I.A.D.A.

International Association for Dialogue Analysis
(Bologna)

I.A.D.A.
Forum

9
2005

Election of IADA Board-Bucharest 2005

TO THE IADA MEMBERSHIP:

At the recent IADA Conference held in Bucharest, Romania, the membership present at the General Meeting elected a new Board. Upon adjournment of the General Meeting, in accordance with the current IADA statutes, the newly elected Board proceeded to make nominations for officers and hold internal elections for the various positions. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce the new Board to you, the members, and thank the previous Board for its years of service to the organization.

EDDA WEIGAND (*Münster*), President
ERNEST W.B. HESS-LÜTTICH (*Bern*), Vice-President
LAWRENCE N. BERLIN (*Chicago*), Secretary
SVĚTLA ČMEJRKOVÁ (*Prague*)
MARCELO DASCAL (*Tel Aviv*)
CORNELIA ILIE (*Orebro*)
LILIANA IONESCU RUXANDOIU (*Bucharest*)
CATHERINE KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI (*Lyon 2*)
ELDA WEIZMAN (*Ramat Gan*)

Please refer to the home web site of IADA--http://www.uni-muenster.de/Ling/iada/--for a listing of the Honorary Board (also elected at Bucharest).

In the next issue of Forum, you will be receiving additional information about the conference in Bucharest, upcoming events and publications, and initiatives of the new Board. Please feel free to contact me with any news, suggestions, or comments at iada2004@neiu.edu. I look forward to hearing from all of you and serving you in the future.

Best regards,

Lawrence N. Berlin, Ph.D.
IADA Secretary

ADRIANA BOLÍVAR

REPORT ON THE I VENEZUELAN IADA COLLOQUIUM.
Caracas, April 21- 22- 23, 2005.

Central Theme: Dialogue Analysis: theoretical and practical perspectives

Aims

The aims of this first Colloquium were to gather researchers from various disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences in order to study dialogue from different theoretical perspectives, and to find out how dialogue is carried out in different private and public spaces in Venezuelan social, cultural and political life.

Organizers and sponsors

The colloquium was organized by Dr. Adriana Bolívar and the Postgraduate Program in Discourse Studies, with the support of Universidad Central de Venezuela and Compañía Anónima Nacional de Teléfonos de Venezuela (CANTV, a private telephone Company).

The Program

The Colloquium was organized around two plenary lectures, four panels and fifty individual papers distributed in eight sessions. The opening words were in charge of Adriana Bolívar who welcomed the participants on behalf of I.A.D.A. The University authorities were also present. Dr. Elizabeth Marval, representing the University Chancellor, delivered a short speech to welcome the participants and to congratulate the organizers for this first colloquium. She stressed the importance of the event in our own cultural and political context.

The plenary lectures:

The first plenary lecture, after the opening session, was by Dr. Guillermo Hoyos (philosopher), from Universidad Javeriana de Bogotá, Colombia, entitled: *El diálogo: ética discursiva y política deliberativa* (Dialogue: discourse ethics and deliberative politics). He focused on fundamental concepts in philosophy to approach politics and peace. The discussion that followed was highly motivating.

A midday cocktail contributed to highlight the event and offered the participants the opportunity of meeting in a more informal way.

The second plenary, on April 22, was by Dr. Luisa Granato (linguist) from Universidad Nacional de La plata, Argentina, entitled: *Los estudios de cortesía en la interacción verbal: motivaciones, teorías y métodos* (Politeness studies: motivations, theories

and methods). She focused on the relevance of politeness studies and the various ways in which these are conceived and approached. For many of the non-linguist participants politeness was a new topic so the discussion focused on questions on how these studies are carried out in practice and cultural differences.

The panels

The panels were on specific topics and integrated by four or five participants each. The topics were approached from the perspectives of philosophy, linguistics, psychology, and education. They were followed by interesting and inspiring discussion.
- Panel 1 (April 21st): Coordinated by Dr. Luz Marina Barreto (philosopher) and integrated by philosophers.
Racionalidad del diálogo y convivencia ciudadana (Citicenship and the rationality of dialogue)
Three fundamental problems in classical political philosophy were approached: friendship, freedom, and political community. The aim of this panel was to bring in key concepts for the discussion during the colloquium.
- Panel 2 (April 22nd): Coordinated by Frances de Erlich (linguist) and integrated by four linguists, two social psychologists and a philosopher.
Diálogo y confrontación en la democracia venezolana (Dialogue and confrontation in Venezuelan political dialogue)
    This panel approached the problem of confrontation as seen in political interaction taking into account the roles of political actors, the press and Internet. The effects of the confrontation and the possibilities of improving dialogue to preserve democracy were the focus of the discussion. The group reported research done as members of the Multidisciplinary Group of Political Discourse Analysis.
- Panel 3 (April 23rd): Coordinated by Margarita Villegas (educator) and integrated by three educators.
El diálogo mediacional: herramienta para la emancipación comunicativa de los protagonistas del hecho educativo escolar (Mediated dialogue as a tool for the communicative emancipation of the protagonists in the educational context).
    Dialogue was approached from a muldimensional perspective in which socio-cultural, cognitive, and strategic knowledge in/about dialogue were discussed. The panel focused on the experience of a group of researchers from Universidad Pedagógica Libertador whose aim is to promote dialogue in schools.
- Panel 4 (April 23rd): Coordinated by Lourdes Pietrosemoli (linguist) and integrated by linguists.
El diálogo en poblaciones especiales: estudios sobre el turno de habla (Dialogue in special groups: studies on turn at talk).
    This panel concentrated on conversation among patients suffering from aphasia and deaf people. The panel members belong to a research group from Universidad de Los Andes that has dedicated several years to this problem aiming at producing rehabilitation programs.

The sessions:

The eight sessions gathered papers around similar topics and problems:
Session 1: Dialogue and democracy. Participants from Psychology, education, international studies, journalism, communication studies.
Session 2: Dialogue in special contexts (chats, oral trials, institutions). Participants: linguists and psychologists.
Session 3: Dialogue and politics. Participants: social communicators, linguists, educators.
Session 4: Dialogue and Religion, Music, and Urbanism. Participants: philosophers, musicians, psychologists).
Session 5: Dialogue and philosophy. Participants: philosophers.
Session 6: Dialogue and cognition. Participants: psychologists and educators.
Session 7: Dialogue and education and literature. Participants: educators, linguists, writers.

The outline above serves to give an idea of the variety of interests and topics discussed in this I Colloquium. One of the aims of the organizers had been to gather specialists from various disciplines, and this is probably why the event was so successful. For the first time in Venezuela, a selected group of researchers got together to focus on dialogue research and, also, to discuss the implications of their research for everyday life, specially to keep peace and understanding among Venezuelans.

As a result of this Colloquium a Venezuelan network of IADA researchers has been created. There is more awareness of the complexity of dialogue and of the need to deal with theory and methods from various perspectives in a more rigorous form.

The proceedings of the Colloquium will be published by the end of November this year in CD Rom version as well as in book form. They will also be available through Internet. The Postgraduate Program in Discourse Studies has been given great support to continue with IADA events in the future.

GIUSEPPE PALUMBO*

ANDERSON, L. AND BAMFORD, J. (eds.) (2004). Evaluation in Oral and Written Academic Discourse, Roma: Officina Edizioni.

BONDI, M., GAVIOLI, L. AND SILVER, M. (eds.) (2004). Academic Discourse, Genre and Small Corpora, Roma: Officina Edizioni.

Evaluation in Oral and Written Academic Discourse and *Academic Discourse, Genre and Small Corpora* are two collections of studies providing a state-of-the-art account of investigations of academic discourse which is likely to be of interest to researchers in the

* University of Modena, palumbo.giuseppe@unimo.it

field from both a thematic and a methodological point of view. The two volumes are reviewed together by virtue of the commonality of the themes they cover. As far as methodology is concerned, the papers presented in the two volumes offer a variety of approaches and present a range of research problems, but nearly all of them rely on small corpora of specialized texts in electronic form and integrate insights derived from the quantitative analysis of corpora with findings based on discourse analytical approaches.

Evaluation in academic discourse is a central topic in both volumes. Recent research by various authors has shown how discourse communities are based upon socio-rhetorical networks that emerge in order to work towards a set of common goals. At the same time as they are demonstrating solidarity with their community, however, academics are also making innovative claims, thus realizing a process of constant negotiation with the other members of the community. This makes discourse a collective endeavour and, perhaps more importantly, "socially constitutive rather than just simply socially shaped" (Hyland 2000: 3). Evaluation is seen by many scholars as the very backbone of the argumentative structure whereby academics make new claims while at the same confirming membership in the academic community. As a result, the range of linguistic elements included under the heading of evaluation is extending and includes items used to express the writer's or speaker's attitude, items used to maintain relations with readers/listeners and items functioning as discourse organizers (Hunston & Thompson 2000).

Corpora have certainly played a major role in helping these new perspectives on academic discourse emerge. Small corpora, in particular, offer the advantage of studying the context (both linguistic and social) of examples while at the same time making safer claims as to the quantitative significance of the features that are analyzed. Where corpus studies gain new insights as to how a language structures itself to express its meaning potential, discourse and genre analysis offer the tools and methods necessary to establish a link between language constructs and the social and cultural activities they are part of. In other words, corpus studies and analyses based on discourse perspectives can reinforce each other by a mutual testing of hypothesis. In particular, if analyzing corpora runs the risk of losing sight of textual dimensions, by starting from texts analysts can make sure that their hypotheses are not formed and proposed in a vacuum. By the same token, where statements about the function of a given discoursal element seem to rest on a shaky empirical foundation, corpora can provide the quantitative data necessary to validate or reject such statements.

Thanks largely to technological progress and methodological refinements, corpora have started to be compiled that 1) do not only contain fragments of texts and 2) incorporate more representative and homogeneous samples of given genres. This has enabled researchers to study naturally occurring discourse and has provided them with tools and methodologies which allow hypotheses to be tested on firmer empirical grounds. The increased availability of corpora of spoken language (or the relative ease with which they can now be compiled) has further contributed to the popularity of corpora in such fields as genre and discourse analysis. As corpora have thus entered the "Age of Specialization",

a new generation of researchers has emerged who use corpora adapting them to their research needs – "linguists who use corpora", as they have been labelled (Partington 2003: 258), that is, researchers who are ready to use corpora in combination with other linguistic records and other analytical techniques, making the most of the various approaches they employ.

In both volumes reviewed here a wide range of academic genres is analyzed and as much attention to oral or mixed genres is dedicated as to written genres. *Evaluation in Oral and Written Academic Discourse* (from now on shortened to *Evaluation*) is clearly divided in two parts, with Part 1 especially dedicated to five studies on evaluation in spoken academic discourse and Part 2 offering three papers on evaluation in written academic texts. In *Academic Discourse, Genre and Small Corpora* (henceforth *Academic Discourse*), four papers are dedicated to written genres and the remaining four to genres involving an oral component (transcribed or video-taped lectures, conference presentations, lectures re-edited for publication in written form). The two volumes offer many good examples of studies making use of the integrated approach outlined above. The present review will focus on the papers in which such an integration is particularly fruitful either because it leads to a more complete picture of the ways evaluation unfolds in concrete contexts of use or because it prevents the researcher from misrepresenting the phenomenon he or she is studying.

In *Evaluation* the paper by L. Anderson presents a close analysis of an evaluative sequence in a graduate reading seminar. The integrated, "unabashedly eclectic" nature of his analytical approach is felt by Anderson as necessary by virtue of the dual nature of evaluation in the specific event under analysis (participants in reading seminar are engaged in evaluating both the writings by absent others and the contributions by present others to the seminar itself). Thus, while the corpus linguistics approach and the narrative studies approach are able to highlight essentially textual and monologic aspects, insights and methods from Conversation Analysis and from a genre-based approach are considered by Anderson better equipped to let interactional and evaluative aspects emerge from the analysis (not only in terms of lexical choices but also with reference to factors such as gaze, facial expression and posture). Also drawing from Conversation Analysis is the paper by L. Gavioli and N. Maxwell, who propose a close study of the systematic features of sequences of talk in which evaluation is negotiated and produced by participants. The method they use is data-based in that audio and video recordings of naturally occurring talk are analyzed, but not corpus-based, as no concordancing tools are employed. As the two authors stress, however, the type of analysis they present can be seen as complementary to more established corpus-based approaches. Equally complementary to a corpus-based approach is G. Diani's genre-based study of academic review articles, presented in *Academic Discourse*. In all of the 60 reviews included of her corpus Diani identifies a series of common moves and steps and then focuses on the move providing praise or criticism of the reviewed book, showing how praise is usually straightforward while criticism is expressed with differing degrees of intensity. A follow-up to this study could perhaps complement the results by, for instance, trying to map the use of specific lexico-grammatical features (e.g. pronouns

or modals) on to the model of moves and steps Diani has identified, so as to verify whether they tend to be associated with certain moves or steps rather than others.

The remaining papers in both volumes are all examples of an analytic procedure essentially based on the following steps: 1) exploratory phase based on a close examination of texts and aimed at defining the research question; 2) corpus-based analysis looking at frequency and collocational behaviour of the elements identified in the previous phase (semantic prosodies and comparative variation may also be investigated at this step); 3) return to texts (and their social context) with a view to evaluate the textual and discursive function of the elements under analysis. The 'return to texts' often requires "examining extended co-text in the original files beyond the concordance line itself", a procedure described by B. Crawford Camiciattoli in her paper in *Evaluation* but typical of most of the studies contained in both volumes. Indeed, as M. Silver warns in his paper on the use of the adverb *naturally* in academic articles (in *Academic Discourse*), a corpus-based analysis of authorial stance which did not take into account discourse in context would inevitably "misrepresent" the object of its analysis. It is, on the other hand, precisely the corpus-based approach which enables Silver to observe the pervasiveness of what he calls the "polyphonic" use of *naturally* in journal articles from history as opposed to articles from economics, where data on the use of this particular adverb reveal a consistently unmarked attitude.

The more convincing studies among those proposed in the two volumes are exactly those presenting well-balanced accounts of the qualitative and quantitative data gathered by the analysts. So, for instance, in *Evaluation* M. Bondi and M. Silver present a study in which they use a cross-disciplinary corpus to validate on a solid empirical foundation their hypothesis that "textual voices" play two very different roles in research article openings of the two disciplines of history and economics, with economics privileging reference to voices coming from within the discipline and history referring more frequently to voices coming from what Bondi and Silver call "Discourse Actors", i.e. voices belonging to the article's object of study. Of particular interest, in this study, is also the identification of a general framing mechanism which seems to be typical of the openings of economics articles, where a universal-to-particular attributive movement is often found, so that a text would open with a generalized subject ("Many economists have emphasized...") and then proceed to refer to increasingly specific sources ("see X and Z", followed by "the model of A / the survey in B is a good starting point for..."). The implications of such findings for pedagogical purposes should be immediately evident.

The 'virtues' of using small corpora for the analysis of specialized discourse are apparent in more than one paper in both volumes. C. Samson presents two studies of the same corpus of written economics lectures, one in each volume: the study presented in *Evaluation* shows how the written medium influences the choice of evaluative adjectives, so that writers tend to use more balanced from of expressions and to avoid the stronger statements found in spoken lectures; in *Academic Discourse*, on the other hand, Samson shows how claiming authority through manipulation of discoursal choices (especially those related with self-citation) is still constrained by the norms and the

social practices of the discipline. Another paper where the advantages of using a small corpus clearly emerge is that presented by P. Webber in *Academic Discourse*. In quantitatively analyzing a corpus of conference monologues (plenary lectures and paper presentations), Webber finds that one of the monologues has a remarkably higher number of passives than the others, a fact which can perhaps only be explained by reference to the paper's contextual factors and, in particular, either to the fact that the speaker was reading a written script aloud or to his not being a native speaker of English (which suggests that one more possible dimension for the comparison of specialized texts in English would be the origin of writers/speakers). Returning to written texts, F. Poppi (in *Evaluation*) sets out to investigate the use and frequency of boosters and hedges in a corpus of economic textbooks. Focusing on the adverb *perhaps*, she shows how it could be seen as a subtler means than a booster to add factivity to the writer's statements – a finding that, once again, is only arrived at by looking at the extended co-text of the adverb.

Overall, and in spite of minor drawbacks mainly relating to the volumes' presentation (some cited authors are not referenced and small portions of text seem to be missing in one or two papers), the two books discussed in the present review offer many interesting examples of how corpus-based and discourse analytical approaches can be combined. If we take corpus linguistics as the study of actual instances of *use* and discourse analysis as the study of actual instances of *communication*, then a combination of the two approaches can probably help us to gain more insights into how language is 'used in order to communicate'. As shown in the majority of these studies a discourse perspective can, initially, be employed to outline and refine research questions. Corpora can then be used to find answers based on representative samples of language and possibly to fine-tune the initial research questions. Finally, a discourse perspective can be reinstated in order to better evaluate and interpret the data. Discourse analysis can be used to 'take the language apart' according to various criteria. Corpus study can provide solid empirical foundations for research hypotheses. The two approaches, as the two volumes reviewed here testify, need not be in opposition.

References

HYLAND, K. (2000). Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing, London: Longman.

HUNSTON, S. & THOMPSON, G. (eds.) (2000). Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

PARTINGTON, A. (2003). The Linguistics of Political Argument. The Spin Doctor and the Wolf-Pack at the White House, London/New York: Routledge.

SPECIAL ISSUE
Studies in Communication Sciences
Studi di scienze della comunicazione

Argumentation in Dialogic Interaction

edited by
Marcelo Dascal, Frans H. van Eemeren, Eddo Rigotti, Sorin Stati & Andrea Rocci

Contents

Order on line from www.scoms.ch