COMMUNICATION 6410  
(Fall, 2010)  
Discourse Analysis

Instructor & Class Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor: Dr. Karen Tracy</th>
<th>Office hours: T 12:15-1:45; Th 3:30-5, &amp; by appt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class: 2-3:15 T &amp; Th, 77 Hellems</td>
<td>Phone: (303) 492-8461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office: 89B Hellems</td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:Karen.Tracy@colorado.edu">Karen.Tracy@colorado.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Home Page: [http://comm.colorado.edu/tracy](http://comm.colorado.edu/tracy)

Seminar Overview

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

Readings


3. A set of journal articles and book chapters. These materials are available on CULearn and are identified by authors’ last names plus the year if there is more than one piece by an author.
Course Readings
[those marked by asterisks are recommended; others are required]


Tracy, K., & Robles, J. (in press). Challenges of interviewers’ institutional positionings: Taking account of interview content AND the interaction. *Communication Methods and Measures, 4*.


**Course Assessment**

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

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

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

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

**Miscellaneous Course Information**

**Equipment:** The Communication Department has equipment that is available for students to checkout. Equipment includes laptops, digital VHS cameras, web cameras, wireless Internet cards, transcribers, tape recorders, and more. Please See Comm TAC (technology across the
curriculum) on the department website [http://comm.colorado.edu](http://comm.colorado.edu) for more information. Students outside of communication, will need my signature to check out equipment.

### Tentative Schedule and Assignments

| Wk1 8/24-26 | Tuesday | Read Tracy 2001 and 2008  
| | Thursday | Read Rapley, chapters 1-5 |
| Wk2 8/31-9/2 | Tuesday | Read Rapley, chapters 6-10; Antaki et al.  
| | | [http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/v1/n1/a1/antaki2002002.html](http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/v1/n1/a1/antaki2002002.html)  
| | | [http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/003/burman2003003.html](http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/003/burman2003003.html)  
| | Transcript # 1 due (short segment of hearing) |
| | Thursday: 2 analyses of same political exchange  
| | Read (1) Clayman & Whalen; (2) Pomerantz 1989, identified as **Bush-Rather exchange**  
| | | [http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/003/burman2003003.html](http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/003/burman2003003.html)  
| | | Recommended: Nofsinger 1989, Schegloff 1989 |
| Wk3 9/7-9 | Tuesday | Read Johnstone Chapter 1, Bucholtz, Ochs  
| | | [http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/003/burman2003003.html](http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/003/burman2003003.html)  
| | Transcript # 2 due (police call) |
| | Thursday: Analyses of police calls  
| | Read (1) Tracy & Tracy; (2) Tracy & Anderson |
| Wk4 9/14-16 | Tuesday | Johnstone, chapters 2-3  
| | | [DA mini-paper #1 due](#) |
| | Thursday: Example analyses of participation in public meetings  
| | Read (1) Potter & Hepburn; (2) Hicks  
| | | [DA mini-paper #1 due](#)  
| | | Recommended: Haspel and Tracy |
| Wk5 9/21-23 | Tuesday | Read Johnstone, chapters 4-5, Pomerantz & Fehr  
| | | [DA mini-paper #2 due](#) |
| Wk6 9/28-30 | **Thursday**: Prior DA student analyses  
Read (1) Agne & Tracy; (2) Hodges  

**Tuesday**  
Read Johnstone, chapters 6-8  
**DA mini-paper # 3 due**  

**Thursday** Sample studies working with newspaper/internet data  
Read: (1) Benwell & Stokoe, (2) Billig & MacMillan;  
Recommended Mautner; and/or Nilsen & Mäkitalo  
**Due: 1-paragraph description of discourse data and likely question focus** |

| Wk7 10/5-7 | **Unit II Approaches to DA & Key Controversies**  
**Student Data Sessions — Each class day, Week 7 - Week 15**  

**Wk8 10/12-14**  
**Approach**: Conversation Analysis (CA)  
**Tuesday**: overview  
(1) Clayman & Gill; (2) Roberts (2004) Kitzinger & Frith  

**Thursday**: CA in studies of institutional interaction  
Read Drew & Heritage  
**Project Issue focus (1-2 sentences) + Bibliography (10-15 references)**  

**Wk9 10/19-21**  
**Approaches**: CA (continued) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)  
**Tuesday**: CA-membership categorization analysis  
Read (1) Pomerantz & Mandelbaum; (2) Hester & Eglin, (3) Roca-Cuberes  

**Thursday**: CDA overview  
Read Fairclough & Wodak  
**Overview of full talk/text materials for study and one sample unit (transcribed/written)**  

**Wk10 10/26-28**  
**Approach**: CDA (continued)  
**Tuesday**: CDA overview/critique  
Read (1) Erickson and (2) Tracy, Martinez-Guillem, Robles, & Casteline  

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

---