified is difficult to ascertain), meaning less time for preparation, and that consequently speech is produced in “spurts of language” (Chafe 1994, Brown & Yule 1983), which Chafe (1979) characterises as “idea units”, units of spoken discourse having a single intonation contour followed by a pause.

Biber et al (ibid) suggest that the rapid production of speech leads to certain specific features of spoken language, the most typical of which are:

- *End-weight* in utterances: “the tendency for long and complex elements to be placed towards the end of a clause.” (ibid: 898).
- *Qualification of what has been said*: “there may be a need to elaborate and modify the message retrospectively, that is, to ‘tag on’ as an afterthought some elements which, in a logically structured and integrated sentence, would have been placed earlier” (ibid: 1067).
- *Parenthetical Structures*: these are situations in which a structure, often a clause and often unintegrated (i.e. they could be omitted with no syntactic effect), is inserted within another structure with which it shares no grammatical link and often no semantic link.
- *Dysfluency and Error*: Minor dysfluencies are common and normal in spoken language, and take the form for example (ibid: 1053ff) of hesitations, repetition (usually just one word or a syllable), reformulations, and syntactic

blends (“a sentence or a clause which finishes up in a way that is syntactically inconsistent with the way it began” (ibid: 1064).

A second important and contributory difference in the production of the two forms is the degree of contextualisation. Tannen (1982b) for instance suggests firstly that spoken language is highly contextualized while written language is generally decontextualized, meaning that spoken language can achieve its cohesion via paralinguistic and non-verbal channels (for example via tone, intonation, prosody, facial expressions, and gestures), while written language tends to achieve its cohesion via lexical and syntactic features, resulting for example in more subordination, and more foregrounding and backgrounding devices (ibid). In this sense, spoken language is more active, more involved, more fragmented, and consists of sequences of information following the speaker’s spontaneous thoughts, while written language is more passive, with elements more carefully combined, and more integrated and detached in nature³⁶. For Tannen (ibid: 8), features that give speech more ‘involvement’, as she terms it, include monitoring of the communication channel, extensive use of first person pronouns, an emphasis on agents and actions, extensive reports of the speaker’s mental states, and frequent direct reporting; while features that give written language more ‘integration’, as she terms it, include the use of nominalisations³⁷, heavier use of participles, and frequent relative clauses.

Chafe and Danielwicz (1987) meanwhile suggest that written language uses a wider range of vocabulary and spoken language a narrower range, while Biber et al (1999:

³⁶ See also Halliday (1987) who views spoken language as active and written language as reflective.

³⁷ See also Chafe (1982), Horowitz & Samuels (1987, and Halliday (1987).

1045) also observe significant lexical differences between spoken and written forms, maintaining for example that conversation is characterised by numerous and regular generalised content words, such as the hedges *kind of*, *like* and *sort of*, or the usage of “vacuous” (ibid: 1045) nouns, for example *thing or thingy*, and high pronominal usage, while written language on the other hand is characterised by high lexical density (in terms of a high type / token ratio) and high nominal usage.

However, while there seems to be broad general agreement with most of these features, they do not meet with universal acceptance. For example, while Halliday (1987) agrees with some of these general characterisations of spoken and written language, particularly for example the heavy use of nominalisations in written language (particularly scientific language), he maintains that written language is in fact “grammatically simple” compared to spoken language, which for Halliday (ibid) is marked by being lexically quite simple but grammatically rather complex. For example, Halliday (ibid) argues that spoken language contains far more clause units than does written language, meaning a heavy cognitive load for a listener, even if those clauses may be shorter than may be found in written language. Even clause subordination, considered as one means of assessing structural complexity in the English language³⁸, is marked by contradictory findings (Biber 1988: 50).

Faced with contradictory claims in this way, it seems Biber (ibid: 52-4) is probably right in arguing that discrepancies between earlier research findings may well in fact be attributable to researchers giving undue weight to specific examples, thus unbalancing findings, and/or to researchers using only a limited selection of genres

³⁸ See for example Tannen (1982a), Thompson (1984).

from spoken and written language as a means of assessing all spoken and written language. As such, Biber et al (1999) argue, as did Halliday (1987 & 1989), that spoken language is far more complex than are written forms, but that the genuine syntactic complexity of spoken language is lost by examining spoken language using criteria derived from the written language to do so.

Significant differences clearly exist between spoken and written language, so in terms of whether a lecture is considered as written or spoken discourse, it seems best to consider spoken and written language not as dichotomous opposites, but instead as existing along a cline, such that different forms of spoken and written language will exhibit differing degrees of spokenness or writtenness depending on the circumstances of their production. This is not a new idea³⁹, and a number of clines have been suggested. For example, Ochs (1979) looked at language in terms of the degree or otherwise of its pre-reception preparation, positing a cline stretching from planned to unplanned, while Chafe (1982: 36) divides discourse into four categories of informal spoken language, formal spoken language, informal written language, and formal written language. A slightly different approach however was taken by Biber (1988), who rather than using a single cline, instead suggests a range of parameters with which to plot discourse, for example formal/informal, restricted/elaborated, contextualised/decontextualised, and involved/detached. As Flowerdew (1994b: 20) suggests, spoken language will generally tend towards being informal, restricted, contextualised and involved, but

³⁹ See for example Chafe & Danielewicz (1987): "It has always been clear, however, that neither spoken language nor written language is a unified phenomenon. Far from there being one single kind of language that people speak and one other kind that they write, each of these two modes itself allows a multiplicity of styles. But, beyond that, there is a great deal of overlap between speaking and writing, in the sense that some kinds of spoken language may be very writtenlike, and some kinds of language may be very spokenlike" (Chafe & Danielewicz 1987: 84).

lectures however are unlikely to exhibit exactly the same characteristics as they are comparatively planned events (ibid), and thus likely to be more towards the formal, elaborated, decontextualised and detached ends of these parameters.

Faced with such broad differences between spoken and written language, it is hard to state categorically where on such a cline from spoken to written, or set of parameters, one might posit the academic lecture in terms of discourse. This is all the more difficult when one considers that although lectures are rightly recognised as a coherent genre (Flowerdew 1994a), their delivery can vary dramatically between disciplines⁴⁰, and probably between individual lecturers within the same discipline too (Morell 2004). Nevertheless, various attempts have been made to describe differences in lecture delivery styles. Morrison (1974 in Flowerdew 1994b) for instance divides science lectures into *informal* (“close to spoken prose”) and *formal* (“high informational content, but not necessarily in a highly formal register”), while Dudley-Evans & Johns (1981) and Dudley-Evans (1994) distinguish between *reading style*, *conversational style*, and *rhetorical style*, echoing Goffman’s (1981) distinctions of *memorization* (sic), *aloud reading*, and *fresh talk*. While such attempts are intuitively correct in recognising differences between individual lectures, and perhaps broadly between disciplines too in terms of delivery styles, the lack of formal features to substantiate or illustrate their categories means such schemes are difficult to apply in any reliable manner.

One very interesting piece of research however derives from Shohamy & Inbar (1988 in Hansen & Jensen 1994: 246). Using Chafe’s (1979) concept of “idea

⁴⁰ See for example Dudley-Evans (1994), Behr (1988), Nesi (2000).

units”, Shohamy & Inbar (ibid) claim that idea units in lectures have a mean count of 11 words as opposed to 7 as in casual conversation, although written-and-read discourse such as news broadcasts carry more still. Hansen & Jensen (ibid: 245) go on to argue that:

“idea units in lectures are expanded through the use of a number of different syntactic devices such as nominalizations (sic), attributive adjectives, indirect questions, complement and restrictive relative clauses, adverbial phrases and prepositional phrases. Thus lectures exhibit a greater degree of syntactic complexity and more literary vocabulary than is found in informal speech situations. These features are reflective of the planned nature of a lecture and the formality of the speaking situation” (Hansen & Jensen 1994: 245)

Hansen & Jensen (ibid: 246) also report that the larger the audience, the less the degree of interaction in a lecture, but simultaneously, what also seems to be true is that there seems to be a move in lecturing styles away from the formal ‘written’ pole of any cline towards the more interactive, ‘spoken’ pole of any cline, as Flowerdew (1994b: 15) suggests⁴¹.

Academic lectures then can be considered as discourse which probably fits into no specific single category, but instead exhibits features of both written and spoken language, and cannot be classified under any rigid schemes due to their

⁴¹ See also Morrel (2004).

heterogeneity in terms of disciplinary and individual delivery styles. Hansen & Jensen (ibid: 246-7) summarise the situation neatly:

“Lectures can be characterized (sic) as planned, message-oriented discourse delivered by one person to a group of people. There is a minimal amount of interaction between speakers and listeners. Lectures are syntactically complex and have a literary rather than a colloquial vocabulary. But they also contain the following oral features: redundancies, pauses, disfluencies, misspeaks and repetition of information” (Hansen & Jensen 1994: 246-7)

In terms of what kind of discourse academic lectures are then, this study understands the genre of the undergraduate academic lecture to be a blend of spoken and written features, displaying pre-planned syntactic complexity but also features of speech such as dysfluencies, parenthetical structures, and incomplete clauses, but whose constituent features will vary, depending particularly on the individual lecturer, individual discipline, the size and situation of the group, and the lecture content itself too (Nesi 2000).

1.3.3 Lectures as Discourses

Viewed in a rather abstract manner, this study recognises that undergraduate academic lectures can broadly be considered as discourses in some respects, primarily because they are entities which constitute disciplinary knowledge (Hyland 2000) and (re-)constitute disciplinary orders of discourse and orders of knowledge in so doing. This investigation therefore recognises that lectures are interdiscursive (Fairclough 1992) entities, meaning they draw explicitly on those discourses and

genres which together constitute their institutional origin, or order of discourse, as resources in doing so. In this sense, a lecture discourse within a given discipline will reformulate various of the discourses and genres, and fusions of them, which together constitute that institutional entity, the discipline-as-order-of-discourse and the discipline-as-order-of-knowledge, to begin with – and lectures-as-discourses in turn will also come to form part of the order of discourse which they constitute.

This investigation also recognises that lectures, as discourses, certainly do provide distinct subject positions and forms of subjectivity for their users, and in doing so, also do constitute relations between those subject positions provided. Lectures, conceived of as discourses, clearly mediate distinct and even geographical (Goffman 1974) subject positions for their two face-to-face participants, lecturer and audience. The strength and implicit mutual acceptance of such positions is evidenced in the way that a lecturer needs to explicitly signal to an audience any changes to the perceived ‘usual’ interactional structure (Goffman *ibid*).

However, despite the attractiveness of the concept of discourses in this broad manner, a critical problem arises in that discourses seem to be rather abstract forms of language with few reliable means of actually identifying them consistently. This means that analysts working in this tradition either tend to avoid any actual textual analysis⁴², or they use rather simplistic lexical cues to identify discourses⁴³. This is a serious problem, as the concept points to language items as the key behind ‘discourses’, and yet ironically fails to provide any means by which the relevant defining language items be located, delineated and so on, such that any ‘discourses’

⁴² See for example Foucault (1972).

⁴³ See for example Coupland & Coupland (1997), and Solin (2001) studying environmental discourses and orders of discourse.

can actually be located with any degree of precision, validity or reliability. While an order of discourse as a broad entity is identifiable via its institutional origin, the discourses themselves that constitute the order of discourse seem to have no such means of identification.

Thus although this investigation does recognise the value of this conceptualisation of 'discourses' from a broad theoretical perspective, and indeed considers the notions of the constitutive and positioning powers of discourses as pre-givens, such an approach based on discourses will not be followed beyond the broadest level due to the difficulties in establishing criteria by which to do so.

Instead, lectures will be located under the notion of genre.

1.3.4.1 Theories of Genre

Genre is a broad-ranging term used extensively in many academic areas, and one which has been the subject of extensive research which can be characterised as deriving from three broad approaches to the notion (Hyon 1996, Hyland 2002). These are firstly approaches within the field of ESP⁴⁴; secondly approaches within the field of North American New Rhetoric studies⁴⁵; and thirdly, approaches within the field of Australian systemic functional linguistics⁴⁶.

⁴⁴ See for example Swales (1990 & 1998), Bhatia (1993 & 1999), Hopkins & Dudley-Evans (1988), Flowerdew (1993).

⁴⁵ See for example Bazerman (1988), Miller (1984 & 1994), Berkenhotter & Huckin (1995), Yates & Orlikowski (1992), Orlikowski & Yates (1994).

⁴⁶ See for example Halliday (1978), Martin (1989, 1991, 1993a, 1993b), Martin et al (1989), Christie & Martin (1997a & 1997b), Christie (1997b, 1998, 1999).

Within the first category, ESP research, genres are initially identified primarily by text-external criteria, particularly by their “communicative purpose” (Swales 1990), and are framed broadly as “oral and written text types defined by their formal properties as well as by their communicative purposes within social contexts” (Hyon 1996: 695). As such, research focuses on the formal properties of genres (e.g. Swales 1990, Swales et al 1998, Thompson 1994), and on their communicative purposes, or social functions within communities. As Hyland (2002: 115) puts it, “genre here comprises a class of structured communicative events employed by specific discourse communities whose members share broad communicative purposes”. In terms of the application of such research, researchers emphasise the implications for practitioners of ESP and EAP, and how such research can help non-native speakers of English master the linguistic conventions of genres they will encounter in their work or studies (Swales *ibid*, Swales & Feak 1994).

Within the second category, North American New Rhetoric studies, genres are viewed less in terms of their formal properties, and more in terms of the situational contexts they occur in, and the social actions they perform within those contexts – genre is viewed as “a socially standard strategy, embodied in a typical form of discourse, that has evolved for responding to a recurring type of rhetorical situation” (Coe & Freedman 1998: 137, in Hyland 2002: 114). Central within NANR studies is Miller (1984) and her seminal shaping of the notion of genre as social action, and in turn the focus on what social acts genres accomplish. This has led to a primary focus on ethnographic approaches to research⁴⁷, offering so-called ‘thick’ (Geertz 1973) descriptions of genres and the social actions they accomplish. As for the

⁴⁷ See for example Bazerman (1988), Berkenhotter & Huckin (1995), Myers (1990). Although see Bazerman (1981) for a non-ethnographic study in this broad tradition.

application of such research, the teaching focus is on the actions performed by genres (Hyland 2002), meaning that central to teaching aims appears to be less the notion of teaching students the formal trappings of genres (Bazerman 1988) than it is of helping students to fully understand the communities within which they are working and writing, so as to better socially situate their own writing and selves within them⁴⁸.

Finally, regarding the third category, Australian systemic functional linguistics (Hyon 1996) or The Sydney School (Hyland 2002), language was considered, initially at least, less in terms specifically of genre and more in terms of register (Halliday 1978, Halliday & Hasan 1989), the theorisation of the links between social context and language, and the functions of language within these social contexts. Register is described (ibid) in terms of field (activity), tenor (the relationships between participants), and mode (the channel of communication), these three elements broadly determining the nature and form of the language used in the social event, or its register. Only later did notions of genre explicitly enter this third category, especially via Martin⁴⁹, leading to the notion of genres as staged, goal-oriented social processes, in specific structural forms, which communities use in certain contexts to achieve various social purposes (Christie & Rothery 1989, Hyon 1996). This third category, similarly with the first category, ESP research, is likewise characterised by detailed linguistic analysis of the formal features of genres, using the framework of Hallidayan SFL⁵⁰. Regarding the application of such research, research has generally focussed on formal schooling, as opposed to university education as with ESP research and American New Rhetoric research,

⁴⁸ See also Lea (1998), and Lea & Street (1998 & 1999).

⁴⁹ See for instance Martin (1989, 1991, 1992, 1993a, 1993b, 1997).

⁵⁰ See for example Christie (1991), Martin (1991, 1993a & 1993b).

with the aim being to increase and improve literacy levels via explicit genre instruction⁵¹, entailing also an ideological interest in socially empowering students via such instruction (Christie 1991, 1999).

These seem to be increasingly superficial differences between the three schools, and broadly speaking, most current genre research can be viewed as deriving from two central assumptions, these being, as outlined by Hyland (2002: 114):

“that the features of a similar group of texts depend on the social context of their creation and use, and that those features can be described in a way that relates a text to others like it and to the choices and constraints acting on text producers” (Hyland 2002: 114)

Hyland (ibid: 116ff) has identified in recent genre research a move away from “simple constituency representations of genre staging” (ibid: 116) and a search for “generic integrity” (Bhatia 1993 & 1999)⁵², towards the examination of clusters of rhetorical features which might distinguish genres, with a focus too on interpersonal dimensions within genres, or what Bakhtin (1981) terms the “addressivity” of genres, and the means of construction of appropriate authorial and audience selves and inter-participant relationships (Hyland ibid)⁵³.

⁵¹ See for example Martin (1989), Christie (1989 & 1997b, Cope & Kalantzis 1993).

⁵² See also Swales’ (1990) notion of “prototypes” and Halliday & Hasan’s (1989) notion of “generic structure potential”.

⁵³ Features studied in recent research include imperatives (Swales et al 1998), personal pronouns (Kuo 1999), hedges (Hyland 1996), appropriacy in teacher feedback (Hyland and Hyland 2001), reader-construction on medical labels (Wright 1999), relationship-construction in casual conversation (Egins & Slade 1997), relationships between verbal and non-verbal elements in texts (Kress & Van Leeuwen 1996, Myers 1997, Lemke 1998), and evaluation (Coffin 1997, Hunston & Thompson 2001).

Evident within much genre research is the implicit awareness firstly that genres are observable as specific linguistic products with observable formal features, or clusters of formal features; secondly that genres are identifiable via their “addressivity” (Voloshinov 1973, Bakhtin 1981 & 1986) and context(s) of use; and thirdly that genres are means of social action, used strategically to achieve social goals, including the construction and maintenance of social relationships and power relations. Genre in this latter sense is viewable as “a social construct that regularizes communication, interaction, and relations” (Bazerman 1992: 62), suggesting echoes of the constitutive and regulatory nature of discourses (Foucault 1972), as discussed earlier, and it is such an understanding of genre that informs this study – lectures are viewed as a means of social action, which position their participants in certain ways, and create structures within which discourse, discourses and texts circulate.

Genres therefore are analysable in terms not only of their enabling aspects, but also in terms of the constraints they impose on their users regarding the particular subject positions they provide. This raises the question of the relationship(s) between individual genre-users and the genre they use (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986, Bakhtin/Medvedev 1928 in Morris 1994), in the sense that genres are viewable as sites of struggle between centripetal and centrifugal forces (ibid), as objects which mediate their use by agents. How such positions and roles are mediated in relationship to ‘intertextuality’ within lectures is a central part of this investigation.

Some of these ideas of genre echo ideas discussed under lectures-as-discourses earlier, indeed, Foucault seems not to distinguish between the two concepts, referring for example to technical instructions and contracts not as genres, as might

be the case in many understandings of the term, but instead as discourses (Foucault 1984: 116 in Solin 2001: 30). Likewise Foucault's notion of discourses as providing subject positions is also important within genres (Kress & Threadgold 1988, Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). Such blurring also gains momentum when for example, genres are considered not so much as specific kinds of text with generic integrity (Bhatia 1993 & 1999), but instead as a system of texts from within which speakers select according to their social purpose, as is the case for Martin (1997: 6), suggesting genre as shifting in its conceptualisation towards 'order of discourse' (Foucault 1972, Fairclough 1992 & 1995).

While there would certainly seem to be shared notions within the two concepts, the crucial difference however seems to be that genres, due to their broader descriptive base in terms of features, origins and directions, are more observable, definable entities, while discourses are significantly less so. Discourses can be delineated approximately by way of their topic primarily (Fairclough 1992, Solin 2001), and perhaps to a degree by their purpose or institutional site, but beyond that, it becomes increasingly difficult to operationalise the concept, despite the richness inherent in it. Genres meanwhile can be described and delineated by topic too, but, more importantly, by way variously too of a recognised group or community, shared rhetorical purpose(s), shared social purpose(s), shared textual characteristics, similarities of audience, and similarities of purpose or social action.

Theorised in this way, undergraduate academic lectures are understood in this study as discourse events united as a broad, macro genre of the 'undergraduate academic lecture' by dint of their shared rhetorical purposes (disciplinary knowledge-(re-

)construction) and uses (the recirculation of disciplinary discourses as curricula (Rose 1997)), their shared audiences (undergraduate students), their shared institutional site of production (the academy broadly), and their broadly shared discursive characteristics in terms of their hybridity of spoken and written discourse (Flowerdew 1994b). Academic lectures therefore are alike in terms of their shared genre status, but not in terms of their incorporated discourses, as the genre of the academic lecture can be used to (re-)construct many different disciplinary discourses, and it can do this in different ways (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986). Because discourses themselves provide different subject positions for their participants, and because, for instance, 'science discourse' is perceived to show significant differences with other academic discourse (Halliday 1988, Halliday & Martin 1993, Halliday & Veel 1998, Woolgar 1988, Lemke 1990 & 1995), this means that the broad genre of the undergraduate academic lecture is likely to show intra-genre variation.

1.3.4.2 Variations in Genres

Much research⁵⁴ seems to point clearly to genres as being historical evolutionary products developing from regularised, stabilised activity within a community, leading to the codification (Bazerman 1988) of that community's discursive habits as genres, even when a community specifically sets out to avoid the potential determinism of this process⁵⁵. Genres are thus entities which of their nature carry a regulative, constraining function. Iser (1978: 143) for example, echoing Berkenhotter & Huckin's (1995) notion of genre as "situated cognition", discusses

⁵⁴ See for example Bazerman (1988), Berkenhotter & Huckin (1995), Salager-Meyer (1999), and Atkinson (1999).

⁵⁵ See Berkenhotter & Huckin (1995: 79-97). See also Myers (1990) on the normative relationship between a genre and its users.

the ways in which genres will shape a reader's subjective contribution to the interactive reading process.

Such effects are potentially pervasive, because genre knowledge is learned, not inherited⁵⁶, and there can be little doubt that users of a genre are constrained to varying degrees by that genre, particularly the more specialised that genre becomes (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986, Bakhtin/Medvedev 1928 in Morris 1994). Genre then is viewable in this way, as a constraining force, but such a view seems perhaps rather deterministic, and if it were so simple, then genres would be static, unchanging objects, and for instance scientists would still be textualising their knowledge-claims using dramatic, staged dialogues, and tropes from Hermetic alchemy or the bible and so on to do so (Paradis 1983, Bazerman 1993b).

The same studies of the historical evolution of genres however clearly point to this not being the case (e.g. Bazerman 1988, Salager-Meyer 1999), and suggest instead that genres are not static products, but are entities that evolve and change via their social use (Bakhtin *ibid*), albeit that both that only high-ranking actors in a community can bend genre conventions to any dramatic degree (Myers 1995, Berkenhotter & Huckin 1995). As such, this suggests a dynamic relationship between genres and their agents, such that both influence the other. In this sense, although genres clearly emerge retrospectively from community activity (Bazerman 1988, Miller 1984, Salager-Meyer 1999) and likewise clearly shape (but not determine) current and future epistemological assumptions and knowledge-constructing practices in an academic community, they are, in the sense of genre as

action (Miller 1984) both constituted and reproduced in the very act of doing so (e.g. Giddens 1984: 15).

In this sense, structures, or genres, are viewed both as the medium and as the outcome of the community reproduction of practices, and thus as evolving and changing to suit historically, or culturally, changing conditions of use. In other words, genres constitute practices, and simultaneously in doing so, reproduce themselves, but in slowly changing forms. Berkenhotter & Huckin (1995: 4) refer to this within their five principles of genre as '*Duality of Structure*' – the principle that as one draws on genre rules to engage in professional activities, one *constitutes* social structures (in professional, institutional, and organisational contexts) and simultaneously *reproduces* those same structures. In this sense, concepts such as “generic integrity” (Bhatia 1993, 1999) are best seen in terms of constraints as opposed to enforcement of identical reproduction, as a ‘potential’ in Halliday & Hasan’s (1989) term. This approximate stability of genres is what enables researchers to use genres as one means by which to investigate a community’s “norms, epistemology, ideology, and social ontology” (Berkenhotter & Huckin 1995: 25), but such investigations necessarily remain historically bound.

This recognition that genres are not homogenous static entities, but are subject to variation broadly, has seen some recent genre research also start investigating non-historical variations within genres, for instance intercultural⁵⁷ and corporate variations⁵⁸. Looking at academic genres specifically, many studies point to

⁵⁷ See for example Connor (1996), Zhu & Thompson (2000), Zhu et al (1998 & 1999, Precht (1998), Scollon (2000a).

⁵⁸ See for example Bargiela-Chiappini & Nickerson (1999b), Gunnarson et al (1997).

significant and observable differences within academic genres⁵⁹, attributable to a variety of factors including culture, historical period, social community, and communicative setting (Hyland 2002: 120). To such a list should also be added change brought about by individual expert genre-users exploiting what Bathia (1999: 26) terms “tactical space” (Bhatia 1999: 26) within genres, and mixing in “private intentions” (Bhatia 1993), suggesting genre variation as attributable to individual use too, though with the caveats outlined above.

Genres are increasingly being recognised then as phenomena which exhibit significant variations at the local level. However, whilst intra-genre variations have been investigated in some academic areas, particularly by Hyland (2000), such variation within the genre of the academic lecture remains a relatively untouched area, particularly regarding their management of intertextuality.

1.3.5 Conclusions

In this section, I have reviewed concepts of the term ‘discourse’, to include discourse as language use, and ‘discourses’ as social practices. Within the first understanding of the word, I looked particularly at whether we might describe undergraduate academic lectures as spoken or written discourse, suggesting them as a fusion of both, while within the second understanding of the term, I looked particularly at the constitutive and positioning power of discourses and their relations with orders of discourse. Despite the richness of the concept of discourses at an abstract level of theorisation, I suggested it is difficult to apply in any investigation due to the problems primarily of the identification of discourses.

⁵⁹ See for example Ferguson (2001), Bondi (1999), Hyland (1996, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2003b), Hyland & Tse (2004), Samraj (2000), Hyon & Chen (2004), Thompson (2000), Thompson & Tribble (2001), and Swales et al (1998).

Instead I have suggested that undergraduate lectures are best conceived of as a macro academic genre, proposing a view of genre which accommodates much of the richness observed in the discussion of discourses, particularly that of the constitutive, regulative nature of discourses, the way they construct subject positions for their users, and the way they affect patterns of intertextuality. Despite the regulative power of genres however, this investigation recognises that genres change over time, and are thus in a dynamic relationship with their users, such that both are mutually influenced. Change over time and different conditions of use both give rise to the concept of genre variations, and although such variations have been investigated in a number of areas, investigations of variation in patterns of intertextuality within a single genre are unusual, and within undergraduate lectures have yet to be conducted.

This study therefore aims to investigate the management of intertextuality in this genre, as the reproduction of disciplinary discourses, understanding the genre as an institutional genre within and via which disciplinary knowledge and its constitutive discourse is reproduced, and understanding disciplinary knowledge and its constitutive discourse itself not only as thoroughly social in its origins, but as thoroughly intertextual in its origins too.

1.4 Lectures and Notions of Discipline

As this study will make intra-genre comparisons of lectures as a genre, using the notion of discipline to do so, in this section, I will briefly examine conceptualisations of academic discipline, as put forward in the literature, focussing particularly on conceptualisations of discipline as specific cultural groups, akin to

notions of tribes (Becher 1989 & 2001), and focussing too on observed disciplinary discursive differences within disciplinary discourse. Such an understanding of disciplines as specific cultural groups with observable qualitative and quantitative differences in their discoursing lies at the heart of this investigation.

1.4.1 What is a Discipline

The term discipline, deriving originally from Plato and then from the trivium and quadrivium of medieval Europe, is used to connote the divisions of the academy into different fields of study (Schwab 1964). From these initial origins, disciplines have become increasingly more specialised, particularly since the Enlightenment (ibid), to the extent that individual disciplines have in many cases typically become associated with physical structures in the shapes of departments and programs in today's universities. What though is understood within this notion of discipline? Much research into the natures of disciplines theorises the concept of discipline via that of the speech community (Saville-Troike 1982), later refined within the concept of discourse community (e.g. Swales 1990, Bazerman 1981, Becher 1981, 1984, 1987, 1989, 2001). Swales (1990) lists six defining characteristics of a discourse community as follows:

- It has a broadly agreed set of common public goals
- It has formal mechanisms for communication among its members
- It uses its participatory mechanisms primarily to provide information and feedback
- It utilises at least one shared genre in the furtherance of its communicative aims
- It has specific lexis and nomenclatures in its genre(s)

- It has threshold level members with a suitable degree of discursive expertise, who in turn will reproduce the community via its genre(s)

In these senses, a discourse community and its genre(s) will share common purposes, common setting(s) and typically common audience(s) too (Bruffee 1986), resulting, particularly from a constructivist view of knowledge, in “traditional, shared ways of understanding experience” and shared patterns of interaction (Bizzell 1982). Although the notion of discourse community has been challenged in some quarters as too structuralist and static a notion (e.g. Chin 1994), or even as another political means of separating insiders from outsiders (e.g. Cooper & Holzman 1989), nevertheless theories of cultural reproduction which allow for change (e.g. Giddens 1984, Berkenhotter & Huckin 1995) clearly point to the possibility, and indeed the desirability of change within discourse communities, which the very fact of the numerous observed changes within discourse communities and their genres simply confirms (e.g. Salager-Meyer 1999, Bazerman 1988).

Central within such an understanding are the roles played by discourse(s) and genre(s), as it is discourse(s) and genre(s) which constitute, and in turn reconstitute communities, ensuring their vitality and development as cultural forms. Within the academy, this clearly is pivotal in maintaining an academic community, or discipline (e.g. Geertz 1983), and indeed it is practices realised within discourse(s) and genre(s) which define and redefine what disciplines and the knowledge they embody are (e.g. Hyland 2000, Bruffee 1986), and in turn through their public discourses and genre(s) that disciplines produce and reproduce their “knowledge” and thus maintain their cultural authority. As such, disciplines must be seen as more

than simply relics of the past, and instead need to be seen as “ways of being in the world, to invoke Heideggerian formula, forms of life, to use a Wittgensteinian, or varieties of noetic experience, to adopt a Jamesian” (Geertz 1983: 155). Such a position has allowed researchers to view the notion of discipline as akin to “cultures” and “tribes” (e.g. Hyland 2000, Becher 1989 & 2001, Myers 1995). For instance, Myers (ibid) points out some of the key similarities between “disciplines” and “cultures”:

“Disciplines are like cultures in that their members have shared, taken for granted beliefs; these beliefs can be mutually incomprehensible between cultures; these beliefs are encoded in a language; they are embodied in practices; new members are brought into culture through rituals” (Myers 1995: 5)

This understanding is echoed too by Becher (1989 & 2001), who also describes disciplines as sharing much in common with cultures, including “traditions, customs and practices, transmitted knowledge, beliefs, morals and rules of conduct, as well as their linguistic and symbolic forms of communication and the meanings they share.” (Becher 1989: 24). In a later work, Becher even argues that so strong are these shared cultural elements that “disciplinary cultures, in virtually all fields, transcend the institutional boundaries within any given system. In many, but not all, instances, they also span national boundaries” (Becher 1994: 153).

Such a view is also widely-held in contemporary research. For instance, McLeod (2000), while researching the possibilities of creating inter-disciplinary movements

in the academy, describes herself and her subjects as confronted by many of the problems found on entering a new culture – she found for example that researchers from different disciplines, on being placed into multidisciplinary situations, described disciplinary cultures in terms of “camps, tribes, communities, worlds, clubs, territories, islands, inside and outside, ends of the continuum, cultures”, with such situations frequently further characterised as “significantly different, profoundly different, dramatically different”, marked by “leaps, gaps, large gulfs”, all experienced in “different languages, different values, different paradigms, different prisms” (McLeod 2000).

Such an understanding of an academic discipline as a specific cultural group or tribe, with its own values, ways of being, language and so on, is that employed within this study, allowing as it does a dynamic view of disciplines not only as specific differentiable cultural groups but also as sites of cultural change, change which is enacted through a discipline’s shared discourse(s) and genre(s). Assuming such a view raises the important question though of how one can differentiate between disciplines. Besides the standard administrative divisions typically enacted through university faculty buildings and departments, probably the most sophisticated means of distinguishing between disciplines derives from Becher (1989 & 2001). Employing a four-way schemata, Becher (ibid) distinguishes between disciplines as follows:

- *Soft – Hard* (the degree of paradigm (Kuhn 1962) associated with a discipline)
- *Pure – Applied* (whether a discipline is one of “knowledge for knowledge’s sake” or is one specific to some practical application(s) in the world)
- *Convergent – Divergent* (how tightly-knit or otherwise a discipline is)

- *Urban – Rural* (the patterns of communication within a discipline)

These differences are outlined in greater detail in table 1.1 beneath:

Disciplinary Grouping	Nature of Knowledge	Nature of Disciplinary Culture
Hard-Pure (Pure Sciences, e.g., Molecular Biology)	Cumulative; atomistic; concerned with universals, quantities, simplification; resulting in discovery	Competitive, gregarious; politically well-organized; high publication rate; task-oriented
Soft-Pure (Humanities & Pure Social Sciences, e.g., Sociology)	Reiterative; holistic; concerned with particulars, qualities, complication; resulting in interpretation	Individualistic, pluralistic; loosely structured; low publication rate; person-oriented
Hard-Applied (Technologies, e.g., Computer Science)	Purposive; pragmatic; concerned with mastery of physical environment; resulting in products/techniques	Entrepreneurial; professional values; patents substitutable for publications; role-oriented
Soft-Applied (Applied Social Science, e.g., Education, Law)	Functional, utilitarian; concerned with enhancement of professional practice; resulting in protocols/procedures	Outward-looking; uncertain in status; dominated by intellectual fashions; consultancies;

Table 1.1: Becher’s system of distinguishing between disciplines, and examples.

The nature and degree of disciplinary difference varies with specific disciplines, so for instance so-called *convergent* and tightly-knit disciplines, or those with a “strong sense of nationhood” (ibid), are likely to occupy intellectual territories with well-defined boundaries, meaning the resulting “patriotic feelings” (ibid) will maintain accepted cultural forms and norms, infiltrations into which will not be accepted – meaning in turn that “deviants” (ibid) are required to set up own their own new discipline, a process known as subject parturition (ibid). *Divergent* and *rural* disciplines on the other hand exhibit opposite tendencies such as ragged borders and cognitive border zones which are not easily marked or defined as there is “no central core which firmly controls intellectual boundaries and reputations” (Whitley 1984 in Becher 1989: 37). Such disciplines, for instance pharmacy (which

shares close relationships with pharmacology, biochemistry and chemistry), or literary theory (which shares close relationships with psychology, sociology and structural anthropology) have “centrifugal tendencies” and are thus more likely to metamorphose and mutate (Becher 1989: 37).

Bernstein (1971) on the other hand discusses such distinguishing sociological features of disciplines using the terminology of *framing* and *classification*. *Classification* refers to the degree or otherwise of subject partitioning, with disciplines characterised as having strong *classification* exhibiting clear boundaries between what is considered relevant knowledge and irrelevant knowledge belonging to another subject. Strong *classification* in a discipline typically leads in turn to strong *framing* in a discipline, this referring to social situations in which hierarchical relationships are strongest.

Although such divisions undoubtedly provide a means of distinguishing between and identifying disciplinary characteristics, nevertheless it is the case that no knowledge categorisation system will provide neat pigeonholes for all disciplines, as boundaries are sometimes blurred and some disciplines do not fit in any category comfortably (Becher 2001: 39), while moreover a discipline may have several faces to it, such as geography or economics, both of which for instance contain Soft/Hard and Pure/Applied characteristics depending on the “specialism” (ibid) a researcher is working in. Another difficulty associated with distinguishing reliably and validly between disciplines is that of disciplinary change, happening increasingly rapidly (ibid) as old disciplinary boundaries break down and disciplines converge in an ever diversifying and increasingly inter-disciplinary academy. Such changes are

associated with what has been described by Gibbons et al (1994) as a move towards what they term mode 2 knowledge over mode 1 knowledge, now associated with outmoded disciplinary structures (ibid). While mode 1 knowledge is “generated within a disciplinary, primarily cognitive context,” mode 2 knowledge on the other hand is created in “broader transdisciplinary social and economic contexts” (Gibbons et al 1994: 1). So-called mode 2 knowledge is said to have the following characteristics (ibid):

- Knowledge is produced in the context of application
- Transdisciplinarity is the norm
- Heterogeneity and organisational diversity are common
- There is enhanced social accountability
- There is a more broadly based system of quality control

Connected with such changes is also a move towards what Barnett (2000) calls “performativity” in the academy, which sees increasingly greater value being placed on operational competence over academic competence. As such, situated as this study is in a constructivist theory of knowledge and a connected constitutive theory of discourse, it is the case that while this study fully accepts the conceptualisation of disciplines as tribes and cultures, it nevertheless requires an understanding of discipline which also fully accounts for their dynamic nature and one moreover which situates human agents at the heart of this process (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986). Such an understanding is provided by Lave & Wenger (1991), who theorise knowledge communities within the concept of “communities of practice” (ibid: 98ff). This shifts the focus from a somewhat static view of language and social structure on to the idea of situated practices, which emphasise situated activities as “a set of relations among persons, activity, and world, over time and in relation with

other tangential and overlapping communities of practice” (ibid: 98). In this understanding, a community of practice has three dimensions, mutual engagement, joint enterprise negotiated communally, and a shared repertoire. Such an understanding best allows for the central role played by human agents in maintaining and changing disciplinary structures and discourse, also allows for the constitutive role of discourse in such maintenance and/or change(s), and most importantly, allows a focus on the vital role(s) of discursively-mediated interaction, as community practice. As such, this is the understanding of “academic discipline” employed within this study.

1.4.2 Disciplinary Differences

While broad disciplinary differences have been examined by Becher (1989 & 2001), explicit discursive differences between disciplines have received detailed attention from linguists. In such studies, disciplinary differences are viewed not just as deriving from different topics and different bodies of knowledge, but as deriving from different discursive orientations altogether. For example, different argument styles have been examined by McCloskey (1993), who notes the use of markets as a metaphor permeating economics writing, and by Bazerman (1988), who looks at scientific reports in terms of their typical argument styles and how such styles set this genre apart in science. In an earlier work, Bazerman (1981) also clearly illustrates how Research Articles are discipline-specific with regard to the different disciplinary treatments of the integration of prior knowledge into the genre, the different reliability of prior literature, the different qualities and quantities of knowledge assumed to be shared with an audience in the genre, and the different degrees of codification between disciplines in the genre. For instance, while the

degree of codification is high in biology, it is low in sociology, and moreover the reliability of prior literature is also low in sociology, meaning that in sociology, “without a fixed, codified literature to place and constrain topics and claims, authors are both free and encouraged to frame their contributions in broad revolutionary terms, reordering large segments of knowledge” (Bazerman 1981: 370). As such, echoing Wittgenstein (1953), Bazerman (ibid: 378) concludes that “in mediating reality, literature, audience, and self, each text seems to be making a different kind of move in a different kind of game”.

Such conclusions are typical of discursively-oriented research into disciplinary differences. Zerger (1999) argues for instance that humanities disciplines typically tend to evaluate discourse positively for exhibiting clever word play and for being vivacious, eloquent, aesthetically satisfying, and natural, while social scientists value non-trivial, relevant, and plausible discourse, arts disciplines prefer creative, imaginative, interesting, and persuasive discourse, and natural scientists value theory-driven and analytical discourse. While these are broad faculty differences, more specific disciplinary differences have also been examined, for instance by Thompson (2000) who uses Swales’ (1990) integral/non-integral framework to examine citation practices in PhD theses in two different sub-disciplines (Agricultural Botany and Agricultural Economics), and finds that non-integral citations are “far more common than integral citations” in the Agricultural Botany theses, meaning that writers tend to focus on previous findings, or suggestions, rather than on the researchers that have made the findings or suggestions in this discipline, in contrast to Agricultural Economics. Such findings are typical of inter-discipline comparative research, and are reinforced for instance by Hyland (2000),

Swales (1990) and Thompson & Tribble (2001), studies which also clearly point to observable and classifiable discursive disciplinary differences and which in turn therefore illustrate the suitability of conceiving of disciplines as different tribes with different territories, customs, rituals and so on. Moreover, such studies also illustrate the central roles played by discourse in enacting differences, and therefore in enacting change and development in disciplinary groups. And such disciplinary characteristics and differences are not only enacted through peer-oriented genres but also in novice-oriented genres such as lectures (Behr 1988)⁶⁰ and textbooks too. Disciplinary differences in textbooks have been identified in terms of form and presentation (Love 1993 & 2002, Myers 1992), as well as in terms of the roles they can play in a discipline – for instance, Hewings (1990) & Tadros (1985) illustrate how textbooks in Economics typically reinforce disciplinary paradigms, while in philosophy the same genre typically not only advances scholarship but also presents original research (Gebhardt 1993, Love 2002).

1.4.3 Conclusions

In this section, I have proposed a view of academic disciplines as specific, observable and differentiable cultural groups or tribes, with specific, observable and differentiable tribal knowledge territories, and equally specific, observable and differentiable discursive characteristics. However, due to the potential danger of too

⁶⁰ “Lecturers in engineering, humanities and science tend to have full lecture notes in front of them when lecturing. Education lecturers tend to give students cyclostyled notes to a greater degree than lecturers in other faculties. Science lecturers make greater use of visual aids and the chalkboard than lecturers in other faculties. Lecturers in engineering and science provide students with adequate time to take down diagrams and notes from the chalkboard. Engineering and health science lecturers are more prone than those in other faculties to structure their lectures on the prescribed textbooks. Commerce, law and science lecturers spell out the objectives of their lectures almost always. Arts and language lecturers use repetition to a greater degree than do lecturers in other fields. Engineering lecturers tend to question students during lectures less often than do lecturers in other faculties” (Behr 1988: 197).

static and structuralist a conceptualisation inherent within such an understanding, and due too to the central and vital role played by discourse in maintaining disciplines and keeping them as living cultural groups, I have also proposed a view of disciplines as sites of situated social practices, or communities of practice, allowing as such a view does a focus on the activities, and particularly in view of the aims of this current investigation, the discursive activities by practitioners within communities of practice which ensure those communities remain as functioning, living tribal groups with contemporary cultural authority.

1.5 Research on Lectures from within Applied Linguistics

Although, as discussed previously, delivery of university undergraduate courses via lectures is sometimes criticised these days for being ineffective (e.g. Bligh 1988, Behr 1988) or for running counter to perceived good learning practice (e.g. Milliken 1998, Entwistle 2003), or for poor delivery⁶¹, it is nevertheless the case that the undergraduate lecture remains at the forefront of undergraduate higher education, both in The UK (Sutherland 2005) and at universities around the world (Flowerdew & Miller 1996, Benson 1989 & 1994). Despite this widespread and recognised commonality of use, and despite too Flowerdew's (1994a) explicit call for more research into lectures, the undergraduate academic lecture nevertheless still remains a relatively neglected academic genre within Applied Linguistics research.

However, this is certainly not to say that the genre is devoid of any research within Applied Linguistics, and as such, in this section, we will assess this existing

⁶¹ See for example Brown (1979), who reports student dissatisfaction with lecture delivery due to "incoherence, failure to pitch subject matter at an appropriate level, failure to emphasise main points, inaudibility, reading verbatim from notes, speed of delivery too fast to allow for proper note-taking, and poor chalkboard work" (Brown 1979 in Behr 1988: 191).

research in terms of three broad areas – firstly the cognitive and linguistic skills required for lecture comprehension by audiences; secondly discourse analysis of lectures; and thirdly sociolinguistic and socio-cultural aspects of lectures.

1.5.2 The Lecture Comprehension Process

Regarding the lecture comprehension process, as Flowerdew (1994b: 8ff) maintains, much research into this has remained within the paradigm of research into the comprehension process generally, this mostly deriving from the field of reading. Within this paradigm, comprehension is generally viewed as requiring five different types of knowledge, pragmatic, semantic, syntactic, lexical, and phonological, and their successful interaction⁶², often discussed too within the concepts of ‘top-down’ (or “global coherence strategies” (Van Dijk & Kintsch 1983) and ‘bottom-up’ (or “local coherence strategies” *ibid*) skills⁶³. These processes have been assumed to apply to listening comprehension broadly too⁶⁴, but nevertheless listening comprehension also carries its own specific features, particularly the perennial problem of real-time processing⁶⁵, and likewise carrying its own particular features is lecture comprehension. For example, Richards (1983) highlights eighteen important micro-skills or listening abilities which L2 lecture audiences will need, including:

- Identifying the purpose and scope of monologue
- Identifying the topic and following its development

⁶² See for example Aebersold and Field (1997) who argue that “reading is what happens when people look at a text and assign meaning to the written symbols in that text...it is however the interaction between the text and the reader that constitutes actual reading”.

⁶³ See for example Grabe (1993), Eskey (1988), Clark (1988), Alderson & Urquhart (eds.) (1984), Carrell et al (eds.) (1988), Carrell (1984), Wallace (1992).

⁶⁴ See for example Ur (1984), Andersen & Lynch (1988).

⁶⁵ See for example Richards (1983), Brown (1990), Rost (1990), Griffiths (1990), Anderson-Hsieh & Koehler (1988).

- Recognising the role of discourse markers⁶⁶
- Recognising key lexical items related to the topic
- Recognising the functions of intonation in signalling discourse structure
- Deducing the meanings of unknown words from context

Richards (*ibid*)⁶⁷ also points particularly here to the specialist background knowledge required in academic lecture comprehension, as well as the need to distinguish between the relevant and irrelevant such as jokes and asides⁶⁸, understand turn-taking conventions, and cope with heavier propositional input, while Jordan (1997) also argues that some of what he terms the “facilitating functions” of interaction, such as repetition, or the negotiation of meaning, are absent in lectures, thus further burdening audiences. Research into comprehension difficulties conducted using L2 listeners themselves as informants by Flowerdew & Miller (1992) reports that L2 listeners found problems due to lecture delivery speed⁶⁹ as well as cognitive overload due for example to complex terminology⁷⁰, and even simple tiredness⁷¹, while comprehension problems caused by lecturers’ accents have also been investigated⁷². More subtle areas of comprehension too have also been investigated by, for example, Brazil (1985), Flowerdew (1994b) and Flowerdew and Miller (1997), who have revealed much about the functions of, and difficulties caused by, intonation features of speech in academic lectures.

⁶⁶ See also Chaudron & Richards (1986).

⁶⁷ See also Powers (1986), Weir (1990), Munby (1978).

⁶⁸ See Strodt-Lopez (1991) on asides.

⁶⁹ See also Griffiths (1990), Conrad (1989), Henrichson (1984), Anderson & Lynch (1988), Tauroza & Allison (1990), Brumfit & Mitchell (1991), and Mason (1994).

⁷⁰ See also Kelly (1991), Rost (1990), Flowerdew & Miller (1992), and Johns & Dudley-Evans (1980) on problems with lecture comprehension caused by lexis.

⁷¹ See also Benson (1989) on problems with lecture comprehension caused by tiredness.

⁷² See for example Kennedy (1978), Richards (1983), Bilbow (1989), Mason (1983) and Anderson-Hsieh & Koehler (1988) on problems with lecture comprehension caused by lecturer accents.

Comprehension, especially for L2 listeners, may also be hindered by extensive use of visual aids – King and McKnight (1994 in Flowerdew and Miller 1997) for instance identify this as a potential problem in that it results in listeners having to simultaneously listen, read and make notes, possibly from both input channels, and note-taking itself too can also place additional strain on comprehension for many L2 listeners⁷³.

1.5.3 Discourse Analysis of Lectures

Regarding the second area, discourse analysis of lectures, early work used Sinclair & Coulthard's (1975) model of classroom discourse to analyse lectures⁷⁴, while in more recent work, primary focus has been placed on analysis of the discourse structuring of lectures, ranging from the analysis of micro-level features of lecture discourse such as the typical types and functions of macromarkers and lexical phrases⁷⁵, to the larger scale analysis of lecture structures. Learner awareness of discourse structure is clearly very important, and has been linked with successful comprehension (Olsen & Huckin 1990, Dudley-Evans 1994) and with effective note-taking too (Sutherland et al 2002, Clerehan 1995), and work in the area of discourse structure has been widespread and varied. For example Dudley-Evans (1994) compared the overall discourse structure of two different lectures from Plant Biology and International Highway Engineering, and found different discourse structures in operation, although the minimal size of his corpus precludes excessive generalisation from his findings, while excellent analysis by Thompson (1994) has revealed the complexities and importance of lecture introductions in establishing a

⁷³ See for example Chaudron et al (1994), Sutherland et al (2002), King (1994), Clerehan (1995), Rost (1990), Dunkel (1988), Flowerdew & Miller (1992) on note-taking in lectures and its difficulties.

⁷⁴ See for example Murphy & Candlin (1979), Coulthard & Montgomery (1981b).

⁷⁵ See for example DeCarrico and Nattinger (1988), Chaudron & Richards (1986), Rounds (1987).

discursive and conceptual framework for a listener to use as a basis for processing the discourse which will follow. Thompson (ibid) identifies two principal functions within lecture introductions, namely the setting-up of the lecture framework and the contextualisation of the topic of the lecture. Within the former, she identifies four sub-functions, announcing the topic, indicating the scope, outlining the structure, and presenting the aims, while within the latter she identifies showing the importance of the topic, relating new to given, and referring to earlier lectures. Unlike Swales' (1990) reasonably clear-cut identification⁷⁶ of moves and steps in Research Article introductions however, Thompson (ibid) concludes that there is no typical sequencing of steps in lecture introductions, but rather a mixing and interweaving of them⁷⁷. Evident from such analyses are the complex nature of lecture discourse, and its nature too as a hybrid of spoken and written discourse features⁷⁸.

1.5.4 Sociolinguistic and Sociocultural Aspects of Lectures

Regarding this third area, much has been written about sociolinguistic aspects of lectures, ranging from investigations into interpersonal features of lectures⁷⁹, into the rhetorical uses of questions⁸⁰, and into the roles of kinesics⁸¹. However, there has also been discussion of larger socio-cultural considerations of academic

⁷⁶ See Swales (1990) on his CARS (Create A Research Space) model. See also Bhatia (1993) on "generic integrity".

⁷⁷ This shows marked similarities with the findings of Young (1994) in her research into the structuring of whole lectures, who reports what she terms as "strands" or "phases" within lectures which interweave cyclically rather than in a linear manner. As she comments, "each strand is interspersed with others, so that what emerges is a continual interweaving of threads of discourse which forms a macro-structure very different from one configured in terms of a simple beginning, middle and end".

⁷⁸ See for example Biber et al (1999).

⁷⁹ See for example Strodt-Lopez (1987 & 1991) on anecdotes and asides in lectures, Flowerdew (1992) on interpersonal features in definitions, and Rounds (1987) on means of creating a cooperative class atmosphere through lecturer discourse.

⁸⁰ See for example Thompson (1998) and Flowerdew and Miller (1996).

⁸¹ See for example Kellermann (1992).

lectures. Higher Education, in Bourdieu's (1991) terms, is viewable as a form of cultural capital, enabling, in theory, its graduates to trade this for other forms of capital (ibid), for example economic or symbolic. This cultural is capital derived from highly regulated entry into, and graduation from, a socio-cultural system, or series of systems (Becher 1989) implicitly involved in the distribution of forms of capital to society (Bernstein 1990 & 1996), and as such the undergraduate lecture, as a central part of this process, is viewable as a socio-cultural phenomenon, as one of the rituals of the cultural system of education (Myers 1995, Bourdieu et al 1994), while the learners in the system(s) are viewable as "essentially social beings who are being inducted into cultural practices and ways of seeing the world that exist in the groups to which they belong" (Barnes 1982: 127)⁸².

Viewed in this manner, and echoing back to the discussion of disciplines as cultural groups earlier, learning is conceivable as a culturally-situated social process which shares attributes commonly associated with cultures, or viewable even as ritual⁸³.

As Benson (1994: 181) suggests, learning as a cultural process has

"its own structures, contexts, rituals, universals, significant symbols, roles, status markers, patterns of behaviour, beliefs, values, assumptions, and attitudes ... just like the larger entities we call cultures". (Benson 1994: 181)

⁸² See also Dudley-Evans and St.John (1998), who assert that "learning is a social process and so attitudes to learning and views of language have a cultural dimension to them, determined by national culture, professional culture and individual culture".

⁸³ See for example Benson (1989 & 1994) and Goffman (1974) on the academic lecture as a form of ritual. See also Bourdieu et al (1977: 63ff & 196ff) on comparisons between academic cultures and lecturers' role(s) in them, and church cultures and priests' roles in those; Fuller (1997) who talks of similarities between scientists and saints; and Voloshinov (1973: 74) who compares the guardianship and dissemination of discourse in religion and academia.

This means that lectures involve sociocultural forms of being which an audience may not be aware of and therefore need to learn, because such sociocultural norms will, as Gumperz (1982: 155 in Benson *ibid*: 189) argues, determine:

“who can take part, what the role relationships are, what kind of content is admissible, in what order information can introduced, and what speech etiquette applies”.

1.5.5 Conclusions

In this section, I have reviewed research into the genre of the undergraduate lecture from within Applied Linguistics, looking particularly at the lecture comprehension process, much of which derives from research into comprehension processes generally, at discourse analysis of lectures, which have established the genre as a fusion of written and spoken features, and at sociolinguistic aspects of lectures, which links the genre in with notions of discipline reviewed earlier. We will now move on to conclusions deriving from this opening chapter.

1.6 Conclusions

In this chapter, I have put forward a view of knowledge and discourse as fundamentally social and interactive in their origins and destinations, as a vital background for this investigation. Furthermore, I have proposed a view of undergraduate lectures as a linguistic form which is a fusion of spoken and written features, and which, while likely to evolve as a linguistic form due to changes in technology and the influences of contemporary educational theory and aims, is

likely to remain at the forefront of Higher Education for many years to come. As such, this study recognises undergraduate lectures as a coherent academic genre, central within Higher Education though subject to change like any other genre (Bazerman 1988, Salager-Mayer 1999), whose primary purpose is to reproduce academic disciplinary knowledge in the spoken medium.

However, although disciplinary knowledge is widely perceived as being heavily implicated in social interaction mediated within discourse (Vygotsky 1978, Wertsch 1991)⁸⁴, and despite too the general, albeit somewhat under-theorised, recognition within much EAP research of the fundamental role of what for now will be broadly termed as ‘intertextuality’ and ‘dialogism’ (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986, Fairclough 1992 & 1995) in the formulation of academic discourse⁸⁵, and whilst genre is widely viewed as influencing patterns of ‘intertextuality’ (e.g. Fairclough 1992, Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999, Kress & Threadgold 1988), and despite too the call by Kress & Threadgold (*ibid*: 236) to investigate how genres “accommodate and reconstruct or reproduce” discourses, there has been, Hyland (2000), Thompson (2000) and Thompson & Tribble (2001) aside, little research into how different academic genres and communities manage the ‘intertextuality’ and ‘dialogism’ implicit in disciplinary knowledge-construction and its recirculation (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986).

Furthermore, investigations into this area have remained solely within the realm of knowledge-constructing genres, particularly the Research Article⁸⁶, while within

⁸⁴ See also Berkenhotter & Huckin (1995), Bazerman (1981 & 1988), Latour & Woolgar (1979 & 1986), Latour (1987), Woolgar (1988).

⁸⁵ See especially Hyland (2000) and Lemke (1990 & 1995).

⁸⁶ See especially Hyland (2000), Swales (1990).

knowledge-transmitting genres, such as the textbook or the undergraduate lecture, such investigations remain very unusual⁸⁷. Research into patterns of ‘intertextuality’ in knowledge-constructing genres has pointed though to significant intra-genre variations, particularly Hyland (2000). This is a comprehensive and incisive account of different disciplinary reporting styles as observed within the broad genre of the Research Article, and an account which clearly demonstrates highly significant intra-genre and inter-disciplinary differences. However, it employs a rather specific understanding of intertextuality as resource. This is defensible in a knowledge-transforming (Bereiter & Scardamalia 1987) genre such as the Research Article, as much of the discourse is likely to be ‘I’-centred discourse, putting forward as this genre does new knowledge-claims. However, such a view of intertextuality as resource is insufficient in a genre such as the undergraduate academic lecture, as in such a knowledge-telling (ibid) genre, much, if indeed not all of the discourse is likely to be historical community discourse (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986) rather than an individual’s private discourse per se – undergraduate lectures typically reproduce disciplinary knowledge and its constitutive intertextual discourse rather than producing it, and in this sense, intertextuality in this genre needs to be managed rather than tactically exploited.

The management of intertextuality and dialogism broadly within academic genres and disciplines seems then to remain a relatively under-theorised and under-researched area, while investigations of the same phenomena within undergraduate academic lectures are yet to be conducted. This seems a serious shortfall, as undergraduate lectures are a genre explicitly and commonly used by expert,

⁸⁷ See though Bondi (1999) on dialogic features of Economics teaching, and for example Love (1991, 1993 & 2002), Myers (1992), and Hyland (1999 & 2000) for general investigations of disciplinary textbook discourse.

enculturated members of a disciplinary community (Benson 1994) as the means of and venue for the discursively-mediated (re-)construction of the knowledge-claims and canons of that disciplinary community (Lemke 1990 & 1995). Viewing “knowledge” as an inherently social and discursive product (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986, Bakhtin/Voloshinov 1973, Vygotsky 1978), ‘dialogism’ and/or ‘intertextuality’ will lie directly at the heart of such a process.

In turn, the disciplinary communities who mediate this process are viewable as socio-cultural groups⁸⁸, who engage with ‘dialogism’ and/or ‘intertextuality’ in the construction of new knowledge (Hyland 2000), and whose continued existence, depending as it does on the continuing reproduction of their disciplinary canons and discourses in undergraduate lectures, will be implicitly involved with processes of ‘dialogism’ and/or ‘intertextuality’ in the genre of the undergraduate lecture too. Because academic communities are widely regarded as exhibiting a wide variety of different social and epistemological characteristics (Becher 1989, Hyland 2000), and likewise as exhibiting a wide variety of different discoursing characteristics⁸⁹, it would seem likely therefore that different disciplinary communities will also exhibit different means of managing this ‘intertextual’ and/or ‘dialogic’ process and its mediation through discourse in their undergraduate lectures too. However, the manifestations and management of ‘dialogism’ and/or ‘intertextuality’, and their relationships to discourse, have not been studied at all in the genre of the

⁸⁸ See for example Myers (1995: 5): “disciplines are like cultures in that their members have shared, taken for granted beliefs; these beliefs can be mutually incomprehensible between cultures; these beliefs are encoded in a language; they are embodied in practices; new members are brought into culture through rituals” (Myers 1995: 5). Culture viewed in this sense provides, as Candlin & Hyland (1999: 12) argue, “an intellectual and communicative scaffold for the writer to construct community-based meanings and knowledge, a framework of conventions and understandings within which individuals can communicate concisely and effectively with their peers” (Candlin & Hyland 1999: 12).

⁸⁹ See for example Hyland (2000), Lemke (1990 & 1995), Bazerman (1981 & 1988), Samraj (2002), Thompson (2000), Thompson & Tribble (2001).

undergraduate lecture, and neither for that matter has any fully satisfactory means of such analysis yet been designed for and/or successfully applied in any academic genre.

As such, the primary and exhaustive aim of this investigation first and foremost is to devise a reliable, consistent and holistic methodology for the analysis of the management of 'dialogism' and/or 'intertextuality' in the genre of the undergraduate lecture. Because the typical view of intertextuality as resource is insufficient for such a study however, the next chapter therefore comprises an extensive review of theorisations and studies of intertextuality, as a means of moving towards a suitable theorisation of the term together with a comprehensive, holistic methodology via which intertextuality and its management in undergraduate lectures can be tracked and investigated. As such, this involves a detailed and comprehensive review of what 'dialogism' and/or 'intertextuality' might actually be, as this is a cross-disciplinary concept which carries a significant baggage of diverse and rich theorisations with it (Orr 2003), and this study therefore requires a precise formulation of quite what the concept(s) being investigated actually are before any suitable holistic methodology can be devised. This is the second primary aim of this study, the development of a coherent conceptualisation of just what dialogism and/or intertextuality actually are, and as such how they might be investigated. Once this is achieved, the methodology will be applied to a corpus of undergraduate academic lectures deriving from The BASE Corpus⁹⁰, and used to build up a cross-disciplinary picture of the various means by which 'dialogism' and/or 'intertextuality' can be realised and/or managed in this broad genre. Finally,

⁹⁰ The BASE (British Academic Spoken English) corpus is a corpus of authentic academic speech events currently being developed at the universities of Warwick and Reading in The UK with funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Board.

because academic disciplinary communities display significant intra-genre variations in the discourse of some of their genres at least (Hyland 2000, Bazerman 1981), this study will conduct inter-disciplinary comparisons of how different academic communities manage the mediated dialogic' and/or 'intertextual' nature of the process of the reformulation of their disciplinary 'knowledge' to undergraduate students in the genre of the undergraduate academic lecture, and establish what links there might be between community structure and patterns of 'dialogism' and/or 'intertextuality'.

This investigation will move now in chapter 2 therefore to conduct a necessarily broad and detailed review of the various different conceptualisations of the terms 'dialogism' and 'intertextuality' and related studies, with the aim of delineating just what it is that this study is exactly investigating and showing the genesis of the methodology informing that process. This second chapter is viewed as the principal thrust of the investigation, because to date there is a lack of a satisfactory methodology for investigating 'dialogism' and/or 'intertextuality' in discourse in a holistic manner.

Chapter 3 is another substantial chapter in which the methodology, terminologies and criteria to be used in this investigation are designed, deriving from observations and conclusions from the preceding chapter, and based on detailed analyses of two lectures from The BASE Corpus, namely 'Radiation Chemistry' and 'The Labour Movement and New Social Movements'. Chapter 4 sees the resulting methodology applied to a corpus of 24 authentic undergraduate academic lectures from The BASE Corpus, and a discussion of the findings. In chapter 5 finally, the study and

its methodology are reviewed, the concept of 'dialogism' and/or 'intertextuality' is discussed in the light of the main study, and the main findings are discussed with regard to what they may indicate about academic disciplines.

Chapter 2

Dialogism and Intertextuality

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will examine what Kozak (2000: 6) appropriately terms the “murky waters of intertextuality”, and use this firstly to develop a suitable theorisation of the concept for the study, and secondly to illustrate the genesis of the system of analysis I will be using to examine this theorisation of intertextuality within the data.

Intertextuality has become a widespread term in many areas of academic life (e.g. Allen 2000, Orr 2003), and is often situated as central within the shifts during the twentieth century from structuralism to post-structuralism (e.g. Foucault 1972, Barthes 1974 & 1977a, Kristeva 1980 & 1986) and from modernism towards what is variously termed as postmodernism (e.g. Jencks 1989, Harvey 1989) or late modernity (e.g. Fairclough & Chouliaraki 1999).

Intertextuality then can be characterized as a broad philosophical phenomenon, and one which has been central as part of the postmodernist movement in questioning notions such as the idea of unique human agency or free subjectivity (Foucault 1972), the concept of the autonomous text produced by the autonomous writer (Kristeva 1980 & 1986, Barthes 1974, 1977a, Culler 1981), the empowering of the reader (Barthes 1975 & 1981, Riffaterre 1978 & 1990), the concept of language as abstract objective system (Voloshinov 1973, Bakhtin 1981 & 1986), and the dualism between real and representation (Kristeva *ibid*). Ironically however, and

illustrative of the complexities of the term, it has also been employed in a rather more structuralist manner, giving rise to richer theories of genre (Bakhtin 1981, 1986, Fairclough 1992, 1995) and richer theorizations of literary canons (e.g. Bloom 1975 & 1976). And its use as a term of reference is not restricted to the areas of language and literature; indeed studies of intertextuality are also widespread⁹¹ in music (e.g. Allsen 1993, Hatten 1985), in cinema (e.g. Reader 1990), in theatre (e.g. Carlson 1994), in art (e.g. Steiner 1985), in photography (e.g. Hutcheon 1989), and in architecture (e.g. Jencks 1989).

What then actually is meant and understood within the term intertextuality? As we can see above, intertextuality has become perhaps one of the most celebrated but nebulous concepts in the academy these days, and one which has been both formulated and theorised, and reformulated and re-theorised, across a large number of disciplines, in a large number of ways, for a large variety of purposes, with a predictably large number of outcomes. Its broad frame of reference⁹² and rapid uptake is not without its critics however, and as Plottel (1978) points out beneath, the breadth and attractiveness of such a notion raises its own problems:

“Intertextuality is a fashionable word in academic literary circles. This is to be expected when we consider that the word implies a subtle sensation of a very special learnedness and pomposity! Such characteristics are the leading

⁹¹ Although see Orr (2003: 6ff) who argues that despite the widespread literature on the term, in fact this body is much less than it should by rights be, because a substantial amount of theorising in languages other than English, such as French, Slav, Central European, and German, never makes it into English / English-language-speaking theorists' bibliographies – Orr gives the example of the edited collection of Broich and Pfister (1985) written in German, whose “ground-breaking” essays are rarely cited.

⁹² See e.g. Culler (1981: 4) for an example of a very broad frame of reference: “What makes a series of noises perceptible as a sequence of meaningful elements is the entire phonological, grammatical and semantic system of a language, and intertextuality, through this analogy, designates everything that enables one to recognise pattern and meaning in texts” (Culler 1981: 104)

assets of most literary terms that come to be in vogue. Another shorter term would surely be more desirable, but none has yet been devised to convey the message of intertextuality” (Plottel 1978. Cited in Orr 2003: 2)

Whether such criticism is justified or not, Plottel (*ibid*) is certainly right to comment on the difficulties of conveying the message(s) of intertextuality – it is undoubtedly a phenomenon which by its very nature of emphasising relationality and problems of signification is very hard to pin down (e.g. Orr 2003: 6ff) or operationalise (e.g. Culler 1981)⁹³; and once pinned down, perhaps it then ironically may lose much of what it may actually, by some accounts, be. The term and its perceived founders have, perhaps rather ironically too given the manner of its rise in the turmoil of Paris in 1968, often been canonised (e.g. Allen 2000), and yet it remains, as a concept, as elusive as ever.

It may, according to some, not even be such a revelatory phenomenon anyway. Echoing the scepticism suggested in the quotation from Plottel (*ibid*) earlier, Plett for instance argues that much of the theorising under the broad notion of intertextuality is “incomprehensible on the one hand and old wine in new bottles on the other” (Plett 1991b: 11) – and certainly if we look back even as far as Ancient Greece, we can see there is certainly plenty of “old wine” to be considered. Indeed, despite its current vogue status, it is important (even sobering perhaps) to remember that the concept of intertextuality has in fact been a recognised phenomenon in art for a very long time. For example, Plato discusses the concept of mimesis, the

⁹³ “It [intertextuality] is a difficult concept to use because of the vast and undefined discursive space it designates, but when one narrows it so as to make it more usable one either falls into [a] source trap of a traditional and positivistic kind (which is what the concept was designed to transcend) or else ends by naming particular texts as the pre-texts on the grounds of interpretive convenience” (Culler 1981: 109)

manner in which for Plato, an artist (a poet for example) is always bound to copy an earlier act of creation, which in turn is itself already a copy – in fact for Plato, all aspects and products of image-making, for example forms of literature such as tragedy and epic are mimetic⁹⁴, suggesting as do Kristeva (1980 & 1986) and Barthes (1974 & 1977a) many years later that a work of art cannot be viewed as an autonomous entity.

Plato even recognised the dialogic nature of philosophy, describing it as “serious truth seeking via a plurality of voices in a specific narrative context and in an ironic mode” (in Worton & Still 1990: 3ff), and in fact one might argue that the generic form of the Socratic Dialogue is inherently intertextual, in a way perhaps even quite similar to aspects of Bakhtinian dialogism⁹⁵. If we consider for example a typical situation in a Socratic Dialogue such as a chance encounter of Socrates with a friend which leads on to debates, we can often see this leading in turn to a play by Plato on and between the various different “social languages” (Bakhtin 1981) of the time, such as that of the authoritarian figure, the opinionated rhetorician, or the naïve and beautiful youth, each representing a belief system coming into dialogue, each perhaps almost reducible to a “voice” in the Bakhtinian sense, and certainly suggesting a highly dialogic, intertextual and heteroglossic scheme.

⁹⁴ See also Longinus, writing in an effort to elucidate the sublime (hypsos) in literature, or the true greatness that elevates, who claims that there are many paths to the sublime including “the zealous imitation of the great prose writers and poets of the past” (Longinus *On the Sublime* 13:2), suggesting imitation especially in terms of style – “no theft; it is rather like the reproduction of good character by sculptures or other works of art”.

⁹⁵ Indeed, Bakhtin (1984: 110) himself wrote that the Socratic dialogues represented “the first step in the history of the new genre of the novel”, and that “at the base of the genre [of the novel] lies the Socratic notion of the dialogic nature of truth, and the dialogic nature of human thinking about truth. The dialogic means of seeking truth is counterposed to official monologism, which pretends to possess a ready-made truth, and it is also counterposed to the naive self-confidence of those people who think that they know something, that is, who think that they possess certain truths. Truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual person; it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction.” (Bakhtin 1984: 110)

Perhaps Bloom's (1975 & 1976) Freudian-influenced ideas concerning what he terms "the anxiety of influence" are not such new wine either – for example Longinus argues that poetry is the overcoming of past influence, pointing out how Plato is involved in a fierce rivalry with Homer:

“[Plato's] striving heart and soul with Homer for first place, like a young contestant entering the ring with a long-admired champion, perhaps showing too keen a spirit of emulation in his desire to break a lance with him, so to speak, yet getting some profit from the encounter” (Longinus. On the Sublime ch.13, 120)

Although little of the theorising of Plato, Socrates or Longinus is directly applicable in this study, it is interesting to observe that notions of dialogism and intertextuality, and curiosity about what constitutes an author, are certainly not the sole preserve of recent academic interest⁹⁶.

Whether and/or to what extent intertextuality is or is not “old wine in new bottles” (Plett *ibid*), it is certainly a very challenging concept which has substantial implications for much theorising in contemporary academic life, and one which is central to this study – this chapter therefore aims to formulate a working conceptualisation of the term so as to delineate just what it actually is this study will

⁹⁶ See also McClellan (1990: 235) who sees elements of medieval rhetorical theory in Bakhtin's theories: “He [Bakhtin] employs the same communication model of speaker/utterance/listener, and he preserves, or rather, reinvents the conflation of speech and writing which occurred in the theory of the Middle Ages when rhetoric, a theory of oratory, was adapted to the study of texts. Both modelling schemes stress the persuasive aspect of discourse and emphasize the importance of the other, the listener, in its generation. Both frameworks are oriented toward contextuality: the practical, ideological environment in which discourse is conducted. Finally, rhetorical and dialogic theories have a materialist view of language. For both, the utterance is the ideological body of language”. McClellan (1990: 235)

be investigating and how this will be done, and based on this, what can be read into the study and what implications any findings may have. As such, this chapter begins by reviewing the writings of Bakhtin (1981 & 1986, Voloshinov 1973, Medvedev 1928 in Morris 1994), as these will underpin the understanding(s) used in this study, before moving on to examine how some of these ideas have been developed and/or applied within Applied Linguistics broadly (e.g. Fairclough 1992, Hyland 2000, Bazerman 1981 & 1988, Swales 1990). The chapter will use these reviews to end with a description of how this study understands and theorises intertextuality, and how this informs the methodology needing to be devised for the study. More recent theorisations of the term within literary theory (Foucault 1972, Barthes 1974, 1975 & 1977a, Kristeva 1980 & 1986, Culler 1981) however are, while undoubtedly of great interest, not ones which inform this study to any great degree due to the manner in which they remove authorhood from the concept – and authorhood, as we shall see, is central to the theorisation developed for this study.

2.2 Dialogism and Intertextuality

2.2.1 Bakhtin

Much of the theorising underlying the concept of intertextuality, and that informing this study, derives from Bakhtin⁹⁷ (see especially Bakhtin 1981 & 1986, Voloshinov 1973, and Medvedev 1928 in Morris 1994). Bakhtin (Voloshinov 1973), originally writing in response to Saussure's (1974) theories concerning the appropriate object of linguistic study and Saussure's (ibid) demarcation of what he termed *langue* and *parole*, objected to what he saw as the de-socialised and abstract nature of

⁹⁷ For convenience, this study takes Bakhtin, Voloshinov and Medvedev to be the same author, although the uncertainty surrounding this is never likely be satisfactorily resolved (see e.g. Emerson & Holquist 1986, Matejka & Titunik 1973, Hirschkop & Shepherd 2001, Morris 1994). When this study cites Voloshinov (1973) or Medvedev (1928 in Morris 1994) therefore, the references are to Bakhtin himself.

Saussure's (ibid) ideas, stressing that language⁹⁸ and the social are inseparable from each other. This is because language for Bakhtin is in essence a "continuous generative process implemented in the social-verbal interaction of speakers" (Volosihinov 1973: 2), meaning a structuralist account of language is insufficient for Bakhtin as it fails to account for the active creative capacity of language and the dynamic and evaluative nature of meaning(s) (Morris 1994: 4ff) in its use by human subjects. Instead for Bakhtin, signs as carriers of actual meaning only come into being on "interindividual territory" (Voloshinov 1973: 12) and language only ever "is" anything in the borderzone between two consciousnesses – and in this sense therefore, the study of langue (Saussure ibid) as a unitary system is nothing but "abstract objectivism" (Voloshinov ibid) without the inclusion of the speaking, or as Bakhtin himself would have it, the uttering subject.

Therefore for Bakhtin, the starting point for any analyses of language must be based on a dynamic view of language as an inherently social, ideological, and (inter-)subjective sphere of human activity, as language is unitary "only as an abstract grammatical system of normative forms, taken in isolation from the concrete, ideological conceptualisations that fill it, and in isolation from the uninterrupted process of historical becoming that is characteristic of all living language" (Bakhtin 1981: 288). In this sense for Bakhtin, the word and idea are living entities, only ever taking meaning and thus 'real' shape at the borderline between individual

⁹⁸ Bakhtin (or perhaps translations of Bakhtin) seem to use the terms word, discourse, utterance and language with broadly similar meanings, except that utterance seems to suggest a 'piece' of actual authentic discourse as actually uttered between human subjects, and can refer to anything from a single word to a complete novel, while the word, language and discourse seem to suggest a broader term of reference. The original Russian word is "slovo", which can signify both discourse and/or an individual word. The key point is that "slovo" always implies a word / words as they are uttered, not language in the abstract (Morris 1994: 1). This study generally uses the term word or discourse except where reference is made to a specific discrete piece of uttered authentic discourse, in which case the term utterance is used.

consciousnesses in the shape of utterances⁹⁹, and are thus inherently what Bakhtin terms dialogic¹⁰⁰:

“[the word is] inter-individual and inter-subjective – the realm of its existence is not individual consciousness, but dialogic communion between consciousnesses” (Bakhtin 1986: 88)

Indeed for Bakhtin, it is this dialogic¹⁰¹ communion, framed in his earlier writings also within the notion of class struggle (Voloshinov 1973), which ensures the very life of the word as it is used in living dialogue between two consciousnesses. Bakhtin (Voloshinov 1973: 23) argues this within the notion of what he terms “reaccentuation”, this being the idea of the way a word is always (re-)used in specific, purposeful dialogic interaction, and thus with specific local contextual meaning. Bakhtin argues that it is precisely this “social multiaccentuality of the sign” (and thus the word) that ensures its “vitality and dynamism and ... capacity for further development” (Voloshinov 1973: 23). For Bakhtin, locating this earlier work as he does within a Marxist theorisation of language, this multiaccentuality of the sign means that the ruling class of a country or social group will always attempt

⁹⁹ Bakhtin defines an utterance as follows: “For speech can exist in reality only in the form of concrete utterances of individual speaking people, speech subjects. Speech is always cast in the form of an utterance belonging to a particular speaking subject, and outside this form it cannot exist. Regardless of how varied utterances may be in terms of their length, their content, and their compositional structure, they have common structural features as units of speech communication and, above all, quite clear-cut boundaries” (Bakhtin 1986: 71)

¹⁰⁰ Dialogue differs from the similar (Marxist) concept of dialectics in that while the former implies incompleteness, and indeed the impossibility of such closure, the latter very much implies closure, “Dialogue and dialectics. Take a dialogue and remove the voices (the partitioning of voices), remove the intonations (emotional and individualising ones), carve out abstract concepts and judgments from living words and responses, cram everything into one abstract consciousness – and that's how you get dialectics.” (Bakhtin 1986: 147)

¹⁰¹ This is not dialogue in the vernacular sense simply of face-to-face conversation but refers to communication broadly – “Dialogue can be understood in a broader sense, meaning not only direct, face-to-face, vocalized verbal communication between persons, but also verbal communication of any type whatsoever” (Voloshinov 1973:95)

to control this 'real' feature of the 'real' word by monologising the word and hoisting an approved single meaning upon it. Nevertheless, for Bakhtin, a living ideological sign is always dialogic by default, and thus any word can be reaccentuated¹⁰², and it is this which ensures language, and thus meaning, are never static – as Bakhtin argues, “a curse can be spoken as a word of praise – and any word can provoke its counter-word” (Voloshinov 1973: 23).

Language for Bakhtin then is not viewed simply as some abstract relational system which generates meaning and communication out of systemic difference (i.e. Saussure's (ibid) notion of *langue*), but instead it is viewed as very much a social and material practice and phenomenon, occurring in dialogic form between uttering agents and taking its life as meaning via “reaccentuation” within dialogic utterances only in so doing – language and the word therefore only “are” anything at the meeting-point of two consciousnesses, this is the arena of signification and meaning and in this sense, discourse, or “the production of actualised meaning” as Morris (1994: 4) neatly puts it, can only ever be studied as a communication event, as dialogic responsive interaction between two or more consciousnesses as realised in utterances.

This personal and socially situated nature of language and meaning, embodied in the utterances of real material uttering subjects, is also discussed by Bakhtin

¹⁰² In his later work “The Dialogic Imagination” (Bakhtin 1981), Bakhtin refers to this process of reaccentuation slightly differently as follows: “As a living, socio-ideological concrete thing, as heteroglot opinion, language, for the individual consciousness, lies on the borderline between oneself and the other. The word in language is half someone else's. It becomes 'one's own' only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention. Prior to this moment of appropriation, the word does not exist in a neutral and impersonal language (it is not, after all, out of a dictionary that a speaker gets his words!), but rather it exists in other people's mouths, in other people's concrete contexts, serving other people's intentions: it is from there that one must take the word, and make it one's own” (Bakhtin 1981: 293-4).

(Voloshinov 1973: 86) under the notion of the “addressivity” of language, the idea that ‘real’ language is always addressed at a ‘real’ interlocutor, meaning the “*word is a two-sided act ... determined equally by whose word it is and for whom it is meant. As word, it is precisely the product of the reciprocal relationship between speaker and listener, addresser and addressee*” (Voloshinov 1973: 86, italics in original). Because of this “addressivity” of language, meaning is therefore again best seen as the product of the synchronic relationship between speaker and hearer embodied in utterances, and thus is very much context-specific (Bakhtin 1981: 428).

This social, situated, temporary, dialogic, and inter-subjective nature of language and its production of meaning within utterances, and the consequent multiaccentuality of the sign, therefore means that words as signifying forms carry with them a multiplicity of potential meanings and a multiplicity of previous uses, which when extended means in turn that there are potentially limitless numbers of idiolects and sociolects within language as a whole. Bakhtin (1981: 221) terms this condition “heteroglossia”¹⁰³, and for Bakhtin, because language is social and historical in its origins but only “exists” in synchronic dialogic utterances between socially and historically-located real speakers (the “addressivity” and “dialogism” of language), heteroglossia is therefore a default condition of language at any given moment in history. Moreover because all language use is inherently ideological and involves the “reaccentuation” of linguistic forms, this means that for Bakhtin, the different languages constituting heteroglossia all inherently embody the world-views and ideologies of their users and as such “are specific points of view on the

¹⁰³ “Thus at any given moment of its historical existence, language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth,” (Bakhtin 1981: 291).

world, forms for conceptualising the world in words, specific world views, each characterised by its own objects, meanings, and values” (Bakhtin 1981: 291) which may “be juxtaposed to one another, mutually supplement one another, contradict one another, and be inter-related dialogically” (ibid: 292).

Heteroglossia¹⁰⁴ explains Bakhtin’s (ibid) idea that language in actual use at any time in history is therefore stratified into a wide variety of “social class dialects, languages of special groups, professional jargons ... genre languages, the languages of generations and age groups, of the authorities, of literary and political movements, historical epochs, etc” (ibid: 262-3), meaning by implication therefore that any instance of language use (as an utterance) embodies, indeed language as a whole is, the contesting social languages, viewpoints, meanings, histories, relations, expectations, experiences and so on of its different speakers and groups. This in turn means that language can only ever be a phenomenon characterised by a dialogic, contextual, and non-unitary nature, and therefore that “the life of any word is as a succession of utterances, in each of which its meanings are enriched, contested, annexed” (i.e. reaccentuated) (Voloshinov 1973: 72) – or in other words, language and meaning are never stable but are highly dynamic. Words, utterances and meaning therefore are still relational, as for Saussure (ibid), but not so much because of their relational place within an abstract system as because of the dialogic nature and “addressivity” of language.

¹⁰⁴ Bakhtin also uses the term “polyphonic” to describe the system of heteroglossia as it is realised in the specific art form of the novel, particularly novels by Dostoevsky, who impresses Bakhtin with his awareness of the multivoicedness of all discourse and his application of this feature to novelistic discourse – for Bakhtin, Dostoevsky hears his epoch as a “great dialogue” of “not only individual voices, but precisely and predominantly the dialogic relationship among voices, their dialogic interaction. He heard both the loud, recognised reigning voices of the epoch, that is, the reigning dominant ideas (official and unofficial), as well as voices still weak, ideas not yet fully emerged, latent ideas heard as yet by no one but himself, and the ideas which were just beginning to ripen, embryos of future world views” (Bakhtin 1984: 90).

Heteroglossia is seen by Bakhtin as a positive feature of language and social life, creating the conditions for free consciousness in people due to the effect of outsideness to language that the existence of multiple social discourses allows speakers to achieve (Morris 1994: 16). This happens because any monologic truth-claims made by one social language will, in situations where dialogism is not socially or politically repressed, be relativised by the existence of other views of the world. In this sense, as Morris (*ibid*) argues, the rich dialogic relations within heteroglossia bring about the “destruction of any absolute bonding of ideological meaning to language” (Bakhtin 1981: 369), resulting in a “radical revolution in the destinies of human discourses: the fundamental liberation of cultural-semantic and emotional intentions from the hegemony of a single language ... as an absolute form of thought¹⁰⁵” (*ibid*: 367).

Language for Bakhtin however is not solely a conflicting, relativising pot of random heteroglossia – for language to function as a workable signifying system within dialogic relations, there need to be some forces of centralisation also so as to guarantee mutual understanding. In this sense, Bakhtin (*ibid*: 272ff) sees two forces

¹⁰⁵ See though Bakhtin’s earlier (Voloshinov 1973) study of reported speech patterns which Bakhtin (*ibid*) argues suggests a historical process in which the boundaries between reporting and reported are increasingly eroded, thus weakening the truth-claims of either. Bakhtin (*ibid*) argues that an assertion made in reported speech will be destabilised/relativised by the intrusion of the opposing tones of the reporting speaker, while the reporting speaker’s authorial or narratorial authority is itself also undermined by the spill-over of tone or words from the reported speaker’s speech – curiously however, the final paragraph (Voloshinov 1973: 159) seems in fact to be rather ambivalent about this historical development in social and literary discourse whereby verbal expression has become simply the realm of ‘opinions’ with the resultant loss of “the word permeated with confident and categorical social value judgement, the word that really means and takes responsibility for what it says”. This seems perhaps somewhat contradictory to the overall ethos of Bakhtin’s writings, and leads Morris (1994: 13) to question whether this final paragraph may in fact be “disguised irony” (Morris 1994: 13).

operating in language, which he terms broadly as centripetal¹⁰⁶ and centrifugal forces, and it is the relations and balance between these two forces which guarantee both change in language (and thus thought too) and also sufficient mutual intelligibility for language to ‘function’. Moreover, for Bakhtin, these two forces are not just abstract forces operating anonymously across the system of language, instead they are embodied in each and every utterance in the total sphere of human communication. This notion of heteroglossia means therefore that all utterances in effect reaccentuate the word with varying degrees of centripetal or centrifugal force entering into this relation, and that not only are utterances dialogic in terms of their synchronic inter-personal and inter-group dialogism (their “addressivity”), but they are also dialogic in a diachronic sense too, in that they thus implicitly reach backwards to preceding utterances in the chain of speech communion as another source of their meaning – meaning language use in the form of the utterance, and therefore meaning itself too, is inherently historical as well as social.

The word thus comes to a current speaker with a long history meaning a speaker therefore cannot be considered “the biblical Adam, dealing only with virgin and still unnamed objects” (Bakhtin 1986: 93) – and as such an utterance is inescapably linked to history, to current and to future, as it takes its synchronic form in a moment of dialogue (its “addressivity”). In this manner therefore, for Bakhtin any synchronic utterance is not only “a moment in the continuous process of verbal communication” (Voloshinov 1973: 95) but also, and vitally, such “continuous

¹⁰⁶ Forces of centralisation for Bakhtin include Aristotelian poetics, poetics of the medieval church, and Cartesian neo-classicism (Morris 1994: 16) – in effect it is any hegemonic process involving the “victory of one reigning language (dialect) over the others, the supplanting of languages, their enslavement, the process of illuminating them with the “True Word”, the incorporation of barbarians and lower social strata into a unitary language of culture and truth, the canonisation of ideological systems” (Bakhtin 1981: 271)

verbal communication” is in turn itself “only a moment in the continuous, all-inclusive, generative process of a given social collective” (ibid: 95). Speakers in social groups therefore by necessity dialogue with the history of that group when they produce utterances within it, and are therefore involved in diachronic dialogism too.

This sense of the historicity of language and of the diachronic dialogism that a speaker therefore enters into in reaccentuating ‘the word’ is more explicitly laid out in Bakhtin’s later work “The Dialogic Imagination” (Bakhtin 1981: 276), in which Bakhtin points out that the topic of any utterance is “already as it were overlain with qualifications, open to dispute, charged with value, already enveloped in an obscuring mist” (ibid), meaning an utterance is therefore “entangled, shot through with shared thoughts, points of view, alien value judgements and accents” and as such “enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgements and accents, weaves in and out of complex inter-relationships, merges with some, recoils from others, intersects with yet a third group” (ibid). Therefore the form that an utterance takes is influenced not only by its dialogue with an immediate addressee, but also, and crucially, by the diachronic dialogism it enters into too, which for Bakhtin “may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile” (ibid: 276).

Here then we can better develop an understanding that an immediate material audience is not the only “addressed” other in an utterance¹⁰⁷, and that any instance of socially-situated language use as a “monument” is therefore intrinsically linked not only to the audience for whom it is intended (its addressivity), but also, and vitally, to the previous discourse that informs it and from which it emerges – and in this sense its form, as evidenced in its lexico-grammatical construction, will also therefore be influenced by this dialogic relation too. In other words therefore, all instances of discourse, or utterances, are formed in a dialogic melting-pot consisting not only of the audience at whom their reaccentuation is addressed in living dialogue, but crucially, of the social history of the word too. This results in what Dentith (1995: 89) aptly calls the “Janus face of the speaking subject”, in that the speaking subject is both immersed in a multiple past by using a language itself bearing traces of the past, and yet also turned towards the future in the shape of the hearer (or the “addressed”) of language.

Thus dialogism means that utterances derive part of their meaning, and indeed therefore part of their form, from the forge of their dialogue with an anterior corpus, likewise from the way they “address” (i.e. predict) potential future utterances, and likewise from the way they “address” a current interlocutor. Dialogism then exists at the level both of the interpersonal and of the historical, in that utterances reach out to an interlocutor and backwards or forwards in the dialogic chain of utterances, and it is these relationships and their dialogism which both shape the form and

¹⁰⁷ See also Bakhtin in his later work “The problem of Speech Genres” (Bakhtin 1986: 72): “Any utterance – from a short (single-word) rejoinder in everyday dialogue to the large novel or scientific treatise – has, so to speak, an absolute beginning and an absolute end: its beginning is preceded by the utterances of others, and its end is followed by the responsive utterances of others (or, although it may be silent, others’ active responsive understanding, or, finally, a responsive action based on this understanding).” (Bakhtin 1986: 72)

bestow a specific meaning on an utterance, and which breathe life into the abstract shell of language.

Consequently therefore, because language is “half someone else’s” (Bakhtin 1981: 294), it becomes a speaker’s own only when that speaker “populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention” (ibid). This process of the reuse of language via reaccentuation and the consequent dialogue with history thus involved is not a simple process however, and neither is it a given with every and any utterance equally open to reaccentuation by a speaker. Bakhtin in fact argues that the very opposite is true¹⁰⁸, and of particular difficulty in reaccentuation is discourse which Bakhtin characterises as the “authoritative word” (compared with what he terms “internally-persuasive discourse”¹⁰⁹). Such discourse is, as the term suggests, discourse which derives from the peaks of hegemonic structures and is language human subjects encounter “with its authority fused into it” (Bakhtin 1981: 342),

¹⁰⁸ “And not all words for just anyone submit equally easily to this appropriation, to this seizure and transformation into private property: many words stubbornly resist, others remain alien, sound foreign in the mouth of the one who appropriated them and who now speaks with them; they cannot be assimilated into his context and fall out of it; it is as if they put themselves in quotation marks against the will of the speaker. Language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker’s intentions; it is populated – overpopulated – with the intentions of others. Expropriating it, forcing it to submit to one’s own intentions and accents, is a difficult and complicated process.” (Bakhtin 1981: 293)

¹⁰⁹ “Internally-persuasive discourse” for Bakhtin is discourse that is inherently ‘easier’ for a speaker to relate to and/or dialogically interact with (i.e. to reaccentuate), and in so doing it is easier for a speaker to make such discourse ‘mean’ in an authentic, subjective manner. “Internally persuasive discourse...is, as it is affirmed through assimilation, tightly interwoven with ‘one’s own word’. In the everyday rounds of our consciousness, the internally persuasive word is half-ours and half-someone else’s. Its creativity and productiveness consist precisely in the fact that such a word awakens new and independent words, that it organizes masses of our words from within, and does not remain in an isolated and static condition... it enters into interanimating relationships with new contexts. More than that, it enters into an intense interaction, a *struggle* with other internally persuasive discourses...The semantic structure of an internally persuasive discourse is not *finite*, it is *open*; in each of the new contexts that dialogise it, this discourse is able to reveal ever new *ways to mean*” (Bakhtin 1986: 345. Italics in original). Internally-persuasive discourse then is discourse which assists in the construction of the human subject¹⁰⁹, or as Morris puts it, “it functions as one of those creative borderzones upon which new meaning is produced; in this case, the self” (Morris 1994: 78).

authority which is unquestionable as its authority “was already acknowledged in the past” (ibid). As such, it is “*prior* discourse” which “demands our unconditional allegiance” and therefore “permits no play with the context framing it, no play with its borders, no gradual and flexible transmissions, no spontaneously stylising variants on it” (ibid). As examples of “the authoritative word”, Bakhtin lists religious, political and moral discourse, the words of a father, acknowledged scientific truth, and a currently fashionable book. This is discourse then that in permitting “no play with its borders” and demanding to remain static, expresses the intent and word of “the other” and is therefore difficult to reaccentuate with the subjective intentions of a current speaker (unless presumably that is the person (re)using such discourse is him/herself a priest, politician and so on) – it is discourse which demands both “reverential transmission” and “reverential reception” (Bakhtin 1986: 121) for itself and therefore too for the social frameworks and history behind it.

Language as word or utterance for Bakhtin therefore is not just random parole as an output of a speaker’s langue, but is systematic and patterned by specific social and historical forces, and as word or utterance takes these systematic shapes and forms (both lexico-grammatical and prosodic) not only via the synchronic dialogism with the addressed other(s) of an utterance but also, and crucially, via the diachronic dialogism implicated in its reaccentuation in so doing. This theorisation of language as systematic living utterances derived from social and historical dialogism is most explicitly formulated in Bakhtin’s theorisations of speech genres (see especially Bakhtin 1986), and it is to this rich area of Bakhtin’s work that we now turn.

2.2.2 Bakhtin and Genre

For Bakhtin (see especially Bakhtin 1986), genre is the concept that locates the speaker, or author, against the history of the language s/he is reaccentuating in living dialogue with an addressed other. As such, for Bakhtin (Bakhtin 1986: 81), speech genres impose order and form on living language use and thus on heteroglossia too, and dramatically affect how meaning is ‘made’¹¹⁰ and how people use language¹¹¹ – and therefore are a means for Bakhtin to formalise the dialogic links discussed above between the history of the word and its current (re-)use in the specific dialogic situation of the utterance.

For Bakhtin (ibid), the very nature of an utterance and particularly their “addressivity” (Voloshinov 1973) means that while a sentence may have grammatical boundaries and completeness in this sense, an utterance on the other hand presupposes “active living responses” to it, and thus this dialogism means the boundaries of the utterance (a change of speaking subject) do not imply closure but that the utterance joins with the whole chain of utterances from that arena and becomes embedded within it, both (re)living that chain and providing the opportunity for more utterances to join it. This is the basis for how genres develop as stable, contemporary forms of utterances and/or groups of utterances (as opposed to developing as abstract forms of language¹¹² and/or remaining as historical shells), and for Bakhtin, because speech genres as typical forms of utterance are associated

¹¹⁰ Countering the post-structuralist perspective, genres can be seen in this sense as stabilising Derrida’s (e.g. 1987) infamous view of discourse as the “free play of signifiers”.

¹¹¹ “The speaker is not the biblical Adam, dealing only with virgin and still unnamed objects, giving them names for the first time.” (Bakhtin 1986: 93)

¹¹² “A speech genre is not a form of language, but a typical form of utterance; as such, the genre also includes a certain typical kind of expression that inheres within it. In the genre the word acquires a particular typical expression. Genres correspond to typical situations of speech communication, typical themes, and, consequently, also to particular contacts between the *meanings* of words and actual concrete reality under certain typical circumstances” (Bakhtin 1986: 87)”

with particular spheres of communication, they consequently develop relatively stable types describable in terms of thematic content, style and compositional structure (ibid: 60).

For Bakhtin therefore, genres are historical, discursively-constituted entities, evolving from and maintained via dialogic utterances between interlocutors¹¹³, both diachronic and synchronic, which influence the way a current interlocutor may speak about a theme (i.e. a topic), in that in discoursing on a theme, that interlocutor cannot help but enter into dialogue with the history of discoursing on that theme, as genre and its constitutive diachronic utterances, too. In this sense for Bakhtin, genres are not created by a speaker but are given to him/her as pre-formed entities, which have a “normative influence”¹¹⁴. Nevertheless for Bakhtin, although genres have “a normative significance” (Bakhtin 1986: 81) on a speaker, his image of “primary” genres absorbing “secondary” genres, (ibid: 62) identifies the fact that for Bakhtin, genres are certainly not static entities, but evolve as forms via their ongoing dialogic uses in cultural communication.

Genres for Bakhtin organise and frame all types of cultural communication, from the everyday to the highly complex, and as well as influencing the form of contemporary dialogic utterances, genres are the very structures within which

¹¹³ This is probably the key distinction between Bakhtin and more contemporary theorisations of intertextuality such as Kristeva's, the central and active role of the human subject in the processes of creating and (re-)living diachronically-connected series of utterances. The removal of the human subject is what led to the term *intertextuality* as opposed to the more Bakhtinian concept of *intersubjectivity*.

¹¹⁴ “A speaker is given not only mandatory forms of the national language (lexical composition and grammatical structure), but also forms of utterances that are mandatory, that is speech genres. The latter are just as necessary for mutual understanding as are forms of language. Speech genres are much more changeable, flexible, and plastic than language forms are, but they have a normative significance for their speaking individual, and they are not created by him but are given to him” (Bakhtin 1986: 80-1)

utterances take their meaning(s)¹¹⁵, and are even the very means by which we learn language(s) in the first place (ibid: 78-9). Indeed for Bakhtin, it seems that being able to communicate in any sphere of cultural life is genre-based from start to finish, and difficulty of communication in any sphere of cultural life is genre-derived rather than a reflection of intellect or ‘language level’ (ibid: 80).

In these senses then, genres are not only the very means by which utterances take life for Bakhtin (in the sense particularly that an utterance only takes meaning within a genre and in concert with the other utterances that constitute that genre), but also a major influence on how a speaker casts the form of his/her synchronic utterance – or in his oft-quoted own words, “utterances and their types, that is, speech genres, are the drive belts from the history of society to the history of language” (ibid: 65).

What become particularly important here are the relationship(s) implied between human agency (in the sense of a speaker-speaking-a-language) and language structure (in the sense of a language-speaking-a-speaker (e.g. Barthes 1977a, Foucault 1979)). Where does human agency end and textual determination begin? Where and when does dialogical history as embodied in genres overcome individual agency? In truth there seems to be no clear cut-off point for Bakhtin – when discoursing in a given area, a speaker cannot help but become involved with the previous discoursing connected with it¹¹⁶ (i.e. genres) and human agents are

¹¹⁵ See Wittgenstein (1953) for a comparative view of what Wittgenstein terms “language games” and how such “language games” can function in (temporarily at least) stabilising meaning. See also Berkenhotter & Huckin’s (1995) notion of “situated cognition”.

¹¹⁶ “The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousnesses around the given object of an utterance, it cannot fail to

subject to the “normative significance” of such genres¹¹⁷; and yet the concepts of “dialogism” and “reaccentuation”, in tandem with the explicitly identified point that genres constantly evolve and change, clearly locate meaning as also residing in a speaker’s subjective, purposeful living utterance too, indeed the very notion of “utterance” for Bakhtin points to the integral role of the current speaker in his theories.

Therefore, although utterances within a specific sphere of cultural communication “are not indifferent to one other, and are not self-sufficient” (ibid: 91), and “are aware of and mutually reflect one another” (ibid), and despite the fact too that “these mutual reflections determine their character” (ibid), it is still the case that the role of the author is of great importance. This is identified in two explicit ways by Bakhtin. Firstly, he talks of a speaker’s “speech will”, which gives a speaker the opportunity to choose which genre to cast his/her utterance within – albeit that this choice is determined by “the specific nature of the given sphere of speech communication” and the “concrete situation of the speech communication” (Bakhtin 1986: 78), meaning therefore that once the speaker has made this choice via his/her “speech will”, s/he then becomes, despite the individuality and subjectivity of the speaker’s speech plan, subject to the genre, meaning his/her utterance is shaped and developed within a certain generic form (Bakhtin 1986: 78).

become an active participant in social dialogue. After all, the utterance arises out of this dialogue as a continuation of it and as a rejoinder to it – it does not approach the object from the sidelines. ... The word is born in a dialogue as a living rejoinder within it; the word is shaped in dialogic interaction with an alien word that is already in the object. A word forms a concept of its own object in a dialogic way” (Bakhtin 1981: 276)

¹¹⁷ “When we understand that communicative interaction takes place largely through genres and . . . that genres are public constructs – and not internal transcendental categories – we no longer need to think of the production and the reception of discourse in terms of internal cognitive processes that, in turn, lead directly to the old Cartesian problems of scepticism and relativism. Because all communicative interaction takes place through the utterance and is consequently genre bound, both the production and the reception of discourse become thoroughly hermeneutical social activities and not the internal subjective activities of a private mind”. (Kent 1981: 302)

The second explicit identification of the importance of the role of the author for Bakhtin is more important, and is identified by the wide range of positions that an author can take up with regard to the “normalising” previous utterances within a genre:

“Others’ utterances can be introduced directly into the context of the utterance, or one may introduce only individual words or sentences, which then act as representatives of the whole utterance. Both whole utterances and individual words can retain their alien expression, but they can also be reaccentuated (ironically, indignantly, reverently, and so forth)¹¹⁸. Others’ utterances can be repeated with varying degrees of reinterpretation. They can be referred to as though the interlocutor were already well aware of them; they can be silently presupposed; or one’s responsive reaction to them can be reflected only in the expression of one’s own speech – in the selection of language means and intonations that are determined not by the topic of one’s own speech but by the other’s utterances concerning the same topic” (Bakhtin 1986: 91-2)

Thus while the previous utterances within a sphere of cultural communication and within that sphere’s constitutive genre may indeed be “normalising”, for Bakhtin (ibid) the author can nevertheless maintain an active role¹¹⁹ by deciding how s/he

¹¹⁸ Bakhtin also phrases this idea using verbs rather than adverbs, saying that an utterance can respond to others coming before it such that it “refutes, affirms, supplements, and relies on the others, presupposes them to be known, and somehow takes them into account” (Bakhtin 1986: 91)

¹¹⁹ This must presumably assume various political and religious freedoms, though Bakhtin does not explicitly seem to say this as such. This is probably due to the social and historical context in which he wrote.

will respond to (or dialogue with) this history inside his/her synchronic utterances, or in other words what relationship(s) s/he will adopt with this history and its constitutive utterances – in this manner acting in effect too as a catalyst in ensuring that the genre and its sphere remains vital and living¹²⁰. Indeed, Bakhtin (ibid) himself seems to see an element of author/genre conflict as vital to meaning, as that which is productive even of all new meaning – it is the very interaction of contradictory and differing voices which is creative for Bakhtin (ibid) and ensures the life of the word¹²¹, in that “the idea begins to live, that is, to take shape, to develop, to find and renew its verbal expression, to give birth to new ideas, only when it enters into genuine dialogic relationships with other ideas, with the ideas of others” (Bakhtin 1984: 88). And such a process depends on active, dialogic responsive understanding as “understanding [that] remains purely passive, purely receptive, contributes nothing new to the word” (ibid: 88).

This means therefore that dialogism between an author’s synchronic utterance(s) and the historical utterances constituting a genre is quite simply inevitable, even if/when that dialogism is downplayed by that author as an expression of his/her

¹²⁰ See also Giddens (1984) and his theory of what he terms “structuration”: “The basic domain of study of the social sciences, according to the theory of structuration, is neither the experience of the individual actor, nor the existence of any form of social totality, but social practices ordered across space and time. Human social activities, like some self-reproducing items in nature, are recursive. That is to say, they are not brought into being by social actors but continually recreated by them via the very means whereby they express themselves as actors. In and through their activities agents reproduce the conditions that make these activities possible.” (Giddens 1984: 2). See also Berkenhotter & Huckin (1995: 4) on “duality of structure” in genres.

¹²¹ And for Bakhtin, also ensures the evolution of the life of the human subject too: “In what way would it enrich the event if I merged with the other, and instead of two there would be now only one? And what would I myself gain by the other’s merging with me? If he did, he would see and know no more than what I see and know myself; he would merely repeat in himself that want of any issue out of itself which characterizes my own life. Let him rather remain outside of me, for in that position he can see and know what I myself do not see and do not know from my own place, and he can essentially enrich the event of my own life.” (Bakhtin, 1990: 87)

“speech will”¹²². It seems clear then that diachronic dialogism is a default condition of all discourse, indeed is constitutive of discourse, but that crucially an author has some ability to fashion, or as this study terms it, to manage the degree to which this dialogism is or is not evident. In this way, an author is subject to the history of a genre but not necessarily mechanically determined by it¹²³ – an author’s voice can mean only in relation with other authors’ utterances too:

“I can mean what I say, but only indirectly, at a second remove, in the words I take and give back to the community according to the protocols it establishes. My voice can mean, but only with others: at times in chorus, but at the best of times in dialogue” (Bakhtin 1981: 165)

Diachronic dialogism within and between utterances therefore can be promoted or downplayed by a speaker¹²⁴, or as this study understands it, managed by a speaker, and although Bakhtin himself rarely, if ever, seems to explicitly state it as such, this choice, while likely being personal in some situations, also in effect therefore becomes a political act (Lemke 1995) in that it marks a speaker’s relationship with

¹²² “However monological the utterance may be (for example, a scientific or philosophical treatise), however much it may concentrate on its own object, it cannot but be, in some measure, a response to what has already been said about the given topic, on the given issue, even though this responsiveness may not have assumed a clear-cut external expression. It will be manifested in the overtones of the style, in the finest nuances of the composition. The utterance is filled with dialogic overtones, and they must be taken into account in order to understand fully the style of the utterance. After all, thought itself – philosophical, scientific and artistic – is born and shaped in the process of interaction and struggle with others’ thought, and this cannot but be reflected in the forms that verbally express our thoughts as well” (Bakhtin 1986: 92).

¹²³ Indeed, for Bakhtin, it is precisely an active authorial persona that makes mankind: “an independent, responsible and active discourse is the fundamental indicator of an ethical, legal and political human being” (Bakhtin 1981: 349-50)

¹²⁴ In his late essay “Problems of the text in Linguistics, Philology, and the Human Sciences: An Experiment in Philosophical Analysis” (Bakhtin 1981: 121), Bakhtin describes this in more detail thus: “the narrow understanding of dialogism as argument, polemics, or parody. These are the most externally obvious, but crude forms of dialogism. Confidence in another’s word, reverential reception (the authoritative word) ... agreement, in its infinite gradations and shadings, ... the combination of many voices (a corridor of voices) that augments understanding, departure beyond the limits of the understood, and so forth”

bodies of discourse – which in turn can confer identity(ies) on both the speaker and on those prior bodies of discourse (Kristeva 1980 & 1986) – and when those bodies of discourse derive from institutionalised structures¹²⁵, such social relationships can become political. In such situations, to realise this dialogism as a chorus (i.e. as downplayed, or as “reverential reception” (ibid: 121)) is a very different political act to realising it as naked disagreement (i.e. as celebrated). What is also very important within this is the notion that this diachronic dialogism, the kind of dialogism which in effect constitutes the genre of the undergraduate lecture, is a phenomenon which can be managed, and moreover, different managements are likely to confer different identities not only on a speaker but, and importantly, on the bodies of discourse involved too¹²⁶.

Bakhtin also discusses this tension between individual subjective creativity and the normalising influences of genre in his earlier work (Medvedev 1928 in Morris 1994: 175ff), in which the Kantian distinction between reality (noumena) and representation (phenomena) that implicitly underlies his theorisations of dialogism and genre is explicitly articulated for one of the few times in his writings. However, as we might expect from Bakhtin’s constant emphasis on the need to study language as it is uttered in dialogic interaction so as to move beyond “abstract objectivism”, it is not language as an abstract system that constitutes reality, but language as it is uttered, i.e. utterances and genres (Medvedev 1928 in Morris 1994: 178). This

¹²⁵ In fact the strong suggestion of idealism (later theorised in among other ways as Social Constructionism e.g. Bruffee 1986) underlying Bakhtin’s work means we might talk here not only about bodies of discourse as merely deriving from institutionalised structures but bodies of discourse as actually creating those institutionalised structures in the first place.

¹²⁶ As Kristeva (1986: 37) neatly puts this idea, “any text is the absorption and transformation of another”. This notion draws attention to the recursive and cyclical nature of intertextuality as system, in that the construction of a new text for Kristeva, or the reaccentuation of new discourse/utterances in a Bakhtinian sense, necessarily implies a reorganisation of the whole body of text(s) or code(s) or utterances that came before it, and indeed that constituted it – or at least that brought about the conditions for its existence.

relationship between utterances and reality is mutually constitutive for Bakhtin however, so neither reality nor genre seems to have the leading role. However, Bakhtin clearly sees genre as the key to viewing reality, and sees too that the distribution of the necessary genres is also social and political¹²⁷ in that “a given consciousness is richer or poorer in genres, depending on its ideological environment.” (Medvedev 1928 in Morris 1994: 178).

The consequence of this for Bakhtin is clear – reality does not present itself to the human subject free from genre, and without genre the human subject may not even ‘be aware of’ reality; yet simultaneously, the act of (re-)representing reality by a human subject in turn extends reality, because “new means of representation force us to see new aspects of visible reality” (Medvedev 1928 in Morris 1994: 178-9) – reality and the genres it is (re-)represented in are thus “inseparable from the other” (ibid).

This allows Bakhtin to argue therefore that in art, the formal unity of a genre lies in what he terms its “double orientation to social reality” (in Morris 1994: 175) – extrinsically, it is determined by its conditions of actualisation in real time and space, while intrinsically it is determined by “the thematic unity of the form understood as the total conception of reality produced by the generic structure as a whole” (ibid). In other words, a genre gains its ‘sense’ and meaning-making

¹²⁷ See also Bernstein (e.g. Bernstein 1990 & 1996) on the distribution of such genre-consciousness(es) as social and/or political in nature, or writers from contemporary literacy studies (e.g. Candlin & Plum (eds) 1998, Barton et al (eds) 1999, Barton 1994, Lea & Street 1998 & 1999) on literacy as a social phenomenon, or detailed ethnographic studies of literacy and the social (e.g. Heath 1983, Barton & Hamilton 1998)

potential both out of the sum total of utterances in it as a structure¹²⁸, and in the interaction of that potential with the human subject in its moment of (re-)articulation. This locates genre as a thoroughly social, dialogic (and close to intertextual in the Kristevan sense of the word) phenomenon.

This seems to be a somewhat more structure-heavy theorisation of agency and system than was the case in Bakhtin's later work discussed previously (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986), but still gives some degree of human agency. The notion of genres as preparing the horizon of the human mind for 'new' reality to be 'noticed' is the key difference – in his later work, it seems that while dialogism implicitly reaches into the future, it is less constitutive of social reality than in this earlier work. Nevertheless, the spectre of idealism that underlies Bakhtinian theorisations of language and genre is fully explicated here, and is an essentially important background to the ideas, not least because if the 'theme' or 'object' at which utterances are addressed is itself a discursive dialogic construct 'constructed' by a genre, then the implications for dialogism are severe – a human subject discoursing on that 'theme' or 'object' cannot possibly avoid dialoguing with those previous utterances that constructed it in the first place, as the 'theme' or 'object' is little more than the product of those utterances anyway¹²⁹.

¹²⁸ Cf. Berkenhotter & Huckin (1995) and their notion of "situated cognition", meaning knowledge produced within and through genres is indexical (Garfinkel 1967), the product of the same activity and situations in which it is produced (Berkenhotter & Huckin 1995: 11).

¹²⁹ Bakhtin's thought here is strikingly similar to that of Bruffee (e.g. Bruffee 1986), one of the main proponents of the so-called social constructionist approach to knowledge – [social constructionism] "assumes that the matrix of thought is not the individual self but some community of knowledgeable peers and the vernacular language of that community. That is, social construction understands knowledge and the authority of knowledge as community-generated, community-maintaining symbolic artefacts. Indeed, some social constructionists go so far in their nonfoundationalism as to assume . . . that even what we think of as the individual self is a construct largely community generated and community maintained." (Bruffee 1986: 777)

2.2.3 Conclusion on Bakhtin and Dialogism

Bakhtinian theorisation of the utterance, dialogism and genre is what informs the conceptualisation of intertextuality in this study, particularly regarding the ideas that genres derive from and are constituted by diachronic dialogism, and are then reconstituted via synchronic dialogism within addressed synchronic utterances. This is particularly relevant in academic, disciplinary genres, and this study understands therefore that the genre of the undergraduate lecture is the institutional embodiment of and site for the synchronic reaccentuation and/or reproduction of those disciplinary diachronic dialogic processes that constitute(d) disciplinary knowledge. Moreover, and central in this investigation, this study understands that this process can be managed by a speaker, such that differing degrees and/or kinds of reaccentuation of a discipline's constitutive, diachronic utterances can take place in this genre, ranging from "reverential transmission" to "intense interaction", lecturer and discipline in chorus to lecturer and discipline in dialogue – and furthermore, and equally importantly, this study understands that this management confers identities on both a speaker (lecturer) and on the prior bodies of discourse involved (academic discipline, academic knowledge, and their constitutive discourses)¹³⁰. However, before we move on to explicate this in more detail, we will firstly examine how the concept has been drawn upon and dialogued with by theorists in applied linguistics, as this will help in developing means of assessing how these processes above are manageable in discourse.

2.3 Intertextuality and Applied Linguistics

¹³⁰ See also Kristeva (1986: 37): "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another". An undergraduate lecture absorbs and transforms disciplinary discourses, or quotations, and this process can be managed differently, resulting in differing degrees of absorption and transformation. Quotations here are not meant by Kristeva in the literal sense.

In this section we will look at how intertextuality has been theorised and investigated in the broad area of applied linguistics, using Fairclough's (1992) useful division of intertextuality into two different types, manifest and constitutive, to do so.

2.3.1 Fairclough

One of the criticisms sometimes levelled at theorisations of intertextuality, the lack of textual analysis to inform such theorisations (e.g. Culler 1981, Plett 1991), is tackled by Fairclough (see especially Fairclough 1992 & 1995) via what he terms his textually-oriented discourse approach (TODA) (Fairclough 1992: 37ff), which attempts to fuse Foucaultian discourse theory (e.g. Foucault 1972) with textual analysis.

Fairclough (1992: 84), basing his ideas on Bakhtin, describes intertextuality broadly as:

“basically the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth” (Fairclough 1992: 84)

However, Fairclough (ibid: 104ff) identifies what he sees as a clear distinction between two broad types of intertextuality, which he terms “manifest intertextuality” and “constitutive intertextuality”.

2.3.2 Fairclough and Constitutive Intertextuality

The first of these broad types of intertextuality, “constitutive intertextuality” or “interdiscursivity” (the term Fairclough (ibid) later settles on) is described as:

“the configuration of discourse conventions that go into its [a text’s] production” (Fairclough 1992: 104)

This second, perhaps more abstract, type of intertextuality sees texts as being constituted in two different ways, firstly as constituted via the paradigmatic axis in terms of the “interdiscursivity” (see also Kristeva 1986) of a text, or what “semiotic resources” are used to constitute a text; and secondly as constituted via the syntagmatic axis in terms of the effects of what Fairclough (ibid) describes as “intertextual chains” on a text.

These understandings of intertextuality give two broad forms of analysis. Looking at the syntagmatic axis of constitutive intertextuality firstly, Fairclough (1992: 130) describes “intertextual chains” thus:

“particular practices within and across institutions have associated with them particular ‘intertextual chains’, series of types of texts which are transformationally related to each other in the sense that each member of the series is transformed into one or more of the others in regular and predictable ways” (Fairclough 1992: 130)

On one level, this means the analyst can follow a text and see what “intertextual chains” it enters into. On a deeper level though, this is in fact Bakhtin’s notion of dialogism operationalised and extended, in that it takes Bakhtin’s vital point that all

utterances (or “monuments” in Voloshinov’s (1973) terms) are a response to previous and future utterances (part of their “addressivity” and “dialogism”), and thus in effect form sequences or chains. This means that utterances can be looked at with regard to how their position in such dialogic sequences influences their forms, and which dialogic sequences influence which texts in which ways. In other words, analysing “intertextual chains” may help the analyst to assess how the constitution of a text is affected by its dialogic situation in a larger chain (Fairclough 1992: 130) – and thus in this way help the analyst to examine the syntagmatic axis of constitutive intertextuality (Fairclough 1992: 130).

Fairclough gives as an example an ‘original’ discourse event such as a speech by a politician which may then become a part of various media texts, the subject of reports, the topic of analyses, subject to commentaries by diplomats or other politicians, the topic of academic books or articles, or provide the generating force behind other speeches which paraphrase, elaborate on, answer it and so on (Fairclough 1992: 131). As this original discourse event passes into these “intertextual chains”, it may be changed and (re-)represented, and thus (re-)constituted, in different ways. This can be compared to parts of a casual conversation for example, which will form very different chains as they move into new discursive contexts – in this sense, different texts vary with regard to the types of distributional networks and intertextual chains they enter into (Fairclough 1992: 131), and the transformations that happen in this process can also be diverse and very different (Fairclough 1992: 131). An undergraduate lecture can be understood as one part of an intertextual chain, specifically a disciplinary intertextual chain. This helps us to understand this genre as a coherent genre, in that undergraduate

lectures are all part of disciplinary chains, though this relationship is perhaps likely to be more formalised in *Pure* (Becher 1989) disciplines than in *Applied* (ibid) disciplines.

Regarding the constitution of texts on the “paradigmatic axis” on the other hand (i.e. the semiotic resources broadly that go into constituting a text), this leads to the second broad form of the analysis of intertextuality for Fairclough, analyses of “interdiscursivity” in terms of what resources a text draws on from the “orders of discourse” (Foucault 1969 & 1972) available to it. For Fairclough (ibid), “orders of discourse” are “the totality of discursive practices within an institution or society” (Fairclough 1992: 43) or “the particular configurations of conventionalised practices ... available to text producers and interpreters in particular social circumstances” (Fairclough 1992b: 194)¹³¹. Studies of this understanding of intertextuality, interdiscursivity, therefore aim to illustrate how a text is constituted in terms of which of the potential constitutive elements available in “orders of discourse” are drawn on.

The potential elements or ‘text types’ available from an order of discourse for the constitution of a text are specified by Fairclough (ibid: 124ff) as ‘genre’, ‘activity type’, ‘style’, and ‘discourse’. Of these four types, genre (as with manifest intertextuality) is seen by Fairclough (ibid) as overarching, because Fairclough (ibid) sees genres as corresponding closely to types of social practice, and he (ibid) maintains therefore that a system of genres at a particular time determines which

¹³¹ Fairclough also describes an order of discourse as follows: “a society, or a particular institution or domain within it, has a particular configuration of genres in particular relationships to each other, constituting a system. And, of course, the configuration and system are open to change” (Fairclough 1992: 126)

combinations and configurations the other four 'text types' types can occur in a text¹³² (ibid: 126), echoing Bakhtin's (1986: 60) notion of "compositional structure" and the way that primary genres are drawn into and rearticulated in/by secondary genres.

Fairclough's (ibid) notion of activity type¹³³ meanwhile seems to emphasise genre-as-action even more strongly, but the most autonomous of the four 'text types' besides genre for Fairclough (ibid: 127) is discourse, which he sees as corresponding to dimensions of texts traditionally discussed in terms of content, ideational meaning, topic, or subject matter. Fairclough (ibid) uses the term 'discourse' though because it better emphasises the construction of a subject-matter, important for Fairclough (ibid) because the "contents or subject-matters – areas of knowledge – only enter texts in the mediated form of particular constructions of them" (Fairclough 1992: 128).

Fairclough (ibid: 114ff) uses a credit card advertisement as an example of an analysis of "interdiscursivity", and comments on how "the text manifests a pattern of alteration at the level of the sentence between the discourse types of financial regulation and advertising" (ibid: 115). This leads to his claim (ibid: 117) of "a colonising movement of advertising from the domain commodity marketing in a

¹³² See also Kress & Threadgold (1988) for a view on how genres determine intertextual relations

¹³³ Fairclough describes activity types as follows: "an activity type can be specified in terms of the structured sequence of actions of which it is composed, and in terms of the participants involved in the activity – that is, the set of subject positions which are socially constituted and recognised in connection with the activity type." (Fairclough 1992: 126). Fairclough gives the example of buying goods in a shop, which will result in a customer and shop assistant assuming subject types and following a sequence of actions, though he does stress too that this is not deterministic: "an activity type often delimits a range of options rather than specifying a single rigid pattern" (Fairclough 1992: 127). Fairclough gives the example of buying goods in a shop, which will result in a customer and shop assistant assuming subject types and following a sequence of actions, though he does stress too that this is not deterministic: "an activity type often delimits a range of options rather than specifying a single rigid pattern" (Fairclough 1992: 127)

narrow sense to a variety of other domains”, and this notion of the colonisation of texts and discourses by other texts and discourses has since been rearticulated elsewhere (e.g. Fairclough 1995, Fairclough & Chouliaraki 1999). Using Fairclough’s framework and ideas, Sollin (2001) also investigated interdiscursivity in texts, examining how texts of environmental pressure groups and science are constituted as interdiscursive entities from available “orders of discourse”, and how the ‘original’ texts change as they pass through “intertextual chains” connected with the media.

Similar studies have in fact been also been conducted in this broad area before Fairclough (ibid) explicitly suggested the division between manifest and constitutive intertextuality, for instance a study by Bellah et al (1985), albeit using different terminologies, discusses the “cultural resources” which interviewees in The USA use in making statements about how to “preserve or create a morally coherent life” (Bellah et al 1985: vii). Bellah et al (ibid) were particularly interested in the wide variety of what they termed “voices” and “languages”¹³⁴ used by their interviewees in discussing morality, which are discussed as forms of cultural resources that shape what people think and say, while the people using these “languages” are described as “invoking” or “ventriloquating” through these social languages. In a similar manner, Tsang (2001) for instance looks at interdiscursivity in compositions about Hong Kong history¹³⁵ and Candlin & Maley (1997) examine

¹³⁴ “We do not use language in this book to mean primarily what the linguist studies. We use the term to refer to modes of moral discourse that include distinct vocabularies and characteristic patterns of moral reasoning. We use first language to refer to the individualistic mode that is the dominant American form of discourse about moral, social, and political matters. We use the term second languages to refer to other forms, primarily biblical and republican, that provide at least part of the moral discourse of most Americans” (Bellah et al 1985: 334)

¹³⁵ See also Scollon et al (1998), Scollon (2000b), Wodak (2000b).

the discourse of mediation and dispute resolution in terms of interdiscursivity, and claim that this area yielded innovative, dynamic and hybrid orders of discourse¹³⁶.

This area has also been looked at with specific regard to language in the classroom. Kamberelis (2001) for example argues that classroom discourse is not a homogeneous entity as implied by the IRE/IRF frameworks (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975), but instead is discourse which exhibits a wide range of speech genres, speech styles, social languages, and cultural practices which interact and interanimate each other (Kamberelis 2001: 86) and in this sense is highly interdiscursive (ibid: 86). Kamberelis terms such discourse use as “hybrid discourse practices”¹³⁷, and like Bakhtin, Kamberelis sees such forms of discourse as a means by which human subjectivity is extended and ‘reality’ is mediated and extended. In this way for Kamberelis (ibid), what he terms (ibid: 91) “discourse genres” are not viewed as cultural fossils but as cultural resources continuously being reaccentuated and thus reconstituted within new contexts and by new users (ibid), meaning interdiscursivity is a dynamic and productive feature of discourse and ensures genres a central role in bringing about social change (ibid: 91).

In a similar vein, Duff (2004) discusses the hybrid discourse practices created in a Humanities course at a Canadian High School when students bring what she terms “pop culture” discourses into their discussions, while Dyson (2001) talks similarly about how first-grade children brought images of space robots and rap lyrics into

¹³⁶ See also Sarangi (2000).

¹³⁷ “In classrooms, hybrid discourse practice involves teachers and children juxtaposing forms of talk, social interaction, and material practices from many different social and cultural worlds to constitute interactional spaces that are intertextually complex, interactionally dynamic, locally situated accomplishments” (Kamberelis 2001: 86).

their talk about the orbits of planets. Lewis' (2001) ethnographic study of a grade five classroom led him to argue likewise, claiming that discussions of literature were interspersed with snippets from pop culture films and books, while Gutierrez et al (1995) on the other hand are slightly less specific about exact forms of talk in classrooms, but they do identify two broad and contrasting forms of talk which they describe as "superordinate" (formal, academic, and mainstream talk) and "subordinate" (vernacular talk) – Gutierrez et al¹³⁸ call these two broad forms the "teacher script" (or epistemic and linguistic orientation script) and the "student script".

One potentially important outcome of such studies as these is that some academic genres, and in our context, that of the undergraduate lecture, may comprise not only reaccentuated disciplinary discourse, but may comprise "genre fragments" (Kamberelis 2001) from beyond the academy too. Nevertheless, despite the intuitive feeling that the variety of analyses such as these above are very revealing of some of the processes of text (re-)constitution (or reaccentuation of the word in Bakhtinian terminology), and are also certainly very fascinating for suggesting what 'kinds' of discourse might help constitute new discourse in specific contexts and some of the ways in which human actors might interact with the various "languages" available to them in social life, such analyses are troubled nevertheless by indistinct terms of reference and a consequent lack of clarity about quite what the constituent factors in a text actually are. Indeed, many of the studies discussed above seem to have rather different terms of reference to Fairclough's (ibid), which probably points to the difficulty of actually identifying clear boundaries between the

¹³⁸ Gutierrez et al (2000) in a later paper also identify what they call a hybrid third space which stages the intersection of official/unofficial codes and scripts – they describe this as a potential ZPD (after Vygotsky 1978).

four ‘text types’ put forward by Fairclough (ibid) in such a way that one might clearly understand quite what the constituent parts of constitutive intertextuality actually are, a problem in fact also pointed out by Fairclough (1992: 125) himself.

A problem also lies in Fairclough’s (ibid) assertion that in constitutive intertextuality, it is genre or a system of genres which is the overarching ‘text type’ that determines in which combinations and configurations the other four ‘text types’ types can occur in a text. However, while genre clearly does play a vitally important role in determining patterns of intertextuality (e.g. Swales 1990), it is hard to see, or indeed measure, how it can be of any ‘more’ influence than discourse is¹³⁹ – technological discourse for instance seems to display certain ‘managements’ of features which may be connected with intertextuality (for instance the downplaying of explicit human or inter-human agency¹⁴⁰), while humanistic discourse on the other hand seems to display perhaps different ‘managements’ of features which may be connected to intertextuality (for instance a greater use of human or inter-human agency.¹⁴¹)

It is also hard to maintain this position if we consider intra-genre variation – Hyland (2000) for instance shows clear evidence of highly significant intra-genre variation in Research Articles in different academic disciplines, suggesting that in academic settings at least, superficially similar genres (in terms of genre-as-social-action at

¹³⁹ Fairclough himself claims that discourse types “differ not only in the way in which they represent discourse, but also in the types of discourse they represent and the functions of discourse in the representing text. Thus there are differences in what is quoted when, how, and why, between sermons, scientific papers, and conversation. A major variable in how discourse is represented is whether representation goes beyond ideational or ‘message’ content to include aspects of the style and context of represented utterances.” (Fairclough 1992: 118-9).

¹⁴⁰ See e.g. Lemke (1990 & 1995), Halliday & Martin (1993), Potter (1996), Woolgar (1988).

¹⁴¹ See e.g. Nelson et al (1987), or Bloor (1996: 34) on philosophical rhetoric as “mind-to-mind combat with co-professionals”.

least) may display very different forms and features (including patterns of intertextuality) depending on their specific disciplinary contexts. In fact this study would question whether there is actually the clear division between manifest and constitutive intertextuality that Fairclough (ibid) claims there is¹⁴². A strong reading of Bakhtin suggests that all discourse is intertextual anyway, and that manifest intertextuality is thus in fact one explicit management system of the general intertextuality of discourse, used to reaccentuate constitutive discourse in a specific manner, as opposed to being a different “type” of intertextuality per se.

Another potential drawback in the suggestion that the specific mix of ‘text types’ which have constituted a text are recoverable is what seems to perhaps implicitly lie behind such a theorisation, namely that there are perhaps somewhere in the human psyche or in the history of human discoursing some original and locatable “pure” genres, activity types, styles and discourses which we might find, perhaps like the human genome – unfortunately however, the very theory of intertextuality itself would seem to mitigate against this. Such a belief would also suggest a view of history as a smooth linear movement forwards as in Liberal and Marxist theories, but such a view of history is contested these days (e.g. Foucault 1972, Lyotard 1984). In these senses, although the concept of constitutive intertextuality / interdiscursivity is a highly credible metaphor for theorising the constitution of texts, it seems very difficult to apply in practice as an analytic scheme, and also requires highly subjective¹⁴³ interpretive analysis (commented on too by Fairclough

¹⁴² See e.g. Ivanic (1997) who claims that this division may be “misleading”

¹⁴³ As an example of how open to debate such a style of analysis can be, Kress (1987 in Fairclough 1992: 125) claimed that students were interpellated (Althusser 1971) as passive consumers via the intertextual constitution of educational texts in their classes about Home Economics, giving the specific example of the style in which (for Kress) the textbook in use distributes agency between a subject and a product (‘Ajax cleans without rinsing’, ‘fine powders can absorb liquids’), thus mixing

himself¹⁴⁴). As such, these kinds of analyses are not the aim of this investigation, which instead is aiming to investigate the management of intertextuality. However, studies from within Fairclough's notion of "manifest intertextuality" (ibid: 104) are central within this investigation, and it is to this area that we turn next.

2.3.3 Fairclough and Manifest Intertextuality

The second of the two different broad types of intertextuality proposed by Fairclough, manifest intertextuality, is described by Fairclough (ibid: 104) as instances of overt, explicitly-signalled intertextual features of discourse, that situation in which:

"other texts are explicitly present in the text under analysis; they are 'manifestly' marked or cued by features on the surface of the text, such as quotation marks" (Fairclough 1992:104)

Fairclough (ibid: 104ff) later specifies manifest intertextuality as comprising five elements, discourse representation, presupposition¹⁴⁵, negation, metadiscourse, and irony, the former of which, discourse representation¹⁴⁶, is of particular importance in this current study. Fairclough again sees genre¹⁴⁷ as the most important factor

an advertisement style with that of a school textbook – for Kress this means that intertextual features in the sense of their constitutive mix in a text can "interpellate" (Althusser 1971) subjects in different ways.

¹⁴⁴ "Linguistic analysis is descriptive in nature, whereas intertextual analysis is more interpretative. Linguistic features of texts provide evidence which can be used in intertextual analysis, and intertextual analysis is a particular sort of interpretation of that evidence" (Fairclough 1995b: 61)

¹⁴⁵ See also Culler (1981) on pre-supposition

¹⁴⁶ In the discussion that follows, the broad concept of "discourse representation" is referred to by a variety of terms, including reporting, referencing, reported speech, and citation. This study maintains the terminologies used by the writers of the studies discussed, understanding all of these terminologies to refer to "discourse representation" broadly. Cf. Sakita (2002: 3) who uses the terminology of "reporting discourse" – "it functions as an umbrella term for reported thought, reported perception, reported written discourse, as well as reported spoken discourse, all of which are closely related to each other" (Sakita 2002: 3)

¹⁴⁷ A genre is defined by Fairclough as "a relatively stable set of conventions that is associated with, and partly enacts, a socially ratified type of activity, such as informal chat, buying goods in a shop, a

influencing manifestations of this form of intertextuality, in that particular genres are associated with particular modes of manifest intertextuality and particularly of discourse representation. For example, Fairclough (ibid: 127) argues that the frequency, modes and functions of discourse representation are different in a news report, in a social chat, and in a scientific article – a verbatim report in a conversation for example (Fairclough ibid) is not expected to be word-perfect, but in a scientific article it is essential, while capturing aspects of the original speech style may well be important in conversation but less so in news reports. In this sense for Fairclough, “contrasting modes and practices of discourse representation develop in connection with different sorts of social activity, according to the different significance and values the discourse of others comes to have” (Fairclough 1992: 128).

The notion that different modes and practices of discourse representation will vary depending on the “different significance and values the discourse of others comes to have” is significant¹⁴⁸, and again points at the way in which intertextuality can be managed by a speaker, as we saw in the discussion of Bakhtin – indeed, this study views manifest intertextuality as one means of the management of intertextuality. However, beyond general statements that this will be the case, there is little concrete

job interview, a television documentary, a poem, or a scientific paper. A genre implies not only a particular text type, but also particular processes of producing, distributing and consuming texts” (Fairclough 1992: 126). See also Mitchell (1957).

¹⁴⁸ See also from Fairclough: “Intertextuality entails an emphasis on the heterogeneity of texts, and a mode of analysis which highlights the diverse and often contradictory elements and threads which go to make up a text. Having said that, texts vary a great deal in their degrees of heterogeneity, depending on whether their intertextual relations are complex or simple. Texts also differ in the extent to which their heterogeneous elements are integrated, and so in the extent to which their heterogeneity is evident on the surface of the text. For example, the text of another may be clearly set off from the rest of the text by quotation marks and a reporting verb, or it can be unmarked and integrated structurally and stylistically, perhaps through as rewording of the original, in the surrounding text. ... So a heterogeneous text may have an uneven and ‘bumpy’ textual surface, or a relatively smooth one.” (Fairclough 1992: 104)

inter-genre exemplification of this by Fairclough beyond an interesting analysis of one article from The Sun newspaper, which Fairclough describes as “blending” the “voice” of an original HMSO document into its “own voice” via its reporting style (ibid: 108), and in doing so as “translating the language of official written documents into a version of popular speech” (ibid: 110).

Nevertheless, extensive studies have been carried out by other theorists in the general area of “manifest intertextuality” in Applied Linguistics broadly (e.g. McCarthy 1998, Sakita 2002), in the field of academic discourse, (e.g. Hyland 2000, Thompson 1996, Thompson & Yiyun 1994, Swales 1990, Bazerman 1981, Jacoby 1987, Tadros 1993, Thompson 2000, Thompson & Tribble 2001), and also in Citation Studies (e.g. Moravcsik & Murugesan 1975, Gilbert 1977, Cronin 1981, Swales 1981 & 1986b, Hauffe 1994, Chubin & Moitra 1975), all of which provide many insights into this broad area of intertextuality. Such studies are usually classified as dealing with “reporting” or “referencing”, all forms of “discourse representation” (Fairclough 1992: 104), and cover the important areas of why writers/speakers report in the first place, how reports can be manifested, and the effects of different reporting styles in terms of their syntax and tense choices.

2.3.3.1 Why Report?

Regarding firstly why writers/speakers might report, studies have been carried out in a number of different social situations, both non-academic and academic. In non-academic situations firstly, reporting has been studied in a wide variety of areas, for instance in children’s story-telling (e.g. Maybin 1997, Hickmann 1993 in Myers 1999), in adult story-telling (e.g. Johnstone 1993, McCarthy 1998 in Myers ibid), in

teenagers' talks about fights (e.g. Shuman 1993 in Myers *ibid*), in college students' seminar-like discussions of issues (e.g. Watanabe 1993, Buttny 1997 in Myers *ibid*), in giving legal evidence (e.g. Matoesian 2000, Shuman 1993, Holt 1996 in Myers *ibid*), in making stories vivid (e.g. Tannen 1989, McCarthy 1998), and in making ironic comment and evaluation (e.g. Mitchell-Kiernan 1972, Holt 1996, Buttny 1997, Maybin 1997 in Myers *ibid*: 377-8). What such studies successfully demonstrate is some of the huge variety of reasons why and settings in which people may choose to use reporting, as well as demonstrating too the appropriateness of Goffman's (1974: 512) questioning of the notion that "in daily life the individual ordinarily speaks for himself, speaks, as it were, in his 'own' character." Instead Goffman asserts, "when one examines speech, especially the informal variety, this traditional view proves inadequate" (Goffman 1974: 512). This points to the important ideas that the act of reporting creates two "centres of consciousness" in discourse (Voloshinov 1973), and that the choice to do this is frequently likely to be motivated and strategic.

Nevertheless, it is in studies of reporting in academic situations that more immediately relevant work on reasons for reporting has been done. Manifest intertextuality, described as a "pragmatic feature central to the modern academic world" (Valle 1995 in Salager-Meyer 1999), features heavily in academic writing for a variety of reasons, and seems to serve a variety of roles, particularly social, epistemological and discourse-structuring roles.

From a practical perspective firstly and deriving from Information Science, Garfield (1965 in White 2004: 107) lists fifteen reasons why a writer may use a citation,

including paying homage to pioneers, giving credit for related work, identifying methods and equipment etc, providing background reading, correcting one's own work, correcting the work of others, criticising previous work, substantiating claims, and alerting readers to forthcoming work. While these reasons are no doubt 'true', they perhaps seem rather positivist and to lack the insights available from research areas focussing on the more social and constructivist nature of discourse and discourse acts (e.g. Bakhtin 1981 & 1986, Hyland 2000), and it is in these areas that richer theorisations of author motivation for citing may be found. Thus from a social and epistemological perspective, reporting previous research serves to position both an audience and the ideational content of a writer's current message, in the sense that it "not only contextualises a research article within the continuum of debate in a particular field of knowledge, it also serves as the justification for the pursuit and publication of the current research¹⁴⁹" (Jacoby 1987: 33), meaning that writers therefore choose to "embed such discussions in a broader context by pointing out how their research fits into, compares with and contributes to the development of the relevant research field as a whole" (ibid: 33)¹⁵⁰. Although this may seem a rather norm-driven positivist conceptualisation¹⁵¹, and although too one might also argue that referencing is in a sense 'window-dressing' which creates the appearance of

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Kuhn's (1962) ideas of normative science progressing affirmatively and smoothly along a cohesive research front

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Swales (1981), who uses the analogy of story-telling and capping (from ethnomethodology) as a metaphor for the idea that a new 'story' (i.e. piece of research) must either undermine or extend a previous 'story', thus creating the impression of a narrative 'whole'.

¹⁵¹ Suggesting the political and institutional role of referencing and deriving from a likewise rather positivist Mertonian view of science, see also Kaplan (1965): "the citation is probably among the more important institutional devices for coping with the maintenance of the imperative to communicate one's findings freely as a contribution to the common property of science while protecting individual property rights with respect to recognition and claims to priority" (Kaplan 1965: 181 in Cronin 1984: 9). Such views are challenged however by two important ethnographic studies of 'real' RA writing by biologists (Myers 1985, and Berkenhotter & Huckin 1995), which suggest referencing as more of an aesthetic and rote feature of academic RA writing determined more by genre expectations than any 'genuine' need. See beneath.

contextualisation, suiting genre conventions¹⁵², nevertheless this does appear to be what writers in many disciplines frequently do indeed do in their writing (e.g. Hyland 2000), and certainly points to the supreme importance of group and community in academic life. “Knowledge” is produced as a product with both a synchronic and diachronic relationship to a group of people, and it is within these relationships and via such contextualising processes that knowledge comes to ‘mean’.

Other studies meanwhile also emphasise the epistemological and sociological roles played by referencing. Hyland (2000: 20ff) for example, maintains that citation provides an epistemological and social framework for acceptance of new arguments, pointing out that new work must be embedded in community-generated literature in order to show the relevance and importance of new knowledge-claims. Scollon (1994) echoes these views, pointing out that citing is a significant way of constructing authorial self¹⁵³, while Gilbert (1977) focuses on the persuasive force of citations¹⁵⁴, arguing for example that “citation is central to the social context of persuasion as it can provide justification for arguments and demonstrate the novelty of one’s position” (Gilbert 1977).

¹⁵² See for example ethnographic studies of reporting behaviour by Myers (1985 & 1990) or Berkenhotter & Huckin (1995), which clearly show writers being obliged to reference their research in such a way as to convey a sense of context, movement forwards and solid epistemological background (although again, this is partly due also to sociological genre influences). One of Myers’ biologist informants for example increased the number of references from 57 to 195 due to the editorial demand for appropriate genre practices and the construction of an intertextual narrative context / framework within which to place the new research.

¹⁵³ See also Fowler (1991: 118) who sees reporting as construction of the ideological self too: “a small reference, powerfully supported outside the text, economically provides readers with a whole frame of values”

¹⁵⁴ See Dubois (1986) for a more cynical view of quotation as persuasion: “Quotation is exploited as a powerful tool for persuasion, to the extent that it shifts hearer’s scrutiny of knowledge, interests, sincerity and fallibility to those who are most able to bear it” (Du Bois 1986: 332)

A crucial factor emerging from this discussion of motivations for reporting is that academic writing is best viewed as a collaborative social affair, and, as discussed in chapter 1, that knowledge is best seen as a social¹⁵⁵ product and entity, and thus one which needs to be ratified at the group level¹⁵⁶ if it is to be ‘accepted’ as ‘knowledge’ (Latour & Woolgar 1979, Ziman 1984). As Hyland argues, academics write as group members and “adopt discursal practices that represent an authorised understanding of the world and (how it can be perceived and reported) which acts to reinforce the theoretical convictions of the discipline and its right to validate knowledge” (Hyland 2000: 17). This means that a writer, when trying to disseminate his/her new ‘knowledge’ is faced with the need for the creation of a shared contextual background or framework against which to paint this new ‘knowledge’ so as to have it not only ‘mean’ but also accepted. It is a writer’s peers who will ultimately provide the social justification which transforms (even if only temporarily) mere ‘beliefs’ into ‘knowledge’¹⁵⁷, subjective to objective¹⁵⁸, meaning that for such a collaborative discursive construction, new knowledge-claims must be situated in a larger disciplinary narrative or framework (Hyland 2000: 20). This also points to the vital importance of community-approved genres and genre-forms in

¹⁵⁵ See also Kochen (1987) for a view of citation behaviour arguing that overt citation is a means for a researcher to exhibit his/her intellectual debt towards those other researchers upon whose work they have built or whose ideas they have borrowed.

¹⁵⁶ See also Smith (1976: 67 in Cronin 1984: 55) who argues for the importance of reporting in the establishment of “valid conceptual links” between documents and hence between ideas, theories and so on. This again points to the importance of group and community in academic settings and that reporting helps construct and maintain these groups. See also Small (1977), who developed ideas of citations as functioning as simple signifiers or symbols denoting specific community-shared theories, concepts, proofs, ideas, and methodologies.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Nietzsche’s claim that there are no facts, only interpretations (Nietzsche 1968: 267).

¹⁵⁸ See particularly Latour & Woolgar (1986), who posit a highly idealist process of knowledge construction, which they see as having five specific and identifiable discursive stages as a type 1 statement (a “claim”) moves to the status of a type 5 statement (a “fact”). Such a view sees knowledge-construction as entirely discursive and social. See also e.g. Knorr-Cetina (1981, 1982, 1996), Bloor (1991), Potter (1997), Latour (1999), Woolgar (1988).

the creation and dissemination of ‘knowledge’, as Bakhtin (1981 & 1986) also argues¹⁵⁹.

Reporting of previous research very clearly then plays a vital epistemological and social role in academic discourse and the construction of knowledge. However, reporting also seems to function at the level of discourse structuring, in the sense that it helps (possibly unwittingly) to construct certain recognised genre discourse patterns or text structures. Swales (1986a & 1990) has written extensively about the notions of four-part moves (CARS) in Research Article introductions, which a writer ‘creates’ and makes use of as a means of strategically positioning both message and audience¹⁶⁰. Such writing behaviour has been observed as highly contributory to the creation of discourse structure, formalised in that its constituent moves can be recognised (in other words it exhibits what Bathia (2001) terms “Generic Integrity”), particularly by Swales (ibid), who discusses the funnelling effect created by reporting in RA introductions, and also by Jacoby (1987), who, (ibid: 38ff), expanding on Hoey’s (1983) Hypothetical-Real theory of discourse patterning, has identified strong links between reporting and this Hypothetical-Real discourse structure, in the sense that reporting (hypothetical) by its nature predicts an evaluation (real).

Such studies therefore successfully identify a number of social and epistemological purposes fulfilled by reporting. Nevertheless however, in such studies reporting is

¹⁵⁹ See also Berkenhotter & Huckin (1995) and Myers (1985 & 1990).

¹⁶⁰ Clearly this is also closely related to a view of knowledge as a social product which needs to be professionally marketed and produced in order to be ratified by a community as ‘knowledge’, in keeping with what Myers (1985 & 1990) and Berkenhotter & Huckin (1995) seem to suggest.

the outcome of motivated, persuasion-oriented choices by a writer¹⁶¹ involving the strategic “reaccentuation” of utterances in Bakhtin’s (ibid) terms, the outcome of ‘playing the game’ (Wittgenstein 1953) perhaps. What characterises these purposes therefore is that they are writer-motivated, strategic discursive choices for a writer involved in making new knowledge-claims, as opposed to communicating established knowledge to a lecture audience. In the genre of the undergraduate lecture, lecturers are unlikely to use reporting for the same purposes, and instead reporting may serve different roles or happen for different reasons. Nevertheless, this study understands that reporting plays a central role as one means of the management of intertextuality in this genre, and as a discursive area in which the dialogic relationship between lecturer and discipline is most easily observable, analyses of reporting will be central in this study. Therefore, in the next section we will examine lexico-grammatical patterns of reporting and their effects.

2.3.3.2 Forms of Discourse Representation

In terms of forms of discourse representation, research in this area has been far-ranging and detailed, and has focussed on broad distinctions between ‘direct’ and ‘indirect reporting’ (e.g. Quirk et al 1972 & 1985, Leech & Svartvik 1975, Banfield 1982, Lucy 1991, Comrie 1986, Coulmas 1986, Baynham 1996), on syntactic forms of reporting clauses (see especially Thompson 1996, also Thompson 1994, Swales 1990, Tarone et al 1981), on lexical choices of reporting verbs (Thompson & Yiyun

¹⁶¹ And thus as also open to influence by more basic human motivation too, including influence by human error even. Cronin (1981) for instance argues that “citation is coloured by a multitude of factors, not all of which have to do with the conventions and procedures of scholarly publishing” (Cronin 1981: 17) – Cronin suggests social and psychological variables, such as an author’s perception of the target audience, the character and status of the target journal, the scope and aims of the paper itself, and an author’s knowledge and ability. See also May (1967) who argues (ibid: 890) not only that citations do not give an accurate picture of intellectual links between publications but also that there is “deviation” resulting from memory failures, carelessness, plagiarism both accidental and deliberate, and not citing obvious sources, brought about because an author is working for his own goals not to describe his “intellectual ancestry” (May 1967: 891)

1991, Hyland 2000, Thomas & Hawes 1994, Caldas-Coulthard 1994), and on tense choices (e.g. Sakita 2002, Shaw 1992, Swales 1990, Oster 1981, Gunawardena 1989).

2.3.3.3 Direct – Indirect Forms of Discourse Representation

Looking briefly at the first of these areas to begin with, distinctions between direct and indirect speech have traditionally been discussed under the broad dichotomy between direct and indirect styles (see e.g. Quirk et al 1972 & 1985, Leech & Svartvik 1975, Comrie 1986, Coulmas 1986), but a third hybrid variety also seems to exist too¹⁶². Banfield (1982: 71) for instance suggests such a tripartite typology, giving direct, indirect and quasi-direct speech:

- John said “Oh, am I tired” (direct)
- John said (that) he was tired (indirect)
- John said: oh was he tired (quasi-direct)

While there is broad agreement on terminologies for the dichotomy of direct-indirect speech, this third form is one with less agreement¹⁶³. Halliday (1994a: 261) for instance seems to refer to the same broad phenomenon but chooses to term it as Free Indirect Speech, arguing that it falls somewhere between direct and indirect speech but is not so much intermediate as anomalous in that it has some features of

¹⁶² Cf. Du Bois (1986: 324-5) who devised a hierarchical classification of speech categories according to the degree to which speech is shaped by either the ‘proximate speaker’ or the ‘alter prime speaker’ – Du Bois (ibid) used this distinction to produce eight different categories of reported speech (sovereign speech, indirect speech, direct quotation, allusive quotation, mimicry, impersonation, trance)

¹⁶³ See also Gennette (1988) who suggests this typology: Direct (reconstructions of a quoted speaker’s words, usually form-focussed, syntactically independent from reporting clause); Indirect (reconstructions are typically dependent on reporting clause, frequently with changes in deixis, tense & pronouns; Narratised (reports of an act of speaking, without speaker’s words being quoted, summarising the event).

both types¹⁶⁴. For Halliday (ibid), it is therefore best thought of as a projection space rather than a single invariable pattern (ibid: 261).

Nevertheless, although this third form exists in literature to a significant degree, it does not seem to be a common feature of academic discourse (e.g. Hyland 2000, Dubois 1988) and so this study uses the simple dichotomy of direct-indirect reporting, both of which can be clearly delineated and both of which have different rhetorical effects. In terms of surface grammatical differences firstly, Li (1986) for instance points out that the key grammatical areas of difference between the two forms are pronominalisation, verb tense, place and time deixis, word order, and the presence/absence of the complementiser “that”, while Halliday (1994a: 219) shows that indirect reporting realises a hypotactic relation between the two clauses (i.e. reporting and reported) but direct reporting realises a paratactic relation between the two clauses. In terms of content meanwhile, Banfield (1973 & 1982) points out that there are a number of syntactic constructions that cannot occur in indirect reporting clauses but only in direct reporting clauses, for instance interrogatives, pre-posed adverbs, nominals, imperatives, truncated sentences, exclamations, and vocatives. To this list should also be added spoken discourse markers (Schiffrin 1987), and also vocative noun phrases. Banfield (ibid) also argues that what she terms “expressive elements” and “affective aspects” of meaning only occur in direct reporting too. The two forms of direct / indirect are therefore clearly distinguishable via these criteria, which seem to have common agreement.

¹⁶⁴ For Halliday (1994a: 261), its structure is paratactic, so the projected clause has the form of an independent clause retaining the mood of the quoted from; but it is a report (indirect), not a quote (direct), so time and person reference are shifted; the intonation though follows that of quoting (direct), in that the projected clause takes the intonation it would have had as a quote, and the projecting form follows as a tail (because the projected clause has the status of an independent speech act).

In terms of perceived differences in meaning however, there is sometimes less agreement. The traditional distinction between the two forms revolves around the notion that the (supposedly) verbatim reproduction in direct reporting reflects the accuracy of the report (e.g. Comrie 1986: 266). In this traditional view¹⁶⁵, direct reporting is viewed as a *de dicto*¹⁶⁶ interpretation displaying the reportee's perspective, and indirect reporting as a *de re* interpretation displaying the reporter's perspective (e.g. Coulmas 1986). However, such a rigid view is challenged nowadays – Clark & Gerrig (1990) for example in their theory of reporting as demonstration argue that in direct reporting, a speaker does not so much report as depict some aspects of an original utterance such as parts of sentences, emotional states, accents, voices, or even non-linguistic actions, while Tannen (1989) rightly argues that much 'direct reporting' is in fact what she terms "constructed dialogue"¹⁶⁷. In this sense, it is agreed that direct reporting can be used to create a vivid and dramatising effect (e.g. Tannen 1986, 1988 & 1989, Li 1986), to project authenticity (e.g. Macaulay 1987), and even to depict imaginary or future worlds

¹⁶⁵ See also Cate (1996: 190): "In direct speech, the utterance of a person (the reported speaker) is conveyed by the reporter in exactly the same form in which it originally was said or written (or at least could have been said or written), or even will or can be said or written in the future. ... In reported speech [indirect speech], the utterance of a reported speaker is reported in a form adapted to the linguistic as well as the extralinguistic context ..." (Cate 1996: 190)

¹⁶⁶ See e.g. Mayes (1990) on the use of direct reporting as evidence, deriving from the popular belief that direct quotes are exact and therefore more reliable, Philips (1985) who shows that in court, direct reporting is used for giving important evidence (in Sakita 2002: 189), or Matoesian (2000) who discusses reporting and the construction of legitimacy in a rape trial

¹⁶⁷ Tannen describes "constructed dialogue" as follows: "my reasons for claiming that one cannot, in any meaningful sense, "report" speech are as follows. First, much of that appears in discourse as dialogue, or "reported speech", was never uttered by anyone else in any form. Second, if dialogue is used to represent utterances that were spoken by someone else, when an utterance is repeated by a current speaker, it exists primarily, if not only, as an element of the reporting context, although its meaning resonates with association with its reported context, in keeping with Bakhtin's sense of polyphony. In the deepest sense, the words have ceased to be those of the speaker to whom they are attributed, having been appropriated by the speaker who is repeating them ... in short, I wish to question the conventional American literal conception of "reported speech" and claim instead that uttering dialogue in conversation is as much a creative act as is the creation of dialogue in fiction and drama." (Tannen 1989: 101).

(e.g. Sakita 1995). One important area of agreement also seems to be the notion that direct reporting creates involvement (Gumperz 1982, Tannen 1982b), and in this sense it might be looked at as an interactive strategy (e.g. Chafe 1982 & 1994, Li 1986, Tannen 1982b, 1986, 1988 & 1989). Labov (1972) also implies this in his claim that in narratives, direct reporting better functions to internally evaluate the point of a story (Labov 1972) because it shows the point rather than telling the point. Finally, Chafe (1994) argues that direct verbatim reporting is sometimes used when the reported language itself has some special relevance or authority such as instructions or advice (and entries from dictionaries or encyclopaedias), while there is also the suggestion of direct reporting functioning almost as a politeness strategy (Brown & Levinson 1987), in that it reduces a reporter's responsibility and thus conveys information implicitly that might be awkward to express explicitly (Pomerantz 1984, Goffman 1974, Kuhn 1989).

Although the notion of an automatic relation between precise replication and direct reporting seems untenable, in many social contexts at least, there are definitely significant differences in both the forms and the perceived effects of these two broad varieties of reporting, and it is particularly important to be clear that the two different forms both create different deictic centres inside a report – direct reporting maintains the deictics of the original or constructed (Tannen 1989) report while indirect reporting moulds the reported unit into the frame of the reporting speech event and thus changes deictics to suit the new reporting context. Nevertheless, and importantly, both choices result in the existence of two “centres of consciousness” (Voloshinov 1973) in discourse, and the relationship(s) between these two centres

of consciousness are different in the two different forms of reporting, suggesting this relationship can be managed differently via the two different forms.

2.3.3.4 Syntactic Forms of Discourse Representation in Academic Genres

Traditionally within academic discourse, there are two clear styles of reporting, indirect (in the form of paraphrasing) and direct¹⁶⁸ (in the form of verbatim quotation) (e.g. Swales 1990, Cronin 1981¹⁶⁹), but these two broad forms can themselves be examined in further syntactic detail. Most studies of the syntactic patterns of reporting in academic genres originally derive from the fields of Information Science and Citation Studies (e.g. Moravcsik & Murugesan 1975, Chubin & Moitra 1975, Cronin 1981, Swales 1981 & 1986b), though the field of Applied Linguistics has also contributed, especially recently (e.g. Thompson 1996, Hyland 2000, Swales 1990, Thompson 2000, Thompson & Tribble 2001, Salager-Meyer 1999, Jacoby 1987).

Such studies rely less on a simple delineation solely between direct-indirect reporting, and instead are devised with the conventions of academic citation in mind. Because the only genre studied in any great detail to date is the RA (though

¹⁶⁸ See though Baynham (1996) who shows extensive use of constructed and hypothetical direct speech by a teacher in a mathematics classroom. Baynham (1996: 72ff) discusses situations in which a mathematics teacher uses the resources of direct (and indirect) speech to reformulate 'original' students utterances in such ways as to shift them in the direction of appropriate 'mathematical reasoning' discourse – for Baynham (ibid) this focus on original participants also constructs interpersonal relationships. Baynham (1996: 78) argues that using direct speech dramatises the process of mathematics reasoning as a way of maintaining involvement, and also serves to decrease social distance between participants. See also Fairclough (1992: 157-8) and Myers (1999: 393-4) on formulations and their association with powerful speakers in asymmetrical situations, and McCarthy (1998: 36) who describes formulations as follows: "formulations comment on the current, ongoing activity in terms of its present progress, with speakers periodically summing up where they think the discourse is ... such formulations enable participants to take the conversation in collaboration from one staging post to another" (McCarthy 1998: 36).

¹⁶⁹ Though see e.g. Hyland (2000) and Dubois (1988) who show that direct verbatim reporting is in fact unusual in the RA genre. Hyland (ibid) for instance describes it as "minimal" in RA's generally and as never appearing in science RA's, while Dubois (ibid), looking at Biochemistry RA's, describes it as "essentially non-existent".

see Thompson 2000 & Thompson & Tribble 2001), these studies and their various taxonomies (see especially Moravcsik & Murugesan 1975, Chubin & Moitra 1975, Swales 1981 & 1986b), therefore take into account that this specific genre is written and can therefore use bracketed forms of citation and citations in footnotes – a significant difference to the general studies examined further above which are based primarily on spoken genres and on literature. Instead, the primary concerns of studies located in academic genres are firstly the syntactic features of the citation, particularly the length and/or detail of a citation, its textual positioning (i.e. whether it is in the running text or in a footnote), and whether the citation includes the original author of the reported discourse in a grammatically significant position or ‘outside’ the grammar of the clause (i.e. in brackets); and secondly, the perceived functions and/or effects of these choices. Thus for instance Moravcsik & Murugesan (1975) devised a rather complex typology for assessing citations, later modified by Swales (1986b: 49ff), but neither typology had specific syntactic features identified. Swales later (1990: 148ff) however developed a new and simpler scheme which relies on a basic syntactic distinction between integral and non-integral forms of citation – for Swales (ibid):

“An integral citation is one in which the name of the researcher occurs in the actual citing sentence as some sentence-element; in a non-integral citation, the researcher occurs either in parenthesis or is referred to elsewhere by superscript number or via some other device” (Swales 1990: 148)

Despite the difficulties applying the first two schemes in particular and the undermining fact too that academic citation is probably not totally “rational”

behaviour¹⁷⁰, what such studies (especially Swales 1990) certainly seem to show is that there are a number of syntactic choices in written academic reporting which have a variety of different effects – writers can choose to make citations as summaries or verbatim, they can manage citations so as to construct the citation as accepted or challenged, and writers particularly can make syntactic choices to emphasise or de-emphasise agency via the choice to realise a report so that syntactically it is “integral” or “non-integral” (Swales 1990: 148ff, see also Thompson 2000 & Thompson & Tribble 2001). Such choices play a significant role in constructing an author’s attitudes to and purposes for reporting, and such choices thus help to construct different forms of interaction and relationships between a writer and his/her community, and with an audience too. In this sense, they are therefore viewable as different means of managing intertextual, and therefore social, relations in discourse, albeit strategically-oriented at persuasion. Finally however, many of these studies also point to significant differences in these phenomena in different genres and particularly in different academic disciplines (see especially Hyland 2000), and it seems it may be hard therefore to develop homogeneous cross-genre descriptions and that instead what are needed are intra-genre descriptions.

Syntactic patterns of reporting and their perceived effects have also been looked at from a diachronic perspective, which also point to how reporting patterns are

¹⁷⁰ See for example Cronin (1981) on the effects on citation of “social and psychological variables” (Cronin 1981: 17): “To understand why an author cites in a particular way at a particular time we would need, to put it crudely, to step inside the author’s head. The complex of factors which characterise an author’s approach to citation belongs to his phenomenal field and not to the public domain” (Cronin 1981: 20). See also Brooks (1986) for a similar discussion of non-normative motivating factors behind citations, and Hauffe (1994) for an exhaustive list of reasons why citation might not be analysable as strictly “rational” behaviour but be influenced by a number of social, institutional, and private factors. Salager-Meyer (1999) also questions whether national/cultural factors such as Confucianism may play a significant role in citation behaviour, pointing out for instance that British and American researchers regularly self-reference as compared with Japanese and Chinese researchers who very rarely do this. See also Hyland (2001 & 2003b) on self-citation.

heavily implicated in the establishment of and changes in social relations in discourse and in communities. Salager-Meyer (1999) for instance, using a typology of verbatim quotes, specific reference, general references, footnote references, and endnote references, investigated the history of referencing patterns in medical RA's, and found significant diachronic change in this genre (see also Bazerman 1988), suggesting strong links between different syntactic patterns of reporting and their effects on notions of agency and on relationships between author and medical community.

What all these studies illustrate is firstly that there is a variety of syntactic patterns open to a writer when reporting in academic genres, viewable as different means for managing intertextuality; secondly that different patterns have different effects, particularly regarding relationships between individual agency, claim and academic community; thirdly that reporting behaviour, while difficult to precisely account for, must be regarded typically as motivated and strategic, at least in the RA genre; and fourthly that different academic communities and different eras seem to display different reporting patterns which interface with, and indeed help to construct, the natures of the groups / eras and the writers writing in them.

Despite the relative successes of and insights derivable from these various studies, they face two problems however. Firstly, they take a rather structuralist route in that only explicit instances of explicit "reporting" (as citations or references) are admitted as data¹⁷¹; and secondly, they examine syntactic patterns using rather broad blades. While they are certainly successful in illustrating broad patterns,

¹⁷¹ See Sinclair (1988) & Tadros (1993) on averral and attribution in text.

another, perhaps more sophisticated means of examining such patterns derives from the work of Thompson (1996), which is notable too for the broader range of structures accepted as “reporting”. Although Thompson’s (ibid) typology derives from his study of “journalese”¹⁷² and his examples from numerous genres, nevertheless, much of his scheme and its accompanying theorising are highly relevant in academic genres too.

Thompson (ibid: 501ff) argues for the relevance of a functional perspective to analyses of reporting as a means of gaining a broader perspective on what reporting actually is and what forms it may take, in this sense seeing reporting as one of the “semantic diffusions” or “semantic motifs” “permeating grammar” like modality and causation (Martin 1992: 16 in Thompson ibid: 502). For Thompson, taking a Bakhtinian perspective, “reporting” is a much broader and more complex phenomenon than many investigations allow for¹⁷³, and as a “permeating semantic motif” there is therefore likewise great variation in potential manifestations of “reporting” (ibid: 503). One of the consequences of this is that “even within academic writing there are examples where it is difficult to decide unambiguously whether a stretch of language can be counted as a language report or not” (ibid: 504).

¹⁷² Because of the importance of the relationship between original speech and report(s) of it, this choice for Thompson (ibid) allows him to focus on manipulation in reports and thus to take a more critical stance as to the ways in which reports are constructed in terms of how/why reports differ from original, the source, whether how and why attribution takes place, and the reporter’s attitude to a report.

¹⁷³ “I include as language reports any stretch of language where the speaker or writer signals in some way that another voice is entering the text, in however muffled or ambiguous a fashion. Such an approach involves including a number of uses of language which are not normally associated with ‘reported speech’” (Thompson 1996: 506).

Starting from this broad perspective, Thompson (ibid: 507ff) identifies four “intermeshing but relatively independent dimensions of choice for the reporter” (ibid: 507):

- *The voice* – who or what is presented as the source of language being reported
- *The message* – the way in which function/content of original language presented
- *The signal* – the way in which reporter indicates this is a language report
- *The attitude* – evaluation by reporter of message and/or original speaker

Elaborating on these dimensions in more detail, Thompson (ibid: 507-11) proposes that the dimension of *voice* (the who or what is presented as the source of a report) can be self, specified other(s), unspecified other(s), community (this can be in the shape of proverbs, folk quotes, allusion, family groups, or academic communities), or even unspecifiable other(s), and importantly too points out that the source of a report can be deliberately obscured¹⁷⁴. This variety allows for the interdiscursive heterogeneity of some academic genres (Kamberelis 2001).

Message (ibid: 511-18) meanwhile, the way in which the report can be presented, can be a quote¹⁷⁵ (revealed by punctuation and/or prosody); it can be an echo – especially common in literature and reporting spoken language, this is ventriloquism, a situation in which there are no reporting signals (ibid: 512) but the voice of the report is different from the narrator, recognisable particularly by

¹⁷⁴ See e.g. Fairclough (e.g. 1992: 108-9) & CDA generally (e.g. Kress & Hodge 1979, Fowler et al 1979, Fairclough 1989, 1992 & 1995, Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999).

¹⁷⁵ Echoing Tannen (1989), for Thompson (ibid: 512) a quote maybe not be the “original words” per se but does indicate faithfulness to original words, and also creates vividness.

prosodic features. Syntactically, echoes are like quotes in that they use aspects of precise original wording, but like paraphrases in that deictic elements take their forms in relationship to the reporting context rather than to the reported discourse itself; it can be a paraphrase, a situation in which the message is expressed in the context of the reporting event; it can be a summary, a situation in which there is a reporting word with a nominal group or a prepositional phrase; or it can be omission, a situation in which there is the indication of a speech event but no indication of what was actually said.

In terms of *signal* (ibid: 518-21), this refers to the logical relationship between the reporting signal and the reported message as realised through the structural dependencies constructed by lexico-grammar, signalling how the report fits in with (and also helps construct) the surrounding discourse and context. *Signal* can be:

- Separate: dominant – a main reporting clause + a subordinate reported clause¹⁷⁶
- Separate: equal – very common with quotes – both sections can stand alone¹⁷⁷
- Separate: subordinate – adjuncts serving as tags / labels
- Fused – no item functioning as reporting signal, signal in wording itself

In terms of *attitude* (ibid: 521-23) finally, this can be neutral, positive or negative. Thompson (ibid: 521-23) suggests a number of means by which evaluation can be constructed including by reporting verb choice and by syntax (e.g. active/passive, use of subordinator 'as').

¹⁷⁶ This is Halliday's (1994a: 219) hypotactic relation between the two clauses.

¹⁷⁷ While this is Halliday's (ibid) paratactic relation between the two clauses.

Although the typology is not applied in Thompson (1996), it is applied in Thompson (1994), and significant genre differences are observed using the scheme between journalese, conversation, novels and academic writing. What the scheme and its application point to is that interaction with diachronic discourse is a valuable and diverse resource for meaning-making broadly and for constructing social relationships too, and that reporting and thus intertextuality broadly, as a significant part of this process, can be managed in a number of significantly different ways within and between different genres, constructing a variety of different relationships between reporter, reported and audience. It also points to the complexity of trying to distinguish “reporting” (i.e. attribution) from “non-reporting” (i.e. averral) in a regular and consistent manner¹⁷⁸, and the highly evaluative nature of reporting and some of the manners in which such evaluation can be constructed syntactically and lexically. As such, it will form the basis for the methodology used to examine syntactic aspects of the management of intertextuality via reporting verbs in this study.

2.3.3.5 Lexical Choices of Reporting Verb in Forms of Discourse Representation in Academic Genres

However, while Thompson’s (ibid) scheme is very robust in its description of syntactic aspects, purely lexical aspects of evaluation and reporting are investigated in the greatest detail elsewhere, with particular emphasis on lexical choices of reporting verb. Although this area has been investigated by Caldas-Coulthard (1994) and also by Thomas & Hawes (1994), it is the rather complex scheme

¹⁷⁸ See e.g. Tadros (1993) on distinguishing between averral and attribution in discourse, deriving from Sinclair (e.g. 1988) – “averral is manifested in various ways in the text – negatively, through absence of attribution, and positively, through commentating, evaluating or metastructuring of the discourse. Attribution, on the other hand, is signaled in the text by a number of devices, of which reporting is an obvious one” (Tadros 1993: 100)

introduced by Thompson & Yiyun (1991) and later modified by Hyland (2000) which is most revealing.

Thompson & Yiyun (1991: 369ff) classify reporting verbs both by the type of activity/ process they refer to (their denotation) and by the evaluation they carry (their connotation)¹⁷⁹. Thompson & Yiyun (ibid) also draw a useful distinction between original author acts and current writer acts¹⁸⁰, implicitly highlighting in doing so Voloshinov's (1973) idea of the "two centres of consciousness" involved in discourse representation.

In terms of author acts firstly, for Thompson & Yiyun (ibid), these can be three different types¹⁸¹, textual, mental and research, while in terms of writer acts (i.e. writer as current re-writer), these can be two different types, comparing and theorising. This gives the following typology of choices in terms of denotation:

Reporting	Author acts	<i>Textual</i>	state, write, term, challenge
		<i>Mental</i>	believe, think, consider, prefer
		<i>Research</i>	measure, calculate, quantify, find
	Writer acts	<i>Comparing</i>	correspond to, accord with, contrast with
		<i>Theorising</i>	account for, explain, support, exemplify

Table 2.1: Classification of denotative meanings of reporting verbs. Based on Thompson & Yiyun (1991: 369-70)

Reporting verbs then can construct representations of different kinds of activity, which may be mental, physical or verbal activity, and such choices are likely to

¹⁷⁹ See also Besnier (1990): "reported speech is both the representation of linguistic actions and commentaries about these actions" (Besnier 1990: 161)

¹⁸⁰ Thompson & Yiyun are right to point out that this is not a watertight distinction – for instance, theorising process verbs may be used to describe author acts, e.g. exemplify; while also some author act verbs can be interpreted as Writer acts if negated / modalised

¹⁸¹ Again, Thompson & Yiyun (ibid) are right to point out that these are not watertight categories – the report verb "analyse" for instance could be a mental process (problem) or a research process (minerals)

construct different kinds of discursive processes. Applied to academic genres, such choices are likely to help point to how a writer sees the “knowledge” and its constituent processes in his/her disciplinary community.

In terms of the connotation(s) of report verbs on the other hand, report verbs can signal author’s stance, writer’s stance, or writer’s interpretation (ibid: 372ff). Author stance, “the attitude which the author is reported (in Author act verbs) as having towards the validity of the reported information or opinion” (ibid: 369ff), can be positive, negative or neutral, while Writer’s stance can also be one of three options, factive, counter-factive and non-factive. Writer’s interpretation finally is described by Thompson & Yiyun (ibid) as being concerned with “various aspects of the *status* of the proposition” (ibid: 372, my italics) as compared with author’s stance and writer’s stance which for Thompson & Yiyun (ibid) is concerned with the truth/correctness of a proposition. Writer’s interpretation can be one of four types for Thompson & Yiyun (ibid), author’s discourse interpretation, author’s behaviour, status interpretation, non-interpretation.

Although this is undoubtedly a rather complex typology, what it nevertheless successfully shows is that discourse representation via reporting verbs as a part of “manifest intertextuality” (Fairclough 1992) is a discursive act which can not only be managed via a rich variety of syntactic means (Thompson 1996) but also via a rich variety of lexical means too, in terms both of the denotation of the act a report realises and in terms of the evaluation¹⁸² a report can carry. As such both their scheme and Thompson’s (ibid) point to some of the numerous different ways in

¹⁸² See also Adams-Smith (1984) on reporting verbs as part of a writer’s means of comment.

which academic utterances might be “reaccentuated” (Bakhtin (1981 & 1986) in academic contexts, and manifest intertextuality therefore managed. It also helps to answer Voloshinov’s (1973) call for a move beyond mechanistic views of speech reporting, and positions discourse representation as a discursive act in which ideologies are likely to play a significant role. Nevertheless, the scheme is, as Hyland (2000) argues, rather complex, and Hyland (ibid) himself presents a modified version of the scheme which is more manageable but without losing the richness of Thompson & Yiyun’s (ibid) original scheme.

In terms of denotation, for Hyland (ibid), report verbs can realise three different types of reporting acts:

- *Research Acts* – these are representations of real-world activities, particularly statements of findings (e.g. observe, discover, notice, show) or of procedures (analyse, calculate, assay, explore)
- *Cognition Acts* – these are representations of mental processes (e.g. believe, view, conceptualise, suspect)
- *Discourse Acts* – these are representations of verbal expression (e.g. ascribe, discuss, state, hypothesise)

This is broadly the same as Thompson & Yiyun’s (ibid) classifications for denotation, and it is in the connotation classifications that Hyland’s (ibid) scheme is simplified. For Hyland (ibid), writers can vary their commitment to a message by adopting an explicitly personal stance or by attributing a position to the original author. This means a writer can represent reported information in one of three ways,

as *true*, as *false*, or as *non-factively*, the latter option of which gives a writer the opportunity to ascribe a view to the original author, reporting him/her as:

- *Positive* (e.g. advocate, argue, hold, see)
- *Neutral* (e.g. address, cite, comment, look at)
- *Tentative* (e.g. allude to, believe, hypothesise, suggest)
- *Critical* (e.g. attack, condemn, object, refute)

Applying this simpler scheme to a corpus of RA's, Hyland (ibid) observes significant differences between academic disciplines in terms of their report verb usages, and again, this clearly points to the idea that this form of "manifest intertextuality" can be managed in a variety of ways with a variety of potential rhetorical effects, demonstrating again that this kind of discursive act is a means of managing intertextuality in that writers have choices regarding how they "reaccentuate" (Bakhtin ibid) academic utterances in new contexts. Nevertheless, what Hyland (ibid) also shows is that vitally, significant empirical inter-disciplinary differences are observable in the patterns of the management of manifest intertextuality in their RA's, meaning genres differ not only in an inter-genre sense (e.g. Fairclough 1992, Kress & Threadgold 1988) but also in an intra-genre sense too, and suggesting too that while reporting is an outcome of strategic choices by a writer, nevertheless it also seems to take patterns which may be subject to larger forces than simple writer motivation. This therefore suggests the tension between genre and individual creativity discussed earlier (Bakhtin 1981, 1986, Voloshinov 1973, Medvedev 1928 in Morris 1994: 175ff), and suggests too that writers are not completely free agents but write as members of recognisably different communities. This may well be all the more so in the genre of the undergraduate lecture.

2.3.3.6 Tense Choices for Reporting Verbs in Forms of Discourse Representation

Finally, in terms of its meaning-making potentials and the different relationships creatable between reporter and reported, discourse representation as a form of manifest intertextuality can also be managed by report verb tense choices.

Generally tense is seen as marking the temporal properties of a verb, and is taken to refer to time at which the action or state referred to by the verb is asserted to hold (e.g. Quirk et al 1985, Biber et al 1999). However, the relationships between tense and time are certainly significantly more complex in reporting (e.g. Crystal 1992: 348, Quirk et al 1985: 175)¹⁸³, and are also surrounded by disagreement.

Certainly tense choice in reporting seems to be viewable as an interactionally-influenced phenomenon in which pragmatic factors override formal grammatical criteria, and which is therefore open to manipulation for subjective ends. For instance, Sakita (2002: 82) views tense choices in story-telling as a strategic device for influencing relationships in discourse, arguing that when reporting in such a genre a speaker's wish is to express "human relations, the participants' psychological states, her/his empathy to the participants, and other pragmatic information" (Sakita 2002: 82).

Certainly in academic genres too, tense choice in reporting verbs is also likely to play a vital pragmatic role in the management of discourse and social interaction.

¹⁸³ See though Malcolm (1987) who argues that while tense choices can be correlated with uses unique to RA's, these correlations can be accounted for by the same temporal meanings and uses as in general English.

However, while there is broad agreement that management choices can be discursively-oriented in the sense of organising discourse and/or evaluation-oriented, what are not so clear are the actual roles played by different tenses in these two management areas.

Looking at the former area first, Lackstrom et al (1970) for instance suggest present tense can correlate with generalisation¹⁸⁴ and in turn be used to structure paragraphs in terms of how a paragraph's core idea is discursively managed, and Lackstrom et al (1972) support this, arguing too that past tense correlates with a lack of generality and present perfect tense with generalisations about past events. Malcolm (1987) supports this view broadly, arguing too that generalisations correlate with present tense, while citations of a particular experiment are likely to be in past tense and an "area of enquiry" in present perfect tense. Swales (1990: 152) on the other hand sees a progression from present to present perfect to past simple as marking increasing distance from the finding being reported, and that the past tense can be used to indicate that discussion is terminating¹⁸⁵. Oster (1981) meanwhile suggests that present perfect tense will indicate that there will be continued discussion of a topic¹⁸⁶, and that present perfect tense also indicates generality about past literature (as opposed to this effect of generalisation being achieved via present simple tense as for Malcolm (ibid)), while past tense signals non-generality plus also the

¹⁸⁴ "In technical English the present tense means generalisation – and the present tense will occur where technical rhetoric requires the expression of this meaning. One of these places will be in the expression of the core idea" (Lackstrom et al 1970: 108-9).

¹⁸⁵ See also Sakita (2002: 88) who sees past tense in extended monologue as indicating leading to a conclusion (Sakita 2002: 88).

¹⁸⁶ See also Gunawardena (1989: 268) who found that present perfect is used predominantly to report early research and/or a group of studies which is relevant to the current research. "Through its ability to involve a span of time from earliest memory to the present, the perfective has an indefiniteness which makes it an appropriate verbal expression for introducing a topic of discourse. As the topic is narrowed down, the emerging definiteness is marked by the simple past" (Quirk & Greenbaum 1973: 44, cited in Gunawardena 1989: 269).

reporting of non-supportive results, and present simple signals the reporting of supportive results plus to refer to (rather than to discuss) past literature. Clearly tense choice does play significant roles in discourse management¹⁸⁷, and thus in construction of stance too, but debate still continues about what these various different roles actually are and how they are achieved.

Shaw (1992) however, examining PhD theses in Agricultural Botany & Biochemistry, complicates the issues further by suggesting that tense choice also correlates with syntactic patterns¹⁸⁸. Shaw (ibid) for instance, using Swales (1990) notion of integral and non-integral reporting structures, claims that integral structures with named researchers in subject position correlate with simple past tense (80%), while non-integral reporting structures, especially with passive voice, correlate with present perfect tense (59%). Shaw's study also found that paragraph generalisations correlate with non-integral present perfect passive and that "other generalisations" also correlate with present perfect passive, while there were very few past tense generalisations and no evidence "that present tense reporting verbs introduce functionally more general statements than past or perfect ones" (Shaw 1992: 317).

It would seem then that there is some degree of agreement that present perfect can correlate with generalisation, and perhaps too that present tense can correlate with

¹⁸⁷ See also Sakita (2002: 158) who sees tense choice as one means by which a speaker/writer can package and shape large narratives involving reported discourse into chunks (Sakita 2002: 158).

¹⁸⁸ See also Tarone et al (1981), looking at "voice" in astronomy articles, who argue that active voice is used to refer to a writer's own work, active voice with third person agent is used for reporting non-conflicting work of others, while passive voice is used for reporting conflicting work and the writer's future work.

extended discussion of a topic and past tense with shorter mentions. Nevertheless, it seems to be hard to discern regular rules *per se*.

As well as the discourse management roles played by simple tense choices however, discourse management can also be achieved via the choice of simple or progressive form of a tense. McCarthy (1998: 171) for instance suggests that the past continuous form of “say” is common in casual conversation as a means of topic management, and is used as a means too (McCarthy 1998: 161) of focussing not on original words but instead on the content in terms of its newsworthiness or topical relevance. This may be why progressive forms appear to be reasonably typical of casual conversation but not so typical of written genres (e.g. Thompson 1994). Continuous forms are also likely to feature in spontaneous (re-)formulations of speech, as discussed by for example Fairclough (1992: 157-8), Baynham (1996), and Myers (1999: 393-4), though the roles of continuous forms in doing so are not explicitly discussed.

Tense choice not only plays roles in discourse management but also in evaluation too, although there is a more limited literature in this area. Johnstone (1987 in McCarthy 1998: 166) for instance suggests that the use of historical present in conversation may coincide with reports of authoritative speakers’ words, thus making them stand out, while McCarthy himself (1998: 167) suggests that present simple tense is also used frequently when reporting speakers’ words which relate to

perceived permanent facts/truths as well as to things still relevant or important (McCarthy 1998: 167)¹⁸⁹.

Others meanwhile argue that simple present report verbs make a narrative dramatic (e.g. Quirk et al 1985), while Sakita (2002: 97) goes one step further than this and sees tense choice as a means of indicating power in conflict situations, arguing that the power balance can be kept parallel via both parties being reported with simple past “said”, but when the balance is broken (via avoidance, softening or escape from the conflict), the report verb tense switches to simple present “says”. In this sense for Sakita (ibid), tense manipulation is a means of reflecting changes in power balances when reporting conflict situations (ibid: 97).

While there is some amount of divergent literature on tense choices of report verbs themselves, there is unfortunately however a very limited body of literature on tense choices within the reported propositions. Comrie (1986) is one of the few who have tackled this area, arguing a rather traditional line:

“if the tense of the verb of reporting is non-past, then the tense of the original utterance is retained; if the tense of the verb of reporting is past, then the tense of the original utterance is backshifted into the past, except that if the content of the indirect speech has continuing applicability, the backshifting is optional” (Comrie 1986: 284)

¹⁸⁹ See also Quirk et al (1985: 181) who say that the implication of the present tense with reporting verbs is that although the original communicative event took place in the past, its result, the information communicated, is still operative.

However, while this may be true to an extent in written genres, it is not always the case in spoken genres. For Sakita for instance, such patterns are far more complex¹⁹⁰, and tense choice in reported clauses is determined not by relation to the head reporting clause but by the “direct relationship to the moment of speaking”, meaning therefore that it is the reporter’s perspective that determines choices (Sakita 2002: 160).

This certainly seems a more balanced perspective, and one which may be useful in this study when one considers that lectures are a hybrid spoken/written form (e.g. Flowerdew 1994b). It also points again to the overriding nature of pragmatic, interactionally-influenced factors in tense choices, and indeed in reporting choices generally, and to the importance of maintaining the author/speaker within studies of the management of intertextuality.

2.3.3.7 Conclusions on Manifest Intertextuality

Tense choice with report verbs and with reported propositions is therefore clearly a substantial part of a speaker’s means of managing both reported discourse and its evaluation, but the lack of agreement on the effects of tense choice suggests not only that this is a highly complex area, but also suggests too that it is likely to be genre-based and perhaps even discipline-based too. It may be that it is not possible to make broad general claims about tense choices and their roles in reporting, and instead it may be that such a debate can only be genre-specific. Nevertheless, syntactic patterns, lexical choices of reporting verb, and tense patterns in reporting

¹⁹⁰ See also Voloshinov (1973) and his criticism of mechanical notions of reporting. Voloshinov argues that the “mechanical, purely grammatical mode of translating reported speech from one pattern into another, without the appropriate stylistic reshaping” is insufficient – “this sort of implementation of the patterns of speech reporting has nothing even remotely to do with their real existence in a language” (Voloshinov 1973: 128).

verb utterances are clearly very rich and varied, both in form and effect, and as such are an invaluable resource for constructing different degrees of “reaccentuation” (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986) in discourse representation, and therefore for managing intertextual relations in discourse. As such, and viewing reporting utterances in undergraduate lecture discourse as probably the richest area for assessing the management of relationships between a lecturer and his/her discipline, these phenomena are a vital aspect in this investigation of the management of intertextuality in lecture discourse.

2.4 Conclusions

In this chapter I have examined understandings and theorisations of the rich notion of intertextuality from its origins in the work of Bakhtin, to its practical applications in Applied Linguistics, a necessarily detailed review. Deriving from this, intertextuality in this study is understood at the broadest level as the system whereby discourse comes to take on meaning(s), which emphasises the deeply historically-implicated nature of both discourse and meaning. While this concept is formulated as deriving from rather abstract code-to-code relationships by Kristeva and Barthes, it is formulated as deriving from diachronic and synchronic relationships of human agents within discourse as the word in (re-)use by Bakhtin, as “a contact of personalities and not of things” (Bakhtin 1986: 162). This means that all knowledge-bearing discourse in a genre such as the undergraduate lecture is inescapably intertextual in origin in the sense that it is reaccentuated discourse deriving from the diachronic, discursively-mediated disciplinary interaction that first constructed that knowledge. In other words, what gives a lecturer the ability and means to discourse now in the disciplinary context of the undergraduate lecture

is constituted by prior disciplinary discourse. This therefore is the basic underlying premise informing this study, that all knowledge-bearing discourse in a lecture is considered to be intertextual by default, regardless of whether this is explicitly manifested or not.

While this is a rich and essential starting point, nevertheless, this study rejects the more extreme consequences of such views as Kristeva's, particularly that human agents are sidelined, and instead intertextuality as understood in this study and in this specific genre follows Bakhtin in situating human agents directly at the heart of these default intertextual processes, as the notion of authorhood in the sense of reaccentuation seems vital for intertextuality to function as a living regenerative system and to avoid stasis or even collapsing in on itself. Discourse certainly may be an abstract historicized code in essence, but it takes on actual meaning only in grounded social dialogic situations of use between human agents (e.g. Wittgenstein 1953). Intertextuality is understood in this study and within this genre therefore not as an abstract code system, but as a system of situated historical, human, disciplinary and discursive relationships lying directly at the heart of disciplinary discourse, within and through which disciplinary agents discourse, within and through which synchronic lecture discourse derives its meanings, and within and through whose management by a speaker lecture discourse derives its textures and patternings.

Such a view emphasises the historicity of discourse, the co-dependence of new discourse on old, and the relationships between their agents, while locating these relationships and their effects, temporarily at least, within the discourse of a

purposeful and active current speaker. Intertextuality within the specific genre of the academic undergraduate lecture then, as it is understood in this study, therefore means firstly that synchronic lecture discourse has discursive relationships to historical (and maybe sometimes contemporary too) forms of disciplinary discourse *and* to the disciplinary agents and/or groups which uttered that discourse; secondly that these relationships are mediated by a lecturer; and thirdly that these relationships and their management are what shape the intertextual patternings of disciplinary lecture discourse. In this sense, the synchronic utterances in a lecture as instances of discourse are therefore understood to be socially situated and historically-derived phenomena, forged in dialogic or intertextual interaction between their speaker, their intended audience (their “addressivity”), and their discursive and human history as disciplinary discourse, as formalised within Bakhtin’s (1981 & 1986) notions of genre and dialogism.

This locates authorhood as a thoroughly social, implicated, historical and dialogic (and close to intertextual in the Kristevan sense of the word) phenomenon, but it certainly does not “kill” it. Indeed the very notion of Bakhtinian dialogism positions authorhood as central in that authors are the active (re)producers of utterances, the mediators of the relationships inherent in discourse, and perhaps too even, in effect, authorhood is in fact the very ‘device’ which delimits otherwise potentially unbounded heteroglossia (i.e. discourse as unfixed abstract code).

In this study therefore, while a lecturer is not seen as a bound agent or as a genre dupe, s/he is seen nevertheless firstly as a socially and historically situated agent, seen secondly as being necessarily in dialogue within his/her genre and its

constituent discourses and orders of knowledge in order to be able to construct lecture discourse in the first place, and seen thirdly as authoring from within the disciplinary community¹⁹¹ and its discourses rather than authoring as a disciplinary Adam.

The 'genre' of the academic discipline is thus discursive first and foremost but materially embodied in uttering subjects, and the utterances of these subjects in undergraduate lectures reaccentuate the genre and its constituent discourses, and thus make it a living community with living discourse; while disciplinary meaning-making or "knowledge" in lectures is seen as the temporary synchronic product of the management of the dialogism/interaction between the participants involved, a lecturer, a discipline and an audience, and their discourses. Different relationships will generate different patterns of discourse, and these relationships can be observed in the discourse patterns they create.

There are a number of important consequences of such a view for this study. Firstly, discourse in undergraduate academic lectures is considered in this study to be the discourse of a community¹⁹² first and foremost, not solely of an individual. A lecturer may choose to explicitly show this in his/her lecture discourse, or to downplay it, but the lecture discourse is nevertheless communal and disciplinary in origin, however much this may or may not be evident in its reaccentuation and

¹⁹¹ See e.g. Lemke (1990: xi): "Whenever we do science, we take ways of talking, reasoning, observing, analysing, and writing that we have learned from our community and use them to construct findings and arguments that become part of science only when they become shared in that community. Teaching science is teaching students how to do science. Teaching, learning, and doing science are all social processes: taught, learned, and done as members of social communities" (Lemke 1990: xi)

¹⁹² See e.g. Rose (1997: 43) for a view on this area. Rose (ibid) sees a direct traceable relationship, and argues for instance that "scientific discourse and practice at the research level are recontextualised at the undergraduate level as curriculum in each of the disciplines" (Rose 1997: 43).

management. This means that the analyst avoids the thorny, if not impossible problem of initially identifying which discourse in a lecture is “intertextual” and which is “not”¹⁹³. Instead the patterns of the reaccentuation of disciplinary discourse are all understood as different patterns derived from the management of this intertextuality.

Secondly, the study of intertextuality as perceived in this study is not the study of which genres, discourses and so on constitute new discourse (e.g. Fairclough 1992, Solin 2001); instead it is the study of how intertextuality, as human, historical and discursive relationships in discourse, is managed, and how these relationships and their management influence patterns of reaccentuating discourse. This study in other words is examining the discursive relationships constructed between lecturer, discipline and audience in the process of the recontextualisation of these resources, rather than aiming to identify explicitly what these resources are in terms of genres, discourses and so on.

For this reason, this study partly rejects the bipartite notion of intertextuality as “constitutive” and/or “manifest” (Fairclough 1992: 104). The study accepts the notion of “constitutive intertextuality”, but views it as hard, if not impossible to examine in any great depth and with any great precision due to the difficulties of establishing which genres, discourses and so on do constitute a new discourse, and then reliably and consistently distinguishing between them. Instead this study views the study of intertextuality as the study of the different relationships taken up with

¹⁹³ See e.g. Culler (1981: 105), who, in tackling Jenny (1976) for omitting allusion from his study of intertextuality in literature, argues that any act of such censorship or the attempt to “to restrict the concept of intertextuality for practical reasons – to mark out a manageable area of investigation – is not an innocent strategy. It poses questions about the claims made for the larger concept” (Culler 1981: 105).

the constituent resources of discourse, and their effects. In this sense, “manifest intertextuality” (Fairclough *ibid*) is viewed not so much as one specific system or type of intertextuality, but as merely one identifiable area of patternings which intertextuality and its management can take. Intertextuality may indeed be “manifest”, indeed it frequently seems to be this way in some academic discourses, but nevertheless, the same essentially inherent feature of discourse, its historicity, may be constructed so that it is not “manifest” but silenced perhaps¹⁹⁴.

Instead, Bakhtin’s concept of “reaccentuation” points very clearly to the fact that in an utterance, the essential dialogism and intertextuality within that utterance¹⁹⁵ can be embraced, tolerated, repressed or outright denied. An utterance might be reaccentuated via reported speech for instance, Fairclough’s (1992: 104) “manifest intertextuality”, in which case the default dialogism/intertextuality within that utterance is usually rendered explicit and there appear to be usually at least two clearly delineated “centres of consciousness” (Voloshinov 1973) observable within it, in explicit dialogue.

However, the same utterance could be reaccentuated in such a way that it *appears* to be averred and to hold only one single “centre of consciousness” (Voloshinov *ibid*) in it. Nevertheless, if one thinks of this not as one *single* “centre of consciousness” (Voloshinov *ibid*), but instead as one *homogeneous* “centre of consciousness”, as

¹⁹⁴ See also Tadros (1993).

¹⁹⁵ “Our thought itself – philosophical, scientific, and artistic – is born and shaped in the process of interaction and struggle with others’ thought, and this cannot but be reflected in the forms that verbally express our thought as well” (Bakhtin 1986: 92)

the two centres of consciousness being in chorus¹⁹⁶, then one can better see the idea that this is one simple instance of different managements of implicit default intertextuality, rather than one utterance ‘with’ dialogism/intertextuality and one ‘without’ it. This is how discourse for Bakhtin can be polyphonic (dialogic) or monophonic (monologic) – polyphonic (dialogic) discourse celebrates open intertextuality and welcomes “other voices” as a constituent part of discourse, it not only accepts heterogeneity but *is* heterogeneity, while monophonic (monologic) discourse on the other hand downplays “other voices” as a constituent part of discourse, it aims at homogeneity, or chorus. This is why Hirschkop (1986: 81) is so right when he draws attention to what dialogism and monologism in fact are:

“Dialogism and monologism are not different kinds of texts, but different kinds of intertextual configuration” (Hirschkop 1986: 81)

This study, as does Bakhtin himself, links this concept broadly to notions of certainty and uncertainty in discourse – monophonic (monologic) discourse in this study is associated broadly with (the (re-)construction of) certain, shared, accepted non-temporal discourse/knowledge (“authoritative discourse”) due to the apparent absence of debate (re)constructed within it (its homogeneity), while polyphonic (dialogic) discourse on the other hand is associated with uncertain, individual, provisional, temporal discourse/knowledge due to the continued debate (re)constructed within it (its heterogeneity)¹⁹⁷.

¹⁹⁶ “I can mean what I say, but only indirectly, at a second remove, in the words I take and give back to the community according to the protocols it establishes. My voice can mean, but only with others: at times in chorus, but at the best of times in dialogue” (Bakhtin 1981: 165).

¹⁹⁷ This study follows Bloor’s (1976) third principle of symmetry, meaning this study does not necessarily accept that monophonic discourse *is* true “knowledge” per se and/or that dialogic

This is why for Bakhtin (1981: 121), we must avoid “the narrow understanding of dialogism as argument, polemics, or parody” – for Bakhtin (ibid), these are merely obvious but crude forms of dialogism. Instead, dialogism might take the form of “confidence in another’s word” (ibid), or “reverential reception” (ibid) (especially with the authoritative word), or “agreement, in its infinite gradations and shadings” (ibid). These are the very means and process(es) by which “the life (and thus form) of any word is therefore its life within a succession of socially-situated utterances, in each of which its meanings can be accepted, enriched, contested, or annexed” (Voloshinov 1973: 72).

Bakhtin himself rarely, if ever, seems to explicitly state it as such, but this management of inherent intertextuality, while likely being very personal in some situations, nevertheless also in effect therefore becomes a social act in that it marks a speaker’s relationship with bodies of discourse – and when those bodies of discourse derive from institutionalised structures, such social relationships can even be viewed as political acts (Lemke 1990 & 1995). In such situations, to realise intertextuality as a chorus between discursive participants (i.e. as downplayed, or as “reverential reception”) is a very different social/political act to realising it as naked disagreement (i.e. as celebrated). This is one of the reasons why the study of the management of intertextuality in lectures has the potential to be a means by which disciplinary social structure can be illuminated.

discourse is untrue “knowledge”, but understands that these discourse patterns *construct* the “knowledge” as true or as contingent.

The final phenomenon regarding intertextuality as it is understood in this study derives from Kristeva, and her idea that in taking up a prior text, a new text absorbs and transforms that initial text¹⁹⁸. Although this notion is part of what assists Kristeva in re-positioning the Bakhtinian notion of inter-subjectivity as intertextuality, in that the semiotic focus on text per se as opposed to authorhood centres text itself as the constitutive factor in her theorisation, what it also rightly points to is the recursive and cyclical nature of intertextuality as a system. The importance of this understanding lies in the idea that the management of intertextuality in the (re-)production of discourse necessarily implies too a (re-)organisation of the whole body of discourse that comes before it and which enables current discourse and/or meaning-making. This seems to be one of the reasons why the codes animating the discursive space in which new discourse takes shape are not stable for Kristeva, but are such that their use destabilises (and then presumably temporarily restabilises) the code from and in which they have appeared. In this sense, the management of intertextuality can be such that it stabilises prior discourse by (re-)constructing it as homogeneous, or such that it destabilises prior discourse by (re-)constructing it as heterogeneous¹⁹⁹.

This lends significance to the idea that the management of intertextuality is therefore both a social and a political act in that in an academic context, this management is not only what reconstructs the discourse of a community, but in

¹⁹⁸ "Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; *any text is the absorption and transformation of another*" (Kristeva 1969: in Moi 1986: 37, my italics).

¹⁹⁹ See also Worton & Still (1990: 12): "Inevitably a fragment and displacement, every quotation distorts and redefines the 'primary' utterance by relocating it within another linguistic and cultural context. Therefore, despite any intentional quest on the part of the quoting author to engage in inter-subjective activity, the quotation itself generates a tension between belief both in original and originating integrity and in the possibility of (re)integration and an awareness of infinite deferral and dissemination of meaning. Quotation as fragmentation does indeed generate centrifugality in reading, but it also generates centripetality, focussing the reader's attention on textual functioning rather than on hermeneutics" (Worton & Still 1990: 12)

doing so is also what (re-) constructs an understanding of that community as a social group. In other words, different managements of intertextuality are likely to result in different (re-)constructions of a community and the discourse that constitutes it²⁰⁰. This is an essential point made by Latour (1987: 27) in his discussion of the life of a statement and of how, if that statement is to become a 'fact', it needs to be spread, or "projected" (Bachelard 1934):

"The fate of the statement, that is the decision about whether or is a fact or a fiction, depends on a sequence of debates later on ... this essential point: the status of a statement depends on later statements. It is made more of a certainty or less of a certainty depending on the next sentence that takes it up" (Latour 1987: 27)

It is the later management of the intertextuality within a statement as it enters new discursive spaces in reaccentuated forms which renders a statement as 'fact' or as 'possibility' or as 'fallacy'. If a statement becomes a community 'fact', then it may

²⁰⁰ See for example Salager-Meyer (1999: 300) and her discussion of historical patterns of 'referencing' as she terms it and social structure in medicine: "The increasing use of footnotes as a way of referring to previously published papers displaced general and specific references during the first half of the twentieth century, and reflected the emergence of an increasingly codified system of scientific documentation and of a tighter and more "academic" scientific community. This, in turn, revealed a trend towards increasing "scientificity", a consequence of the expansion of medical knowledge worldwide. The end-list pattern of referencing (characteristic of the second half of the twentieth century) reflects the highly the highly professionalised, structured and conventional character of late twentieth century medical research and medical research writing, and mirrors a tight communication network and a well-established scientific community made of "invisible" scholars." (Salager-Meyer 1999: 300). She uses this example: "In early papers, explicit referring to other researchers' works was very general and author-centred, thus reflecting the narrative rhetoric of personal experience and the individual character of early nineteenth century medical science. Reference citing evolved over time to a very precise, objectified and object-centred system of codification that truly reflects the more scientific, technical, expert-like, professionalised, highly-structured and specialised character of today's medical science" (Salager-Meyer 1999: 301). See also Bazerman (1988).

even lose all signs of its intertextual origins²⁰¹. Bazerman (1992) too draws attention to this social and political relationship²⁰² of a speaker and his/her genre and its constituent discourse very clearly too:

“Once a rhetorical field is highly developed, individuals find themselves in the middle of intertextual webs within which they can act only by modifying the intertextuality through new statements. Our goals and activities influence our idiosyncratic placement in and interpretation of that intertextual field. When physicists read professional articles, they do so with any eye toward promoting their own research projects within a competitively structured argument over what claims are considered to be correct and important and how the literature should be synthesized (sic) and advanced. There is constant negotiation among prior statements, new statements, responses and further work over what constitutes credibility and creditability. By reconstructing the literature around their on-going work and then representing their new work within that reconstructed matrix of the

²⁰¹ See for example Merton (1996): “Certain patterns of referencing behaviour would seem to set limits on the use of citation counts for tracing the long-term genealogy of ideas. One of these patterns has been described as “obliteration by incorporation” (Messeri 1978): the obliteration of the source of ideas, methods, or findings by their incorporation in currently accepted knowledge. In the course of this hypothesized process, the number of explicit references to the original work declines in the papers and books making use of it. Users and consequently transmitters of that knowledge are so thoroughly familiar with its origins that they assume this to be true of their readers as well. Preferring not to insult their readers’ knowledgeability, they no longer refer to the original source.” (Merton 1996)

²⁰² Lemke (1995: 601) for instance sees issues of social power involved in the politics of intertextuality: “Both condensation and monologism in technical discourse serve to establish and maintain a social elite, its claims of privilege and its access to power. These strategies, once confined to technical and scientific discourse, have with the increased power and visibility of science come to be adopted into managerial and bureaucratic discourse, from which technocratic discourse itself emerges.” (Lemke 1995: 60-1). This is the case for Lemke because “in general, it helps to establish a heteroglossic opposition between ‘science’ and ‘common sense’ (with a strong value bias in favour of science) that is ideologically useful in getting the public to defer to the ‘scientific knowledge’ of a technical elite” (Lemke 1995: 7).

literature, individuals make the field over fresh and construct a new place for the self' (Bazerman 1992: 65)

This is the very reason why social identities in discourse are not static on the one hand or structurally determined on the other, but instead are "contextually situated and interactionally emergent" (Matoesian 2000: 882), and possess the immanent potential to shift in the fine-grained details of real-time interactive discourse" (Matoesian 2000: 882).

Intertextuality as understood in this study then is a feature which permeates all knowledge-bearing discourse in undergraduate academic lectures, and a feature whose management is a highly significant factor in determining discursive patterns in this genre and in determining the perception of community social structure too. In order to study this phenomenon as it is understood in this manner, what is needed therefore is a holistic, organic means of analyses allowing all lecture discourse to be examined in similar ways. However, such a methodology seems to be lacking, meaning one of the most significant aims of this study is to devise such a holistic and organic methodology informed by the rich understanding of intertextuality put forward in this chapter.

The need for such a methodology has in fact been identified before, but never realised. For instance, Chandler (2001) suggests that among important features of intertextuality needing examination can be included:

- **Reflexivity:** how reflexive (or self-conscious) the use of intertextuality seems to be.

- **Alteration:** the alteration of sources – what happens to ‘source’ discourse (more noticeable alteration presumably means that ‘new’ discourse is more reflexively intertextual).
- **Explicitness:** the specificity and explicitness of reference(s) to other discourse (e.g. direct quotation, attributed quotation).
- **Criticality to comprehension:** how important it would be for an audience to recognize the intertextuality involved.
- **Scale of adoption:** the overall scale of allusion/incorporation within the text.
- **Structural unboundedness:** to what extent ‘new’ discourse is presented (or understood) as part of or tied to a larger structure (e.g. as part of a genre, of a series, of a serial, of a magazine, of an exhibition etc.).

(From Chandler 2001).

For Chandler (ibid), one of the chief concerns of any investigation into intertextuality is, appropriately, the fact that “the dominant mode of producing texts seems to involve masking their debts”, meaning “reflexivity seems to be an important issue” (ibid), suggesting again the idea of intertextuality as a managed phenomenon which can be marked or masked for instance. However, Chandler fails to give any means of carrying out his ideas. Therefore, taking the above as a broad conceptual basis for what any methodology needs to be able to reveal, the next chapter sets out to show how such a methodology might be conceived.

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter illustrates how a coherent, holistic and consistent scheme for analyses of the management of intertextuality in academic undergraduate lectures is arrived at, based on two broad ideas set out in the previous chapter; firstly that all disciplinary knowledge-bearing discourse in a lecture is intertextual by default, meaning that the methodology for this study needs therefore to be holistic rather than selective; and secondly that the study of intertextuality in the genre of the undergraduate academic lecture is the study of the management of the discursively-mediated interactions of the participants involved and the ways these relationships are constructed in the genre, meaning the participants and their potential relationships and encodings need to be identified and formalised.

As such, using two lectures²⁰³ from two different disciplines to do so, the stages of this chapter are firstly to illustrate how lecture discourse can be reliably segregated into consistent units for analyses such that the management of intertextuality can be observed, quantified and compared reliably and in detail across the entire corpus; secondly to identify who the participants in lecture discourse are, and to illustrate how these participants, their relationships and their contributions within lecture discourse can be encoded and recognised; thirdly, using the notion of what I have termed “intertext”, to illustrate what functions in lecture discourse each participant/

²⁰³ These two lectures are “Radiation Chemistry” from the discipline “Chemistry”, and “The Labour Movement and New Social Movements” from the discipline “Sociology”. Both are from The BASE corpus.

combinations of participants can be constructed as performing; to illustrate fourthly how these choices contribute to the management of intertextuality; and finally, to illustrate how the features above are amalgamated into the coding typology to be used in this study, via which the management of intertextuality can be reliably and consistently tracked in lecture discourse. This methodology will then be used for the analyses of a corpus of twenty-four undergraduate academic lectures in chapter 6. This methodology derives though from the initial analyses of the two lectures beneath, as no suitable methodology currently exists.

3.2 Segregating the Data into Independent Units

Segregation of spoken discourse can be achieved via three broad types of unit, by semantic units (e.g. Sinclair & Coulthard 1975), by intonational units, or by syntactic units (Foster et al 2000). Because this study will use quantifications in the main data analyses and therefore requires consistency, the former two of these are therefore rejected due to their unreliability, and instead, this study uses syntactically-derived units to segregate the data, specifically a modified means of syntactic segregation based on Biber et al (1999) and their notion of what they term the C-unit²⁰⁴. This unit revolves around the basic unit of the independent clause, but is modified by Biber et al (ibid) to better accommodate the nature of spoken discourse, specifically the phenomena of non-clausal units and inserts (ibid), while this study also further modifies this scheme so as to better fit the specific nature of the data in this study and the specific aims of this study.

²⁰⁴ A C-unit is described by Biber et al (1999: 1070) as follows: "Clausal and non-clausal units are maximal grammatical units in the sense they cannot be *syntactically* integrated with the elements which precede or follow them. (The highlighting of the word 'syntactically' here is important: of course there are many interconnections between units on the semantic and discourse levels.) We will use the term **C-unit** for both clausal and non-clausal units: *i.e. for syntactically independent pieces of speech.*" (Biber et al 1999: 1070. Italics, bold and parentheses in original).

As such, the independent unit used as the means of data segregation in this study is derived from the independent clause, and can be broadly defined as an independent clause plus any dependent clauses attached to it. Such a unit is usually recognisable by having a subject (though this may be omitted due to ellipsis) and a finite verb. A unit based on this understanding is a suitable unit not only because it is consistently observable in discourse (Foster et al *ibid*), but also because the clause is recognised as the basic unit enabling the construction of discourse in terms of message, exchange and representation (Halliday 1994a: 34ff). This means that each unit of discourse in the data will be analysable for similar features using the same methodology for doing so, therefore enabling a consistent and holistic approach to the data.

Despite the sometimes complex nature of lecture discourse due to its hybrid nature of spoken and written features (e.g. Flowerdew 1994b), this broad definition accommodates the majority of units observed in the initial data. Nevertheless, there are some common features of authentic lecture discourse which means this unit requires further attention and modification so as to ensure that every piece and/or feature of the data can either be consistently assigned within a superordinate independent unit or consistently be assigned the status of an independent unit. These features are units of Direct Reported Speech, Parenthetical Structures, and units of discourse which are broadly non-clausal in nature, what Biber et al (*ibid*) term Peripheral Elements, Non-clausal Units and Inserts.

3.2.1 Units of Direct Reported Speech

While instances of *Indirect Reported Speech* are consistently understood in this study as hypotactic (Halliday 1994a: 219ff) and therefore as dependent on their superordinate reporting unit, meaning both reporting clause and indirect reported clause are classified as the one independent unit, this study treats instances of *Direct Reported Speech*, frequently instances of *Constructed Dialogue* (Tannen 1989), on the other hand as units of discourse which are paratactic (Halliday *ibid*), and thus have independent status. This allows for potentially important distinctions between the two forms (Gumperz 1982, Tannen 1982b & 1989, Swales 1981 & 1986b, Hyland 2000) to be highlighted in the data from the start. However, because instances of *Direct Reported Speech* cannot usually be viewed as totally independent of their reporting clause, this feature, very common in the initial data, is treated as follows:

RC514) and what's known is a very very fast reaction between H₂O plus and water to give H₃O plus and OH radical

RC515) so you might have thought [well] [perhaps we're getting some OH radical]

RC516) [well]

RC517) [perhaps we're getting some OH radical]

RC518) what about the electrons?

In this way, using [square brackets] to identify the relevant units within their reporting clause and then placing them beneath that reporting unit, still within their [square brackets], units of *Direct Reported Speech* are classified for what they are,

pragmatically dependent on their reporting unit but also syntactically independent. This choice is followed consistently throughout the study.

3.2.2 Parenthetical Structures

Common in the initial data and sometimes running to a large number of units, these are digressive structures with the status of an independent unit(s) which occur in the midst of another syntactically unrelated unit, often in effect disrupting or dividing the main unit – very usually they could in fact be omitted with no syntactic effect on the main unit except to allow it to recombine again. Parenthetical structures, testament to the spoken nature of lecture discourse, are treated consistently in this study as follows – a parenthetical structure is marked in [square brackets] within its superordinate structure, and then, still in its [square brackets] so as to enable permanent recognition of its status as a parenthetical unit, it is placed directly beneath the superordinate structure in which it is spoken. All these units are then analysed as independent units in the same manner as all other independent units:

TLM163) again his claim is that after that time [he is not precise] [he can't put them this down to a particular date October the fourteenth nineteen-forty-nine or something but from around that sort of time] he sees er the privileged sections of the labour movement not as providing leadership but as entering into an internal competition with other groups in the labour movements particularly over wages

TLM164) [he is not precise]

TLM165) [he can't put them this down to a particular date October the fourteenth nineteen-forty-nine or something but from around that sort of time]

TLM166) so the privileged groups of the period ... Hobsbawm sees as not providing leadership

3.2.3 Peripheral Elements, Non-clausal Units and Inserts

Peripheral Elements (from Biber et al 1999: 136-40) describes a category of discourse material which does not quite fit into formal notions of the independent clause and is in fact not unique to speech, being found in written discourse too, while *Non-clausal Units* (from Biber et al: 1067ff) describes a category of discourse material which does not fit into formal notions of the independent clause at all, and is associated by and large with spoken discourse. *Inserts* meanwhile are single-item *Non-clausal Units*.

The former of these, *Peripheral Elements*, examples of which include stance/linking adverbials and prefaces, are consistently understood as dependent items in this study and are therefore consistently maintained within their superordinate unit, while both *Non-clausal Units*, for instance elliptic replies or condensed questions, and *Inserts*, for instance spoken discourse markers, a highly common feature of the initial data, are consistently classified as units of independent status in this study. This is because not only are they pragmatically independent units (Sacks et al 1974), typically used to facilitate interaction, but also because they are prosodically

independent too, typically separated within discourse by small pauses and frequently marked by a change of voice tone too²⁰⁵:

RC277) and the question raised in people's minds [okay] [this is what you see at ten to the minus nine] [but what if we could actually shorten the pulse further would we see earlier events?]

RC278) [okay]

RC279) [this is what you see at ten to the minus nine]

RC280) [but what if we could actually shorten the pulse further would we see earlier events?]

3.2.4 Conclusion

This then is the system by which the data is classified into independent units in a consistent and reliable manner, a system deriving originally from the concept of the independent clause as found in written discourse, but modified extensively so as to be authentic and applicable to spoken forms of discourse and specifically to the nature of this particular data. The unit used comprises the independent clause or independent non-clausal unit, standing alone as an independent unit:

TLM32) this is a theory shared well beyond Marxism within other branches of of the labour movement

TLM33) so let's er just state the theory

TLM34) the first point to state about is the idea of historical inevitability

²⁰⁵ See Couper-Kuhlen (1998) and Gunthner (1998) on this common feature in spoken forms of reporting. Such items also frequently mark a change in participation frameworks too (Goffman 1974 & 1981, Schiffrin 1987), in other words these items can frequently also signal a change in "voice" in a more Bakhtinian sense of the word. They therefore play a very important interactive role in spoken discourse, and an equally important role in lecture discourse too.

It comprises the independent unit together with any other units dependent on it:

TLM25) and then to conclude the lecture we'll move on to a different kind of theory the theory of so-called New Social Movements which claims er that either the pre-eminence of the labour movement has now declined and there it's just one amongst many

And it also comprises and allows for the natural features of spoken discourse such as *Non-clausal Units, Inserts, Parenthetical Structures* and so on to be reliably and consistently accounted for in the data too:

TLM357) they were members of a loose network of people who were concerned about this and who came together er for their stint at Greenham Common on an informal basis

TLM358) finally let's me offer some er critical thoughts on the theory [α whoops α] [β wrong bit β] on the theory of new new social movements

TLM359) [α whoops α]

TLM360) [β wrong bit β]

TLM361) the first criticism takes objection to the er to the description new social movements

Each unit derived from the application of the scheme to the discourse is numbered chronologically and prefaced with capital letters to indicate which lecture it derives from, and this concept of the independent unit devised for this study means therefore that all lecture discourse can be classified consistently and reliably into

units for analyses, in turn enabling the beginnings of consistent and reliable analyses of the management of intertextuality in lecture discourse. Appendix 1 contains a table summarising the system devised for and employed throughout this study for segregating the data into independent units.

The next step is to identify which “other voices” and/or combinations of “other voices” can potentially exist in and/or co-construct lecture discourse, and particularly to establish how they may be validly and consistently recognised. In this way, what this study aims at, a coherent analysis of all discourse within the same framework, as it relates to the management of intertextuality, can be produced.

3.3 Participants in Lecture Discourse

3.3.1 Participants & Interactions in Lecture Discourse

This study understands that it is through and within the discursively-mediated interactions and relationships of discourse participants, as the management of intertextuality, that lecture discourse is created:

“Language, culture, and society are grounded in interaction: they stand in a reflexive relationship with the self, the other, and the self-other relationship, and it is out of these mutually constitutive relationships that discourse is created” (Schiffrin 1994: 134)

Who though are these participants? This study understands that there are three participants in lecture discourse, namely lecturer, discipline and audience. In this

example beneath, from *Radiation Chemistry*, we can see two of these participants in the discourse, the lecturer and the audience:

RC515) so **you** might have thought [well] [perhaps we're getting some OH radical]
RC516) [well]
RC517) [perhaps we're getting some OH radical]
RC518) what about the electrons?
RC519) well
RC520) an electron the kind of an electron which goes along a wire in a torch or in a TV set or to this overhead projector if you put an electron in water
RC521) I don't know what **you** know about solutions of sodium in ammonia or potassium in ammonia
RC522) but if you take ammonia and you dissolve potassium or sodium [α have **you** done that α] [β have **you** had an experiment in the lab with sodium and ammonia β] [χ have **you** ever had to look at ammonia as a reagent χ] [δ maybe not δ] [ϵ well ϵ] [ϕ if you take ammonia ϕ]

Here we can see two of the three participants in lecture discourse, the lecturer and the audience – the lecturer is the first obvious participant as the speaker, I, but the audience, in being given a grammatical role in discourse in this way via you, or projected (Thompson & Thetela 1995, Thompson 2001), are also openly involved in the discourse, meaning the discourse is viewable as interactional (Thompson 2001), and from a Bakhtinian perspective, dialogic as its “addressivity” is rendered explicit.

However, there is a third participant in this genre too, namely the academic discipline within and through which the lecture derives. This third participant can be explicit or implicit. What though does this mean? Beneath is a section of discourse from the lecture *Radiation Chemistry* which in Tadros' (1993) terms is averred:

RC28) and you get a certain amount of ion recombination
RC29) and when this electron returns to that cation it is very likely to form it in an excited state
RC30) so it will get additional excited states from ion recombination
RC31) but also what can happen is that the RH plus the cation radical is a very powerful proton donor
RC32) and it will give a proton towards almost anything in sight
RC33) this will tend to happen
RC34) and perhaps the best known example of this is if you imagine RH plus is H₂O plus the water cation then that will give away a proton to a nearby water molecule to give H₃O plus
RC35) and you're left with OH behind
RC36) so you do get these proton transfers occurring

Here the discourse, comprising mostly material and relational processes as we would expect in science discourse (Halliday 1994b, Lemke 1990 & 1995), realised in present simple tense constructing factivity via permanent applicability time-wise (Quirk et al 1972), is averred (Tadros 1993) and monologic (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986). In this way, the default intertextual nature of the discourse is downplayed, and instead a single monologic, authoritative authorial voice is constructed. This is the third participant in lecture discourse, the academic discipline and its constituent discourses from which the lecture emerges. Although this participant is not explicitly projected in the example above and instead is downplayed, or implicit, it is nevertheless inherently involved in such a genre, and this inherent involvement becomes clearer in the example beneath from the second lecture, *The Labour Movement and New Social Movements*. This is broadly a similar lecture function as the first example above from *Radiation Chemistry*, the explication of disciplinary theory to a novice audience, but here the third participant (originally) behind the theory, the discipline in the shape of a specific disciplinary theorist, Eric Hobsbawm, is very much an explicit participant in its retelling, and therefore

constructed as a more active participant in the process of the (re-)construction of disciplinary meaning:

TLM139) in terms of work experience in terms of life style in terms of political awareness the proposition is put forward by er by **Hobsbawm** that there was an increasing what **he** called proletarianisation of working class life
TLM140) in support of that **he** he makes the point that most most workers up to that time were increasingly male increasingly manual
TLM141) uum
TLM142) there is another characteristic
TLM143) I can't just think we just leave it at male and manual
TLM144) er
TLM145) white is the other criteria
TLM146) most most workers were white male and manual workers
TLM147) and based upon that their experience of work and their the these people's family **Hobsbawm** claims that there was a trend towards what **he** calls the this proletarianisation of life a common experience of life
TLM148) now from around nineteen-fifty **he** claims that that common experience has changed direction towards a greater heterogeneity of experience
TLM149) and **he** puts forward the claim that the work force has become increase increasingly differentiated rather than focused upon white male manual workers

The propositions above are framed by reporting verbs and/or reporting nouns, meaning the original disciplinary agent behind the disciplinary meaning, Eric Hobsbawm, is still very much involved in its explication – as a disciplinary participant, he has not been downplayed or removed as happens in the previous example from *Radiation Chemistry*, but is explicitly involved, meaning in turn that the discourse is overtly intertextual. This means that while in the previous example from *Radiation Chemistry*, disciplinary meaning and its history is presented as contemporary here-and-now monologic disciplinary meaning isolated from its historical mediation and construction, and disciplinary involvement is implicit, in this example directly above on the other hand, there is both there-and-then and here-and-now disciplinary meaning being interactively (re-)constructed, disciplinary involvement is explicit, and we can more clearly see there being not just the two participants in lecture discourse, but three – lecturer, audience and discipline.

Nevertheless, viewing ‘knowledge’ and discourse as socially-derived and mutually (re)-informing phenomena²⁰⁶, this study understands that it would be wrong to say that the discourse from *The Labour Movement* is intertextual, while that from *Radiation Chemistry* is not. Instead, this study understands that the two different discourse patterns are the discursive products of different means of managing intertextuality, or different configurations of intertextuality (Hirschkop 1986: 81) – in Bakhtinian terminology, the disciplinary genre and its constituent discourse are reaccentuated differently in the two excerpts.

In the excerpt from *Radiation Chemistry*, the disciplinary genre and its constituent discourse are reaccentuated as reliable, objective, factual contemporary meaning, divorced from its original claiming agent(s) – this is evidenced in the lexicogrammar, particularly the lack of reporting²⁰⁷; while in the excerpt from *The Labour Movement* on the other hand, the disciplinary genre and its constituent discourse are reaccentuated instead as contingent, unproven, subjective meaning, still married to its original claiming agent²⁰⁸. However, the social and diachronic processes behind knowledge-construction are not understood in this study as being greatly different in the two disciplines, meaning therefore that this study understands that the discursive situation in lecture discourse in which “other voice(s)” of the discipline is/are not signalled or given explicit participant status does not mean that “other voices” are considered never to have been involved with the ‘knowledge’ and its original

²⁰⁶ See especially Latour & Woolgar (1979) on the discursive transformation of scientific facts from type 1 to type 5 statements. See also Bazerman (1988), Salager-Meyer (1999), Woolgar (1988).

²⁰⁷ This equates with Latour & Woolgar’s (1979) type 5 statements, the least modalised, least subjective statements, which construct what they state as accepted ‘fact’.

²⁰⁸ This equates with Latour & Woolgar’s (1979) type 1 statements, the most modalised, most subjective statements, which usually contain reporting structures and construct what they state as ‘opinion’.

constructing discourse – instead this study understands that the social and discursive historicity of the discourse has disappeared, and that “disciplinary voice(s)” are simply managed differently in having been downplayed or removed from the (re-)constructing lecture discourse. In other words this discursive pattern in lecture discourse is the product of a different management of intertextuality. This therefore is why the methodology for this study must examine all the discourse in the data to in order comprehensively assess how the management of intertextuality is achieved in academic lectures in different disciplines, rather than cherry-picking explicit instances signalled by reporting.

3.3.2 Clear Participants in Lecture Discourse

In this study therefore, it is understood that there are three clear participants in the discourse – the lecturer as *I*, the audience as *you*, and the discipline as *he/she/they*. These are outlined in table 3.1 beneath:

Participants	Examples	Comments
1) Lecturer as <i>I</i>	I don't know what you know about solutions of sodium in ammonia or potassium in ammonia	Refers clearly to the lecturer as participant
2) Audience as <i>you</i>	have you had an experiment in the lab with sodium and ammonia? have you ever had to look at ammonia as a re-agent?	Refers clearly to the audience as direct participants
3) Discipline as <i>he / she / they</i>	and based upon that their experience of work and their the these people's family Hobsbawm claims that there was a trend towards what he calls the this proletarianisation of life a common experience of life now from around nineteen-fifty he claims that that common experience has changed direction towards a greater heterogeneity of experience and he puts forward the claim that the work force has become increase increasingly differentiated rather than focused upon white male manual workers	Refers clearly to the discipline as enacted / projected participants

Table 3.1: Clear Participants in Lecture Discourse

Understanding intertextuality as the discursively-mediated relationships of the participants in discourse, these above then appear to be the most immediately obvious manifestations of the three participants in lecture discourse – we have the clear and unambiguous lecturer-as-*I*, audience-as-*you*, and discipline-as-*s/he/them*, all three clearly indexed by names and/or personal pronouns.

3.3.3 Unclear Participants in Lecture Discourse

However, as illustrated with the excerpt from Radiation Chemistry above, there are times when there is less explicit indication of clear individual participants in the discourse, and instead participants are implicit. Not only this, but there are also

suggestions of conjoined participants. These participants, and their encodings, are outlined in table 3.2 beneath:

Participants	Examples	Comments
You	how do you measure the efficiency of a radiation chemistry process?	Refers to 'generic practitioner' of discipline – the <i>you</i> form is not indexing audience directly, instead it indexes an idealised disciplinary practitioner
	if you put sodium in ammonia it dissolves and gives you a deep blue solution	
We	How many ions do we get?	Refers to lecturer + audience [+ possibly to discipline too] as fused participants
	so we might have thought well perhaps we're getting some OH radical what about the electrons?	
We	TLM1) over the last two weeks we 've been talking about democracy TLM2) we 've been talking about the state as part of a series of lectures on the politics of modern society	Refers to lecturer + audience + discipline as fused participants
Unmarked	and when this electron returns to that cation it is very likely to form it in an excited state so it will get additional excited states from ion recombination	Refers to disciplinary theory realised as contemporary knowledge & with original participants no longer a part of their discourse

Table 3.2: Obscured Participants in Lecture Discourse

Above then we have the less clear but still identifiable discourse participants of generic-practitioner-as-*you*, lecturer-and-audience-as-*we*, lecturer-and-audience-and-discipline as-*we*, and discipline-as-*unmarked*. These last four areas are very important in this study and perhaps slightly nebulous, so we will say a few words about them.

This study follows Benveniste (1966)²⁰⁹ in conceiving of pronouns as unfilled signs which take on their meaning only by constant synchronic reference within the

²⁰⁹ See also Lyons (1968, 1977, 1981).

discourse surrounding them, in other words as potentially not having fixed semantic meanings and instead as having contextually-bound local and dynamically-unfolding spatio-temporal meanings. This is probably partly because English lacks the breadth of pronouns necessary to encode all possible participants statuses and relationships (Benveniste *ibid*, Lyons 1968), and probably also partly perhaps because English has been described as an egalitarian language less concerned with overt statements of speaker rank and speaker-hearer relationships, and hence with exclusive/inclusive dimensions (Spiegelberg 1973). Lyons (1968) suggests nevertheless that first, second and third person pronouns respectively encode speaker inclusion, addressee inclusion, and speaker and addressee exclusion, an argument also taken up by Rounds (1987) who claims, on the evidence of the lack of third person forms in her data (Mathematics lessons) that “whereas *I* and *you* must refer to participant roles in the speech event, third person has no such function” (Rounds 1987: 14). She suggests (*ibid*: 23) that this may be because teachers in her data wish not to construct contrastive relationships between *you*-as-audience and *they*-as-mathematicians. However, this current study appears to differ in this respect, as the data quite clearly lends a participant role to the third person of a discipline. Therefore this study understands that the third person pronoun encodes a specific participant role, as we saw earlier with the role of discipline.

The first category from table 3.2 above, that of *you* as a generic form, is also different from Lyons’ (1968) idea that second person pronoun encodes addressee inclusion, in that while it clearly does encode addressee inclusion, it also seems to encode the inclusion of ‘another’, in these cases a generic practitioner in a discipline, and in doing so to encode statements of how things should be carried out

within a discipline – it is thus potentially a rather assertive form in that it could be replaced with direct imperative form. Kitigawa & Lehrer (1990) refer to this understanding of the pronoun *you* as the “impersonal you”, but in lecture discourse, preparing as it is new disciplinary practitioners, it can also be audience-inclusive in that it refers outwards too to index how things are done in a discipline by anyone who is an accepted practitioner in that discipline. It thus seems to index an idealised participant and idealised disciplinary procedural competence, and thus by implication indexes the discipline rather than anyone else. This form of *you* is therefore understood as indexing the discipline behind a lecture rather than the audience per se.

The second category in table 3.2 above of lecturer-and-audience-as-*we* meanwhile is one which understands the first person plural *we* pronoun as having two possible semantic mappings, those of the “audience-inclusive-*we*”²¹⁰ and the “audience-exclusive-*we*”²¹¹. The mapping in question here is probably the former one, that of the “audience-inclusive-*we*”, although instances of “audience-exclusive-*we*” do also occasionally occur in the data too. The third category in table 3.2 above meanwhile, another context of *we*, seems to be definitely “audience-inclusive-*we*”. This form is particularly common with metalanguage in the data, and this study understands such instances as indexing all three participants as jointly involved in emerging discursive interaction – in the vernacular, we might say that such discourse constructs all three participants as singing from the same disciplinary hymn sheet. Such instances are therefore classified as indexing the discipline first and foremost, and in doing so, the *we* or *us* is viewed in this study as also positioning the lecturer

²¹⁰ This use of “audience-inclusive-*we*” was observed as a frequent phenomenon by Rounds (1987: 20f) in her data, and it is frequent in the data for this study too.

²¹¹ See Haas (1969), Spiegelberg (1973), Rounds (1987).

and audience *within* the discipline. The pronominal form *we* therefore can index lecturer + discipline, it can index lecturer + audience, and/or it can index lecturer + discipline + audience.

The final unclear participant to be discussed from table 3.2 is that of the *Unmarked* form of *s/he/they* as the discipline behind a lecture. This category understands that the third participant in academic lectures, the academic discipline in question, can, as discussed above, be explicitly (re-)constructed as an active participatory *s/h/they*, or it can be implicitly (re-)constructed such that the original *s/he/they* has been made redundant as an active co-constructing participant, and the contribution of the *s/he/they* is instead (re-)constructed as seemingly averred synchronic discourse without its original participants' continuing involvement. In this sense, the original disciplinary knowledge and its constitutive discourse, derived both diachronically and socially from discursively-mediated interaction, has been more heavily modified, such that it can be (re-)constructed as contemporary 'here-and-now' disciplinary 'knowledge' with broader ontological reference than if it were still explicitly attached to its original creators and thus contextually anchored (Latour & Woolgar 1979). Such discourse may superficially be averred, but the rich understanding of intertextuality within this genre in this study denies that such discourse can be a lecturer's 'private' discourse, and instead this study understands such discourse as the outcome of a discursive fusion of lecturer and discipline as a single, monophonic, homogeneous participant/voice, but such that the discipline is the dominant partner. This contrasts with the more heterogeneous disciplinary voice as seen in *The Labour Movement*, in which lecturer and discipline are not constructed in monophonic unison but in dialogue.

What has happened in such instances is that the disciplinary social processes of knowledge construction and ratification have enabled the particular claims in question to become ‘knowledge’ in a discipline’s eyes, and hence realisable as unmediated and unframed contemporary knowledge statements separated from their original participants – in other words, the processes of accreditation and/or inscription (Latour & Woolgar 1979, Ziman 1968 & 1984, Myers 1992) have led to such claims being encoded as established disciplinary knowledge with universal ontological reference, and therefore (re)constructable likewise in lecture discourse; and the use of the *s/h/they* form of the discipline and therefore the use of reporting in realising such established facts would potentially remove some of their fact status²¹². Thus this category of “unmarked-*s/he/they*-as-discipline” understands such instances as being one form of disciplinary participation in the lectures, albeit one in which intertextuality has been downplayed to the extent of being lexicogrammatically invisible. Messeri (in Merton 1996) refers to this process of the loss of original claiming language as “obliteration by incorporation”, and this particular *Unmarked* means of managing intertextuality in undergraduate lecture discourse is of tremendous importance in this study, as it is the default means by which a significant proportion of disciplinary ‘knowledge’ is (re-)constructed in lecture discourse.

3.4 Participants as Textual Phenomena

²¹² See for instance Hyland (1999 & 2000), Latour & Woolgar (1979), Myers (1992) for discussion of the potentially relativising effects of encoding knowledge-claims as reported via their original third person participatory agents. Cf. Tadros (1993) for a different view on the destabilising effects of reporting on authorial identity for an undergraduate textbook writer.

These then are the three participants in lecture discourse, lecturer-discipline-audience and combinations thereof, and it is the different ways in which these participants, as “other voices”, are encoded in lecture discourse and their relationships as intertextuality mediated and hence managed, that this study aims to assess and compare. However, this study is assessing a monologic form of interaction in discourse as opposed to a dialogic form of interaction in the sense of there being two or more physically-contributing participants in the discourse as would occur in face-to-face interaction. Therefore the vital and fascinating issue is that these participants do not speak for themselves, but instead a lecturer, as an institutionally empowered speaker, speaks on their behalf, and is responsible for encoding these “other voices” or participants and combinations of them, and thus managing their participation and interaction in discourse – and it is through and within this discursive management that undergraduate lecture discourse, as intertextual ‘disciplinary knowledge’, is (re-)constructed.

In this sense then, these participants are enacted in text and are therefore enacted textual phenomena first and foremost. Understood in this way, they are similar to what Thompson & Thetela (1995) refer to as “the reader-in-the-text”, this conceptualisation chosen in their work into interaction because it emphasises that what is being examined is participants *as construed by the text*. This is a very important point, participants *as construed by the text*, because it allows us to put textual evidence to the fore, and means too that issues of audience compliance with their enacted roles can be avoided, as the issue is not of how an audience and/or discipline actually is, but of how it is *construed*.

Therefore, this study needs a means of establishing not only how these participants and combinations thereof, as textual phenomena, can be described, but also, and particularly, how they can be recognised consistently in the discourse. With this in mind, we turn now to Goffman (1974 & 1981) and his work on footing, as this will provide the broad theoretical means by which to conceptualise and describe these participant categories. The emphasis on the textual also means that terminology will change to reflect this, and what I have to now referred to as “other voices” and/or “participants” will from now be described within the notion of “intertext”²¹³ – such a term emphasises both the aim of this study, the analysis and comparison of intertextuality, as the discursively-mediated relationships of participants in discourse, and the textual nature of the phenomena in this particular discursive situation.

3.5 Footing and Intertexts

3.5.1 Introduction to Footing

As a means of conceptualising and describing *intertext*, this study uses the ideas of footing and participation frameworks, as described by Goffman (1974 & 1981). Goffman (1981: 144ff) maintains that the typical dichotomy of speaker – hearer is too simplistic, and instead he breaks the speaker role down into what was initially four (ibid: 1974), and then three (ibid: 1981), social roles or identities, as a means of better understanding what he terms the “production format” of an utterance. For Goffman, the notion of footing is concerned with “the alignments we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production

²¹³ Cf. Barthes’ (1974) and Culler’s (1981) notion of intertext as the original ‘whole’ texts which go into a new text’s production. This study uses the term differently and uses it to label units of discourse according to the participation frameworks behind them.

of an utterance” (ibid 1981: 128), and different alignments will create different participation frameworks. In other words, the theory concerns the location of the self and other(s) within discourse, and the participant relationships which can be construed.

Goffman (ibid: 144ff)²¹⁴ identifies three social roles for a speaker in the participation framework behind an utterance, which can be filled by the one person or by different people:

- *Animator* – this is the person who physically speaks (an analytical role more than a social one) – “in short, he is the talking machine, a body engaged in acoustic activity, or if you will, an individual involved active in the role of utterance production” (ibid: 144).
- *Author* – this is the person “who has selected the sentiments that are being expressed and the words in which they are encoded” (ibid: 144).
- *Principal* – this refers to the moral presence behind talk, to the person “whose position is established by the words that are spoken, someone whose beliefs have been told, someone who is committed to what the words say” (ibid: 144).

²¹⁴ Cf. Goffman’s (1974) initial discussion of footing, in which there are four possible participant statuses for the producer of a unit within a participation framework, these being animator, author, figure and principal – these four slots can be filled by four different people or by one single individual. For Goffman, these four roles are initially described thus:

- The animator is the person who physically produces the talk, the articulator or vocaliser
- The author is the person who creates / scripts the talk, the creative agent behind the textualisation of the talk
- The figure is the person who is portrayed through the talk, or the person positioned by the talk
- The principal is the person who is morally responsible for the talk

Explaining what he means by these roles, Goffman (ibid: 145-6) elaborates thus:

“When one uses the term “speaker”, one often implies that the individual who animates is formulating his own text and staking out his own position through it: animator, author, and principal are one ... but, of course, the implied overlaying of roles has extensive institutionalised exceptions. Plainly, reciting a fully memorised text or reading aloud from a prepared script allows us to animate words we had no hand in formulating, and to express opinions, beliefs, and sentiments we do not hold. We can openly speak for someone else and in someone else’s words, as we do, say, in reading a deposition or providing a simultaneous translation of a speech”
(Goffman 1981: 145-6)

For Goffman (ibid), the notions of participation framework and footing thus describe the way participants and their relationships are constructed and mediated within discourse, and it is the different roles taken or construed within the participation framework of an utterance which create different frameworks, and therefore different notions of both selfhood and otherhood in talk. These different participation frameworks are, as Goffman (ibid) points out above, particularly important in any study of institutional talk, as in such situations, there are likely to be many situations in which agents are likely to be talking ‘on behalf’ of other people, rather than purely on their own behalf – as, for example, when a lecturer talks when (re-)constructing his discipline and its constituent discourses in an undergraduate lecture.

Importantly, footing is a phenomenon which can be altered in different ways during talk at any time, creating different participation frameworks, often for strategic effect. Goffman refers to such changes as shifters of footing, and among typical shifters of footing, he (ibid: 127) lists direct or reported speech²¹⁵, selection of recipient, interjections, repetitions, personal directness or involvement, new and old information, and emphasis, to which, and particularly in monologic forms of discourse, can also be added spoken discourse markers (Schiffrin 1987).

Analyses of the effects of shifts in footing meanwhile have suggested that such shifts can be used by speakers as a strategic means of constructing neutrality in news interviews by distancing a speaker from a claim via reporting (Clayman 1992); they can be used as a means of supporting arguments in conflict talk by changing the focus in talk from the truth of a proposition to a focus on speaker sincerity, thus making it more difficult to dismiss the argument (Schiffrin 1990); while Pomerantz (1984) suggests shifts in footing can be used to help a speaker perform sensitive actions in talk, often by the distancing of self from talk. This latter phenomenon has also been observed by O'Connor (2000: 119ff) in her study of prisoner narratives, in which she claims that prisoners use frame breaks and shifts in footing to enable direct inward reflection on their narratives of their life situations. Footing shifts then can change participation frameworks and hence relationships between participants, constructing differing degrees of involvement and distance, and in so doing constructing different notions of self and other in discourse.

²¹⁵ See also Myers (1999).

3.5.2 Footing and Intertexts

For the purposes of this study, the notion of footing is used as a broad heuristic to conceptualise how each independent unit in lecture discourse can be classified according to its participation framework, by establishing who is/are the sole/primary author(s) and/or principal(s) behind each unit. This will enable us to conceive of three categories for units determined by the notion of whose voice(s) each indexes/enacts in the discourse. The term *Intertext* will be used to refer to this, meaning that a unit in which a lecturer is constructed as primary principal and/or author behind it is classified as *Lecturer Intertext*, a unit in which the discipline is constructed as primary principal and/or author unit is classified as *Disciplinary Intertext*, and a unit in which the audience is constructed as primary principal and/or author behind it is classified as *Audience Intertext*.

In this way, each independent unit in the data is assessed and marked firstly as to whether it is *Lecturer Intertext*, *Disciplinary Intertext*, or *Audience Intertext* – this is the first step in arriving at a comprehensive, holistic typology for coding each independent unit in the data. Each *Intertext* category will then be examined to assess the various functions that units within it can perform in lecture discourse, which will therefore allow us finally to build up an appropriate typology according to both the “voice” and the function of a unit.

How then does the notion of footing enable us to move towards this? If we conceive of a lecturer as being the *animator* behind every independent unit in a lecture, it is the differing participation frameworks as revealed by which participant(s) is/are constructed as primary *author* and/or *principal* behind an independent unit which

will be used to assign each unit to an *Intertext* category – this choice will depend particularly on who it is that is being positioned by a unit, or in other words who it is that is constructed as primary *principal* behind a unit. We will therefore examine each of the three intertext categories in turn in the following section, looking firstly at how each can be more precisely defined within this notion of footing, and secondly at how each can be consistently recognised in lecture discourse by lexico-grammatical criteria.

3.6 Descriptions of Each Intertext

3.6.1 Lecturer Intertext

The first principle for classifying a unit of lecture discourse as *Lecturer Intertext* is that *Lecturer Intertext* describes those units in which the lecturer-as-*animator* takes on the roles of lecturer-as-*author* and lecturer-as-*principal* in the participation framework in the discourse. This is often signalled via the pronoun *I/my/me* indexing the lecturer, as for instance beneath in which we can clearly see how the lexico-grammar constructs the lecturer, as *I*, as both *author* and *principal* behind the units:

RC3) yesterday **I** was talking about the idea of a track in radiation chemistry
where as the particle moves it's losing energy [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM31) but what **I want to stress** is that this is not a particularly Marxist
theory [*Lecturer Intertext*]

As we can see, much Lecturer Intertext seems to realise metadiscourse broadly, particularly discourse structuring and evaluation. However, Lecturer Intertext can also realise propositional input:

TLM203) people don't become miners or carpenters or radiographers because one year they might be picking fruit er in during the summer er that
[Lecturer Intertext]

TLM204) then the next summer they might be er er working as a coach hostess on Harry Shaw's trips to to the Mediterranean *[Lecturer Intertext]*

TLM205) um *[Lecturer Intertext]*

TLM206) **that's taken from a particular interview I had** with er er with a a non-worker who was flitted from one kind of work to another *[Lecturer Intertext]*

Usually then, Lecturer Intertext units are clearly recognisable by pronominal reference of I/me/my. Sometimes however, Lecturer Intertext units are not signalled via I/me/my but can be less explicitly signalled, as for example beneath:

RC8) but **that's** an overall picture *[Lecturer Intertext]*

TLM164) [α **he** is not precise α] *[Lecturer Intertext]*

RC139) **that's** very important in photo-chemistry *[Lecturer Intertext]*

RC72) what happens to the rest? *[Lecturer Intertext]*

In such instances as these, each unit is assessed on an individual basis. Nevertheless, the examples above illustrate a second important principle in the recognition and classification of units as Lecturer Intertext, namely that in such instances as these above, the fact that these units are all realising either unattributed evaluation of disciplinary phenomena or discourse-structuring suggests that they are lecturer-oriented. This is because this study follows studies such as those by Crismore (1989), Crismore & Farnsworth (1990), Hyland (1999), and Schiffrin (1980), which take as starting-points the idea that such instances of metadiscourse as above are at heart author-derived discourse by default. As Hyland (1999: 109), elaborating on Schiffrin (1980: 231), puts it, “metadiscourse is the author’s linguistic and rhetorical manifestation in the text in order to “bracket the discourse organisation and the expressive implications of what is being said”” (Hyland 1999: 109, Schiffrin 1980: 231). Goffman too (1981) comments that among instances of discourse which can change footing are instances of personal directness or involvement, which these instances above can probably be described as. Such units therefore are consistently classified as Lecturer Intertext by default unless the lexico-grammar clearly signals otherwise²¹⁶.

The final type of unit usually classified as *Lecturer Intertext* by default is the category of spoken discourse markers (Schiffrin 1987) standing as independent units, particularly the item *well*. This is because such units are facilitating on-going interaction (ibid), and are therefore an important resource for a lecturer in managing his/her spoken discourse:

²¹⁶ As for instance if an independent unit realising discourse structuring is realised via the *we* form, in which case it is classified as *Disciplinary Intertext*, as we will see in the next section.

RC21) what about the cations that are formed? [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC22) **well** [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC23) if you just consider a general [I've put RH plus] [but it could be anything] [suppose it was [I don't know] hexane or something] then the cation radical which is the thing you get by taking the electron out of the molecule will react with electrons that are nearby the ones that haven't got away so to speak [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

This is not to say however that spoken discourse markers functioning as independent units are always classified as *Lecturer Intertext* – such units are sometimes realised as part of attributed (and often hypothesised) direct reports, usually *Constructed Dialogue* (Tannen 1989), in which cases they are classified within the reporting episode they are 'managing', and therefore according to the *Intertext* of that episode, as for instance beneath in units RC10-11:

RC9) now that being the case **you** might say [**well**] [**alright**] [you've got ions in excited states] [or so you say] [what happens immediately after this event has occurred] [*Audience Intertext*]

RC10) [**well**] [*Audience Intertext*]

RC11) [**alright**] [*Audience Intertext*]

RC14) [what happens immediately after this event has occurred] [*Audience Intertext*]

Units RC10-11 above are classified as Audience Intertext because the lecturer constructs the discourse markers well and alright as if they are managing the direct

report attributed to the audience. This principle is applied in all such instances, and the same principle is also followed for spoken discourse markers which are constructed as if managing units whose participation frameworks marks them as Disciplinary Intertext, as for instance beneath in unit TLM51:

TLM50) and then thirdly at the level of the individual the idea is that people's moans and groans would er move on from moaning and groaning about your particular boss or your particular supervisor er to thinking [well] [it's not just me that has this problem] [I'm in the same boat as other people] [we all form part of first of all the trade or the industry] [Disciplinary Intertext]

TLM51) [well] [Disciplinary Intertext]

TLM54) [we all form part of first of all the trade or the industry] [Disciplinary Intertext]

This again is how such units are consistently classified.

3.6.1.1 Summary of Lecturer Intertext²¹⁷

Lecturer intertext is a category for units of lecture discourse in which:

- Lecturer is animator
- Lecturer is sole/dominant author
- Lecturer is sole/dominant principal
- Units are fronted with *I/me/my* as the primary participant

²¹⁷ See appendix 2 for a table comparing *Lecturer/Disciplinary/Audience Intertext*.

- Each unit is assessed on an individual basis – lexico-grammatical criteria are used where possible, although the functional nature of a unit can help too
- Following Crismore & Farnsworth (ibid), Hyland (ibid) and Schiffrin (ibid), this study understands and classifies units realising metadiscourse as being lecturer intertext by default except when clearly signalled otherwise by *you/your* or *we/our*
- Lecturer intertext can also realise propositional input. This is signalled by *I/me/my* indexing the lecturer as the author and principal behind the unit(s)

3.6.2 Disciplinary Intertext

The first principle for classifying a unit of lecture discourse as Disciplinary Intertext is that Disciplinary Intertext describes those units in which the roles of author and principal are either solely the discipline's, or more typically primarily the discipline's. Typically in this genre, most instances of Disciplinary Intertext see the roles of author and principal in fact shared, implicitly or explicitly, between lecturer and discipline (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986)²¹⁸, with the degrees of responsibility for authorship and principalship alterable by lexico-grammatical choices (Thompson & Yiyun 1991, Thompson 1996).

Such units typically realise propositional input, though they can also sometimes realise metalanguage too. Looking at the former of these functional areas first, there are two broad varieties of these Disciplinary Intertext units, the first and most

²¹⁸ "I can mean what I say, but only indirectly, at a second remove, in the words I take and give back to the community according to the protocols it establishes. My voice can mean, but only with others: at times in chorus, but at the best of times in dialogue" (Bakhtin 1981: 165)

significant of which are those units in which disciplinary knowledge-claims are constructed as Unmarked, seemingly averred discourse, as for example beneath:

RC184) if you take that silver mirror of sodium which is very very pure and you react it with a dilute solution of Naphthalene in an ether you end up by getting a deep green solution [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

Such *Unmarked* units, comprising the majority of *Disciplinary Intertext* units in lecture discourse, are averred in Tadros' (1993) sense, but the institutional frame of the genre and the rich understanding of intertextuality and disciplinary knowledge employed in this study means it is the discipline which is understood as being the primary *author* and *principal* in such units, not the lecturer. This kind of unit therefore sees an implicit sharing of authorship and principalship between lecturer and discipline, and the homogeneous nature of the participation framework in such units fuses lecturer and discipline into a single monophonic voice/participant, in chorus, (Bakhtin 1981: 165) but with the discipline understood as primary. Such units, in being constructed as undialogised and universal, have high truth status (Latour & Woolgar 1979).

The second broad variety of *Disciplinary Intertext* units realising propositional input are those units in which disciplinary knowledge-claims are constructed as attributed discourse, still fused with their original claiming agents:

TLM182) now at this point **Gortz** introduces a contrast between um such cogs in a bureaucratic machine and the skilled craft worker [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

In such units, the choice to use a reporting verb/noun means a lecturer is explicitly presenting both his/her own voice and that of the discipline simultaneously (Voloshinov 1973), thus constructing a dialogic discursive situation in which both lecturer and discipline are explicitly constructed as sharing authorship and principalship – though not as a homogeneous monophonic union in chorus as in Unmarked units discussed above, but as a distinctly heterogeneous dialogic overlap. Authorship and principalship are therefore an explicitly dual effort (ibid), an example perhaps of the celebration or at least the acceptance of the intertextual nature of disciplinary meaning/knowledge and its constitutive discourse. Even in situations in which a lecturer chooses to report disciplinary knowledge-claims using strongly I-influenced interpretive and/or evaluative reporting verbs/nouns to do so, as for example beneath, this study still understands that such units are Disciplinary Intertext, albeit that the “second centre of consciousness” (Voloshinov 1973), the lecturer, is obviously gaining in influence in terms both of authorship and principalship:

TLM183) **his idea** is that if you work in a bank or a hospital or a large private company then you become extremely skilled [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM46) so **the idea** is that spatially the labour movement grows from everyday experience of problems in in Capitalist society into a national and indeed international movement [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

In units of *Disciplinary Intertext* realised via reporting verbs/nouns, degrees of homogeneity and/or heterogeneity, of chorus and dialogue (Bakhtin 1981: 165) between lecturer/disciplinary voices can be modified by the choice of reporting verb/noun and associated lexico-grammatical patterns, such that either gains/loses degrees of influence. For instance, a unit introduced by a factive reporting verb (Thompson & Yiyun 1991) such as 'shows' gives a high influence to the disciplinary voice via a lecturer's implicit acceptance of the reported proposition, while a unit introduced by a non-factive reporting verb (ibid) such as 'claims' gives a much higher influence to the lecturer voice via the implicit distance and dialogue constructed between the lecturer and the reported proposition. This is a key resource by which a lecturer can choose to differently manage the intertextual relations inherent in discourse (Thompson 1994, Thompson & Yiyun 1991, Hyland 2000), and as probably the richest seam for investigating the management of intertextuality in lecture discourse, will form a significant part of later analyses.

Disciplinary Intertext seems to correlate predominantly with units realising propositional input, and therefore such units, unless they are units marked clearly as *Lecturer* or *Audience Intertext* via *I/me/my* or *you/your*, are understood by default as *Disciplinary Intertext*. This is not to say however that *Disciplinary Intertext* units only realise propositional input, they can also realise metalanguage too, particularly discourse structuring and reference within and between lectures. This is achieved

via units fronted via the pronominal form *we*, understood in this study and in the institutional context of lectures as enacting all three participants in shared discursive participation:

RC37) how many ions do *we* get? [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC246) *we*'ve talked about flash photolysis before [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC247) that's where you take a flash lamp or a laser that's pulsed
[*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM28) so let's start then with the classic theory of the labour movement
[*Disciplinary Intertext*]

Such units fronted via the pronominal form *we* are consistently classified as *Disciplinary Intertext* in this study, because the form constructs the participation framework behind the unit such that all three participants are involved in the unit via the shared principalship of *we*. This understands that lecturers lecture as members of a disciplinary community rather than as individuals (Hyland 2000) and that lectures aim to integrate new members, the audience, into that community too.

3.6.2.1 Summary of Disciplinary Intertext²¹⁹

Disciplinary intertext describes those units in a lecture which are animated by a lecturer, but which are typically authored by both the discipline and the animating lecturer (Voloshinov 1973), and which typically construct both as principal too. These units are involved primarily in realising propositional input, though they can realise metalanguage too. In the former of these areas, the degrees of union between

²¹⁹ See appendix 2 for a table describing and comparing *Lecturer/Disciplinary/Audience Intertext*.

these two participants as authors and/or principals can change from a homogeneous, monophonic union or chorus as in Unmarked units, to a heterogeneous, dialogic overlapping union as in reporting verb and reporting noun units. Nevertheless, the processes leading to these choices are understood in this study as deriving from diachronic, social disciplinary processes (Latour & Woolgar 1979, Ziman 1984) as opposed to purely individual practitioner processes.

In brief then, *Disciplinary Intertext* is the category for units with:

- Lecturer as animator
- Discipline as sole/dominant author
- Discipline as sole/dominant principal
- Each unit is assessed on an individual basis – lexico-grammatical criteria are used where possible, although the functional nature of a unit can help too
- Strong correlation of *Disciplinary Intertext* with propositional input
- This study understands propositional input as being *Disciplinary Intertext* by default unless clearly signalled otherwise
- Units realising metadiscourse can also be realised via *Disciplinary Intertext* too, such units recognisable by being fronted with the *we* pronoun

3.6.3 Audience Intertext

Audience Intertext, the least common type of *Intertext* in the initial data, describes those units in lecture discourse which are animated and very usually authored too by a lecturer, but which position the audience as the *principal* behind the units. This understands two ideas – firstly the idea that an audience member will bring with him/her to a lecture an existing, and highly intertextual ‘text’ concerning the subject

of a lecture which a lecturer might choose to blend into lecture discourse and make use of, sometimes as a basis for mutual knowledge construction, other times as a demonstration of erroneous thinking. And secondly, this understands that as part of the pedagogic process as it appears in the data, it seems a lecturer will sometimes enact a hypothetical audience²²⁰ and their thinking or talking. *Audience Intertext* is in a sense then sometimes a hypothesised intertext, in that a lecturer cannot claim to accurately 'know' precisely what an audience will know or think. It is also hypothetical in the sense that it is uncertain if the audience will comply with their positioning. Nevertheless, this does not seem to stop lecturers from quite often bringing this intertext into lectures in the data for this study, one feature marking the highly interactive nature of lecture discourse. This then is the first principle for classifying *Audience Intertext*, namely that *Audience Intertext* describes those units in which the audience is constructed as principal in the participation framework.

The most obvious manifestation of this, and the second principle for recognising it, is that *Audience Intertext* is usually realised such that the audience-indexing-*you* pronoun is in subject position. Distinguishing between audience-indexing-*you* and the disciplinary-practitioner-indexing-*you* form is a matter of assessing the context (Benveniste 1966)²²¹. Beneath are two examples of unambiguous *Audience Intertext*, in which we can clearly see how the lexico-grammar constructs the

²²⁰ Cf. Thompson & Thetela (1995) and their idea of is the reader-in-the-text as a construed reader/hearer.

²²¹ Cf. the disciplinary-practitioner-indexing-*you* form:

RC69) but in fact **you** don't get ten ions

RC70) **you** get typically two or three ions

RC71) maybe slightly more than three sometimes but not much more than three

RC72) and so the ionisation efficiency is not enormously high

RC73) but of course **you** also get the excited states as well

RC74) and so if you add the excited state yield which is also often about two or three well for some systems **you're** using about fifty per cent of the energy chemically productively

RC77) the rest **you** get ion recombination

audience as the principal behind the units and in which the units clearly index the immediate *you* of the audience:

TLM9) **those of you** who might be members of a trade union or a political party [do you want to pick one of those up] will er will know that they can take an extremely bureaucratic form in which the powers of committees and what not are closely defined [*Audience Intertext*]

TLM111) **some of you** will be becoming aware of the work of Max Weber [*Audience Intertext*]

Sometimes Audience Intertext is also used not only as a means of dialoguing between discipline and what (a lecturer assumes) the audience knows, but also perhaps as a means of structuring discourse, as for instance beneath:

RC9) now that being the case **you** might say [well] [alright] [you've got ions in excited states] [or so you say] [what happens immediately after this event has occurred] [*Audience Intertext*]

RC14) [what happens immediately after this event has occurred] [*Audience Intertext*]

In such situations, it is hard to ascertain exactly if the choice is to create dialogue or to structure discourse, as the units seem to be functioning in both ways. However, for the purposes of consistency, such units are understood first and foremost as

constructing dialogue between the audience and the emerging discourse²²², rather than as structuring discourse.

Audience Intertext is certainly brought into lectures surprisingly frequently it appears from the initial data²²³, testament to the highly interactive nature of authentic lecture discourse, and is recognisable consistently via the audience-indexing-*you* form. Other means of fronting *Audience Intertext* do not seem to appear in the data, with two small exceptions, firstly, situations in which a lecturer structures discourse via the imperative form of the verb *let*, and secondly a rather unusual form of hedging. When a lecturer realises discourse structuring via the form *let me ...*, this is understood in this study as positioning the audience as *principal*, because in essence it is asking a direct request of the audience:

TLM134) so **let me** try to er take you through the basic ideas in these critiques [*Audience Intertext*]

The second situation meanwhile is a specific form of hedging, very likely unique to spoken forms of academic discourse:

²²² See Baynham (1996) on this feature in mathematics discourse in school classrooms.

²²³ Cf. for instance Kuo (1999: 126), who found in her study of pronouns in Research Articles that both the audience-indexing 'you' and 'your' forms rarely occur. This could be reflect the difference in audiences in an RA and in a lecture, in that as Smith (1985 in Kuo *ibid*) argues, 'you' can be regarded as the most interactive of pronouns as it explicitly acknowledges hearer-reader, and in this sense, as Kuo herself argues too, such a lexico-grammatical choice could construct inappropriate relationships in an RA between writer and reader who are, after all, likely to be peers – thus as Kuo (*ibid*: 126) argues, “from the perspective of reader-writer relationship in a journal article, *you* could sound offensive or detached since it separates readers, as a different group, from the writer”. Nevertheless, the 'you' form, directly indexing the audience, is a surprisingly common feature in the data for this particular study. The 'you' form then appears to be a means of constructing polarity, or its avoidance a means of constructing solidarity, between speaker/writer and hearer/reader.

TLM37) the idea is that the labour movement grows out of the everyday experience of people in modern society the everyday experience of the deprivations of work poverty problems in housing [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM38) **da didah didah** [*Audience Intertext*]

TLM39) but that that would grow in three different ways [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

As with the form let me above, this item dah didah and derivatives thereof is also classified as Audience Intertext, because it is understood as positioning the audience in that it presumes and constructs audience familiarity with discourse.

3.6.3.1 Summary of Audience Intertext²²⁴

In brief then, Audience Intertext is the category for units with:

- Lecturer as animator
- Lecturer as dominant author
- Audience as dominant principal
- Each unit is assessed on an individual basis – strong lexico-grammatical criterion of audience-indexing *you*
- Strong correlation of *Audience Intertext* with hypothesised statements of lecturer-presumed audience knowledge which a lecturer uses to build on or to contradict

3.6.4 Conclusion

²²⁴ See appendix 2 for a table describing and comparing *Lecturer/Disciplinary/Audience Intertext*.

This then is the initial part of the scheme used to develop the typology to be used for this study, achieved by classifying each independent unit of lecture discourse in terms of their voice, theorised as Intertext. Each Intertext is recognisable by their formal features in terms of the authorship and principalship behind them, while lexico-grammatical criteria, particularly pronominal choices, enable Lecturer Intertext and Audience Intertext units to be reliably distinguished from default Disciplinary Intertext units.

The scheme understands that both authorship and principalship in the participation frameworks for units can be constructed such that one single participant is *author* and/or *principal* behind a unit, constructed such that both lecturer and discipline are *author* and/or *principal*, with differing degrees of influence depending on lexico-grammatical choices, or constructed such that all three participants are *principal*. This reflects the default dialogic and intertextual nature of all discourse (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986), which can be downplayed or celebrated, and it is the possibility of different participation frameworks which provides the interactive means by which the management (i.e. the downplaying or celebration) of this dialogic and intertextual nature of all discourse is achieved, and realised in discourse. And it is these different means of the management of this phenomenon, as realised in discourse, which this study aims to establish, and compare across disciplines.

The system is best viewed as one which sees Intertexts as strands, somewhat akin to Halliday's (1994a) notions of the interweaving nature of the ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions of language – except that this study analyses and compares Intertexts as they are realised in discourse at the independent

unit level. Intertextuality is likewise best seen as a series of strands, as a motif, a permeating phenomenon, sometimes one which is pushed to the surface of discourse and is highly evident in being lexically signalled, or in written language marked with quotation marks with original source in brackets and so on – or in other words an open celebration of dialogism and intertextuality; and sometimes one which is completely obscured, one which is downplayed to the extent that it seems to not be present – or in other words the construction of monologism in lecture discourse.

Once a participation framework is set up in the discourse, this is understood as applying until a lecturer marks a break. This means that the same Intertext can run for a number of units, comprising in effect an episode, as we can see for instance beneath as the lecturer answers the hypothesised audience question RC209-11 with the unmarked form of Disciplinary Intertext running through from RC213-230, prefaced by the Lecturer Intertext unit well in RC212, interrupted in RC227-8, and then restarted again via the discourse marker so introducing unit RC229:

RC209) you might say [what happens to the solute?] [does it ionise that as well?] [*Audience Intertext*]

RC210) [what happens to the solute?] [*Audience Intertext*]

RC211) [does it ionise that as well?] [*Audience Intertext*]

RC212) well [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC213) it's purely statistical [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC214) it will excite electrons in whatever it's passing by [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC215) and of course statistically if you take something like methanol or pentane and take a litre of that and work out how many moles there are in liquid pentane it's about ten molar [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC226) so it's playing the role of a scavenger [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC227) I'm actually writing on the glass at the moment [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC228) so I'll get back on the [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC229) so the methylene is C₁₀H₈ as a scavenger [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC230) and this was the key to getting a much better answer to what was going on [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

Alternatively, units can move more rapidly between *Intertexts*, in effect constructing interaction between the participants, but within the form of monologue:

RC8) but that's an overall picture [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC9) now that being the case you might say [well] [alright] [you've got ions in excited states] [or so you say] [what happens immediately after this event has occurred] [*Audience Intertext*]

RC10) [well] [*Audience Intertext*]

RC15) and I suppose the first thing that happens is that the electrons which are formed in the ionisation act [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC20) and they have a very high mobility [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC21) what about the cations that are formed? [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC22) well [*Lecturer Intertext*]

It is clear from the extracts above that each *Intertext* can realise a variety of functions in the data, ranging from propositional input to evaluation to discourse structuring and so on, and this study understands that using different *Intertext* to realise the same function means that function is managed in a way that constructs different relationships between the participants/voices involved. Therefore we turn now to establishing exactly what functional roles can be played by each *Intertext*.

3.7 Functions of the Three Intertexts

In this section, we will examine what functions *Lecturer*, *Disciplinary* and *Audience Intertext* can perform in the two initial lectures, and how they can contribute at the independent unit level to the interactive discursively-mediated (re-)construction of disciplinary knowledge in undergraduate lecture discourse. This will lead firstly to a typology of functions for each *Intertext*, together with their potential lexicogrammatical realisations; and it will lead secondly to the necessary full-scale comprehensive typology covering each *Intertext* and each functional role identified for independent units of lecture discourse. This typology will then be applied to the data as the means of assessing, quantifying and comparing typical patterns of the management of Intertextuality in lecture discourse.

3.8 Lecturer Intertext Functions

Lecturer Intertext generally functions particularly to realise two broad types of metadiscourse at the independent unit level – firstly units which realise a textual function of discourse reference, particularly referring to other parts of a lecture and/or other lectures in a series of lectures, or what I term *Intra-lecture Reference* and *Inter-lecture Reference*, and *Macro-discourse Structuring*; and secondly, units

which realise an evaluative function of the emerging message(s)/discourse in a lecture. It can also function to realise *Propositional Input*. It is important to remember that some of these functions can also be realised using *Disciplinary* or *Audience Intertext* to do so, in which cases the management of the function is discussed in these other categories too. This after all is one clear manifestation of different means by which Intertextuality can be differently managed. For instance, *Macro-discourse Structuring* can be realised using *Lecturer Intertext*, or it can be realised using *Disciplinary* and/or *Audience Intertext*, and such a situation presupposes that the different participation frameworks constructed behind the unit realising the function are motivated rather than merely random. Beneath then we will examine the functions that *Lecturer Intertext* can realise.

3.8.1 Commentary: self

This functional category refers to those situations in which a lecturer passes comment on his/her actions simultaneously with performing those actions – in other words *Lecturer Intertext* units in these instances realise commentary on current on-going temporary lecturer actions, actions which can be physical, mental, or verbal. The discourse in this functional area is very usually “fresh talk” (Goffman 1981), often realised within embedded parenthetical units. It can function both to regulate a lecturer’s own talk and/or actions and provide corrections and/or management of errors/forgetfulness, and also seems to perhaps play a phatic role in enabling a lecturer to keep the channel open and maintain the floor. Beneath are some examples:

3.8.1.1 Commentary on Physical Actions/Discursive Performance

RC99) and I'll draw one of these [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC227) I'm actually writing on the glass at the moment [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC228) so I'll get back on the [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC329) [β so perhaps I'll put a dot there just to remind you β] [*Lecturer Intertext*]

3.8.1.2 Commentary on Mental Actions/Performance

RC380) [sorry] [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM291) oh dear [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM359) [αwhoopsα] [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM360) [βwrong bitβ] [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM306) have I missed anyone out peace movements nuclear anti-nuclear environmentalism feminism civil rights [*Lecturer Intertext*]

These are all instances in which a lecturer 'breaks into' lecture discourse in reaction to on-going performance issues. As such they are unlikely to form an important part of this study.

3.8.2 Commentary: Discourse

This functional category however is a significant category, and refers to *Lecturer Intertext* units which organise a lecture as a discursive event, specifically *Inter-lecture* and *Intra-lecture Reference, Reformulation, Lexical Reference, and Discourse Structuring* at both the Macro and Micro levels.

3.8.2.1 Inter-lecture Reference

These are situations in which a lecturer refers to usually past lectures, typically as an aide memoire for the audience and/or to contextualise the current lecture:

RC3) yesterday I was talking about the idea of a track in radiation chemistry where as the particle moves it's losing energy [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC48) [and the point I was trying to make yesterday] [*Lecturer Intertext*]

C157) I mentioned some of them in the photo-chemistry section of the course [*Lecturer Intertext*]

3.8.2.2 Intra-lecture Reference

These are situation in which a lecturer refers to other parts of the same lecture s/he is currently giving, typically to list what s/he has talked about so far:

RC436) now I've talked about the capturing of the electrons [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC437) I've talked about capturing the excited states [*Lecturer Intertext*]

3.8.2.3 Reformulations

These are situations in which a lecturer, perhaps realising the audience is not following him/her completely, tracks back in the discourse and reformulates it.

These instances are consistently introduced with *in other words*:

TLM191) **in other words** it's possible to do it outside the organisation and outside the the control of capital [*Lecturer Intertext*]

3.8.2.4 Lexical reference

These are instances in which a lecturer stops to highlight a specific word, term or abbreviation:

RC460) [that's what BPR stands for] [*Lecturer Intertext*]

3.8.3 Macro Discourse structuring

This functional category refers to unit level Discourse Structuring, in other words to Lecturer Intertext units which construct a framework for a lecture as discourse. This function is realised via two broadly different lexico-grammatical forms, firstly through Interrogative Forms predicting their forthcoming answering, and secondly through Averred Forms, or statements of lecturer discursive intent, realised with material/ mental/verbal process verbs such as outline, do, want to, move, start, and talk. Beneath are some examples:

3.8.3.1 Interrogative forms

RC21) what about the cations that are formed? [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC38) how do you measure the efficiency of a radiation chemistry process?

[*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM107) so why [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM201) what does he mean by non-workers [*Lecturer Intertext*]

3.8.3.2 Averred forms

These can be what will come:

RC438) the last thing I want to talk about is capturing the positive ions

[Lecturer Intertext]

TLM22) and so I'll start my lecture by talking about a theory of the labour movement and then er a sort of lo lack of confidence about the labour movement which set in er during the nineteen-seventies *[Lecturer Intertext]*

They can be what will not come:

RC468) now I'm going to skip the scavenger equation because I'm going to come back to that later on *[Lecturer Intertext]*

They can be non-clausal units:

TLM47) secondly the idea of um of organisational expansion *[Lecturer Intertext]*

RC305) the measurement of excitation yields in radiolysis *[Lecturer Intertext]*

And they can be somewhat 'spoken' in their nature:

TLM178) the division goes along these lines *[Lecturer Intertext]*

RC151) and it goes as follows *[Lecturer Intertext]*

3.8.3.3 Micro Discourse Structuring

This category refers to inserts (Biber et al 1999) or spoken discourse markers (Schiffrin 1987) used at the local level to mediate local level interactions, often between intertexts, and/or to mark changes in participation frameworks. These units perform a variety of roles in lecture discourse, but in terms of their classification by

Intertext, they are consistently classified with the *Intertext* episode they assist in 'managing':

TLM106) then it all seemed to go wrong whichever of these two routes we looked at [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM107) so why [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM108) well [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM109) just as a a er little introduction to this this theory of the labour movement that I've been putting forward has been criticised in in many ways [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

3.8.4 Commentary – Message

This category refers to those units of *Lecturer Intertext* realising explicit evaluation of the messages (and/or of their original agents) and/or procedures discussed in a lecture. In this category of *Commentary: Message*, it is important to note that we are concerned with evaluation as it is expressed at the level of the whole independent unit, rather than via individual lexis embedded within units which may be realising other functions. This study recognises that evaluation is clearly a phenomenon much like a strand running within all discourse, present in every unit, and manifested in a variety of ways²²⁵, but for the purposes of this analysis, this category describes explicit evaluation only when realised at the level of the independent unit. Such units can therefore also sometimes mark boundary points between *Intertext* episodes.

²²⁵ See e.g. Conrad & Biber (2000) and Channell (2000) for analyses of evaluation at the lexical level within clauses.

This form of evaluation realised via *Lecturer Intertext* is usually of a specifically pedagogic nature, concerned with explicit pedagogic guidance through the lecture, and as such is probably typically a bit more explicit than evaluation in other academic genres such as RA's. This is probably due to the different nature of the audiences for the two genres²²⁶. Much of this evaluation can best be described as *Relational* in nature, relating the specific messages expressed in a lecture to a broader disciplinary picture, in this way helping to provide guidance for a neophyte audience over what Hyland terms "the epistemological map of the disciplinary landscape" (Hyland 2000: 105); while the remaining evaluation can best be described as *Epistemic* in nature, commenting on either the *Degree of Difficulty* of ideas expressed, or the *Truth Value* of ideas expressed. Thus this evaluation is concerned with relating disciplinary ideas and procedures both to each other and to disciplinary canons, and constructing both epistemological coherence and epistemological significance for an audience. In this sense it is interactive in that it constructs desired relationships between audience and emerging discourse.

There seem to be two types of explicitly *Relational* evaluation realised via *Lecturer Intertext* in lectures, what I have termed *Relational: Status* and *Relational: Origins* – the first of these passes comment on discourse in terms of its importance and value to the audience, and in terms of its discourse type (e.g. as *aside*, *main point*, or *overall picture*); while the second of these, *Relational: Origins* passes comment on discourse in terms of where the discourse derives from, i.e. from individual actors or schools of thought (e.g. *Marxist*).

²²⁶ See for instance Myers (1989) for a subtle and detailed look at the fine points of evaluation in RA's. Myers reports a lack of explicit evaluation in that particular genre, and ascribes it to the audience and the face-threatening nature (Brown & Levinson 1987) of evaluating peers.

There are also two types of explicitly *Epistemic* evaluation realised via *Lecturer Intertext* in the two initial lectures, what I have termed *Epistemic: Degree of Difficulty*, and *Epistemic: Truth Value*. Curiously, there also appears to a fifth, less common type of evaluation expressed via *Lecturer Intertext* which can best be described as *Aesthetic Evaluation*.

This Lecturer Intertext function of evaluation is typically realised via attributive relational processes (Halliday 1994a) with nominal groups (usually deictic pronouns *it*, *this* and *that*) and adjectives realised in the participant roles. It also includes units which are directly averred via mental processes (for example *I think* or *I don't recommend*), and via nominal groups (such as *in my opinion*), and those units which are not clearly averred or attributed. Beneath are further descriptions of the categories suggested above, together with examples from the data.

3.8.4.1 Commentary: Message – Relational – Status

This idea of *Status* value refers to the concept of the significance of the messages and ideas expressed in a lecture. It can be used to evaluate explicit ideas or pieces of information, or to assign a status to a piece of discourse in terms of its relation to the overall discourse, for example as *aside* or *digression* or as *key point* – in this sense this aspect of this category is similar to Conrad & Biber's (2000) notion of style stance, the indication of how something is written. It is probably an explicitly pedagogic form of evaluation, and enables a lecture audience to assign differing degrees of significance to what they hear, and perhaps to prioritise. Beneath are some examples:

RC8) but that's an overall picture [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC197) now this is a very important idea here which I want to stress

RC198) I'll go on about it a bit [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC375) that was a bit of an aside [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM271) [this is the second key idea] [*Lecturer Intertext*]

3.8.4.2 Commentary: Message – Relational – Origins

This second form of *Relational* evaluation relates ideas expressed in a lecture to a bigger picture in a conceptual sense, rather than in the sense of their significance. It evaluates the ideas and messages in a lecture in terms perhaps of their ontological personality, and sometimes aims to map new ideas and messages onto (assumed) already existing conceptual knowledge. In this sense, it is also explicitly pedagogic in nature, guiding an audience and aiming to enable interactive knowledge construction by relating new ideas to already known ideas. Beneath are some examples:

TLM31) but what I want to stress is that this is not a particularly Marxist theory [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM126) I think all three authors um are politically associated with the left

TLM127) er Eric Hobsbawm until at least very recently maintained his membership of the Communist Party of Great Britain [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM129) Andre Gortz was a member of the French Communist Party [*Lecturer Intertext*]

TLM131) to I am not sure about Adam Provotzki's er political allegiances

[Lecturer Intertext]

TLM132) but er his book is clearly from the left *[Lecturer Intertext]*

RC256) so it's exactly the same type of idea *[Lecturer Intertext]*

3.8.4.3 Commentary: Message – Epistemic – Degree of Difficulty

This is probably another explicitly pedagogic form of evaluation, this time Epistemic in origin, aimed at conveying to an audience how difficult, or easy, the ideas and messages expressed in a lecture are. In this sense, it functions to clarify messages and assist an audience in interacting successfully with those messages.

This seems a less usual type in the initial data, but beneath is an example:

RC100) it's a very simple idea *[Lecturer Intertext]*

3.8.4.4 Commentary: Message – Epistemic – Truth Value (reliability)

This second form of Epistemic evaluation identifies the perceived Truth Value of disciplinary propositions. It is aimed at disciplinary ideas, procedures and discourse, and seems to aim at assisting an audience in building up a coherent picture of what is considered reliable knowledge in a discipline. Beneath are some examples:

TLM13) if you look in the the the textbook that we use in this course one of the more disappointing chapters there is on social movements

TLM14) I don't particularly recommend that because it seems to me to become er convoluted into a debate about how we define a social movement

[Lecturer Intertext]

TLM30) this is a nice neat statement of the theory of the labour movement
[Lecturer Intertext]

3.8.4.5 Commentary: Message – Aesthetic

This final form of evaluation is probably an unusual category in most forms of academic discourse, and is aimed at simple Aesthetic reactions to ideas and messages in a lecture.

RC475) in a way it's quite interesting {it = what happens when you irradiate water} *[Lecturer Intertext]*

RC175) it's quite a spectacular experiment to do *[Lecturer Intertext]*

RC176) it's a nice demonstration *[Lecturer Intertext]*

3.8.5 Propositional input

The final broad category of *Lecturer Intertext* function is one relating to actual direct *Propositional Input* to a lecture audience – in other words situations in which a lecturer is directly averring *Propositional Input*, either via *I*-fronted reporting verbs or via reporting nominal groups prefaced by *my*, as opposed to directly attributing it or leaving it as *Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext*. Generally this seems to be the least typical function for *Lecturer Intertext*, although the choice to realise *Propositional Input* via *Lecturer Intertext* as opposed to via *Disciplinary Intertext* is clearly a choice with highly significant consequences on disciplinary identity, and will form a key part of analyses in this study. Beneath is an example of nominally reported *Lecturer Intertext Propositional Input*:

TLM203) people don't become miners or carpenters or radiographers because one year they might be picking fruit er in during the summer er that
[Lecturer Intertext]

TLM204) then the next summer they might be er er working as a coach hostess on Harry Shaw's trips to to the Mediterranean *[Lecturer Intertext]*

TLM205) that's taken from a particular interview I had with er er with a a non-worker who was flitted from one kind of work to another *[Lecturer Intertext]*

3.8.6 Typology of Lecturer Intertext Functions

These are the functions played by *Lecturer Intertext* in the initial data, which give the following typology shown beneath in table 3.3. This will be used to develop the comprehensive typology to be employed in this study. This typology works with the idea that the functions at the bottom of the typology are those in which the 'voice' of the lecturer as an active meaning-making agent is most distinct, i.e. those in which s/he is most clearly *author* and *principal*. Thus at the bottom we find *Propositional Input* and *Commentary: Message*, as these two functions most clearly see the lecturer as constructed with a unique 'voice'. At the top of the typology on the other hand, we find functions which are less concerned with direct meaning-making than they are concerned with functioning as on-going guidance for the audience. Thus here we find *Commentary: Self*. In the middle of the typology meanwhile, we find functions which are important to the successful communication of the overall message of the lecture, but perhaps play a less significant role in overall meaning-making, the broadest category in the typology, *Commentary: Message*.

Broad Type	Function	Examples
Commentary: self	Commentary on actions/ discursive performance	RC99) and I'll draw one of these RC150) because I've got these on the slide I'll put the slide on
	Commentary on mental actions/performance	TLM291) oh dear TLM359) [α whoops α] TLM360) [β wrong bit β]
Commentary: discourse	Inter-lecture reference	RC3) yesterday I was talking about the idea of a track in radiation chemistry where as the particle moves it's losing energy RC157) I mentioned some of them in the photo-chemistry section of the course
	Intra-lecture reference	RC436) now I've talked about the capturing of the electrons RC437) I've talked about capturing the excited states
	Reformulations	RC182) in other words if you take a sodium film if you purify sodium [α in fact you heat it up α] [β and evaporate it β] and then could allow the sodium vapour it connects on glass you get a sodium mirror a mirror of sodium
	Lexical reference	RC460) [that's what BPR stands for]
Commentary: discourse	Macro Discourse structuring – Interrogative Forms	RC21) what about the cations that are formed? RC38) how do you measure the efficiency of a radiation chemistry process? RC72) what happens to the rest? TLM68) what about the experience of er the labour movement and its history
	Macro Discourse structuring – Averred Forms	RC469) what I'd like to do now is to say a little bit about water TLM22) and so I'll start my lecture by talking about a theory of the labour movement and then er a sort of lo lack of confidence about the labour movement which set in er during the nineteen-seventies
	Micro Discourse Structuring	

Commentary – Message	Commentary: Message – Relational – Status	RC8) but that's an overall picture RC2197) now this is a very important idea here which I want to stress RC198) I'll go on about it a bit RC375) that was a bit of an aside
	Commentary: Message – Relational – Origins	TLM31) but what I want to stress is that this is not a particularly Marxist theory TLM126) I think all three authors um are politically associated with the left TLM127) er Eric Hobsbawm until at least very recently maintained his membership of the Communist Party of Great Britain TLM129) Andre Gortz was a member of the French Communist Party TLM131) to I am not sure about Adam Provtzki's er political allegiances TLM132) but er his book is clearly from the left
	Commentary: Message – Epistemic – Degree of Difficulty	RC100) it's a very simple idea
Commentary: message	Commentary: Message – Epistemic – Truth Value (reliability)	TLM30) this is a nice neat statement of the theory of the labour movement TLM164) [α he is not precise α] TLM165) [β he can't put them this down to a particular date October the fourteenth nineteen-forty-nine or something but from around that sort of time β]
	Commentary: Message – Aesthetic	RC475) in a way it's quite interesting {it = what happens when you irradiate water} RC175) it's quite a spectacular experiment to do RC176) it's a nice demonstration
Propositional input		TLM203) people don't become miners or carpenters or radiographers because one year they might be picking fruit er in during the summer er ... TLM205) that's taken from a particular interview I had with er er with a a non-worker who was flitted from one kind of work to another

Table 3.3: Typology of Lecturer Intertext Functions

3.9 Disciplinary Intertext Functions

Disciplinary Intertext can realise two main functional areas of lecture discourse, *metadiscourse* and particularly *Propositional Input*. Regarding the former of these, as with *Lecturer Intertext*, it can realise *Intra-lecture* and *Inter-lecture Reference*, and *Macro-discourse structuring*; these units are distinguishable from *Lecturer Intertext* via the pronoun *we* indexing lecturer and audience, and as understood in this study, by implication indexing the discipline too. It can also realise a function I have entitled *Scaffolding*, this referring to units realising rhetorical emphasis of the on-going lecture tasks and discourse. *Disciplinary Intertext* functions most crucially however to realise *Propositional Input*. As with *Lecturer Intertext* above, the choice to realise functions via *Disciplinary Intertext* is presupposed in this study to be motivated rather than merely random. Beneath we will examine in more detail the functions that *Disciplinary Intertext* can realise.

3.9.1 Commentary: Discourse

This functional category is a significant category, and refers to *Disciplinary Intertext* units which organise a lecture as a discursive event, specifically *Inter-lecture* and *Intra-lecture Reference*, and *Macro-discourse Structuring*. Such units are observable via the pronoun form *we*.

3.9.1.1 Inter-lecture Reference

TLM1) over the last two weeks we've been talking about democracy
[Disciplinary Intertext]

TLM2) we've been talking about the state as part of a series of lectures on
the politics of modern society *[Disciplinary Intertext]*

3.9.1.2 Intra-lecture Reference

RC385) we've looked at the emission from the anthracene say or whatever else you were using [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

3.9.1.3 Scaffolding

This very significant function of *Scaffolding* refers to units which realise on-going focussed commentary on what the lecturer, audience and discipline are doing in a lecture. It helps to build a coherent message, and serves to create scaffolds from which discourse can commence. It serves two main functions, the first of which is connected with rhetorical emphasis, focussing on message, main points and sometimes aims or perspectives of discourse, often realised with the *Present Continuous* tense, achieving high focus on message (McCarthy 1998):

TLM4) it's perhaps best just to to give you some names to illustrate what we're talking about [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM5) **we're talking** about the peace movement [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM6) **we're talking** about the woman's women's movement [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM7) **we're talking** about the socialist movement the movements for civil rights the movement for animal rights [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

And secondly such units of *Scaffolding* can realise spontaneous setting up of discursive situations in terms both of devising imaginary situations[*1] and of

contributing to the boardwork assisting a lecture, for instance adding symbols[*2], devising names and titles, giving figures[*3], and so on:

[*1] RC499) [δ let us suppose δ] [ϵ ... ϵ] [δ 2 but let us suppose that water does indeed undergo radiolysis to give an oxidising species and a reducing species δ] [*Disciplinary intertext*]

RC500) [ϵ and of course I know the answer to this ϵ] [*Lecturer Intertext*]

[*1] RC501) [ϕ but let's also suppose that they are extremely good at getting back again to water ϕ] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC502) [γ right γ] [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC503) [η let's look at it in more detail now η] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC504) we might have thought we'd ionise [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

[*2] RC505) so we write H₂O plus and E minus and H₂O star [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC61) ionisation of a typical organic is about ten eleven or twelve [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

[*3] RC62) let's say ten for the sake of argument [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

3.9.2 Macro Discourse structuring

As is the case too when this function is realised via Lecturer Intertext units, this function can be realised via interrogative forms or through declarative statements of intention, realised via we with material/mental/verbal process verbs such as outline, do, want to, move, start, and talk. Beneath are some examples:

3.9.2.1 Interrogative forms

RC37) how many ions do we get? [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC52) so how do we cope with this idea? [*Disciplinary intertext*]

3.9.2.2 Averred forms

TLM28) so let's start then with the classic theory of the labour movement
[*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM324) the three points that we can bring in here are a b and c
[*Disciplinary Intertext*]

3.9.3 Propositional Input

As discussed previously, *Propositional Input* is typically realised via *Disciplinary Intertext*, and in this form can be realised via three broadly different potentials, *Unmarked* units, *Reporting Verb* units, and *Reporting Noun* units.

3.9.3.1 Unmarked Units

Unmarked units are units in which there is an absence of any reporting structures realising the proposition, in relation to the disciplinary corpus. Such a choice means that the proposition a unit realises contains in effect only the single centre of consciousness (Voloshinov 1973), a monophonic, homogeneous union of and chorus between lecturer and discipline. Units with such lexico-grammar are therefore understood in this study as constructing the propositions they embody as

unproblematic, universally shared within the discipline, and therefore as true (Latour & Woolgar 1979):

RC72) what happens to the rest? [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC73) well [*Lecturer Intertext*]

RC74) you get ion recombination [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC75) the ions don't escape at all [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC76) they're formed [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC77) and they recombine instantly [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC78) don't measure them because they're not around to be measured anymore [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

An important point here is that *Unmarked* units of *Disciplinary Intertext* are units which are not explicitly reported in relation to the disciplinary corpus. *Unmarked* units can however sometimes be realised via reporting structures, but in these instances the propositions they embody are attributed to (very usually hypothesised) 'original people' whose actions, motivations and so on are being described. They are **not** attributed though to a disciplinary corpus. Beneath is such an example of a series of *Unmarked* units of *Disciplinary Intertext*, in this instance attributed to the original workers who started the labour movement – such units are classified as *Unmarked* because they do not report units/propositions in relation to the disciplinary corpus:

TLM40) first of all spatially it would grow from groups of workers coming together in a work place and thinking [we're being done here] [we're being er exploited here] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM41) [we're being done here] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM42) [we're being er exploited here] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

Unmarked units are units then which (re-)construct original disciplinary knowledge-transforming disciplinary discourses as contemporary, objective, and reliable disciplinary “knowledge”²²⁷, removed from its original context(s) of production and divorced from its original claiming human agent(s). This can happen because the original claims have been ratified as truthful by a discipline, and as a result of this social and diachronic process the claims have been re-authored as “knowledge” (Latour & Woolgar 1979, Ziman 1984) and can be (re-)constructed as such in undergraduate lectures. In effect, such units see a lecturer uniting him/herself in chorus with his/her discipline as a single monophonic participant behind the units, meaning the interaction within such units is very much discipline-led, with lecturer and audience being subsumed within a monophonic and monologic pattern of (re-)construction. Such units typically are undialogised *Material / Relational / Existential / Behavioural* processes (Halliday 1994a), though sometimes they can also realise *Verbal* processes (ibid) too, but in such instances the units are not reporting in relation to a disciplinary corpus, but animating (idealised) disciplinary thought processes.

3.9.3.2 Reporting Verb Units

²²⁷ See e.g. Latour & Woolgar (1979) on how statements in science change their lexico-grammatical form as they become accepted, or Ziman (1984) on the process of accreditation.

The second broad potential for realising *Propositional Input* via *Disciplinary Intertext* is *Reporting Verbs* units. Such units must be reporting units/propositions in relation to the disciplinary corpus. The choice to realise *Disciplinary Intertext Propositional Input* via *Reporting Verbs* is understood in this study as introducing a distinct “second centre of consciousness” (Voloshinov 1973) into the unit realising the *Propositional Input*, and in so doing threatening the monophonic, homogeneous union of lecturer and discipline in the participation framework (Goffman 1974) behind the unit. This choice therefore typically, though not always, dialogises and relativises the unit, thus rendering its proposition as more subjective than is the case with *Disciplinary Intertext Propositional Input* realised via *Unmarked* units (Latour & Woolgar 1979). This therefore means that such units typically construct the propositions they embody as less universal, and therefore probably as less ‘true’:

TLM148) now from around nineteen-fifty **he {Hobsbawm} claims** that that common experience has changed direction towards a greater heterogeneity of experience [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM149) and **he {Hobsbawm} puts forward the claim** that the work force has become increase increasingly differentiated rather than focused upon white male manual workers [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM153) and **Hobsbawm claims** that that has er broken away from this trend towards er a common experience towards a differentiation of experience [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

3.9.3.3 Reporting Noun Units

The third broad potential for realising *Propositional Input* via *Disciplinary Intertext* is *Reporting Nouns*. Again, such units must be reporting units/propositions in relation to the disciplinary corpus. Such a lexico-grammatical choice is also understood in this study as introducing a “second centre of consciousness” (ibid) into the unit realising the *Propositional Input*, and therefore again typically, though not always, as relativising it and rendering it as more subjective, and consequently as less universal and ‘true’, than is the case with propositions realised via *Unmarked* units (Latour & Woolgar 1979):

TLM162) so that indicates the idea that um prior to nineteen-fifty in **Hobsbawm's view** a labour elite provided a class leadership for the working class as a whole [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM183) his {Gortz's} idea is that if you work in a bank or a hospital or a large private company then you become extremely skilled [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM184) but what you become skilled in is operating in that kind of environment [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

Reporting Noun units can either maintain a monophonic union between lecturer and discipline in chorus as in *Unmarked Units*, or more typically can fracture it. This will depend on the inherent dialogicity of the reporting nouns used to realise the units, and on how those nouns are actually used in discourse. Thus for example, many reporting nouns, such as *question*, *case* and *answer*, are in and of themselves dialogic only according to their context and surrounding lexico-grammar – they are able to (re-)construct a monophonic community *question* and *answer*, perhaps by

realising them as “*the/our question/answer is ...*”, maintaining the chorus of lecturer and discipline:

RC311) and **the answer is** that if you're looking at free radical chemistry cyclo-hexane is quite a good thing to work with because if you look at cyclo-hexane you've got pairs of hydrogens all the way round [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

Or they are able to (re-)construct knowledge such that it becomes more dialogic, (re-)constructing perhaps a specific agent's *question* and *answer*, perhaps as “*agent X's question/answer is*”:

TLM221) Provotzki's er question is [why has haven't those parties implemented the socialist ideal of creating a socialist society rather than er a capitalist society that] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM236) and his answer has three component parts [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

Some reporting nouns therefore are not necessarily ones which inherently introduce dialogism into discourse, instead the degree of dialogism they introduce depends on how they are used. Reporting nouns such as *claim*, *idea* or *argument* on the other hand however are inherently and explicitly dialogic, as they separate reporter and reported through their inherent semantics and embody “two centres of consciousness” (Voloshinov's 1973). This separation of reporting agent and reported agent in such reporting nouns can become a full-scale divorce when they

are realised with syntax stressing the subjectivity of the *claim*, perhaps for example by the pattern “*agent X’s claim is ...*”.

In terms of the interaction enacted within such units, we generally see less a discipline-led monologic homophony and instead an emerging and more assertive role for both individual disciplinary agents, and concurrently with this, for a lecturer as a second “centre of consciousness” (ibid) within the units, resulting in a more dialogic and polyphonic (re-)constructing lecture discourse.

3.9.4 Typology of Disciplinary Intertext Functions

These are the functions played by *Disciplinary Intertext* in the initial data, which give the following typology shown beneath in table 3.4. This will be used to develop the comprehensive typology to be employed in this study.

Broad Type	Function	Examples
Commentary: discourse	Inter-lecture reference	TLM1) over the last two weeks we've been talking about democracy [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM2) we've been talking about the state as part of a series of lectures on the politics of modern society [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]
	Intra-lecture reference	RC385) we've looked at the emission from the anthracene say or whatever else you were using [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC610) so we've talked about radiolysis using scavengers of organic systems [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]
	Scaffolding	TLM5) we're talking about the peace movement [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM6) we're talking about the woman's women's movement [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM7) we're talking about the socialist movement the movements for civil rights the movement for animal rights [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]
	Macro Discourse structuring – Interrogative Forms	RC37) how many ions do we get? [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC52) so how do we cope with this idea? [<i>Disciplinary intertext</i>] RC439) how do we know? [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]

	Macro Discourse structuring – Declarative Forms	TLM28) so let's start then with the classic theory of the labour movement [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM33) so let's er just state the theory [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM324) the three points that we can bring in here are a and c [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]
Propositional Input	Unmarked	RC74) you get ion recombination [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC75) the ions don't escape at all [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC76) they're formed [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]
	Reporting Verbs	TLM148) now from around nineteen-fifty he {Hobsbawm} claims that that common experience has changed direction towards a greater heterogeneity of experience [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM149) and he {Hobsbawm} puts forward the claim that the work force has become increase increasingly differentiated rather than focused upon white male manual workers [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]
	Reporting Nouns	TLM163) again his {Hobsbawm's} claim is that after that time [α he is not precise α] [β he can't put them this down to a particular date October the fourteenth nineteen-forty-nine or something but from around that sort of time β] he sees er the privileged sections of the labour movement not as providing leadership but as entering into an internal competition with other groups in the labour movements particularly over wages [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM183) his {Gortz's} idea is that if you work in a bank or a hospital or a large private company then you become extremely skilled [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]

Table 3.4: Typology of Disciplinary Intertext Functions

3.10 Functions of Audience Intertext

Audience Intertext is the least typical *Intertext* unit in the data, but is sometimes brought into lectures as a means of enacting hypothetical dialogue between the audience's existing and/or assumed state of knowledge and the emerging message(s) of a lecture, one of the indicators of the highly interactive nature of the genre. These contributions can be built on by a lecture or contradicted, and sometimes these contributions also in effect simultaneously realise a form of discourse structuring, although the primary function of such units seems to be to enact dialogue, meaning this is how they are consistently classified in this study.

3.10.1 Hypothesised Propositional Input

This category of Audience Intertext function refers to what are usually hypothesised contributions from the audience. It does not refer to genuine display questions – such questions will be placed in a category of their own as they realise ‘genuine’ dialogue.

Such contributions can be at the level of the individual unit, for example:

TLM315) you might er er be aware that Marx and Engels called their their form of socialism scientific socialism [*Audience Intertext*]

It can refer to what an audience does know, constructing a collaborative mutually constructive discursive situation:

TLM9) those of you who might be members of a trade union or a political party [do you want to pick one of those up] will er will know that they can take an extremely bureaucratic form in which the powers of committees and what not are closely defined [*Audience Intertext*]

Or it can refer to what an audience does not know:

TLM376) many of you perhaps haven't heard of Ellen Wilkinson [*Audience Intertext*]

Such contributions can be contradicted by what follows:

RC61) ionisation of a typical organic is about ten eleven or twelve

[*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC62) let's say ten for the sake of argument [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC63) then you would say [well] [if we got ten ions that would be one hundred per cent efficient] [*Audience Intertext*]

RC66) but in fact you don't get ten ions [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC67) you get typically two or three ions [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

The vast majority of these hypothesised contributions are realised using Direct Speech, typically Constructed Dialogue (Tannen 1989), another indicator of the highly interactive nature of this genre, though occasionally Indirect Speech is used too:

RC578) you might have thought there might be a reasonable yield [*Audience Intertext*]

RC579) but in fact when you radiolise water you form these two in spur [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

This category of Hypothesised Propositional Input then is a broad area of Audience Intertext, which constructs varying epistemological relationships for an audience with emerging lecture discourse.

3.10.2 Macro-discourse Structuring

This is a second function of *Audience Intertext*, used to mutually co-construct *Macro-discourse Structuring*. In the initial data it seems to only take the form of “let me ...” imperatives, directed at the audience, requesting their permission to allow something to happen in the lecture:

TLM134) so let me try to er take you through the basic ideas in these critiques [*Audience Intertext*]

These then appear from the initial data to be the two functions realised via *Audience Intertext*, namely *Hypothesised Propositional Input* and *Macro-discourse Structuring*.

3.10.3 Typology of Audience Intertext Functions

These are the functions played by *Audience Intertext* in the initial data, which give the following typology shown beneath in table 3.5. This will be used to develop the comprehensive typology to be employed in this study.

Function	Examples
Hypothesised Propositional Input	<p>RC63) <u>then you would say</u> [well] [if we got ten ions that would be one hundred per cent efficient] [<i>Audience Intertext</i>]</p> <p>RC64) [well] [<i>Audience Intertext</i>]</p> <p>RC65) [if we got ten ions that would be one hundred per cent efficient] [<i>Audience Intertext</i>]</p> <p>RC66) <u>but in fact you don't get</u> ten ions [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]</p> <p>TLM8) now there's enormous variation in the form of social movements [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]</p> <p>TLM9) <u>those of you who might be members of a trade union or a political party</u> [do you want to pick one of those up] <u>will er will know</u> that they can take an extremely bureaucratic form in which the powers of committees and what not are closely defined [<i>Audience Intertext</i>]</p> <p>TLM11) alternatively if <u>you've engaged in er in direct action er to stop er calves being exported er alive to the continent or</u></p>

	something like that <u>then you'll</u> know that er the form of organisation is extremely loose and network-based [<i>Audience Intertext</i>]
Discourse Structuring	TLM134) so <u>let me try</u> to er take you through the basic ideas in these critiques [<i>Audience Intertext</i>] TLM358) finally <u>let me offer</u> some er critical thoughts on the theory [α whoops α] [β wrong bit β] on the theory of new new social movements [<i>Audience Intertext</i>]

Table 3.5: Typology of Audience Intertext Functions

3.11 Other Units

There are a small number of *Other Units* in the two initial lectures which are either realising direct authentic dialogue, or realising what I have broadly termed administrative details:

RC585) has **anybody** any idea what it is for water? [*Audience Intertext*]

RC586) the diametric constant for water or electric permativity of water any feel for that? [*Audience Intertext*]

TLM87) **everyone** turned the page [*Audience Intertext*]

TLM114) pick up one of those [*Audience Intertext*]

Such units are consistently classified separately in this study, because authentic dialogue breaks the monologue of the lecture, initiates a potential response in the audience, and therefore changes the dynamics of the discourse to areas beyond the realms of this particular study. As for units realising administrative details, these too are classified separately because their topic is often disconnected from that of the main discourse, and as such they are interruptions.

3.12 Conclusion

These then are the functions that each Intertext can play in lecture discourse, as revealed by initial analysis of the two lectures *The Labour Movement* and *Radiation Chemistry*. These functions are recognisable in discourse formally via their lexico-grammatical forms and/or pragmatically by the discourse which follows them, and each function can also be reliably and consistently classified in terms of Intertext, again by lexico-grammatical and/or pragmatic criteria. A crucial observation is that many of these functions can be realised using different Intertext to do so, and it is these choices that this study aims to investigate and compare.

The next step is to integrate each Intertext typology into a larger comprehensive typology with mutually exclusive categories which will allow every independent unit in lecture discourse to be classified and coded, leading in turn to the means by which lectures can be reliably and consistently assessed and compared both quantitatively and qualitatively for how Intertextuality is managed.

3.13 A Comprehensive Typology To Illustrate Management of Intertextuality in Lecture Discourse

In the literature, there unfortunately appears to be a lack of any relevant comprehensive typology within which to assess and discuss the management of Intertextuality in undergraduate lecture discourse. Moreover, this study has taken a rather restrictive understanding of Intertextuality as its starting point, linking it firmly with notions of disciplinary ‘knowledge’ (re-)construction in the specific genre of the undergraduate lecture, and examination of the functions performed by each *Intertext* above suggests that not all these functions are connected explicitly

with Intertextuality as understood in this way. Instead it seems that there are a number of units realising functions outside this understanding of Intertextuality, meaning there is therefore a need for a typology with categories beyond Intertextuality in this study. Therefore in this section, we will firstly briefly examine the one semi-applicable typology put forward in the literature to discuss Intertextuality (Genette 1997), before illustrating the typology to be used.

3.14 Genette and Transtextuality

Despite the widespread and cross-disciplinary interest in Intertextuality, there somewhat surprisingly seems to exist only the one potentially relevant typology in the general literature on Intertextuality (Genette 1997), deriving from the study of written literature. Under the broad heading of Transtextuality, Genette (ibid) lists five varieties of Intertextuality as follows:

- *Intertextuality* – this refers to direct and indirect quotation, to plagiarism, and to allusion.
- *Paratextuality* – this refers to the perceived connections between a specific text and what Genette terms its “paratext”. By paratext, Genette (ibid) understands firstly the discourse surrounding the main body of a text, specifically a title, preface(s), dedication(s), and acknowledgement(s); and secondly the discourse inside the body of a text in the form of headings, footnotes, and illustrations²²⁸.
- *Architextuality* – this refers to the way in which a text is classified within a genre(s).

²²⁸ Cf. e.g. Kress & Van Leeuwen (1996), Kress (1998).

- *Metatextuality* – this refers to explicit and/or implicit evaluation by one text on another text.
- *Hypertextuality*²²⁹ – this refers to the relationship(s) between a specific text and a preceding “hypertext”. The hypertext of a text for Genette (ibid) refers to the other text(s) and/or genre(s) which a text is based on but which it transforms or extends, for instance by parody, translation or sequel.

While such varieties of our phenomenon can undoubtedly be recognised in the specific field of literature texts, and while too Genette’s (ibid) category of Metatextuality is broadly applicable in this current study, such a typology is nevertheless unfortunately for the most part not applicable to the data in this specific study. Instead we therefore need to devise a typology driven by the examinations of *Intertexts* and their functions as discussed in this chapter.

3.15 The Typology for Use in This Study

Examination of the functions performed by *Lecturer*, *Disciplinary* and *Audience Intertext* units earlier in this chapter suggests that there seem to be three broad functional areas for independent units in the lecture discourse in the data, which can be categorised as *Intratextuality*, *Metatextuality* and *Intertextuality*.

3.15.1 Intratextuality

This study understands *Intratextuality* as a category for units realising metalanguage in a lecture, specifically the observed functions of *Macro-discourse Structuring*, *Inter-lecture* and *Intra-lecture Reference*, *Reformulation*, *Lexical Reference* and

²²⁹ Cf. though the different usage of the terms hypertext and hypertextuality in internet text(s) (e.g. Landow 1992, Perelman 1992).

Scaffolding. This category then refers to independent units of lecture discourse realising the discursive organisation of a lecture and/or a series of lectures, and to language realising discursive focus on message and/or specific words or items in a lecture. This functional area can be realised via *Lecturer*, *Disciplinary* or *Audience Intertext*.

3.15.2 Metatextuality

This study understands *Metatextuality* as a category for units realising explicit unit-length evaluation of emerging discourse in a lecture – these seem to be the least typical type of unit. This functional area is realised exclusively via *Lecturer Intertext*.

3.15.3 Intertextuality

The central thrust of this study, *Intertextuality* is the category for those units realising the *Propositional Input* in a lecture, or in other words for those units realising the (re-)construction of disciplinary knowledge-bearing discourses in a lecture. This functional area can be realised via *Lecturer Intertext* or most typically via *Disciplinary Intertext*, while a lecturer may also choose to realise *Hypothesised Propositional Input* via *Audience Intertext* too.

This study understands that *Intertextuality* can be managed as either a monophonic or a dialogic phenomenon. The former of these sees disciplinary “knowledge”, a social and historical outcome, (re-)constructed as contemporary community-shared “knowledge”, typically with a high truth value. Typically this happens via

Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked units²³⁰, though some lexico-grammatical patterns of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* units can have this effect too, particularly regarding the naming of disciplinary phenomena²³¹. Such units are likely, typically, to have been heavily re-authored within a discipline to achieve this status (Latour & Woolgar 1979).

Dialogic Intertextuality on the other hand sees historical disciplinary discourses (re)constructed via *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Noun* or *Reporting Verb* units as historical, and usually individual, claims, still residing in their original contexts of production and still complete too with their original reporting claimers. Such units have therefore been less heavily re-authored within a discipline. This is because the knowledge-claims they embody have either not been ratified (chronological issues) or are unratifiable (epistemological issues) by a discipline, which illustrates the central role played by the process(es) of disciplinary ratification of knowledge-claims in the management of Intertextuality in undergraduate lecture discourse. Dialogic Intertextuality also refers to *Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality*, units which realise a lecturer's own personal claims. As such, the "knowledge" (re-)constructed in such units is likely to be subjective and not necessarily community-endorsed. Because the management of Intertextuality is the central area of investigation in this thesis, we will assess the three management potentials for the phenomenon in greater detail beneath.

3.15.3.1 Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked Units

²³⁰ See e.g. Latour & Woolgar (1979) on how statements in science change their lexico-grammatical form as they become accepted, or Ziman (1984) on the process of accreditation.

²³¹ For instance, the use of *Passive Anonymous* syntax with *Present Simple* tense.

These units (re-)construct original disciplinary knowledge-transforming disciplinary discourses as contemporary, objective, and reliable disciplinary “knowledge”²³², removed from its original context(s) of production and divorced from its original claiming human agent(s). This can happen because the original claims have been ratified as truthful by a discipline, and as a result of this social and diachronic process the claims have been re-authored as “knowledge” (Latour & Woolgar 1979, Ziman 1984) and can be (re-)constructed as such in undergraduate lectures. In effect, such units see a lecturer uniting him/herself in chorus with his/her discipline as a single monophonic participant behind the units, meaning the interaction within such units is very much discipline-led, with lecturer and audience being subsumed within a monophonic and monologic pattern of (re-)construction. Such units typically are undialogised *Material / Relational / Existential / Behavioural* processes (Halliday 1994a):

RC28) and you get a certain amount of ion recombination [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC29) and when this electron returns to that cation it is very likely to form it in an excited state [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC30) so it will get additional excited states from ion recombination [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC31) but also what can happen is that the RH plus the cation radical is a very powerful proton donor [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC32) and it will give a proton towards almost anything in sight [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

²³² See e.g. Latour & Woolgar (1979) on how statements in science change their lexico-grammatical form as they become accepted, or Ziman (1984) on the process of accreditation.

These are the typical form that such units take. However, sometimes they can realise *Verbal* processes (ibid) too, but in such instances the units are not reporting in relation to a disciplinary corpus, but animating (idealised) disciplinary thought processes:

RC92) and whenever you're discussing radiation chemistry of anything you begin by saying [well] [what is its G value] [is it one or three or five]

[*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC94) [what is its G value] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC95) [is it one or three or five] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC96) and if it's a lot more than ten or becomes hundreds then again you've got a chain reaction running away [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

3.15.3.2 Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Noun Units

The second of these potentials for managing *Disciplinary Intertext* Intertextuality, *Reporting Nouns*, is a potential which can either maintain the monophonic union of lecturer and discipline in chorus as above with *Unmarked Propositions*, or more typically can fracture it. This will depend on the inherent dialogicity of the reporting nouns used to realise the units, and on how those nouns are actually used in discourse. Thus for example, many reporting nouns, such as *question*, *case* and *answer*, are in and of themselves dialogic only according to their context and surrounding lexico-grammar – they are able to (re-)construct a monophonic

community *question* and *answer*, perhaps by realising them as “*the/our question/answer is ...*”, maintaining the chorus of lecturer and discipline:

RC311) and **the answer is** that if you're looking at free radical chemistry cyclo-hexane is quite a good thing to work with because if you look at cyclo-hexane you've got pairs of hydrogens all the way round [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

Or they are able to (re-)construct knowledge such that it becomes more dialogic, (re-)constructing perhaps a specific agent's *question* and *answer*, perhaps as “*agent X's question/answer is*”:

TLM221) Provotzki's er question is [why has haven't those parties implemented the socialist ideal of creating a socialist society rather than er a capitalist society that] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM236) and his answer has three component parts [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

...

Some reporting nouns therefore are not necessarily ones which inherently introduce dialogism into *Disciplinary Intertext* Intertextuality, instead the degree of dialogism they bring to the recontextualisation process depends on how they are used.

Reporting nouns such as *claim*, *idea* or *argument* on the other hand however are inherently and explicitly dialogic, as they separate reporter and reported through their inherent semantics and embody “two centres of consciousness” (Voloshinov's

1973). This separation of reporting agent and reported agent in such reporting nouns can become a full-scale divorce when they are realised with syntax stressing the subjectivity of the *claim*, perhaps for example by the pattern “agent X’s claim is ...”.

In terms of the interaction enacted within units realising *Disciplinary Intertext* Intertextuality in this broad manner, we generally see less a discipline-led monologic homophony and instead an emerging and more assertive role for both individual disciplinary agents, and concurrently with this, for a lecturer as a second “centre of consciousness” (ibid) within the units, resulting in a more dialogic and polyphonic (re-)constructing lecture discourse.

Not only the extent of use of this potential, but also the reporting nouns used and their patterns of use are both therefore important factors in investigating the management of Intertextuality, as both these choices play key roles in (re-)constructing the landscape of a discipline behind a lecture as homogeneous and monologic, or as a heterogeneous, dialogic and polyphonic.

3.15.3.3 Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb Units

The final of the three potentials for managing *Disciplinary Intertext* Intertextuality, and that viewed in this study as the richest seam for investigating the management of Intertextuality in undergraduate lectures, is *Reporting Verbs* units. As with *Reporting Nouns* units above, this potential is not necessarily one which threatens a union of lecturer and discipline by default – although typically it is certainly likely to do so. Due to the central role played by this potential both in managing

Intertextuality and in revealing disciplinary landscapes behind undergraduate lectures, this study has developed a detailed series of analyses for this potential, based partly on Thompson (1996), Thompson & Yiyun (1991) and Hyland (2000), which can analyse the management of this potential in five different ways:

- i Types of Reporting Verbs Used – Acts
- ii Types of Reporting Verbs Used – Evaluation
- iii Uttering Source Choices with Reporting Verb Acts
- iv Presentation of Report
- v Presentation of Reported Material

Types of Reporting Verbs Used – Acts

This study uses the typology developed by Hyland (2000) to discuss the types of reporting verbs used:

- **Research Acts** are reports of real-world research activities, specifically reports of findings (e.g. *observe, discover, notice, show*) or procedures (e.g. *analyse, calculate, assay, explore*)
- **Cognition Acts** are reports concerned with mental and/or cognitive processes (e.g. *believe, conceptualise, suspect, view*)
- **Discourse Acts** are reports of acts involving verbal expression (*ascribe, discuss, hypothesise, state*) or discursive intent (e.g. *conclude*)

Types of Reporting Verbs Used – Evaluation

This study also uses Hyland's (ibid) typology to discuss evaluation within reporting verbs. In terms of evaluative options, a writer according to Hyland can represent reported information in one of three ways (Hyland ibid: 28):

- as **True** (e.g. *acknowledge, point out, establish*)
- as **False** (e.g. *fail, overlook, exaggerate, ignore*; such evaluation is often in fact realised by negatively marked true or non-factive reporting verbs, e.g. the theory *didn't predict ...*)
- **Non-factively** (i.e. giving no clear signal, e.g. *claim, say, argue, hold*). If a reporting verb is non-factive, the [current] writer however can choose to convey the [original] author's attitude to their report, these choices being *author positive/author neutral/author tentative/author critical*.

Uttering Source Choices with Reporting Verb Acts

This study has developed its own typology for assessing this area of *Reporting Verb* units. The notion of *Uttering Source* is similar to what Halliday (1985: 32) terms the “logical subject”, or the “doer of the action” – *Uttering Source* is understood in this study therefore as being the who/what is presented as the source of the report, and in this sense it need not necessarily actually be in grammatical subject (Halliday *ibid*) position.

In Thompson's (1996) typology, this concept is discussed under the notion of *Whose voice?* (Thompson *ibid*: 507), leading to distinctions for Thompson (*ibid*: 507-11) between *Self*, *Specified other(s)*, *Unspecified other(s)*, and *Community*. This however lacks the specificity wanted in this study, probably due to the pedagogic nature of the discourse, and instead the typology to be used in this study uses the more specific categories of *Disciplinary agents* (named or pronominal forms); *Human verbal / mental constructs* (for instance, *book, theory, experiment*); and *Anonymous* (no agency constructed). The aim of this typology therefore is to

allow more specific comparisons within *Reporting Verb* units in terms of who or what a report is attributed to, and the different constructions of discipline as revealed by this are intended to better enable comparisons between lectures.

	Examples
Disciplinary Agents	<i>Named agent</i>
	<i>Named agent pronominal form</i>
	<i>Un-named disciplinary practitioners ['people' / 'authors' / they]</i>
Human Constructs	<i>Theory</i>
	<i>Book</i>
	<i>Experimental finding</i>
	<i>Critique</i>
	<i>Experiment</i>
	<i>State of knowledge</i>
Anonymous	<i>No agent</i>

Table 3.6: Uttering Sources in Reporting Verb Units

Presentation of Report

This concept refers to the syntactic forms that *Reporting Verb* units can take. Swales (1981, 1986, 1990; see 1990: 148 for clearest description) draws a distinction between what he terms *Integral* and *Non-integral* reporting structures, the former referring to structures in which the reported author is given a grammatical role in the reporting act and the latter to structures in which the reported author is given a non-grammatical role in the act by being placed either in parentheses after the reporting act or in footnotes/endnotes marked by superscript numbers. Such choices are said to help emphasise or downplay the role of agency in reporting, in that they result in a focus on agency (*Integral*) or on findings (*Non-integral*) (Swales *ibid*).

This distinction has been maintained in more recent studies too (Hyland 1999, Thompson 2000, and Thompson & Tribble 2001), but it is a typology derived from and applicable really only to written academic discourse – given their use of written conventions such as parentheses, it is hard really to conceive for example how *Non-integral* forms would appear in spoken academic language such as academic lectures. Therefore for the purposes of this particular study, these distinctions have been modified somewhat, and leading instead to a five-part typology which more suitably accounts for the apparent surface forms of *Reporting Verb* units as they appear in the data in this study. *Reporting Verb* units are thus describable according to five different surface syntactic forms:

1) *Integral Subject* – in this form, the reported author or human mental/verbal construct functions as grammatical subject, realising the reporting act, with the reported material usually realised as a complement *that* clause:

TLM190) now **Gortz** claims that if you are a craft worker you can see all the processes of production and you can also see how it is possible to do it all by yourself or do it in collaboration with other workers [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

Thompson (1996: 519²³³) refers to this pattern within his typology as a *Separate: dominant* signal, the effect of which is to emphasise the reporting clause over the reported message. This therefore has the potential of explicitly dialogising discourse via its strong emphasis on the act of reporting itself, although this dialogising and its extent will also depend too on what reporting verbs and tenses the pattern uses – higher dialogising with *Discourse Acts*, especially those in *Present Simple tense*, and less with *Research Acts*, especially those in *Past Simple tense*.

2) *Integral Embedded* – in this form the reported author or human mental/verbal construct appears in an embedded clause, usually as a present participle form:

TLM172) this is say **this** is Gortz as I said earlier a member of the French communist party um **saying** [the working class] [thing of the past] [bye bye] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM173) [the working class] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM174) [thing of the past] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM175) [bye bye] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

²³³ This Thompson (1996) is a different Thompson to Thompson (2000) discussed on the previous page.

Thompson (1996: 519-20) refers to this pattern within his typology as a *Separate: equal* signal, emphasising both the reporting clause and the reported message. As continuous forms seem to construct a focus on message though (McCarthy 1998), from a functional perspective, this pattern thus focuses more on message than does the *Integral subject* form above, and this may help explain why this pattern consistently seems to correlate with constructed 'real speech' (Tannen 1989) in the initial data.

3) *Cleft* – in this form, the reported author appears in a *what* cleft clause, in so doing effectively transforming a Verbal/Mental process into a Relational process with two paratactic clauses:

TLM275) **what it [Keynes' theory] meant thirdly** was some degree of state intervention to er generate social goods social goods er such as er education or health in er to maintain overall demand and to er re redistribute wealth in these kind of ways [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

Thompson (1996) does not refer to this pattern within his typology, but it would appear to match his description as a *Separate: subordinate* signal, in that the reported message achieves a high degree of prominence by being realised as a paratactic rather than a hypotactic clause.

4) *Passive + Agent* – in this form, the reported author appears in an adjunct to the reporting utterance:

RC149) but then **there** were some very clever experiments that were done by a chap called Hamill [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

As above, Thompson (1996) does not refer to this pattern within his typology, but it would appear to match his description as a *Separate: dominant* signal in that the act of reporting itself is still emphasised, despite the passive syntax. This is because of the mention of the agents, albeit in adjuncts. Compare the example above with example TLM113 beneath, where the same syntax but without agents seems nearer a *Separate: equal* signal, in that the reported message seems to achieve a somewhat higher degree of prominence with no agent in adjunct position.

5) *Passive Anonymous* – in this form the reported author is omitted from the reporting utterance altogether:

TLM113) **Max Weber er er Max Weber's work has often been er des described** as a debate with the ghost of Marx a putting forward of an alternative theory of society to that developed by Marxism [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

Again, Thompson (1996) does not refer to this pattern within his typology, but this pattern would also appear to match his description as a *Separate: equal* signal, in that the reported message achieves a higher degree of prominence that it does in syntax with an agent in an adjunct.

These then are the patterns used in this typology in this area of the study, outlined in table 3.7 beneath, and by examining syntactic patterns in this way, the aim is to

establish an idea of what the typical patterns in lectures are, and also to enable more subtle comparisons between lectures. This is because different syntactic patterns can lend or diminish prominence to authors or to their claims (see e.g. Swales 1990, Hyland 1999, Shaw 1992) by placing original authors in or removing them from strong grammatical positions in an utterance, what Bazerman (1988) refers to as “central grammatical position”²³⁴.

Type	Effect
Integral Subject	Higher emphasis on reporting act itself.
Passive + Agent	Higher emphasis on reporting act itself
Integral Embedded	Higher emphasis on reported message
Cleft	Higher emphasis on reported message
Passive Anonymous	Equal emphasis on reporting act & reported message

Table 3.7: Presentation of Report in Reporting Verb units.

Presentation of Reported Material

This refers to the different ways in which reported material itself can be presented in *Reporting Verb Units*. The aim of such a typology is to assess if there are any particular choices or consistent patterns in lectures, particularly with regard to the indicated origins of reported material, i.e. whether it comes from a single specific source (*Quotations* or *Summary*) or is an amalgamation from several sources (*Generalisation*) – such choices can assist in making a disciplinary landscape more or less homogeneous / heterogeneous. The typology is based on Hyland (1999),

²³⁴ Hyland (2000: 24-6) for instance has established clear disciplinary differences in RA’s regarding syntax and author/claims emphasis, showing that Soft disciplines, and Philosophy in particular, tend to highlight authors, and thus agency, through using *Integral* forms (*Integral* understood here in the manner as originally outlined by Swales), while Physical Sciences tend to give prominence instead to findings as opposed to agency by using *Non-integral* forms such as end-notes, or by choosing passive structures and/or adjunct agent structures, both of which have the effect of removing authors from a strong grammatical position.

although again I have modified it somewhat to better account for the data in this particular study.

Presentation of reported material within this typology can take one of four forms – *Genuine Quotations*, *Constructed Quotations*, *Summaries*, and *Generalisations*, which are understood within this study as follows:

1) *Genuine Quotes* are understood as quotes from original sources of any length [cf. Hyland who draws a distinction between quotes of up to 8 words and block quotes]. No genuine quotes seem, perhaps surprisingly, to in fact appear in the initial data however.

2) *Constructed Quotes* are understood as instances of lecturer-constructed and agent-attributed speech/thought which are presented as if quotes, what Tannen (1989) describes as constructed dialogue. Note the deixis and syntax choices constructing such discourse as ‘real’ – for example:

TLM171) this is say this is **Gortz** as I said earlier a member of the French communist party um **saying** [the working class] [thing of the past] [bye bye]
[*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM172) [the working class] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM173) [thing of the past] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM174) [bye bye] [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

3) *Summaries* are understood as reports deriving from a single source, for example:

TLM147) and based upon that their experience of work and their the these people's family **Hobsbawm claims** that there was a trend towards what he calls the this proletarianisation of life a common experience of life
[Disciplinary Intertext]

4) *Generalisations* finally are understood as reports deriving from more than the one single original author, for example:

TLM113) **Max Weber er er Max Weber's work has often been er des described** as a debate with the ghost of Marx a putting forward of an alternative theory of society to that developed by Marxism *[Disciplinary Intertext]*

Choices of reporting verb, and associated lexico-grammatical choices such as tense, presentation of report, and presentation of reported material, can have a wide variety of effects and consequences, constructing different degrees of dialogism and polyphony, though not necessarily by default the separation of reporting and reported agent. Nevertheless, it is often the case, particularly with *Non-factive Discourse Acts* realised in *Present Simple tense* with *Integral Subject Syntax*, that this potential does introduce explicitly individual talking agents into the discourse as current reproducers of the discipline along with the lecturer, in this sense explicitly introducing a second, sometimes highly active, “centre of consciousness”

(ibid) into the discourse, and in doing so constructing highly polyphonic and dialogic discourse²³⁵:

TLM147) and based upon that their experience of work and their the these people's family **Hobsbawm claims** that there was a trend towards what he calls the this proletarianisation of life a common experience of life
[*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM153) and **Hobsbawm claims** that that has er broken away from this trend towards er a common experience towards a differentiation of experience [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

TLM182) now at this point **Gortz introduces a contrast** between um such cogs in a bureaucratic machine and the skilled craft worker [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

The use of this potential thus often (re)-constructs heterogeneous disciplinary landscapes in which final truth is hard to reach, meaning monophonic, monologic (re)-constructions of disciplinary truth are unlikely and/or misleading (Grice 1975). In terms of the interaction within the units realising *Disciplinary Intertext* Intertextuality in this broad manner, we typically see significantly less of a discipline-led monologic homophony, and instead typically an active role for individual talking disciplinary agents and an equally active role for a lecturer as a

²³⁵ Compare though the effect of Past Tense Research Acts with Integral Subject syntax, in which dialogism is not the end result:

RC152) **Hamill worked with** solutions [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC154) and **he worked with** lots of other ones as well [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

RC170) **he rotated** these solutions in these glassy forming solvents [*Disciplinary Intertext*]

second “centre of consciousness” (ibid) within such discourse, dialoguing with individual agents within the unit, and constructing in so doing significantly more dialogic and polyphonic lecture discourse.

These then are the three key potentials via which *Disciplinary Intertext* Intertextuality can be managed in undergraduate lecture discourse. As discussed, these three potentials construct different interaction patterns for lecturer and discipline within discourse, and each potential in turn therefore has different effects regarding the (re)-construction of disciplinary knowledge and therefore of disciplinary landscape. With this in mind, assessing their extents and patterns of use in lectures will enable us to arrive at conclusions regarding how *Disciplinary Intertext* Intertextuality is managed, and the effects of these choices.

Intratextuality, Metatextuality and Intertextuality then are the three broad functional areas observed in the initial data, and the next step therefore is to illustrate how these can be combined into the comprehensive typology to be employed in this study, and its associated coding scheme. Table 3.8 beneath illustrates how this is achieved²³⁶:

Functional Area	Function	Specific Pattern	Coding
Intertextuality	Propositional Input	Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked Propositions	I
		Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Nouns	II
		Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs	III
		Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verbs	IV
		Lecturer Intertext Reporting Nouns	V
		Audience Intertext	VI

²³⁶ See appendix 3 for this typology and coding scheme complete with examples from the data.

Intratextuality	Macro-discourse Structuring	Lecturer Intertext Averal	VII
		Lecturer Intertext Interrogative	VIII
		Disciplinary Intertext Averal	IX
		Disciplinary Intertext Interrogative	X
		Audience Intertext Averal	XI
	Micro-discourse Structuring		XII
	Inter-lecture Reference	Lecturer Intertext Inter-lecture Reference	XIII
		Disciplinary Intertext Inter-lecture Reference	XIV
	Intra-lecture Reference	Lecturer Intertext Intra-lecture Reference	XV
		Disciplinary Intertext Intra-lecture Reference	XVI
Scaffolding		XVII	
Reformulation		XVIII	
Lexical Reference		XIX	
Metatextuality	Relational – Status		XX
	Relational – Origins		XXI
	Epistemic – Degree of Difficulty		XXII
	Epistemic – Truth Value		XXIII
	Aesthetic		XXIV
Other Units	Administrative		XXV
	Authentic Lecturer – Student Interaction		XXVI
	Abandoned Units		XXVII

Table 3.8: Typology and Coding Scheme For Investigation of Management of Intertextuality in Lectures.

3.16 Conclusion

The typology and coding scheme illustrated in table 3.8 above, derived organically in this chapter from the analyses of the initial two lectures, is that which will be used in this investigation of the management of intertextuality in lectures. Such a typology, based on interactive, functional and lexico-grammatical criteria, built on strong theoretical foundations and yet also data-driven, has two very important strengths. Firstly, it allows for the three different functional areas to be investigated discretely, allowing for the fact that while the management of Intertextuality can be conclusively linked with disciplinary history, the management on the other hand of

Metatextuality, and particularly of Intratextuality, may well be significantly more personally motivated. Moreover, investigating the three areas discretely does not prohibit their later recombination.

Secondly, such a typology will mean every unit of lecture discourse is analysed, and analysed using the same criteria for doing so. This will result in a more consistent and rigorous approach, will allow both qualitative and quantitative investigations, and will achieve the holistic approach desired in this study to track Intertextuality and how its management(s) contributes to homogeneity and/or heterogeneity in academic disciplines at undergraduate level. Applied to the data, this typology will therefore give the analyst firm ground from which to investigate and compare the management of Intratextuality, Metatextuality and Intertextuality, and will allow for consistent, rigorous and reliable observations and comparisons to be made between lectures and disciplines – and it is to the application of this typology to the data and the findings deriving from this that we turn in the next chapter.

3.17 Summary

In this long and necessarily detailed chapter, we have seen how the principal aim of this entire study, the development of a consistent, reliable, rigorous and holistic methodology for the exploration of the management of Intertextuality in undergraduate lecture discourse has been arrived at organically from the data itself. Due to the nature of the data as a hybrid of spoken and written forms of discourse (Flowerdew 1994b), we initially looked to begin with at how the data for the study can be consistently and reliably segregated into independent units, looking particularly at how certain more “spoken” features of lecture discourse such as

parenthetical forms and non-clausal material (Biber et al 1999) can be consistently dealt with. We also examined some of the crucial roles played by spoken discourse markers in the data and how such items can be classified. Following on from this, we then moved on to examine participants and interactions in lecture discourse, outlining three participants in lecture discourse, a lecturer, discipline and audience, and how they can be identified in the data, and outlining too some of the interactions these participants can be involved in. Using the notion of participation frameworks (Goffman 1974) in discourse, we then discussed how each unit in the data can be classified by its *Intertext*, describing the “voice” behind the unit. This choice is recognisable particularly via pronominal forms, such that each independent unit can be classified as *Lecturer*, *Disciplinary* or *Audience Intertext*. This choice shows which participant(s) is/are discursively constructed as sole or primary *author* and/or *principal* behind each unit. We also examined how spoken discourse markers can indicate interaction between *Intertexts* and thus between the participant(s) in the discourse. This gives the basis for seeing broadly how Intertextuality, theorised as the discursively mediated interactions of the participants involved in discourse, can be managed.

Nevertheless, it was considered insufficient in this study to use a typology merely indicating participants and their involvement(s) in the discourse, and so each of the three *Intertext* categories was further analysed in terms of its function in the discourse. This meant that *Lecturer Intertext*, *Disciplinary Intertext* and *Audience Intertext* categories were each analysed to establish which functions each can potentially perform in lecture discourse, which led to a typology of functions for each *Intertext*. This resulted in the establishment of three broad functional areas in

need of analyses, namely Intertextuality, Intratextuality and Metatextuality, the first two of which can be realised via *Lecturer*, *Disciplinary* or *Audience Intertext*, a choice which constructs different managements of the functional area. It is these different realisations and managements that this study aims to assess and compare, particularly with regard to the management of Intertextuality, and so it is to this that we move in the next chapter.

Chapter 4

Data Analyses

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, using the methodology organically built up from the analyses of the two lectures ‘The Labour Movement and New Social Movements’ and ‘Radiation Chemistry’ in chapter 3, we will assess and compare the main data in terms of its management particularly of Intertextuality, and assess what such analyses might suggest about the natures of the academic disciplines behind their undergraduate lectures. While patterns of Intratextuality and Metatextuality will also inform the discussions to a small degree, it is the management of Intertextuality particularly, as the reaccentuation (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986) of a discipline’s knowledge-bearing discourses, which this study views as being of prime importance in painting the brightest pictures of disciplinary landscapes behind undergraduate lectures.

4.2 The Data

The data for the main analyses in this study comprises a total of twenty-four undergraduate lectures, all drawn from The BASE corpus. The BASE corpus is subdivided by disciplinary area, not using the clines devised by Becher (1989) but by the standard administrative disciplinary divisions of Physical Sciences, Life and Biomedical Sciences, Social Studies and Social Sciences, and Arts and Humanities, a division which this study maintained for the initial selection of data. This means that the corpus²³⁷ for the main data analyses in this study comprises six lectures from each of these four broad disciplinary areas – and analyses of the lectures in

²³⁷ See appendix 4 for details of each lecture used in the main data analyses.

these four areas should help to indicate whether such standard disciplinary divisions are supported by the data or not.

Due to the wide range of variables potentially influencing the data for this study, the twenty-four lectures were each chosen according to the following principles:

- Give a broad disciplinary spread in each disciplinary grouping
- Ensure the audience for the lectures are always undergraduates
- Lectures must be of similar length in terms of their numbers of words and units. Each of the twenty-four lectures are similar in these regards, except for lecture 1 ‘Hume’s Treatise’ (10,131 words, 862 units), lecture 10 ‘Environment and Sustainability’ (12,231 words, 797 units), and lecture 18 ‘Man’s Impact on Environment – Pesticides’ (10,915 words, 640 units)
- Avoid lectures with any more than minimal lecturer-audience interactions. All twenty-four lectures are similar in this regard except for lecture 1 ‘Hume’s Treatise’ in which there are 190 such units²³⁸, but this is mitigated by the overall length of this lecture at 862 total units
- In connection with this (Hansen & Jensen 1994), choose lectures with audience sizes which are less likely to lead to one-to-one lecturer-student interaction(s) in the discourse – this means 20+ students. Only three lectures fell beneath this figure, lecture 10 ‘Environment & Sustainability’ (15 students), lecture 16 ‘Agricultural Botany’ from Biomedical & Life Sciences (7 students), and lecture 22 ‘Polymers’ from Physical Sciences (16 students). However in none of these three lectures do their smaller audience figures

²³⁸ This amounts to 220 of these units per 1000 units in this lecture, as compared to the average across the corpus of 39.5 per 1000 units.

seem to lead to atypical lecturer-audience interaction(s) and/or to atypical lecture discourse

- Ensure specific lecturers are only included once
- Ensure a spread of male and female lecturers
- Avoid lectures with particularly extensive use of visual semiotic support such as slides, videos and so on, as the methodology for this particular study lacks the means of integrating such semiotic media into it
- Avoid lectures with unusually large quantities of administrative talk / interruptions in them
- Ensure there is at least the audio-cassette of each lecture available to the analyst, and ideally the video-cassette too

Following these principles meant a number of lectures in each disciplinary grouping in The BASE corpus were rejected due to their idiosyncratic natures, such as very small audiences, a high degree of lecturer-audience interaction, extensive administrative talk, a heavy use of other semiotic media, their audience being postgraduate students, the absence of their accompanying audio-cassette, or excessive length. Balancing between the principles for data selection led to the corpus of twenty-four lectures to be used, which gives the following breakdown in each disciplinary grouping shown beneath in table 4.1:

Disciplinary Area	Total Words	Total Units	Average Audience
Arts & Humanities	50,498	3,264	48
Social Studies & Social Sciences	53,265	3,235	55
Biomedical & Life Sciences	47,420	3,221	48
Physical Sciences	41,891	3,125	48
Totals	193,074	12,845	50

Table 4.1: Broad Breakdown of Data

We can see that while each category contains slightly different word totals, the number of independent units in each category is remarkably similar, with the largest discrepancy being only 139 units (Arts & Humanities / Physical Sciences).

Each of these lectures was then transcribed or their existing transcriptions were rigorously checked by the analyst, using their audiocassette and where possible their videocassette. No punctuation is included in the transcriptions except for questions marks indicating that a unit with interrogative syntax is functioning pragmatically as a question, while significant pauses are marked with a <pause>, and instances of reading aloud are marked likewise²³⁹, as are occasional instances of laughter by a lecturer if it seems significant²⁴⁰. The transcribed discourse in each of these lectures was then segregated into independent units using the scheme derived in chapter 3, and each of these independent units finally was coded using the typology also derived in chapter 3. This corpus of twenty-four coded lectures²⁴¹ is what forms the data for these main analyses and conclusions deriving from them.

However, as a means of ensuring maximum validity and reliability in this study, sample selections of the data were also coded by volunteers, each of them knowledgeable and involved in Linguistics work as teachers/lecturers and/or PhD students. For this reliability test, four lectures, one lecture from each disciplinary category and each selected entirely at random from the main corpus of twenty-four

²³⁹ For instance: HT169) [III] and Hume starts out by saying [<reading> all the perceptions of the human mind resolve themselves into two distinct kinds which I'll call impressions and ideas </reading>]

²⁴⁰ For instance: AB555) [III] we haven't got a clue what it {a protein sequence that's quite like the storage proteins} does in an animal <lecturer laughs> because <pause>

²⁴¹ See the accompanying CD-rom for copies of each of these lectures segregated and coded using the methodology.

lectures for the main study, were given to volunteers to code individually in their own time. With the sample data each volunteer was also given documents²⁴² outlining the overall study, the data segregation system, and the coding typology, together with one of the other lectures²⁴³ from the main data fully coded according to the typology, with explanations and rationales given for the various coding choices. Each volunteer was asked to code a total of 250 units in his/her lecture for this reliability test, an amount chosen so as to ensure a significant number of units were coded and thus to ensure a good test of reliability. The four blocks of 250 units to be coded by the volunteer were chosen so as to ensure that a beginning, an ending and two mid-sections of lectures were each coded, in case any section of a lecture proved easier/more difficult to apply the coding system to. No additional help was given. On completion of their task, each volunteer's coding choices were compared with those of the analyst, and simple percentage correlations calculated, the results of which are shown beneath in table 4.2:

²⁴² See appendices 5.1 to 5.4 inclusive for copies of these documents.

²⁴³ Lecture 3 'The French Revolution' (WL026) from Arts & Humanities. See appendix 5.4.

Lecture	Grouping	Discipline	Units	Correlation
5) Aftermath of Political Nationalism in C19 Latin-America [WL010]	<i>Arts & Humanities</i>	History	APN 254- 504	75.6% (Pelham)
11) Observational or Social Learning [RL017]	<i>Social Studies & Social Sciences</i>	Psychology	OSL 200- 453	74.4% (Dimitra)
14) Systems Physiology [RL022]	<i>Biomedical & Life Sciences</i>	Biology	SP 5- 254	78.8% (Batool) 78.8% (Andrea) 74.4% (Martin)
23) Organometallic Chemistry [RL005]	<i>Physical Sciences</i>	Chemistry	OMC 100- 272	75.6% (David) 71.2% (Androulla)
Totals				75.5%

Table 4.2: The Data and Results for the Coding Typology Reliability Test.

These results above, at an average correlation between the analyst and volunteer of 75.5% and with no significant fluctuations either side of this mean figure, suggest that the coding typology used for the main data analyses in this study is reliable and consistent, and as such can be relied on for achieving what it was designed for, tracking the management of Intertextuality, Intratextuality and Metatextuality in undergraduate academic lectures. Furthermore, disagreements between the analyst and each of the volunteer coders were typically in units realising Intratextuality and Metatextuality, while the figures in units realising Intertextuality were consistently above 90%. Because the main thrust of the data analyses in this chapter focuses on the management of Intertextuality, the coding typology used for this study can therefore be described as very reliable.

This then is the data for the main study, and the steps taken to prepare it for the study. The remainder of this chapter will focus on analyses of the management particularly of Intertextuality in the data, and discussions of what this might suggest about academic disciplines in the light of this.

4.3 The management of Intertextuality

4.3.1 The management of Intertextuality in the Four Disciplinary Groupings

The corpus was analysed firstly to assess the distribution patterns of units across the four broad disciplinary groupings. Remembering other studies of disciplinary discourse in different disciplines²⁴⁴, we would probably expect that the Physical Sciences and Biomedical & Life Sciences groupings would be likely to display greater use of the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* units [I] to manage Intertextuality, while the Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences & Social Studies groupings on the other hand would probably display greater use of the other four potentials. Table 4.3 beneath shows the figures:

²⁴⁴ See particularly Becher (1989), Hyland (2000) and Nelson et al (1987).

	<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>			<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>	
	Unmarked [I]	Reporting Noun [II]	Reporting Verb [III]	Reporting Verb [IV]	Reporting Noun [V]
Arts & Humanities	63.75% ^a	3.5%	25.5%	7%	–
	387.8 ^b	18.3	150.5	41.7	–
Social Sciences	73.25%	4%	11.5%	9.25%	1.75%
	487	22.2	80.4	55.9	11
Biomedical Sciences	80%	0.75%	7.75%	10.75%	0.25%
	547	5.1	51.9	67.2	2
Physical Sciences	86.5%	1.25%	7.75%	4.25%	0.25%
	482.6	6.8	46.1	24.5	1.1
Averages in Corpus	76%	2.3%	13%	7.8%	0.5%
	476.1	13.1	82.2	47.3	3.6

Table 4.3: The Management of Intertextuality across the Four Disciplinary Groupings

^a Percentage calculations are calculated as a percentage of the total units managing Intertextuality in the grouping.

^b These figures are calculated per 1000 units of lecture discourse in the grouping²⁴⁵.

Firstly, we can see that the default choice for the management of Intertextuality in the genre of the undergraduate lecture is, as anticipated, the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* units [I], which accounts for an average of 76% (476.1/1000) of units managing Intertextuality in the corpus. This reflects the epistemological status of undergraduate lectures as being sites for the reproduction of disciplinary knowledge as opposed to the sites of its initial production.

Table 4.3 also indicates that there are broad differences between the disciplinary groupings, as also anticipated. The broad categories of Physical Sciences and Biomedical & Life Sciences certainly exhibit the heavier use of the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* [I] for managing Intertextuality, with this potential accounting for 86.5% (482.6/1000) of all units realising Intertextuality in Physical

²⁴⁵ This system of both percentage figures and figures per 1000 units is used throughout this chapter.

Sciences and 80% (547/1000) in Biomedical & Life Sciences, while accounting for a lower figure of 73.25% (487/1000)²⁴⁶ in Social Sciences and only 63.75% (387.8) in Arts & Humanities. This points to the successful ratification of disciplinary knowledge, and the consequent typical separation of knowledge-claim and claimer in these former two disciplinary groupings due to the social integration of the original claim into a discipline's body of community-endorsed 'knowledge' – this is why the knowledge can be (re-)constructed via *Unmarked* [I] units as a monophonic chorus of lecturer and discipline in these former two disciplinary areas but less so in the latter two.

In tandem with this, table 4.3 indicates too that the latter two disciplinary groupings typically exhibit a significantly higher use of the potentials of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Nouns* [II] and *Reporting Verbs* [III], these two potentials accounting for 4% (22.2/1000) / 11.5% (80.4/1000) of units realising Intertextuality in Social Sciences and the even higher figures of 3.5% (18.3/1000) / 25.5% (150.5/1000) in Arts & Humanities, pointing to the more typical situation in these two disciplinary areas of the continuing link between knowledge-claim and claimer and the resultant higher contingency construed for the knowledge (re-)constructed in their lectures. This significantly higher incidence of *Reporting Verb* [III] units in Arts & Humanities (25.5%, 150.5/1000) points therefore to the continued reliance in this disciplinary area on individual agency in knowledge (re-)construction in their undergraduate lectures, due to the difficulty in such disciplines of knowledge being

²⁴⁶ The figures per 1000 units are slightly misleading, as lectures in Physical Sciences consistently realise more units of Intratextuality (223.2/1000) than do the other groupings (average 170.3/1000), particularly units realising Scaffolding (117/1000, average across corpus 69.6/1000). This is why percentage figures are also used in the analyses, indicating as they do more specific ratios within units realising solely Intertextuality.

ratified as community-endorsed and therefore (re-)constructable as objective and universal (Becher 1989, Hyland 2000, Grice 1975).

Rather more curious and unexpected however are the figures for the two potentials of *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verb* [IV] and *Reporting Noun* [V] units in the data – the broad initial figures show that it is the two categories of Social Sciences (11%, 66.9/1000) and Biomedical Sciences (11%, 69.2/1000) which exhibit greatest use of these two potentials, as compared to what we might expect, Arts & Humanities (7%, 41.7/1000). This points to a high explicit lecturer-as-I involvement within Intertextuality in the Biomedical Sciences grouping, suggesting differences between this grouping and its apparent cousin, Physical Sciences (4.5%, 25.6/1000). We will examine the data in this category in greater detail later in this section to assess this more carefully.

These initial figures indicate therefore that the broad groupings used in the BASE corpus are broadly appropriate, and indicate too that broadly speaking, the management of Intertextuality in lectures deriving from Physical Sciences and Biomedical Sciences suggests homogeneous disciplines behind the lectures, (re-)constructed in chorus between lecturer and discipline, while that in lectures from Social Sciences and particularly from Arts & Humanities suggests on the other hand suggests greater heterogeneity in the disciplines behind the lectures, (re-)constructed in dialogue between lecturer and discipline. However, there are lectures in each grouping displaying apparently idiosyncratic features which influence the figures quite significantly. For instance, the potential of *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verb* [IV] units would only account for 2% (16.9/1000) of Intertextuality in the

Biomedical Sciences grouping if lecture 16 ‘Agricultural Botany’ were excluded, while that of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III] units would account for only 3.4% (14.4/1000) of Intertextuality in the Physical Sciences grouping if lecture 19 ‘Artificial Life’ were excluded. This means we therefore need to examine each grouping in greater detail to arrive at clearer pictures of the disciplinary groupings and the lectures in them.

4.3.2 The management of Intertextuality in Physical Sciences

Table 4.4 beneath shows the breakdown for each lecture in this grouping:

	Unmarked [I]	Reporting Noun [II]	Reporting Verb [III]	Lecturer [IV]	Lecturer [V]
19 Artificial Life	56%	5%	24%	15%	–
	436	40.8	190	114.5	–
20 Probability Distributions	97%	–	3%	–	–
	523	–	15.2	–	–
21 Holography	95%	–	4.5%	0.5%	–
	436	–	23.2	2.1	–
22 Polymers	97%	–	3%	–	–
	446	–	11.7	–	–
23 Organo- metallic Chem.	94%	–	2.5%	3.5%	–
	629	–	19.6	23.9	–
24 Formal Logic	93%	–	4%	1.5%	1.5%
	408	–	17.1	6.8	6.8
Totals	86.5% (95%)²⁴⁷	1.25%	7.75% (3.4%)	4.25% (1.1%)	0.25%
	482.6	6.8	46.1 (14.4)	24.5 (5.4)	1.1

Table 4.4: The Management of Intertextuality in Physical Sciences Grouping

Table 4.4 above shows that with the exception of lecture 19 ‘Artificial Life’, this is a coherent disciplinary grouping, certainly regarding the management of Intertextuality, with the remaining five of the six lectures exhibiting an almost

²⁴⁷ Mean figure in parentheses here calculated without lecture 19 ‘Artificial Life’.

exclusive reliance on the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* [I] units to realise Intertextuality – together lectures 20-24 have an average of 95% of units realising Intertextuality managed in this way (488.4/1000). This constructs the discourse in these lectures as monophonic, monologic discourse with high authority and universality, meaning in turn that knowledge is (re-)constructed in these lectures as having high truth status. This suggests the (re-)construction of authoritative, confident disciplines behind these five lectures, marked, at the undergraduate level at least, by homogeneous disciplinary landscapes.

In these five lectures, the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Nouns* [II] is never used, and the potential of *Reporting Verbs* [III] accounts on average for only 3.4% of units realising Intertextuality (17.3/1000). Moreover, on the few occasions that the potential of *Reporting Verbs* [III] is used, it is used in ways that do not dialogise the discourse. These instances are almost invariably to name disciplinary phenomena (10 instances) or to explain what a rule / law says (12 instances), and in these instances, the discourse is never dialogised – instead, the lexico-grammatical choices construct a tight monophonic union of lecturer and discipline in chorus. This can be via *Passive Anonymous* structures meaning there is no agency as *Uttering Source*:

FL140) [III] **it's all be called transitivity** that proof is a transitive
idea

Or it can be with disciplinary-*we* as *Uttering Source*:

HO323) [III] and **that part of the beam we call it** the background beam or reference beam

Such choices clearly construct the discipline as the homogeneous authority behind the calling act – and a lecturer reproduces this homogeneity in these acts of calling, particularly when binding him/herself in chorus to the discipline via the *we* form. In fact, in these five lectures there is only the one single instance of an apparent lack of agreement in a discipline about naming phenomena, settled seemingly via the adverb *formally* in OMC278:

OMC252) [III] that reaction {metal-hydrogen exchange} in the textbooks is **sometimes referred to** simply as metallation

OMC253) [III] some textbooks **call it**²⁴⁸ {metal-hydrogen exchange} metallation

OMC255) [III] but you will find that some textbooks **use the term** metallation

OMC277) [III] but many textbooks don't actually include it as an insertion reaction

OMC278) [III] but of course **formally** it is

The second typical reporting act in these five lectures involves outlining disciplinary rules / laws. Such laws are the final contemporary reified outcomes of historical disciplinary knowledge-construction by disciplinary agents, and have

²⁴⁸ Unit OMC253 here is a good example of the typical construction of polyphony and therefore uncertainty caused by changing from *Passive Anonymous* structures to realise the process of calling disciplinary phenomena, and then identifying an *Uttering Source* other than disciplinary-*we* as the caller in the process.

been granted such high truth status within the discipline that these rules / laws now act as the *Uttering Sources* in the units and simply speak their own truth – all the original agency behind their creation has either been crystallised as an epithet naming the law / rule or has simply disappeared:

PM111) [III] and here saying the ratio of stress of the matrix to strain of the matrix is the Young's modulus of the matrix

FL261) [III] {the rule of} theorem introduction says you just go to the conclusion

FL262) [III] it {the rule of theorem introduction} just says that you can introduce a theorem wherever you like simply introduce it wherever you feel like it

Such choices likewise construct the discipline, in the shape of its laws / rules, as the powerful participant in these units, an authority accepted by a lecturer – and which can even be constructed as determining actions of disciplinary practitioners, as beneath for instance where the lecturer is constructed as the *receiver* (Halliday 1994a: 140) and the rule as the *sayer* (ibid):

FL386) [III] and therefore conditional proof then asks me to prove if P then Q

Human agency seems to be steadfastly avoided in the management of Intertextuality in these five Physical Sciences lectures, a feature of Physical Science discoursing observed elsewhere (Lemke 1990 & 1995, Bazerman 1981 & 1988, Halliday 1988), and in fact in these five lectures, there is only the one single instance in which

human agency is ascribed in a reporting verb unit that is not naming disciplinary phenomena – and even in this instance this is only a *Generalisation*²⁴⁹ with a rather vague *people* as *Uttering Source*, therefore again avoiding specific agency in the discourse:

PM119) [III] and **people have used that equation {Young's modulus of the matrix} to make predictions** about elastic properties of composites

What we can clearly see in the management of Intertextuality in these five lectures then is disciplinary 'knowledge' behind them being (re-)constructed as true and unproblematic, in the sense that it is (re-)constructed as knowledge shared and agreed on by apparently homogeneous disciplines, suggesting authoritative and stable paradigms (Kuhn 1962). This observation is reinforced by the very limited use in these five lectures of the two potentials of *Lecturer Intertext* Intertextuality (*Reporting Verbs* [IV] and *Reporting Nouns* [V]) whose use might suggest a lecturer operating outside a paradigm – only the one lecture, Organometallic Chemistry (lecture 23), makes any significant use of this potential at all, and such instances are not used for knowledge-claims per se but almost for asides (as too are the few other instances in lecture 24, Formal Logic):

OMC236) [IV] for example **if I remember** [let me just give you a guess] **I think** the P-K-A for this molecule is something like fifteen

OMC237) [IV] [let me just give you a guess]

²⁴⁹ This is another good example of *Present Perfect* tense being used with *Generalisations*, as identified by Swales (1990).

These five lectures seem therefore to share very similar characteristics regarding how their ‘knowledge’ is (re-)constructed in their undergraduate lectures, in turn pointing to rather homogeneous disciplinary landscapes behind these lectures. However, the remaining lecture in this category, ‘Artificial Life’ (lecture 19), presents an altogether different picture. Although this lecture is also science-based, it shares none of the features suggested above – instead the knowledge-claims in this lecture are as likely to be attributed to specific human agents as *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Noun* [II] and *Reporting Verb* [III] Intertextuality, and/or to the lecturer himself as *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verb* [IV] and *Reporting Noun* [V] Intertextuality, as they are to be realised as *Unmarked* [I] units:

	<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>			<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>	
	<i>Unmarked</i> [I]	<i>Reporting Noun</i> [II]	<i>Reporting Verb</i> [III]	<i>Lecturer</i> [IV]	<i>Lecturer</i> [V]
Artificial Life (19)	56%	5%	24%	15%	–
	436	40.8	190	114.5	–
Grouping Averages ^a	95%	–	3.4%	1.1%	0.25%
	488.4	–	17.3	6.5	1.1

^a These figures are the average for the other five lectures in the grouping

Straightaway this points to very dialogised discourse in this lecture, and this is certainly the case – the *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Noun* [II] and *Reporting Verb* [III] units consistently introduce a wide variety of specific human agents into the lecture as active talking agents, constructing dialogic discourse characterised by a variety of subjective knowledge-claims and a range of ungratified opinions ranging from past to contemporary.

In its *Reporting Noun* [II] units, this is achieved instead by attributing the units to specific agents and/or by marking them as chronologically specific:

AL33) [II] **his {Thomas Hobbes}** idea of the ideal political system **was** based on the idea that first we must understand what human beings are really like and how their minds work in order to devise a system within which they can live together safely

AL44) [II] it's a **classic** example of a program which behaves intelligently solves problems and generally speaking can be applied to a large variety of different situations on the simple basis that it makes a representation of the world in terms of statements in a simple language and these statements can be manipulated to produce different representations of the world as it might be <pause>

AL172) [II] and on the **old** idea what you did was you wrote a program which had instructions in it [like lift the left leg] [move it forward] [drop it again] and [when you are stable do the same with the right leg and so on]

While in its *Reporting Verb* [III] units, this is achieved via patterns consisting typically of *Discourse Acts* with individual disciplinary agents as *Uttering Source* in *Integral Subject* syntax reporting units in *Simple Present* tense:

- AL271) [III] because sometimes **he {Rodney Brooks} calls himself a**
psychologist²⁵⁰
- AL272) [III] sometimes **he {Rodney Brooks} calls himself an**
engineer
- AL281) [III] and **he {Rodney Brooks} said [well] [I'm {Rodney**
Brooks} a bit of everything] [and if you want me to describe
my work **I'd {Rodney Brooks} put it like this**] [I'm
{Rodney Brooks} making a home for the mind] [and hoping
that the mind will come]
- AL287) [III] **what he {Rodney Brooks} does is he builds** [he
{Rodney Brooks} calls it] behaviour based robotics
- AL288) [III] [**he {Rodney Brooks} calls it**]
- AL289) [III] **he {Rodney Brooks} builds complete creatures**
- AL290) [III] and **he {Rodney Brooks} describes his work a little bit**
like this [a project to capitalise on computation to understand
human cognition] [we will build integrated physical system
including vision sound input output manipulation] [the
resulting system will learn to think by building on its bodily
experiences]
- AL393) [III] and **what he {Jonathan Kingdom} claims is that**
human beings get over power genetic material overlaps with
that of our close evolutionary relatives like the benobo
chimpanzees to something like ninety-nine per cent

²⁵⁰ This unit clearly illustrates the pragmatic distinction between the act of calling realised via *Passive Anonymous* syntax (it's called ...) and realised via *Integral Subject* syntax. Likewise units AL288.

- AL401) [III] but **what are a lot of biologists are now saying and Jonathan Kingdom is one of them is that** we do not need to look inside of human beings for what makes us unique different from animals
- AL403) [III] and **Jonathan Kingdom puts it like this** [the human beings are in effect artefacts of their own artefacts]

Such choices are radically different to those in the other five lectures in the grouping of Physical Sciences, and construct highly dialogised discourse populated by individual talking disciplinary agents, whose individual and probably pre-paradigmatic knowledge-claims are what is (re-)constructed in the lecture – the focus is very much on individual claims as opposed to disciplinary knowledge (e.g. present continuous *saying* in AL401 above, and the extensive use of *constructed dialogue* (Tannen 1989)). We can see too for instance that the act of naming disciplinary phenomena, the patterns of which are indicative of authoritative, homogeneous disciplinary landscapes behind the other five lectures in this category, is constructed as a personal act in this lecture (AL271-2, 287-8 above). This lecture therefore seems to have a less dominant paradigm behind it and instead a rather individualised, heterogeneous landscape behind it, in which there is clearly a variety of live opinions, disagreement and conflicting thoughts concerning the topic, artificial intelligence.

Concomitant with this, we also see a high lecturer involvement in the discourse, marked not only by the extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units realised with openly dialogising *Discourse Act* reporting verbs such as *claim*

above (AL393), but also by the high proportion of *Lecturer Intertext* Intertextuality (15%), which, in contrast to the highly peripheral use of this potential in the other five lectures, is characterised by authoritative, decisive claims concerning the topic of the lecture:

- AL380) [IV] **I suggest that** it's cybernetic philosophy
- AL386) [IV] and the way that they interact is structured by Cog's interaction with the social world
- AL406) [IV] if you think about **what I'm playing with here is the idea that** artificial life may be creating cyborgs
- AL484) [IV] so **I will finish with this idea** that artificial life in its many forms the making of artefacts which are organic
- AL487) [IV] and human beings have the ability to control themselves

This lecture therefore displays very different features to the other five in this grouping, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and suggests that in science fields, the chronological status of knowledge has a significant impact on how it can be (re-)constructed at undergraduate level. This points to the linear, cumulative landscapes typically behind science disciplines (Becher 1989), but shows too that such linearity is a social and rhetorical consequence rather than a pre-given, because in order for disciplinary knowledge-claims to be able to evolve into simple *Unmarked* [I] units in their undergraduate lectures, such disciplines require a stable ratification process to achieve this. This is in contrast typically to Arts & Humanities disciplines in which the chronological status of knowledge seems to have limited impact on how it is (re-)constructed.

4.3.2.1 Conclusion on The management of Intertextuality in Physical Sciences

In conclusion, we can see five lectures in this category of Physical Sciences which (re-)construct tight, monophonic discourse via the almost exclusive reliance on the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* [I] units, (re-)constructing apparently tight, authoritative, homogeneous disciplines behind them marked by consensus, and one lecture which seems entirely opposite to this, a lecture marked by heavily dialogised and thus heterogeneous discourse, suggesting that behind this lecture lies a far more heterogeneous disciplinary landscape, marked by disagreement and individuality. Whether this is sufficient evidence to argue that the entire discipline itself is marked by heterogeneity, or merely to argue merely that it is this particular specialism (Becher 1989) within the discipline which is marked by heterogeneity, is unclear. It may also/instead be that in contrast to the other five lectures, this lecture 'Artificial Life' is tackling a topic right at the cutting edge of the discipline as opposed to topics at the base of a paradigm (Kuhn 1962) which the other five lectures appear to be tackling. This would indicate the historicity of knowledge as also being very important in determining how it is (re-)constructed in science fields, and perhaps if this lecture were to be given in some years' time, it might display a rather different management of Intertextuality more similar to the other five lectures.

4.3.3 The management of Intertextuality in Arts & Humanities

Table 4.5 shows the breakdown for each lecture in this grouping:

	Disciplinary Intertext			Lecturer Intertext	
	Unmarked [I]	Reporting Noun [II]	Reporting Verb [III]	Lecturer [IV]	Lecturer [V]
1 Hume's	37%	8%	49%	6%	–

Treatise	169	39.4	229	29	–
2 Contem	38%	6%	47%	9%	–
Appr H A	205	33	278	19.5	–
3 The Fre	92%	1%	3%	4%	–
Revoln	634	6.8	19.5	27.5	–
4 Roman	65%	3%	31.5%	0.5%	1 (1)
Britain	525	26.8	263	8	0.5
5 Pol Nat	67%	1%	13%	19%	–
C19 L-A	290	1.9	55.3	78.2	–
6 Allegory	83%	1%	9%	7%	–
Fae Quee	504	3.8	57.9	44.4	–
Totals	63.75%	3.5%	25.5%	7%	1 (1)
	387.8	18.3	150.5	41.7	0.3

Table 4.5: The Management of Intertextuality in Arts & Humanities Grouping

In contrast to the Physical Sciences grouping, table 4.5 above shows a very diverse set of lectures in this grouping, with three lectures (1, 2 & 4) exhibiting, as we might expect, a significant use of the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units, but with two lectures (3 & 6) on the other hand exhibiting a significant use of the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* [I] units. One lecture (5) meanwhile makes extensive use of *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verb* [IV] units. This means there is as much intra-category variation here as inter-category variation, which may suggest, initially at least, perhaps that there is not some generic style in Arts & Humanities lecture discourse, or perhaps that this administrative grouping may not be as valid as the grouping of Physical Sciences seems to be. Due to these wide intra-category variations, we will examine each lecture to identify what its main characteristics seem to be regarding its management of Intertextuality.

Looking firstly at the management of Intertextuality in the two lectures with high use of *Unmarked* [I] units, ‘The French Revolution’ (92%, 634/1000) and ‘Allegory

in *The Faerie Queene*' (83%, 504), both these lectures exhibit features suggesting a rather homogeneous disciplinary landscape behind them. This is noticeable not only via their extensive use of *Unmarked* [I] units to manage Intertextuality, but also by the patterns exhibited on the few occasions that the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units is used (3%, 19.5/1000). For instance, of the five reporting episodes in 'The French Revolution', three are realised as *Generalisations* with the generic title *historians* and/or *we* indexing *historians* as *Uttering Source*:

FR56) [III] I mean **the best illustration which historians usually give of that** is the s{}the first celebration of the fourteenth of July which was obviously a year later in seventeen-ninety

FR60) [III] they have an enormous civil festi{}a civic festival

FR432) [III] so as well as and arguing as well as revolutionising as as long as as well as the war revolutionising the revolution **we would also say that** the revolution revolutionised warfare that the the way in which warfare was fought war was fought is changed like this

FR518) [III] **what historians get very agitated about very divided about very upset about sometimes is that** the the the ideology and the discourses of Enlightenment have also seemed to prove the p{} provide the justification behind the reign of terror

FR520) [III] [that's what Robespierre is always talking about virtue]

These choices serve to avoid dialogising the discourse in that the disagreeers and their disagreements are not themselves brought into the discourse, we know merely that there are disagreements. This seems to suggest the discipline behind the lecture

as comprising a group with a strong sense of shared *we* identity – even if they may get *agitated / divided / upset* by issues in their discipline. Nevertheless, there is a very limited sense of disciplinary division or agitation in this lecture, and in the one instance when the lecturer does bring a specific disciplinary agent into the discourse, firstly his contribution is limited, secondly it is evaluated as *interesting* and *convincing*, and thirdly, the *Cleft* pattern of realisation avoids him actively talking in the discourse as would be the case with *Integral Subject* form – the focus is thus on his message as much as or more than on Timothy Tackett himself as an active talking agent (Thompson 1996):

FR204) [III] **very interesting work been done in recent years by an American historian called Timothy Tackett** t-a-c-k-e-double-t

FR205) [III] **and what he argues** [I think it's a convincing argument if you read the book] is that that that oath which [you know] obviously it's the clergy that take

FR207) [III] **in fact that's like a sort of popularity poll ... one way or another**

This points, perhaps rather surprisingly, to a limited reliance on outside sources in this particular lecture at least, and although it seemed reasonable to wonder if the lecturer is therefore instead constructing a highly personal take on the discipline, rendering the knowledge as his version of disciplinary knowledge, as we might perhaps expect in this discipline (Becher 1989), reanalyses of the lecture discourse in fact failed to indicate many conclusive lexico-grammatical indications of this. There are a small number of *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verb* [IV] units realised via *I think* in this lecture (8 units in total, 4%, 27.5/1000) which definitely give a

flavour of a higher lecturer involvement in this lecture than was observed in the very homogeneous Physical Sciences grouping, but they seem to cover small numbers of units and to realise local propositions – there are no confident assertions as were observed in ‘Artificial Life’:

FR61) [IV] this so-called fête de la fédération the the festival of the federation symbolising **I think** this idea of the new unity the new indivisibility of the new regime

FR62) [IV] and yet even by seventeen-ninety **I think** the fissures are opening up

One possible reason for these observations may be that history at the undergraduate level, or perhaps as it appears in this specific lecture anyway, is as much about reconstruction of events as it is about interpretation of those events. Or perhaps lecturers in some disciplines feel less of a need to mark propositions in lectures as their own if their discipline fosters a personal stance by default. On the evidence of this particular lecture/lecturer at least though, the discipline of History as (re)constructed at the undergraduate level seems then to be quite a homogeneous discipline, marked as such here by the reliance on *Unmarked* [I] units and by the use of the generic term *historians* and the *we* pronominal form indexing them in its *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units.

The second lecture marked by heavy use (83%, 504/1000) of the potential of *Unmarked* [I] units in this grouping is lecture 6 ‘Allegory in The Faerie Queene’, a lecture which moreover also makes limited use of the potential of *Disciplinary*

Intertext Reporting Verb [III] units (9%, 57.9/1000) too. And when it does make use of this potential, this lecture likewise exhibits lexico-grammatical choices which downplay individual agency in the discourse, opting consistently for a pattern of *Generalisation* which places the *you* of the audience in subject position as *Receivers* (Halliday 1994a: 140) of claims from either the broad generic group of *critics* or *people*, sometimes as embedded parenthetical units (AFQ100) further lessening their discursive prominence:

AFQ99) [IX] now something we have here to think about is two other words [and **you'll often find this being thrown at you by critics** so we might as well get it right] [<writing on board> vehicle and tenor]

AFQ134) [III] and **you will sometimes find a critic toss us** [oh] [yes] [this is a euhemeristic reading]

AFQ156) [III] and so very often **you'll find stories and interpretations where people will go around to say** [well] [there must originally have been a human being who behaved in a particular way]

AFQ160) [III] and that's how ideas about how Jupiter turned himself into a bull and raped Europa started something like that

Such choices avoid these agents taking any active part in the discourse by expounding what they will *throw / toss / say*, and this avoidance of active and/or individual agency is maintained throughout the *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units in this lecture. For instance beneath, Euhemerus, the original creator

of a particular interpretive system, is not given any opportunity to talk his ideas – instead he is given a rather passive role in the discourse by *Simple Past* tense choice in a narrative of his achievement, much as we saw with Hammil’s theorising in the lecture ‘Radiation Chemistry’:

AFQ138) [III] and **this is called after** the Greek critic Euhemerus a man for whom I have enormous respect who looked at the pagan myths and legends of the gods and heroes around him

AFQ140) [III] but **he was the one to get i{} get it named after him**

AFQ141) [III] **what he {Euhemerus} did was he thought of this** interpretive system which he felt was desperately needed in order to explain a curious anomaly about myths of the gods and heroes

AFQ152) [III] and so **Euhemeris like others before and after him came up with the idea that** the real truth was not so much ... as if they were gods

These choices suggest that this theory is viewed as unproblematic in the discipline, and alongside the other features noted, point, perhaps rather surprisingly, to strong paradigms (ibid) in this discipline. As with ‘The French Revolution’, it seemed reasonable to wonder therefore if the lecturer is constructing a highly personal take on the discipline, and again, as observed in ‘The French Revolution’, there are instances (7) in this lecture of *Lecturer Intertext* units [IV] (7%, 44.4/1000) prefaced by *I think*, suggesting a heavier lecturer involvement than is the case in the Physical

Sciences grouping – but again, such units seem to govern only very local level propositions:

AFQ186) [IV] symbolism is a is a word **I think** that many people find fraught with perils

AFQ320) [IV] but **I think** we can all think of ourselves have there been occasions when you feel your face has burned and tickled with a cobweb broken across it

It therefore seems to be the case that the discipline of English, as (re-)constructed in this particular lecture at least and maybe only at the undergraduate level, seems also to be quite a homogeneous discipline, marked by consensus and a strong sense of *we* identity, and perhaps as evidencing strong paradigms. The same too might be said of the discipline of History, which may suggest that the age of an academic discipline may itself play a role in how knowledge is (re-)constructed in undergraduate lectures, as both English and History are long-established disciplines (Manicas 1988). Conversely, it might be the case that lecturers in such disciplines feel less of a need to mark personal discourse explicitly as their own, meaning that what appear lexico-grammatically as *Unmarked* [I] units are in fact nearer *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] or [V] units.

The remaining four lectures in this grouping however exhibit features which might be more expected, particularly regarding their more extensive use of the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units. Lecture 1 ‘Hume’s Treatise’

exhibits the highest use of this potential in the corpus²⁵¹, accounting for 49% of Intertextuality in this lecture (229/1000), a substantial quantity. Philosophical rhetoric has been described as “mind-to-mind combat with co-professionals” (Bloor 1996: 34), suggesting the highly individualised and subjective nature of ‘knowledge’ in this discipline, while Derrida²⁵² (in Wood (ed) 1992) has commented on the cyclical nature of philosophy and the impossibility of closure in this discipline – and thus we should not be surprised that this lecture makes such extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units. The nature of philosophy as a cyclical phenomenon working and reworking the texts of others is very apparent in the opening of this lecture, in a series of *Integral Subject* syntax units in *Simple Present* tense with a specific human agent (Hume) as *Uttering Source* – these choices focus very much on agency and construct Hume as following on from other philosophers to voice his own historical but still similarly unresolved claims:

HT19) [III] like Locke and Berkeley **he {Hume} thinks** that all of our interesting knowledge is derived from experience

HT22) [III] and **he’s {Hume} also following on from the arguments** from the kind of from the challenges that were laid down by Locke and Berkeley

HT23) [III] so **he {Hume} takes on a lot of Locke’s a lot of the the terminology** used by Locke and Berkeley

²⁵¹ See also Thompson & Tribble (2001: 94) who also identify Philosophy as exhibiting easily the highest quantity of Integral citations in their corpus of RA’s and PhD theses, and as the only discipline favouring Integral citations. See also Hyland (2000) who identifies likewise for Philosophy in RA’s.

²⁵² See also Whitehead’s description of philosophy as a recursive, cyclical discipline: “The safest general characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato” (Whitehead 1969: 53). See also Wittgenstein (1958) on philosophy as a “language game”.

HT24) [III] and **he {Hume} looks at** another lot of the same kind of problems

HT25) [III] I mean particularly **he's {Hume} interested in** abstraction scepticism whether Locke and Berk{} whether Locke's account in particular ap{} implies scepticism about the ex{} external world whether empiricism implies scepticism about the external world

HT26) [III] and the most I mean **one of the most famous things that he {Hume} takes on from Locke and Berkeley is** is the theory of personal identify

HT27) [III] **he {Hume} looks at** Locke's account

HT28) [III] **he {Hume} looks at** Berkeley's account

HT29) [III] and then **he {Hume} proposes his own account**

These choices, typical of those throughout the management of this potential in this lecture, create very dialogic discourse with clear participation for both original disciplinary agents and the lecturer within the units. Sometimes the lecturer's voice gains discursive prominence through the use of *Present Continuous* forms (HT22 above), often in conjunction with *Cleft* syntax and/or with *so* pointing at an alteration in participation frameworks (Schiffrin 1987) and/or with the adverb *basically*, constructing an interpretive focus on Hume's message(s) – such choices are generally atypical of the rest of the corpus but very typical in this lecture, marking Philosophy as a thoroughly discursively-based discipline:

HT63) [III] **basically what Hume's saying is** there's one kind of explanation that's applicable to all of these things

Sometimes the choices of *Present Continuous* forms with *so* also reflects the clear pedagogic nature of the discourse in that it allows the lecturer to focus both on Hume's actual original words and their perceived consequences:

HT169 [III] and **Hume starts out by saying** [<reading> all the perceptions of the human mind resolve themselves into two distinct kinds which I'll call impressions and ideas </reading>]

HT171 [III] and so Locke is imme{} Hume's [I beg your pardon] **Hume is immediately laying down his terminology** in a different way from Locke

This choice is even sometimes maintained in *Passive* syntax, creating rather unusual reporting structures:

HT196 [III] so **the distinction seems to be being made here {by Hume}** in two ways

The pedagogic nature of the reporting is also evidenced via the sometime use of *Present Perfect* tense (Swales 1990), again in this instance in tandem with *so* (Schiffrin 1987), constructing a summative focus on Hume's discourse:

HT178 [III] so **he's s{} started by having a go at Locke** who's used this term idea to stand for all of our perceptions

Sometimes, rather peculiarly, such summative syntax even constructs Hume's method as a future speaker – there is a strong contrast however between this

phenomenon in Physical Sciences with *Simple Present say* and *Indirect Speech*²⁵³, and the *going to be saying* beneath followed by *Direct*, or in fact *Constructed Dialogue* (Tannen 1989), with the former constructing a more authoritative nature to the rule/law/method:

HT742 [III] so his {Hume's} basic philosophical method is going to be saying that [here's a philosophical term [here it is] like like substance] [where's the impression from which this idea is derived] [if we can't find one then it's insignificant]

The typically strong participation of the lecturer in the *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units in this lecture is also manifested in the frequent choice of *Cognition Acts* (Hyland 2000), again typically realised in *Present Simple* tense and highlighting the unresolved nature of knowledge in this discipline:

HT69) [III] and I mean Hume Hume sees this as a kind of an experimental enquiry <pause>

HT82) [III] so he {Hume} wants to come up with some kind of laws of association

Finally, and again suggestive of the strong participation of the lecturer within much of the use of this potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units in this lecture, the lecturer also makes quite regular use of overtly *Constructed Dialogue* (Tannen 1989), in this instance complete with 'authentic' discourse marker *well*,

²⁵³ For instance: FL262) [III] it {the rule of theorem introduction} just says that you can introduce a theorem wherever you like simply introduce it wherever you feel like it

which although attributed to Hume clearly cannot be Hume's actual words – instead this choice allows the lecturer to allow Hume to voice highly reformulated and summarised versions of his own discourse:

HT550 [III] and **Hume says** [well] [no] [there aren't]

Sometimes this can be 'pseudo-authentic' as above, or hypothesised as beneath:

HT619 [III] and **Hume would say** [well] [the reason that you have this confused and vague idea is because it's not really an idea at all]

All these choices construct highly dialogic, polyphonic discourse, and the lecturer's active *I* involvement in the discourse is further manifested through *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verb* [IV] units, creating further dialogicity. Although this potential is not used as frequently as in some lectures, its use at 6% (29/1000) of Intertextuality in this lecture is higher than in over half the lectures in the overall corpus, and it can realise direct dialogue with Hume's ideas:

HT699 [IV] and **I think** that's where he he {Hume} sort of gets his his terminology from that when obviously when you have your idea of remembering the the car crash later it is only a faint copy of the original impression

HT704 [IV] but that's not going to do all the work that Hume wants it to do because he can't he can't make the he doesn't want to make the distinction

between perceiving and thinking just in terms of of what's going on out there

In conclusion then, this lecture 'Hume's Treatise' is probably the most dialogic lecture in the corpus, and (re-)constructs the discipline behind it as apparently very heterogeneous, marked by a recursive and cyclical nature to its knowledge and the individual nature of its practitioners. It also shows that the historicity of knowledge in some Arts & Humanities areas seems to be irrelevant to how it is (re)constructed, because much disciplinary knowledge is unratifiable – and therefore untransformable into *Unmarked* [I] units. Tense choices are typically therefore related to issues of truth status and discourse management rather than simple chronology, and this is precisely how and why recursive and cyclical landscapes derive and are in turn reproduced in some undergraduate lectures.

Lecture 2 in this category, 'Contemporary Approaches to The History of Art', is another highly dialogic lecture, and one too which makes extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units (47%, 278/1000), and particularly *Integral Subject* syntax with *Human Agents* as *Uttering Sources*, typically with *Discourse Acts* realised in *Simple Present* tense. The instance beneath is in fact an episode of direct quotation, seemingly and perhaps rather surprisingly a very unusual feature in the entire corpus outside this lecture and lecture 5 'The Aftermath of Political Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Latin-America':

CAHA271 [III] **Bryson says** [in Watteau a whole narrative structure insists on meaning] ... [at the same time that sign makes the claim for a power and

an attractive signified in this case melancholy that is nowhere stated in the paint-painterly signifier explicitly]

It seems to be a consistent choice in the overall corpus to realise read-aloud *Genuine Quotations* via *say*, probably because it is such a neutral reporting verb (Thompson & Yiyun 1991). As in the lecture 'Hume's Treatise' discussed above, the lecturer also makes use of *Present Continuous* forms of *say* to focus on interpretation of the messages of disciplinary agents, again very typically in *Cleft* syntax to further focus on message (Thompson 1996):

CAHA283) [III] so **what he's saying here he's really saying that Bryson that is that** the meaning of the figures in the picture is at once dependent on the original context the theatre yet is not like Wittgenstein's Life of Speech reducible to it

However, unlike 'Hume's Treatise' above, this lecture also introduces a wider range of human agents into the discourse, frequently generic groups of people, ranging from *art historians* or the pronoun *they* indexing them (CAHA33-6), schools of thought (CAHA53), people behind an art exhibition (CAHA74), feminists, and also a number of individual agents too such as Wittgenstein, Saussure, and Freud amongst others, and inter-agent and/or inter-group dialogue certainly seems to mark this lecture, suggesting a very heterogeneous discipline behind this lecture, marked by disagreement and a breadth of opinion:

CAHA77) [III] but soon after the exhibition opened and this characteristically voluminous catalogues was issued **this exhibition came under heavy criticism from people who were influenced by post-colonial discussions**

Interestingly, in this lecture, the lecturer makes greater use of tense shifts than seems to be the case in any other lectures in the corpus, meaning that although reporting units are typically realised in *Simple Present* tense, giving discursive space to the agents behind them, some are also realised in *Simple Past* tense:

CAHA231) [III] now **he {Wittgenstein} held that** language emerges within and transforms our social transactions

CAHA233) [III] {Wittgenstein held} but that state of a affairs is permanated permeated by the life of speech by the way and the context it which we utter something

CAHA170) [III] **he {Ferdinand Saussure} stated stated** this analysis of science in in in terms which are still in use

CAHA172) [III] and **he {Ferdinand Saussure} called** the signified which is already a mental concept and not a object out in um um in the world something which a signifier refers to

CAHA96) [III] now **Said in this book Orientalism has very forcefully argued** that western societies not only just exploited others' other cultures in their colonial strategies but in fact fabricated those societies in their own

image other societies became and actually took on that character simply by being characterised in opposition to western cultures

CAHA102) [III] and he {Said in his book *Orientalism*} also argued that in fact because of the many many years of encounters these societies then took on those characteristics were really shaped in those images ...

Such *Simple Past* tense choices seem to realise discursive organisation of the reports in terms of their 'air time' (Swales 1990), and corresponds with relatively limited reporting episodes realising claims which are background to the lecture as opposed to central points to be discussed. This points to a high lecturer involvement in the discourse in this lecture, also manifested earlier above in the *Present Continuous* form of reporting verb *say* focussing on Bryson's claims (CAHA283). In the same vein and as was also the case in 'Hume's Treatise', the lecturer also makes quite extensive use of *Cognition Acts*, interpreting disciplinary agents:

CAHA153) [III] in fact he he {Jimmie Durham} really does feel that the found object what he finds and assembles needs to be left in its own right must not be homogenised in a sort of entity which loses where all the individual elements u-lo-u-use-lose their own characteristic

CAHA154) [III] so he {Jimmie Durham} really does want an assemblage which looks quite assembled and not really homogenised in a unified object because he thinks that would just simply ameliorate the character of th{} o{} of all the individual elements in the way that the

colonials ameliorate of the natives when they arrived in their country or attempted to

As in 'Hume's Treatise', the lecturer also uses hypothesised contributions from disciplinary agents, again suggestive of a relatively high lecturer involvement in the discourse:

CAHA222) [III] so **Rosalind Krauss if she looked at this picture would point out** how much actually it is a two dimensional construct

CAHA225) [III] and she {**Rosalind Krauss**} would take er{}an{}di **discuss** that as then constructing the meaning which of course in the end would come close to the meaning I've just discussed the meaning of ...

This higher lecturer involvement in the discourse is also manifested in the use of *Lecturer Intertext* Intertextuality (8%, 19.5/1000) for assertive claim-making as opposed to realising 'asides' as in many of the lectures in the corpus:

CAHA375) [IV] but here at the very end [and **I think** one can] [and I have to be a bit more careful] **I think** it is fair to say that a psychoanalytical approach would always have a have a special affinity with a biographical approach

CAHA376) [IV] [and **I think** one can]

CAHA378) [IV] you do need to if you start from the individual and his or her make-up you do need to have some kind of knowledge of the of the [not always as my analysis of Renoir showed] [you can do without it if you take

it in very general terms] but **I think** it's fair to say that there there is a special affinity to the biographical approach

This lecture therefore seems to exhibit features we might expect in Arts & Humanities discourse (Nelson et al 1987), in the sense that it is highly dialogic and suggestive of a recursive disciplinary landscape populated by individual agents, even at the level of the undergraduate lecture.

This leaves two lectures to assess in this category of Arts & Humanities, the first of which is lecture 5 'The Aftermath of Political nationalism in Nineteenth Century Latin-America'. This lecture exhibits the highest use of *Lecturer Intertext* Intertextuality in this grouping (19%, 78.2/1000), but a relatively low extent of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* (13%, 55.3/1000). This suggests a high lecturer-as-I involvement in this lecture, and curiously, this correlates with one of the only instances of what we might have imagined would be typical reporting act syntax in lecture discourse:

APN156) [III] **as John Lynch m{} m{} might put it as as he describes** it in one of his books [same new old new rider]

APN157) [III] [same new old new rider]

This pattern of *as* [agent] [report verb] serves to integrate a reported message into a writer's own discourse, often as support, by focussing on the message as opposed to its agency (Thompson 1996), but is highly atypical of the lectures in the corpus for this study at least. This seems rather surprising, and perhaps points to the

institutionalised nature of undergraduate lectures as opposed to their individual nature. In discourse with a more powerful author function, this choice is highly typical – for instance, in Bryson (2003), a popularised narrative of science marked by a powerful central narrator, this pattern accounts for a dramatic quantity of reporting acts, used to blend supporting authorities into the author’s own narrative and argument. This choice thus seems to serve to construct a powerful authorial identity as s/he not only tells the report but also makes active use of it in his/her own narrative. The use of this pattern in this lecture therefore seems to point to a strong lecturer presence in the discourse, an observation supported by another curious instance of reporting in this lecture, in which the lecturer directly appropriates some else’s exact words to make her own point:

APN494) [III] to use this nice phrase of **Benedict Anderson** who I mentioned a moment ago this was a time during which the political leaders of these new republics urged Americans to create imagined communities

APN495) [III] that’s a phrase that **Benedict Anderson** has used imagined communities to try to describe the process that I’ve been talking about to to try to des{} describe the way in which nationalism isn’t simply something founded in language or geography

This seems to point perhaps to an enjoyment of well-phrased discourse in this discipline and a value placed on eloquent literacy, observable too in the episode beneath in which the lecturer again makes direct and extensive use of another historian’s words:

APN219) [III] **there's also some very nice work done on Chile** I I should in the spirit of scholarly acknowledgement **I should say that what I'm about to say is taken partly from the work of Simon Collier** who's <writes 'Simon Collier' on blackboard> [so this is a footnote to my lecture a nod towards Simon Collier] who's done this nice work on on Chilean nationalism

APN235) [III] [<reads from {Simon Collier's} book> we are the founders of a nation </reading {Simon Collier's} book>]

These episodes point to this lecturer making her own narrative (see unit APN136 beneath) into which she blends supporting sources, and the contributions made via *Lecturer Intertext* Intertextuality in this lecture (19%) certainly realise assertive knowledge-claims as opposed to supporting comments or asides:

APN124) [IV] now **I don't want to suggest that total stagnation** [if that's the right word] or or total continuity characterised the entirety of the post-independence experience across Spanish America as a whole

APN125) [IV] [if that's the right word]

APN126) [IV] in many places **I think it did** for the first fifty years

APN129) [IV] Mexico **I think** is the strongest example of this

APN133) [IV] but **I think** that these were exceptions

APN134) [IV] these were this was not the general trend for the first fifty years or so after independence

APN135) [IV] and **what I would like to stress** was this element of continuity **I think** as as much as the these particular moments of change

APN136) [IV] after the mid-century after about eighteen-fifty **if I were** going to talk about continuity **I would be telling** a very different story

APN137) [IV] after eighteen-fifty **I think** the structure of the economy in most Latin American countries changed dramatically

Through such episodes we gain a powerful sense of this being a very personal take on disciplinary knowledge by a strong authorial figure, and on the evidence of this lecture at least then, this discipline seems to be populated by agents with a strong sense of their individuality, who (re-)construct their discipline subjectively, even at the level of the undergraduate lecture. Why this is so evident in this lecture but not in lecture 3 'The French Revolution' is a moot point, and it may suggest that in some disciplines, lecture discourse is considered as personal by default, meaning there is less of a need seen to overtly mark it as such. Alternatively, it may point to the risk in assuming shared disciplinary discoursing policies in undergraduate lectures; or perhaps it may suggest instead that the two disciplines behind these two lectures, despite both being involved in history, are actually rather different, perhaps in that the discipline of Comparative American Studies is a younger discipline.

Lecture 4 in this grouping finally, 'Roman Britain', also makes extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* (31.5%, 263/1000), and moreover, seems to be a rather idiosyncratic lecture, exhibiting features not seen elsewhere in this grouping. Firstly, though not unique to this lecture, there is a strong sense of solidarity in the discipline, evidenced by the frequent use of the disciplinary-*we* form functioning as *Receiver* (Halliday 1994a: 140) in reporting units:

RB101) [III] **we hear** for instance of a projected invasion in thirty-four bc from Dio Cassius

RB213) [III] now Gaius Caligula has come down to **us** through the writings of people like Suetonius as an insane monster

RB217) [III] and **we're told** he {Adminius} was driven out of Britain by his father Cunobelinus

Secondly, as also observed in 'The Faerie Queene', the lexico-grammar of reporting units also frequently places the *you* of the audience as *Receivers* (ibid) of reported messages, suggesting perhaps an ideology of individuality within solidarity in this lecture:

RB74) [III] **you read Solway you'll see the coin record being used for the establishment** of a period of aggrandisement on the part of the Catuvellauni of Hertfordshire and the surrounding counties against their Eastern neighbours the Trinovantes against their Southern neighbours the Cantiaci of Kent and the Atrebates of Hampshire

These choices, consistent throughout the lecture, seem to suggest an ideology of keen but humble discovery in this discipline, as its practitioners are constructed as the *Receivers* (ibid) of evidence which needs to be carefully but modestly interpreted – indeed states of uncertainty and of not knowing in this lecture are frequently voiced and seem to be an important part of the disciplinary landscape:

RB24) [III] **as far as we can tell** he {Caesar} had his hands full in Gaul the great uprising of Vercingetorix

RB25) [III] and thereafter never had the opportunity to renew any plans he may have had for a third expedition

RB162) [III] **we don't know**

RB163) [III] later on **we find coins issued by Verica** [and I've got a few slides that might show this later] on which have as their motif on them a vine leaf

RB170) [III] **we can't really say**

RB171) [III] **we note** what is there

This humility before the evidence is also manifested in the typical choice of tentative reporting verbs such as *suggest*, constructing a manifest lecturer involvement in the discourse, and also by the very typical choice in this lecture of placing evidence as the *Uttering Source* in such tentative reporting units:

RB26) [III] **the terms though that he'd imposed** upon people like

Cassivelaunus at the end of the fifty-four campaign **do suggest** however that

Caesar saw that campaign as a preliminary to an eventual Roman takeover

RB242) [III] and **there are various other bits of evidence which suggest** that Caligula was mad

RB250) [III] so **all the evidence that comes out of this suggests** an insane monster

This lecture then is one which suggests a tightly-knit group of individuals who as a disciplinary group together endeavour to piece together knowledge from uncertain evidence, and in so doing seem to have a strong sense of solidarity. The lecturer undoubtedly has a fairly individual presence in the discourse, but this is often played down by the disciplinary-*we* form and the mutual humility before the evidence this discipline uses to construct its knowledge-claims.

4.3.3.1 Conclusion on The management of Intertextuality in Arts & Humanities

In conclusion, this grouping of Arts & Humanities lectures seems to share a characteristic of a more influential, individual role for a lecturer, both as a second centre of consciousness (Voloshinov 1973) in *Reporting Verb* [III] units and via *Lecturer Intertext* Intertextuality, though this is stronger in some lectures than others. The disciplines of Philosophy and History of Art are (re-)constructed at the undergraduate level as very heterogeneous disciplines, populated by a variety of active, individual agents and with recursive and cyclical landscapes. They seem to be thoroughly discursively-based disciplines, in the sense that discoursing and rediscoursing seems to be what binds them together as disciplines – there is little of the sense of discovery in them. The discipline of Comparative American Studies also seems to be discursively-based, but one in which there is less inter-agent dialogism and instead a strong role for the lecturer as a knowledge-claimer, even at the undergraduate level. Classics meanwhile seems to be (re-)constructed as a tightly-knit discipline, and English too seems to be characterised by a strong sense of a rather homogeneous and established community, as too does History. This may suggest that established disciplines in Arts & Humanities share a strong sense of disciplinary identity which influences patterns of Intertextuality in their lectures,

particularly the use of *Unmarked* [I] units suggesting paradigms and the way that disciplinary-*we* and/or the *you* of the audience frequently functions as *Uttering Source* and/or as *Receiver* (ibid) in *Reporting Verb* [III] units. What is probably rather surprising however is the apparent lack of shared discursive style at the undergraduate level, instead this grouping is marked by a variety of different characteristics.

4.3.4 The management of Intertextuality in Social Sciences & Social Studies

Table 4.6 shows the breakdown for each lecture in this grouping:

	Unmarked [I]	Reporting Noun [II]	Reporting Verb [III]	Lecturer [IV]	Lecturer [V]
7 Coll Def & Milit Allian	91%	2%	6.5%	0.5%	–
	561	12.1	40.1	2.9	–
8 Inflation Targeting	80.5%	–	1.5%	17.5%	0.5%
	515	–	9.6	114.3	1.9
9 Silence as Evidence	33%	18.5%	40%	8.5%	–
	163	94	199	50.4	–
10 Environment & Sustainability	71.5%	6%	9.5%	13%	–
	565	46.3	74	94.1	–
11 Observa / Social Learn	82%	1.5%	13.5%	3%	–
	553	10.4	89.6	20.2	–
12 Pricing	75%	–	9%	8%	8%
	567	–	69.1	62.7	62.7
Totals	73.25%	4% (1.9)²⁵⁴	11.5% (8)	9.25%	1.75%
	552	22.2 (7.8)	80.4 (56.6)	55.9	11

Table 4.6: The Management of Intertextuality in Social Sciences & Social Studies Grouping

Looking at the broad picture firstly, this grouping, as with the Arts & Humanities grouping, exhibits a rather diverse set of lectures, or at least certainly with regard to their management of Intertextuality, with lecture 7 exhibiting features similar to those in the Physical Sciences grouping, while the remaining five lectures are each different and seem in fact to lack many shared features.

²⁵⁴ Figures in parentheses here calculated without lecture 9 ‘Silence as Evidence’.

Looking at each lecture individually therefore, Intertextuality in lecture 7, Collective Defence and Military Alliances, is managed almost exclusively via *Unmarked* [I] units (91%, 561/1000), suggesting an unproblematic knowledge-field behind this lecture, and when it does occasionally make use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III] (6.5%, 40.1/1000), it typically does so with *Generalisations* and with syntax avoiding any active talking agents in the discourse:

CDMA40) [III] the collective defence but even more so military alliances **are generally associated with realist assumptions** about how international relations work

CDMA46) [III] and as you know **realists see military** or economic capabilities as a central defining element of state power

Similarly, its *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Nouns* [II] units (2%, 12.1/1000) too are not ones which threaten to dialogise the discourse in any way:

CDMA41) [II] **these {realist assumptions about IR} are basically** [as you all know but just to recall them] that armed force is the most effective {} most effective foreign policy tool because in the end if you can't coerce a potential adversary into complying with your wishes then you can always {} if by other means like political diplomatic or economic means the use of armed force if you have superior armed force might actually achieve {} achieve that objective

CDMA103) [II] **from a systemic perspective** if alliances form in response to imbalances in the balance of power then states which are outside the alliance might feel it necessary to form alliances themselves

And when the lecturer does make his one contribution (0.5%, 2.9/1000), it is not an assertive knowledge-claim but more an aside:

CDMA202) [IV] if well depending on who wins the U.S elections today but with President if it was to be President Bush **I'm pretty sure I would hazard the guess** that the issue {of the so-called burden sharing debate} will come up again

This lecture then seems to share much in common with the typical features observed in the Physical Sciences grouping, namely an almost exclusive reliance on *Unmarked* [I] units to manage Intertextuality and a lack of dialogism in its type [II] and [III] units, suggesting in so doing a seemingly homogeneous disciplinary landscape behind this lecture marked, perhaps surprisingly, by apparent consensus.

Lecture 11, 'Observational and Social Learning' meanwhile is also a lecture exhibiting features we might associate with science discourse. Although this may seem initially surprising given its relatively high use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III] units (13.5%, 89.6/1000), these units are used much as they are in the initial lecture 'Radiation Chemistry', that is to say they typically realise instances of disciplinary agents' past experimentation in *Integral Subject* syntax with *Research Acts* but in *Simple Past* tense:

OSL121) [III] to test this {whether learning was individual or social}

Galef did the following simple experiment

OSL122) [III] he **tested** the young rats alone with food A versus a novel food that they'd never had before

OSL126) [III] now to test whether the young rats had learned to avoid food B **he tested them again** on their own with B versus C

The results of Galef's work however, since seemingly ratified as disciplinary knowledge, are realised very differently – *Integral Subject* syntax is maintained but the tense changes to *Simple Present* and the experiment is now the *Uttering Source*:

OSL134) [III] and **this simple experiment makes a very general point that** just because an animal behaves the same way as another doesn't mean it's acquired all the knowledge that the other has

OSL135) [III] {this simple experiment makes a very general point that} there might be simpler means by which the young rats come to behave in the same way as the adults

In this way we see an ideology behind this discipline, or in this particular lecture at least, of empiricism, much as in Physical Sciences, evidenced via the construction of community *now*-knowledge as deriving from agents' *past*-experimentation. This is a consistent pattern in this lecture:

OSL206) [III] and **what Galef found** was that if you just expose observer rats to the smell of food X plus the smell of carbon disulphide

without any rat being there at all they would acquire just as much preference as if they'd smelled it on the face of a wak { } a waking rat

OSL207) [III] what **this implies** is that there was no real social element to the learning

OSL213) [III] but **what this series of experiments shows** is that the presence of a live rat is not necessary for the learning

OSL214) [III] so **this kind of experiment helps us to refine our understanding** of what actually goes on as opposed to what might go on

The move from hypothesis to experimentation to knowledge is clearly important in this discipline, and is also revealed for instance when the lecturer animates Galef's research questions, perhaps training the audience in such appropriate disciplinary behaviour:

OSL197) [III] Galef **tried** two other conditions

OSL198) [III] for example **he said** [what would happen if you expose the observer to the food not on the nose and mouth but on the back of a live rat]

Even though three different researchers are brought into the discourse in this lecture, accounting for the relatively extensive use of this potential, they are, with one exception (OSL508), not given active talking roles in the discourse but are constructed as experimenters as above, while their results often function as *Uttering Source* and speak the community knowledge derived. This suggests a confident and coherent discipline behind this lecture, unified in shared endeavour as *we* (e.g.

OSL214 above), showing similarities in this sense with the disciplines behind the Physical Science lectures, though this lecture also exhibits some difference from the Physical Science lectures in that individual lecturer claim-making is still nevertheless important, even at the undergraduate level – the lecturer uses a small number (9) of *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verbs* [IV] units (3%, 20.2/1000) to conclude the lecture with her own claims:

[OSL462) [VII] finally then <pause> [I don't have time to discuss all these cases] but these are the conclusions **I'd like to draw]**

OSL470) [IV] that just isn't true

OSL471) [IV] animals' social learning is often a lot simpler than it would be in our case

These features above suggest this discipline as empirically-based but also as highly and explicitly interpretive with a fairly strong lecturer-*I* presence in the discourse, and as such as occupying a borderzone between Science and Humanities. While the lecture shares discursive similarities with lecture 19 'Artificial Life', this latter lecture is at the cutting-edge of the discipline, which probably accounts for its features, while the topic of 'Observational or Social Learning' appears to be an already established part of the discipline's paradigm, suggesting that this discursive style at undergraduate level is likely to be typical in this discipline.

Lecture 9, 'Silence as Evidence', however is a very idiosyncratic lecture. In fact this lecture was the most complex to code, as a result of the difficulty sometimes of establishing whether Intertextuality units are *Disciplinary* or *Lecturer Intertext*.

There are certainly a number of specific and authoritative participants in this lecture, ranging from the lecturer himself to the authority of courts, The House of Lords, the police, legal acts and lawyers themselves, each with different priorities and perspectives, which means a very significant proportion of Intertextuality is managed via *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III] (40%, 199/1000) and *Reporting Nouns* [II] (18.5%, 94/1000), creating highly dialogic discourse and a clear discursive space for the lecturer himself to operate in too. This reflects this discipline's position as mediating between these participants, and also its position as directly straddling academia and the real and powerful world of Law. The influence of the very 'real world' nature of Law is shown in the fact that the vast majority of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Nouns* [II] and *Verbs* [III] units do not reproduce academic authorities but legal statements and/or specific legal actors, and the high authority of Law is (re-)constructed via the typical factive *Reporting Nouns* [II] and *Reporting Verbs* [III] used:

SAE67) [II] **second requirement** {of section thirty-four} is that at any time before he is charged on being questioned under caution by a constable when that constable is investigating an offence the defendant has failed to mention some facts or fact which he later relies upon in his defence {one of the **key aspects** of section thirty-four}

SAE89) [II] and **under the new streamlined form of committal proceedings** only the prosecution gives its evidence normally in documentary form

SAE99) [III] **section three eight three says** you cannot be convicted purely on the basis of an inference from the fact that the defendant was silent under accusation

SAE101) [III] **it {section three eight three of the Act} does tell us** that there can be no conviction solely on the basis of an inference singular

The use of *Present Simple* tense *say* and/or *tell* with *Legal Constructs* as *Uttering Source* in *Integral Subject* Syntax units for instance is typical in instances of mediation of the authority of Law via *Reporting Verbs* [III] units, and (re-)constructs in so doing the powerful authority of Law. There are occasional reports of a more academic nature, but these are very limited in their extent, and are typically realised as *Generalisations* as compared to the *Summaries* consistently used with the 'real world' participants:

SAE128) [III] **a lot of people have queried to what extent that** caution makes sense to ordinary people

SAE129) [III] **there have been studies done** with 'A' level students that showed that only forty per cent fully understood it

The multiple-participant nature of the discourse and extensive use of *Reporting Nouns* [II] and *Reporting Verbs* [III] units means too that the lecturer himself is frequently a likewise manifestly active participant in the discourse, as was frequently the case in the Arts & Humanities grouping. This is evidenced sometimes via explicit evaluation embedded into such units in dependent clauses, for instance

via *but there is no doubt about it* and *although I think ...* beneath, showing also though how Law is the dominant participant in such units:

SAE56) [II] *but there is no doubt about it* that this is one of the **purposes of the legislation** {section thirty-four The Criminal Justice and Public Order Act of nineteen-ninety-four} get the suspect to speak

SAE96) [III] the second point to notice is that *although I think drawing an inference clearly means treating the silence as evidence* section three eight three of the nineteen-ninety-four Act **does make clear** it's necessary to do so that you can't sustain a conviction purely upon the basis of an inference from silence

Sometimes the strong lecturer involvement is evidenced via the use of openly evaluative and/or interpretive *Reporting Nouns* [II] units:

SAE57) [II] **the idea** {of section thirty-four The Criminal Justice and Public Order Act of nineteen-ninety-four} **is** once he's speaking even if he's trying to raise a false defence it could be broken down

SAE81) [II] so **the suggestion there** {in section thirty-four of the act} **is** that inferences can support the first stage [is there a case to answer] and also support a finding of guilt

SAE84) [II] it had certainly been **the intention of the legislation** in nineteen-ninety-four that inferences from silence might have operated not only at trial but also at the earlier stage of committal proceedings the stage at

which traditionally the court has satisfied itself that there is sufficient evidence for the defendant to be put on trial

SAE85) [II] and it was certainly **the intention**

The active involvement of the lecturer is also evidenced via the regular use of *Present Continuous* tense *saying* in *Reporting Verb* [III] units, drawing out the perceived messages of different participants in the discourse – this seems to be a consistent feature in many of the lectures in the study:

SAE248) [III] so **what the court are really saying is** [well] [if you want to rely upon legal advice as a basis for saying that inferences shouldn't be drawn you must tell us what the nature of the advice was] ...

SAE260) [III] the **House of Lords was saying** [yes] [we'll uphold legal professional privilege] ...

SAE263) [III] in *Condon & Condon* **the Court of Appeal is saying** [well] [you want to rely upon legal advice you've got to tell us what your lawyer told you] [what's more once you've done that the whole of the discussion between lawyer and client can be exposed to cross-examination by the prosecution]

This is also achieved sometimes via *non-factive Reporting Verbs* such as *suggest*, in this instance in tandem with *Cleft* syntax to focus on perceived message again (Thompson 1996):

SAE254) [III] **what was suggested in this case** Condron & Condron and in fact confirmed in a later case called Roble R-O-B-L-E was that once privilege had been waived then if you like the lawyer and the client can be cross-examined about everything that passed between lawyer and client
<pause>

And it is achieved in this instance beneath via *constructed speech* (Tannen 1989), a concise way of drawing out the perceived message of a case:

SAE280) [III] **Condron {the Condron case} says** [well] [if the lawyer advises silent silence the court at a later stage could say [[well] [inferences can be drawn]] [or they could accept that the lawyer's advice was bona fide and not draw inferences]

It is also evidenced via the lecturer's position of mediating between the numerous *alternative perspectives* brought into this lecture:

SAE206) [III] **on the one hand we {law people} might say** [well] [suspect goes into a police station] [the moment they get into police station they are given certain rights certain entitlements one of which is to have a lawyer somebody who is supposed to be highly professional and is there to protect their interests and indeed is paid for by the state paid for by the legal aid] [so you get in there] [do you want to legal adviser] [yes please] [what's the legal adviser there for] [he's there to protect your interests]

SAE224) [II] on the other hand looking at it **from the alternative perspective** the purpose of changing law in nineteen-ninety-four was to put pressure on suspects to speak at interview wasn't it

Finally, the strong lecturer-as-*I* involvement in this lecture is also evidenced via both the extent of *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verb* [IV] units (8.5%, 50.4/1000), and the fact that such units realise assertive knowledge-claims as opposed to 'asides' as happens in many lectures in the corpus when this potential is used:

SAE52) [IV] and that {encouraging more defendants to speak} of course is not simply for the purpose of finding out what any defence might be

SAE53) [IV] but also **I think** that there is an assumption that once a defendant or suspect is speaking there is more likelihood of getting either damaging admissions or some confession for him

... SAE55) [IV] as we saw last week **I think** all the empirical evidence suggests the police aren't really actually very good at that {breaking down the story which the defendant might raise}

In brief, this lecture 'Silence as Evidence' is probably that in the overall corpus with the largest number of participants brought into it, each of whom/which seem to disagree, and a lecture too with a consequently very influential role for the lecturer as an explicit *I* presence. This means this is probably the most openly polyphonic lecture in the corpus, doubtless reflecting the reality of the professional pursuit of Law.

'Silence as Evidence' derives from very much an *Applied* discipline (Becher 1989), and it seems perhaps in fact that lectures deriving from *Applied* (ibid) disciplines allow for an atypically strong participation by the lecturer as an active *I* presence in their discourse. This is certainly the case in this lecture, and this seems to stretch too to the three remaining lectures in this grouping, lectures 8 'Inflation Targeting', 10 'Environment & Sustainability' and 12 'Pricing', each of which also derive very much from *Applied* (ibid) disciplines and each of which also exhibit similar quantities of *Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality* [IV] & [V] units (18%, 114.3/1000; 13%, 94.1/1000; 16%, 125.4/1000). These frequent contributions see a lecturer assuming an active participatory *I* role in the lecture discourse, though in these three lectures almost exclusively less as an assertive knowledge-claimer than simply as a recounter of narratives from the real world of his/her work, which illuminate the lectures and the points in them:

PR541) [IV] **I used to work for Unilever before I became an academic**

PR545) [IV] **but it wasn't if it was something you were aiming at the mass market you just wouldn't get the distribution if the channel wants to make the maximum margin**

ES720) [IV] **I remember I I did a project for the government on defence estate looking at redundant defence estate**

ES735) [IV] **so that's the kind of attitude you can get in an organization like the MOD the Ministry of Defence**

These contributions can sometimes be very extensive:

IT120) [IV] and I guess one of the reasons I'm I'm giving this course is that
I have a background in central banking

IT121) [IV] and **I was working at** the Bank of England at the time

IT122) [IV] **I worked** at the Bank of England for five years

IT123) [IV] it was just the most remarkable day of well one of the most remarkable days **I've I've encountered** because when I arrived at the Bank of England in the morning to discover that interest rates had been put up by three percent already

IT182) [IV] but **I find it astonishing** how quickly **we found** some some new policy

IT183) [IV] it was only a month or less than a month before **we adopted** an inflation target which is **our** current nominal anchor only a month to devise a whole new method of monetary policy a whole new framework for monetary policy

Curiously, in these three lectures reports are sometimes mediated via the lecturer, so that s/he seemingly becomes an equal or even the dominant *Author* and *Principal* (Goffman 1974) behind someone else's words, typically reports of conversations from the real world of his/her work:

PR90) [IV] not so many years ago about five or six years ago **I was talking to some of the banks**

PR91) [IV] **and they {banks} were saying** {to lecturer} that in that market the only basis on which you could compete was cost

PR95) [IV] the danger of that was that people then began to perceive that the price should be lower and lower and lower for that type of service

ES574) [IV] **I I've talked to the Agenda Twenty-one guy at Reading**

ES575) [IV] and he {the Agenda Twenty-one guy at Reading} says [well] [there's about in each of each of these GLOBE groups there's probably about maybe tops five per cent maybe not of the local population that's in that are involved in some way] [but maybe about another thir{} about thirty per cent have heard about it]

With one exception in lecture 19 'Artificial Life', this pattern only seems to happen with reports from outside the academy, and lecturers perhaps feel the need to mark such contributions as deriving as much from themselves as from the original speakers, perhaps to give the reports more authority in an academic context. Or perhaps it is simply that such contributions derive from conversations and are only meant as narrative asides. Whichever it may be, narrative-style *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verbs* [IV] contributions deriving from their own work and/or conversations from work seem to mark these three lectures as their predominant feature, and this feature seems to be an important characteristic of lectures deriving from *Applied* (ibid) disciplines.

In these three lectures, *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III] units are relatively infrequent (1.5%, 9.6/1000; 9.5%, 74/1000; 9%, 69.1/1000), and when this potential is used, it is often simply to name phenomena. Reflecting the distinct *I*-participation of a lecturer in these three lectures, the choices in these instances frequently indicate a heterogeneous collection of individuals behind these disciplines/professions as opposed to the more community-shaped *Pure* (Becher 1989) nature of the disciplines behind many of the lectures in the overall corpus. This is particularly the case in lecture 8 ‘Inflation Targeting’:

IT99) [III] but it was one that **Alex Bowen** who I guess is quite quite important figure in the bank in terms of dealing with inflation targeting **he was one of the first people to coin that phrase** {inflation targeting}

IT277) [III] now **Milton Friedman** I think was the first person to coin long and variable lags in relation to monetary policy

IT294) [III] **they {Bank of England} call it a six equation macro-economic model**

This suggests a very heterogeneous disciplinary landscape behind this lecture, and perhaps even the lack of a coherent discipline. A similar picture is observable in lecture 12 ‘Pricing’, in which this potential is used typically to outline different theories, with the theories themselves as *Uttering Source*, as was also observed in lecture 22 ‘Polymers’ and lecture 24 ‘Formal Logic’ in the Physical Sciences category:

PR74) [III] so if cost plus pricing is saying that you've got a cost and you want to charge a margin over and above that **competition based pricing** says that if I've got A if I'm going to launch a new mobile phone onto the market and it's already a competitive market and there's lots of different people out there charging x price per minute charging whatever rental for the phones [you're not looking for computer graphics are you] [good] [good] then I'd have to make some basic choices about what my strategy is

PR443) [III] **product life-cycle** says that a product will be introduced into a market and will grow gradually will mature and then eventually decline

PR448) [III] but they decline very fast

Such a choice avoids attributing a theory to any disciplinary agent, and seems to suggest a disciplinary landscape, at the undergraduate level at least, in which there are a small number of broad theories but a lack of a coherent academic community and more a sense of a heterogeneous collection of individual real-world practitioners with their own versions of 'knowledge', typically deriving from their own personal working experiences. This sense of individuality rather than community behind these three disciplines is also very much evidenced by the avoidance of any disciplinary-*we* forms in units realising Intertextuality in these three lectures.

This is not to say though that there is a total absence of contributions from the academic side of these disciplines, such contributions do occur sometimes, though

only in lecture 10 'Environment and Sustainability'. Such instances however see practice as leading to academic theory rather than vice versa:

ES361) [III] Steven Young [and this came] [not on the reference list]

Steven Young has done some research survey work looking at local authorities researching them done a kind of comprehensive review as as far as possible of the different approaches to Agenda Twenty-one at the local level

ES371) [III] thirdly **he {Steven Young} identified** a yes but strategy

ES93) [III] **Jeremy Raemaek{} Raemaeker's article** which is on the reading list **reviews action** that was being taken in the late eighties and early nineties

ES98) [III] the first phase of local authority action {phases of action by local authorities as identified by Jeremy Raemaeker} was was geared around producing environmental charters and action plans

Typically even in this lecture though, *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Nouns* [II] and *Reporting Verbs* [III] units are used much more frequently to report from beyond the academy per se, particularly for instance from the Rio conference of 1992:

ES62) [III] also the other thing about Rio which again Mike Breheny probably has picked up on is that **it {the Rio conference} defined** sustainable development in quite broad terms

ES66) [III] so very it's {sustainable development} very much again de{}
defined {from the Rio conference} in terms of human processes quality of
life issues in relationship to environmental constraints

What we can see in these three lectures then, and also in lecture 9 'Silence as Evidence', is a complex fusion of academia with professional working lives, creating a particular kind of lecture discourse with high levels of individuality in it for all the participants involved. This seems to be a feature of lectures deriving from *Applied* (ibid) disciplines, and as we will shortly see, similar can also be said for the two lectures in the Biomedical Sciences category deriving from *Applied* (ibid) disciplines.

4.3.4.1 Conclusion on The management of Intertextuality in Social Sciences

The grouping of Social Sciences shows mixed characteristics, with lecture 7 'Collective Defence and Military Alliances', perhaps surprisingly, exhibiting features similar to lectures from the Physical Sciences category in the sense of a heavy dependence on *Unmarked* [I] units (91%) and a lack of individual agency, while lecture 11 'Observational or Social Learning' also shows some marked similarities to Physical Sciences lectures – this derives to a degree too from its dependence on *Unmarked* [I] units (82%), but to a greater degree from its typical use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III] units to realise individual agency as *past*-experimentation, the results of which have been ratified either as *we*-community knowledge or as knowledge 'spoken' by the experiments themselves, showing its empirical basis for knowledge-(re-)construction. This points probably to quite a homogeneous disciplinary landscape at the level of the undergraduate

lecture, albeit that the lecturer has a slightly greater degree of individual participation than in the Physical Science lectures, reflecting the necessarily interpretive nature of Psychology. The remaining four lectures meanwhile see a highly significant role for the lecturer as an individual participant, the degrees of which seem to reflect the increasingly individual and heterogeneous natures of their disciplinary landscapes – Law sees an active lecturer involvement, albeit constrained by and mediated within the authority of the numerous authoritative participants within the lecture discourse, while the remaining three disciplines seem to be marked by particularly influential lecturer involvement, most typically in the shape of narratives from their professional working lives.

4.3.5 The management of Intertextuality in Biomedical Sciences

Table 4.7 shows the breakdown for each lecture in this grouping:

	Unmarked [I]	Reporting Noun [II]	Reporting Verb [III]	Lecturer [IV]	Lecturer [V]
13 HIV & AIDS	92%	1%	7%	–	–
	505	4.9	39.4	–	–
14 Systems Physiology	96.5%	–	2.5%	1%	–
	657	–	19.3	9.6	–
15 Immunology	94%	3%	3%	–	–
	665	21.4	21.4	–	–
16 Agri Botany	43%	–	13%	42%	2%
	327	–	94.8	319	12
17 Genetics & Mol Bio	87%	0.5%	12%	0.5%	–
	500	1.7	72.5	1.7	–
18 Man's Imp –Pesticides	81.5%	1%	8%	9.5%	–
	628	3.1	64	73.4	–
Totals	80% (90%)²⁵⁵	0.75%	7.75% (6.5%)	10.75% (2.2%)	0.25%
	547 (591)	5.1	51.9 (43.3)	67.2 (16.9)	2

Table 4.7: The Management of Intertextuality in Biomedical Sciences Grouping

²⁵⁵ Figures in parentheses here calculated without lecture 16 'Agricultural Botany'.

This grouping of Biomedical Sciences is a more coherent group than are the Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences groupings, with five of the six lectures exhibiting similar features regarding their management of Intertextuality, broadly speaking a very similar management to that in the Physical Sciences grouping. Although lecture 17 'Genetics' shows slight variation with more extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III] (12%, 72.5/1000), it is lecture 16 'Agricultural Botany' which shows very idiosyncratic characteristics, exhibiting a similar extent of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III] as lecture 17 'Genetics' (13%, 94.8/1000) but a highly significant extent of *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verbs* [IV] units (42%, 319/1000), quite easily the highest of the overall corpus and indicating a lecture marked by very active lecturer-as-I knowledge-claiming.

Looking firstly at the three lectures (lectures 13 'HIV & AIDS', 14 'Systems Physiology', & 15 'Immunology') which show strikingly similar characteristics to the lectures in the Physical Sciences grouping, these lectures also manage Intertextuality almost exclusively via the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* [I] units (92%, 505/1000; 96.5%, 657/1000; & 94%, 665/1000), (re-)constructing in so doing an unproblematic knowledge terrain in the disciplines behind the lectures. This is furthered by the typical choices used in these three lectures with the potentials of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Nouns* [II] and *Reporting Verbs* [III], which, and again strikingly similar to the use of these potentials in Physical Sciences, typically do not dialogise the discourse – instead, the potentials are used almost exclusively to name disciplinary phenomena and to (re-)construct agents' past experimentation.

Regarding the naming of disciplinary phenomena in these three lectures (13, 14 & 15), we get a clear picture of unified, coherent disciplines, evidenced by disciplinary-*we* as *Uttering Source* and/or by *Passive Anonymous* syntax in such units:

SP121)[III] and this inappropriate this pathological movement of water **we call oedema**

SP284) [III] and the largest veins **are called** vena cavae

Interestingly, beneath we can see in lecture 15 ‘Immunology’ the way in which the naming of phenomena is a community process, in the sense that what this discipline (“*so far as immunology s{} is concerned*”) calls *cytokines* might be called differently in other disciplines – here perhaps is the sense of disciplinary communities carving out their knowledge terrains and claiming ownership of areas via their naming processes:

IMM446) [III] and these secreted factors **so far as immunology s{} is concerned are called** cytokines <writing on board> cytokines

IMM448) [III] and most of them not all of them {cytokines} **are called** by the abbreviation I-L

In contrast generally to the lectures in Arts & Humanities and in Social Sciences, naming seems a definite community as opposed to individual process in these three lectures, (re-)constructing in so doing unified disciplines marked by community

agreement, and we get a similar impression of unified homogeneous *we* disciplines in the few instances of *Research Acts* in these three lectures too:

IMM119) [III] and **what we {discipline} find** is that the first three sorts these polymeric mitogenic or complement binding ones tend not to use any cells that are derived from the thymus

IMM125) [III] and therefore the majority of antigens like sheep red blood cells are called thymus-dependent antigens

However, and somewhat in contrast to the lectures in Physical Sciences, there are nevertheless also a few instances in lecture 13 'HIV & AIDS' where knowledge is (re-)constructed as being perhaps not quite so certain, even at the undergraduate level. This can be constructed via the tentative reporting noun *suggestion*, albeit that *quantification* may enable a later change from the low truth status of *suggestion*:

HIV83) [II] **there is some suggestion that** if you are infected for example with treponema syphilis if you have syphilis [remember HIV is predominantly a sexually transmitted disease globally as you'll see in a minute when I come on to the global figures] and a co-infection with other sexually transmitted diseases seems to be bad news

HIV85) [II] **there is a suggestion although it's never been quantified** that there may be a genetic component to susceptibility to to progression into AIDS

Uncertainty is also (re)constructed in this lecture via the non-factive reporting verb *estimate*, of which there are five instances:

HIV135) [III] **the WHO estimates** thirty-point-six-million people globally living with HIV at the end of nineteen-ninety-seven

Of these three lectures however, it is only lecture 13 'HIV & AIDS' which constructs uncertainty for its (re-)constructed knowledge while the other two (lectures 14 & 15) avoid this. However, both these lectures illustrate the apparent importance of chronology in knowledge-construction in the two disciplines behind them, in the sense that knowledge can seemingly be ratified by the passage of time in both lectures 14 & 15:

IMM273) [II] **early on the theory was that** you got a response something like this

IMM274) [II] this is what you would find in many early textbooks

IMM285) [II] **so the picture was something like this** that you had T-helper cells recognizing one end of the molecule the B-cell recognizing the bit that one's interested in against which you'll make the antibody

IMM287) [II] whatever help might mean

SP421)[III] **it used to be thought** that each physiological system had a centre in the brain

SP422)[III] there'd be a cardiovascular centre and a respiratory centre

SP423)[III] and **that's now believed to be** too simplistic

SP424)[III] but you'll probably still see that **in textbooks it will be referred to** as the medullary cardiovascular centre

SP432)[III] and it's called the baro{} baroreceptor reflex or the baroreflex for short

This feature was never observed in the Physical Sciences grouping, and there is therefore a slightly more developed sense of both the contingency and contemporariness of (re-)constructed knowledge in these three lectures in comparison with the lectures in Physical Sciences. This points to the existence of more established paradigms in the disciplines behind the lectures in Physical Sciences, albeit that this contingency in Biomedical Sciences can seemingly be removed by time, in sharp contrast to the knowledge typically (re-)constructed in the Arts & Humanities grouping in which it cannot. In these three lectures, there is in fact only the one instance of knowledge being constructed as strongly contingent, coupled with the suggestion that the lecturer himself is not entirely convinced by what he has just expounded:

IMM393) [I] and so when these T-helper cells come along which is **a bit of a mind-boggling event** because how does a rare cell meet another rare cell **I don't know**

IMM394) [III] but this is **what is said** to occur

The interesting thing here though is that, theoretically at least, the lecturer could have isolated this particular theory by attributing it to a disciplinary agent to put forward, as typically happens in Arts & Humanities lectures, thus maintaining its

agency and (re-)constructing it as individual heterogeneous knowledge. However, he chooses not to do so, and instead realises the theory consistently via *Unmarked* [I] units, in so doing (re-)constructing an apparently homogeneous disciplinary community, and only stops to suggest that part of the theory *is a bit of a mind-boggling event but is what is said to occur* retrospectively. In this sense, unit IMM394 is functioning as much for evaluation as it is for reporting, and it clearly highlights the markedly different effects of the three different potentials discussed in this study for the realisation of *Disciplinary Intertext* Intertextuality on the (re-)construction of knowledge in undergraduate lectures. It is also telling that the lecturer chooses the maintenance of a homogeneous community over the introduction of individual talking voices and thus heterogeneity.

Nevertheless, this is the only significant instance of the sense of a gap between lecturer and discipline in these three lectures, and this observation is reinforced via the almost complete lack of *Lecturer Intertext* Intertextuality in them – the only instances derive from lecture 14 ‘Systems Physiology’ and are asides at best as opposed to assertive knowledge-claims:

SP200)[IV] [I think that’s how you spell it]

SP201)[IV] [I wouldn’t swear to it]

SP202)[IV] I think that’s the technical term for it filariasis filariasis

SP203)[IV] I’m not sure how you pronounce that either

SP391)[IV] so I couldn’t introduce that until u{} until I’ve discussed everything else

These initial three lectures then share very similar characteristics to those in the Physical Sciences grouping with regard to their management of Intertextuality, albeit with an occasional flavour of slightly more contingent knowledge. This slightly higher contingency of knowledge (re-)constructed in the lectures in this category becomes somewhat more however in lecture 17 'Genetics & Molecular Biology', in which *Unmarked* [I] units account for 87% (500/1000) of *Disciplinary Intertext* Intertextuality while *Reporting Verbs* [III] units account for 12% (72.5/1000). These two figures in themselves point to a noticeable difference between this lecture and the three lectures discussed above and those in Physical Sciences – and indeed, this picture is supported by the instances themselves of *Reporting Verbs* [III] units in this lecture.

This is not to say that this lecture is one heavily populated by individual talking agents as in some of the Arts & Humanities lectures, but it is to say that this lecture is populated by a significant number of individual researching agents – in many of the lectures in Physical Sciences by comparison, such research is typically (re-)constructed via *Unmarked* [I] units with original researchers' names crystallised as epithets naming the resulting laws and rules and/or by placing the derived rules/laws as *Uttering Sources* in *Reporting Verb* [III] units, so the existence of individual researching agents in this lecture 'Genetics' gives a sense of a young discipline in which individuals' work has yet to be blended into a homogeneous paradigm (re-)constructable via *Unmarked* [I] units in undergraduate lectures.

In fact the discipline behind this lecture seems to straddle a gap between a homogeneous *we* discipline and a more heterogeneous discipline in that there is

what initially seems a curious contrast of a large number of *Reporting Verb* [III] units with disciplinary-*we* as *Uttering Source*, suggesting a rather homogeneous, tightly-knit disciplinary community, and a large number of units with individual agents as *Uttering Source*, suggesting perhaps a rather heterogeneous community of individual voices. Looking firstly at the former of these, *Reporting Verb* [III] units with disciplinary-*we* as *Uttering Source*, this choice accounts for 17 of the 40 *Reporting Verb* [III] units, a significant proportion and the highest in the corpus. Such a choice, as was the case too particularly in lecture 14 ‘Systems Physiology’, is frequently used for naming disciplinary phenomena:

GMB222)[III] **we conventionally call that** {a something with no phosphate on it at one end of the molecule} the three-prime end because there’s a free three-prime carbon stuck here

GMB225) [III] so **we call that** end of the molecule the five-prime end

This slightly more constitutive lexico-grammar for naming disciplinary phenomena (in contrast to *this is called ...*) gives a slightly higher sense of contingency and more active human agency in this lecture, and this is also evident in the sometime use not of the report verb *call* for this act of naming, but of the slightly less fixed *refer*, very much pointing to the human discursive act itself²⁵⁶ as compared with the idea that phenomena come to scientists’ attention already possessing a name to be called by:

²⁵⁶ See Woolgar (1988: 71), who discusses the avoidance of such forms due to the attention they draw to agency and the consequent loss of facticity in scientific discourse.

GMB339) [III] so the process whereby we take a DNA double helix and make two DNA double helices is **the process we {discipline} refer to as replication**

GMB359) [III] and **some people and we do in molecular biology refer to these strands as sticky**

Moreover, the sense in this lecture of their discourse actively constituting their knowledge is rather less opaque than in other lectures from the science fields in the corpus – beneath *the chains of DNA double helix* may not in fact necessarily be *complementary to each other*, and *DNA synthesis* may not actually be *semi-conservative*, instead these are what *we say* as being the case, constructing a high degree of contingency to the concepts and very much not downplaying the discursively-constituted nature of disciplinary knowledge as typically happens in science fields (Lemke 1990 & 1995, Halliday 1988):

GMB353) [III] and **we {discipline} say that** the chains of a DNA double helix are complementary to each other

GMB387)[III] so **we {discipline} say the** DNA synthesis is semi-conservative

Likewise, phenomena are constituted via *description*:

GMB358) [III] **we {discipline} can describe that in very crude terms and say they stick to each other**

And knowledge is *concluded* rather than appearing and simply speaking itself without active interpretation:

GMB74) [III] and so we **conclude that** it's the nucleic acids in the phage that are carrying the genetic information and not the protein

This is also the only lecture from the science fields to talk of disciplinary *belief* as opposed to 'fact':

GMB195) [III] **roughly we {the discipline} believe** that each each DNA <inaudible> DNA in one haploid amount of DNA in one of your cells is three-thousand-million nucleotides whereas for a our poor old friend the *ecoli* bacterium it's only some four-million a trifling amount

These features make this lecture stand out from the other science lectures in the corpus (except for lectures 16 'Agricultural Botany' & 19 'Artificial Life'), and the curious contrast of the rich use of disciplinary-*we* as *Uttering Source* in *Reporting Verb* [III] units and active individual agency is perfectly demonstrated in the extract beneath, where we can clearly see the original Meselson-Stahl experiment, which led to disciplinary knowledge, being (re-)constructed as very much two the individuals' work – but this is then blended into disciplinary knowledge as the disciplinary-*we* becomes the *Uttering Source* and takes ownership, even of the original experiment itself as *we were able to prove or Meselson-Stahl were able to prove what we now believe to be knowledge*:

GMB391) [III] this {the Meselson-Stahl experiment} **was an experiment which was done** in the nineteen-fifties in which <pause>

GMB392) [III] what the the two authors Meselson and Stahl did **was to label** the strands of DNA this time

GMB393) [III] in the Hershey-Chase experiment remember we {discipline} s{} labelled DNA and labelled protein

GMB394) [III] in the men{} Meselson-Stahl experiment **what we {discipline} do what we did was to label** the old strands of DNA with one isotope not a radioactive one in this case of nitrogen okay and the new strands for the new isotope

GMB396) [III] and {in the Meselson-Stahl experiment} we {discipline} **then look at** the DNA molecules that were formed

GMB397) [III] in fact what **what they {Meselson and Stahl} did was to start with** nitrogen fifteen

GMB398) [III] and then **they {Meselson and Stahl} substituted** it with nitrogen fourteen

GMB400) [III] and **they {Meselson and Stahl} showed** that density by running the DNA molecules in an ultra-centrifuge

GMB419) [III] so by measuring the density of DNA during an experiment in which we substituted a light nitrogen isotope for a heavy nitrogen isotope **we were able to prove or Meselson-Stahl were able to prove** that semi-conservative was the correct model for DNA replication

GMB433) [III] however from that origin **we can very easily show** that the DNA r{} is replicated in both directions [okay] that replication is bi-directional

In these ways, this lecture (re-)constructs a strong sense of a unified, coherent discipline behind this lecture, frequently acting as *we* as the *Uttering Sources* in *Reporting Verbs* [III] units which and who are actively constituting the knowledge in their discipline in the wakes of individual and seemingly high status disciplinary agents. It is unusual to observe such phenomena in science lectures in the corpus for this study, as with the marked exception of lecture 16 ‘Agricultural Botany’ and lecture 19 ‘Artificial Life’, the lectures seem to (re-)construct orthodox unproblematic paradigms, and it probably points to the discipline behind this lecture as being very contemporary, even at the undergraduate level. The age of a discipline therefore seems to be emerging as an important factor in how knowledge is (re-)constructed in undergraduate lectures, indicating that the management of Intertextuality is not only influenced epistemologically and socially but is chronologically implicated too.

However, while lecture 17 ‘Genetics’ above shows some unusual features, it is lecture 16 ‘Agricultural Botany’ which really sets itself apart, even from lecture 19 ‘Artificial Life’. This lecture is both highly polyphonic and highly individual, with a highly significant proportion of Intertextuality in it realised via *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verbs* [IV] (42%, 319/1000) and *Reporting Nouns* [V] (2%, 12/1000), and 13% (94.8/1000) realised via *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III]. Moreover, the management choices also consistently set up very dialogic relations between the participants involved, the main dialogue being between two rival commercial research groups, one based in Canada and the other in The UK, although a third rival group from Germany are also involved. Much as we might

expect in an RA (Swales 1990), initial *Reporting Verb* [III] units are used to construct the background to the research and consequent knowledge-claims, in terms of background concerning what is/was already *known*, its applications and previous research on the phenomenon:

AB73) [III] and there are two enzymes **that are known** to to break down oxalic acid

AB84) [III] so a lot more **was known** about this enzyme

AB99) [III] and **this whole idea has been taken and used in** over the last five years by companies in North America in particular

AB111) [III] it was an enzyme in fact that **had been isolated** previously

AB112) [III] and **had been given the name Germin** about twenty years ago

AB115) [III] but it Germin **wasn't known** to be this enzyme

AB117) [III] **they'd {a research group in Canada} found** that it Germin had these characteristics

AB118) [III] but **they {a research group in Canada} had no idea** about its Germin function

AB128) [III] and it {Germin protein} **was considered to be important** because there was a lot of it

AB129) [III] and **biologists think** [well] [if there's a lot of it it must be important]

From this initial introduction, the research problem itself is outlined:

AB154) [III] and the slime mould is one of these eukaryotes that **not as much is known about biochemically**

AB157) [III] but it **{Germin protein} was known** to be somehow related to desiccation

And rival theories put forward, one by the group in Canada and the other by the group in Germany:

AB173) [III] and **this was put together by a group in Germany** again around this period of five to six years ago

AB174) [III] and **they {a group in Germany} started with a hypothesis that said** [if you believe in evolution then at the beginning of time there sh{} should be some so-called ancestral protein from which all these other proteins were produced during evolution]

This leads to the research reported in the lecture by the lecturer's group:

AB297) [IV] and **the great benefit for us** {the biochemists and the genetics people incl. lecturer in what was then Zeneca Plant Sciences at Jealott's Hill} is that we had the structure of a storage protein

AB301) [IV] and **this is what we** {the biochemists and the genetics people incl. lecturer in what was then Zeneca Plant Sciences at Jealott's Hill} **did** a couple of years ago {try and fit the Germin sequence onto that backbone and see what we got}

AB326) [IV] so **in folding the protein we've** {the biochemists and the genetics people incl. lecturer in what was then Zeneca Plant Sciences at

Jealott's Hill} **brought** the third histidine close to the first two which confirms now that you have three histidines together

Research in which the lecturer as *I* was very personally involved as originator, doer and concluder:

AB339) [IV] but **I wanted** to push the boundary in time back a bit further

AB340) [IV] and so **I started to search for** bacterial and primitive archaeol which is a a a related form of primitive bacteria

AB367) [V] and so **the conclusion must be that** you will find in bacteria the underlying three-dimensional components of all other proteins that have been produced during evolution

The results of this research contradicted that of the Canadian group:

AB420) [III] for many years for about ten years **the biochemists in Canada had said** [we {the biochemists in Canada} think that the Germin protein is made out of five subunits because when we separate them [which you can do] we get kind of five] [and we lo{} if we {the biochemists in Canada} measure the molecular weight we get something that says [the molecular weight of the total protein's five times the weight of the sub-unit]]

AB439) [III] and **the Canadian group were said** [oh] [sniff] [we've {the Canadian group} spent ten years] [and we've {the Canadian group}

said it's a pentamom because if you measure the weight then that tells you it's a pentamom]

Nevertheless, more research was still needed to resolve a continuing problem:

AB445) [IV] and **we** {the biochemists and the genetics people incl. lecturer in what was then Zeneca Plant Sciences at Jealott's Hill} **did {resolved} it through** conventional crystallography

AB453) [IV] but eventually **he** {PhD student working for biochemists and the genetics people incl. lecturer in what was then Zeneca Plant Sciences at Jealott's Hill} **found us a crystal** that was good enough to be able to resolve in the in the x-ray beams that you use for this sort of thing

This research was successful, meaning:

AB458) [IV] so **we've** {the biochemists and the genetics people incl. lecturer in what was then Zeneca Plant Sciences at Jealott's Hill} **confirmed absolutely** that it is a hexamer

AB513) [IV] so **we've** {the biochemists and the genetics people incl. lecturer in what was then Zeneca Plant Sciences at Jealott's Hill} **got absolute now structural confirmation that our hypothesis that storage proteins were related to this is confirmed** by real measurement in space

But this new knowledge, deriving from the lecturer's group, in turn leads to more research being needed in the future:

AB546) [III] **but now we understand the structure there are GM people who are modifying peanut proteins** to remove those loops and therefore remove the allergic potential of peanuts

AB553) [III] **nobody knows what they** {proteins that are related to C-storage proteins} **do yet** <lecturer laughs>

AB555) [III] **we haven't got a clue** what it {a protein sequence that's quite like the storage proteins} does in an animal <lecturer laughs> because <pause>

AB556) [III] **we we suspect it's** {a protein sequence that's quite like the storage proteins} got something to do with with desiccation-tolerance **but we don't know yet**

This lecture, in effect a narrative of an entire research process over a number of years, is highly atypical of the corpus, and the extensive use of *Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality* (44%) in (re-)constructing it really marks this off as a lecturer and lecture deriving very much from an *Applied* (Becher 1989) discipline. Its frequent use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III] units for contextualising the (re-)constructed research (Swales 1990) also sets this lecturer and lecture very much apart from the others in the corpus, in which this potential of *Reporting Verbs* [III] is invariably used for knowledge-telling (Bereiter & Scardamalia 1987) as opposed to knowledge-transformation (ibid). Active and dialogic agency constructing ownership of the research and claims is ensured throughout this lecture by consistently placing the various rival groups as *Uttering Sources* in the *Disciplinary*

Intertext Reporting Verb [III] units, and the lecturer-as-I and/or as *we*²⁵⁷ as *Uttering Source* in the numerous *Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verb* [IV] units, choices which very much (re-)construct a picture of science as it is in the commercial workplace as opposed to in the academy, with its rival claimers and strong sense of commercial competition. While it shares similarities with lecture 19 ‘Artificial Life’ on account of their shared extensive use of *Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality*, these units in this lecture ‘Agricultural Botany’ realise both knowledge-claims and the original research enabling them, while in ‘Artificial Life’ they realise knowledge-claims deriving from research by other people – this is what sets lecture 16 ‘Agricultural Botany’ apart, as, perhaps very surprisingly, it seems to be that a lecturer’s own research is almost never brought into undergraduate lectures, or certainly in the corpus for this particular study at least.

The final lecture in this category, lecture 18 ‘Man’s Impact on the Environment: Pesticides’, is one whose features position it midway between ‘Agricultural Botany’ above and the remaining lectures in the category. It also seems to derive from an *Applied* (Becher 1989) discipline, in that it also exhibits a relatively significant extent of *Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality* (9.5%, 73.4/1000), though these episodes (5 in total) are not used particularly to realise knowledge-claims so much as asides, illustrating the lecture:

MIE201) [IV] I always think it’s ironic that if you go a garden centre and you go to the organic sort of gardening section they include Bordeaux mixture as a traditional organic remedy which in fact it’s probably about the

²⁵⁷ The *we* form here does not index the discipline, it indexes the lecturer and his particular research associates from Zeneca Plant Sciences at Jealott’s Hill.

worst thing you could spray on your on your garden because it is very persistent

MIE203) [IV] **the house we used to live in** off the Oxford Road in Reading which was built in about nineteen hundred I analysed the soil from from the back garden

MIE204) [IV] and **it had about between five and ten times the normal background level of copper**

MIE205) [IV] and it's almost certainly because people have been spraying Bordeaux mixture on their r{ } on their roses or whatever they were growing there at the turn of the century

Its use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units too is higher than average in the corpus (8%, 64/1000), though typically such contributions again are used to illustrate the discourse more than they are to realise knowledge-claims per se, particularly articles from *The New Scientist* – there are five such instances, four of which are read aloud, itself very unusual in the corpus and never observed in science fields:

MIE266) [III] **this {the article from Nature back in November} says** <pause> [<reading> area under transgenic crops shoots up forty-four percent]

MIE268) [III] **it {the article from Nature back in November} says** [the area of land planted with GM crops is expected to increase dramatically particularly in China Argentina Canada and South Africa according to Monsanto the US agri-biotechnology company] <pause> [the company said

that almost forty million hectares will be planted with GM crops this year

</reading>]

This lecture then seems, in discussing social consequences to science, to have taken on some aspects of Social Sciences lecture discourse, particularly its use of outside authorities (as does lecture 13 'HIV & AIDS'), and the use of *Lecturer Intertext* to realise asides which help to contextualise the lecture message.

4.3.5.1 Conclusion on The management of Intertextuality in Biomedical Sciences

With the marked exception of lecture 16 'Agricultural Botany', this grouping of Biomedical Sciences generally exhibits similar features to the lectures in Physical Sciences, particularly lectures 13 'HIV & AIDS', 14 'Systems Physiology' and 15 'Immunology' which show a very similar preference for the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* [I] units. Nevertheless, there is a sense of slightly less authoritative paradigms in this grouping and slightly more contingent knowledge, evidenced by the slightly higher incidences of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units and *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] & [V] units. Lecture 17 'Genetics & Molecular Biology' on the other hand exhibits features which suggest it as being a rather youthful discipline, with its knowledge (re-)constructed even at the undergraduate level as more contingent than in other science areas, while lecture 16 'Agricultural Botany' exhibits features which mark it as being very different to the other science lectures, particularly regarding its extensive use of *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] & [V] units for realising Intertextuality, (re-)constructing the knowledge in the lecture as deriving very much from the lecturer himself and his research group.

Lecture 18 meanwhile, 'Man's Impact on the Environment: Pesticides', exhibits features which suggest it as occupying a niche between these two poles in the grouping, with its relatively high use of *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] & [V] units (9.5%) pointing to its position probably nearer the *Applied* end of Becher's (1989) cline. This suggests there are observable differences between lectures from *Pure* (Becher 1989) and from *Applied* science fields, which are probably attributable to the paradigms in both areas and to the apparently slightly more individualistic ethos behind *Applied* (*ibid*) fields. Similar differences are observable in the lectures in the Social Sciences grouping too, indicating the broader social backgrounds behind *Applied* (*ibid*) disciplines generally.

4.3.6 Conclusion on The management of Intertextuality in Undergraduate Lectures

These analyses of the management of Intertextuality in the lectures from the four disciplinary groupings indicate firstly that the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* [I] units is very much the default means by which disciplinary knowledge is (re-)constructed and Intertextuality is managed in the genre of the undergraduate lecture (average 76% of Intertextuality across the corpus, 476.1/1000 units), and that the other four potentials are marked potentials ([II] average 2.3%, 13.1/1000; [III] average 13%, 82.2/1000; [IV] average 7.8%, 47.3/1000; [V] average 0.5%, 3.6/1000). This is particularly the case in lectures deriving from science disciplines, though it is also surprisingly typical in some lectures deriving from other disciplinary areas too, which indicates that this genre is typically involved in interaction with established disciplinary knowledge of paradigmatic status rather than with more cutting-edge knowledge, and that this genre is typically

involved in the reproduction of disciplinary knowledge as opposed to the production of new disciplinary knowledge. Further research should show if this is typical of lecture discourse per se, or if the management of Intertextuality changes at a higher academic level such as in post-graduate lecture discourse, in which lecturers may wish to challenge disciplinary paradigms more via more extensive dialoguing with them.

Secondly, and in tandem with this, this study indicates that as the potential of *Unmarked* [I] units is the default means by which Intertextuality is managed in this genre, purely quantitative analyses alone are insufficient to establish more than broad management patterns, as much of the management variation is very local in nature, and instead it is within qualitative analyses of the intricacies and nuances of management choices within *Reporting Verb* [III] units that the most interesting and revealing disciplinary interactions are observable. Moreover, it suggests that for purely quantitative analyses to be valid and satisfactorily revealing in a larger corpus, a very complex coding typology will be required to reliably and consistently code such local level, revealing distinctions.

Thirdly, these analyses indicate that while the disciplinary groupings used in this study are broadly appropriate in terms of their similar content areas and for the most part broadly appropriate too in terms of their managements of Intertextuality, there are nevertheless also three important identifiable features regarding the management of Intertextuality in undergraduate lectures which point to clusters of lectures across different groupings, and/or which point to differences between lectures within disciplinary groupings. These are marked uses of the three potentials of Disciplinary

Intertext *Unmarked* [I] units, Disciplinary Intertext *Reporting Verb* [III] units, and Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality [IV] and [V].

The first of these features, extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* [I] units for managing Intertextuality, sees a marked reliance on those units which construct a tight, monophonic union between a lecturer and discipline in chorus, and in so doing have the effect of (re-)constructing disciplinary knowledge as true and unproblematic, and therefore as homogeneous in the sense that it is shared in a disciplinary community. Although this study shows that such units have proved to be the default option for managing Intertextuality in undergraduate lecture discourse across the academy, particularly extensive use of this potential will nevertheless point to particularly confident, authoritative disciplines with community-perceived coherent undergraduate paradigms which a lecturer does not wish to challenge at the undergraduate level²⁵⁸. As disciplinary ‘knowledge’ is a chronological product (Latour & Woolgar 1979), and remembering too the analyses of lecture 17 ‘Genetics’, extensive use of *Unmarked* [I] units is also likely to point too to long-standing, more mature disciplines which have had the time to develop strong paradigms at the undergraduate level. Lectures from the corpus grouped by this feature of extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* [I] units are:

1. Lecture 3 ‘The French Revolution’ (92%, 634/1000)
2. Lecture 7 ‘Collective Defence & Military Alliances’ (91%, 561/1000)
3. Lecture 13 ‘HIV & AIDS’ (92%, 505/1000)
4. Lecture 14 ‘Systems Physiology’ (96.5%, 657/1000)

²⁵⁸ Although clearly this may not necessarily be the case in lecture discourse aimed at postgraduate audiences, in which a lecturer may wish to challenge conventional disciplinary paradigms, and is typically not the case in RA’s, in which a writer is as likely to disrupt a paradigm (CARS – Swales 1990) as s/he is to continue it.

5. Lecture 15 'Immunology' (94%, 665/1000)
6. Lecture 20 'Probability Distributions' (97%, 541/1000)*
7. Lecture 21 'Holography' (95%, 436/1000)*
8. Lecture 22 'Polymers' (97%, 446/1000)*
9. Lecture 23 'Organo-metallic Chemistry' (94%, 629)
10. Lecture 24 'Formal Logic' (93%, 408)*

* Figures per 1000 units are lower in these four lectures due to their shared extensive use of Scaffolding [XVII] units in their discourse.

We might also say that lecture 6 'Allegory in The Faerie Queene' (83%, 504/1000), lecture 11 'Observational or Social Learning' (82%, 553/1000), and perhaps even lecture 17 'Genetics' (87%, 500) might also qualify to be included in this group, as the instances of *Reporting Verbs* [III] units (9%, 57.9/1000) in the former of these lectures are typically only *Generalisations*, thus avoiding individual agency in them, while its instances of *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] & [V] units (7%, 44.4/1000) typically function as asides as opposed to direct knowledge-claims. In the latter two lectures 'Observational or Social Learning' and 'Genetics' meanwhile, *Reporting Verbs* [III] units (13.5%, 89.6/1000 & 12%, 72.5/1000) typically are *Research Acts*, again avoiding any individual talking agents in the discourse, though lecture 17 'Genetics' also exhibits a number of instances of *Discourse Acts* and *Cognition Acts* with disciplinary-*we* as *Uttering Source*, seemingly highlighting the discursively-constituted nature of knowledge behind this discipline, meaning it distinguishes itself from the other lectures above due to this feature.

This cluster then seems to correspond very much with lectures from science and/or mathematics fields (8 of the 10 lectures), fields already identified as typically

exhibiting strong paradigms at undergraduate level via their textbooks (Ziman 1984) and described as *Hard* and *Pure* disciplines by Becher (1989) – this indicates the ideology in these disciplines of linear, cumulative disciplinary landscapes enabling the (re-)construction of strong, authoritative paradigms at undergraduate level, constructed as such by the non-dialogic relations set up between lecturer and discipline in their (re-)telling via *Unmarked* [I] units. The two other lectures (Lecture 3 ‘The French Revolution’ and Lecture 7 ‘Collective Defence & Military Alliances’) in this cluster are a slight surprise though, and their presence certainly seems to suggest that the maturity of a discipline does have a strong influence on the management of Intertextuality too, and that the more mature a discipline is the more likely it is to have formalised paradigms at the undergraduate level. This would also account for lecture 6 ‘Allegory in The Faerie Queene’ seeming to almost qualify for a place in this cluster. This cluster also corresponds very strongly with *Pure* (ibid) disciplines, whose ‘knowledge’ is ‘academic’ – such disciplines are ones whose ‘knowledge’ typically derives from experimentation and discoursing within the academy, meaning they are very likely to have extensive and formalised academically-oriented orders of discourse to draw on in their undergraduate lectures.

The lectures marked by this feature of extensive management of Intertextuality via *Unmarked* [I] units therefore have in common a non-dialogising, and therefore a non-relativising relationship between lecturer and discipline at undergraduate level, meaning they (re-)construct disciplinary knowledge at this level as true and authoritative, and in so doing (re-)construct the disciplines behind their lectures as authoritative and homogeneous at this level.

The second feature which creates a clear cluster of lectures is extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units for managing Intertextuality. These units typically (re-)construct disciplinary knowledge as that of an individual rather than as shared across a community, meaning disciplinary knowledge appears as heterogeneous and contingent knowledge-claim, as opposed to ratified community knowledge-statement. In so doing, such units therefore typically bring about not only the rupture of a discipline as a homogeneous entity at undergraduate level, but also a rupture of the tight monophonic union between lecturer and discipline observed in *Unmarked* [I] units (Voloshinov 1973). This choice therefore typically (re-)constructs a discipline differently to *Unmarked* [I] units, typically as a more polyphonic, heterogeneous entity populated by individual agents dealing with unrated, or unratable, recursive knowledge, and/or as an entity where homogeneous statements are either difficult due to competing authorities in the discipline, for instance Law, or simply misleading²⁵⁹ (Grice 1975). It may also point to more youthful disciplines in which heterogeneous knowledge-claims have not yet had the necessary time to evolve into homogeneous knowledge-statements necessary for stable paradigms to evolve at the undergraduate level. Lectures from the corpus grouped clearly by this feature of extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units are:

1. Lecture 1 'Hume's Treatise' (49%, 229/1000)
2. Lecture 2 'Contemporary Approaches to the History of Art' (47%, 278/1000)

²⁵⁹ For instance, knowledge in History of Art could conceivably be (re-)constructed as authoritative and true via *Unmarked* [I] units, there are no purely lexico-grammatical or discursive reasons why this could not happen – but this would likely be seen by many as misleading and/or as a strong, not to say even totalitarian socio-political act.

3. Lecture 9 'Silence as Evidence' (40%, 199/1000)
4. Lecture 4 'Roman Britain' (31.5%, 263/1000)
5. Lecture 19 'Artificial Life' (24%, 190/1000)
6. Lecture 16 'Agricultural Botany' (13%, 94.8/1000)
7. Lecture 5 'Aftermath of Political Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Latin-America' (13%, 55.3/1000)

This is a smaller cluster than the first one, and indeed, use of *Reporting Verb* [III] units in managing Intertextuality is surprisingly limited across undergraduate lecture discourse, indicating that the majority of disciplines have authoritative, coherent paradigms at undergraduate level. Nevertheless, the seven lectures in this cluster above each display extensive use of this potential, particularly the first five, and the cluster seems to correspond with lectures from Arts & Humanities, a disciplinary area which is typically viewed as comprising disciplines with heterogeneous, recursive, and cyclical landscapes in which knowledge is typically contingent and personal, and not supported (or even supportable (Searle 1991²⁶⁰) by community consensus (Becher 1989, Hyland 2000, Nelson et al 1987). This means that perhaps it would be viewable as misleading (Grice 1975) to typically (re-)construct their knowledge in undergraduate lectures via *Unmarked* [I] units, while *Reporting Verb* [III] units are more faithful to the heterogeneous nature of their disciplinary knowledge. Moreover, the use of *Reporting Verb* [III] units in (re-)constructing the knowledge of a discipline typically also gives a more influential *I* role to a lecturer as a "second centre of consciousness" (Voloshinov 1973) in the discourse, further

²⁶⁰ Searle (1991) identifies the problems caused by what he terms "intentional causation" in arriving at explanations in human phenomena, and also argues that certain social facts have logical features rendering them totally unlike hard science facts (ibid: 335) in that they are "permeated with mental components", making hard objective community-agreed knowledge-statements difficult in such areas.

rendering the lecture discourse, and the landscapes behind the discourse, as heterogeneous.

This cluster also seems to correspond with *Pure* (Becher 1989) disciplines, probably because such disciplines have extensive and formalised academic orders of discourse to draw on, interaction with which is precisely what (re-)constructs these disciplines as *Pure* (ibid). It is probably rather surprising to have only a small number of lectures in this cluster, though this is probably partly explained by the apparently large numbers of lectures from *Applied* (Becher 1989) disciplines in the Social Sciences category – *Applied* (ibid) disciplines seem to typically be marked by high extent of *Lecturer Intertext*, which functions to bring in the real world discourses that make disciplines *Applied* (ibid).

The presence of lecture 19 ‘Artificial Life’ in this cluster, a lecture from the discipline of Psychology but very science-influenced, also suggests perhaps that this discipline, despite its efforts to be ‘scientific’ (Manicas 1988), frequently cannot escape its highly interpretive, individualistic nature and thus (re-)construct homogeneous, authoritative knowledge statements at undergraduate level. Alternatively, the content of this lecture seems to be cutting-edge, which would seem to indicate again that the maturity of a discipline does play an important role in how its knowledge is (re-)constructed in its undergraduate lectures, as was also observed with lecture 17 ‘Genetics’ in the previous category of lectures characterised by extensive use of *Unmarked* [I] units. Alternatively, it may suggest that the concept of academic discipline is itself too broad a notion, and that the notion of *specialism* (Becher 1989) may in fact be more appropriate.

The third feature which creates a clear cluster of lectures is extensive use of *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] & [V] units for managing Intertextuality. Such units mark Intertextuality as being a lecturer-as-*I* phenomenon, signalling knowledge-claims (and disciplinary meaning-making in the broadest sense) as a lecturer's own. In this sense, this potential sees the heaviest involvement for a lecturer as an active *I* agent in lecture discourse, again typically rupturing any monophonic union of lecturer and discipline in so doing. Instead these units typically see a lecturer (re-)constructing a discipline as it relates to his/her professional life, which therefore broadens the orders of discourse brought in to the genre. Lectures from the corpus grouped clearly by this feature of extensive use of *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] & [V] units are:

1. Lecture 5 'Aftermath of Political nationalism in Nineteenth Century Latin-America' (19%, 80.1/1000)
2. Lecture 8 'Inflation Targeting' (18%, 116.2/1000)
3. Lecture 10 'Environment & Sustainability' (13%, 94.1/1000)
4. Lecture 12 'Pricing' (16%, 127/1000)
5. Lecture 16 'Agricultural Botany' (44%, 331/1000)
6. Lecture 19 'Artificial Life' (15%, 114.5/1000)

This cluster might also include lecture 2 'Contemporary Approaches to the History of Art' (9%, 58.9/1000), lecture 9 'Silence as Evidence' (8.5%, 50.4/1000), and lecture 18 'Man's Impact on the Environment – Pesticides' (9.5%, 73.4/1000).

This cluster contains lectures which use *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] & [V] units for two separate reasons, the first of which typically is to realise relatively simple *I*

narratives deriving from lecturers' previous or current working lives, sometimes running to large numbers of units, which focus disciplinary knowledge on its applications and origins:

1. Lecture 8 'Inflation Targeting'
2. Lecture 10 'Environment & Sustainability'
3. Lecture 12 'Pricing'
4. Lecture 18 'Man's Impact on the Environment – Pesticides'

This usage corresponds with lectures deriving from *Applied* (Becher 1989) Social Science disciplinary areas, given by lecturers who typically used to work in the commercial world but now work for a university, or who work for both a university and another commercial organisation. This seems to allow for the direct personal involvement of the lecturer as a narrative-teller, in contrast to the typical situation in *Pure* (ibid) disciplines in the corpus where this does not happen, indicating the different orders of discourse brought into *Pure* and *Applied* (ibid) lectures. This feature however seems, in this corpus at least, to be a characteristic only of *Applied* (ibid) disciplines towards the *Softer* end of the scale – *Hard Applied* (ibid) lectures do not seem to exhibit this feature.

The second use of *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] & [V] units in this cluster of lectures approximates²⁶¹ to the realisation of the *Real* part of *Hypothetical-Real* discourse structures (Jacoby 1987), typical of an RA:

1. Lecture 2 'Contemporary Approaches to the History of Art'

²⁶¹ This process may be on-going as a strand through the discourse as opposed to being chronologically final as in an RA, which is why I use the word 'approximate to' rather than anything stronger.

2. Lecture 5 'Aftermath of Political nationalism in Nineteenth Century Latin-America'
3. Lecture 19 'Artificial Life'
4. Lecture 16 'Agricultural Botany'
5. Also lecture 9 'Silence as Evidence'

These lectures each see the extensive involvement of the lecturer as a mediator of sometimes rival claims via *Reporting Verb* [III] and sometimes *Reporting Noun* [II] units, the *Hypothetical* part of the *Hypothetical-Real* discourse structures (ibid), and *Lecturer Intertext* units bring closure (the *Real*) to the process. Lecture 16 'Agricultural Botany' is the clearest example of this, and uses such units to realise numerous personal *Research Acts* from which equally numerous *Lecturer Intertext* knowledge-claims derive, solving the problems identified via its extensive *Reporting Verbs* [III] units – in these ways it displays almost a classic knowledge-transforming (Bereiter & Scardamalia 1987) RA structure (Swales 1990). Lecture 2 'Contemporary Approaches to the History of Art', Lecture 5 'Aftermath of Political nationalism in Nineteenth Century Latin-America', and lecture 19 'Artificial Life' on the other hand see lecturer involvement as predominantly discursively-based, in the sense that their *Lecturer Intertext* claim-making is not derived from personal *Research Acts* as in 'Agricultural Botany', but is a rhetorical act to bring discursive closure to the contingency constructed by reporting the work of others. This is still illustrative of knowledge-transforming (ibid) discourse and/or the *Hypothetical-Real* discourse structure (Jacoby 1987), but probably adapted somewhat for this particular genre of knowledge-telling (Bereiter & Scardamalia 1987) undergraduate lecture discourse.

These then seem to be the three major clusters observable via analyses of the management of Intertextuality in the corpus, outlined beneath in table 4.8:

Extensive use of <i>Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked</i> [I] units	Extensive use of <i>Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb</i> [III] units	Extensive use of <i>Lecturer Intertext</i> [IV] & [V] units
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lecture 3 'The French Revolution' (92%) 2. Lecture 7 'Collective Defence & Military Alliances' (91%) 3. Lecture 13 'HIV & AIDS' (92%) 4. Lecture 14 'Systems Physiology' (96.5%) 5. Lecture 15 'Immunology' (94%) 6. Lecture 20 'Probability Distributions' (97%) 7. Lecture 21 'Holography' (95%) 8. Lecture 22 'Polymers' (97%) 9. Lecture 23 'Organometallic Chemistry' (94%) 10. Lecture 24 'Formal Logic' (93%) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lecture 1 'Hume's Treatise' (49%) 2. Lecture 2 'Contemporary Approaches to the History of Art' (47%) 3. Lecture 9 'Silence as Evidence' (40%) 4. Lecture 4 'Roman Britain' (31.5%) 5. Lecture 19 'Artificial Life' (24%) 6. Lecture 16 'Agricultural Botany' (13%) 7. Lecture 5 'Aftermath of Political Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Latin-America' (13%) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lecture 8 'Inflation Targeting' 2. Lecture 10 'Environment & Sustainability' 3. Lecture 12 'Pricing' 4. Lecture 18 'Man's Impact on the Environment – Pesticides'
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Lecture 6 'Allegory in The Faerie Queene' (83%) 12. Lecture 11 'Observational or Social Learning' (82%) 13. Lecture 17 'Genetics' (87%) 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lecture 2 'Contemporary Approaches to the History of Art' 2. Lecture 5 'Aftermath of Political nationalism in Nineteenth Century Latin-America' 3. Lecture 19 'Artificial Life' 4. Lecture 16 'Agricultural Botany' 5. Also lecture 9 'Silence as Evidence'

Table 4.8: Clusters of Lectures Identifiable via Analyses of the Management of Intertextuality

Table 4.8 above indicates that firstly, there does seem to be a broadly shared discursive policy in science lectures regarding how the relationship between the two primary participants in lecture discourse, lecturer and discipline, are mediated, with the discipline being given very much the primary status as the authoritative participant via the potential of *Unmarked* [I] units, albeit that this also constructs high authority for the lecturer (re-)constructing these disciplines at the

undergraduate level. This choice indicates the existence of established, authoritative paradigms at the undergraduate level in these science fields. The science lectures also typically seem to exhibit a broadly shared similarity of use for the potential of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units, these being the naming of disciplinary phenomena and sometimes the narrative reporting of past disciplinary research, but typically little beyond this.

Three science lectures however, particularly lecture 16 'Agricultural Botany' and lecture 19 'Artificial Life', and lecture 18 'Genetics' to a lesser degree, exhibit features which set them very much apart from the other 'typical' science lectures in the corpus, namely their extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units and *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] & [V] units, which very much open a discursive, social and epistemological gap between lecturer and discipline and construct a much more active individual role for a lecturer in doing so. To these 'typical' science lectures can also probably be added lecture 11 'Observational or Social Learning', which exhibits some features broadly similar to 'typical' science lectures and which suggest it as deriving from an empirically-based discipline, particularly its extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verb* [III] units for (re-)constructing the disciplinary research leading to the knowledge-claims in the lecture, though it also differs from 'typical' science lectures in that it exhibits a relatively high lecturer involvement through these same units, along with the fact too that although her own contribution via *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] & [V] units is limited in its extent (3%), it is quite important in its content. In this sense, it seems broadly similar to lecture 17 'Genetics' in that it combines a strong sense of disciplinary community in tandem

with a strong sense of the individual, probably reflecting the fact that this discipline lies on the borderzone between *Soft* and *Hard* (ibid) disciplinary areas.

The analyses also seem to point to a typicality of features in lectures deriving from *Applied* (ibid) disciplines, albeit that these lectures straddle two of the disciplinary groupings used above, the Social Sciences and Biomedical Sciences groupings. This is the typically extensive use of *Lecturer Intertext* [IV] & [V] units for realising Intertextuality in the lectures deriving from these *Applied* (ibid) disciplines, marking knowledge-claims and/or supporting narratives as deriving from a lecturer him/herself and/or from his/her working life.

Finally, and slightly contrary to expectations, the analyses suggest that discursive policy regarding the management of Intertextuality varies in Arts & Humanities, with some lectures exhibiting what we would probably expect, extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III] for managing Intertextuality, indicating the recursive and plurally-opinionated landscapes behind them, while other lectures on the other hand exhibit extensive use of *Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked* [I] units, suggesting instead stable and authoritative paradigms in the disciplines behind them. While this is to be expected in Social Science areas, straddling as this area does the social and the scientific, this was not expected in Arts & Humanities lectures. This suggests that at the undergraduate level at least, and on the basis of this small corpus, some Arts & Humanities disciplines, or perhaps some of the undergraduate lectures deriving from them, seem to display features closer to *Hard* (ibid) disciplines, particularly English and History. Further research on a

significantly larger corpus in tandem with ethnographic research will be necessary to establish this more precisely.

4.4 The Management of Intratextuality

It was hoped that analyses of the management of Intratextuality would also shed light on the academic communities behind their lectures, deriving both from analyses of the extents of use of functional areas within Intratextuality and from the types of relationships that are constructed between lecturer, discipline and audience within the management of such units. However, there are significantly less units in lecture discourse which manage Intratextuality (an average across the corpus of 170.3/1000 units), and therefore significantly less data. It also seems to be the case that the management of this feature of lecture discourse is influenced as much by personal factors as it is by disciplinary factors, as few patterns were observed. It may well be that this functional area, as part of the inter-discursivity (Fairclough 1992) of undergraduate lecture discourse, is constituted from different orders of discourse to those of Intertextuality, meaning disciplinary influences are less pronounced. Therefore this study concludes that a larger corpus will be required to establish any disciplinary patterns in this area.

4.5 The Management of Audience Intertextuality

Similar applies to instances of *Audience Intertextuality* [VI] units, which although illustrative of the highly interactive and spoken nature of undergraduate lecture discourse, do not appear to indicate any consistent disciplinary patterns, due to their relatively low frequency in the genre (average across the corpus 12.1/1000 units). The use of this interactive potential may well also be as much or probably more personally motivated than it is motivated by disciplinary affiliation.

4.6 The Management of Metatextuality

Again, it was hoped that quantitative analyses of this functional area, as an explicit indicator of the participation of the lecturer-as-*I* in undergraduate lecture discourse, would indicate consistent disciplinary patterns. However, the limited data (average across the corpus 22.3/1000 units) makes any consistent observations difficult in this area. Nevertheless, there is one interesting observation here, deriving from quantifications of units realising *Epistemic: Truth Value* [XXIII] Metatextuality. Here there is a very clear division between the Physical Sciences/Biomedical Sciences groupings (18 and 14 instances, 5.6/1000 and 4.3/1000) and the Arts & Humanities/Social Sciences groupings (37 and 46 instances, 13.1/1000 and 14.4/1000) – and in fact this would be an even greater discrepancy without the 8 instances from lecture 19 ‘Artificial Life’, already established as a highly dialogic lecture. Although there is limited data, this seems to be a relatively conclusive result (chi-square 23.477), and points to the broadly different truth statuses of the ‘knowledge’ (re-)constructed in the two disciplinary areas, and the consequent need in the latter two groupings for a lecturer to directly intervene and mediate a relationship between the audience and the emerging ‘knowledge’ due to its typically

lower truth status and higher heterogeneity. This means a lecturer has a more active participation in this regard in these latter two groupings, and points to the typically more homogeneous disciplinary landscapes behind the former two groupings at the undergraduate level. Nevertheless, beyond this there are limited patterns and limited data, meaning a larger corpus will be necessary for more conclusive observations to be made.

4.7 Summary

In this chapter, I have discussed the findings derived from application of the methodology to the corpus of lectures, with particular regard to the management of Intertextuality. Because quantifications alone have the potential to be misleading, I looked at each of the four disciplinary groupings in turn, and identified both broad characteristics and specific features of each lecture. This resulted in the establishment of three clusters of lectures, each clearly identifiable – the first via its high extent of Disciplinary Intertext *Unmarked* [I] units, the second via its high extent of Disciplinary Intertext *Reporting Verb* [III] units, and the third via its high extent of Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality [IV] & [V] units. Analyses of Intratextuality and Metatextuality however were more circumspect, and will require a larger corpus before any firm conclusions can be drawn. In the next and final chapter, I will outline the whole study, outline the main findings and achievements, and briefly discuss the notions of Intertextuality, genre and academic discipline in the light of this study, before finishing by evaluating this study and proposing some areas for further research.

Chapter 5

Overview of The Study and Implications for Further Research

5.1 Overview

In this final chapter, I will summarise the main characteristics of the study, and then discuss what it suggests about and contributes to the main foci and fields of the study, particularly regarding understandings of Intertextuality and its roles in socio-cultural life. I will then evaluate the methodology and discuss limitations to the study, before finishing by outlining some recommendations for areas of future research.

5.2 The Main Characteristics of the Study

This study has been an extensive inter-disciplinary comparison of the management of Intertextuality in undergraduate lecture discourse, an area identified as having had no previous research in this genre. The first and vital objective therefore was to identify quite what Intertextuality actually is. In a detailed and necessarily lengthy chapter, this study therefore reviewed theories and research into the phenomenon of Intertextuality, and showed it to be a highly complex, under-determined term, of interest since antiquity and little closer to being satisfactorily theorised now than it was then. Rejecting more recent post-structuralist theorisations of the concept due to their abstract natures, their lack of textual research, and their removal of authorhood, and viewing the genre of the academic lecture as in a sense deriving from formalised Intertextuality, this study followed Bakhtin in theorising Intertextuality in this specific genre as the dialogic interactions (re-)constructed in synchronic lecture discourse between lecturer, audience, and the diachronic history

of the discourse as genre (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986). Understanding disciplinary knowledge itself too as the discursive outcome of these same interactions, in short, the study of Intertextuality in this thesis has been the study and comparison of the management of the reaccentuation of disciplinary knowledge-bearing discourses in different disciplines. This is the first key achievement of this study, the theorisation of a workable understanding of the phenomenon which can actually be investigated consistently, not only in this particular genre of the undergraduate lecture, but in future studies of other academic genres too.

However, devising a methodology to achieve this was complicated, and necessitated a number of stages. To begin with, as this study wanted not only to be able to describe different managements qualitatively but also to quantify their different extents of use in different disciplines, the first requirement was to devise a scheme for segregating the data, authentic undergraduate lecture discourse, into consistent units for analyses so as to enable consistent quantifications. Unfortunately there was no such scheme available for lecture discourse, and the scheme employed in this study, the second key achievement of the study, was devised using the concept of the independent unit. Due to the nature of lecture discourse as a hybrid of features of spoken and written language, such a unit, based primarily on structural criteria so as to achieve the desired consistency, had to accommodate some of the more spoken features of lecture discourse such as parenthetical structures, the extensive use of *Direct Speech* and/or *Constructed Dialogue* (Tannen 1989) in reporting units, peripheral elements, non-clausal units, and inserts, particularly the numerous spoken discourse markers which help manage interaction in lecture discourse.

The development and eventual application of this scheme on the initial data indicated that lecture discourse is typically highly interactive discourse and frequently very “spoken” in its nature too, and although thorough analyses of this area was outside the remit of the current study, the establishment of authentic lecture discourse as being typically very spoken and interactive in nature, together with the means of identifying those features which make it so, can probably be described as the first findings of this study.

This meant the segregation scheme for the data was necessarily an elaborate one because of the sometimes complex structural nature of lecture discourse and its typically regular use of non-clausal material, and the strengths of the scheme are firstly that it allowed for consistent and reliable quantifications to be made in lecture discourse in this particular study, avoiding sole reliance on a simpler cherry-picking approach to the study; secondly that it will allow for detailed future research into the very spoken and interactive nature of lecture discourse, together with the features which make it so; and thirdly that it can be applied to monologic discourse of any kind, spoken or written. This means that the same system can be reliably employed not only for future larger scale studies on a larger corpus of authentic lectures, but also for future investigations of the management of Intertextuality in other academic, and for that matter non-academic genres too.

The main objective of the methodology and initial data analyses following this was to reach a thorough understanding of two areas in this genre, neither of which had received any previous research attention. The first of these was to establish who the participants in lecture discourse are, and in the light of this to establish how the

'voice' of each of these could be consistently identified behind every independent unit of data, in turn allowing the various discursively-mediated participant relationships constructed in the discourse, as Intertextuality, to be unearthed. This, the third key achievement of this study, was achieved using pragmatic criteria based on Goffman's (1974) notion of participation frameworks, together with functional and lexico-grammatical criteria. This resulted in the term *Intertext* to describe whose 'voice(s)' and combinations thereof is/are behind each unit of discourse, leading to each unit in the initial data analysis being coded as *Lecturer Intertext*, *Disciplinary Intertext*, or *Audience Intertext*.

However, because the conceptualisation of Intertextuality used in this study is rather literalist and firmly fused with notions of disciplinary 'knowledge' and history, and because segregation of the data into independent units had revealed a number of units whose functional roles were not connected directly with the reaccentuation of disciplinary knowledge-bearing discourse per se but with providing a discursive frame within which this process can happen, the second necessity in the methodology and initial data analysis therefore was to reach a thorough understanding too of the various functional roles played in lecture discourse by all independent units of the discourse. In this way, Intertextuality could be investigated in the manner in which it was theorised for this particular study, specifically as the discursively-mediated interactions between a lecturer and the discursively-constituted knowledge of a disciplinary community and the disciplinary agents behind that knowledge.

This was achieved using detailed analyses of the two initial lectures, the results of which proved in fact to be rather surprising and can probably be classed as the second important findings of this study, in that both lectures exhibited a significant number of independent units whose function was to realise interactional and/or textual functions involved simply in the rhetorical construction of the overall discursive situation. This is probably due to the predominantly spoken nature of lecture discourse, meaning that typical textual support found in written academic discourse such as headings, paragraphs, typesets, parentheses, text boxes and so on are absent and need to be compensated for orally in the genre – which explains the regular employment of units realising functions such as *Macro-discourse Structuring*, *Inter-lecture Reference*, *Scaffolding* and so on in lecture discourse.

In a sense therefore, these analyses observed what we might term a constructive “telling” text and a “told” text in lecture discourse. As each of these is performing very different acts in lecture discourse, and as it was unclear if the former was Intertextual in the manner in which this term was understood in this study, it was felt necessary therefore to divide the two so as to allow explicit focus in this study on the “told” text, those units explicitly involved in the reaccentuation of disciplinary knowledge-bearing discourse, distinct from the supporting “telling” text. The consequent analyses of the various functions performed by independent units in the two initial lectures resulted in the establishment of three key broad functional areas in lecture discourse, namely *Intertextuality* (broadly knowledge-(re-)telling acts), *Intratextuality* (broadly text construction acts) and *Metatextuality* (explicit unit-length evaluation acts). The latter two of these were understood as the “telling text” and the former as the “told” text, and all three functional areas are

clearly and consistently recognisable in lecture discourse by pragmatic and/or lexico-grammatical criteria. Such a scheme allowed the analyst to approach the three areas separately, enabling explicit focus on Intertextuality as understood in this study, while knowing however that they could be reintegrated if necessary.

Finally, having reached a detailed understanding of the independent units in the two initial lectures in terms both of their *Intertext* and of their functional roles in the genre, and having identified that Intratextuality, and particularly Intertextuality, could be managed via different *Intertexts*, or in other words via different participant 'voices' and combinations thereof, each of which crucially have different effects on the managements of the functional areas and in tandem with this different effects regarding the (re-)construction of homogeneity and heterogeneity in lecture discourse, the final part of the methodology therefore was to devise a comprehensive coding scheme which would allow both of these aspects to be mapped consistently onto each independent unit in lecture discourse such that every independent unit in the corpus could each be coded consistently and reliably by their combination of *Intertext* and function, which in turn would allow the management of each of the three broad functional areas to be analysed separately. This coding scheme, comprising twenty-seven options, was developed organically from the two initial lectures and clearly delineated between the three different functional areas identified, enabling clearly observable and quantifiable patterns concerning the managements of Intertextuality, Intratextuality, and Metatextuality.

This complex, rigorous, data-driven, and, as the reliability tests run on it indicate, reliable methodology, designed to enable analyses of every independent unit of

discourse in lectures, allows therefore not only for consistent qualitative analyses of the management of Intertextuality in this genre and others, but allows also for consistent quantitative analyses of the management of Intertextuality too. This methodology enables therefore the holistic study of Intertextuality in this genre and others, and as such avoids the perennial problem of cherry-picking in such investigations. Moreover, it also opens up lecture discourse for investigations of other fascinating issues besides the management of Intertextuality. As such, it is probably the primary achievement of this study, and although its application to the corpus reveals it will need minor modifications beforehand to enable quantitative analyses of a sufficiently sophisticated nature to be conducted on larger and/or other corpuses, it will be able to shoulder the significantly larger scale investigations into the management of Intertextuality across a variety of academic genres which are planned in the future.

The data analyses finally were conducted on a corpus of twenty-four authentic undergraduate lectures selected from The BASE corpus, six from the four broad disciplinary groupings of Arts & Humanities, Social Sciences & Social Studies, Biomedical & Life Sciences and Physical Sciences. Each of these lectures was segregated into independent units and then coded using the methodology developed, giving a corpus of twenty-four lectures which can also be used for investigations besides the current one, after which both quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted between and within the four disciplinary groupings, focussing particularly on the management of Intertextuality. While quantitative analyses painted the broad pictures necessary to establish broad patterns of management in lectures, and clearly identified lectures with shared characteristics, much of these

analyses were qualitative in nature, and focussed particularly on the management of Intertextuality as observed in *Reporting Verb* [III] units, as this area proved to be the richest for gaining detailed insight into relationships constructed between lecturer and discipline in the reaccentuation of disciplinary knowledge-bearing discourse.

On the back of this rigorous, exhaustive approach, this study has generated a number of interesting findings. Firstly, it has identified undergraduate lecture discourse as being highly interactive discourse – this is evidenced for instance by the extensive use of spoken discourse markers managing interaction between different Intertext units and therefore between different participants, by the frequent use of *we* as subject and/or *Uttering Source* in many units realising Intratextuality, integrating the audience into the emerging discourse as joint, active participants in its construction, and by the typical use in all twenty-four lectures of Audience Intertext units constructing relationships between the audience and emerging knowledge, typically realised via *Constructed Dialogue* (Tannen 1989), making these contributions very interactive and vivid and also integrating the audience into the emerging discourse as active and/or reactive participants.

Secondly, and connected with this, this study indicates that lecture discourse is frequently very “spoken” in nature, in the sense of frequent parenthetical structures, frequent *Constructed Dialogue* (ibid), extensive spoken discourse markers, extensive *Scaffolding* units and so on. These features are very much what distinguishes lecture discourse from written textbook discourse. Indeed, one area of future study is to compare lecture and textbook discourse for such features.

Thirdly, it has clearly identified a variety of functions in lecture discourse together with their potential patterns of management in the genre, some of which, for instance *Scaffolding*, have not been widely discussed in the literature, and categorised these various identified functions via the three functional areas of Intratextuality, Metatextuality and Intertextuality.

Fourthly, it suggests, albeit on the evidence of limited data and needing further research on a larger corpus of lectures, that Intratextuality, a vital part of the “telling” text in lecture discourse, is probably not influenced by disciplinary factors to any significant degree, and is instead probably a broadly generic cross-disciplinary form of discourse influenced as much by personal factors as by anything else. Indeed, considering lecture discourse in terms of its interdiscursivity (Fairclough 1992), it seems likely that the orders of discourse constituting the discursive resources for managing Intratextuality in the genre of the undergraduate lecture are likely to be broader in origin than those constituting the resources for Intertextuality.

However, it is regarding the management of Intertextuality itself in undergraduate lecture discourse that this study has made its most significant findings. Firstly, this study has identified a number of different means by which Intertextuality can be managed in lecture discourse, not only in terms of broad potentials but also, and particularly, in fine-grain detail, particularly regarding the intricacies of *Reporting Verb* [III] units, probably the most productive area for qualitatively comparing the management(s) of Intertextuality in the genre. These findings will be used in future

research to further refine the coding typology so as to allow for detailed and accurate quantifications on larger corpuses, and will also be useful for developing EAP materials for teaching, as will much of the work behind the methodology broadly.

Secondly, this study has identified that Intertextuality is, broadly speaking, managed differently in different academic areas. Specifically, this study suggests that science areas typically share a management of Intertextuality which means their diachronic disciplinary discourses are typically (re-)constructed via Disciplinary Intertext *Unmarked* [I] units as synchronic, truthful, objective, community-accepted, undialogised and monophonic knowledge-statements, suggesting in turn the existence of influential, authoritative paradigms behind science areas. In this sense, science disciplines can typically be described as homogeneous disciplines at the level of the undergraduate lecture, in that they typically exhibit a monophonic disciplinary landscape, revealed in the monophonic union created between a lecturer and his/her discipline in chorus²⁶² behind the units (re-)constructing disciplinary knowledge. Although Bakhtin lists acknowledged scientific truth as one example of the “authoritative word” (Bakhtin 1981: 342) which permits “no play with its borders” (ibid), demands to remain static, and expresses the intent and word of “the other” as much or more than that of the speaker, whether this typical management of Intertextuality in this area amounts to “reverential transmission” (Bakhtin 1986: 121) is a moot point. Nevertheless, the management choice of *Unmarked* [I] units certainly enacts very little play with the borders of disciplinary paradigms, indeed

²⁶² Cf. Max Planck’s argument that a basic aim of science is “the finding of a fixed world picture independent of the variation of time and people” or in other words “the complete liberation of the physical picture from the individuality of separate intellects” (Planck 1909. Cited in Manicas 1988: 245).

the lack of play is precisely what (re-)constructs paradigms, though this may be a function as much of the genre as of the discourse itself.

However, and perhaps somewhat surprisingly, this study also indicates that some lectures from disciplinary areas within Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences also exhibit an almost exclusive reliance on this management of Intertextuality too, suggesting the existence of equally influential, authoritative paradigms behind some of these disciplinary areas as well, particularly in more established disciplinary areas such as English and History. This certainly seems to suggest that at the level of the undergraduate lecture at least, and on the basis of currently limited evidence, these disciplines are also rather homogeneous in nature. This however would seem to contradict previous research on academic discourse in these disciplinary areas (Bazerman 1981, Nelson et al 1987a, Hyland 2000), and it is probably the case firstly that academic disciplines are (re-)constructed differently in different academic genres, and secondly that even supposedly heterogeneous disciplines such as are typically found in Arts & Humanities carry stocks of trusted disciplinary knowledge with paradigmatic status at the level of the undergraduate lecture. Therefore further research, not only on a larger corpus of lectures and in different genres, but also ethnographic in nature, will be needed to establish more precisely if this is indeed the case, or if on the other hand lecturers in some disciplinary areas perhaps avoid marking knowledge-statements as their own knowledge-claims in this specific genre if their discipline fosters an independent stance by default. This may well be the case in History for instance.

Nevertheless, despite the observed variety within the grouping, this study indicates that Arts & Humanities areas typically, though less conclusively, manage Intertextuality in their undergraduate lecture discourse via Disciplinary Intertext *Reporting Verb* [III] and/or *Reporting Noun* [II] units, enacting not a chorus between lecturer and discipline but dialogue, meaning their diachronic disciplinary discourses are typically (re-)constructed as contingent, subjective, non-community-endorsed knowledge-claims, suggesting in turn more fractured and inconclusive paradigms behind these disciplinary areas. In this sense, typically these are more heterogeneous disciplinary areas, with influential roles for individual talking disciplinary agents in their undergraduate lecture discourse, and consequently too a more active and influential *I* role for a lecturer as the “second centre of consciousness” behind the units, acting as mediator and evaluator.

This study also suggests though that not only does disciplinary background influence the management of Intertextuality, but so too probably does the chronological status of the disciplinary discourse being reaccentuated in a lecture. This is suggested for instance in the extensive use of *Unmarked* [I] units for managing Intertextual relations in more mature Arts & Humanities disciplines in the study, and suggested too by the fact that more contemporary disciplinary discourses, even in science areas, seem to be (re-)constructed to a significant extent via *Reporting Verb* [III] units. This was particularly evident in lecture 19 ‘Artificial Life’, a very polyphonic lecture, but also in lecture 17 ‘Genetics’, exhibiting as it did a very reflexive awareness of the constitutive nature of discourse and agency in its knowledge. The apparent relative absence of cutting-edge disciplinary discourse (re-)constructed in undergraduate lectures, or in those in this particular corpus at

least, in turn suggests too though that typically at the undergraduate level, more contemporary disciplinary discourses are generally less likely to appear in undergraduate lectures. Further research, both on lectures at Masters and/or PhD levels in disciplinary areas, and research of an ethnographic nature too, will be necessary to establish what disciplinary protocols tend to be regarding this, and if the chronology of disciplinary discourses does influence their (re-)construction in lectures. As knowledge is essentially a chronological outcome and/or product, there are likely to be important links between the chronology of disciplinary discourses and their management in their re-telling.

These distinctions above are primarily *Soft-Hard* (Becher 1989) distinctions, suggesting that typically, there are clear and observable differences regarding the management of Intertextuality in undergraduate lectures between disciplines at opposite ends of this cline. However, this study has also observed an important distinction between lectures deriving from *Pure* and *Applied* (ibid) disciplines, namely that in lectures deriving from the latter areas, particularly *Soft-Applied* (ibid) disciplines, there seems to be a more individual *I* role for a lecturer in disciplinary meaning-(re-)making, evidenced by the typically higher extents of Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality [IV] & [V] units in these lectures. Such contributions may be knowledge-claims per se, or more often narratives deriving from a lecturer's work and/or life, but they mark a key distinction between *Pure* and *Applied* (ibid) disciplines, and typically are unusual in the former. This shows the distinction between knowledge for knowledge's sake in *Pure* (ibid) disciplines, meaning knowledge-statements and/or claims in these areas always have a discursive and social relationship with a disciplinary corpus, while in *Applied* (ibid) disciplines on

the other hand, knowledge is for practical end results, and as such moves into and derives from other social contexts, processes which seem to be managed in undergraduate lectures via Lecturer Intertext [IV] & [V] units. In other words, the orders of discourse drawn on are typically more diverse in *Applied* (ibid) disciplines, and those deriving from beyond the academy per se seem typically to be managed via Lecturer Intertext [IV] & [V] units. This is not to say that a higher extent of such Lecturer Intertext units marks a lecture conclusively as deriving from an *Applied* (ibid) discipline, as such a feature can also typically be found in lectures which exhibit a high extent of Disciplinary Intertext *Reporting Verb* [III] and/or *Reporting Noun* [II] units, where it functions to bring closure to the heterogeneity caused by such units in discourse (Jakoby 1987), but lectures deriving from *Applied* (ibid) disciplines, particularly those towards the *Soft* (ibid) end of the *Hard-Soft* (ibid) cline, do tend to exhibit this feature.

These then are the principal findings and achievements of this study, but before we move on to assess the methodology and to discuss further areas for research, I will discuss what the study suggests particularly about Intertextuality, but also academic disciplines and genre.

5.3 Intertextuality

This study has conceived a rather structuralist, literalist understanding of Intertextuality, and certainly a very specific one which may not necessarily be suitable for all genres, and one which may, in taking such a literalist stance, have sidestepped some of the more celebrated aspects of the phenomenon such as the destabilisation of exact meaning (Kristeva 1980 & 1986, Barthes 1974, 1975,

1977a), or the moot implications for subjectivity (Kristeva *ibid*) and authorhood (Barthes *ibid*, Foucault 1979). The advantage of this understanding nevertheless is that it isolates Intertextuality firmly as a recognisable and observable phenomenon in discourse, and, in contrast to post-structuralist approaches, situates it directly within human relations and social interaction – and in so doing exposes it for systematic study. Such an understanding of the phenomenon should not be seen as challenging other understandings though, but as complementing them.

In a highly specific genre such as that of the undergraduate lecture, where such an understanding is not only possible but rewarding, this study shows that Intertextuality and specifically, its management, is central in shaping the reproduction of academic communities at undergraduate level. It is directly at the fulcrum of this process, in that social relationships, central in the production and reproduction of disciplinary “knowledge”, at once shape the management of Intertextuality, and in turn are (re-)shaped by it. The management of Intertextuality not only confers a discursive order on past discourse (Kristeva 1980 & 1986), be it homogeneous or heterogeneous order, but crucially also moves that order into the future too. And that order is both a discursive order and a social order, the two cannot be separated. Even the most monophonic management of Intertextuality imaginable, with no dialogism whatsoever and thus no change in a discourse whatsoever, such as typically happens with some religious texts for instance, moves not only the discourse, but the social order behind it, into the present and future, albeit in an unchanged form. This is probably why the reproduction of such discourse becomes enveloped in ritualistic behaviour, dress and even tone, such phenomena perhaps are the skeletal remains of the lack of dialogic life in such

discourse. Only in such discourse could we rightly say “the author is dead” (Barthes 1977a: 142-8). As such the management of Intertextuality is the link between past present and future in all areas of social life, but particularly in such obviously discursively-constituted areas of social life as academic disciplines and knowledge.

This is why the Bakhtinian perspective, highlighting as it does the central role(s) of human agency in the phenomenon, is a more rewarding and credible perspective than more recent post-structuralist conceptualisations of the term, which emphasise Intertextuality as anonymous code which in a sense speaks the speaker and (re-)constructs him/her as a social being, but in a process in which the speaker has little conscious control. For a speaker to live within a discourse in this sense however, or even to ‘be spoken by a discourse’, s/he must fully accept that discourse and the social order behind it – and one could question quite how often this in fact happens in social life, or at least in a democratic social life, and quite how deterministic this process necessarily is. Nevertheless, what one can say is that this is precisely why totalitarianism is the death of dialogism and why powerful discourses can be thought of in terms of symbolic control (Bernstein 1990 & 1996)²⁶³ or even in terms of symbolic violence (Bourdieu 1991).

Consequently, while at the very broadest level post-structuralist conceptualisations may be true to a degree, in that a speaker cannot dialogue but via code(s) whose history moves way beyond the contemporary individual, both socially and historically, what such theorisations crucially neglect nevertheless is firstly that the

²⁶³ “Symbolic control is the means whereby consciousness is given a specialised form and distributed through forms of consciousness which relay a given distribution of power and dominant cultural categories. Symbolic control translates power relations into discourse and discourse into power relations” (Bernstein 1990: 134)

individual speaking agent lies at the heart of this process, and, assuming democratic freedoms, s/he speaks in specific socio-cultural contexts in/for which s/he adopts and adapts anonymous code but, vitally, renders it specific, both socially and tempero-spatially. Or in other words, the diachronic word is repopulated (Bakhtin 1981: 293) with the current speaker's intention, which although in itself may be influenced by larger social factors (such as "speaking as a lecturer", or in terms of the inequitable social distribution of "genre consciousnesses"²⁶⁴), nevertheless cannot be neglected, as without this, the word would simply die or simply remain utterly static. The very fact that language use changes across individuals and across groups insists that the role of the individual agent cannot be forgotten.

Secondly, such theorisations typically take language as constituting consciousness and identity, and while again at the broadest level this is very much true (Bakhtin 1981 & 1986, Bakhtin/Medvedev 1928 in Morris 1994, Mead 1934, Bernstein 1990 & 1996), nevertheless consciousness and identity are not static entities that simply arrive on us and/or into which we slip as we enter the realm of language and the social, otherwise human consciousness and identity, at both the individual and the group level, would never change. Yet they do change, and furthermore it is precisely through dialogism that they do change (Bakhtin *ibid*). Therefore Intertextuality cannot be credibly theorised in the absence of the human agent, as

²⁶⁴ "One might say that human consciousness possesses a series of inner genres for seeing and conceptualising reality. A given consciousness is richer or poorer in genres, depending on its ideological environment." (Bakhtin/Medvedev 1928 in Morris 1994: 178). See also Bernstein (e.g. Bernstein 1990 & 1996) on the distribution of such genre-consciousness(es) as social and/or political in nature, or writers from contemporary literacy studies (e.g. Candlin & Plum (eds) 1998, Barton et al (eds) 1999, Barton 1994, Lea & Street 1998 & 1999) on literacy as a social phenomenon, or detailed ethnographic studies of literacy and the social (e.g. Heath 1983, Barton & Hamilton 1998)

s/he is at the very least the crucible within which Intertextuality is to be located and the catalyst which ensures Intertextuality even “is” in the first place.

Understood in these ways, we can see the central role(s) played by the management of Intertextuality in the academy itself, and with particular regard to the genre of the undergraduate lecture, we can see epistemological and sociological landscapes behind disciplines not only playing very influential roles in the management of Intertextuality in the genre, but also as being reproduced in so doing. This illustrates Bakhtin’s point that “any concrete utterance is a link in the chain of speech communication of a particular sphere” (Bakhtin 1986: 84), and illustrates moreover that continued utterances within “a particular sphere” are vital for that sphere to continue as a recognisable and meaningful socio-cultural entity. This is very much what the genre of the undergraduate lecture ensures in the academy, and a change in the ways that the constitutive Intertextuality of a sphere is managed will bring about changes in the nature of that sphere in its reproduced state – enabling for instance the construction of disciplinary paradigms. Or for that matter their deconstruction.

This is why not only is the system of Intertextuality central within continuing socio-cultural lives, and especially within the academy, but why too the central roles of agency within the system cannot be discounted – it is only via situated agent-derived dialogue with and within a sphere, whether that be of a monophonic or dialogic nature, that a sphere continues to exist as a meaningful entity and avoid becoming an abstract shell. In this way, spheres, be they institutional structures or social groups of any kind, are best understood not as systems of things but as systems of doers which continue to exist only via actions of their doers, and why

Intertextuality, as central within this process in the academy, cannot be isolated from its doers.

The view of Intertextuality argued above has clear implications for conceptualisations of academic disciplines too, specifically that they be regarded as systems of actors as opposed to systems of actions, perhaps as “communities of practice” (Wenger 1998), interaction within and with which gives both an academic discipline and its members disciplinary identity. This identity is not fixed however, but is in effect renegotiated in all instances of practice – and particularly via the management of intertextual relations in their various genres.

The view of Intertextuality argued above also has implications for notions of genre, particularly that genres are highly intertextual entities, and that as with disciplines above, it is interaction within and through a genre that means the continued existence and development of that genre. Genres are also what further problematise post-structuralist conceptualisations of Intertextuality, in that they are a means by which code(s) is anything but anonymous and random. Instead, genres locate code(s) both historically and socially within meaningful, socially-understood and recognised forms. Therefore while it is true that a speaker cannot dialogue but via code(s) whose existence moves way beyond the contemporary individual, both socially and historically, genres stabilise these code(s) such that they come to a speaker already formed.

In conclusion, in investigating how genres, or at least this specific genre of the undergraduate lecture, “accommodate and reconstruct or reproduce” discourses

(Kress & Threadgold 1988: 236), this study shows that genres are thoroughly intertextual entities, and moreover that the different means by which undergraduate lectures “accommodate and reconstruct or reproduce” (ibid) disciplinary discourses, or manage Intertextuality, is primary in conferring discursive personality on lecture discourse and as such is both the product and producer of the primary areas of difference between lectures in different disciplines.

5.4 The Limitations of the Study

In this section, I will look briefly at the academic discipline as a unit of analysis, and then at aspects of the methodology.

5.4.1 Academic Discipline as Unit of Analysis

While the notion of the academic discipline is a valuable cross-institutional concept²⁶⁵, it may well be the case that in fact this unit of analysis is becoming redundant. One important consideration here is firstly that disciplines themselves change over time, and increasingly rapidly so, meaning that the distinctions between disciplines, what Bernstein (1996) terms a discipline’s classification, the extent to which its contents are clearly delineated from those of other disciplines, may become eroded. For instance, the classification of academic disciplines by Aristotle (in Schwab 1964: 15ff) into the three groups of theoretical, practical, and productive disciplines, is hopelessly outdated today, as is that of Comte and his so-called positive hierarchy of the sciences²⁶⁶ (in Schwab 1964: 18ff and Manicas 1988:

²⁶⁵ “Disciplinary cultures, in virtually all fields, transcend the institutional boundaries within any given system. In many, but not all, instances, they also span national boundaries” (Becher 1994: 153)

²⁶⁶ “... five fundamental sciences in successive dependence, - Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry, Physiology, and finally, Social Physics. The first considers the most general, simple, abstract, and remote phenomena known to us, and those which affect all others without being affected by them. The last considers the most particular, compound, concrete phenomena, and those which are the most

60ff). Instead, there are increasingly rapid changes in the structure of the academy, characterised for instance by a move towards performativity (Barnett: 2000), the greater value placed on operational competence over academic competence (ibid), and a move towards what Gibbons et al (1994) term ‘mode 2’ knowledge over ‘mode 1’ (outmoded disciplinary structures). Mode 2 characteristics include (ibid):

- Knowledge is produced in context of application
- Transdisciplinarity is the norm
- Heterogeneity and organisational diversity are common

Implicit in the fundamental changes underway in Higher Education are the general economic and societal changes underway in what is termed as ‘postmodernism’ (Scott 1997, Harvey 1989, Lyotard 1984, Baudrillard 1988), one of the most important consequences of which for Higher Education is that privileged bodies of information controlled by academic hierarchies (what might in some respects be known as academic disciplines) are becoming legacies of the past, and instead Higher Education seems to be entering a very uncertain brave new world in which these structures are both multiplying and diluting, and their boundaries completely altering.

Barnett (2000) terms the resulting new situations in Higher Education as “supercomplexity”²⁶⁷, one of the many consequences of which is the emergence of

interesting to man.” (Comte in Manicas 1988: 61). These ideas are memorably described as “tyrannical” by Manicas (1988:62) for their ideal of forcing natural laws derived from physics onto society, and for the way they led to the search for a natural order in evolution (Darwin and Spencer), a natural order in society (Locke, Comte), the existence of laws for economy (Adam Smith) and the mechanical nature and hence predictability of history (Hegel, Marx and Engels).

²⁶⁷ “Supercomplexity arises when the separate elements come to operate under their own rules and motivations, and so become disconnected from each other. And that is exactly the situation into which the postmodern university has drifted. There are – it would seem – no general rules that hold the university together; nor is there any single set of ideas that supplies any unifying ideology; and nor, as a final resort, is there any discipline that can seriously lay claim to holding some kind of

what Barnett (ibid: 95) terms 'epistemological space', into which many new forms and concepts of knowledge (or multiple knowledges) can fit, meaning, as Barnett (ibid: 104) says, "a discipline's space cannot be held pure to itself; it is subject to invasion from any quarter" (Barnett 2000: 104):

"in a university, in an age of supercomplexity, there can be no fixed borders. Borders, boundaries and demarcations: these necessary elements of institutional and social life have to be permanently on the move in the postmodern university" (Barnett 2000: 107)

Whether this is to be welcomed or feared is unclear, but it has attracted much comment. Smith & Webster (1997a) talk neutrally of 'epistemological wobble', Lukaszewicz (1994) talks very negatively of 'expanding ignorance' and the 'ignorance explosion', while Barnett (2000) talks more positively of 'epistemological elasticity'. Clark (1996: 18) maintains that the more recent history of disciplines is one of "unrelenting generation of new fields and specialities, of specialisation that on a world-wide scale is uncontrolled and uncontrollable", while Gibbons (1998) meanwhile goes as far as to declare that this all in fact signals 'the end of disciplines'.

Whatever the consequences may be, an important consequence of such changes in relation to studies such as the current one therefore is that the academic discipline, as a unit of comparison, may well be unwieldy and too monolithic, and analysis of small numbers of the lectures from a 'discipline' may therefore present a misleading picture. For this reason, it may well be that a more appropriate unit of analysis is

signal position and that, thereby, can act as a kind of epistemic supernova under whose light others are drawn." (Barnett 2000: 88)

that of what Becher (1989 & 2001) terms specialisms. Becher (ibid) maintains in fact that specialisms in one discipline may have more in common with similar specialisms in another discipline than with the parent discipline. For this reason, although it may initially be difficult to identify specialisms, such a unit may prove to be more suitable in future studies.

5.4.2 Methodology

There are a number of issues to consider here. Firstly regarding issues of data collection, it is imperative that lectures not only be audiotaped but videotaped too, as this gives consistent access to phenomena which may further enrich analyses, for instance paralinguistic cues, identified as being important, both in this study and elsewhere (Couper-Kuhlen 1998), in switches between voices, particularly in instances of *Constructed Dialogue* (Tannen 1989). It would also be useful, where possible, to conduct recorded interviews with both the lecturer and the audience immediately after a lecture has been recorded, so as to gain additional information which may assist in analyses and to establish lecturer and audience perceptions of the event while they are still remembered.

Secondly, regarding issues of data transcription, transcriptions need not only to be consistent and detailed in terms of the discourse uttered, particularly regarding inserts and so on which might easily be missed, but also, while striking a balance between usability and detail, encoding of instances of paralinguistic cues and prosodic features would also further enrich later analyses and/or allow investigations of specific features as they relate to the management of

Intertextuality. Such features will enrich future analyses, especially prosodic features with instances of interaction managed via *Constructed Dialogue* (ibid).

Furthermore, an important lack in this study has been copies of all other semiotic material used in a lecture²⁶⁸, for instance copies of audience handouts, slides, diagrams, boardwork and so on, as such material is likely to influence discourse patterns in a lecture, particularly regarding the management and extents of Intratextuality. In the future, such material should consistently be collected and copied, and/or videoed in the case of boardwork.

Thirdly, regarding the specific corpus of twenty-four lectures used in this study, although it was a substantial size, it would clearly be advantageous to have used as large a corpus as possible, and probably one larger than was actually used. This would mean more than one lecture can be used to assess disciplinary identity/ies at undergraduate level, making conclusions more valid and reliable, and in particular would go further towards ensuring that one instance of an idiosyncratic lecture does not alter findings to any significant degree and/or lead to conclusions that may be appropriate for that lecture but not necessarily for the discipline behind it. Given the changes in disciplinary identities identified above, it may also be expedient to select lectures in terms of their specialism as opposed to their discipline.

Fourthly, regarding the methodology used for the coding of independent units. Although the coding typology was successfully applied, it is nevertheless difficult to distinguish at times quite what function a unit is realising and/or what *Intertext* lies

²⁶⁸ See Kress (1998) who identifies a central role played by other semiotic media such as diagrams in science education, and illustrates that such semiotic systems are of equal status with language and therefore equally as important.

behind a unit(s). This is particularly the case sometimes when distinguishing between *Lecturer* and *Disciplinary Intertext*, lecture 9 ‘Silence as Evidence’ proving the most troublesome in this regard, albeit that such difficulty indicates by default how polyphonic a lecture is.

In contrast to this however, the coding typology in fact also needs to be expanded slightly, specifically with regard to the function of *Scaffolding* [XVII]. The initial data suggested that in terms of management choices, the single choice of *Disciplinary Intertext* was sufficient for this function, but the larger corpus indicated that in fact this was mistaken on the analyst’s part, and it needs the option of *Lecturer Intertext* too. The category of *Scaffolding* [XVII] also needs to be broken into broader categories in terms of specific function too, so as to be able to differentiate between discourse focussing on main points in a lecture, the original functional identity of the category, and instances of discourse realising narratives which form the basis of disciplinary discussion, particularly common in lecture 9 ‘Silence as Evidence’, and discourse realising read-aloud instances of novels, poetry and so on which again form the basis of discussion, particularly common in lecture 6 ‘Allegory in The faerie Queene’. As it currently stands, this functional category has become a bit of a catch-all, and as such is insufficient. This is unfortunate as in the analyst’s eyes it is one of the most interesting functions identified in the genre. The coding typology would also benefit from having its category of *Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs* [III] enlarged and refined so as to accommodate the various patterns and their varying degrees of dialogising effects identified within this study encoded within it in future studies from the outset, thus enabling a focus on purely quantitative analyses.

Finally, there is the thorny and perennial problem in such studies as this of moving from observation to interpretation. This study has developed a rich series of understandings of discourse, knowledge and Intertextuality, within which interpretations were duly made. This means however that such observations are theory-laden (Knorr-Cetina 1980), or instances perhaps of “situated cognition” (Berkenhotter & Huckin 1995) and may not stand up to critical scrutiny from outside such a paradigm as was created for this study. For instance, there is a strong background of philosophical idealism behind the methodology and its supporting theorisations of knowledge and Intertextuality which could be challenged by some.

Some observations moreover also relied on the assumption that lecturers manage Intertextuality consistently, regardless of its origins, i.e. regardless of which orders of discourse it derives from. However, it is conceivable that the origin(s) of (re-)constructed discourse may influence its management as much as do disciplinary characteristics, which raises the question of what happens if/when a lecturer takes discourse and/or ‘knowledge’ from outside his/her immediate disciplinary area? Does this change its management? This is all the more important to resolve given firstly the sweeping changes coming over the academy and the breakdown of traditional disciplinary territories (Becher 2001, Barnett 2000) discussed above, and secondly the observed tendency to realise discourse from outside the academy via *Lecturer Intertext*. It may well be the case that the management of the (re-)construction of discourse whose origins lie outside a discipline’s or specialism’s immediate area is influenced or even determined by its origins as opposed to being determined by the discipline itself.

5.5 Recommendations for Further Research

In terms of future research, there are a number of future research areas opened up by this investigation. Firstly, a similar study could, and probably should be conducted on a bigger corpus, so as to enable greater reliability and to lessen the impact(s) of particular lectures on findings. This can be both in terms of more lectures from single disciplinary areas or specialisms (Becher 1989) and in terms of larger disciplinary groupings too.

Furthermore, future studies should include inter-genre analyses, to see if the genre of the undergraduate lecture shares management patterns with other academic genres, particularly post-graduate lectures, undergraduate textbooks, and undergraduate and post-graduate seminars. This could also stretch to knowledge-transforming (Bereiter & Scardamalia 1987) genres to see to what extents and in what manners the different author aims in such genres influence management choices. The move from the state of Intertextuality as a default situation in knowledge-telling genres (ibid) to that of Intertextuality as strategic resource is very likely to have significant effects on its management.

Secondly, such studies as these are in great need of accompanying ethnographic research as a means of consolidating and/or enriching, or of rejecting, analyst conclusions deriving from textual research. This would also help in identifying to what degrees lecturers are aware of their discursive management(s) of Intertextuality, and why they manage it in the ways they do, helping to lessen the

difficulty of moving from analysis of an individual disciplinary agent to conclusions about a disciplinary tendency.

Thirdly, there should also be future longitudinal studies of the management of Intertextuality in undergraduate lectures. This is firstly because disciplines and disciplinary territories are changing, as discussed above, and secondly because this study has identified that the age of the disciplinary discourse (re-)constructed in a lecture seems to influence the management of its Intertextual relations, particularly in science area where the status of knowledge and therefore its discursive management is more likely to change with time.

Finally, this study has taken a rather literalist theorisation of dialogism and Intertextuality as its conceptual backdrop, and perhaps one open to challenge by more post-structuralist understandings of the term. If such theorisations are right in saying that human consciousness and subjectivity is derived from relations in and with what is in effect little more than abstract code, and that such codes determine what we think and theorise and the language in which this happens, then the implications for a study such as this are severe. If we look back to early science and remember the way such early science originally drew on what now seem very unusual and even perhaps even irrelevant orders of discourse such as dramatic, staged dialogues, and tropes from Hermetic alchemy or the bible and so on in order to construct scientific knowledge (Paradis 1983, Bazerman 1993b), so too may the current orders of discourse drawn on in this study seem equally unusual and perhaps even irrelevant too in the future – in which case theorisations such as Kristeva's may prove to be more apt than this study has suggested.

REFERENCES

- Aaronson, S. (1975). The footnotes of science. *Mosaic* 6(2), 22-7.
- Adams, P., Heaton, B. & Howarth, P. (Eds). (1991). *Sociocultural Issues in English for Academic Purposes. Developments in ELT*. Hemel Hempsted; Phoenix ELT.
- Adams-Smith, D.E. (1984). Medical Discourse: Aspects of Author's Comment. *English for Specific Purposes* 3, 25-36
- Aebersold, J. & Field, M. (1997). *From reader to reading teacher: issues and strategies for second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Agger, G. (2001). *Intertextuality Revisited: Dialogues and Negotiations in Media Studies*. [http://www.uqtr.quebec.ca/AE/vol_4/gunhild.htm] [04/12/2004]
- Alderson, J. & Urquhart, A. (Eds.). (1984). *Reading in a foreign language*. London: Longman.
- Alexandrov, D. & Struchkov, A. (1993). *Bakhtin's Legacy and the History of Science and Culture: An Interview with Anatolii Akhutin and Vladimir Bibler*. Conducted by Daniel Alexandrov and Anton Struchkov. *Configurations* 1(3), 335.
- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Allsen, J. (1993). Intertextuality and compositional process in two cantilena motets by Hugo de Lantsi. *Journal of Musicology*, 11(2), 174-202.
- Allwright, J., Clark, R., & Marshall-Lee, A. (1996). Developing a Critical Approach to Study. In Hewings, M. and Dudley-Evans, T. (Eds.). *Evaluation And*

- Course Design In EAP*. Prentice Hall Macmillan in association with The British Council.
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New Left Books. London.
- Anderson, A. & Lynch, T. (1988). *Listening*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, P. V., Brockmann, R. J., & Miller, C. R. (Eds.). (1983). *New essays in technical and scientific communication: Research, theory, practice*. Farmingdale, NY: Baywood Publishing Co.
- Anderson, T. (1997). Integrating lectures and electronic course materials. *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 34(1), 24-31.
- Anderson-Hsieh, J. & Koehler, K. (1988). The effects of foreign accent and speaking rate on native speaker comprehension. *Language Learning*, 38, 561-613.
- Apple, M.W. & Christian-Smith, L. (Eds.). (1991a). *The Politics of the Textbook*. London: Routledge.
- Apple, M.W. (1991b). The Culture and Commerce of the Textbook. In Apple, M.W. & Christian-Smith, L. (Eds.). *The Politics of the Textbook*. London: Routledge.
- Apple, M.W. (Ed.). (1995). *Review of Research in Education*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Ashmore, M., Mulkay, M., & Pinch, T. (1989). *Health And Efficiency*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Atkinson, D. (1992). The evolution of medical research writing from 1735 to 1985. the case of the Edinburgh Medical Journal. *Applied Linguistics*, 13(4), 337-374.

- Atkinson, D. (2001). Reflections and refractions on the JSLW special issue on voice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(72-76).
- Atkinson, J. & Heritage, J. (Eds.). *Structure of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge.
- Bachmair, B. (2000). Creator Spiritus: Virtual Texts in Everyday Life. In Meinhof, U.H. & Smith, J. (Eds.). *Intertextuality and The Media*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Bacon, F. (1963). *The Works of Francis Bacon, 14 Volumes*. Spedding, J., Ellis, R.L., and Heath, D.D. (Eds.). FriEdrich Fromann Verlag: Stuttgart
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. (Trans. and Ed. Emerson, C.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*. (Trans. McGee, V. Eds. Caryl Emerson, C & Holquist, M). University of Texas Press: Austin.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1990). *Art and answerability*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. (Trans. Emerson, C. & Holquist, M.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Banfield A (1982). *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and representation in the Language of Fiction*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Banfield A. (1973). Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech. *Foundations of Language*, 10, 1-39.
- Banfield, A. (1993). Where epistemology, style and grammar meet literary history: The development of represented speech and thought. In Lucy, J. (1993a)

- (Ed.). *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barett, O. (Eds.). *Media Texts: Authors and Readers*. Multilingual Matters:
Clevedon.
- Bargiela-Chiappini, F. & Nickerson, C. (1999a). Business writing as social action.
In Bargiela-Chiappini, F. & Nickerson, C. (Eds.), *Writing business: Genres,
media and discourses*. London: Longman.
- Bargiela-Chiappini, F. & Nickerson, C. (Eds.). (1999b). *Writing business: Genres,
media and Discourses*. London: Longman.
- Barker, E. (1985). The Conversion of conversion: A Sociological Anti-Reductionist
Perspective. In Peacocke (Ed.). *Reductionism in Academic Disciplines*.
SRHE & NFER-WILSON. Guildford.
- Barker, P. (1998). Virtual universities and electronic course delivery. [[http://www.
bireme.br/cgi-bin/crics4w/text0?id=crics4-mr2-co2](http://www.bireme.br/cgi-bin/crics4w/text0?id=crics4-mr2-co2)]
- Barker, P., & Tan, C. (1997). Making a Case for Electronic Lectures, *Innovations in
Education and Training International*, 34(1), 11-16.
- Barnes, B. & Edge, D. (Eds.). (1982). *Science in Context*. Open University Press:
Milton Keynes.
- Barnes, B. (1974), *Scientific Knowledge and Sociological Theory*, London:
Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Barnes, B. (1977). *Interests and the Growth of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Barnes, B. (1982). *T.S. Kuhn and Social Sciences*. London: Macmillan.
- Barnes, D., Bloor, D. & Henry, J. (1996). *Scientific Knowledge: A Sociological
Analysis*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

- Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the University in an age of supercomplexity*. SRHE and Open University Press: Buckingham.
- Barnett, R. (Ed.). (1994). *Academic Community: Discourse or Discord?* London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Barthes, R. (1974). *S/Z*. (Trans. Howard, R.). New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barthes, R. (1975). *The Pleasure of the Text*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barthes, R. (1977a). *Image – Music – Text*. (Trans. Heath, S.). Fontana: London.
- Barthes, R. (1977b). *Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes*. (Trans. Howard, R.). Hill and Wang: New York.
- Barthes, R. (1981). Theory of the Text. In Young, R. (Ed.). *Untying The Text: A Post-structuralist Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Barthes, R. (1984). *Elements of Semiology*. (Trans. Lavers, A & Smith, C.). Jonathan Cape: London.
- Barthes, R. (1990). *Fragments: A Lover's Discourse*. (Trans. Howard, R.). London: Penguin.
- Bartholomae, D. (1986). Inventing the university. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 5, 4-23.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barton, D. & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local Literacies: reading and writing in one community*. London: Routledge.
- Barton, D. (1994). *Literacy: An Introduction to the Ecology of Written Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context*. London: Routledge.

- Basturkmen, H. (1998). 'Discourse in MBA Seminars: Towards a Description for Pedagogical Description'. *English for Specific Purposes* 18(1).
- Baudrillard, J. (1988). *Selected Writings*. (Ed. Poster, M.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Baynham, M. (1996). Direct speech: What's it doing in non-narrative discourse? *Journal of Pragmatics* 25, 61-81.
- Bazerman, C. (1981). What written knowledge does: Three examples of academic discourse. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 11, 361-387.
- Bazerman, C. (1983). *Scientific writing as a social act: a review of the literature of the sociology of science*. In Anderson, P.V., Brockman, R.J., & Miller, C.R. (Eds.). *New Essays in Technical and Scientific Communication*. Baywood: Farmingdale.
- Bazerman, C. (1987). Codifying The Social Scientific Style. The APA Publication Manual as a Behaviorist Rhetoric. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds.). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin Press.
- Bazerman, C. (1992). From Cultural Criticism to Disciplinary Participation: Living with Powerful Words. In Herrington, A. & Moran, C. (Eds.). *Writing, Teaching, and Learning in the Disciplines*. New York: Modern Language Association.
- Bazerman, C. (1993a). Intertextual self-fashioning: Gould and Lewontin's representation of the literature. In Selzer, J. (Ed.). *Understanding Scientific Prose*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Bazerman, C. (1993b). Forums of Validation and Forms of Knowledge: The Magical Rhetoric of Otto von Guericke's Sulfur Globe. [<http://muse.jhu.edu/cgi-bin/access.cgi?url=/journals/configurations/v001/1.2bazerman.html&session=21509259>] [04/12/04].
- Bazerman, C., & Paradis, J. (Eds.). (1991). *Textual Dynamics of the Professions: Historical and Contemporary Studies of Writing in Professional Communities*. Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin Press.
- Bazerman, C. (1984). Modern Evolution of the Experimental Report in Physics: Spectroscopic Articles in Physical Review, 1893-1980. *Social Studies in Science* 14, 163-96.
- Beaman, K. (1984) Coordination and subordination revisited: syntactic complexity in spoken and written narrative discourse. In D. Tannen (Ed.) *Coherence in spoken and written discourse*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Becher, T. (1981). Towards a definition of disciplinary cultures. *Studies in Higher Education*, 6(2).
- Becher, T. (1987). Disciplinary Discourse. *Studies in Higher Education* 12(3).
- Becher, T. (1994). The Significance of Disciplinary Differences. *Studies in Higher Education*, 19(2).
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic Tribes and Territories: intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Becher, T. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories: intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. 2nd Edition. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Behr, A.L. (1988). Exploring the Lecture Method: an empirical study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 13(2).

- Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., Swidler, A., & Tipton S. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Benest, I. (1997). The specification and presentation of on-line lectures. *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 34(1), 32-43.
- Benson, J. & Greaves, W. (Eds.). *Systemic perspectives on discourse*. Volume 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Benson, M. (1989). The academic listening task: a case study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(3), 421-445.
- Benson, M. (1994). *Lecture Listening in an Ethnographic Perspective*. In Flowerdew, J, (Ed.). (1994a). *Academic Listening Research Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benveniste, E. (1966). *Problems in general linguistics*. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press.
- Bereiter, C. and Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The Psychology of Written Composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Berger, P. and Luckman, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality*. Penguin. London.
- Berkenhotter, C., & Huckin, T. (1993). Rethinking genre from a socio-cognitive perspective. *Written Communication* 10(4), 475-509.
- Berkenkotter, C. & Huckin, T. (1995). *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication. Cognition/Culture/Power*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Berman, R. (1984). Syntactic components of the foreign language reading process. In Alderson and Urquhart (Eds). *Reading in a foreign language*. London: Longman.
- Bernard, C. (1957). *An Introduction to the Study of Experimental Medicine*. (Trans. Greene, H.C.). New York: Dover.
- Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of Educational knowledge. In Young, M. (Ed.). *Knowledge and Control*. London. Collier-Macmillan.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *Class, Codes and Control: The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Besnier N. (1993). Reported speech and affect on Nukulaelae atoll. In Hill & Irvine (Eds.). *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse: Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Besnier, N. (1990). Language and affect. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 419-451.
- Bhatia, V. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings* Harlow: Longman.
- Bhatia, V. (1999). Integrating products, processes, processes and participants in professional writing. In Candlin, C. & Hyland, K. (Eds.). *Writing: Texts, processes and practices*. London: Longman.
- Biber, D. (1988) *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (1999). *The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Bilbow, G. (1989). Towards an understanding of overseas students' difficulties in lectures: a phenomenographic approach. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 13(2), 85-99.
- Birch, D. & O'Toole, M. (Eds.). (1988). *Functions of Style*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Bizzell, P. (1982). Cognition, convention, and certainty: What we need to know about writing. *PreText*, 3, 213-243.
- Bizzell, P. (1988). Arguing about literacy. *College English*, 50, 141-153.
- Blackburn, S. (1994). *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Bligh, D. (1998). *What's the Use of Lectures?* (5th Edition). Wiltshire: Cromwell Press.
- Bloom, H. (1975). *A map of Misreading*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bloom, H. (1976). *Poetry and Repression*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bloor, D. (1976). *Knowledge and Social Imagery*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bloor, D. (1982). Durkheim and Mauss revisited: classification and the sociology of knowledge. *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science*. 13: 267-97.
- Bloor, D. (1991). *Knowledge and Social Imagery*, 2nd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bolden, G. (2004). The quote and beyond: defining boundaries of Reported speech in conversational Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1071-1118.
- Bondi, M. (1999). *English across genres: Language variation in the discourse of economics*. Modena: Edizioni Il Fiorino.

- Bool, H. and Luford, P. (1999). *Academic Standards and Expectations*. Nottingham: Nottingham University Press.
- Booth, W. (1974). *Modern Dogma and The Rhetoric of Assent*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J-C. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980). The production of belief: contribution to an economy of symbolic goods. *Media, Culture and Society*, 2, 261-93.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J.C., & Martin, M. (1994). *Academic discourse: linguistic misunderstanding and professional power*. (Trans. Teese, R.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bowden, D. (1999). *The mythology of voice*. Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook Heinemann.
- Boyle, R. (1996). Modelling Oral Presentations. *ELT Journal* 50(2).
- Brazil, D. (1985) *The Communicative Value of Intonation in English*. English Language Research: University of Birmingham.
- Brent, D. (1994). Information Technology and The Breakdown of "Places" of Knowledge. *Ejournal*, 4(4)
[\[http://www.ucalgary.ca/ejournal/archive/rachel/v4n4/article.html\]](http://www.ucalgary.ca/ejournal/archive/rachel/v4n4/article.html) [11-08-03]
- Broadhead, G. J., Berlin, J. A. & Broadhead, M. M. (1982). Sentence structure in academic prose and its implications for college writing teachers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 16, 225-240.

- Broich, U. & Pfister, M. (Eds.). (1985). *Intertextualitat: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Brooks, T. (1986). Evidence of Complex Citer Motivations. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 37: 34–36.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- Brown, G. (1990). *Listening to Spoken English*. 2nd Edition. London: Longman.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R. (1987). Reason as Rhetorical: On Relations Among Epistemology, Discourse, and Practice. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Brown, S., Bell, D. & McDowell, L. (1995) What makes a good lecturer in higher education? Outcomes of a SCED/SEDA small-grant project. In Smith, B. & S. Brown (Eds.). *Research Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Bruce, I. (1984). Access and Recruitment to Management. In Goodlad (Ed.). *Education for the Professions. Quis custodiet...?* SRHE & NFER-NELSON. Surrey.
- Bruffee, K. (1986). Social Construction, Language, and the Authority of Knowledge: A Bibliographic Essay. *College English* 48(8), 773-90.
- Brumfit, C. & Mitchell, R. (1991). Research in Applied linguistics of relevance to language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 24(3), 137-142.

- Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The Culture of Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bryson, B. (2003). *A Short History of Nearly Everything*. London: Transworld Publishers.
- Bublitz, W., Lenk, U., & Ventola, E. (Eds.). *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse – How to Create it and How to Describe it: Selected Papers from the International Workshop on Coherence, Augsburg, 24-27 April 1997*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Buck, G. (1991). The testing of listening comprehension: an introspective study. *Language Testing*, 8(1), 67-91.
- Burnard, L. & McEnery, T. (Eds.). (2000). *Rethinking language pedagogy from a corpus perspective*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Burnard, L. (1999). Is Humanities Computing an Academic Discipline? or, Why Humanities Computing Matters. [<http://www.hcu.ox.ac.uk/humcomp.html>.] [04/12/2004].
- Butler, C. (1994). *Early Modernism: Literature, Music and Painting in Europe, 1900-1916*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Buttny, R. (1997). Reported speech in talking race on campus. *Human Communication Research*, 23(4), 477-506.
- Button, G & Sharrock, W. (1993). A disagreement over agreement and consensus in constructionist sociology. *Journal for The Theory of Social Behaviour* 23, 1-25.

- Cadman, K. (1997). Thesis writing for international students: A question of identity? *English for Specific Purposes*. 16, 3-14.
- Caldas-Coulthard, C.R. (1994). On reporting reporting: the representation of speech in factual and fictional narratives. In Coulthard, M. (Ed). (1994a). *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Campbell, J.A. (1987). Charles Darwin: Rhetorician of Science. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Candlin, C. & Hyland, K. (Eds.). (1999). *Writing: texts, processes and practices*. London: Longman.
- Candlin, C. & Maley, Y. (1997). Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the discourse of alternative dispute resolution. In Gunnarsson et al (Eds.). *The Construction of Professional Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Candlin, C. & Plum, G. (Eds.). (1998). *Researching academic literacies. Framing student literacy: cross-cultural aspects of communication skills in Australian university settings*. Sydney: NCELTR, Macquarie University.
- Cannon, W.F. (1968). Darwin's Vision in On The Origin of Species. In Levine, G. & Madden, W. (Eds.). *The Art of Victorian Prose*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Carlson, M. (1994). Invisible presences: performance intertextuality. *Theatre Research International*, 9(2), 111-17.
- Carlston, D.E. (1987). Turning Psychology in on itself. The Rhetoric of Psychology and the Psychology of Rhetoric. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. Language and*

- Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Carrell, P. (1984). The effects of rhetorical organization on ESL readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 1(2).
- Carrell, P. (1990). Second language reading-ability or proficiency? *Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 159-179.
- Carrell, P., Devine, J., & Eskey, D. (Eds.). (1988). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, R. & McCarthy, M. (1995). 'Grammar and The Spoken Language'. *Applied Linguistics* 16(2).
- Cate A. (1996). Modality of verb forms in German Reported speech. In Janssen, T.A. & Wurff, W. (Eds.). (1996a). *Reported Speech: Forms and Functions of the Verb*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chafe W (1994). *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chafe W. (1996). How consciousness shapes language. *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 4(1), 35-54.
- Chafe, W. & Danielewicz, J. (1987). Properties of spoken and written language. In Horowitz, R, & Samuels, S.J. (Eds.), *Comprehending oral and written language*. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- Chafe, W. & Nichols, J. (Eds.). (1986). *Evidentiality. The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Ablex: New Jersey.
- Chafe, W. (1982). Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature. In Tannen (Ed). *Spoken and written language: exploring orality and literacy*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

- Chafe, W. (1986a) Writing in the perspective of speaking. In Cooper, C. & Greenbaum, S. (Eds.). *Studying Writing*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Chafe, W. (1986b). Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In Chafe, W. & Nichols, J. (Eds.). (1986). *Evidentiality*. New Jersey: Ablex.
- Chafe, W. L. (1984). *How People Use Adverbial Clauses*. Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society. Berkeley.
- Chafe, W.L. (1985). Linguistic differences Produced by differences between speaking and writing. In Olson, D.R., Torrance, N. & Hildyard, A. (Eds.). *Literacy, language and learning: The nature and consequences of reading and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chandler, D. (2001). Intertextuality. [<http://www.aber.ac.uk/mEdia/Documents/S4B/sem09.html>] [04/12/2004]
- Chaudron, C. & Richards, J. (1986) The effects of discourse markers on the comprehension of lectures. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 113-127.
- Chaudron, C., Loschky, L. & Cook, J. (1994). In Flowerdew, J. (Ed). (1994a). *Academic Listening Research Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cheyne, J. A., & Tarulli, D. (1999). Dialogue, Difference, and the “Third Voice” in the Zone of Proximal Development. [<http://www.arts.uwaterloo.ca/~acheyne/ZPD.html>] [04/12/2004]
- Chin, E. (1994). Ethnographic interviews and writing research: A critical examination of the methodology. In P. Smagorinsky (Ed.). *Speaking about writing: Reflections on research methodology*. Sage Series in Written Communication, Vol. 8 (pp. 247-272). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Chouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Christie, F. & Martin, J.R. (Eds.). (1997a). *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*. London: Cassell.
- Christie, F. (1991). First- and second-order registers in Education. *Functional and Systemic Linguistics*. E. Ventola. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Christie, F. (1997b). Curriculum Macrogenres as Forms of Initiation into a Culture. In Christie, F. & Martin, J.R. (Eds.). *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*. London: Cassell.
- Christie, F. (1998). Science and apprenticeship. In Martin, J. & Veel, R. *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science*. London: Routledge.
- Christie, F. (1999). Genre theory and ESL teaching: A systemic functional perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(4), 759-763.
- Chubin, D. & Moitra, S.D. (1975). Content analysis of references: adjunct or alternative to citation counting? *Social Studies of Science*, 5, 423-41.
- Clark, B.R. (1996). Diversification of Higher Education: Viability and Change. In Meek, V. and Goedegebuure, L. (Eds.). *The Mockers and The Mocked: Comparative Perspectives on Differentiation, Convergence and Diversity in Higher Education*. IAU Press. Pergamon.
- Clark, H.H. & Gerrig, R.J. (1990). Quotation and demonstration. *Language* 66, 784-805.
- Clarke, M. & Silberstein, S. (1988). Towards a realization of psycholinguistic principles in the ESL reading class. In Carrell, P., Devine, J. & Eskey, D.

- (Eds). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, M. (1988). The short-circuit hypothesis of ESL reading-or when language competence interferes with reading performance. In Carrell, P., Devine, J. & Eskey, D. (Eds). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, S. (1992). Footing in the achievement of neutrality: The case of news interview discourse. In Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clennell,C. 1997. Raising the pedagogic status of discourse intonation teaching. *ELT Journal* 51(2).
- Clerehan,R. (1995). Taking it Down: Notetaking Practices of L1 and L2 Students. *English for Specific Purposes* 14(2).
- Coates. J. (1990). Modal meaning: the semantic-pragmatic interface. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 7(1), 53-63.
- Coffin, C. (1997). Constructing and Giving Value to the Past: An Investigation into Secondary School History. In Christie, F. & Martin, J.R. (Eds.). *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*. London: Cassell.
- Cohen, A. et al. (1979). Reading English for specialized purposes: discourse analysis and the use of student informants. In Carrell, P., Devine, J. & Eskey, D. (Eds). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (Eds.). *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.

- Coles, N., and Wall, S.V. (1987). Conflict and power in the reader-responses of adult basic writers. *College English*, 49, 298-314.
- Collins, H. & Cox, G. (1976). Recovering relativity: did prophecy fail? *Social Studies of Science* 6: 423-44.
- Collins, H. & Pinch, T. (1993). *The Golem... What Everyone Should Know About Science*. Cambridge: Canto.
- Collins, H. (1975). The seven sexes: a study in the sociology of a phenomenon, or the replication of experiments in physics. *Sociology* 9, 205-24.
- Collins, H. (1981a). Son of the Seven Sexes: The Social Destruction of a Physical Phenomenon. *Social Studies of Science*, 11, 33-62.
- Collins, H. (1981b). What is TRASP? The radical programme as a methodological imperative. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 11, 215-24.
- Collins, H. (1982). The seven sexes: A Study in the Sociology of a Phenomenon, or the Replication of Experiments in Physics. In Barnes, B. & Edge, D. (Eds). *Science in Context*. Open University Press: Milton Keynes.
- Collins, H. (1983). An empirical relativist programme in the sociology of scientific knowledge. In Knorr Cetina, K. & Mulkay. M. (Eds.). *Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Study of Science*. London: Sage.
- Collins, H. (1985). *Changing Order: Replication and Induction in Scientific Practice*. London: Sage.
- Collins, H.. & Pinch, T. (1982). *Frames of Meaning: the Social Construction of Extraordinary Science*. London: Routledge.
- Comrie B (1986). Tense in indirect speech. *Folia Linguistica: Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae*, 20(3-4), 265-96.
- Comrie, B. (1985). *Tense*. London: Cambridge University Press.

- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conrad, L. (1989). The effects of time-compressed speech on native and EFL listening comprehension. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 1-16.
- Conrad, S. & Biber, D. (2000). Adverbial Marking of Stance in Speech and Writing. Hunston, S. & Thompson, G. (Eds.). (2000). *Evaluation in Text. Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, C. & Greenbaum, S. (Eds.). (1986). *Studying Writing*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Cooper, M. & Holzman, M. (1989). *Writing as Social Action*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton.
- Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (1993). *The Powers of literacy: a genre approach to teaching writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Coulmas, F. (Ed.). (1986). *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Coulthard, M. & Montgomery, M. (Eds.). (1981a). *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Coulthard, M. & Montgomery, M. (1981b). The structure of monologue. In Coulthard, M. & Montgomery, M. (Eds.). (1981a). *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (1994a). *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Coulthard, M. (1994b). On analysing and evaluating written text. In Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (1994a). *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1998). Coherent voicing. On prosody in conversational Reported speech. In Bublitz, W., Lenk, U., & Ventola, E. (Eds.). *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse – How to Create it and How to Describe*

- it: Selected Papers from the International Workshop on Coherence, Augsburg, 24-27 April 1997.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Coupland, N. & Coupland, J. (1997). Bodies, beaches and burntimes: 'Environmentalism' and its discursive competitors. *Discourse and Society* 8, 1, 7-25.
- Covi, L.M. (1996). *Material Mastery: How University Researchers Use Digital Libraries for Scholarly Communication.* [<http://www.scils.rutgers.Edu/~covi/dissertation/Mastery.html>]
- Crane, D. & Small, H. (1992). American Sociology since the Seventies: The Emerging Crisis in the Discipline. In Halliday, T. & Janowitz, M. (Eds.). *Sociology and its Publics: The Forms and Fates of Disciplinary Organization.* The University of Chicago Press. Chicago.
- Crane, D. (1972). *Invisible colleges: diffusion of knowledge in scientific communities.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Crismore, A. & Farnsworth, R. (1990). Metadiscourse in popular and professional science discourse. In Nash, W. (Ed.). *The writing scholar.* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Crismore, A. (1989). *Talking with readers: metadiscourse as rhetorical act.* New York: Peter Lang.
- Cronin, B. (1981). The Need For A Theory Of Citing. *Journal of Documentation*, 37(1), 16-24.
- Cronin, B. (1984). *The Citation Process: The role and Significance of Citations in Scientific Communication.* London: Taylor Graham.
- Crystal D (1992). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* 3rd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Crystal D. (1985) *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Culler, D. (1968). The Darwinian Revolution and Literary Form. In Levine, G. & Madden, W. (Eds.). *The Art Of Victorian Prose*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Culler, J. (1981). *The Pursuit of Signs. Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. London: Routledge & Kegan.
- Culler, J. (1983). *Barthes*. London: Fontana Paperbacks.
- Curt, B. (1994). *Textuality and Tectonics: Troubling Social and Psychological Science*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Cutting, J. (2000). *Analysing the Language of Discourse Communities*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Davis, P.J. & Hersh, R. (1987). Rhetoric and Mathematics. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds.). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press: Wisconsin.
- De La Croix, H. & Tansey, R. (1975). *Gardner's Art Through The Ages*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. New York.
- De Man, Paul (1978). The Epistemology of Metaphor. In Sacks, S. (Ed.). *On Metaphor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- DeCarrico, J. and Nattinger, J. (1988). Lexical phrases for the comprehension of academic lectures. *English for Specific Purposes*, 7(2).
- Declerck (1990). Sequence of tenses in English. *Folia Linguistica: Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae*, 24, 513-44.
- Dentith, S. (1995). *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*. London: Routledge.

- Derrida, J. (1987). *Positions*. (Trans. Bass, A.). Athlone Press: London.
- Dilverman, D. (Ed.). *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. Sage: London.
- Draper, S. (2005). Electronic Voting Systems and interactive lectures. [<http://www.psy.gla.ac.uk/~steve/ilig/papers/printfull.html>]
- Draper, S., Brown, M., & Stuart, S. (2004). *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, April 2004, vol. 20, no. 2, p. 95-102
- Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Bois J. (1986). Self-evidence and ritual speech. In Chafe, W. & Nichols, J. (Eds.). (1986b). *Evidentiality*. Ablex: New Jersey.
- Dubois, B. (1988). Citation in Biomedical Articles. *English for Specific Purposes* 7, 181-193.
- Dudley-Evans, T, & Henderson, W. (1990). The organisation of article introductions: evidence of change in economics writing. In Dudley-Evans, T. & Henderson, W. (Eds.) *The Language of Economics: the analysis of economics discourse*. ELT Documents 134.
- Dudley-Evans, T. & Henderson, W. (Eds.) (1990). *The Language of Economics: the analysis of economics discourse*. ELT Documents 134.
- Dudley-Evans, T. & St.John, M. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Dudley-Evans, T. (1994). Variations in the discourse patterns favourEd by different disciplines and their pEdagogical implications. In Flowerdew, J. (Ed).

- (1994a). *Academic Listening Research Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, P. (2004). Intertextuality and Hybrid Discourses: The Infusion of Pop Culture in Educational Discourse. *Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 14, 231-276.
- Duffy, T., Jonassen, D., & Lowyck, J. (Eds.). (1993). *Designing Constructivist Learning Environments*. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg.
- Duhem, P. (1962). *The Aim and Structure of Physical Theory*. New York: Atheneum.
- Dunkel, P. (1988). The Content of L1 and L2 Students' Lecture Notes and its Relation to Test Performance. *TESOL Quarterly* 22(2).
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, A. (Ed.). (2001). *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dyson, A.H. (2001). Where are the childhoods in childhood literacy? An exploration in outer (school) space. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 1, 9-39.
- Eagleton, T. (2001). Bakhtin, Schopenhauer, Kundera. In Hirschkop, K. & Shepherd, D. (Eds.). *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Edgerton, S.Y. (1976). *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Linear Perspective*. Harper & Row. New York.
- Eggins, S. & Martin, J. (1996). Genres and registers of discourse. In Van Dijk, T. (Ed.). (1996). *Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Eggins, S. & Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Continuum.

- Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing with power*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Elbow, P. (1991). Reflections on academic discourse: How it relates to Freshmen and colleagues. *College English*, 53, 135-155.
- Elbow, P. (1994). What do we mean when we talk about voice in texts? In Yancey, K. B. (Ed.). *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry*. Urbana IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Elton, L., & Cryer, P. (1992). *Teaching Large Classes*. Sheffield: University of Sheffield Teaching Development Unit.
- Emerson, C. & Holquist, M. (1986). Editors' Introduction to Bakhtin: Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*. University of Texas Press: Austin.
- Entwistle, N. (2003) A second example of 'big' research: approaches to learning at university, *Research Intelligence*, 84, pp. 19-20.
- Eskey, D. (1988). Holding in the bottom: an interactive approach to the language problems of second language readers. In Carrell, P., Devine, J., & Eskey, D. (Eds.). (1988). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, T. & Henderson, W. (Eds.). *The language of economics: the analysis of economic discourse*. ELT Documents 134. Modern English Publications: London.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In Van Dijk, T. (Ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage.
- Fairclough, N. (1988). Register, Power and Sociosemantic Change. In Birch, D. and O'Toole, M. (Eds.). *Functions of Style*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

- Fairclough, N. (1992a). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992b). Discourse and text: linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 3(2), 193-217.
- Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995b). *MEdia Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold
- Ferguson, G. (2001). If you pop over there: A corpus study of conditionals in medical English. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 61-82.
- Feyerabend, P. (1975). *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*. London: New Left Books.
- Finniston, M. (1984). Overview of Issues in Engineering Education. In Goodlad, S. (Ed). (1984). *Education for the Professions. Quis custodiet...?* SRHE & NFER-NELSON. Surrey.
- Fish, S. (1980). Is there a Text in the Class? *The authority of Interpretative Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fleck, L. (1935 [1979]). *The Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fleischman, S. (1990). *Tense and Narrativity*. London: Routledge.
- Flower, L. & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. *College Composition and Communication*, 31, 21-32.
- Flower, L. S. & Hayes, J. R. (1988). The construction of purpose in writing and reading. *College English*, 50, 528-550.
- Flowerdew, J. & Miller, L. (1992). Student perceptions, problems, and strategies in L2 lectures. *RELC Journal*, 23(2), 60-80.

- Flowerdew, J. & Miller, L. (1996). Lectures in a second language: notes towards a cultural grammar. *English For Specific Purposes*, 1996, 15(2), 121-140.
- Flowerdew, J. & Miller, L. (1996). Lectures in a Second Language: Notes towards a Cultural Grammar. *English for Specific Purposes* 15(2)
- Flowerdew, J. & Miller, L. (1997). The Teaching of Academic Listening Comprehension and the Question of Authenticity. *English for Specific Purposes* 16(1).
- Flowerdew, J. (1992). The language of definitions in science lectures. *Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 202-221.
- Flowerdew, J. (1994b). Research of relevance to L2 lecture comprehension. In Flowerdew, J. (Ed). (1994a). *Academic Listening Research Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flowerdew, J. (2003). Signalling nouns in discourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, 329-346.
- Flowerdew, J. (Ed). (1994a). *Academic Listening Research Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flowerdew, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Academic Discourse*. London: Pearson.
- Ford, G. and Pugno, L. (Eds.). (1964). *The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- Foster, P., Tonkyn, A., & Wigglesworth, G. (2000). Measuring Spoken Language: A Unit for All Reasons. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(3), 354-375.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.

- Foucault, M. (1977). *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. (Ed. Bouchard, D., Trans. Bouchard, D. & Sherry, S.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Foucault, M. (1979). What is an Author? In Harari, J.V. (Ed.). Cornell University Press: Ithaca.
- Foucault, M. (1981). The Order of Discourse. In Young, R. (Ed.). *Untying The Text: A Post-structuralist Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fowler, Roger (1981). *Literature as Social Discourse: The Practice of linguistic Criticism*. Bloomington.
- Fox, H. (1994). *Listening to the world: Cultural issues in academic writing*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Fox, N. J. (1992). *The Social Meaning of Surgery*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Francis, G. (1994). Labelling discourse: an aspect of nominal-group lexical cohesion. In Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (1994a). *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Frank, J. (1989). On conversational involvement by mail: The use of questions in direct sales letters. *Text*, 9, 231-59.
- Fries, P.H. (1994). On Theme, Rheme and discourse goals. In Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (1994a). *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Frow, J. (1990). Intertextuality and ontology. In Worton, M. & Still, J. (Eds.). (1990). *Intertextuality: theories and practices*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Fuller, S. (1995). On the motives for the new sociology of science. *History of the Human Sciences*, 7, 287-91.
- Fuller, S. (1997). *Science*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Fulton, O. (1984). Overview of Access and Recruitment to the Professions. In Goodlad, S. (Ed.). (1984). *Education for the Professions. Quis custodiet...?* SRHE & NFER-NELSON. Surrey.
- Gage, N. (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. London: Rand McNally.
- Galileo, G. (1623). The Assayer. (Ed. & Trans. Drake, S). In Drake, S. (1957). *Discoveries and Opinions of Galileo*. Doubleday Anchor: New York.
- Garfield, E. (1979). *Citation indexing: its theory and application in science, technology, and humanities*. New York: Wiley
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Prentice-Hall.
- Garfinkel, H. (1972). Remarks on Ethnomethodology. In Gumperz, J. & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). *The Ethnography of Communication. Directions in Sociolinguistics*. Hold, Rinehart and Winston: New York
- Gebhardt, R. (1993). Scholarship, promotion and tenure in composition studies. *College Composition and Communication*. 44, 439-442.
- Gee, J.P. (1996). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Gee, J.P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1982). The way we think now: toward an ethnography of modern thought. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 35(5), 14-34.

- Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geis, M. (1982). *The language of Television Advertising*. London: Routledge.
- Genette, G. (1988). *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. (Trans. Lewin, J E.). Ithaca NY: Cornell University.
- Genette, G. (1997). *Palimpsests: literature in the second degree*. (Trans. Newman, C. & Doubinsky, C.). Lincoln NB: University of Nebraska Press.
- Gergen, K.J. (1994). *Toward Transformation in Social Knowledge* (2nd Edition). Sage: London.
- Ghadessy, M. (Ed.). (1988). *Registers of Written English*. London: Pinter
- Ghadessy, M. (Ed.). (1993). *Register Analysis: Theory and Practice*. London: Pinter
- Gibbons, M. (1998). *Higher Education Relevance in the 21st Century*. Washington: World Bank.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartaman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: the Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- Gibbs, W. (1998). Beyond Physics: Renowned scientists contemplate the evidence for God. [<http://www.sciam.com/1998/0898issue/0898scicit3.html>] [04-12-2004]
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of The Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Books.
- Gilbert, G. & Mulkay, M. (1982). Warranting scientific belief. *Social Studies of Science*, 12, 383-408.
- Gilbert, G. & Mulkay, M. (1984). *Opening Pandora's Box: a Sociological Analysis of Scientists' Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gilbert, G.N. (1977). Referencing as persuasion. *Social Studies of Science*, 7, 113-22.
- Glazener, N. (2001). Dialogic subversion: Bakhtin, the novel and Gertrude Stein. In Hirschkop & Shepherd (Eds.). (2001). *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay On The Organisation Of Experience*. New York: Harper Row.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goodlad, S. (1985). Administrative REductionism. In Peacocke, A. (Ed.). (1985). *Reductionism in Academic Disciplines*. SRHE & NFER-WILSON. Guildford.
- Goodlad, S. (Ed). (1984). *Education for the Professions. Quis custodiet...?* SRHE & NFER-NELSON. Surrey.
- Gordon, H. (1991). *The History and Philosophy of Social Science*. Routledge. New York.
- Gouldner, A. (1976). *The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology*, MacMillan Press.
- Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 375-406.
- Grabe, W. (1993). Current developments in second language reading research. In Silberstein, S. (Ed.). (1993). *State of the Art TESOL Essays: Celebrating 25 years of the discipline*. TESOL.
- Graddol, D. & Boyd-Barrett, O. (Eds.). (1994). *Media texts: Authors and readers*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Graddol, D. (1994). Three Models of Language Description. In Graddol, D. & Boyd-Barrett, O. (Eds.). (1994). *Media texts: Authors and readers*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Graddol, D., Thompson, L. and Byram, M. (Eds.). (1993). *Language and Culture*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Grenoble, L.A. (1998). *Deixis and Information Packaging in Russian Discourse*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). The logic of conversation. In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (Eds.). *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Griffith, B., Small, H., Stonehill, J., & Dey, S. (1974). The Structure of Scientific Literatures ii: Toward a Macro- and Microstructure for Science. *Science Studies*, 4, 339-365.
- Griffiths, R. (1990). Speech rate and NNS comprehension: a preliminary study in time-benefit analysis. *Language Learning*, 40(3), 311-336.
- Grimshaw, A. (Ed.) *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistics Investigations of Arguments in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gross, P. & Levitt, N. (1994). *Leftist Science and Skeptical Rhetoric: Higher Superstition: The Academic Left and its Quarrels with Science*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gumperz, J. & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). *The Ethnography of Communication. Directions in Sociolinguistics*. Hold, Rinehart and Winston: New York.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gunawardena, C.M. (1989). The Present Perfect in the Rhetorical Divisions of Biology and Biochemistry Journal Articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 8, 265-73.

- Gunnarsson, B.L., & Backlund, I. (Eds.). *Writing in Academic Contexts*. Stockholm: Uppsala Universitet.
- Gunnarsson, B.L., Linell, P., & Nordberg, B. (Eds.). (1997). *The Construction of Professional Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Gunthner, S. (1998). *Polyphony And The "Layering of Voices" in Reported Dialogues: An Analysis of the Use of Prosodic Devices in Everyday Reported Speech*. [<http://inlist.uni-konstanz.de/issues/3/inlist3.pdf>] [04-12-2004]
- Gunthner, S. (1999). Polyphony and the "layering of voices" in Reported dialogues: an analysis of the prosodic devices in everyday Reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 685-708.
- Gutierrez, K., Baquedano-Lopez, P., & Tejada, C. (2000). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, & Activity: An International Journal*, 6(4), 286-303.
- Gutierrez, K., Rymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65, 445-471.
- Guy, J. and Small, I. (1993). *Politics and Value in English Studies: A Discipline in Crisis?* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Haarder, B. (1998). "The Future Global Context And Its Likely Influence On Higher Education". [<http://www.csus.edu/iaup/haarder.htm>] [04-12-2004]
- Haas, M. (1969). "Exclusive" and "inclusive": A look at early usage. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 35, 1-6.
- Habeshaw, S., Habeshaw, T., & Habeshaw, S. (1992). *53 problems in large classes: making the best of a bad job*. Bristol: Technical & Education Services.

- Hacking, I. (1992). The self-vindication of the laboratory sciences, in Pickering (1991) *Science and practice as culture*. Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Hacking, I., (1999) *The social construction of what?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Halliday, M. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective* (2nd Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. & Martin, J. (1993). *Writing Science: Literary and Discursive Power*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Halliday, M. & Veel, R. (1998). *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science*. London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. (1977). Text as semantic choice in social contexts. In Van Dijk, T.A., & Petofi, J. (Eds). (1977). *Grammars and Descriptions. (Studies in Text Theory and Text Analysis)*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Halliday, M. (1978). *Languages as Social Semiotic. The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 1st Edition. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. (1987). Spoken and written modes of meaning. In Horowitz, R, & Samuels, S. (Eds.). *Comprehending oral and written language*. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- Halliday, M. (1988). On The Language of Physical Science. In Ghadessy, M. (Ed.). (1988). *Registers of Written English*. London: Pinter.

- Halliday, M. (1989) *Spoken and Written Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. (1994a) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd Edition. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. (1994b). The construction of knowledge and value in the grammar of scientific discourse, with reference to Charles Darwin's *The origin of Species*. In Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (1994a). *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Halliday, T. & Janowitz, M. (Eds.). (1992). *Sociology and its Publics: The Forms and Fates of Disciplinary Organization*. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago.
- Hansen, C., & Jensen, C. (1994). Evaluating lecture comprehension. In Flowerdew, J. (Ed). (1994a). *Academic Listening Research Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haraway, D. (1989). *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Science*. Routledge. New York and London.
- Harman, G. (1998). *The Major Transformations of the 20th Century in Higher Education and the World of Knowledge*.
[\[http://www.csus.edu/iaup/18_2/index.htm\]](http://www.csus.edu/iaup/18_2/index.htm) [04-12-2004]
- Harris, J. (1989). The idea of community in the study of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 40, 11-22.
- Harris, R. (1988). *Language, Saussure and Wittgenstein: How to Play Games with Words*. Routledge: London.
- Harris, Z. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Linguistics*, 28, 1-30.

- Harrisberger, L. (1984). Curricula and Teaching Methods in Engineering Education.
- In
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the origins of Cultural Change*. Blackwell. Oxford.
- Harvey, A. (1992). Science Reports and Indexicality. *English for Specific Purposes*, 11, 115-128
- Hatten, R. (1985). The place of intertextuality in music studies. *American Journal of Semiotics*, 3(4), 69-82.
- Hauffe, H. (1994). Is Citation Analysis a Tool for Evaluation of Scientific Contributions? [<http://www.uibk.ac.at/sci-org/voeb/vhau9402.html>] [04-12-2004]
- Havelock, E. (1963). *Preface to Plato*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Haverkate H. (1996). Modal patterns of direct and indirect discourse in Peninsular Spanish: An analysis within the framework of speech act typology. In Janssen, T.A. & Wurff, W. (Eds.). (1996a). *Reported Speech: Forms and Functions of the Verb*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- He, A.W. (1993). Exploring modality in institutional interactions: cases from academic counselling encounters. *Text* 13(4), 503-28.
- Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with Words: language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henrichson, L. (1984). Sandhi-variation: a filter of input for learners of ESL. *Language Learning*, 34, 103-126.
- Hernadi, P. (1987). Literary Interpretation and the Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds.). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of*

- the Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs.* The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Hess, N. and Ghawi, M. (1997). 'English for Academic Purposes: Teacher Development in a Demanding Arena'. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(1)
- Hesse, M. (1974). *The Structure of Scientific Inference*, London: Macmillan.
- Hesse, M. (1980). *Revolutions and Reconstructions in the Philosophy of Science.* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hewings, A. (1990). Aspects of the language of economics textbooks. In Dudley-Evans, T. & Henderson, W. (Eds.) (1990). *The Language of Economics: the analysis of economics discourse.* ELT Documents 134.
- Hewings, M. and Dudley-Evans, T. (Eds.). (1996). *Evaluation And Course Design In EAP.* Prentice Hall Macmillan in association with The British Council.
- Hickmann, M. (1993). The boundaries of Reported speech in narrative discourse: Some developmental aspects. In Lucy, J. (Ed.). (1993a). *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hicks, D. (1995). Discourse, learning and teaching. In Apple, M.W. (Ed.). (1995). *Review of Research in Education.* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Hiley, D., Bohman, J. & Shusterman, R. (Eds.). (1981). *The Interpretive Turn: Philosophy, Science, Culture.* Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Hill, J & Irvine, J. (Eds.). (1993). *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse: Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hinkel, E. (1999b). Objectivity and credibility in L1 and L2 academic writing. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.). (1999a). *Culture in second language teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinkel, E. (Ed.). (1999a). *Culture in second language teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirschkop, K. & Shepherd, D. (Eds.). (2001). *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hirschkop, K. (1986). Bakhtin, discourse and democracy. *New Left Review*, 160 (92-113)
- Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2001). Coming back to voice: The multiple voices and identities of mature multilingual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 83-106.
- Hockings, C. (2004). Innovative teaching and learning – Who benefits? A case study. Paper presented at the British Association of Educational Research Annual Conference, University of Manchester, 16-18 September 2004. [<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003817.htm>]
- Hoey, M. (1983). *On the Surface of Discourse*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Hoey, M. (1988). *Writing to meet the reader's needs: Text patterning and reading strategies*. Trondheim papers in Applied Linguistics IV: 51-73.
- Hoey, M. (Ed.). (1993). *Data, Description and Discourse*. London: Harper Collins
- Hopkins, T., & Dudley-Evans, T. (1988). A genre-based investigation of the discussion section in articles and dissertations. *English for Specific Purposes*, 7, 113-122.
- Hornstein N (1990). *As Time Goes by: Tense and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Horowitz, R, & Samuels, S.J. (Eds.). (1987). *Comprehending oral and written language*. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- Houser, N. & Kloesel, C. (Eds.). (1992). *The Essential Peirce*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hunston, S. & Thompson, G. (Eds.). (2001). *Evaluation in Text. Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hunston, S. (1993). Evaluation and ideology in scientific writing. In Ghadessy, M. (Ed.). *Register Analysis: theory and practice*. Pinter: London.
- Hunston, S. (1993). Projecting a Sub-Culture: The Construction of Shared Worlds by Projecting Clauses in Two Registers. In Graddol, D., Thompson, L. & Byram, M. (Eds.). (1993). *Language and Culture*. ClevEdon: BAAL and Multilingual Matters.
- Hunston, S. (1994). Evaluation and organisation in a sample of written discourse. In Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (1994a). *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Hunston, S. (1998). *Language at Work*. Multilingual Matters.
- Hunt, N.P., (1999) PROJECT LEARN: Supporting On-Campus Learning with On-line Technologies, *Interactive Learning Environments*, 7(2/3), 269-282.
- Hutcheon (1989). *The Politics of Postmodernism*. London: Routledge.
- Huxham, M. (2005). Learning in lectures: do “interactive windows” help? *Active Learning in Higher Education*, March 2005, vol. 6, no. 1, p.17-31
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 185-212.

- Hyland, K. & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25, 156-177.
- Hyland, K. (1996). Writing Without Conviction? Hedging in Science Research Articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(4).
- Hyland, K. (1999). Talking to Students: Metadiscourse in Introductory Textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(1).
- Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary Discourses. Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 207-226.
- Hyland, K. (2002). Genre: Language, context, and literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 113-135.
- Hyland, K. (2003a). Dissertation acknowledgements: The anatomy of a Cinderella genre. *Written Communication*, 20(3), 242-268.
- Hyland, K. (2003b). Self-citation and self-reference: Credibility and promotion in academic publication. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 54, 206-26.
- Hyland, K. (2003c). Genre based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 17-29.
- Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(2), 133-151.
- Hyland, K. (1999). Talking to students: Metadiscourse in Introductory Textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(1), 3-26.
- Hymes, D. (1972a). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In Gumperz, J. & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). *The Ethnography of*

- Communication. Directions in Sociolinguistics*. Hold, Rinehart and Winston: New York.
- Hymes, D. (1972b). On personal pronouns: "Fourth" person and phonesthematic aspects. In Smith, M. (Ed.). *Studies in honor of George L. Trager*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hyon, S. & Chen, R. (2004). Beyond the research article: University faculty genres and EAP graduate preparation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 233-263.
- Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in Three Traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 693-718.
- Ikegami, Y. (Ed.). *Varieties of English: Proceedings of the British Council Conference at Kyoto*. Tokyo: Maruzen.
- Isaacs, G. (1994) "Lecturing practices and note-taking purposes" *Studies in Higher Education*, 19, 2, pp. 203-216.
- Iser, W. (1978). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Ivanic, R. (1997). *Writing and identity: the discorsal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ivanic, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 3-33.
- Ivins, W. (1964). *Art and Geometry*. Dover: New York.
- Ivins, W. (1975). *On the Rationalisation of Sight*. Da Capo Press: New York.
- Jacob, M. (2000). Imagining the Future University. In Jacob, M. and Hellstrom, T. (Eds.). (2000). *The future of Knowledge Production in the Academy*. SRHE and Open University Press. Buckingham.

- Jacob, M. and Hellstrom, T. (Eds.). (2000). *The future of Knowledge Production in the Academy*. SRHE and Open University Press. Buckingham.
- Jacoby, S. (1987). References to Other Researchers in Literary Research Articles. *English Language and Research Journal*, 1(33-78).
- Janssen, T.A. & Wurff, W. (Eds.). (1996a). *Reported Speech: Forms and Functions of the Verb*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Janssen, T.A., & Wurff, W. (1996b). Introductory remarks on Reported speech and thought. In Janssen, T.A. & Wurff, W. (Eds.). (1996a). *Reported Speech: Forms and Functions of the Verb*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jasanot, T., Markle, G., Pinch, T., & Petersen, J. (Eds.). *Handbook of Science. Technology and Society*. London: Sage.
- Jencks, C. (1989). *What is Post-Modernism?* New York: Academy.
- Jin, L. and Cortazzi, M. (1993). Cultural Orientation and Academic Language Use. In Graddol, D., Thompson, L. and Byram, M. (Eds.). (1993). *Language and Culture*. Clevedon BAAL and Multilingual Matters.
- Johns, A. (1981). Necessary English: a faculty survey. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 51-57.
- Johns, T. & Dudley-Evans, A. (1980). An experiment in team-teaching of overseas postgraduate students of transportation and plant biology. *ELT Documents* No. 106, 6-23. London: British Council.
- Johnson, T. (1984). Professionalism: Occupation or Ideology? In Goodlad, S. (Ed). (1984). *Education for the Professions. Quis custodiet...?* SRHE & NFER-NELSON. Surrey.
- Johnson-Laird, P. (1983). *Mental models*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

- Johnston, S. (1995) Conversations with students teachers - enhancing the dialogue of learning to teach. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 19(2), 71-82.
- Johnstone, B. (1987). 'He says ... so I said': *Verb tense alteration and narrative depictions of authority in American English*. *Linguistics*, 25(1), 33-52.
- Johnstone, B. (1993). Community and contest: Midwestern men and women in conversational story-telling. In Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1993). *Framing in Discourse*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jordan, M. (1998). The power of negation in English: Text, context and relevance. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 29, 705-52.
- Jordan, R. (1997). *English for Academic Purposes*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jordan, R. (Ed.). (1983). *Case Studies in ELT*. Collins: London.
- Jule, A. (2004). Lecturing at a theology college: masculine morality and feminine forbearance. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Manchester, 16-18 September 2004. [<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003837.htm>]
- Kamberilis, G. (2001). Producing Heteroglossic Classroom (Micro)cultures Through Hybrid Discourse Practice. *Linguistics and Education*, 12(1), 85-125.
- Kamberlis, G. & Scott, K.D. (1992). Other People's Voices: The Coarticulation of Texts and Subjectivities. *Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 4, 359-403.
- Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural Education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1-20.
- Kehm, M. (1998). *Internationalization of Higher Education: An Answer to Global Challenges?* [<http://www.csus.edu/iaup/kehm.htm>] [04-12-2004]

- Keller, E. F., & Longino, H. E. (Eds.). (1996). *Feminism and Science*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kellerman, S. (1992). "I See What You Mean": The role of kinesic behaviour in listening and implications for foreign and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 13(3), 239-258.
- Kelly, G., & Bazerman, C. (2003). How students argue scientific claims: A rhetorical-semantic analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 28-55.
- Kelly, P. (1991). Lexical ignorance: the main obstacle to listening comprehension with advanced foreign language learners. *IRAL XXIX*, 2, 135-149.
- Kelly-Holmes, H. (2000). 'Strong Words Softly Spoken': Advertising and The Intertextual Construction of Irishness. In Meinhof, U.H. & Smith, J. (a) (Eds.). (2000). *Intertextuality and The Media*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kennedy, G. (1978). *The testing of listening comprehension*. RELC Monograph Series. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Kent, T. (1981). Hermeneutics and Genre: Bakhtin and the Problem of Communicative Interaction. In Hiley, D., Bohman, J. & Shusterman, R. (Eds.). *The Interpretive Turn: Philosophy, Science, Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Kim, T.L. (1997). A Commodity for the Masses. *Bangkok Post Newspaper*, 26th January 2002.
- King, P. (1994). Visual and verbal messages in the engineering lecture: notetaking by postgraduate L2 students. In Flowerdew, J. (Ed). (1994a). *Academic Listening Research Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kiparsky, P. & S. Anderson (Eds.). (1973). *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston.
- Kiparsky, P. (1968). Tense and mood in Indo-European syntax. *Foundations of Language*, 4, 30-57.
- Kitigawa, C. & Lehrer, A. (1990). Impersonal uses of personal pronouns. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 739-59.
- Klamer, A. (1987). As If Economists And Their Subject Were Rational. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds.). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Klein, J. (1998). *Notes Toward a Social Epistemology of Transdisciplinarity*. [<http://perso.club-internet.fr/nicol/ciret/bulletin/b12/b12c2.htm>] [04-12-2004]
- Klewitz, G. & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1999). Quote-Unquote? The role of prosody in the contextualisation of Reported speech sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9(4), 459-485.
- Knorr Cetina, K. & Mulkay, M. (Eds.). (1983). *Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Study of Science*. London: Sage.
- Knorr Cetina, K. (1981). *The Manufacture of Knowledge: An Essay on the Constructivist and Contextual Nature of Science*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Knorr Cetina, K. (1982a). Relativism - what now? *Social Studies of Science*, 12, 13-6.
- Knorr Cetina, K. (1982b). The constructivist programme in the sociology of science: retreats or advances. *Social Studies of Science*, 12, 320-4.

- Knorr Cetina, K. (1995a). Laboratory studies: the cultural approach to the study of science. In Jasanot, T., Markle, G., Pinch, T., & Petersen, J. (Eds.). *Handbook of Science. Technology and Society*. London: Sage.
- Knorr Cetina, K. (1996). *Epistemic Cultures: How Scientists Make Sense*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Knorr Cetina, K. (1997). Sociality with Objects: Social Relations in Postsocial Knowledge Societies. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 4 (4), 1-30.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. (1983). The Ethnographic Study of Scientific Work: Towards a Constructivist Interpretation of Science. In Knorr-Cetina, K. Mulkay, M. (Eds.). *Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Study of Science*. London: Sage.
- Koch, S. & Leary, D. (Eds.). (1985). *A Century of Psychology as Science: Retrospections and Assessments*. McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Kochen, M. (1987). How Well Do We Acknowledge Our Intellectual Debts? *Journal of Documentation* 43, 54–64.
- Kong, K. (2001). Marketing of belief: intertextual construction of network marketers' identities. *Discourse and Society*, 12(4), 473-503.
- Kozak, K. (2000). *The Advantages of Critical and Systematic Literary Taxonomies: A Review Article of New Work by Cerquiglini, Juvan, and Zima*. [<http://clcwebjournal.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb00-4/books00-4.html>] [04-12-2004]
- Kress, G. & Hodge, B. (1979). *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, G. & Threadgold, T. (1988). Toward a social theory of genre. *Southern Review*, 21.3, 215-243.

- Kress, G. & Van Leeuwen, T. (1996.). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language: a semiotic approach to literature and art*. (Trans. Gora, T., Jardine, A. & Roudiez, L. Ed. Roudiez, L.). Columbia University Press: New York.
- Kristeva, Julia. (1986). Word, dialogue, and the novel. In Moi, T. (Ed.). *The Kristeva reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Krug, K. (1997). HYPERdisciplinarity?! Exploring the Link Between Hypertext and Interdisciplinarity. [<http://www.iisgp.ubc.ca/symposium/kkrug.htm>] [04-12-2004]
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. The University of Chicago Press. London.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd Edn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhn, T.S. (1977) *The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tradition and Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhn, T.S. (1983). Rationality and Theory Choice. *Journal of Philosophy*, 80.
- Kuo, C. (1999). The Use of Personal Pronouns: Role Relationships in Scientific Journal Articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(2).
- Labov, W. & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York: Academic Press
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.
- Lackstrom, J., Selinker, L. & Trimble, L. (1972). Grammar and Technical English. *English Teaching Forum*, 10(5).

- Lackstrom, J.E., Selinker, L., & Trimble, L.P. (1970). Grammar and Technical English. In Lugten, R. (Ed.). (1970). *English as a Second Language: Current Issues*. Philadelphia: CCD Chilton.
- Lackstrom, J.E., Selinker, L., & Trimble, L.P. (1973). Technical Rhetorical Principles and Grammatical Choice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 7, 127-136.
- Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Verso: London.
- Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A. (Eds.). (1970a). *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakatos, I. (1970b). Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A. (Eds.). *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakatos, I. (1978). *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Landes, D. (1969). *The Unbound Prometheus: technological change and industrial development in Western Europe from 1750 to the present*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Landow, G. (1992). *Hypertext: The Convergence of Contemporary Critical Theory and Technology*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Latour, B. & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory Life: The Social Construction of Scientific Facts*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Latour, B. & Woolgar, S. (1986). *Laboratory Life: The Social Construction of Scientific Facts*. 2nd Edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Latour, B. (1983). Give Me a Laboratory and I Will Raise the World. In Knorr-Cetina, K. & Mulkay, M. (Eds.). (1983). *Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Study of Science*. London: Sage.
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in Action: How to follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Open University Press: Milton Keynes.
- Latour, B. (1993). *We Have Never Been Modern*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Latour, B. (1999). *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*, Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory life: the social construction of scientific facts*. Sage: Beverly Hills.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laver, J. (1980). *The Phonetic Description of Voice Quality*. Cambridge: Cambridge
- Laver, J. (1994). *Principles of Phonetics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lea, M. & Street, B. (1998). Student Writing in Higher Education: an Academic Literacies Approach. In *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), 157-172.
- Lea, M. & Street, B. (1999). Writing as academic literacies: understanding textual practices in Higher Education. In Candlin, C. & Hyland, K. (Eds.). *Writing Texts, Processes and Practices*. London: Longman.
- Lea, M. (1998). Academic literacies and learning in higher Education: constructing knowledge through texts and experience. In *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 30(2), 156-171.
- Lechte, J. (1994). *Fifty Key Contemporary Thinkers*. Routledge.

- Leech G. & Svartvik J. (1975). *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G. (1966). *English in Advertising*. London: Longman.
- Lemke, J. (1990). *Talking Science. Language, Learning, and Values*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Lemke, J. (1995). *Textual Politics. Discourse and Social Dynamics*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Lemke, J. (1998). Multiplying Meaning: Visual and Verbal Semiotics in Scientific Text. In Martin, J. & Veel, R. (Eds.). *Reading Science*. London: Routledge.
- Lemke, J.L. (1992). Intertextuality and Educational Research. *Linguistics and Education*, 4, 257-267.
- Levine, G. & Madden, W. (Eds.). *The Art of Victorian Prose*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, C. (2001). *Literacy practices as social acts: Power, status, and cultural norms in the classroom*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Li, C. (1986). Direct and indirect speech: A functional study. In Coulmas, F. (Ed.). (1986). *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lonagacre R. (1976). *An Anatomy of Speech Notions*. Lisse, Belgium: Peter de Ridder Press.
- Longacre, R.E. (1994). The dynamics of Reported dialogue in narrative. *Word*, 45(2), 125-143.
- Longinus. On The Sublime. [<http://www.classicpersuasion.org/pw/longinus/>] [04-12-2004]

- Love, A. (1991). Process and product in geology: an investigation of some discourse features of two introductory textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes*, 10, 89-109.
- Love, A. (1993). Lexico-grammatical features of geology textbooks: process and product revisited. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 197-218.
- Love, A. (1993). Lexico-grammatical features of geology textbooks: process and product revisited. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 197-218.
- Love, A. (2002). Introductory concepts and 'cutting Edge' theories: Can the genre of the textbook accommodate both? In Flowerdew, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Academic Discourse*. London: Pearson.
- Lucy, J. (1993a) (Ed.). *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lucy, J. (1993b). Reflexive language and the human disciplines. In Lucy, J. (1993a) (Ed.). *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lugten, R. (Ed.). (1970). *English as a Second Language: Current Issues*. Philadelphia: CCD Chilton.
- Lukasiewicz, J. (1994). *The Ignorance Explosion*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Lunenberg, M., Korthagen, F. A. J. (2003) Teacher educators and student-directed learning, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19(1), pp. 29-44.
- Lynch, M. (1993). *Scientific Practice and Ordinary Action: Ethnomethodology and Social Studies of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch, T. & Anderson, K. (1991). Do You Mind if I Come in Here?- a comparison of EAP seminar/discussion materials and the characteristics of real academic

- interaction. In Adams, P., Heaton, B. & Howarth, P. (Eds). (1991). *Sociocultural Issues in English for Academic Purposes. Developments in ELT*. Hemel Hempstead; Phoenix ELT.
- Lyons, J. (1968). *An introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, L. (1981). *Language, meaning and context*. London: Fontana Linguistics.
- Lyotard, J-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester University Press. Manchester.
- Macaulay, R. (1987). Polyphonic monologues: Quoted direct speech in oral narratives. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics*, 1(2), 1-34.
- Maier et al. (1998). *Using Technology in Teaching and Learning*. Internet Learning Centre: The University of Southampton.
- Malcolm, I. (1999). Writing as an intercultural process. In Candlin, C. & Hyland, K. (Eds.). (1999). *Writing: texts, processes and practices*. London: Longman.
- Malcolm, L. (1987). What rules govern tense usage in scientific articles? *English for Specific Purposes*, 6(1), 31-43.
- Maloney, M. & Lally B. (1998) 'The relationship between attendance at
- Mandelbaum, M. (1964). *Philosophy, Science and Sense Perception: historical and critical studies*. John Hopkins University Press. Baltimore.
- Mandelbaum, M. (1971). *History, Man and Reason*. Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore.
- Manicas, P. (1988). *A History and Philosophy of the Social Sciences*. Basil Blackwell. Oxford.

- Mannheim, K. (1925/52). *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.
- Marshall, B.K. (1992.). *Teaching The Postmodern*. Routledge: New York.
- Martin, E. (1996). The Egg and the sperm: How science has constructed a romance based on stereotypical male-female roles. In Keller, E. F., & Longino, H. E. (Eds.). (1996). *Feminism and Science*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. & Veel, R. (1998). *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science*. London: Routledge.
- Martin, J. (1989). *Factual writing: exploring and challenging social reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. (1991). Intrinsic functionality: Implications for contextual theory. *Social Semiotics*, 1(1), 99-162.
- Martin, J. (1992). *English Text: System and Structure*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Martin, J. (1993a). *A contextual theory of language: the powers of literacy – a genre approach to teaching writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Martin, J. (1993b). Genre and literacy: Modelling context in Educational linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 141-172.
- Martin, J. (1997). Analysing Genre: Functional Parameters. In Christie, F. & Martin, J.R. (Eds.). (1997). *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*. London: Cassell.
- Martin, J., Christie, F. & Rothery, J. (1997). Social processes in Education: a reply to Sawyer and Watson (and others). In Reid, I. *The place of genre in learning: current debates*. Geelong, Victoria: Centre for Studies in Literary Education: Typereader Publications.

- Mason, A. (1983). *Understanding Academic Lectures*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Mason, A. (1994). By dint of: Student and lecturer perceptions of lecture comprehension strategies in first-term graduate study. In Flowerdew, J. (Ed). (1994a). *Academic Listening Research Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matejka, L. & Titunik, I.R. (1973). *Translators' Introduction to Marxism and The Philosophy of Language*. Seminar Press: New York.
- Mathis, T. & Yule, G. (1994). Zero Quotatives. *Discourse Processes*, 18(1), 63-76.
- Matoesian, G. (2000). Intertextual authority in Reported speech: Production mEdia in the Kennedy Smith rape trial. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 879-914.
- Matsuda, P.K. (2001). Voice in Japanese written discourse: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 35-53.
- Maunder, R., & Harrop, A. (2003). Investigating students' perceptions of what contributes to productive seminars and lectures and staff predictions of students' perceptions: how well do staff know their students? *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 27(4).
- Mauranen A. (1993). Contrastive ESP Rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English Economics Texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 3-22.
- May, J.D. (1989). Questions as suggestions: the pragmatics of interrogative speech. *Language and Communication*, 9(4), 227-43.
- May, K.O. (1967). Abuses of Citation Indexing (Letter to The Editor). *Science*, 156, 890-2.

- Maybin, J. (1997). Story voices: The use of Reported speech in 10-12 year olds' spontaneous narratives. In Thompson, L. (Ed.). *Children Talking: The Development of Pragmatic Competance*. ClevEdon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mayes P. (1990). Quotation in Spoken English. *Studies in Language*, 14(2), 325-63.
- McCarthy, M. (1992). Grammar, discourse and the fanzine. In Ikegami, Y. (Ed.). *Varieties of English: Proceedings of the British Council Conference at Kyoto*. Tokyo: Maruzen.
- McCarthy, M. (1998). *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCeachie, W. (1963). *Teaching tips; a guide-book for the beginning college teacher*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: G.Wahr Publishing Company.
- McClellan, W. (1990). The Dialogic Other: Bakhtin's Theory of Rhetoric. *Social Discourse*, 3:1-2, 234-49.
- McGee, M.C. & Lyne, J.R. (1987) What Are Nice Folks Like You Doing in a Place Like This? Some Entailments of Treating Knowledge Claims Rhetorically. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- McKeachie, W. (1963). Research on teaching at the college and university level. In Gage, N. (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. London: Rand McNally.
- McLeod, D. (2000). *Truth, Territory and the CoffeeBreak: experiences of multidisciplinary research in Education and training*. SOCINET, CSSE: University of Alberta.
- Mead, G.H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Medawar, P. (1964). Is the Scientific Paper Fraudulent? *Saturday Review*, 49.
- Meek, V. and GoEdgebuure, L. (Eds). (1996). *The Mockers and The MockEd: Comparative Perspectives on Differentiation, Convergence and Diversity in Higher Education*. Oxford: IAU Press, Pergamon.
- Megill, A. and McCloskey, D.N. (1987) The rhetoric of History. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Meier, A. (1997). Expressing Politeness. *ELT Journal*, 51(1).
- Meinhof, U.H. & Smith, J. (Eds.). (2000). *Intertextuality and The Media*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Merton, R. (1968a). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Merton, R. (1968b). The Mathew Effect in Science. *Science*, 159, 56-63.
- Merton, R. (1970). *Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth-century England*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Merton, R. (1973). *The Sociology of Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Merton, R. (1996). Foreword to "Citation Indexing – Its Theory and Application in Science, Technology, and Humanities by Eugene Garfield". [<http://www.garfield.library.upenn.edu/cifwd.html>] [04-12-2004]
- Miller, C. (1984). Genre as Social Action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 151-176.
- Miller, T. (Ed.). (1997). *Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Applications*. Paris: USIA.
- Milliken, J. (1998). Assessing student perceptions of electronic lectures in marketing. *Virtual University Journal*, 1(1-4), 34-45.

- Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Mitchell, T.F. (1957). The language of buying and selling in Cyrenaica: a situational statement. *Hesperis*, XLIV, 31-71.
- Moi, T. (Ed.). (1986). *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Moon, R. (1994). The analysis of fixed expressions in text. In Coulthard, M. (Ed.) *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Moravcsik, M. & Murugesan, P. (1975). Some results on the function and quality of citations. *Social Studies of Science*, 5(1), 86-92.
- Moravcsik, M.J. & P.Murugesan. (1979). Citation Patterns in Scientific Revolutions. *Scientometrics*, 1(2), 161-9.
- Morel, T. (2004). Interactive lecture discourse for university EFL students. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 325-338.
- Morell, T. (2003). Interactive lecture discourse for university EFL students. *English for Specific Purposes* 23(3).
- Morris, P. (Ed.). (1994). *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, and Voloshinov*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Mulkay, M. (1985). *The Word and the World*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Mullins, N., Hargens, L., Hecht, P., & Kick, E. (1977). The Group Structure of Cocitation Clusters: A Comparative Study. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 552-562.
- Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative Syllabus Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murphy, D. & Candlin, C. (1979). Engineering lecture discourse and listening comprehension. *Practical Papers in English Language Education*, 2, 1-79. Lancaster: Lancaster University Press.

- Murugesan, P. & Moravcsik, M. (1978). Variations of the Nature of Citation Measures with Journals and Scientific Specialities. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 29(3), 141-7.
- Myers, G. (1985). The social construction of two biologists' proposals. *Written Communication*, 2, 219-245.
- Myers, G. (1989). The Pragmatics of Politeness in Scientific Articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 10(1).
- Myers, G. (1990). *Writing Biology: Texts in the Social Construction of Scientific Knowledge*. The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Myers, G. (1992). Textbooks and The Sociology of Scientific Knowledge. *English for Specific Purposes*, 11, 3-17.
- Myers, G. (1994). Narratives of science and nature in popularising molecular genetics. In Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (1994a). *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Myers, G. (1995). Disciplines, departments, and differences. In Gunnarsson, B.L., & Backlund, I. (Eds.). *Writing in Academic Contexts*. Stockholm: Uppsala Universitet.
- Myers, G. (1997). Words and Pictures in a Biology Textbook. In Miller, T. (Ed.). (1997). *Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Applications*. Paris: USIA.
- Myers, G. (1999). Functions of Reported Speech in Group Discussions. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(3), 376-401.
- Myers, G. (2000). Unspoken Speech: Hypothetical Reported Discourse and the Rhetoric of Everyday Talk. *Text*, 19, 571-590.
- Myhill, J. (1992). *Typological Discourse Analysis: Quantitative Approaches to the Study of Linguistic Fiction*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

- Nakau, M. (1994). *Principles of Cognitive Semantics*. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- Nash, W. (Ed.). (1990). *The writing scholar*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Needham, J. (1969). *The Great Titration: Science and Society in East and West*.
London: Unwin & Allen.
- Nelson, J.S. (1987). Seven Rhetorics of Inquiry. A Provocation. In Nelson, S.,
Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds.). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human
Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The
University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds.). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the
Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public
Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Nelson, S., Megill, A., & McCloskey, D.N. (1987b). Rhetoric of Inquiry. Nelson,
S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds.). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the
Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public
Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Nesi, H. (2000). *A corpus-based analysis of academic lectures across disciplines*.
Paper given at The BAAL Conference, Cambridge UK, September 2000.
- Newbould, I. (1998). *Universities In The New Global Context*.
[<http://www.csus.edu/iaup/Newbould.htm>] [04-12-2004]
- Niemi, H. (2002) Active learning - a cultural change needed in teacher education
and schools, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, pp.763-780.
- Nietzsche, F. (1968). *Der Wille zur Macht* (1901). *The Will to Power*. (Trans.
Kaufmann, W. & Hollingdale, R.). New York: Random House.
- Ninomiya, M. (1986). Iu to omou (On 'say' and 'think'). *Gengo (Language)*, 413,
(70-80).

- Nisbet, R. (1980). *History of the Idea of Progress*. Basic Books. New York.
- O'Connor, P. (2000). *Speaking of Crime. Narratives of Prisoners*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000.
- O'Donnell, R.C. (1974) Syntactic differences between speech and writing. *American Speech*, 49, 102-110.
- Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (2001). Language Acquisition and Socialization: Three Developmental Stories and Their Implications. In Duranti, A. (Ed.). (2001). *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.). (1979). *Developmental pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.). *Developmental pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Olsen, L., Huckin, T. (1990). Point-driven understanding in engineering lecture comprehension. *English for Specific Purposes*, 9, 33-47.
- Olson, D.R., Torrance, N. & Hildyard, A. (Eds.). (1985). *Literacy, language and learning: The nature and consequences of reading and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ong, W. (1982). *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of The Word*. New York:
- Orlikowski, W. & Yates, J. (1994). Genre repertoire: The structuring of Communicative Practices in Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(4), 541-574.
- Orr, M. (2003). *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity
- Oster, S. (1981). The Use of Tense in the Reporting of Past Literature in EST. In Selinker, L., Tarone, E., & Hanzeli, V. (Eds.). (1981). *English for Academic*

- and Technical Purposes: Studies in Honor of Louis Trimble*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Outcalt, D. (1998). Leading Universities in White Water. [<http://www.csus.edu/iaup/outcalt.htm>] [04-12-2004]
- Painter, C. (1984). *Into the Mother Tongue: A Case Study of Early Language Development*. London: Pinter.
- Paradis, J. (1983). Bacon, Linnaeus, and Lavoisier: Early language reform in the sciences. In Anderson, P. V., Brockmann, R. J., & Miller, C. (Eds.). *New essays in technical and scientific communication: Research, theory, practice*. Farmingdale, NY: Baywood Publishing Co.
- Partee, B. (1973). The syntax and semantics of quotations. In Kiparsky, P. & S. Anderson (Eds.). (1973). *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston.
- Peacocke, A. (Ed.). (1985). *Reductionism in Academic Disciplines*. SRHE & NFER-WILSON. Guildford.
- Peck MacDonald, S. (1992). A method for analyzing sentence-level differences in disciplinary knowledge making. *Written Communication*, 9, 533-569.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). Incommensurable Discourses? *Applied Linguistics*, 15, 2, 115-138.
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Vulgar Pragmatism, Critical Pragmatism, and EAP. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(4).
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Perelman, C. (1979). *The new rhetoric and the humanities: Essays on rhetoric and its applications*. Dordrecht, Holland Boston: D. Reidel Company.

- Perelman, L. J. (1992). *School's Out: Hyperlearning, the New Technology, and the End of Education*. New York: Avon Books.
- Perfetti, C. (1985). *Reading Ability*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Perridon, H. (1996). Reported Speech in Swedish. In Janssen, T.A. & Wurff, W. (Eds.). (1996a). *Reported Speech: Forms and Functions of the Verb*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pigliucci, M. (1999). The Case Against God: Science and the Falsifiability Question in Theology. [<http://www.skeptic.com/archives05.html>] [04-12-2004]
- Pinch, T. (1985). Towards an analysis of scientific observation: the externality and evidential significance of observational reports in physics. *Social Studies of Science*, 15, 3-36.
- Plett, H. (1991a). (Ed.). *Intertextuality*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Plett, H. (1991b). Intertextualities. In Plett, H. (Ed.). (1991). *Intertextuality*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred / dispreferred turn shapes. In Atkinson, J. & Heritage, J. (Eds.). *Structure of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Giving a source or basis: the practice in conversation of telling "how I know." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8, 607-673.
- Porter, A. (1977). Citation analysis: queries and caveats. *Social Studies of Science*, 7, 257-67.
- Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Potter, J. (1996) *Representing Reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London: Sage.

- Powers, D. (1986). Academic demands related to listening skills. *Language Testing*, 3(1), 1-38.
- Poynton, C. (1985/1989). *Language and Gender: Making the Difference*. Geelong, Vic: Deakin University Press.
- Precht, K. (1998). A cross-cultural comparison of letters of recommendation. *English for Specific Purposes Journal*, 17, 241-265.
- Price, D. (1963). *Little Science, Big Science*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Psathas, G. (Ed.). *Phenomenological Sociology*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Purg, P. (2001). *Intertextuality and Coauthorship in the Three Plays by W. H. Auden and Christopher Isherwood*.
[\[http://peterpurg.kdpm.org/DIPLOMSKA_AN_WEB.htm\]](http://peterpurg.kdpm.org/DIPLOMSKA_AN_WEB.htm) [04-12-2004]
- Quine, W. & Ullian, J. (1970). *The Web of Belief*. New York: Random House.
- Quine, W. (1961). *From a Logical Point of View*. 2nd Edition. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech, G., & Svartik, J. (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, R. & Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A Concise Grammar of Contemporary English*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Quirk, R., S.Greenbaum, G.Leech, and J.Svartik. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Rabinov, P. (1984). *The Foucault Reader*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999). Individualism, academic writing and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 45-75.

- Ramanathan, V., & Kaplan, R. (1996). Audience and voice in current composition texts: Some implications for ESL student writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5, 21-34.
- Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Rankin, W. (2000). *Introducing Newton and Classical Physics*. Totem Books. New York.
- Reader, K. (1990). Literature/cinema/television: intertextuality in Jean Renoir's *Le Testament du docteur Cordelier*. In Worton, M. & Still, J. (Eds.). (1990). *Intertextuality: theories and practices*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Reid, I. (1997). *The place of genre in learning: current debates*. Geelong, Victoria: Centre for Studies in Literary Education: Typereader Publications.
- Richards, J. (1983). Listening comprehension: approach, design, procedure. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 219-240.
- Richardson, K. (2000). Intertextuality and The Discursive Construction of Knowledge: The Case of Economic Understanding. In Meinhof, U.H. & Smith, J. (Eds.). (2000). *Intertextuality and The Media*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Riffaterre, M. (1978). *Semiotics of Poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Riffaterre, M. (1990). Compulsory reader response: the intertextual drive. In Worton, M. & Still, J. (Eds.). (1990). *Intertextuality: theories and practices*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Rifkin, J. (1984). *Algeny*. Penguin Books. New York.
- Romanyshyn, R. (1992). *Technology As Symptom & Dream*. Routledge. London.

- Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and The Mirror of Nature*. Princeton University Press: Princeton)
- Rorty, R. (1987). Science as Solidarity. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds.). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Rose, D. (1997). Science, Technology and Technical Literacies. In Christie, F. & Martin, J.R. (Eds.). (1997). *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*. London: Cassell.
- Rose, M. (1985). The Language of exclusion: Writing instruction at the university. *College English*, 47, 341-359
- Rose, S. (1985). The Roots and Social Functions of Biological Reductionism. In Peacocke, A. (Ed.). (1985). *Reductionism in Academic Disciplines*. SRHE & NFER-WILSON. Guildford.
- Rost, M. (1990). *Listening in language learning*. London: Longman.
- Rost, M. (1994). On-line summaries as representations of lecture comprehension. In Flowerdew, J. (Ed.). (1994a). *Academic Listening Research Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rott, G., Diefenbach, B., Vogel-Heuser, B., & Neul, E. (2003). The challenge of inter- and transdisciplinary knowledge: results of the WISA project. Paper presented at the European Conference of Educational Research, University of Hamburg, 17 - 20 September 2003. [<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003520.htm>]
- Rounds, P. (1987). Characterizing successful classroom discourse for NNS teaching assistant training. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 643-672.

- Russell, D. (1991). *Writing in the academic disciplines, 1870-1990: A curricular history*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP.
- Sacks, H., Schlegoff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Sacks, S. (Ed.). (1978). *On Metaphor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sakita T. (1995). Functions of reporting discourse from a discourse analytic perspective. *Papers in Linguistic Science*, 1, 1-13.
- Sakita, T. (2002). *Reporting Discourse, Tense, and Cognition*. New York: Elsevier.
- Salager-Meyer, F. (1999). Referential Behaviour in Scientific Writing: A Diachronic Study (1810-1995). *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(3).
- Samraj, B. (2002). Disciplinary variation in abstracts: The case of Wildlife Behaviour and Conservation Biology. In Flowerdew, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Academic Discourse*. London: Pearson.
- Sander, P., Stevenson, K., King, M., Coates, D. (2000) University students' expectations of teaching. *Studies in Higher Education* Vol 25 (3) pp 309-323.
- Sarangi, S. & Coulthard, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Discourse and Social Life*. London: Pearson.
- Sarangi, S. (2000). Activity Types and Interactional Hybridity: The Case of Genetic Counselling. In Sarangi, S. & Coulthard, M. (Eds.). *Discourse and Social Life*. London: Pearson.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. (1974). *Course In General Linguistics*. London: Peter Owen.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1982). *The Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Schiffrin D. (Ed.). (1984). *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Schiffrin D (1993). 'Speaking for another' in sociolinguistic interviews: Alignments, identities, and frames. In Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1993a). *Framing in Discourse*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schiffrin D. (1981). Tense variation in narrative. *Language*, 57(1), 45-62.
- Schiffrin, D. (1980). Metatalk: organisational and evaluative brackets in discourse. *Sociological Inquiry: Language and social interaction*, 50, 199-236.
- Schiffrin, D. (1980). Metatalk: organisational and evaluative brackets in discourse. *Social Inquiry: Language and Social Interaction*, 50, 199-236.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Schiffrin, D. (1990). The management of a co-operative self during argument: the role of opinion and stories. In Grimshaw, A. (Ed.) *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistics Investigations of Arguments in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Schlegoff, E. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 7, 289-327.
- Schwab, J. (1964). Structure of Disciplines: Meanings and significances. In Ford, G. and Pugno, L. (Eds.). (1964). *The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- Scollon, R. (1998). *Mediated discourse as social interaction: A study of news discourse*. London: Longman.
- Scollon, R. (2000a). *Intercultural Communication*. London: Blackwell.

- Scollon, R. (2000b). Methodological Interdiscursivity: An Ethnographic Understanding of Unfinalisability. In Sarangi, S. & Coulthard, M. (Eds.). *Discourse and Social Life*, London: Longman.
- Scollon, R., Tsang, W.K., Li, D., Yung, V., & Jones, R. (1998). Voice, appropriation and discourse representation in a student writing task. *Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 9, 227-250.
- Scott, P. (1997). The Postmodern University? In Smith, A. And Webster, F. (Eds.). (1997). *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*. Open University Press. Buckingham.
- Scriven, M. (1964). The Structure of the Social Studies. In Ford, G. and Pugno, L. (Eds.). (1964). *The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. (1991). Intentionalistic Explanations in the Social Sciences. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 21(3).
- Selinker, L., Tarone, E., & Hanzeli, V. (Eds.). (1981). *English for Academic and Technical Purposes: Studies in Honor of Louis Trimble*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Selinker, L., Trimble, L., & Vroman, R. (1972). *Working papers in English for Science and Technology*. (Progress Rep. No.5). Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Office of Engineering Research.
- Selzer, J. (Ed.). *Understanding Scientific Prose*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Seng, L.B. & Willett, P. (1995). *The citedness of publications by United Kingdom library schools*. *Journal of Information Science*, 21, 68-71.
- Shapin, S. & Schaffer, S. (1985). *Leviathan and the Air-pump*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shapin, S. (1982). History of science and its sociological reconstructions. *History of Science*, 20, 157-211.
- Shapiro, M. (1987). The Rhetoric of Social Science. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds.). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.
- Shaw, P. (1992). Reasons for The Correlation of Voice, Tense and Sentence Function in Reporting Verbs. *Applied Linguistics*, 13, 302-19.
- Shen, F. (1989). The classroom and the wider culture: Identity as a key to learning English composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 40, 459-466.
- Shepherd, D. (2001). Bakhtin and the reader. In Hirschkop, K. & Shepherd, D. (Eds.). (2001). *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Shermer, M. (1997). *Why People Believe Weird Things: Pseudoscience, Superstition, and Other Confusions of our Time*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Sheyholislami, J. (2001). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. [<http://www.carleton.ca/~jsheyhol/articles/what%20is%20CDA.pdf>] [04-12-2004]
- Shinzato, R. (2004). Some observations concerning mental verbs and speech act verbs. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 861-882.

- Shireen, C. (Ed.). (1998) *Travels with the Midwest Writing Centers Association. 1996-1997. Conference Proceedings*. Midwest Writing Centers Association.
- Shuman, A. (1993). "Get outa my face": Entitlement and authoritative discourse. In Hill, J. & Irvine, J. (Eds.). *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silberstein, S. (Ed.). (1993). *State of the Art TESOL Essays: Celebrating 25 years of the discipline*. TESOL.
- Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J.McH. (1988). Mirror for a Text. *Journal of English and Foreign Languages* (Hyderabad, India), 1.
- Slezak, P. (1989). Scientific Discovery by Computer as Refutation of the Strong Programme. *Social Studies of Science*, 19, 4 563-600.
- Slezak, P. (1991). Bloor's Bluff: Behaviourism and the Strong Programme. *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 5(3), 241-256.
- Smagorinsky, P. (Ed.). (1994). *Speaking about writing: Reflections on research methodology*. Sage Series in Written Communication, Vol. 8 (pp. 247-272). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Small, H. & Griffith, B. (1974). The Structure of Scientific Literatures i: Identifying and Graphing Specialties. *Science Studies*, 4, 17-40.
- Small, H. (1977). A Co-citation Model of a Scientific Specialty: A Longitudinal Study of Collagen Research. *Social Studies of Science*, 7, 139-166.
- Smith, A. & Webster, F. (1997b). An Affirming Flame. In Smith, A. & Webster, F. (Eds.). (1997a). *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*. Open University Press. Buckingham.

- Smith, A. & Webster, F. (Eds.). (1997a). *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*. Open University Press. Buckingham.
- Smith, E.L. (1985). Functional types of scientific prose. In Benson, J. & Greaves, W. (Eds.). *Systemic perspectives on discourse*. Volume 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Smith, Jr., E.L. (1985). Functional types of scientific prose. In Benson, J. & Greaves, W. (Eds.). (1985). *Systemic perspectives on discourse*. Volume 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Smith, M. (Ed.). (1972). *Studies in honor of George L. Trager*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Smith, D. (1984). Medical Discourse: Aspects of Author's Comment. *English for Specific Purposes*, 3, 25-36.
- Snyder, H. and Bonzi, S. (1998) Patterns of self-citation across disciplines. *Journal of Information Science*, 24, 431-435.
- Solin, A. (2001). *Tracing Texts. Intertextuality in Environmental Discourse. Pragmatics, Ideology and Contacts Monographs 2*. department of English: University of Helsinki.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Spiegelberg, H. (1973). On the right to say "we": A linguistic and phenomenological analysis. In Psathas, G. (Ed.). *Phenomenological Sociology*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

- Stapleton, P. (2002). Critiquing voice as a viable pedagogical tool in L2 writing: Returning the spotlight to ideas. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11, 177-190.
- Steiner, W. (1985). Intertextuality in painting. *American Journal of Semiotics*, 3(4), 57-67.
- Stephens, J. (1975). *Francis Bacon and the style of science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stephens, J. (1983). Style as therapy in Renaissance science. In Anderson, P., Brockmann, V., & Miller, R. (Eds.) *New essays in technical and scientific communication: Research, theory, practice*. Farmingdale, NY: Baywood Publishing Co.
- Strangway, D. (1998). *Issues for the 21st Century. Planning and Preparing for the 21st Century in Higher Education*. [<http://www.csus.edu/iaup/Strangwa.htm>] [04-12-2004]
- Strodt-Lopez, B. (1987). Personal anecdotes in university classes. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 29(2), 194-258.
- Strodt-Lopez, B. (1991). Tying it all in: asides in university lectures. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 117-140.
- Stubbs, M. (1994). Grammar, Text, and Ideology: Computer-assisted Methods in the Linguistics of Representation. *Applied Linguistics* 15(2).
- Stubbs, M., (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sutherland, P. (2005). Diversity and Difference in Adult Education: Diversity and Differences in How Lecturers Perceive the Function of Lectures in Australia and Scotland. Paper presented at the 35th Annual SCUTREA

Conference July 5-July 7 2005, University of Sussex, England, UK.

[<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/142028.doc>]

Sutherland, P. and Badger, R. (2004) "Lecturers' Perceptions of Lectures" *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28, 23, pp.277-289

Sutherland, P., Badger, R., & White, G. (2002). How New Students Take Notes at Lectures. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 26 (4).

Swales, J. & Feak, C. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students: a course for non-native speakers of English*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Swales, J. (1981). *Aspects of Article Introductions*. Language Studies Unit: University of Aston, Birmingham.

Swales, J. (1983). Developing materials for writing scholarly introductions. In Jordan, R. (Ed.). (1983). *Case Studies in ELT*. Collins: London.

Swales, J. (1986a). *Episodes in ESP*. (2nd Edition). Oxford: Pergamon.

Swales, J. (1986b). Citation Analysis and Discourse Analysis. *Applied Linguistics* 7(1).

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings*. CUP: Cambridge.

Swales, J., Ahmad, U., Chang, Y., Chavez, D., Dressen, D. & Seymour, R. (1998). Consider This: The Role of Imperatives in Scholarly Writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 97-121.

Tadros, A. (1985). *Prediction in Text*. Discourse analysis monograph No 10. University of Birmingham.

- Tadros, A. (1993). The Pragmatics of Text Aversion and Attribution in Academic Texts. In Hoey, M. (Ed.). (1993). *Data, Description and Discourse*. London: Harper Collins.
- Tadros, A. (1994). Predictive categories in expository text. In Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (1994a). *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The "I" in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, 23-39.
- Tannen D (1988b). Hearing voices in conversation, fiction, and mixed genres. In Tannen (Ed). (1988). *Linguistics in Context: Connecting Observation and Understanding*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tannen, D. (1982b) The oral/literate continuum in discourse. In Tannen, D. (Ed.) *Spoken and Written language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1991). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. London: Virago Press.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender and discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1982a). *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1988a). *Linguistics in Context: Connecting Observation and Understanding*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1993a). *Framing in Discourse*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1993b). *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarone, E., Dwyer, S., Gillette, S., & Icke, V. (1981). On the use of the passive in two astrophysics journal papers. *English for Specific Purposes*, 1(2), 123-40.
- Tauroza, S. & Allison, D. (1990). Speech rates in British English. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 90-105.
- Tauroza, S. & Allison, D. (1994). Expectation-driven understanding in information systems lecture comprehension. In Flowerdew, J. (Ed). (1994a). *Academic Listening. Research Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, K. (1990). *Gender and Subject in Higher Education*. SRHE and Open University Press.
- Thomas, S. & Hawes, T. (1994). Reporting Verbs in Medical Journal Articles. *Applied Linguistics* 13(2).
- Thompson, G. & Thetela, P. (1995). The sound of one hand clapping: The management of interaction in written discourse. *Text*, 15(1), 103-27.
- Thompson, G. (1991). Interaction in Academic Writing: Learning to Argue with the Reader. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1) 58-78.
- Thompson, G. (1994). *Collins Cobuild English Guides 5: Reporting*. London: HarperCollins.
- Thompson, G. (1996). Voices in the Text: Discourse Perspectives on Language Reports. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(4).
- Thompson, G. and Yiyun, Y. (1991). 'Evaluation in the Reporting Verbs used in Academic Papers'. *Applied Linguistics* 12(4).
- Thompson, L. (Ed.). *Children Talking: The Development of Pragmatic Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Thompson, P. & Tribble, C. (2001). Looking at Citations: Using Corpora in English for Academic Purposes. *Language Learning & Technology*, 5(3), 91-105.
- Thompson, P. (2000). Citation practices in PhD theses. In Burnard, L. & McEnery, T. (Eds.). (2000). *Rethinking language pedagogy from a corpus perspective*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Thompson, S. (1984) 'Subordination' in formal and informal discourse. In Schffrin, D. (Ed.). (1984). *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Thompson, S. (1994). Frameworks and Contexts: A Genre-Based Approach to Analysing Lecture Introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(2).
- Thompson, S. (1998). Why Ask Questions in Monologue? Language Choice at work in Scientific and Linguistic Talk. In Hunston, S. (1998). *Language at Work*. Multilingual Matters.
- Tiles, M. & Pippin, R. (Eds.). (1984). *Bachelard: Science and Objectivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toolan, M. (1988). *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Toolan, M. (1998). *Language in Literature. An Introduction to Stylistics*. New York: Arnold
- Torring, J. (1999). *New Theories of Discourse. Laclau, Mouffe, and Zizek*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Toulmin, S. (1958). *The uses of Argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toulmin, S. (1972). *Human Understanding: The Collective Use and Evolution of Concepts*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Triki, M. (2001). *Review of Collins, Daniel E. (2001) Reanimated Voices: Speech Reporting in a Historical-Pragmatic Perspective*. John Benjamins Publishing. Company [<http://www.linguistlist.org/issues/13/13-4.html>] [04-12-2004]
- Tsang, W.K. (2001). Intersection of school writing and public *discourse*. *Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 12, 51-83.
- Twaddell, W. (1960). *The English of Verb Auxiliaries*. Providence, RI: Brown University Press.
- UNESCO-CEPES. (2003). *Report on Trends and Developments in Higher Education in Europe*, (in the context of the follow-up to the World Conference on Higher Education - WCHE + 5 - 1998 - 2003). Paris: UNESCO.
- Ur, Penny. 1984. *Teaching listening comprehension*. *Cambridge Handbooks for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Uspensky, B. (1973). *A Poetics of Composition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Van Dijk, T. & Petofi, J. (Eds). (1977). *Grammars and Descriptions*. (*Studies in Text Theory and Text Analysis*). New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Van Dijk, T. (1988). *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Van Dijk, T. (Ed.). (1996). *Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. (Ed.). (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic.

- Varnava-Marouchou, D. (2004). The New Millennium: Implications For Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Manchester, 16-18 September 2004. [<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003857.doc>]
- Veel, R. (1997). Learning how to Mean – Scientifically speaking: Apprenticeship into Scientific Discourse in the Secondary School. In Christie, F. & Martin, J.R. (Eds.). (1997). *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School*. London: Cassell.
- Vice, S. (1997). *Introducing Bakhtin*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Voloshinov, V.N. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. (Trans. Matejka, L. & Titunik, I.) New York: Seminar Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wade E & Clark H (1993). Reproduction and demonstration in quotations. *Journal of memory and Language*, 32, 805-19.
- Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading*. Oxford University Press.
- Watanabe, S. (1993). Cultural differences in framing: American and Japanese group discussions. In Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1993b). *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Watson, R. (1987). Ethnomethodology and Textual Analysis. In Dilverman, D. (Ed.). *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. Sage: London.
- Webber, P. (1994). The function of questions in different medical journal genres. *English for Specific Purposes* 13: 257-68.

- Weber, J. (1996). *The Stylistics Reader: From Roman Jakobson to the Present*. New York: Arnold
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society*. University of California Press. Berkeley.
- Weir, C. (1990). *Communicative Language Testing*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Weissberg, R., & Buker, S. (1990). *Writing up research: Experimental research report writing for students of English*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Wells, G. (1959). *Herder and After: a study in the development of sociology*. Mouton. The Hague.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- West, M. (1953). *A general service list of English words*. London: Longman.
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and Interpretive Repertoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-Structuralism in Dialogue. *Discourse and Society* 9(3).
- White, D., Sullivan, D., & Barboni, E. (1979). The Interdependence of Theory and Experiment in Revolutionary Science: The Case of Parity Violation. *Social Studies of Science*, 9, 303-328.
- White, H. (2004). Citation Analysis and Discourse Analysis Revisited. *Applied Linguistics*, 25, 89-116.
- White, J.B. (1987). Rhetoric and Law: The Arts of Cultural and Communal Life. In Nelson, S., Megill, A. and McCloskey, D. (Eds). (1987a). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Wisconsin.

- Whitehead, A. (1969). *Process and Reality*. London: Free Press.
- Whitley, R. (1969). Communication nets in science: status and citation patterns in animal physiology. *Sociological Review*, 17(2), 219-33.
- Widdowson, H. (1988). Poetry and pedagogy. *Linguistics in context: Connecting observation and understanding*. In Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1988a). *Linguistics in Context: Connecting Observation and Understanding*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1984). *Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka A (1974). The semantics of direct and indirect discourse. *Papers in Linguistics*, 7(3-4), 267-307.
- Winstanley, M. (1976). Assimilation into the literature of a critical advance in molecular biology. *Social Studies of Science*, 6, 545-9.
- Winstanley, M. (1976). Assimilation into the literature of a critical advance in molecular biology. *Social Studies of Science*, 6, 545-9.
- Winter, E. (1994). Clause relations as information structure: Two basic text structures in English. In Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (1994a). *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1958). *Philosophical Investigations*. (Trans. Anscombe, G.) Macmillan: New York.
- Wodak, R. (2000a). Does Sociolinguistics need Social Theory? New Perspectives in Critical Discourse Analysis. [<http://www.oew.ac.at/wittgenstein/unemploy/handout%20bristol11.htm>] [04-12-2004]
- Wodak, R. (2000b). Recontextualisation and the transformation of meanings: a critical discourse analysis of decision making in EU meetings about

- employment policies. In Sarangi, S. & Coulthard, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Discourse and Social Life*. London: Pearson.
- Wodak, R. (Ed.). (1989). *Language, Power and Ideology. Studies in political discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wood, D. (Ed.). (1992). *Derrida: A Critical Reader*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Woolgar, S. (1988). *Science: The very idea*. London: Macmillan.
- Worton, M. & Still, J. (Eds.). (1990). *Intertextuality: theories and practices*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Wright, P. (1999). Writing and information design of healthcare materials. In Candlin, C. & Hyland, K. (Eds.). (1999). *Writing: texts, processes and practices*. London: Longman.
- Wu, S., & Rubin, D. (2000). Evaluating the impact of collectivism and individualism on argumentative writing by Chinese and North American college students. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 35, 148-178.
- Wyatt, J. (1994). Maps of Knowledge: do they form an atlas? In Barnett, R. (Ed.). (1994). *Academic Community: Discourse or Discord?* London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Yancey, K. B. (Ed.). (1994a). *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry*. Urbana IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Yancey, K.B. (1994b). Introduction: Definition, intersection, and difference – mapping the landscape of voice. In Yancey, K. B. (Ed.). (1994a). *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry*. Urbana IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

- Yates, J. & Orlikowski, W. (1992). Genres of Organizational Communication: A Structural Approach to Studying Communication and Media. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(2), 299-326.
- Young, L. (1994). University lectures – macro-structure and micro-features. In Flowerdew, J. (Ed). (1994a). *Academic Listening Research Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, M. (Ed). (1971). *Knowledge and Control*. London. Collier-Macmillan.
- Young, R. (Ed.). *Untying The Text: A Post-structuralist Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Yule, G., Mathis, T. & Hopkins, M. (1992). On Reporting What Was Said. *ELT Journal*, 46(3), 243-51.
- Zamel, V. (1993). Questioning Academic Discourse. *College ESL* 3 (1).
- Zerger, S. & McQueeney, P. (1998). ‘This is chemistry, not English literature’: Supporting writing across campus. In Shireen, C. (Ed.). *Travels with the Midwest Writing Centers Association. 1996-1997. Conference Proceedings*. Midwest Writing Centers Association.
- Zerger, S. (1999). Discipline-Specific SI Strategies for Writing. [<http://www.umkc.edu/cad/si/sidocs/szcpap99.htm>] [04-12-2004]
- Zhang, D.L. (1991). Role relationships and their realization in mood and modality. *Text*, 11(2), 289-318.
- Zhu, H., Li, W., & Qian, Y. (1998), Gift offer and acceptance in Chinese culture: Contexts and functions. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 8(2), 87-101.
- Zhu, H., Li, W., & Qian, Y. (1999), The sequential organisation of gifts offering and acceptance in Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(1), 81-103.

- Zhu, Y. & Thompson, P. (2000), Invitation or sexual harassment? An analysis of an intercultural communication breakdown. *M/C- A Journal of MEdia and Culture*, 4(3).
- Ziman, J. (1968). *Public Knowledge*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Ziman, J. (1984). *An Introduction to Science Studies: the philosophical and social aspects of science and technology*. Cambridge: CUP
- Zuboff, S. (1988). *In the Age of the Smart Machine: The Future of Work and Power*. New York: Basic Books.
- Zuckerman, H. & Merton, R. (1971). Patterns of Evaluation in Science: Institutionalisation, Structure and Functions of the Referee System. *Minerva*, 9(1), 66-100.

APPENDIX 1: Table for Segregation of Data into Independent Units

Broad type	Specific type	Status	Example
Independent Clause	Standing alone	Independent	<p>TLM32) this is a theory shared well beyond Marxism within other branches of the labour movement</p> <p>TLM33) so let's er just state the theory</p>
	Standing in a chain	Independent	<p>TLM23) so I'll outline a theory</p> <p>TLM24) and then I'll outline some er scepticism from within er the labour movement about that theory</p>
	Complex with dependent units	Independent	<p>TLM25) and then to conclude the lecture we'll move on to a different kind of theory the theory of so-called New Social Movements which claims er that either the pre-eminence of the labour movement has now declined and there it's just one amongst many</p> <p>TLM26) or a more radical version of the theory is that the labour movement er is now um an anachronism and has been overtaken by New Social Movements</p>
Reported Units	Indirect reported units	Dependent	<p>RC577) surprisingly perhaps they're not</p> <p>RC578) you might have thought there might be a reasonable yield</p> <p>RC579) but in fact when you radiolise (?) water you form these two in spur</p>
	Direct reported units	Independent	<p>RC514) and what's known is a very very fast reaction between H2O plus and water to give H3O plus and OH radical</p> <p>RC515) so you might have thought [well] [perhaps we're getting some OH radical]</p> <p>RC516) [well]</p> <p>RC517) [perhaps we're getting some OH radical]</p>
Parenthetical Units		Independent	<p>RC321) now if you take cyclo-hexane and you irradiate it [α and I've just put [β this is a symbol by the way that sort of lightning looking symbol above β] [χ that's the symbol for high energy radiation ionising radiation χ] [α and I've put gamma α] [δ and I should have put alpha δ] [e it was alpha radiation ϵ] <and you get three things happening></p> <p>RC322) [α and I've just put [β ... β] and I've put gamma α]</p> <p>RC323) [β this is a symbol by the way that sort of lightning looking symbol above with the (?) above β]</p>

				RC324) [χ that's the symbol for high energy radiation ionising radiation χ] RC325) [δ and I should have put alpha δ] RC326) [ϵ it was alpha radiation ϵ]
Broad type	Specific type	Status	Example	
Peripheral Elements	Stance adverbials Linking adverbials Detached predicatives Prefaces Noun phrase tags Question tags Declarative tags Vocatives. Overtures.	Dependent		
Non-clausal Units	Politeness Formulae	Independent	RC379) so you get quite high excited state yields from radiolysis of something like cyclo-hexane hexane dioxan benzene and toluene and all those sorts of solvents high yields from organic solvents particularly if there are no organic radicals there [sorry] if there are no hydroxy groups there RC380) [sorry]	
	Elliptic Replies	Independent	RC476) if you take a vessel and you fill it almost to the top put a stopper in take this vessel of pure water completely full and if you gamma irradiate it for days and then you do a big analysis of it what happens? RC477) and the answer is RC478) almost nothing	
	Condensed questions	Independent	TLM86) but secondly there is a second route forward again which actually happened what I'll call the social democratic route TLM87) everyone turned the page	
	Echo questions	Independent	RC584) the dialytic or electric permattivity of hexane is about two RC585) has anybody any idea what it is for water? RC586) the dialytic constant for water or electric permattivity of water any feel for that?	
	Self-monitoring	Independent	RC364) and these systems they have a special name RC365) in that technology they're called liquid scintillators RC366) so if I put in brackets under here liquid scintillators RC367) they are a very good way of measuring ionising radiation RC368) you can use liquid ones	

	Titles / definitions	Independent	<p>RC303) there are various ways of trying to see them</p> <p>RC304) let's look now at excited states</p> <p>RC305) the measurement of excitation yields in radiolysis</p> <p>RC306) what we think happens</p> <p>TLM306) have I missed anyone out peace movements nuclear anti-nuclear environmentalism feminism civil rights</p> <p>TLM307) so a contrast between new and old</p> <p>TLM308) secondly was a claim that the labour movement had become er have played its part in the development of the modern world</p>
	On-line summaries	Independent	<p>TLM37) the idea is that the labour movement grows out of the everyday experience of people in modern society the everyday experience of the deprivations of work poverty problems in housing</p> <p>TLM38) da didah didah</p> <p>TLM39) but that that would grow in three different ways</p>
	Substitution	Independent	
	Specific type	Status	Example
Broad type	Well	Independent	<p>RC52) how do we cope with this idea?</p> <p>RC53) well</p> <p>RC54) we cope with it by saying [how many molecules or how many ions do we get for a certain amount of energy deposited]</p>
	Right	Independent	<p>RC333) what happens if anthracene is there?</p> <p>RC334) right</p> <p>RC335) if I've got anthracene A what happens is this</p>
	Okay	Independent	<p>RC277) and the question raised in people's minds [okay] [this is what you see at ten to the minus nine] [but what if we could actually shorten the pulse further would we see earlier events?]</p> <p>RC278) [okay]</p> <p>RC279) [this is what you see at ten to the minus nine]</p> <p>RC239) and the question then arose [we'll] [oh] [that's fine for frozen matrices] [what about liquids?]</p> <p>RC240) [well]</p> <p>RC241) [oh]</p>
	Oh	Usually independent	

	Now	Usually dependent	RC319) there's only one C6H11 RC320) so whichever of those bonds you break you always have the same radical RC321) now if you take cyclo-hexane and you irradiate it TLM45) but it moved from that level spatially to the idea of the regional trade union and then the national trade union and then international workers TLM46) so the idea is that spatially the labour movement grows from everyday experience of problems in in Capitalist society into a national and indeed international movement
Broad type	Specific type Interjections	Status Independent	Example TLM358) finally let me offer some er critical thoughts on the theory [α whoops α] [β wrong bit β] on the theory of new new social movements TLM359) [α whoops α] TLM172) this is say this is Gorz as I said earlier a member of the French communist party um saying [the working class] [thing of the past] [bye-bye]
Inserts – Others	Greetings & farewells Attention signals Response elicitors	Independent Usually independent Usually independent	
	Hesitators	Usually dependent	TLM21) er the labour movement made up of trade unions co-operative parties um political parties and all sorts of er other associated um er groupings seemed to have a pre-eminence
Broad type	Specific type	Status	Example

APPENDIX 2: Table for Intertext Recognition & Classification

Intertext	Formal criteria	Typical functions	Examples
Lecturer as <i>I</i> is author and Principal behind the unit		Referring to other lectures	RC3) yesterday I was talking about the idea of a track in radiation chemistry where as the particle moves it's losing energy [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]
		Discourse structuring	TLM22) and so I'll start my lecture by talking about a theory of the labour movement and then er a sort of lack of confidence about the labour movement [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]
		Closings	RC609) on that amazing thought I'll bring things to an end [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]
		Commenting on performances	RC150) because I've got these on the slide I'll put the slide on [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]
		Evaluation	TLM31) but what I want to stress is that this is not a particularly Marxist theory [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]
Lecturer Intertext	Recognisable via pronoun forms <i>I/my/me/mine</i>		TLM203) people don't become miners or carpenters or radiographers because one year they might be picking fruit er in during the summer er that [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] ... TLM205) um [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] TLM206) that's taken from a particular interview I had with er with a a non-worker who was flitted from one kind of work to another [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC8) but that's an overall picture [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] TLM164) [α he is not precise α] [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC139) that's very important in photo-chemistry [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]
Recognisable by function of the unit – instances of clausal level metadiscourse classified as lecturer intertext by default unless specifically marked otherwise		Propositional input	
		Evaluation without the <i>I</i> form	
		Discourse structuring without <i>I</i> form	RC72) what happens to the rest? [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC38) how do you measure the efficiency of a radiation chemistry process? [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]

	Instances of spoken discourse markers classified as lecturer intertext by default	Managing discourse / interaction	RC21) what about the cations that are formed? [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC22) well [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]
Disciplinary Intertext	Intertext	Typical functions	Examples
	Discipline in form of named individual practitioners or pronominal forms indexing them is main author and principal behind the unit (authorship and principalship is shared between discipline and lecturer with the former understood as dominant). Discipline as heterogeneous "voice".	Propositional input	TLM139) in terms of work experience in terms of life style in terms of political awareness the proposition is put forward by er by Hobsbawm that there was an increasing what he called proletarianisation of working class life [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM140) in support of that he he makes the point that most most workers up to that time were ...
	Discipline (in form of superficially averred statements) is main author and principal behind the unit (authorship and principalship is shared between discipline and lecturer with the former understood as dominant). Discipline as homogeneous "voice" subsuming lecturer.	Propositional input	RC29) and when this electron returns to that cation it is very likely to form it in an excited state [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC30) so it will get additional excited states from ion recombination [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC31) but also what can happen is that the RH plus the cation radical is a very powerful proton donor [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]
	Pronoun <i>you</i> as indexing typical disciplinary practitioner	Propositional input	RC184) if you take that silver mirror of sodium which is very very pure and you react it with a dilute solution of Naphthalene in an ether you end up by getting a deep green solution [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC199) when you do photochemic excitation you match the quantum of the light to the energy level of the solute [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]
	Pronoun <i>we</i> as indexing all three participants in joint	Discourse structuring	RC37) how many ions do we get? [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC52) so how do we cope with this idea? [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]

	discourse performance	Referring to other lectures Joint construction of discursive situation	RC246) we've talked about flash photolysis before RC247) that's where you take a flash lamp RC61) ionisation of a typical organic is about ten eleven or twelve [Disciplinary Intertext] RC62) let's say ten for the sake of argument [Disciplinary Intertext]
Intertext	Formal criteria	Typical functions	Examples
Audience Intertext	Audience in form of <i>you / your</i> form indexing them is main principal behind the unit, although lecturer authors unit. Often these are hypothetical statements about what the audience might be thinking, or general statements of what (the lecturer assumes) they know	Dialoguing with audience (presumed) state of audience knowledge	TLM9) those of you who might be members of a trade union or a political party [do you want to pick one of those up] will er will know that they can take an extremely bureaucratic form in which the powers of committees and what not are closely defined [Audience Intertext] TLM11) alternatively if you've engaged in er in direct action er to stop er calves being exported er alive to the continent or something like that then you'll know that er the form of organisation is extremely loose and network-based [Audience Intertext] TLM11) some of you will be becoming aware of the work of Max Weber [Audience Intertext] RC9) now that being the case you might say [well] [alright] [you've got ions in excited states] [or so you say] [what happens immediately after this event has occurred] [Audience Intertext] RC10) [well] [Audience Intertext] RC11) [alright] [Audience Intertext] RC12) [you've got ions in excited states] [Audience Intertext] RC13) [or so you say] [Audience Intertext] RC14) [what happens immediately after this event has occurred] [Audience Intertext]
		Possibly discourse structuring	

APPENDIX 3: Typology and Coding Scheme for Data Analysis

Area	Function	Specific Pattern	Example	Coding
Intertextuality	Propositional Input	Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked Propositions	RC74) [I] you get ion recombination [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC75) [I] the ions don't escape at all [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC76) [I] they're formed [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC77) [I] and they recombine instantly [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]	I
		Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Nouns	TLM162) [III] so that indicates the idea that um prior to nineteen-fifty in Hobsbawm's view a labour elite provided a class leadership for the working class as a whole [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM183) [III] his {Gortz's} idea is that if you work in a bank or a large private company then you become extremely skilled [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]	II
		Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs	TLM190) [III] now Gortz claims that if you are a craft worker you can see all the processes of production and you can also see how it is possible to do it all by yourself or do it in collaboration with other workers [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM139) [III] in terms of work experience in terms of political awareness the proposition is put forward by er by Hobsbawm that there was an increasing what he called proletarianisation of working class life [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]	III
		Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verbs	TLM392) [IV] so I think basically there are fundamental flaws in this idea that the labour movement is now an old movement which has been surpassed by new social movements [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] TLM15) [IV] so to cut through all of that I use a nice straightforward definition which we've got here [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] TLM16) [IV] forms of popular organisation which have their basis outside the political system but which seek to influence the political system in the direction of their cause [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]	IV
		Lecturer Intertext Reporting Nouns	TLM203) [V] people don't become miners or radiographers because one year they might be picking fruit er in during the summer er that [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] ... TLM205) [V] that's taken from a particular interview I had with a non-worker who was fitted from one kind of work to another [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]	V

		Audience Intertext	TLM111) [VI] <u>some of you will be becoming aware</u> of the work of Max Weber [Audience Intertext] TLM315) [VI] <u>you might er be aware that Marx and Engels called their their</u> form of socialism scientific socialism [Audience Intertext]	VI
Intratextuality	Macro-discourse Structuring	Lecturer Intertext Averral	TLM22) [VII] and so I'll start my lecture by talking about a theory of the labour movement and then er a sort of lo lack of confidence about the labour movement which set in er during the nineteen-seventies [Lecturer Intertext] TLM23) [VII] so I'll outline a theory [Lecturer Intertext] TLM24) [VII] and then I'll outline some er scepticism from within er the labour movement about that theory [Lecturer Intertext]	VII
		Lecturer Intertext Interrogative	RC21) [VIII] what about the cations that are formed? [Lecturer Intertext] RC38) [VIII] how do you measure the efficiency of a radiation chemistry process? [Lecturer Intertext] RC72) [VIII] what happens to the rest? [Lecturer Intertext]	VIII
		Disciplinary Intertext Averral	TLM33) [IX] so let's er just state the theory [Disciplinary Intertext] TLM25) [IX] and then to conclude the lecture we'll move on to a different kind of theory the theory of so-called New Social Movements which claims er that either the pre-eminence of the labour movement has now declined and there it's just one amongst many [Disciplinary Intertext]	IX
		Disciplinary Intertext Interrogative	RC37) [X] how many ions do we get? [Disciplinary Intertext] RC52) [X] so how do we cope with this idea? [Disciplinary Intertext] RC439) [X] how do we know? [Disciplinary Intertext]	X
		Audience Intertext Averral	RC209) [XI] <u>you might say [what happens to the solute?] [does it ionise that as well?]</u> [Audience Intertext] RC210) [XI] [what happens to the solute?] [Audience Intertext] RC211) [XI] [does it ionise that as well?] [Audience Intertext] RC212) [XII] well [Lecturer Intertext]	XI
		Micro-discourse Structuring		

	Inter-lecture Reference	Lecturer Intertext Inter-lecture Reference	RC3) [XIII] yesterday I was talking about the idea of a track in radiation chemistry where as the particle moves it's losing energy [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC48) [XIII] and the point I was trying to make yesterday [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC157) [XIII] I mentioned some of them in the photo-chemistry section of the course [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]	XIII
		Disciplinary Intertext Inter-lecture Reference	TLM1) [XIV] over the last two weeks we've been talking about democracy [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM2) [XIV] we've been talking about the state as part of a series of lectures on the politics of modern society [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]	XIV
	Intra-lecture Reference	Lecturer Intertext Intra-lecture Reference Disciplinary Intertext Intra-lecture Reference	RC436) [XV] now I've talked about the capturing of the electrons [<i>Lect Intert</i>] RC437) [XV] I've talked about capturing the excited states [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC385) [XVI] we've looked at the emission from the anthracene say or whatever else you were using [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] RC610) [XVI] so we've talked about radiolysis using scavengers of organic systems [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]	XV
Intratextuality	Scaffolding		TLM4) [XVII] it's perhaps best just to give you some names to illustrate what we're talking about [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM5) [XVII] we're talking about the peace movement [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM6) [XVII] we're talking about the woman's movement [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>] TLM7) [XVII] we're talking about the socialist movement the movements for civil rights the movement for animal rights [<i>Disciplinary Intertext</i>]	XVII
	Reformulation		RC182) [XVIII] in other words if you take a sodium film if you purify sodium and then could allow the sodium vapour it connects on glass you get a sodium mirror a mirror of sodium [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC460) [XIX] [that's what BPR stands for] [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]	XVIII
	Lexical Reference			XIX
Metatextuality	Relational – Status		RC8) [XX] but that's an overall picture [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC375) [XX] that was a bit of an aside [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] TLM271) [XX] [this is the second key idea] [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]	XX
	Relational – Origins		TLM31) [XXI] but what I want to stress is that this is not a particularly Marxist theory [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC256) [XXI] so it's exactly the same type of idea [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]	XXI

	Epistemic – Degree of Difficulty	RC100) [XXII] it's a very simple idea [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]	XXII
	Epistemic – Truth Value	TLM30) [XXIII] this is a nice neat statement of the theory of the labour movement [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] TLM164) [XXIII] [α he is not precise α] [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] TLM165) [XXIII] [β he can't put them this down to a particular date October the fourteenth nineteen-forty-nine or something β] [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC175) [XXIV] it's quite a spectacular experiment to do [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC176) [XXIV] it's a nice demonstration [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]	XXIII XXIV
	Aesthetic		
Other Units	Administrative	TLM66) [XXV] we'll see if I can get this lined up [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] TLM214) [XXV] I'm not sure if I pronounce that right [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] TLM216) [XXV] it's it's er a Polish name [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] TLM217) [XXV] and to me it sounds sort of Polish like that [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] TLM218) [XXV] so if any of you er speak Polish or have Polish ancestry my apology if I have made a complete arse of how to pronounce this Polish word [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>]	XXV
	Authentic Lecturer – Student Interaction	RC523) [XXVI] [α have you done that α] [<i>Audience Intertext</i>] RC524) [XXVI] [β have you had an experiment in the lab with sodium and ammonia β] [<i>Audience Intertext</i>] RC525) [XXVI] [χ have you ever had to look at ammonia as a reagent χ] [<i>Audience Intertext</i>] RC526) [XXVI] [δ maybe not δ] [<i>Audience Intertext</i>]	XXVI
	Abandoned Units	TLM215) [XXVII] but it does {Abandoned unit} [<i>Lecturer Intertext</i>] RC49) [XXVII] and the alpha particle has {Abandoned Unit} TLM265) [XXVII] what these di depended upon {Abandoned Unit}	XXVII

APPENDIX 4: The Corpus

Grouping	Lecture	Number	Discipline	Words	Units	Audience
Arts & Humanities	1) Hume's Treatise	RL063	<i>Philosophy</i>	10,131	862	35 UG2
	2) Contemporary Approaches to History of Art – Iconography, Marxism & Feminism	WL036	<i>History of Art</i>	8,259	424	30 UG
	3) The French Revolution **	WL026	<i>History</i>	9,134	563	100+ UG
	4) Roman Britain	WL009	<i>Classics</i>	6,852	373	25 UG2/3
	5) The Aftermath of Political Nationalism in C19 Latin-America *	WL010	<i>Comparative American Studies</i>	8,266	524	50 UG
	6) Allegory in The Faerie Queen	RL041	<i>English</i>	7,856	518	50 UG2
Totals				50,498	3,264	48/lecture
Grouping	Lecture	Number	Discipline	Words	Units	Audience
Social Studies & Social Sciences	7) Collective Defence & Military Alliances	RL047	<i>Modern International Relations</i>	6,764	340	60 UG2
	8) Inflation Targeting – Economic Policy in The UK	WL015	<i>Economics</i>	8,473	516	30 UG
	9) Silence as Evidence	WL040	<i>Law</i>	7,055	436	100 UG
	10) Environment & Sustainability	RL040	<i>Land Management</i>	12,231	797	15 UG3
	11) Observational & Social Learning *	RL017	<i>Psychology</i>	9,337	524	45 UG1
	12) Pricing – Marketing Analysis	WL059	<i>Warwick Business School</i>	9,405	622	80 UG
Totals				53,265	3,235	55/lecture
Grouping	Lecture	Number	Discipline	Words	Units	Audience
Life &	13) HIV & AIDS	WL001	<i>Biological Sciences</i>	6,290	406	20 UG
	14) Systems Physiology *	RL022	<i>AMS</i>	7,742	517	45 UG2
	15) Immunology	RL023	<i>AMS</i>	6,282	513	50 UG

Medical Sciences	16) Agricultural Botany	RL025		8,248	580	7 UG3
	17) Genetics & Molecular Biology	RL024	<i>AMS</i>	7,943	565	150 UG1
	18) Man's Impact on Environment – Pesticides	RL019	<i>Zoology</i>	10,915	640	20 UG3
Totals				47,420	3,221	48/lecture
Grouping	Lecture	Number	Discipline	Words	Units	Audience
Physical Sciences	19) Artificial Life	WL054	<i>Psychology</i>	6,835	489	100 UG
	20) Probability Distributions	RL067	<i>Economics</i>	7,915	523	60 UG1
	21) Holography	RL045	<i>Physics</i>	6,009	474	25 UG1
	22) Polymers	RL028	<i>Engineering</i>	7,545	598	16 UG2
	23) Organometallic Chemistry *	RL005	<i>Chemistry</i>	6,048	459	50 UG2
	24) Formal Logic	WL047	<i>Philosophy</i>	7,539	582	35 UG
Totals				41,891	3,125	48/lecture

* These four lectures were also used for the coding reliability tests

** A copy of this lecture fully coded using the typology was used in the coding reliability test as part of the supporting documentation. See appendix 14.4

Disciplinary Area	Total Words	Total Units	Average Audience
Arts & Humanities	50,498	3,264	48
Social Studies & Social Sciences	53,265	3,235	55
Biomedical & Life Sciences	47,420	3,221	48
Physical Sciences	41,891	3,125	48
Totals	193,074	12,845	50

APPENDIX 5.1: Summary of Study for Coding Reliability Test

The object of this exercise is to try to ensure that I have devised a valid and reliable coding scheme for the data in my PhD. Beneath I will outline what my study is about, what I am trying to find via my study, and the coding scheme I have used to code my data. I will also show you a series of units coded using the scheme to help you to get into my system. The final aim is that I will then ask you to code a number of units yourself using the scheme I have devised, and hopefully with a favourable wind, your results will tally with mine ☺ Assuming so & all limbs crossed, this will enable me to argue that the scheme I have used to code my data is both valid and reliable.

What my study is about

- This study aims to establish three broad preliminary things – firstly how “other voices” (in the Bakhtinian sense) are constructed / represented in undergraduate lecture discourses of different disciplines; secondly, what roles the “other voices” perform in lecture discourses; and thirdly how the relationships between these “other voices” are mediated and set up
- Once these things are established, the overall aim of this study is to establish how *Intertextuality* is managed and realised in lecture discourses – in terms of which “other voices” / participants realise it, how they realise it lexico-grammatically, and the extents to which the different choices identified are used in different disciplines
- All academic discourse is understood in this study as inherently and inescapably dialogic and intertextual to begin with, whether this (perceived) reality is obscured or celebrated. Undergraduate lectures themselves are viewed as discursive sites of (or discursive spaces for) the recontextualisation of a discipline’s original knowledge-constructing discourses (i.e. their knowledge-building Research Articles, books etc), i.e. lectures are understood as fundamentally intertextual discourses themselves in that they recontextualise the already constructed *knowledge* of a discipline – by implication, lecturers are viewed as the recontextualisers of a discipline
- The *knowledge* of a discipline is viewed in this study from the perspective of constructivism and/or rhetoric, i.e. this study understands disciplinary *knowledge* as constructed in discourse as opposed to simply represented in it – *knowledge* is discourse in other words, the two are inseparable – the reproduction / reconstruction of *knowledge* in a lecture is therefore viewed in this study as the reproduction / reconstruction of disciplinary discourses – and hence why all academic discourse in lectures is understood in this study as inescapably intertextual

- *Knowledge* is also viewed as the outcome or product of interaction and dialogism as mediated within discourse (e.g. Bakhtin, Wertsch, Vygotsky) – this is why this study is interested in establishing the potential and actual interactions between “other voices” realised in the recontextualisation of *knowledge* lectures, and interested too in establishing the different attitudes towards *knowledge* constructed via the different interactions identified

Methodology

i) Units

- The corpus consists of 24 lectures from the BASE²⁶⁹ corpus, 6 each from the broad disciplinary categories of “Arts & Humanities”, “Social Sciences”, “Life & Bio-Sciences”, and “Physical Sciences (incl. maths & computing)”
- Each lecture has been transcribed, and each of the transcriptions broken down into independent units. Each independent unit in each lecture has been marked according to the lecture it derives from with capital letters (e.g. TLM, RC etc), and numbered chronologically according to its position in the lecture. This has resulted in a corpus of all the independent units from each of the 24 lectures, each unit labelled according to lecture and numbered chronologically per lecture
- An independent unit is to all intents and purposes an independent clause complete with any dependent clauses (i.e. similar to Halliday’s notion of the clause nexus), but modified to allow for the spoken nature of lecture discourse (modified following Biber et al (1999))
- This means that an independent unit can take the form of a ‘regular’ clause; or it can sometimes take the form of what Biber et al (ibid) call ‘non-clausal material’, common in the spoken form of English – ‘non-clausal material’ in lectures usually takes the form of an ‘insert’ (usually discourse markers such as “alright”, “okay”, “well”) or hesitators (such as “er”, “um”):

TLM386) so I think basically there are fundamental flaws in this idea that the labour movement is now an old movement which has been surpassed by new social movements
 TLM387) okay
 TLM388) that's just about done it in the time
 TLM389) so
 TLM390) er
 TLM391) um
 TLM392) I think we'll draw to a close now
 TLM393) and er I'll see you next week

- Spoken English is different in its structure to written English, and one of the manifestations of this is the presence in the data of larger independent units

²⁶⁹ The BASE corpus is The British Academic Spoken English corpus being developed at The Universities of Warwick and Reading

with smaller independent unit(s) embedded inside them – i.e. an ‘on-going’ clause/unit is interrupted, a lexico-grammatically separate independent unit is uttered, and then the original clause/unit is continued. This phenomenon is known as a “parenthetical structure” (Biber et al ibid), and is a common feature in the data. When this phenomenon happens, the same process happens each time – because they are independent in status, the embedded independent unit(s) is/are marked inside the ‘main’ clause/unit with [square brackets], and then they are placed beneath the larger unit so they stand as the independent units they are, and form part of the analysis:

TLM160) again his claim is that after that time [he is not precise] [he can't put them this down to a particular date October the 14th 1949 or something but from around that sort of time] he sees er the privileged sections of the labour movement not as providing leadership but as entering into an internal competition with other groups in the labour movements particularly over wages
 TLM161) [he is not precise]
 TLM162) [he can't put them this down to a particular date October the 14th 1949 or something but from around that sort of time]
 TLM163) so the privileged groups of the period from the 1950's through to the 1970's in particular mine workers er car workers transport workers er those three groups in particular Hobsbaum sees as not providing leadership

TLM351) they were members of a loose network of people who were concerned about this and who came together er for their stint at Greenham Common on an informal basis
 TLM352) finally let's me offer some er critical thoughts on the theory [whoops] [wrong bit] on the theory of new new social movements
 TLM353) [whoops]
 TLM354) [wrong bit]
 TLM355) the first criticism takes objection to the er to the description new social movements

- The other use of [square brackets] in the data for this study occurs with instances of direct reported speech (much direct “reported speech” in the data is often in fact “constructed speech” in Tannen’s (1989) – but the syntax is still that of direct reported speech). When this happens, the [square brackets] are used to mark the unit(s) of direct speech inside the ‘main’ unit, and the unit(s) of direct speech in [square brackets] is/are then also placed beneath the original reporting unit as separate units. This means there is the one single ‘original’ unit comprising the reporting clause and all the direct speech units in it in [square brackets]; and beneath that ‘original’ unit there is/are each independent unit of direct speech from inside that ‘original’ unit.
- This is done for two reasons – firstly because units of direct speech are not truly dependent on (although nor are they truly independent of) their reporting clause (as observable in the deixis & “genuine” nature of the reported speech units); and secondly because this allows the scheme to make a distinction between units realised with direct and indirect speech:

RC11) now that being the case you might say [well] [alright] [you've got ions in excited states] [or so you say] [what happens immediately after this event has occurred]
 RC12) [well]
 RC13) [alright]
 RC14) [you've got ions in excited states]
 RC15) [or so you say]
 RC16) [what happens immediately after this event has occurred]

- Each independent unit has then been coded according to two criteria – firstly according to its function with regards to the realisation / management of what I have termed *Transtextuality* (more beneath); and secondly according to which of the three “other voices” or participants is constructed as its source or authority
- It is this particular part of the scheme which I am wanting to establish validity and reliability for with your help – and it is to the details of this that we turn next:

ii) Coding Scheme

- In the typology for this study, three key “other voices” or discourse participants are identified in lectures – lecturer, discipline and audience
- In the typology for this study (viewing “academic discourse” as inherently dialogic and intertextual) three broad functional areas have been identified under the broad notion of *transtextuality*:
- *Intertextuality* – broadly speaking, this equates with the propositional or ideational content in a lecture, or the recontextualised *knowledge*
- *Intratextuality* – broadly speaking, this equates with the organising language used to construct discourse in a lecture such as discourse structuring, reference backwards and forwards both within a single lecture and between a series of lectures, and reformulation
- *Metatextuality* – broadly speaking, this equates with units realising explicit unit-length evaluation in a lecture – these are the least common type of unit
- Each independent unit in each lecture is then coded via a coding scheme incorporating both of these criteria above – that is according to the function of the unit (i.e. what aspect of *Transtextuality* the unit is realising); and according to the “other voice” or participant identified (explicitly or implicitly) as the source or authority behind the unit (i.e. how the interaction and dialogism within a unit is structured, or its participation framework in Goffman’s (1981) terms)
- Therefore in this coding scheme, the functional area of what I have termed *Intratextuality* for example can be realised such that one or a combination of the three “other voices” or participants (lecturer / discipline / audience)

is/are constructed as the source or authority behind the unit realising the function.

- This means, as an example, that the function of what I have termed *Macro-Discourse Structuring* within *Intratextuality* can be realised such that the lecturer is constructed as the source or authority behind the unit (i); such that the discipline (conceived here in this functional area as a fusion of lecturer and audience via “we”) is constructed as the source or authority behind the unit (ii); or such that the audience is constructed as the source or authority behind the unit (iii):

Type	Examples
i	TLM22) and so I'll start my lecture by talking about a theory of the labour movement and then er a sort of lo lack of confidence about the labour movement which set in er during the 1970's TLM23) so I'll outline a theory TLM24) and then I'll outline some er scepticism from within er the labour movement about that theory TLM284) now for the third part of the lecture I want to move from er a focus upon the labour movement and its dilemmas and problems on to a different kind of theory
ii	TLM28) so let's start then with the classic theory of the labour movement TLM33) so let's er just state the theory TLM25) and then to conclude the lecture we'll move on to a different kind of theory the theory of so-called New Social Movements TLM321) the three points that we can bring in here are a) b) and c)
iii	RC11) now that being the case you might say RC12) well RC13) alright RC14) you've got ions in excited states RC15) or so you say RC16) what happens immediately after this event has occurred

- This system of coding a unit according to its function and the source or authority behind it (its participation framework in Goffman's (1981) terms) has been applied to each independent unit from each lecture – this means I now have a corpus consisting of approximately 24 (lectures) X 600 (average number of units per lecture) – so a corpus of about 14,000-14,500 units, each of which is marked for the lecture it derives from (TLM, RC etc) and its position within that lecture (TLM56, RC469 etc), and coded in terms of the function it realises within *Transtextuality* and the source behind the unit
- These units will be used to identify patterns for the realisation of the three functions within *Transtextuality* in academic undergraduate lectures, or to establish the potentials for the realisation of these three functions – and then these patterns will be compared across and between lectures to see if any discernible disciplinary patterns emerge

iii) The typology in more detail

- The typology used to map patterns of *Transtextuality* in the corpus consists of a total of 26 options, represented by Roman numerals (I to XXVI)

- The first 6 of these options (I to VI) deal with the functional area of *Intertextuality* (broadly speaking, this area refers to units realising the propositional / ideational content or *knowledge* recontextualised in a lecture) – this is the most typical functional area of units
- The next 12 options (VII to XIX) deal with the functional area of *Intratextuality* (broadly speaking, this area refers to units realising metadiscourse, i.e. the discourse-organising language in a lecture) – this is the second most typical functional area of units
- The next 4 options (XX to XXIV) deal with *Metatextuality* (this refers to units realising explicit unit-length evaluation of other units in a lecture) – this is a relatively unusual functional area as most evaluation in a lecture seems to be a permanent motif realised implicitly in an on-going local manner within lexico-grammar choices rather than via explicit clausal-length units
- The final two options are ‘outside’ the typology – firstly one option for units realising administrative talk (XXV); and secondly one option for units explicitly realising requests for student participation, or units actually realised / uttered by students (XXVI) (not because such units are unimportant, but because my study is looking at monologue not dialogue.)
- This study identifies three broad participants in academic lectures – lecturer, discipline and audience. These broadly are the three “other voices” within undergraduate lecture discourse, though clearly “discipline-as-a-voice” is a broad concept. Each unit is identified as having one of these participants as its source or “voice”
- These voices-as-realised/constructed-in-text are referred to in this study by the notion of “intertext”, so the terminologies of Lecturer Intertext, Disciplinary Intertext, and Audience Intertext refer to the voice or source behind a unit – and each intertext can potentially be used to realise any of the functions within *Intratextuality* and *Intertextuality*
- Thus to go back to the earlier examples, the functional area of *Intratextuality* can be realised via Lecturer Intertext (i), by Disciplinary Intertext (ii), or by Audience Intertext (iii) – these choices in this functional area are observable by pronoun choice (more details later):

Type	Examples
i	<p>TLM22) and so <u>I'll start</u> my lecture by talking about a theory of the labour movement and then er a sort of lo lack of confidence about the labour movement which set in er during the 1970's</p> <p>TLM23) so <u>I'll outline</u> a theory</p> <p>TLM24) and then <u>I'll outline</u> some er scepticism from within er the labour movement about that theory</p> <p>TLM284) now for the third part of the lecture <u>I want to move</u> from er a focus upon the labour movement and its dilemmas and problems on to a different kind of theory</p>
	<p>TLM28) so <u>let's</u> start then with the classic theory of the labour movement</p> <p>TLM33) so <u>let's er just state</u> the theory</p>

ii	TLM25) and then to conclude the lecture <u>we'll move on to a different kind of theory the theory of so-called New Social Movements</u> TLM321) <u>the three points that we can bring in here are a) b) and c)</u>
iii	RC11) now that being the case <u>you might say</u> RC12) well RC13) alright RC14) <u>you've got</u> ions in excited states RC15) or so <u>you say</u> RC16) <u>what happens</u> immediately after this event has occurred

- The functional area of *Metatextuality* is considered in this study to be Lecturer Intertext by default as evaluation is by default I-centred discourse – if it were marked as deriving from discipline (e.g. by a lecturer + discipline “we” pronoun) it would be classified as Disciplinary Intertext – however, this never happens and thus all *Metatextuality* is Lecturer Intertext by default
- The functional area of *Intertextuality* (the propositional / ideational content or *knowledge* recontextualised in a lecture) and its management in lectures however is the main interest of this study. *Intertextuality* can be realised by Lecturer or by Disciplinary or by Audience Intertext – in this study, *Intertextuality* is considered to be Disciplinary Intertext by default unless otherwise marked, **because a lecturer is viewed in this study as speaking on behalf of his/her discipline by default at all times in the institutional context of a lecture unless the lexico-grammar** (very usually by pronoun forms) **marks a unit otherwise.**

In lectures, it seems much intertextuality is realised via straightforward unattributed statements. Therefore units realising *Intertextuality* in lectures are considered to be what I am terming Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked Propositions by default (coding [I] in the typology) unless lexico-grammar indicates otherwise:

HO23)	[I] so light intensity goes on the screen
HO24)	[I] it gets reflected
HO25)	[I] and that information goes into our eye
HO26)	[I] and we see a two-dimensional image
HO27)	[I] but we miss something
HO28)	[I] the what we miss is information

- *Intertextuality* realised via Disciplinary Intertext can however also take the form of obvious attribution via reporting, either via reporting verbs (e.g. “Hobsbawm claims that X equals Y”) [type [III] coding in the typology, ‘Disciplinary Intertext Intertextuality Reporting Verbs’] or via reporting nouns “Hobsbawm’s claim is that X equals Y” [type [II] coding in the typology, ‘Disciplinary Intertext Intertextuality Reporting Nouns’]); this gives three options for the realisation of Intertextuality via Disciplinary Intertext:

AL393) [III] **and what he {Jonathan Kingdom} claims is that** human beings get over power genetic material overlaps with that of our close evolutionary relatives like the benobo chimpanzees to something like ninety-nine per cent
 AL394) [III] we are very similar genetically speaking to chimpanzees
 AL395) [III] and yet we are completely different
 AL396) [III] we have language

AL33)[II] **his {Thomas Hobbes}' idea** of the ideal political system was that first we must understand what human beings are really like and how their minds work in order to devise a system within which they can live together safely

AL78)[I] what these networks are like is a series of units which are connected to the outside world
 AL79)[I] so these units which are could be it could be a little computer or it could be some bundle of electronics or it could be some simulation of electronics are connected to something like a camera or a microphone or that in some way they are driven by the outside world
 AL80)[I] in between there are a number of units which are connected to the inputs and to each other

- In the first examples above (AL393-396), the knowledge-claim is constructed as an individual knowledge-claim by an individual disciplinary theorist (Jonathan Kingdom) via the reporting verb 'claim' – and is thus coded as [III] 'Disciplinary Intertext *Intertextuality* Reporting Verbs' (with the implication of a possible lack of disciplinary agreement about the status of this claim or *knowledge*)
- In the second example above (AL33), the knowledge-claim is again constructed as an individual claim by an individual disciplinary theorist (Thomas Hobbes), this time via the reporting noun 'claim' – and is thus again Disciplinary Intertext *Intertextuality*, this time coded as type [II] in the typology (coding [II] stands for disciplinary intertext *Intertextuality* reporting nouns)
- In the third examples above (AL78-80), the knowledge-claims / *facts* are constructed as shared disciplinary *facts* / *knowledge* by the lexicogrammar, coded as type [I] in the typology (coding [I] stands for Disciplinary Intertext *Intertextuality* Unmarked) because they are unattributed in any way
- However, a lecturer can sometimes explicitly mark a unit(s) realising *Intertextuality* as deriving from himself/herself (e.g. by the pronoun "I" or derivatives thereof, such as I think ..., I'd argue that ..., my opinion is ..., in my view ..., it seems to me that ...) – in which cases the unit(s) are therefore coded as lecturer intertext *Intertextuality* (option [IV] or [V] in the typology) – because this choice constructs the lecturer as the source or authority behind the unit:

378) [VIII] what was that?
 AL379) [XII] well
 AL380) [IV] **I suggest** that it's cybernetic philosophy

AL381) [XVIII] that is to say the Cog project can stand for a number of projects around the world now which are attempts to create what in popular fiction would be called the cyborg the cybernetic organism
 AL382) [XVIII] that is to say Cog begins to look like a humanoid
 AL383) [IV] it has nothing inside it having anything to do with artificial intelligence
 AL384) [IV] there're no representations no Cartesian ratio right in the middle
 AL385) [IV] it's just a seething mass of lots of different collectionist systems different ways of getting different aspects of intelligence to interact with each other
 AL386) [IV] and the way that they interact is structured by Cog's interaction with the social world
 AL387) [IV] **so what I'm putting in front of you** is a proposition that what we are creating is artificial life which in some sense will share our social world
 AL388) [IV] and we will create artificial intelligence not by programming anything in explicit symbolic terms but machines which are broadly speaking organisms

Alternatively, a lecturer sometimes explicitly marks a unit(s) realising *Intertextuality* as deriving from the audience (almost exclusively via the pronoun form 'you') – in which cases the unit(s) are coded as audience intertext *Intertextuality* (option VI) because the audience are constructed as the source or authority behind the unit:

HO15) [XII] okay
 HO16) [VI] **you all have heard** before the word holography
 HO17) [VI] **you know that** it {holography} is a technique that produces three-dimensional images

- This phenomenon of Audience Intertext *Intertextuality* above understands that an audience usually comes to a lecture with an existing discourse on a topic. Such units are a lecturer's realisation of his/her hypothesised understanding of this existing / emerging audience discourse / *knowledge*, and a lecturer sometimes introduces these hypothesised 'versions' of these existing / emerging audience discourses into a lecture in order to build on them or use them to assist in explaining disciplinary phenomena (typical in Arts & Humanities), or to challenge them with a new discourse (typical in Sciences). Thus a lecturer can set up a consensual or a contrastive dialogic relationship between discipline and audience in a lecture
- These are the three broad lexico-grammatical means by which disciplinary *Intertextuality* can be realised / constructed in lectures, and they each have different implications for the status of the *knowledge* they recontextualise
- Polyphony (the presence of many individual "other voices" in discourse) and/or the presence of lecturer ↔ discipline dialogism (the typical consequence of the use of reporting verbs [III] / reporting nouns [II] to realise Disciplinary Intertext *Intertextuality*) within a lecture are thus viewed within this study as probably being suggestive of a perceived lack of agreement in a discipline, and therefore as suggestive too of a lack of homogeneous notions of "truth" and *knowledge* in the epistemological landscape behind a discipline – leading to sociological patterns such as a heterogeneous discipline as observable in the field of recontextualisation

- Monophony (the absence of individual “other voices” in discourse) and a lack of lecturer \Leftrightarrow discipline dialogism (the typical consequence of the use of Unmarked Propositions [I] to realise Disciplinary Intertext *Intertextuality*) are viewed on the other hand as probably being suggestive of perceived agreement in a discipline, and therefore suggestive too of notions of homogeneous “truth” and *knowledge* in the epistemological landscape behind a discipline (remembering that truth / *knowledge* are viewed in this study as a product of discourse and of interactions in discourse rather than as pre-existing discourse)
- The specific details of the typology with examples of each coding are set out in document 2) (“Coding Guidelines Table”); and there is also a smaller document 3) (“Coding Heuristic”) which is designed to assist in coding a unit by running through the necessary decisions. Finally document 4) (“Example Lecture Coding”) is a fully coded lecture with explanations of coding choices so you can see the scheme in action

Key Points to Remember

1. Each unit is already marked according to the lecture it derives from and its chronological position within that lecture with capital letters and numbers
2. *Intertextuality* equates broadly with propositional input, *Intratextuality* with metadiscourse, and *Metatextuality* with evaluation
3. Regarding coding for the source / authority / “voice” behind a unit, the options are *Lecturer Intertext*, *Disciplinary Intertext*, or *Audience Intertext* – this choice is often recognisable by pronoun choice
4. *Intertextuality* is considered to be coding [I] by default (Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked Disciplinary Propositions, marked by the absence of any reporting structures and/or pronouns identifying a unit as deriving from a specific person / group) unless marked otherwise by reporting nouns [II] / reporting verbs [III], or unless marked as deriving from a lecturer [IV] or [V] or as deriving from the audience [VI]
5. Once a coding choice is made, this choice continues until signalled otherwise by pronoun choice / change in unit function, in which instance the coding will also change. Sometimes a coding choice may last just one unit, sometimes over several or many units
6. The typology comprises coding options which are mutually exclusive – however, there are numerous instances where it is difficult to accurately and exactly assess the function and “voice” of a unit. This is the reality of data comprising spoken language. Sometimes for instance a unit may appear to be a blend of different functions or “voices”. In these instances, choose what seems to be the most likely coding, or remember that coding [I] is the default choice and therefore the most populated category and so will be too harmed by extra additions. This is the reason why I am needing to check if application of the typology by other people will result in a good degree of inter-rater reliability or a headache for me
7. Code grouping [I] contains many examples of what appear to be instances of ‘Direct Reported Speech’, but are in fact examples of what Tannen (1989) calls ‘Constructed Speech’, i.e. they are instances of a lecturer hypothesising the thinking / talking of people as a means of explaining human motivation

and so on (see e.g. units FR132-6 in document 4) “Example Lecture Coding”) – such units are coded as [I] because they are not reporting per se, and they are certainly not reporting disciplinary theorists. For a unit to qualify as coding [III] it must be reporting the words / thoughts etc of a disciplinary theorist

8. Many thanks again!

Bibliography

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (1999). **Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English**. London: Longman.

Goffman, E. (1981). **Forms of Talk**. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Tannen, D. (1989). **Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX 5.2: Coding Guidelines Table for Coding Reliability Test

Function	Coding	Description	Examples
Disciplinary Intertext Unmarked Propositions	I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most common type of unit. Realise 'straightforward' unattributed unmarked propositions / knowledge-claims. All units realising propositions are [] unless specifically introduced with reporting verbs [III] / reporting nouns [II], or are signalled as a lecturer's own propositions / knowledge-claims [IV] or [V] by lexico-grammar 	<p>HO23) [] so light intensity goes on the screen HO24) [] it gets reflected HO25) [] and that information goes into our eye HO26) [] and we see a two-dimensional image HO27) [] but we miss something</p>
Disciplinary Intertext Propositions with Reporting Nouns	II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise proposition / 'knowledge-claim' via reporting noun such that the proposition is attributed to a specific disciplinary agent(s) / school of thought Reporting nouns MUST be reporting something verbal / mental for them to qualify as reporting nouns Typical reporting nouns are claim, idea, argument, opinion, term, view, point etc – reporting nouns need to be clearly marked as someone else's voice by named agency / pronouns Category also covers simple prepositional attribution (see HT507) ⇒ 	<p>AL33) [II] <u>his</u> {Thomas Hobbes} <u>idea</u> of the ideal political system was that first we must understand what human beings are really like in order to devise a system within which they can live together safely HT179) [III] but really perceptions is <u>is Hume's</u> <u>term</u> for idea HT744) [II] that is <u>his</u> {Hume's} <u>big philosophical argument</u> HT507) [III] basically this is what empiricism is <u>for Hume</u></p>

<p>Disciplinary Intertext Propositions with Reporting Verbs</p>	<p>• Realise a proposition / 'knowledge-claim' via a reporting verb & proposition is thus attributed to a specific disciplinary agent(s) / school of thought</p> <p>• This study takes a broad view of "reporting verbs" (see Hyland 1999) – includes obvious speech act reports (e.g. claim, argue, hold, assert, say, suggest, propose etc) but also many mental act reports (e.g. think, know, believe) as well as research act reports (e.g. calculate, measure, find out, show, discover, do research etc)</p> <p>• After this choice is made by a lecturer, units continue to be marked as [III] until a clear change of source / voice as signalled by lexico-grammar or topic change (see AL393-5) ⇒</p> <p>• Reporting verbs are usually realised with human agents / pronouns as their (explicit/ implicit) subject, but they can also be realised with inanimate objects as their subject or 'uttering-source', e.g. "the book says ..." (see APN182-3) / with agentless passive syntax (see APN199)</p>	<p>AL392 [I] this is Jonathan Kingdom who is a biologist who is very interested in evolution</p> <p>AL393 [III] and what he {Jonathan Kingdom} claims is that human beings get over power genetic material overlaps with that of our close evolutionary relatives like the benobo chimpanzees to something like ninety-nine per cent</p> <p>AL394 [III] we are very similar genetically speaking to chimpanzees</p> <p>AL395 [III] and yet we are completely different</p> <p>APN199 [III] this is an area where there's currently a lot of rather interesting historical research being done</p> <p>APN182 [III] if you look it up in a dictionary national{} the dictionary will say something helpful like <u>nationalism is the devotion to the interests of a particular nation</u></p> <p>APN183 [III] [nationalism is the devotion to the interests of a particular nation]</p>
---	---	--

<p>Lecturer Intertext Reporting Verbs</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">IV</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realise lecturer-derived propositions / ideas / 'knowledge-claims' / opinions etc – clearly signalled as a lecturer's personal proposition / input via a reporting verb with "I" as a subject • Units with "I think" are classified as coding [IV] consistently • Units in which commentary is embedded in a unit via "as ..." (e.g. "as I've said", "as you know" etc) are classified according to their primary function – e.g. – SP96) [I] <i>but as I've said the body can't prevent it completely</i> is classified as [I] – a unit is only classified otherwise if the comment is realised as a full clause e.g. "I've said ..." rather than "as I've said ...", or "you know ..." rather than "as you know ..." • This classification is kept in succeeding units until an explicitly signalled change of uttering-source (see AL380-389 [N.B. 381-2 as reformulation though!]) 	<p>AL380) [IV] I suggest that it's cybernetic philosophy AL381) [XVIII] that is to say the Cog project can stand for a number of projects around the world now which are attempts to create what in popular fiction would be called the cyborg the cybernetic organism AL382) [XVIII] that is to say Cog begins to look like a humanoid AL383) [IV] it has nothing inside it having anything to do with artificial intelligence AL384) [IV] there're no representations no Cartesian ratio right in the middle AL387) [IV] so what I'm putting in front of you is a proposition that what we are creating is artificial life which in some sense will share our social world</p>
<p>Lecturer Intertext Reporting Nouns</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realise lecturer-derived propositions / ideas / 'knowledge-claims' / opinions etc – clearly signalled as a lecturer's personal proposition via a reporting noun usually with "my" • Unusual type of unit • Typical realisation is in prepositional phrases such as "in my view" or "in my opinion" 	<p>IT4) [V] now inflation targeting really in my view covers well basically all of the current macro-economic monetary policy framework FL329) [V] don't be too much work {to prove this theorem} FL330) [V] that's my advice {don't be too much work to prove this theorem}</p>

<p>Audience Intertext Propositions</p>	<p>VI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise audience-attributed ideas / knowledge-claims / state of knowledge etc (very often realise lecturer's hypothesised state of audience's knowledge) Usually signalled as such by pronoun "you" + reporting verb Must be genuinely / hypothetically REPORTING audience's speech / thought / state-of-knowledge / research activity – otherwise likely to be simple type [I] units i.e. Unmarked Disciplinary Propositions Units with an imperative "remember ..." fronting them are coded as type [I] units i.e. as Disciplinary Unmarked Propositions – e.g. – SP67) <i>[I] remember that pressure is connected to the potential energy of a fluid and if we have to force that fluid through a higher resistance more energy is dissipated</i> 	<p>HO16) [VI] <u>you all have heard</u> before the word holography HO17) [VI] <u>you know that</u> it {holography} is a technique that produces three-dimensional images OMC141) [VI] from what we said so far <u>what you might well try</u> would be to take vinyl chloride or vinyl bromide and metallic lithium OMC142) [VI] it sounds like a good bet OMC322) [VI] now <u>you know</u> of course that we can't actually start with borane itself because borane exists as a dimer B-two-H-six and that's rather inconvenient <pause></p>
<p>MDS – Lecturer Averbals</p>	<p>VII</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise structuring of lecture discourse They are marked usually by "I" / "my" Declarative syntax Can realise retrospective structuring (see SP69) – though unusual This coding includes the phenomenon of spoken headings & titles (see CDMA39) 	<p>TLM22) [VII] and so I'll start my lecture by talking about a theory of the labour movement and then er a sort of lack of confidence about the labour movement which set in er during the 1970's SP69) [VII] so <u>that's the first thing that happens</u> {retrospective} CDMA38) [XII] right CDMA39) [VII] <u>collective defence and military alliances</u> CDMA40) [III] the collective defence but even more so military alliances are generally associated with realist assumptions ... RC40) [VIII] how <u>do you measure</u> the efficiency of a radiation chemistry process? RC401) [VIII] how <u>does this happen</u>? RC75) [VIII] what happens to the rest? RC339) [VIII] what <u>happens</u> if anthracene is there? RC478) [VIII] what <u>happens</u> with water? HT505) [VIII] why <u>is</u> that an important principle? SAE152) [VIII] what <u>happened</u> in this case?</p>
<p>MDS – Lecturer Interrogatives</p>	<p>VIII</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These units realise structuring of lecture discourse Interrogative syntax, often with "you" Observable via absence of "we" pronoun (this is the difference between these [VIII] units and [X] units beneath) 	<p>RC40) [VIII] how <u>do you measure</u> the efficiency of a radiation chemistry process? RC401) [VIII] how <u>does this happen</u>? RC75) [VIII] what happens to the rest? RC339) [VIII] what <u>happens</u> if anthracene is there? RC478) [VIII] what <u>happens</u> with water? HT505) [VIII] why <u>is</u> that an important principle? SAE152) [VIII] what <u>happened</u> in this case?</p>

MDS – Disciplinary Averrals	IX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These units realise structuring of lecture discourse • Declarative syntax & pronoun “we” / “us” (+ imperative form “let’s...”) • Difference between [IX] / [X] and [VII] / [VIII] above is presence of “we” / “us” pronoun in [IX] & [X] 	<p>TLM25) [IX] and then to conclude the lecture <u>we’ll move on to a different kind of theory the theory of so-called New Social Movements</u></p> <p>TLM321) [IX] <u>the three points that we can bring in here are a) b) and c)</u></p> <p>TLM256) [IX] <u>so this leads us into the third point that what was there was something that looked like a possible alternative</u></p> <p>TLM28) [IX] so <u>let’s</u> start then with the classic theory of the labour movement</p> <p>TLM33) [IX] so <u>let’s</u> er <u>just state</u> the theory</p> <p>SAE304) [IX] <u>let’s</u> move on</p> <p>RC39) [X] how many ions <u>do we get?</u></p> <p>RC55) [X] so how <u>do we cope</u> with this idea?</p> <p>RC445) [X] how <u>do we know?</u></p>
MDS – Disciplinary Interrogatives	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These units realise structuring of lecture discourse • Interrogative forms + pronoun “we” / “us” 	<p>RC11) [XI] now that being the case <u>you might say</u></p> <p>RC12) [XI] well</p> <p>RC13) [XI] alright</p> <p>RC14) [XI] <u>you’ve got</u> ions in excited states</p> <p>RC15) [XI] or so <u>you say</u></p> <p>RC16) [XI] <u>what happens immediately after this event has occurred</u></p>
MDS – Audience Averrals	XI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realise structuring of lecture discourse • Declarative / imperative syntax with pronoun “you” / “your” (indexing audience) • Also marked by imperative “let me ...” (as in effect this syntax is appealing to audience) 	<p>TLM134) [XI] so <u>let me try to er take you through the basic ideas in these critiques</u></p> <p>TLM387) [XII] <u>okay</u></p> <p>TLM389) [XII] <u>so</u></p> <p>TLM390) [XII] <u>er</u></p> <p>TLM391) [XII] <u>um</u></p> <p>FL519) [I] and this is an assumption that <u>[well]</u> the only way we know how to get rid of it is by RAA</p> <p>FL520) [XII] <u>[well]</u></p>
Micro- Discourse Structuring	XII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single item units / spoken discourse markers realising local level discourse structuring (esp. “well”, “okay” & “right”) • Can occur as solitary items (see TLM387-91) and/or as items embedded within larger units (see FL519-20) 	<p>TLM134) [XI] so <u>let me try to er take you through the basic ideas in these critiques</u></p> <p>TLM387) [XII] <u>okay</u></p> <p>TLM389) [XII] <u>so</u></p> <p>TLM390) [XII] <u>er</u></p> <p>TLM391) [XII] <u>um</u></p> <p>FL519) [I] and this is an assumption that <u>[well]</u> the only way we know how to get rid of it is by RAA</p> <p>FL520) [XII] <u>[well]</u></p>

<p>Inter-lecture Reference – Lecturer</p>	<p>XIII</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise reference backwards / forwards to other lectures (to past / future lectures) within a series of lectures Realised with declarative syntax & marked by pronoun “I” or by “my” – or no pronouns as in SP512 ⇒ 	<p>RC161) [XIII] <u>I mentioned them in the photo chemistry section of the course</u></p> <p>SP512) [XIII] <u>the next two lectures the next two weeks will be on much broader topics</u></p> <p>SP513) [XIII] next week I'm going to be talking about some specialized circulations which are rather interesting</p>
<p>Inter-lecture Reference – Disciplinary</p>	<p>XIV</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise reference backwards / forwards to other lectures (to past / future lectures) within a series of lectures Realised with declarative syntax and marked by pronoun “we” / “us” 	<p>RC252) [XIV] <u>we've talked about flash photolysis before</u></p> <p>RC253) [XIV] <u>that's where</u> you take a flash lamp or a laser that's pulsed</p> <p>RC254) [XIV] and you administer a flash of light or a pulse of light from the laser to the sample</p> <p>OMC435) [XIV] but <u>we'll go on and discuss it in much greater detail next time</u></p>
<p>Intra-lecture Reference – Lecturer</p>	<p>XV</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise reference backwards or forwards within the same lecture Realised with declarative syntax & marked by the pronoun “I” or by “my” 	<p>RC442) [XV] <u>I've talked about the capturing of the electrons</u></p> <p>RC443) [XV] <u>I've talked about capturing the excited states</u></p> <p>CDMA206) [XV] <u>I'll get back to the problem of different perceptions U.S and Europe of NATO in a minute</u></p>
<p>Intra-lecture Reference – Disciplinary</p>	<p>XVI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise reference backwards or forwards within the same lecture Declarative syntax and marked by the pronoun “we” or by “us” (distinguishes such units from [XV] above) Postponement of discourse also classified as [XV] when realised via “we” (OMC120) 	<p>HO197) [XVI] <u>so going back to the deal the idea of holography we said that we've got two parts of a laser beam recombining on a photographic plate</u></p> <p>HO198) [XVI] and <u>we said that there we've got fringes on that photographic plate</u></p> <p>OSL270) [XVI] <u>we've seen in the last experiment that monkeys can readily learn to be afraid of snakes by watching another monkey who shows fear of snakes</u></p> <p>OMC120) [XVI] later on <u>we'll discuss what the actual structures of these compounds are</u> because although I've written lithium ethyl up there as though it was simply one lithium metal bonded to one ethyl group its structure actually turns out to be more complicated than that for reasons that I will explain later on</p>

Scaffolding	<p style="text-align: center;">XVII</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These units help construct the message(s) of a lecture in two different ways: • Firstly, they realise a marked focus on <u>message</u> (TLM5-6 & 97) – i.e. units in which a lecturer focuses on key points / aims / ideas etc – not a very common function but a very important function • Secondly, to realise construction of rhetorical / pedagogic situation from which to build / convey a message, i.e. these are units with which a lecturer sets up a problem / case study from which to proceed • Latter usage particularly common in lectures in Maths and/or Logic, in which a lecturer needs to construct a situation before showing how it can be tackled / solved etc 	<p>TLM5) [XVII] <u>we're talking</u> about the peace movement</p> <p>TLM6) [XVII] <u>we're talking</u> about the woman's women's movement</p> <p>TLM97) [XVII] in this particular case <u>what we're talking</u> about is the more that social democratic parties er gained political power the more they seemed to be not doing away with so with capitalism but depending upon capitalism</p> <p>PM12) [XVII] <u>we know</u> the properties of the matrix in terms of that's <writing on board> Young's modulus Poisson's ratio sheer modulus</p> <p>PM13) [XVII] similarly <u>we do know</u> the properties of the fibres again Young's modulus Poisson's ratio and sheer modulus</p> <p>PM14) [XVII] <u>and so long as we know</u> how many fibres we've actually put in the system [okay] <writing on board> [so we got fibre content] [okay] <u>we can try to see how we work on that</u></p> <p>PM15) [XII] [okay]</p> <p>PM16) [XVII] [so we got fibre content]</p> <p>PM17) [XII] [okay]</p> <p>PM18) [XVII] <u>so the first property that we need to determine is the</u></p>
Reformulation	<p style="text-align: center;">XVIII</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realise explicit rewording / reformulation of 'just uttered' discourse • Marked usually by "in other words ..." 	<p>FL32) [IV] it's what I usual refer to as a compounds negation</p> <p>FL33) [XVIII] <u>in other words</u> a negation of an already complicated sentence</p> <p>OSL127) [I] but they didn't they showed no preference at all</p> <p>OSL128) [XVIII] <u>in other words</u> the adults rats knew that food B was bad</p> <p>OSL7) [VII] I'll be talking about experiments where some animals are observers [that is they watch other animals performing] and some animals demonstrators</p> <p>OSL8) [XIX] [that is they watch other animals performing]</p> <p>OMC54) [I] and three the apparatus must be either under vacuum or if that's not possible it must be under a flow of inert gas</p> <p>OMC55) [XIX] <u>that's to say</u> nitrogen or argon</p>
Lexical Reference	<p style="text-align: center;">XIX</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These units realise explicit focus on the meaning(s) of / idea(s) behind a very recently uttered word or phrase • Explicitly marked as such via e.g. "by this I mean ... " or "[word X] means ... " or "that is ... " or "that is to say ... " 	<p>FL32) [IV] it's what I usual refer to as a compounds negation</p> <p>FL33) [XVIII] <u>in other words</u> a negation of an already complicated sentence</p> <p>OSL127) [I] but they didn't they showed no preference at all</p> <p>OSL128) [XVIII] <u>in other words</u> the adults rats knew that food B was bad</p> <p>OSL7) [VII] I'll be talking about experiments where some animals are observers [that is they watch other animals performing] and some animals demonstrators</p> <p>OSL8) [XIX] [that is they watch other animals performing]</p> <p>OMC54) [I] and three the apparatus must be either under vacuum or if that's not possible it must be under a flow of inert gas</p> <p>OMC55) [XIX] <u>that's to say</u> nitrogen or argon</p>

<p>Relational Status Evaluation</p> <p>–</p>	<p>XX</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise explicit unit-length evaluation of importance / scale / rank of discourse / ideas uttered in a lecture Can realise evaluation of the content itself of previous / forthcoming utterances (RC144-5, RC202-3, RC235, TLM268) and / or can realise evaluation of the <u>scope</u> / 'type' of previous / forthcoming discourse (RC10, RC362, RC381) Typical syntax is relational clauses with "this / that" + is/are + adjective/noun Such units are unusual and tend to occur as just single units or sometimes two units 	<p>RC144) [XX] <u>that's very important</u> in photo-chemistry</p> <p>RC145) [XX] <u>it's very important</u> in radiation chemistry as well</p> <p>RC202) [XX] <u>now this is a very important idea</u> here which I want to stress</p> <p>RC203) [XX] <u>I'll go on about</u> it a bit</p> <p>RC235) [XX] and <u>this was the key</u> to getting a much better understanding of what was going on</p> <p>TLM268) [XX] [<u>this is the second key idea</u>]</p> <p>RC10) [XX] but <u>that's an overall picture</u></p> <p>RC362) [XX] <u>this is a very slight digression</u> but</p> <p>RC381) [XX] <u>that was a bit of an aside</u></p>
<p>Relational Origins Evaluation</p> <p>–</p>	<p>XXI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise explicit unit-length comparative evaluation of discourse / ideas uttered within a lecture (RC270 & RC262) and / or explicit commentary on origins / originators of ideas in terms of the politics, schools of thought, ideologies behind them (TLM126-32) Typical syntax is relational clauses with "this / that / it / named agent" + is/are + adjective/noun 	<p>RC270) [XXI] so <u>it's</u> the same experiment in a way that Hamill did except that it's in the liquid phase to begin with</p> <p>RC262) [XXI] so <u>it's exactly the same type of idea</u></p> <p>TLM126) [XXI] <u>I think</u> all three authors are politically associated to the left</p> <p>TLM127) [XXI] er <u>Eric Hobsbawm</u> until at least very recently maintained his membership of the Communist Party of Great Britain</p> <p>TLM129) [XXI] <u>Gorz</u> was a member of the French Communist Party</p> <p>TLM131) [XXI] to <u>I am not sure</u> about Adam Provoztzki's politics</p> <p>TLM132) [XXI] but er <u>his book</u> is clearly from the left</p>
<p>Epistemic Difficulty Evaluation</p> <p>–</p>	<p>XXII</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise explicit unit-length evaluation of discourse, ideas, concepts etc re: their difficulty / easiness Typical syntax is relational clauses with "this / that / it" + is/are + adjective/noun 	<p>RC42) [XXII] in photo-chemistry <u>it's very easy</u> because you had the idea of a photon</p> <p>RC49) [XXII] so <u>it's</u> a very very clear idea</p> <p>RC103) [XXII] <u>it's</u> a very simple idea</p>

Epistemic – Truth Value Evaluation	XXIII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise explicit unit-length evaluation of discourse, ideas, concepts etc in terms of their truth / reliability Typical syntax is relational clauses with “this / that / it / agent” + is/are + adjective/noun 	<p>TLM30) [XXIII] <u>this</u> is a nice neat statement of the theory of the movement</p> <p>TLM163) [XXIII] <u>he</u> is not precise]</p> <p>TLM164) [XXIII] <u>he</u> can't put them <u>this</u> down to a particular date October the 14th 1949 or something but from around that sort of time]</p> <p>TLM236) [XXIII] now <u>this</u> depends upon how you define working class</p> <p>MIE434) [XXIV] it's a revolting sty{ } ifestyle {of a screw worm fly}</p>
Aesthetic Evaluation	XXIV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realise explicit unit-length evaluation of discourse, ideas, concepts etc in terms of their aesthetics This is a very uncommon unit 	

Administrative Talk	XXV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These units realise talk of an administrative and/or non lecture/topic-related nature This may be information about trips, essays, exams, reasons for absences etc. Such units also realise openings & closings, greetings, interruptions from outside etc. Such units also realise self-corrections (see FR481) ⇒ 	<p>OSL461) [VII] finally then <pause> [<u>I don't have time to discuss all these cases</u>] but these are the conclusions I'd like to draw</p> <p>OSL462) [XXV] [<u>I don't have time to discuss all these cases</u>]</p> <p>TLM387) [XII] okay</p> <p>TLM388) [XXV] <u>that's just about done it in the time</u></p> <p>TLM389) [XII] so</p> <p>TLM390) [XII] er</p> <p>TLM391) [XII] um</p> <p>TLM392) [XXV] <u>I think we'll draw to a close now</u></p> <p>TLM393) [XXV] <u>and er I'll see you next week</u></p> <p>FR481) [XXV] [I should have put the third heading as well <writing on board>]</p>
---------------------	------------	---	--

Student Situations	XXVI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Situations of genuine lecturer-audience dialogue Realise explicit requests by lecturer for student contributions, and/or units realised by students (questions, requests, elicited replies etc) Can comprise individual units / series of units Classified separately as the discourse is 	<p>HT137) [XXVI] do you do any of Hume's moral philosophy in your morals course?</p> <p>HT838) [XXVI] <student: maybe he didn't know how light worked then because I guess you could> [mm] [mm] <student: put it in a scientific sense because> [yeah] <student: different you know shades of light they're they're different they're different wavelengths and then then we can </student></p> <p>HT165) [XXVI] now what did Locke call what was Locke's term for the contents of the human mind all the objects of perception</p>
--------------------	-------------	--	--

		<p>changed by the change in direct participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although this study uses lectures chosen due to their consistent delivery style, all the lectures have occasional requests for / examples of direct student participation 	<p>HT166) [XXVI] <student: inaudible> idea </student> HT167) [XXVI] right</p>
--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 5.3: Coding Heuristic for Coding Reliability Test

Function of unit	Voice of unit	Syntax	Coding
Giving disciplinary 'knowledge' Giving propositional input Making a claim about a disciplinary topic Giving disciplinary 'information' [Ideational content]	Simple unattributed / unreported statement of 'knowledge'	Declarative	I
	Attributed to specific disciplinary theorist (named agent, s/he)	Reporting noun	II
	Lecturer's own claim / view (I, my, mine, me)	Reporting verb	III
		Reporting verb	IV
		Reporting noun	V
		Any	VI
Structuring the lecture discourse prospectively / retrospectively (i.e. lecturer saying what will be talked about in the lecture, and / or sometimes saying what has just been talked about)	Lecturer (I, my, mine, me)	Declarative	VII
	Lecturer (I, my, mine, me)	Interrogative	VIII
	Disciplinary (we, us, let's)	Declarative	IX
	Disciplinary (we, us, let's)	Interrogative	X
	Audience (specific you referring to audience)	Any (usually declarative)	XI
	X	X	XII
	Lecturer (I, my, mine, me)	Any (usually declarative)	XIII
	Disciplinary (we, us, let's)	Any (usually declarative)	XIV
	Lecturer (I, my, mine, me)	Any (usually declarative)	XV
	Disciplinary (we, us, let's)	Any (usually declarative)	XVI
	Usually 'we' / 'us'	Any (often declarative)	XVII
Any	Any (often declarative)		
Any	Any (usually declarative)	XVIII	
Any	Any (usually declarative)	XIX	
Evaluate importance of an idea / rank of a piece of discourse Compare ideas / people in terms each other / background Evaluate difficulty / easiness of an idea / a piece of discourse Evaluate truthfulness / accuracy of idea / a piece of discourse Evaluate aesthetic qualities of an idea / a piece of discourse	Explicit / Implicit 'I' (via I, me, mine, my)	Any (usually declarative)	XX
		Any (usually declarative)	XXI
		Any (usually declarative)	XXII
		Any (usually declarative)	XXIII
		Any (usually declarative)	XXIV
		Any	
Any			
Talk about administrative things	Any	Any	XXV

Request for / respond to dialogue with audience member(s) Function of unit	Any	Voice of unit	Any	XXVI Coding
			Any Syntax	

APPENDIX 5.4: Example Lecture Coding for Coding Reliability Test

[XII] okay <micro-dance or marker> [XII]

[XIII] well <micro-dance or marker> [XIII]

[XIV] today we're gonna be carrying on with the Lecture Association <Micro-dance Structuring, raised his arms at 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000]

APPENDIX 5.4: Example Lecture Coding for Coding Reliability Test

FR1) [XII] okay <micro-discourse markers = [XII]>

FR2) [XII] well <micro-discourse markers = [XII]>

FR3) [IX] today we're gonna be carrying on with the French Revolution <MDS (Macro-Discourse Structuring), realised via pronoun 'we' so therefore = coding [IX]>

FR4) [XIII] you may have noticed I was sort of getting rather enthusiastic and carried away at the end of the last one <Reference back to previous lecture, realised via pronoun 'I', so therefore = coding [XIII]>

FR5) [XIII] I was sort of almost like I sort of started at the beginning about someone standing on a coffee table and shouting [to arms citizens] as if I was gonna sort of leap up on the desk and say [to arms] [let's storm the Rootes Social Building] or [let's go out arm in arm singing the Marseillaise] or something like that <Continuation of above, reference back to previous lecture, realised via pronoun 'I', so therefore = coding [XIII]>

FR6) [XIII] [to arms citizens] <coding [XIII] as continuation of unit FR4 – example of a unit of direct speech, so in brackets inside original unit, and now beneath original unit to form part of analysis>

FR7) [XIII] [to arms] <As above – coding [XIII] as continuation of unit FR4 – example of a unit of direct speech so in brackets inside original unit and now beneath original unit to form part of analysis>

FR8) [XIII] [let's storm the Rootes Social Building] <As above – coding [XIII] as continuation of unit FR4 – example of a unit of direct speech so in brackets inside original unit and now beneath original unit to form part of analysis>

FR9) [XIII] [let's go out arm in arm singing the Marseillaise] <As above – coding [XIII] as continuation of unit FR4 – example of a unit of direct speech so in brackets inside original unit and now beneath original unit to form part of analysis>

FR10) [XII] well <micro-discourse markers = [XII] – end of Inter-Lecture Reference from unit FR4>

FR11) [XVII] this is obviously partly at least because the revolution the French Revolution resonates with something about us about the sort of political life that we lead the way in the some type of society in which we live <Seems to be a focus on overall message of lecture, what we can learn from the events described etc. So therefore coding [XVII] as 'Scaffolding'. See also units FR37 & FR40-7 beneath. You could argue though that this is just a straightforward type [I] unit as it could be considered as simply an Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition – sometimes all I can say is simply that it is hard to decide for sure, so it's a case of just making the 'best guess'>

FR12) [XVII] and this is one of the reasons why historians have thought it important because it does seem to set [I think I mentioned to you in a previous lecture] set the sort of framework set the framework in existence through within which we still live much of our political and social life sets a sort of agenda if you like of what we expect as participants within the type of society in which we we live <As above>

FR13) [XIII] [I think I mentioned to you in a previous lecture] <Reference back to previous lecture, I = 'lecturer' so therefore = coding [XIII] – example of an independent unit embedded inside a larger unit or a 'parenthetical structure'>

FR14) [I] so the declaration of the rights of man which as I said came out on the twenty-sixth of w{ } was issued by this new national assembly representing the nation the French nation for the first time an elected body which worked according to a new constitution new written constitutional settlement <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR15) [I] this provides a set of rights which are not privileges of a set of corporate groups not the sort of privileges of the nobility or the privileges of the clergy or the privileges of such and such a town or cathedral or whatever they are rights which every man it is held has <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR16) [I] and that that declaration is one of the biggest intellectual influences cultural influences on the United Nation Declaration of Human Rights which was issued in nineteen-forty-seven and as as I say is [you know] the way in which we think about not just our own government not just European governments but world governments the way in which we think societies ought to operate in a fair and just and equal way <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR17) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse marker = coding [XII]>

FR18) [I] so for example the freedom of speech <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR19) [I] the freedom to publish <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR20) [I] the right to live in a society without fear of arbitrary arrest <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR21) [I] the right to have a religion religious views of your own without any sort of harassment from the state <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR22) [I] the right to have per{ } to have political rights if you like to belong to a nation in such a way that a political entity I should say in such a way that you actually your views are heard you have a a a a a role in shaping the political system in some ways <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR23) [I] the French Revolution really sets that out in a sort of model way for the first time in in a way which is durably extremely influential so that when we think about seventeen-eighty-nine when we think about the French Revolution we think about that movement of élan that movement of tremendous energy and excitement and enthusiasm when new things suddenly seem to be possible when a new epoch in human history seemed to be starting up <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I] – you could argue though that this is in fact another instance of 'Scaffolding' [XVII] like unit FR11. Again, you might be right. I have coded it as [I] because the main thrust seems to be a simple proposition while the potential 'scaffolding' part seems to be secondary via the 'so' conjunction>

FR24) [I] it's not for an act{}{} it's not by any accident although it was a couple of years after seventeen-eighty-nine in fact that the French Revolutionaries introduced their own calendar a new calendar to get rid of the old religious calendar which existed and to create a calendar which [and it's an amazingly obvious sort of enlightenment reference here] a calendar which somehow reflected nature <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR25) [XXI] [and it's an amazingly obvious sort of enlightenment reference here] <Evaluation of idea in terms of its origins ('enlightenment') so therefore = coding [XXI]>

FR26) [I] so months were named after weather conditions <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR27) [I] and types of the seasons were named after after after after sort of natural objects <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR28) [I] the days were not saints' days but plants and flowers and things like that <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR29) [I] so the idea that a new epoch has been created and the revolutionary calendar starts from year one [you know] to get rid of seventeen-eighty-nine and we go to a new calendar in human history <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR30) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Marker = coding [XII]>

FR31) [I] so this idea of a new opening a ne{}{}new possibilities and with that the idea [and this of course is something which is true of many revolutions] the idea that the revolution could create could could reorganise society rationally <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR32) [XXI] [and this of course is something which is true of many revolutions] <Evaluation of idea comparing it to a broader picture (as typical of all revolutions) so therefore = coding [XXI]. Example of a 'parenthetical structure' embedded inside a larger unit>

FR33) [XII] yeah <Micro-discourse Marker = coding [XII]>

FR34) [II] again a very enlightenment sort of project in a way that everyone had a say everyone had a say and this would produce a new type of human individual no longer a subject no longer a sort of person who just follows orders but a citizen equal in rights equality before the law to all other citizens <Difficult unit this one. I have coded it as [II] because A) it seems to be realising the idea via a possible reporting noun 'project' modified via 'enlightenment' (indexing a large body of discourses and agents) as the 'source'; B) the 'report' sees backshifted tense form ('would') suggesting a possible instance of reporting; C) the tense form 'had' suggests 'previous thinking' and again therefore perhaps a report. You might argue though that it's actually an instance of coding [XXI] again, or simply a type [I] Unmarked Proposition. It's hard to say really. This is precisely why I need to see if the coding system is reliable or not!>

FR35) [II] this idea of a new man the nation the French nation would be regenerated in this way a new species of humanity would evolve and France would be in the sort of vanguard of a transformation of the whole of the world <See point B) above; coding as [II]>

FR36) [II] France was sort of leading the world in pioneering fashion towards a new future
<See point C) above. Coding as [II]>

FR37) [XVII] and that's exciting and that because it links up with [you know] some of the things which we still feel is one reason why people look back to the revolution and think incredibly positive things about it <Seems to be a focus again on overall message of lecture, as suggested in FR11, what we can learn from the events described etc. So therefore coding [XVII] as 'Scaffolding'. You could argue again though that this is in fact just a straightforward type [I] unit as it could be considered as simply an Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition>

FR38) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Marker = coding [XII]>

FR39) [X] but on the other hand what do we think about when another part of our mind thinks about the French Revolution <MDS (Macro-Discourse Structuring), Interrogative form, realised with pronoun 'we', so therefore coded as [X]. It is perhaps on the boundary between MDS and a simple rhetorical question not structuring the discourse, but I coded it as [X] as it predicts a number of following units (FR40-6)>

FR40) [XVII] it thinks guillotines <Seems to be a focus again on overall message of lecture, as suggested in FR11 & FR37, what we can learn from the events described etc. So therefore coding [XVII] as 'Scaffolding'. See also unit FR47 beneath in which the lecturer suggests the term 'paradox' as being a key message in his lecture. These units FR41-6 draw out the paradoxical feelings people have for The French Revolution. See also units FR48-53 beneath. You could argue again though that this is in fact just a straightforward type [I] unit as it could be considered as simply an Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition>

FR41) [XVII] it thinks reign of terror <See unit FR40 above>

FR42) [XVII] it thinks a chilling bureaucracy <See unit FR40 above>

FR43) [XVII] it thinks a revolutionary tribunal <See unit FR40 above>

FR44) [XVII] it thinks the mass execution of peasants men women and children in areas of France which were not as excited about this new revolutionary beginning as others <See unit FR40 above>

FR45) [XVII] it thinks about war <See unit FR40 above>

FR46) [XVII] it thinks about a war of y{}{}of France and revolution against just about the whole of the rest of Europe <See unit FR40 above>

FR47) [VII] and it's for this reason that I've sort of put the in the first heading there the term paradox <MDS, declarative syntax, realised with pronoun 'I', so therefore = coding [VII]>

FR48) [XVII] you know that that is one of the great things about the revolutionary legacy if you like to the rest of the nineteenth century that there is this sense of paradox about about the French Revolution which the whole of the nineteenth century really is intensely engaged with and which still in the twentieth century we can we can sort of still sort of understand <Seems to be a focus again on overall message of lecture, as suggested in FR11, FR37, and FR41-6 above, what we can learn from the events described etc. So therefore coding [XVII] as 'Scaffolding'. See also unit FR47 above in which the lecturer suggests the term 'paradox' as being a key message in his lecture. These units FR41-6 draw out the paradoxical feelings people have for The French Revolution. You could argue again

though that this is in fact just a straightforward type [I] unit as it could be considered as simply an Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition>

FR49) [XVII] on the one hand the revolution as new opening new beginning new possibilities the regeneration of the human species <See unit FR48 above>

FR50) [XVII] on the other the revolution as an instrument of terror of repression a sort of early eighteenth century version of the kind of totalitarian democracy the totalitarian repression the totalitarian regimes I mean which whi{} which we've become depressingly familiar in the late twentie{}by the late twentieth century <See unit FR48 above>

FR51) [XVII] so that sort of paradox the posti{} pluses and the minuses is what I wanna sort of put absolutely in front of you today <See unit FR48 above>

FR52) [XVII] I put it un{} at the start of the lecture <See unit FR48 above>

FR53) [XVII] I put it under this heading Living Paradoxes because it the emphasis I'd like to place is that people just normal individuals had to try and live through the two aspects of the revolution and try somehow keep them in within the same sort of box in their in their lives in in the in the seventeen{}nineties <See unit FR48 above>

FR54) [I] and many groups found it too difficult to keep those things you know together <This unit seems to be much nearer to a 'conventional' Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext unit realising Intertextuality, so therefore = coding [I]>

FR55) [I] and what you actually see in the revolution is an increased polarisation of society a pro enthusiastically pro the revolution and an enthusiastically against the revolution a counter revolutionary movement as well a revolution which has stressed harmony equality every community everyone being in together (See unit FR54 above>

FR56) [III] I mean the best illustration which historians usually give of that is the s{} the first celebration of the fourteenth of July which was obviously a year later in seventeen-ninety <This seems a pretty clear instance of Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs realising Intertextuality – the proposition is realised via the reporting verb 'give an illustration' and with 'historians' as its subject, so therefore = coding [III]>

FR57) the French have what the [abandoned clause] <Abandoned clauses are not part of the data to be analysed but are left in situ anyway>

FR58) [III] in Paris they create this enormous sort of amphitheatre <Continuation of report in unit FR56 above, so this unit maintains the same coding [III] as it is realised as part of the same 'reporting episode'>

FR59) [III] people come up from every part of France <See unit FR58 above>

FR60) [III] they have an enormous civil festi{} a civic festival <See unit FR58 above>

FR61) [IV] this so-called fête de la fédération the the festival of the federation symbolising I think this idea of the new unity the new indivisibility of the new regime <This is a tricky unit to code – it could be argued as a continuation of unit FR56 above, in which case it would be coded as [III]. I wouldn't disagree. I have coded it as [IV] however due to the presence of the 'I think' in the unit, seeming to index it as the lecturer's own personal take, meaning I see it as an instance of Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality with Reporting Verbs, so therefore as coding [IV]>

FR62) [IV] and yet even by seventeen-ninety I think the fissures are opening up <The 'I think' marks this as lecturer's own opinion and therefore as 'Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality Reporting Verbs' coding = [IV]>

FR63) [XI] let me start <Imperative form 'let' is addressed to audience and is therefore coded as 'MDS Audience' = coding [XI]>

FR64) [XI] let me start at the top <Imperative form 'let me' is addressed to audience and is therefore coded as 'MDS Audience' = coding [XI]>

FR65) [XXV] sorry <Such units as these, performing functions such as apologising or correcting little errors I code simply as [XXV], as 'Administration' – this is because they are not particularly relevant to the analyses for this study but are full units in the system I used to break up the data>

FR66) I'm not just gonna [abandoned clause] <Abandoned clauses are not part of the data to be analysed but are left in situ anyway>

FR67) [XXV] it sounds like I'm doing a strip tease [(if i)? don't take my ?? off ??] <Such units as these, where a lecturer is commenting on his/her own performance in a humorous manner and not 'lecturing' in a 'formal' sense I code simply as [XXV], as 'Administration' – this is because they are not particularly relevant to the analyses for this study but are full units in the system I used to break up the data>

FR68) [XXV] that wasn't the intention at all <See above>

FR69) [IX] let's start with a king <Straightforward MDS with "let's" = coding [IX]. Compare with unit FR64 above – "let me ..." = coding [XI] but "let us ..." = coding [IX]>

FR70) [I] there's a really good engraving <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR71) [XXV] I{} I'm sorry <Such units as these, performing functions such as apologising or correcting little errors I code simply as [XXV], as 'Administration' – this is because they are not particularly relevant to the analyses for this study but are full units in the system I used to break up the data>

FR72) [XXV] I meant to bring it along <See above>

FR73) [I] it's an engraving of Louis the sixteenth <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR74) [I] and it's an engraving originally done under the ancien regime so he's looking [I don't know if you've ever seen a picture of Louis the sixteenth] but he's trying to look serious which is difficult for Louis the sixteenth because he's very very he's a simpleton really <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR75) [VI] [I don't know if you've ever seen a picture of Louis the sixteenth] <Difficult unit to code. The 'I' of 'I don't know ...' seems to index the lecturer as the source, suggesting a coding of [IV]. However, the proposition is actually positioning the audience it seems to me, hence why I have coded it as [VI]. See also units FR385 & FR394>

FR76) [I] he's he's well{} meaning but [you know] profoundly silly <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR77) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring = coding [XII]>

FR78) [I] a twerp in in breeches Louis the sixteenth <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR79) [I] and he's there sort of looking in this bovine way <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR80) [I] and the genre of the engraving is sort of very sort of adulatory [you know] trying to make him look good <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR81) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR82) [I] he's got a star <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR83) [I] and he's [you know] looking good ancien regime version of the king <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR84) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR85) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR86) [I] on the top of this on the top of his head right just painted on the top is a big red bonnet the bonnet which came to symbolise revolutionary patriotism <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR87) [I] it was actually the idea of a red bonnet to symbolise freedom and equality came from the red bonnet which in antiquity was given to slaves who had been freed <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR88) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR89) [I] so under in ancient Rome if you were a slave you got freedom you could wear the red bonnet to show that you were emancipated as a slave <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR90) [I] and the revolutionaries pick up on this idea because they have been slaves allegedly under the ancien regime and now they are free men <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR91) [I] and what thi{} and with this moreover goes a tricolore the tricolore flag a{} but(?) a tricolore coquet <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR92) [I] the tricolore is the mixture of the colours of Paris the the ceremonial colours of Paris red and blue with the white colour which is the Bourbon the Bourbon dynasty the the royal dynasty's ceremonial colour <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR93) [I] so putting these together seems to symbolise that new new unity <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR94) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR95) [I] so you've got Louis the sixteenth in this sort of ancien regime type of engraving with on his ? sort of painted on in this very crude way a red bonnet a revolutionary coquet <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR96) [IV] and for me what that painting says is [can Louis the sixteenth be a free man] [can Louis the sixteenth adapt to a new type of political system in which he is not God's representative on earth who everyone has to obey] <pause> <Clear instance of Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality, signalled by prepositional phrase "for me ..." = coding [IV]>

FR97) [IV] [can Louis the sixteenth be a free man] <Direct speech from unit FR96 above = separate unit in this system, and retains coding of the unit in which it is realised, i.e. unit FR96 = coding [IV]>

FR98) [IV] [can Louis the sixteenth adapt to a new type of political system in which he is not God's representative on earth who everyone has to obey] <As above>

FR99) [I] because he's allegedly absolute monarch the only sort of representative of the of the French nation he has to work within a new political system which is totally new to him totally foreign and different and difficult for him to accept that he is just one agent of the French nation <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Although it seems to follow on from units FR96-8 above, there is limited textual evidence for giving it the status of [IV]>

FR100) [I] he's called the King of the French now <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR101) [I] and the idea is that he is the the executive arm of of an elected assembly the national assembly which has come into existence in seventeen-eighty-nine which he hasn't very little control over <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The use of the noun phrase "the idea [is] ..." suggests a degree of lecturer voice (in the sense of a high lecturer 'involvement' via the interpretation implied by "the idea is ...") within this unit but there is no way of consistently and reliably accommodating for this phenomenon in the already complex coding scheme, so such issues will be dealt with later in the analyses of each coding grouping. You may in fact have noticed some other [I] units already in which we might argue there is a degree of lecturer voice present, as well as the blending of "I think ..." [IV] with Unmarked [I] (FR98-99). This kind of phenomenon will be dealt with in later analyses. This is the difficult reality of coding spoken data>

FR102) [I] he can veto legislation a little but not very much frankly the sort of sovereignty in the within France has shifted from the body the person of the monarch to this national assembly this new national assembly <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR103) [VIII] and within that sit{} situation can Louis the sixteenth cope <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS, but with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>

FR104) [VIII] can he can he sort of deal with this new political arrangement (As above>

FR105) [VII] I've got <switches on OHP, showing transparency with key dates on it> sort of few dates for you there to to look at <Straightforward declarative form of MDS with 'I' pronoun = coding [VII]>

- FR106) [VII] I might mention some of these things as we go through <As above>
- FR107) [XII] well <Micro-discourse Structuring>
- FR108) [VIII] can he can he cope <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>
- FR109) [I] no he can't cope <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>
- FR110) [I] throughout seventeen-eighty-nine and ninety we find him endlessly vacillating wanting to sort of half{} accept things then sort of falling back on <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>
- FR111) [I] when he's sort of pressed he's very very lukewarm about the revolution in a way that many people who are enthusiastic revolutionaries find extremely difficult to to take <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>
- FR112) [I] and their patience becomes increasingly tested <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>
- FR113) [VIII] now what are the things that Louis the sixteenth finds difficult to accept <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>
- FR114) [XII] well <Micro-discourse Structuring>
- FR115) [I] obviously the reduction in his own power that's a that's the first thing <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>
- FR116) [IV] but I think also he finds two other areas of the new revolutionary situation the new political system of post{}seventeen-eighty-nine France very difficult to cope with <The 'I think' marks this as lecturer's own opinion and therefore as 'Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality Reporting Verbs', so therefore = coding [IV]>
- FR117) [IV] first of all the reduction of the nobility's status the idea that the nobility who were [you know] the most powerful group of individuals within France <Continuation of unit FR116 above, so therefore = coding [IV]>
- FR118) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>
- FR119) [IV] they were s{} allegedly the second estate [you know] <Continuation of unit FR116-7 above, so therefore = coding [IV]>
- FR120) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>
- FR121) [IV] the ones who above the third estate above everyone else these too have to accept that they are normal citizens as well <Continuation of unit FR116-7 above, so therefore = coding [IV]>
- FR122) [I] indeed in seventeen-ninety all titles are abolished throughout France so you're not allowed to call yourself the Duke of this the Marquis of that or or whatever <Difficult unit to code. I think it's most likely to be a straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. There is an argument that it is a continuation of unit FR116 above but there is limited textual evidence for this and the 'indeed' seems perhaps to mark a change of 'interaction' from 'I' to 'discipline', so therefore = coding [I]>

FR123) [I] you have to take normal li{} normal names like everyone else
<Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR124) [I] and many of the privileges and rights which they have had for literally more than a millennia in many cases are removed them removed from them <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR125) [I] one of the things which k{} happens in seventeen-eighty-nine which makes this such an important powerful national movement is the peasants' rising in seventeen-eighty-nine following the overthrow of the Bastille which leads to the abolition of feudalism the abolition of many of the senatorial and feudal rights which the nobility in particular although other social groups as well have maintained <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR126) [I] so the nobility is losing its rights losing its power losing its its sort of status within French society and putting a lot of pressure on the king to stand by them
<Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR127) [XII] you know <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR128) [I] the king is a noble <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR129) [I] he's the first of all nobles the first of ar{} most aristocratic of all aristocrats if you like he <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR130) [I] the nobility are putting pressure on him not to fall in with this new revolutionary system but to stick by their rights <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR131) [I] one way one thing which this which many of these nobles were starting to do in sevente{} well even in seventeen-eighty-nine but particularly in seventeen-ninety and ninety{} one is to emigrate to get out of France <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR132) [I] they just say [this is hopeless] [we're getting out] [you know] [this is a sort of political system we don't like] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of reporting, this unit is actually a good example of constructed speech hypothesising the words of people at the historical time to explain / dramatise human motivation, but it is NOT reporting any disciplinary theorists per se – so therefore although it is realised as direct speech, it is still an example of coding [I]. This is a phenomenon which will be investigated in detail when all examples of coding [I] are examined>

FR133) [I] [this is hopeless] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR132 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR134) [I] [we're getting out] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. See unit FR133 above>

FR135) [I] [you know] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. See unit FR133 above. It is difficult to say with accuracy if this "you know" is the hypothesised / constructed 'reported direct speech' of the original people (the 'nobles' of unit FR131) or the speech of the lecturer breaking up his report – such units though are consistently classified where possible as deriving from the original agents being 'reported', so therefore = coding [I]. This phenomenon of a lecturer using 'constructed' / 'hypothesised' 'reported direct speech' of the original people involved in events is widespread in the corpus of lectures. It is consistently coded as [I] because it is NOT reporting actual disciplinary theorists per se>

FR136) [I] [this is a sort of political system we don't like] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. See unit FR133 above>

FR137) [I] they emigrate <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR138) [I] and they s{} try and put pressure on the political leaders of other countries particularly in Germany to s{}to build up an army on the French frontiers which will frighten the French out of their sort of revolutionary ways <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR139) [I] so the émigrés the emigrated nobles other groups as well but the nobles are the most important start talking conspiracy <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR140) [I] they start conspiring in some of the provinces <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR141) [I] but outside France they're trying to make the overthrow of the new revolutionary government on the top of the agenda of most of the European rulers <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR142) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR143) [XVII] so already you've got a sort of sense of polarisation there coming up very strongly <You could argue this is simply another example of Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. However, it seems to me to be focussing too on the overall message of the lecture so far, drawing out the key point as the lecturer sees it – so therefore I have coded it as 'Scaffolding' = coding [XVII]>

FR144) [I] so the king is worried about his own position <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR145) [I] he's worried about that of the nobility <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR146) [I] he's worried too [and I think this cannot be underestimated or overestimated whichever word is right] then clergy okay religion <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR147) [XX] [and I think this cannot be underestimated or overestimated whichever word is right] <Evaluation of message in terms of importance, so therefore = coding [XX]>

FR148) [XIII] now I didn't when I was talking about the Enlightenment I didn't say that much about religion <Reference backwards to another lecture, realised via pronoun 'I', so therefore = coding [XIII]>

FR149) [XIII] I emphasised the changes in in ideas which the Enlightenment had brought about <As above>

FR150) [XIII] emphasised how the ideas of the Enlightenment circular{} circulate among social groups and in settings and urban setting in which they obviously are doing doing very well <As above>

FR151) [I] but if one looked at the total picture of France in seventeen-eighty-nine one would probably say that most of the population are still Catholics <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR152) [I] and many of them are intensely Catholic <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR153) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR154) [I] when the revolution first{} first comes out first occurs many people don't see a problem with that <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR155) [I] they don't see that a revolution need necessarily be anti{}clerical <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR156) [I] in fact the fête de la fédération which I mentioned to you which is this sort of celebration of harmony and unity in seventeen-ninety is in fact celebrated by a Te Deum <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Evidence too of reference backwards to 'the fête de la fédération' but this reference backwards is embedded in the unit inside a relative clause, and so is not the key message of the unit – so therefore coding as [I] >

FR157) [I] there is actually a an altar at the centre of this enormous sort of amphitheatre where someone [you know] celebrates a Mass <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR158) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR159) [XVIII] and so in other words religion is part of the new sort of revolutionary sort of culture <Reformulation realised via 'in other words', so therefore = coding [XVIII]>

FR160) [I] but it doesn't last like that for very long <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR161) [I] if you remember the reason why the state is having a revolution at all in seventeen-eighty-nine is because of its financial problems <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR162) [I] it's facing bankruptcy <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR163) [I] and one of the first things that the revolutionary assembly does in seventeen-eighty-nine is try and seek a way out of that by nationalising church property
<Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR164) [I] the church owns probably between six and ten percent of the total cultivable land within France between six and ten percent so straightaway as soon as you've nationalised that you're basically you're gonna be all right financially <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR165) [I] that's a lot of money coming in return for that nationalisation of land
<Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR166) [I] the church says [we will reorganise the church] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of 'reported direct speech', this unit is actually a good example of constructed speech hypothesising the words of people existing at the historical time to explain / dramatise human motivation – it is not reporting any disciplinary theorists per se – so therefore it is an example of coding [I], though a phenomenon which will be investigated in detail when all examples of coding [I] are examined. See also unit FR132 previously>

FR167) [I] [we will reorganise the church] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR166 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR168) [I] no{ } now it reorganises the church along lines which you'd expect <pause> [because as i say the influence of the Enlightenment is very clear] which are rational straightforward administratively very clear-cut <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR169) [XV] [because as i say the influence of the Enlightenment is very clear] <Reference backwards within the same lecture, realised via pronoun 'I', so therefore = coding [XV]. You might argue this is not actually an independent unit as it is realised via the subordinating 'because', but the <pause> suggests it is conceived of as an independent unit, and that is why I have made it as one. You might disagree>

FR170) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR171) [I] many people within the church accept that they accept that the revolution the revolutionary ?? has the right to impose a new structure on the French church
<Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR172) [I] many however do not <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR173) [I] what happens in seventeen-ninety seventeen-ninety-one the so-called Civil Constitution of the Clergy which is voted through a new constitution for the clergy as well which will be written into the in the political constitution as well <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR174) [I] so there'll be salaries for priests <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR175) [I] there'll only be one bishop in every department <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR176) [I] most monastic orders lose their property <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR177) [I] and the monks and nuns are grouped together <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR178) [I] there won't be any sort of perpetual vows cos this is it's alleged to be against individual freedom and all the rest of it <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR179) [I] a lot of the clergy say [yes] [this is a good system] [this will allow us to work within it] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of reporting, this unit is actually a good example of constructed speech hypothesising the words of people at the historical time to explain / dramatise human motivation, it is not reporting any disciplinary theorists per se – so therefore it is an example of coding [I], though a phenomenon which will be investigated in detail when all examples of coding [I] are examined. See also FR132 & FR166 previously>

FR180) [I] [yes] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR179 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR181) [I] [this is a good system] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. See above>

FR182) [I] [this will allow us to work within it] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. See above>

FR183) [I] but many people are extremely unhappy about that cos many people lose <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR184) [I] within the clergy ?? the old bishops the people who have been monks and nuns the cathedral chapters all of these people earn a lot of wealth within the within the ancien regime are gonna lose that <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR185) [I] they're gonna be opposed to it many of the high ?? <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR186) [IV] one should also say most in fact I would say go so far to say make a generalisation all of the high clergy is noble <The 'I would go so far as to say ...' seems to mark this as the lecturer's own proposition, so therefore as coding [IV]. A good example of a blending of 'lecturer' and 'disciplinary' voices which will be investigated in more detail in later analyses>

FR187) [IV] in fact it's usually very noble indeed very aristocratic <As above in unit FR186>

FR188) [IV] the highest positions within the church are almost monopolised by a small set of very aristocratic families the people who because they are nobles are against the revolution <As above in units FR186-7>

FR189) [I] these al{} co{} al{} people also have a reason cos they're religious to be against the revolution <Difficult unit. I have coded it as [I] because it seems to revert to the description of events rather than to continue the proposition concerning 'who' these people are as in units FR186-8 above, so therefore = coding [I]. You may disagree>

FR190) [I] what happens in seventeen-ninety-one and ninety-two is that the the national assembly realising that France is divided on this imposes an oath of loyalty to the new civil constitution <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR191) [I] if you vote for it fine <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR192) [I] you know you can stay within the church <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR193) [I] you can become a priest <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR194) [I] you can become a bishop <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR195) [I] you you know you everything will work well for you <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR196) [I] you are like a state civil servant for religion <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR197) [I] if you don't however if you don't vote for it then basically you're out you wha{} you haven't got the right to any position within the church <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR198) [I] you lose your salary <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR199) [I] you lose any any sort of rights to a pension <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR200) [I] late seventeen-ninety there is an oath the clergy splits down the middle <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR201) [I] roughly half vote for the constitution civil constitution half against <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR202) [I] interestingly [you know] is that just the clergy which ?? it's the clergy who are half for half against <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR203) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR204) [III] very interesting work been done in recent years by an American historian called Timothy Tackett t-a-c-k-e-double-t <This seems a pretty clear instance of 'Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs' realising 'Intertextuality' – the proposition is realised via the reporting verb 'do work' and with 'Timothy Tackett' as its subject, so therefore = coding [III]>

FR205) [III] and what he argues [I think it's a convincing argument if you read the book] is that that that oath which you know obviously it's the clergy that take <This seems a pretty clear instance of 'Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs' realising 'Intertextuality' – the proposition is realised via the reporting verb 'argue' and with 'he' (Timothy Tackett) as its subject, so therefore = coding [III]>

FR206) [XXIII] [I think it's a convincing argument if you read the book] <Evaluation of message in terms of its truthfulness, so therefore = coding [XXIII]>

FR207) [III] in fact that's like a sort of popularity poll on the revolution by the whole of the French nation because the people who are voting you know for it for the oath the clergy are under pressure from their parishioners or from the people in their neighbourhood to vote one way or another <This unit seems to be a clear continuation of Timothy Tackett's argument above, so therefore = coding [III]>

FR208) [XVIII] in other words the complexion of the the sort of religious the the geography if you like of voting for and voting against is is mapped over a sort of s{ } a regional geography of pro-church and anti-church feeling <Reformulation realised via 'in other words', so therefore = coding [XVIII]>

FR209) [I] and this in France at least [and I think this is not just France] but you know France is very very clear <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR210) [IV] [and I think this is not just France] <Clear indication of lecturer's voice via the 'I think', so therefore = coding [IV]. This unit continues the feeling of a blend between lecturer and disciplinary voices. This is very noticeable in this particular lecture>

FR211) [I] its vote of seventeen-ninety-one divides France for the rest of the seventeen-nineties and indeed to a very considerable extent for the next two centuries <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR212) [I] if you look for example at who votes right and who votes left in [it's not so clear actually it must be said] in the nineteen-eighties and nineteen-nineties but if you look in nineteen-seventies look at [you know] the voting pattern who's [you know] like in England north of England normally votes Labour the south well you know [I know it's been different since Blair] but [you know] that's usually the sort of what we expect <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR213) [XXIII] [it's not so clear actually it must be said] <Evaluation of message in terms of its truthfulness, so therefore = coding [XXIII]>

FR214) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR215) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR216) [XXIII] [I know it's been different since Blair] <Evaluation of message in terms of its truthfulness, so therefore = coding [XXIII]>

FR217) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR218) [I] in France you look at the map and you see that the righ{} the places which vote right and are therefore tend to be pro supporting supportive of the church places like Brittany in particular in the west the Massif Central these are very precisely the areas which voted against the civil constitution in seventeen-ninety <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR219) [XVIII] so in other words religion has broken apart has has crea{} created a massive fissure within the rev{} new revolutionary nation which had been established in seventeen-ninety <Reformulation realised via 'in other words', so therefore = coding [XVIII]>

FR220) [I] the clergy therefore had to live this paradox <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR221) [I] seventeen-eighty-nine had seemed to open up a new a new era to them <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR222) [I] they had to accept that half of them at least are not finding this something they wanna go along with fro{} <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR223) [I] the the the the the unity of seventeen-eighty-nine is breaking apart <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR224) [I] in seventeen-ninety-one as you'll see the situation sort of looks as if it's coming to a head when Louis the sixteenth the king leaves Paris secretly clandestinely where he feels he's being held prisoner and makes a run for the border makes a run for the frontier where all these émigré armies are <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR225) [I] he's fortunately caught before he gets there <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR226) [I] he's brought back to Paris <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR227) [I] many people would say at that stage [let's get rid for him for heaven's sake] [you know] [the man's obviously against the revolution] [he's actually creating more trouble than he's worth] [let's get rid of him] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of reporting, this unit is actually a good example of constructed speech hypothesising the words of people at the historical time to explain / dramatise human motivation, it is not reporting any disciplinary theorists per se – so therefore it is an example of coding [I], though a phenomenon which will be investigated in detail when all examples of coding [I] are examined>

FR228) [I] [let's get rid for him for heaven's sake] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR166 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR229) [I] [you know] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. It is impossible to know if this 'you know' is functioning within the reporting unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the lecturer to punctuate his discourse) or if it is functioning within the reported unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the original speakers, the 'many people' in unit FR227. In this kind of situation, I consistently code such units as belonging to the original speakers, so therefore as coding [I]>

FR230) [I] [the man's obviously against the revolution] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR231) [I] [he's actually creating more trouble than he's worth] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR232) [I] [let's get rid of him] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR233) [I] this is the exact opposite of what in fact happened [okay] because this gives the revolutionary national assembly a chance if you like to blackmail Louis the sixteenth into accepting the new constitution which they are gonna pass in seventeen-ninety-one creating a constitutional monarchy <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR234) [XII] [okay] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR235) [VIII] why don't they get rid of him <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>

FR236) [XII] well <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR237) [IV] because I think very largely you've got the pressure from the émigrés the pressure from the the clergy as well <Clear indication of lecturer's voice via the 'I think', so therefore = coding [IV]. This unit continues the feeling of a blend between lecturer and disciplinary voices. As I say, this is very noticeable in this particular lecture>

FR238) [IV] the other grouping I think in this period we would say isn't which is living the paradox of the revolution is the lower classes and in particular the most politically conscious of those the people in the towns the urban consumers who are <starts writing on board> they're often called in fact [and you'll get used to this term] the sans culottes <Clear indication of lecturer's voice via the 'I think', so therefore = coding [IV]. This unit continues the feeling of a blend between lecturer and disciplinary voices. As I say, this is very noticeable in this particular lecture>

FR239) [I] [and you'll get used to this term] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR240) [I] this does not mean that they didn't wear trousers by the way those who have sort of o-level gcse French <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR241) [I] sans culottes this means without knee breeches <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR242) [I] the knee breeches is the sign of gentility <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR243) [I] it shows you're sort of a gent <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR244) [I] if you don't if you wear the straight trousers of the workmen that means you're a worker <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR245) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR246) [I] it's it's not always the case but [you know] that's that's the idea <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR247) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR248) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR249) [I] so the sans culottes are the politically active group of the urban working and labouring classes a lot of artisans a lot of shopkeepers as well generally speaking not those who are have benefited most from the revolution <pause> <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR250) [I] cos this is the paradox for for many of these the revolution has seemed to open up this era of equality equality before the law <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. This unit hovers on the boundary between [I] and [XVII] because of the use of the word 'paradox' again. However, I have coded it as [I] because it seems to focus on describing the situation for the 'sans culottes' rather than focussing on overall message as happens for coding [XVII]. You may disagree>

FR251) [I] but that equality does not make many people's lives better <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR252) [I] in fact the economy is going through very considerable problems from seventeen-ninety seventeen-ninety-one the e{} economy which has done well over the an{} the the ancien regime over the eighteenth century as i have argued <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. You might argue this is in fact reference back to a previous lecture, realised via pronoun 'I', so therefore = coding [XIII]. But in fact the reference backwards is subordinated / embedded via the 'as ...' and so is not the main focus of the unit. So therefore coding = [I]>

FR253) [I] but the disruption caused by the revolution is causing very severe problems <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR254) [I] prices are going up <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR255) [I] price of bread is going up <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR256) [I] there's a lot of layoff with of employment <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR257) [I] there's a lot of trade disruption a lot of industrial disruption as well <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR258) [I] and so a lot of the as I say politically conscious work{} labouring classes are saying [well] [look this is a revolution that's supposed to be equali{} about equality] [where where is the equality for us] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of reporting, this unit is actually a good example of constructed speech hypothesising the words of people at the historical time to explain / dramatise human motivation, it is not reporting any disciplinary theorists per se – so therefore it is an example of coding [I], though a phenomenon which will be investigated in detail when all examples of coding [I] are examined>

FR259) [I] [well] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. It is impossible to know if this 'well' is functioning within the reporting unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the lecturer to punctuate his discourse) or if it is functioning within the reported unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the original speakers, the 'labouring classes' in unit FR258. In this kind of situation, I consistently code such units as belonging to the original speakers, so therefore as coding [I]>

FR260) [I] [look this is a revolution that's supposed to be equali{} about equality] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR258 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR261) [I] [where where is the equality for us] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR262) [I] and these people blame the elite <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I].>

FR263) [I] they blame the old elite <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR264) [I] they they blame the king <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR265) [I] they blame the nobility <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR266) [I] they blame the clergy for not producing not delivering the goods if you like on the equality and the liberty which they've been promised <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR267) [I] and when the king comes back from Varennes very precisely there are massive a massive growth within Paris of popular anti-royalism anti{} <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR268) [I] there's real anti-monarchism coming out <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR269) [XVIII] a lot of people in other words are saying which they never said in seventeen-eighty-nine they're saying [let's have a republic] [you know] [the king is hopeless] [you know] <This unit is realising 'Reformulation' as signalled by 'in other words', and is therefore coded as [XVIII]. Although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of reporting, this unit is actually a good example of constructed speech hypothesising the words of people at the historical time to explain / dramatise human motivation, it is not

reporting any disciplinary theorists per se – so therefore it is an example in this instance of coding [XVIII]>

FR270) [XVIII] [let's have a republic] <The direct speech from unit FR269 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is coding [XVIII] as the 'reported direct speech' from the 'Reformulation' in unit FR269>

FR271) [XVIII] [you know] <The direct speech from the 'Reformulation' in unit FR269 above. Again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is coding [XVIII] as the 'reported direct speech' from unit FR269. It is impossible to know if this 'you know' is functioning within the reporting unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the lecturer to punctuate his discourse) or if it is functioning within the reported unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the original speakers, the 'lot of people' in unit FR269. In this kind of situation, I consistently code such units as belonging to the original speakers, so therefore in this instance as coding [XVIII]>

FR272) [XVIII] [the king is hopeless] <The direct speech from unit FR269 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is coding [XVIII] as the 'reported direct speech' from the 'Reformulation' in unit FR269>

FR273) [XVIII] [you know] <The direct speech from the 'Reformulation' in unit FR269 above. Again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is coding [XVIII] as the 'reported direct speech' from unit FR269. It is impossible to know if this 'you know' is functioning within the reporting unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the lecturer to punctuate his discourse) or if it is functioning within the reported unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the original speakers, the 'lot of people' in unit FR269. In this kind of situation, I consistently code such units as belonging to the original speakers, so therefore in this instance as coding [XVIII]>

FR274) [I] deputies in the national assembly are therefore caught in this very sort of odd position whereby they want the king because they need the king's s{ } support for the revolution so that they can fight against the émigrés the an{ } and the nobles and the clergy who are wanting a return to the ancien regime <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR275) [I] they want the king so that they can prevent the lower classes getting too powerful getting above their station perhaps wanting a republic a more democratic system than the one that which they have introduced in seventeen-eighty-nine <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR276) [I] so in the summer of seventeen-eighty-nine [so{ } sorry] of seventeen-ninety-one you in fact find the king despite the flight from Varennes actually comes back into the national assembly <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR277) [XXV] [so{ } sorry] <Such units as these, performing functions such as apologising or correcting little errors I code simply as [XXV], as 'Administration' – this is because they are not particularly relevant to the analyses for this study but are full units in the system I used to break up the data>

FR278) [I] and there's sort of agreement between the national assembly and the king [let us have a a new constitution a new constitutional monarchy] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR279) [I] [let us have a a new constitution a new constitutional monarchy]
<Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I].
The direct speech from unit FR278 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR280) [I] a new constitution is elected <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR281) [I] a new assembly is elected <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR282) [I] seventeen-ninety-one seems to be again the possibility of a new beginning all those paradoxes (after that)?? will not go away <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR283) [VII] <writing on board> war and revolution <MDS, function of unit as a 'Heading', so therefore = coding [VII]>

FR284) [I] some [you know] sort of question that comes up on on the exam papers occasionally war and revolution and re{} revolutionised the revolution is this true <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR285) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR286) [XII] well <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR287) [IV] i think it is true <Clear indication of lecturer's voice via the 'I think', so therefore = coding [IV]. This unit continues the feeling of a blend between lecturer and disciplinary voices. As I say, this is very noticeable in this particular lecture>

FR288) [VIII] and why <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>

FR289) [XII] well <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR290) [VII] that's what i'm gonna explain <MDS, declarative syntax, realised with pronoun 'I', so therefore = coding [VII]>

FR291) [XVII] we've got a situation there when you've got a increased polarisation of F{} the French political system <You could argue this is simply another example of Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. However, it seems to me to be focussing too on the overall message of the lecture so far, drawing out the key point as the lecturer sees it – so therefore I have coded it as 'Scaffolding' = coding [XVII]. See also unit FR143>

FR292) [XVII] by by the time you're going into seventeen-ninety-one you've got a counter-revolution quite clearly developing <You could argue this is simply another example of Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. However, it seems to me to be focussing too on the overall message of the lecture so far,

drawing out the key point as the lecturer sees it – so therefore I have coded it as 'Scaffolding' = coding [XVII]. See also unit FR143>

FR293) [XVII] you've got a a a strong revolutionary group but not the sort of harm {} harmonious community that you seem to be introducing in seventeen-eighty-nine <See FR291-2 above>

FR294) [XVII] and you've got a king a pivotal figure who is the symbol to the counter-revolutionaries [let's give the king back all his power from seventeen-eighty-nine] <See FR291-2 above>

FR295) [XVII] [let's give the king back all his power from seventeen-eighty-nine] <The 'reported direct speech' from unit FR294 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this keeps the coding of the original unit, = coding [XVII]>

FR296) [XVII] but it's also a symbol a contested symbol as well for the revolutionaries cos they say [well] [you know] [he's the man who's accepted the revolution] <Continuation of 'Scaffolding' from unit FR291 above, so coding therefore = [XVII]>

FR297) [XVII] [well] <The 'reported direct speech' from unit FR296 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this keeps the coding of the original unit, = coding [XVII]>

FR298) [XVII] [you know] <See above>

FR299) [XVII] [he's the man who's accepted the revolution] <See above>

FR300) [I] the king continues to vacillate on the one hand supporting seeming to give support to the counter-revolution then finally under pressure agreeing to to support the revolution in the new assembly <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR301) [I] <writing on board> a group who were called very often called by historians the Girondins cos they come from the department of the Gironde for many of them round Bordeaux start arguing start arguing that maybe given the situation what France really needs to create a new unity or to refine that unity of seventeen-eighty-nine is warfare to attack the Europe which seems to be so counter-revolutionary to wipe out those émigrés on the frontiers who seem to be so so contentious and so opposed to the revolution and to reunite the nation behind the war a war for revolution <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The reporting verb 'called ...' is subordinated by being in a relative clause, so coding = [I]>

FR302) [I] and moreover it will make the position of the king utterly clear <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR303) [I] there will be no longer the chance of sitting on the fence when you're at war <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR304) [I] you basically have to be for the war or against it <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR305) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR306) [I] they drift to war <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR307) [I] they go to war in <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR308) [I] from April seventeen-ninety-two there're war up against most of Germany Ger{} most of Germany <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR309) [I] most of the rest of Europe comes ?? down to early seventeen-ninety-three <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR310) [VIII] what happens <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>

FR311) [XII] well <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR312) [I] the king has to choose <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR313) [I] but he doesn't he doesn't choose <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR314) [I] he again continues to vacillate at a time when it frankly is impossible to vacillate <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR315) [I] and what happens on the tenth of August seventeen-ninety-two is that there is a popular insurrection on these politically sort of active groups with? <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR316) [I] the sans culottes within Paris reinforced by many people who were pouring through Paris so they can go and fight on the front attack the Tuileries Palace <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR317) [I] pull him out of there <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR318) [I] s{} send him to prison <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR319) [I] and the national assembly has to accept the fact that [you know] you need a new constitution which is a republican constitution which is more democratic than the constitution so far which gives those sans culottes some sort of stake in the nation and which can re{} re{} reunite in a patriotic manner behind the revolutionary assembly which will then go on and win the win the war <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR320) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR321) [XVIII] so in other words what you had is a second revolution <Reformulation realised via 'in other words', so therefore = coding [XVIII]>

FR322) [I] in some ways at the time they looked back to say seventeen-eighty-nine saying [yeah] [seventeen-eighty-nine was the revolution of liberty] [that's when we got our freedom] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of reporting, this unit is actually a good example of constructed speech hypothesising the words of people at the historical time to explain / dramatise human motivation, it is not reporting any disciplinary theorists per se – so therefore it is an example of coding [I], though a phenomenon which will be investigated in detail when all examples of coding [I] are examined>

FR323) [I] [yeah] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. It is difficult to know if this 'yeah' is functioning within the reporting unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the lecturer to punctuate his discourse) or if it is functioning within the reported unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the original speakers, the 'they' in unit FR322. In this kind of situation, I consistently code such units as belonging to the original speakers, so therefore as coding [I]>

FR324) [I] [seventeen-eighty-nine was the revolution of liberty] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR322 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR325) [I] [that's when we got our freedom] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR322 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR326) [I] if you like [seventeen-ninety-two is the revolution of equality where we s{} took liberty but we also decided that equality was essential] [and we got rid of the king] [and we tried to establish a republic without a sort of some{} someone standing over us and sort of telling us what to do or thinking they ought to return to the old regime or whatever just as war has just as the revolution has become so polarised in other words] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of reporting, this unit is actually a good example of constructed speech hypothesising the words of people at the historical time to explain / dramatise human motivation, it is not reporting any disciplinary theorists per se – so therefore it is an example of coding [I], though a phenomenon which will be investigated in detail when all examples of coding [I] are examined>

FR327) [I] [seventeen-ninety-two is the revolution of equality where we s{} took liberty but we also decided that equality was essential] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR326 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR328) [I] [and we got rid of the king] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR329) [I] [and we tried to establish a republic without a sort of some{} someone standing over us and sort of telling us what to do or thinking they ought to return to the old regime or whatever just as war has just as the revolution has become so polarised in other words] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR330) [I] so the war will make that polarisation much deeper and moreover make that polarisation separated with groups one from another by a line a line of blood a line of dead bodies a line of corpses because war counteract{} war produces an increasing level of violence within revolution and counter revolution which makes it very difficult to to go back to tho{} o{} those old days of harmony <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR331) [I] so for example in following the overthrow over the king in August lots of the people are going off to the front <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR332) [I] war's going terribly badly <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR333) [I] the German troops Prussian troops Austrian troops are not very far away from Paris <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR334) [I] it looks like they'll kinda come and slaughter everyone <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR335) [I] many of the sans culottes many of the people come up through Paris going out to the front decide that if they're gonna go out they don't want the prison{} the prisoners within the Paris prison breaking out of prison where they're allegedly various prison plots and slaughtering all their wives and children <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR336) [I] so in fact the so-called September massacres horrible horrible murders groups of sans culottes go from prison to prison basically massacring prisoners in vast numbers innocent people a whole pile of prostitutes who were there I> <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR337) [I] they just [you know] they need they need blood <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR338) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR339) [I] the revolution becomes a revolution of blood-drinkers buveurs de sang <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR340) [I] this is the way it looks from the revolution <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR341) [I] this is the way it looks to English people at the at this time as well <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR342) [I] they go out these people <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR343) [I] they attack the the German troops <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR344) [I] they drive the German troops back <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR345) [XVII] but from this moment on the revolution has got that that sort of polarised that sort of paradoxical thing <A return to the focus on the concept of 'paradox' as the key message of the lecture, so therefore = coding [XVII]>

FR346) [XVII] on the one one hand it has been a revolution about liberty and s{ } allegedly equality <A return to the focus on the concept of 'paradox' as the key message of the lecture, so therefore = coding [XVII]>

FR347) [XVII] but it's a revolution too about killing people killing people in prison who are not who are not ba{ } basically guilty of anything apart from the fact that they're not enthusiastic supporters of the revolution <A return to the focus on the concept of 'paradox' as the key message of the lecture, so therefore = coding [XVII]>

FR348) [XVII] and that that line of blood if you like which is created from seventeen-ninety-two onwards actually causes this sort of polarisation to to continue and be durable throughout the revolution and and beyond <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR349) [I] many of the Girondins felt that war would be successful war would be successful <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR350) [I] but for a single country to take on the united forces of Europe is frankly too much <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR351) [I] and the war goes actually by seventeen-ninety-three extremely badly <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR352) [I] it's not just at the front <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR353) [I] you're also getting internal counter-revolution within France in <writing on board> western France in particular <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR354) [I] in the ?? of the Vendée there is a sort of full-scale popular royalist uprising a peasant revolt if you like <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR355) [VIII] and what caused that {full-scale popular royalist uprising} <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>

FR356) [XII] well <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR357) [I] it was precisely the war because the revolutionaries go in there and they try and recruit they try and conscript local people to go off to the front <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR358) [I] they revolt <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR359) [I] that is the trigger if you like of a whole sort of area becoming massively a{ } counter-revolutionary in the name of church and king <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR360) [I] and there are other areas like that <view of more of transparency> <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR361) [I] in the middle of seventeen-ninety-three it looks literally as if France is gonna fall apart the whole of France is gonna fall apart <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR362) [I] the armies are sort of pouring in over every front <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR363) [I] the British navy is blockading all the ports <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR364) [I] it is probably one of the most serious occasions in French history for just survival <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR365) [I] survive they do <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR366) [I] they survive through war <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR367) [I] they survive through terror <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR368) [IX] let's take war first <Straightforward MDS with "let's" = coding [IX]>

FR369) [VII] ancien regime armies <Straightforward MDS with unit functioning as a 'heading' = coding [VII]>

FR370) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR371) [XXIII] now sort of very very you've got an <erasing board> incredibly simplistic sort of Ladybird guidebook guide to conduct of war coming up <Evaluation of message in terms of its 'truth value' (just about!), so coding therefore = [XXIII]. This unit hovers between evaluation for 'difficulty' and for 'truth value', but I think the latter is most likely. You may disagree. See also unit FR415>

FR372) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR373) [I] under the in the eighteenth century armies <starts drawing on board> fight against each other in lines <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR374) [I] they're all in lines like this <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR375) [I] and they <drawing on board> march across through <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR376) [I] the lines are always very long so if you don't then obviously it's <drawing on board> rather vulnerable to <drawing on board> sort of flanking attack so you have to lengthen <drawing on board> the lines as much as possible so you can't be sort of like surrounded <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR377) [I] they're all incredibly well-trained so one line sort of shoots [you know] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR378) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR379) [I] then they sort of go to the back to reload <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR380) [I] the second line comes through <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR381) [I] volley <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR382) [I] fire <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR383) [I] all the rest of it like that <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR384) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR385) [VI] I don't know if you've ever seen a film like this all those red coats marching along [you know] firing <Difficult unit to code. The 'I' of 'I don't know ...' seems to index the lecturer as the source, suggesting a coding of [IV]. However, the proposition is actually positioning the audience it seems to me, hence why I have coded it as [VI]. See also units FR75 & FR394>

FR386) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR387) [I] that's it <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR388) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR389) [VII] revolution <MDS, form of a 'heading', so therefore = coding [VII]>

FR390) [I] most of the officer corps emigrates in France <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR391) [I] they just can't do it <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR392) [I] you can't train a load of peasants who are enthusiastic to to to fight like that <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR393) [I] you need years of training so that you can fight under that sort of discipline <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR394) [VI] don't know if you've ever been in the Boy Scouts or the CCF or whatever [you know] you where you sort of like walk in a line across broken country <Difficult unit to code. The assumed 'I' of 'don't know ...' seems to index the lecturer as the source, suggesting a coding of [IV]. However, the proposition is actually positioning the audience it seems to me, hence why I have coded it as [VI]. See also units FR75 & FR385>

FR395) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR396) [XXVI] the girls here have been have you <Direct dialogue with audience, therefore coded as [XXVI]>

FR397) [I] it's very difficult to do <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. This unit is not talking about the difficulty of the message in terms of comprehension>

FR398) [I] it's very difficult to do <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR399) [I] you need training <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR400) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR401) [I] most of that training has gone <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR402) [I] France is facing the armies of ancien regime Europe who have this training <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR403) [VIII] how do they actually manage to sort of just hold up against those armies <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>

FR404) [XII] well <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR405) [I] the way they do that is that they use the single thing that they've got well the two things they've got going for them <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR406) [I] one is numbers <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR407) [I] people are enthusiastic about the revolution <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR408) [I] they actually wanna win <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR409) [I] they wanna beat the army <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR410) [I] and they wanna go home <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR411) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR412) [I] and secondly besides numbers they have obviously enthusiasm
<Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR413) [I] so numbers and enthusiasm is the way in which the revolutionary armies
conquer <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore
coding = [I]>

FR414) [I] instead of coming <starts drawing on board> in a sort of linear way they
basically form if you like again [i{} is incredibly simplistic] [and in fact any military
historian in in here please put something over your ears] but <drawing on board> as I say
it's just a simplified very s{} very much running at the enemy firing as they go basically
frightening the shit out of the the enemy by these wild men who come come who come
enthusiastically towards you shooting off as they go and <drawing on board> punching a
hole through these these lines by just sort of sheer force of numbers <Straightforward
Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR415) [XXIII] [i{} is incredibly simplistic] <Evaluation of message in terms of its
truthfulness (just about!), so therefore = coding [XXIII]. See also unit FR371>

FR416) [VI] [and in fact any military historian in in here please put something over your
ears] <Direct appeal to audience, therefore coding = [VI]. Unusual unit>

FR417) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR418) [I] that's the way that the revolution is witnessed <Straightforward Unmarked
Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR419) [I] Marshal [sorry] Marshal General Hoche says h-o-c-h-e says [what have we got]
[we've got fire steel and patriotism] [okay] [enthusiasm fire steel] [okay] [close in close in
the ??] [puncture ?? that hole] [destroy wipe out the the sort of linear perfection of the of
the ancien regime armies] [and and conquer] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary
Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR420) [I] [what have we got] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext
Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR419 above, so again,
although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct
reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding
[I]>

FR421) [I] [we've got fire steel and patriotism] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary
Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR422) [I] [okay] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so
therefore coding = [I]. It is impossible to know if this 'okay' is functioning within the
reporting unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the lecturer to punctuate his discourse) or if it is
functioning within the reported unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the original speaker, 'General
Hoche' in unit FR419. In this kind of situation, I consistently code such units as belonging
to the original speakers, so therefore as coding [I]>

FR423) [I] [enthusiasm fire steel] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext
Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR166 above, so again,
although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct
reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding
[I]>

FR424) [I] [okay] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. It is impossible to know if this 'okay' is functioning within the reporting unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the lecturer to punctuate his discourse) or if it is functioning within the reported unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the original speakers, 'General Hoche' in unit FR419. In this kind of situation, I consistently code such units as belonging to the original speakers, so therefore as coding)>

FR425) [I] [close in close in the ??] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR419 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR426) [I] [puncture ?? that hole] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR427) [I] [destroy wipe out the the sort of linear perfection of the of the ancien regime armies] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR428) [I] [and and conquer] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR429) [I] and that's what they do <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR430) [I] they're very successful as we see when we're talking about Napoleon <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR431) [I] that's his type of fighting as well <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR432) [III] so as well as and arguing as well as revolutionising as as long as as well as the war revolutionising the revolution we would also say that the revolution revolutionised warfare that the the way in which warfare was fought war was fought is changed like this <Difficult unit. It could just about be 'Scaffolding' [XVII], but in fact I'm taking the 'we' to refer to 'historians' rather than to 'lecturer + audience', and so therefore I take this unit as an example of 'Disciplinary Intertext reporting Verbs Intertextuality' ('we would say ...'), and therefore I have coded it as [III]>

FR433) [XVIII] it's sort of like a mass army in other words <Reformulation realised via 'in other words', so therefore = coding [XVIII]>

FR434) [I] and is precisely [and this is something we'll talk about later in the term] the up{} in August of of seventeen-ninety-three the levé en masse is declared by the national assembly <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR435) [XIV] [and this is something we'll talk about later in the term] <Reference forwards to another lecture, realised via pronoun 'we', so therefore = coding [XIV]>

FR436) [XIX] that is every person in the whole of the republic has the duty to support the the war effort in some ways <Explanation of 'leve en masse' in unit FR434 via 'that is ...', so therefore = coding [XIX]>

FR437) [I] old men should sort of collect saltpetre to be made into gunpowder
<Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR438) [I] women should sort of knit socks for the people at the front <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR439) [I] and men have the right and the duty if they're called on to go and fight for the front <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR440) [I] so this is sort of first inkling of this idea of mass warfare which is obviously such an important thing in the nineteenth and particularly the twentieth century
<Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR441) [VIII] so around that patriotism how do you get people to how do you mobilise that enthusiasm <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>

FR442) [I] obviously the revolution has brought much <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR443) [VIII] in seventeen-ninety-three how in seven{} in seventeen-eighty-nine how in seventeen-ninety-three do you make people want to go out and [you know] even kill themselves on the battlefield for an entity front which probably didn't mean very much to them before seventeen-eighty-nine <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>

FR444) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR445) [XII] well <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR446) [I] there're two arms to the strategy of within France of mobilising the nation in this way <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR447) [VII] <view of more of transparency> I've sort of given some of the things here
<MDS, declarative syntax, realised with pronoun 'I', so therefore = coding [VII]>

FR448) [IV] very si{} very simplistically I would say radical social policies and terror
<The 'I would say' marks this as lecturer's own opinion and therefore as 'Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality Reporting Verbs', so therefore = coding [IV]. This unit continues the perceived blurring between lecturer and disciplinary voices as observed elsewhere and will be dealt with in more detail in later analyses>

FR449) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR450) [IX] let's start with radical social policies cos they are often forgotten because people have a view of the terror which is almost entirely negative <Straightforward MDS with "let's" = coding [IX]>

FR451) [I] but if you were writing the history of the welfare state you would make a big detour into this period because it's precisely in this period that the French legislative asse{} the French national convention and particularly this guy particularly Robespierre argued that in order to give people something to fight for you've got to give them something you've got to introduce the maximum in other words a ceiling on prices so grain and bread is at an

affordable price <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR452) [I] you've gotta introduce a whole welfare package for families of of soldiers for the aged for the infirm whole sort of set up new hospitals and all the rest of it a whole sort of set of welfare provision within this period so that people have something to fight for <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR453) [I] and if they're not if they're not enthusiastic if they're not keen then you have to frighten them into being keen as well <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR454) [I] that's the other side you a{} the terror side is that you use violence the violence of the revolutionary state against the enemies of the republic both without and within <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR455) [I] so you've got the e{} the the idea of of this su{} sort of new national this new nation fighting against the the the the the forces of counter revolutionary Europe <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR456) [I] but within you've got also a set of terroristic policies meant to keep the enemies of the revolution quiet and even in its more horrible e{} exemplifications to liquidate them <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR457) [I] so you had a revolutionary tribunal a special court where anyone accused of a a counter revolutionary offence will go <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR458) [I] and this becomes tighter and tighter and more defined <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR459) [I] basically anyone can go and have their head chopped off <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR460) [I] by the by the summer of seventeen-ninety-four you have a committee of public safety a war cabinet but also a sort of terror cabinet in which the Robespierre faction the person Robespierre as I say who gets this sort of this strategy of war on the frontiers but so{} radical social policy [give the people something to fight for] [let them rally around the flag of the republic] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR461) [I] [give the people something to fight for] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR460 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR462) [I] [let them rally around the flag of the republic] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR463) [I] Robespierre dominates the committee of public safety <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR464) [I] you've got the maximum the law of suspects sort of very m{ } very vague definition of counter revolution <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR465) [I] and you've got these representants missions deputies elected to the national assembly going into the provinces and using violence against anyone who seems to be counter revolutionary <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR466) [I] I mean some of the famous ones people like Carrier in Nantes where he sort of puts whole piles of priests and counter revolutionaries on boats <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR467) [I] floats them out into the middle of the River Loire <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR468) [I] and then pulls the plugs <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR469) [I] and so thousands of people die <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR470) [I] or Lyon <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR471) [I] or indeed in in the Vendée where people where basically in certain you've got a sort of free fire zone essentially in many parts of of Brittany and in some of the other areas of counter revolution where if you see anyone with a rifle in your hand in their hands you shoot them if you're a a revolutionary soldier <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR472) [I] and you go through a policy of s{ } of burning houses down killing civil populations and all the rest of it <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR473) [I] that's horrible side of the revolution horrible side of the revolution which is however effective <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR474) [I] the Marseillaise is created <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR475) [I] the the French national anthem is created precisely at this time in August seventeen-ninety-two <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR476) [I] don't know if you've ever listened to the words of the Marseillaise or or translated them <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR477) [I] it's all about blood flowing through through furrows and things like that <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR478) [I] it is a it's a marching song a militaristic song <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR479) [I] the idea is the French republic is an army a nation with rights the citizen is a rights bearing individual but he's also an arms bearing cit{} cit{} citizen he bears arms to defend the r{} the republic <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The word 'idea' suggests a degree of lecturer voice in the unit but not in a way that can be consistently coded. Such phenomena will therefore be assessed in more detail when all units in coding grouping [I] are analysed>

FR480) [I] and this policy is successful because by seventeen-ninety-four what's happening is that [I should have put the third heading as well <writing on board>] what's happening by seventeen-ninety-four is that the counter revolutionary armies are being driven back France <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR481) [XXV] [I should have put the third heading as well <writing on board>] <Such units as these, performing functions such as apologising or correcting little errors I code simply as [XXV], as 'Administration' – this is because they are not particularly relevant to the analyses for this study but are full units in the system I used to break up the data>

FR482) [I] there aren't any more sort of troops or anything on French soil <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR483) [I] in fact the French are pushing them into their own into Europe as we'll see when talking about this next week <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Unit also contains reference forwards to another lecture, realised via pronoun 'I', suggesting a coding [XIV], but this reference is embedded via 'as ...', so the main thrust of the unit is simply [I]>

FR484) [I] so to a certain extent the terror has its justification <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR485) [XII] you know <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR486) [XXIV] this is a horrible way a horrible logic <Difficult unit to code. It seems to me to be an aesthetic evaluation and therefore a coding as [XXIV]. You may disagree>

FR487) [I] if you like the terror has its justification <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR488) [I] and that it's successful <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR489) [I] it defends France against <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR490) [I] it allows the it allows France to stay geographically united even though socially and politically it's very divided <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR491) [I] and by the middle of seventeen-ninety-four you've got a a choice <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR492) [I] it's open to you really <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR493) [I] if you're within France if you're [as long as you're keeping your head down if you're a counter revolutionary obviously] but if you're a revolutionary you have two choices <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR494) [I] [as long as you're keeping your head down if you're a counter revolutionary obviously] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR495) [I] one of them is to say [well] [terror] [you know] [we don't like what's gone on in the terror] [but it has been successful at least] [so let's go back to you know what it was before] [let's go back and to sort of seventeen-ninety-two or seventeen-ninety or something] [let's dismantle all this sort of stuff all this sort of apparatus of terror this apparatus of strong centralised government which has been set up by the war emergency] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of reporting, this unit is actually a good example of constructed speech hypothesising the words of people at the historical time to explain / dramatise human motivation, it is not reporting any disciplinary theorists per se – so therefore it is an example of coding [I], though a phenomenon which will be investigated in detail when all examples of coding [I] are examined>

FR496) [I] [well] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. It is impossible to know if this 'well' is functioning within the reporting unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the lecturer to punctuate his discourse) or if it is functioning within the reported unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the original speakers, the implied 'you' in unit FR495. In this kind of situation, I consistently code such units as belonging to the original speakers, so therefore as coding [I]>

FR497) [I] [terror] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR495 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR498) [I] [you know] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. It is impossible to know if this 'you know' is functioning within the reporting unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the lecturer to punctuate his discourse) or if it is functioning within the reported unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the original speakers, the implied 'you' in unit FR495. In this kind of situation, I consistently code such units as belonging to the original speakers, so therefore as coding [I]>

FR499) [I] [we don't like what's gone on in the terror] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR495 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR500) [I] [but it has been successful at least] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR501) [I] [so let's go back to you know what it was before] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR502) [I] [let's go back and to sort of seventeen-ninety-two or seventeen-ninety or something] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR503) [I] [let's dismantle all this sort of stuff all this sort of apparatus of terror this apparatus of strong centralised government which has been set up by the war emergency] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR504) [I] and yet there is that group <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR505) [I] and yet there is another group [Robespierre is pro{ } the most prominent and certainly the most articulate of them] who say [no] [no turning back] [this is the time to create a new republic] [that new man which we talked about in seventeen-eighty-nine may have been a new man of the age of liberty] [what we need is a new man of the age of equality even though] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. Although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of reporting, this unit is actually a good example of constructed speech hypothesising the words of people at the historical time to explain / dramatise human motivation, it is not reporting any disciplinary theorists per se – so therefore it is an example of coding [I], though a phenomenon which will be investigated in detail when all examples of coding [I] are examined>

FR506) [I] [Robespierre is pro{ } the most prominent and certainly the most articulate of them] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR507) [I] [no] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR505 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR508) [I] [no turning back] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR509) [I] [this is the time to create a new republic] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR510) [I] [that new man which we talked about in seventeen-eighty-nine may have been a new man of the age of liberty] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR511) [I] [what we need is a new man of the age of equality even though] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR512) [XVIII] in other words the war is being won <Reformulation realised via 'in other words', so therefore = coding [XVIII]>

FR513) [XVIII] and the the the sort of rationalisation for terror is no longer there <Reformulation realised via 'in other words', so therefore = coding [XVIII]>

FR514) [IX] let's take things further <Straightforward MDS with "let's" = coding [IX]>

FR515) [I] what is very interesting [and I think it's also one of the reasons why this paradox about the revolutionary le{ } legacy is so powerful and yet so difficult for us in the ni{ } in the twentieth and the nineteenth and twentieth century] is that where Robespierre gets his ideas from where this idea of a purification of the nation of more radical social legislation

more equality within the within the system is very precisely from the Enlightenment
<Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR516) [IV] [and I think it's also one of the reasons why this paradox about the revolutionary le{} legacy is so powerful and yet so difficult for us in the ni{} in the twentieth and the nineteenth and twentieth century] <The 'I think' marks this as lecturer's own opinion and therefore as 'Lecturer Intertext Intertextuality Reporting Verbs' coding = [IV]>

FR517) [XIII] the Enlightenment I've argued has created the sort of conditions the social conditions and the ideology that the discourses which makeseventeen-eighty-nine possible
<Reference back to previous lecture, realised via pronoun 'I', so therefore = coding [XIII]>

FR518) [III] what historians get very agitated about very divided about very upset about sometimes is that the the the ideology and the discourses of Enlightenment have also seemed to prove the p{} provide the justification behind the reign of terror <This seems a pretty clear instance of Disciplinary Intertext Reporting Verbs realising Intertextuality – the proposition is realised via the reporting verb 'get agitated ... divided ... upset about' and with 'historians' as its subject, so therefore = coding [III]>

FR519) [III] the idea that a new republic of virtue [that's what Robespierre is always talking about virtue] that one can get a new civ{} a new civic system of equality where everyone basically has a sort of direct and equal relationship to each other and in which the state sits over above them <Continuation of unit FR518 above, so therefore = coding [III]>

FR520) [III] [that's what Robespierre is always talking about virtue] <Very difficult unit to code – do we class Robespierre as a disciplinary agent? I have decided yes on this occasion as his discourses are still read as history and in this sense he is part of the disciplinary community of historians. So therefore a coding of [III]. You may disagree>

FR521) [I] and so we have a situation where Robespierre is sticking up <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR522) [I] and his s{} supporters on the Committee of Public Safety you know the these the storm centre the the sort of brain centre of the terror and much of the rest of the the political nation are thinking [well] [surely this is the time to draw back] [this is not the time to to to go on] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR523) [I] [well] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. It is impossible to know if this 'well' is functioning within the reporting unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the lecturer to punctuate his discourse) or if it is functioning within the reported unit (i.e. it is 'used' by the original speakers, the 'the rest of the political nation' in unit FR522. In this kind of situation, I consistently code such units as belonging to the original speakers, so therefore as coding [I]>

FR524) [I] [surely this is the time to draw back] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR522 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR525) [I] [this is not the time to to to go on] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR526) [I] but such is the terror that there is not by late by the spring of seventeen-ninety-four the sort of freedom of opinion freedom of speech which you had in seventeen-eighty-nine <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR527) [I] people are frightened <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR528) [I] that's this is why [you know] there're a lot of those ideas about the terror being a sort of proto{ }totalitarian system [you know] that that sort of fear in which people never know whether there's going to be a knock on the door <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR529) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR530) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR531) [I] they're frightened of the meaning of words where [you know] you can use the word subject instead of citizen and you'll be seen to be a counter revolutionary <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR532) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR533) [I] and which you can say [I quite liked the Louis the sixteenth] and you'll end up before the revolutionary tribunal <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR534) [I] [I quite liked the Louis the sixteenth] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR533 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR535) [I] so opinion opinion is no longer free <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR536) [VIII] so how do you get rid <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>

FR537) [VIII] how do you change it <Straightforward interrogative form of MDS with no 'we' pronoun = coding [VIII]>

FR538) [I] [you have to get rid of Robespierre] this is what many of the people who got rid of him later say <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I].>

FR539) [I] [you have to get rid of Robespierre] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR538 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR540) [I] they say [we couldn't do anything] [you had to kill him] [there was no way out] [Robespierre has to go] [the symbol of this new idea of of of revolutionary virtue has to be

executed] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. It may look like reporting, and syntactically and lexico-gramatically it is reporting, but it is not reporting disciplinary theorists per se>

FR541) [I] [we couldn't do anything] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. The direct speech from unit FR540 above, so again, although the syntax & lexico-grammar is that of direct reported speech, it is not the direct reported speech of a disciplinary theorist per se – so therefore this is an example of coding [I]>

FR542) [I] [you had to kill him] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR543) [I] [there was no way out] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR544) [I] [Robespierre has to go] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR545) [I] [the symbol of this new idea of of of revolutionary virtue has to be executed] <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]. As above>

FR546) [I] there is a coup d'etat on the n{ } ninth of thermidor under the new calendar on the twenty-seventh of July seventeen-ninety-four where he he he is captured he <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR547) [I] and they are all executed <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR548) [I] a gang of them are executed the next day the the people who've been the driving force the van if you like of the movement for social regeneration and political regeneration social welfare policies but also terror but also terror <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR549) [I] so [you know] very much the two sides are removed and wha{ } <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR550) [XII] [you know] <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR551) [I] and if you like the revolutionaries get get the sense of going back so that they can get go forward <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR552) [I] they've got over the political crisis <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR553) [I] they've got over the social divisions if you like of seventeen-ninety-three to ninety-four <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR554) [I] they've fought back the the armies <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR555) [I] seventeen-ninety-five they can sort of move forward without Robespierre without the option of a terroristic policy hopefully at least and create a new political system in which those virtues of seventeen-eighty-nine and seventeen-ninety-one those liberal equalities those lib{} liberal and free free virtues of of seventeen-eighty-nine to ninety-one will be dominant and not the virtue not the liberty not the equality as it's been interpreted under Robespierre <Straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition, so therefore coding = [I]>

FR556) [XVII] so the very vocabulary in which we think in which revolutionaries in seventeen-ninety f{} nineties think about these things but in which we in the ?? late twentieth century are still thinking about the about politics [what does freedom mean] [what does equality mean] [how do these two things actually mesh in any political system] <Difficult unit. Could be straightforward Unmarked Disciplinary Intertext Proposition [I], but in fact I think this is a return to the 'Scaffolding' and focus on the key message of the lecture, so therefore a coding of [XVII]>

FR557) [XVII] [what does freedom mean] <As above. The direct speech from unit FR556 above, so therefore this is an example of coding [XVII]>

FR558) [XVII] [what does equality mean] <As above>

FR559) [XVII] [how do these two things actually mesh in any political system] <As above>

FR560) [XVII] these things have become in that sort of short laboratory like period of of just four or five years up into the open up into discussion <As above>

FR561) [XVII] they've become the thing ?? the framework within which we all try and live <As above>

FR562) [XII] okay <Micro-discourse Structuring>

FR563) [XXV] have a nice weekend <Such units as these, performing functions such as greetings and leave-taking I code simply as [XXV], as 'Administration' – this is because they are not particularly relevant to the analyses for this study but are full units in the system I used to break up the data>