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As Thomas Huckin pointed out in chapter 1, one starting point for the analysis of texts is meaning. This chapter begins from a different starting point for the investigation of texts, which is the analysis of language through a method known as discourse analysis. In this chapter, I introduce discourse analysis as a method for analyzing the ways that specific features of language contribute to the interpretation of texts in their various contexts. Discourse analysis, broadly defined, is the study of the ways that language is organized in texts and contexts; discourse analysis can investigate features of language as small and specific as aspects of sentence structure, or it can investigate features of texts and contexts as large and diffuse as genres and sociocultural world views. Discourse analysis can be practiced either quantitatively or qualitatively, or with an emphasis on linguistic structure or contextual function, although most discourse studies utilize a combined design of qualitative–quantitative and structural–functional methods and analyses. There are currently a great many approaches to discourse analysis because it is practiced by many researchers in different fields, but we focus here on discourse analysis as it has been developed in the field of linguistics and practiced in the field of composition studies. This chapter first covers basic concepts and approaches in discourse analysis, reviews the literature on one seminal issue within the field, and then describes a method for discourse analysis of written texts called rich feature analysis.
BASIC CONCEPTS AND APPROACHES IN DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Discourse analysis developed originally within the field of linguistics, so it may be helpful to introduce linguistics briefly as the scientific study of language. One of the ways that I as a generative linguist introduce linguistics to students new to the field is to note that many linguists investigate language as both a cognitive and social object, viewing language as a set of structures and a variety of functions. Under this view, speakers have internalized the rules and constraints that underlie the grammatical structures of their language, and they have learned various conventions that underlie situational and contextual functions of language in use. Two key terms in linguistics, then, are **structure** and **function**: a structure is a unit of language (sound, syllable, word, phrase, clause, sentence), a function is a use of language for a particular purpose, whether that purpose is informational, expressive, or social (Schiffrin, 1994). A crucial issue in linguistic theory involves the assignment of a language to a particular register or genre.

---

1 use a few terms from linguistics in this chapter:

- **syntax**—rules of sentence formation in a language: rules for combining phrases and clauses into sentences
- **semantics**—system of meaning in a language (e.g., ideas in sentences)
- **clause**—subject-predicate structure
- **dependent clause**—subject-predicate structure that is embedded into a larger sentence
  - subordinate clause—begins with a subordinating conjunction (e.g., I ate lunch after I went to class)
  - relative clause—begins with a relative pronoun, modifies within a noun phrase (e.g., I attended the class that I hate)
  - participial clause—headed by a verbal participle (e.g., Running to class, I lost my notebook)
  - infinitive clause—headed by an infinitive (to + V) (e.g., I hate to miss class)

I also use some terms from discourse analysis in this chapter:

- **register**—a variety of a language that occurs in a specific context (e.g., scientific discourse); a register typically has a set of co-occurring features associated with it (e.g., the passive in scientific discourse)
- **genre**—a conventionalized variety of text structure in a language, either oral (e.g., a sermon) or written (e.g., the IMRD [Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion] structure of a scientific research article)
- relationship between register and genre—some discourse analysts make a distinction between the investigation of registers as focused on the sets of co-occurring linguistic features in a variety, and the study of genres as focused on the rhetorical form of texts, but other discourse analysts see the terms as describing virtually the same phenomenon of oral and written varieties within a language (cf. Atkinson, 1999, pp. 9–11)
volves the complexities of the interaction of structure and function, and different linguistic theories take different approaches to seeing structure or function as primary, or to seeing them as relatively separate or inherently fused (Newmeyer, 1986b, 1998).

Traditionally, structural linguistics has focused primarily upon language as a cognitive object, investigating the rules and constraints that make up a language (and language in general) by trying to account for the creativity of language that allows speakers to produce and understand utterances they have never heard before (in generative linguistic theories, notably those derived from the work of Noam Chomsky, this is called speakers' linguistic competence; cf. Newmeyer, 1986b, 1998). The rules of language, in this sense, are not conscious directions that are taught to speakers but deeply internalized and highly abstract principles that make up speakers' knowledge of their language(s). An example of a structural rule of language is word order. Some languages, for example, English, structure their sentences with a subject-verb-object order, but other languages use different word orders: Japanese, for example, structures sentences with a subject-object-verb order, while Irish structures sentences with a verb-subject-object order. No speaker, even a child learning language, is ever consciously directed to form sentences in a particular order (no one tells a toddler learning English, "Now the rule is to put the object after the verb; obey it"), but every speaker internalizes the word order rules for the language(s) that he or she speaks, and uses the rule again and again to produce and understand new sentences.

At the same time that modern structural linguistics developed, anthropological linguistics and sociolinguistics came to focus primarily upon language as a social object. Some sociolinguists investigate the variation in language that arises when groups of speakers learn the same language in different dialects, with a recent focus on how variation in language leads to language change (cf. Trudgill, 2001). Other sociolinguists and some anthropological linguists investigate language in a social perspective more broadly, focusing on how speakers know how to make choices and follow practices of using language appropriately in various sociocultural contexts (in some theories, notably those derived from the work of Dell Hymes, this is called speakers' communicative competence; cf. Saville-Troike, 1989; Schiffrin, 1994). Variation in language is sometimes described in terms of rules (e.g., regional dialect pronunciations), but much variation in language arises from speakers making and following choices about the uses and functions of language in different contexts, choices that can be described in terms of conventions of language use. An example of contextual variation in this sense is the level of formality speakers choose to use in a given situation: The features of language in the setting of informal conversation (e.g., clipped pronunciations like 'bringin' instead
of bringing, elliptical syntax like sentence fragments) would not conventionally be chosen for the more formal situation of written academic discourse. Conventions of language in context, in this view, are not matters of simple surface correctness (or what linguists would call prescriptive rules in the sense of stylistic dictates taught in school) but complex connections between the use of a linguistic feature and its function and interpretation in a text or context. Sometimes these choices and conventions are the result of active attention by the speaker to his or her use of language (e.g., telling a story differently to different audiences), and other times these choices and conventions are the habituated results of community practices of language use (e.g., answering greetings appropriately). In other words, conventions describe a relationship between the repeated or typical use of a feature (e.g., the recitation of a Bible verse) and its function in a context (e.g., to signal the beginning of a sermon).

Structural linguistics typically focuses on units of language at or within the level of the sentence, since structural rules describe the possible combinations of basic linguistic units into grammatical sentences (e.g., word order). In anthropological linguistics, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis, as we see shortly, the focus is on uses of language in context (e.g., formal/informal variations), and conventions refer not to matters of grammaticality, strictly speaking, but to the connections between features of language and their functions in context (e.g., the Bible verse and the sermon).

(Discourse analysis) developed from a number of traditions in linguistics, some of which were concerned primarily with linguistic structure but most of which were concerned primarily with linguistic use. For example, early work in anthropological linguistics by Dell Hymes (1972) on what he called the ethnography of communication suggested that discourse analysts look at the ways in which language in different communicative events functions to create and reflect aspects of culture, including world view; his work also suggested that discourse analysts look at communication cross-culturally (Scollon & Scollon, 2001). In another example, early work in sociolinguistics by William Labov (1972a) on oral narratives by young African-American speakers suggested that discourse analysts look at the ways in which oral language is structured within units that are larger than a sentence, such as stories and other genres; Labov’s work also suggested that discourse analysts look at the organization of language and dialects in minority social and ethnic groups (Wolfram, Adger, & Christian, 1999). More than 30 years of research has taken the field in many different directions, but most work in discourse analysis somehow considers the structure of language and its functions in social and cultural contexts. The field called discourse analysis, then, poses a number of
questions: How do speakers and writers organize language to function at or beyond the level of the sentence? How do speakers and writers organize language to function in texts and contexts? In what specific ways? For what purposes? With what effects?

A number of theories and methods of discourse analysis have developed over the years, approaches that often reflect the interdisciplinary configurations of their practitioners. For example, the ethnography of communication, which aims at describing how communication works within different cultures, draws from linguistic anthropology, and looks at issues such as language socialization (Saville-Troike, 1989; Schieffelin, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1990). Interactive sociolinguistics, which describes language within smaller social groups, including gender groups, looks at conversations, arguments, and other interactions conventional to those groups (Schiffrin, 1984b; Tannen, 1984, 1993). Genre analysis, which describes the structure of texts in the contexts of discourse communities, especially academic disciplinary communities, focuses on the ways that texts reflect the social nature of disciplines in the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities and draws from applied linguistics to pay special attention to the texts of second language speakers and writers (Johns, 1997; Swales, 1990; cf. Bazerman, chap. 11, this volume). Systemic linguistics, developed by M.A.K. Halliday as one of the earliest and most elaborate discourse theories, draws upon theories of social semiotics to describe the structure of clauses, sentences, and texts with a focus on textual structure (Halliday, 1978, 1998). More recently critical discourse analysis draws from various social theories to analyze the complex interactions of language and ideology in various contexts (van Dijk, 1998).

These different approaches to discourse analysis have also focused on different kinds of data for investigation. Work in the ethnography of communication, for example, often collects data from cultural performances of oral traditions, such as narratives told by a culture’s storytellers (Scollo & Sco, 1981). Work in interactive sociolinguistics also looks at narratives, but primarily narratives that arise in ordinary conversation (Schiffrin, 1984a). Genre analysis, as noted, often uses academic discourse as data when it investigates the natural and social sciences, although other work has looked at texts in the contexts of business and legal systems (Bhatia, 1993). Systemic linguistics draws its data from many sources, but recently has emphasized language and genres in educational settings (Halliday & Martin, 1993). Critical discourse analysis also draws data from many sources, but has developed a focus on language in the public and political domains by examining language in the news and in bureaucratic settings such as parliamentary debates and official reports (van Dijk, 1991, 1993; Wodak & van Dijk, 2000).
THE ANALYSIS OF ORAL–WRITTEN LANGUAGE IN DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

To give a sense of the research conducted within discourse analysis, consider the investigation of one particularly interesting issue—the systematic differences between the features and functions of oral and written language. Some of the earliest work in discourse analysis, work that defined the emerging field, looked at the intriguing differences between the ways people talk and the ways they write, and work on this topic has continued in discourse analysis within a variety of approaches and methods.

Using an inductive methodology based on the close examination of samples of oral and written language, Wallace Chafe has been prominent in arguing that oral and written language exist upon a structural and functional continuum, with different features typical of either end (Chafe, 1982, 1994; Chafe & Danielewicz, 1987). Consider the following utterance from oral language (the dots are to be read as pauses—two dots for a short pause, three dots for a longer pause):

...And...she was still young enough so I...I just...was able to put her in an...uh—sort of...sling...I mean one of those tummy packs...you know. (Chafe & Danielewicz, 1987, p. 89)

The features of this utterance in oral language include its many false starts and hesitations (repetitions, fillers like uh), its many informal mitigations (sort of, I mean, you know), its basic-level vocabulary (sling, tummy pack), its short and simple syntax in 5- to 7-word units expressing one idea (phrases and simple clauses bounded by pauses), and its basic connectives between units (so, and). Compare this utterance to a sentence from written language:

Language change has occurred when the utterances of some members of that community have characteristics demonstrably different from those in utterances of previous generations. (Chafe & Danielewicz, 1987, p. 98)

The features of this sentence in written language include its length (24 words), its lack of disfluencies and mitigations, its elevated vocabulary, and its complex syntax with syntactic embedding of multiple ideas in a single sentential unit, complete with punctuation (e.g., modification and dependent clauses).

Although Chafe’s close investigations of many language samples have confirmed the basic features of the ends of the continuum, it is important to note that he argues not for an absolute characterization of oral and written language. In other words, not all oral language is characterized by the presence of false starts and hesitations, and not all written language is characterized by its length and formal structure.
ence of all of the features listed above, and not all written language is characterized by the presence of contrasting features: Academic lectures, for example, are a type of oral language that draws upon features of written language (e.g., complex vocabulary), and informal letters (and more recently, email) are a kind of written language that draws upon features of oral language (e.g., simple syntactic units that are not necessarily complete sentences). Speakers and, especially, writers can draw upon the repertoire of features in oral and written language to function for different purposes and effects in different texts and contexts.

Chafe’s methodology for discourse analysis is primarily **qualitative and inductive, with basic quantitative verification**: he collected and examined many language samples that he thought would be illustrative of different kinds of oral and written language, identified features of interest through close qualitative analysis, verified the occurrence of these features across the corpus of samples through basic quantitative analysis, and presented the results of his analysis primarily using examples to relate structural features to functional and contextual dimensions. In discussing why oral and written language typically have different structural features, for example, he suggests a functional explanation based on the different contexts of oral and written language: Oral language takes place in a context of involvement—face-to-face interaction between speakers, interaction that is constrained by the limits of short-term memory, hence its conventionally short and syntactically simple utterances with basic vocabulary; written language, on the other hand, takes place in a context of detachment—no immediate interaction between an author and a non-present audience, a situation that allows careful composition and editing to achieve the complex lexical and syntactic features of written discourse.

Recent work in linguistics on the analysis of oral and written language by Douglas Biber has developed a more **systematic quantitative methodology**, based on large corpora of language samples selected for their representativeness and analyzed using a statistical technique called **Multidimensional Analysis** (a form of factor analysis, for those familiar with statistical methods; Biber, 1988). The overall method is too complex to summarize in full detail here, but the basic idea is that different registers and genres of oral and written language are characterized not by single features but by sets of **co-occurring features** (cf. fn 1). To analyze features in sets, Biber worked with a large corpus of texts (his baseline analysis utilized 481 texts in 23 different genre/register categories). Atkinson (1999) gave a simplified, but illustrative, example from this method. One of the linguistic features included in this analysis is simple past tense. Simple past tense, it turns out, co-occurs at a high rate of frequency with several other features, including third person personal pronouns, perfect-aspect verbs (i.e., verbs that describe actions or events completed in the past), and verbs that report com-
municative acts (e.g., report, claim). This set of linguistic features, Biber argued, is constitutive of the functional category narrative; in other words, this set of features is characteristic of registers and texts, including written texts, that are narrative, such as romantic fiction and biography. Other registers and genres, such as academic discourse, for example, are not typically characterized by the features of narrative (although that is not to say that these features never occur in academic discourse). The crucial point here is that it is not a single feature that characterizes different registers and genres, but multiple, co-occurring sets of features. Biber (1988) identified five key dimensions of variation: involved vs. informational production, narrative vs. non-narrative concerns, situation-dependent vs. explicit reference, overt expression of persuasion, and non-abstract vs. abstract information. In the results of his numerous studies, face-to-face oral conversation is characterized by involved production and non-abstract information, while written academic discourse is characterized by informational production and abstract information.

THE ANALYSIS OF ORAL–WRITTEN LANGUAGE IN COMPOSITION STUDIES

The qualitative work of Chaîne and the quantitative work of Biber, then, converge in support of a view of oral and written language on a structural–functional continuum, with different structures conventionally associated with different functions in context. Their work further suggests that written academic discourse has a number of structural features that have complex functions in the construction of knowledge in the context of the academy, which is one special interest in the field of composition studies. Work on oral–written language specifically and work in discourse analysis generally, then, has long been influential in composition studies, with early work leading to detailed investigations of academic discourse written by student writers and by scholars and researchers in different disciplines. Mina Shaughnessy’s (1977) classic work Errors and Expectations, for example, drew extensively upon the discourse analysis of oral–written language to argue that basic writers may not be familiar with the conventions of written language in the academy. One of the earliest anthologies in composition studies, Kroll and Vann’s (1981) Exploring Speaking-Writing Relationships: Connections and Contrasts, included many innovative studies of student writing from the perspective of the oral–written language continuum, including Anne Ruggles Gere’s (1981) thoughtful discussion of the connections between oral and written language and sociocultural ideas about literacy. These early studies contributed significantly to the field’s view of student writers as linguistic and rhetorical practitioners working in what
may be an unfamiliar and even potentially alienating context of academic discourse.

More generally, discourse analysis of written language in a wide variety of academic and non-academic contexts became prominent in the early development of composition studies as a field, and still occupies an important place in research today. Charles Bazerman’s (1981) seminal study “What Written Knowledge Does: Three Examples of Academic Discourse,” for example, described the different features and functions of texts in the contexts of the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities; Susan Peck MacDonald (1994) took up this kind of description in her study of three fields in the social sciences and the humanities (psychology, history, literary theory). Dwight Atkinson’s (1999) historical study of the evolution of scientific discourse in the publications of The Royal Society of London (1675–1975) drew upon Biber’s statistical analysis in combination with rhetorical discourse analysis to show how the conventions of the scientific article changed over time. Paul Prior’s (1998) studies of orality in written discourse explored the complex ways in which oral language contributes to the writing process (cf. Leander & Prior, chap. 8, this volume). Researchers in technical and professional communication have been particularly active in describing the structure of texts and their functions in institutional contexts: Jennie Dautermann’s (1997) study of nurses writing procedural manuals in a hospital, for example, showed how the texts were shaped to reflect the organizational and political realities of the field of nursing in contemporary medical care. All of these studies, and many more, draw implicitly or explicitly upon work in discourse analysis to develop structural–functional analyses of written language in context. Most of these analyses are qualitative, although the field has grown increasingly interested in combined qualitative–quantitative methodologies. In the following section, I describe such a combined qualitative–quantitative method of discourse analysis that I use to work within composition studies.

RICH FEATURE ANALYSIS

In an earlier work entitled “Context Sensitive Discourse Analysis,” Thomas Huckin (1992) described the basic methodological procedures for undertaking a discourse analysis within composition studies:

1. selecting an initial corpus that is of intrinsic interest to the audience (in composition studies, many researchers begin with a corpus of student writing, a collection of disciplinary articles in the sciences or humanities, or a set of texts from an institutional workplace);
2. identifying salient patterns, usually by scanning texts holistically;
3. determining "interestingness" (how are the identified patterns interesting in composition studies?);

4. selecting a study corpus (sampling);

5. verifying the pattern (coding, counting, and other forms of empirical analysis);

6. developing a functional-rhetorical analysis (explaining the significance of a pattern in its context).

Working within this framework, my own work elaborates Step 2, describing what makes up a salient pattern in more detail. In this approach, I define a pattern as the conventional relationship between a structural feature and its function, meaning, or significance in context. This relationship is centered upon what was earlier described as a convention: A convention is an interpretive association between the typical use of a feature and its meaning in context (recall the example of a Bible verse conventionally signaling the beginning of a sermon). In the approach I call rich feature analysis, then, I look for particular features in a text or a set of texts that are associated with conventions of meaning and significance in context. I call these rich features. Rich features are defined as those features that point to the relation between a text and its context. Rich features have both linguistic integrity (i.e., they are structural features of language, so they can be defined in linguistic terms and then categorized, coded, counted, and otherwise analyzed empirically) and contextual value (i.e., they can be conventionally connected to matters of function, meaning, interpretation, and significance). The connection between a feature and its contextual value is a convention of language use. In this method, then, the connection between structure and function is the primary focus of analysis.

A rich feature can be any linguistic feature in a text or a set of texts that points to the way that meaning is embedded into that text in connection to its context. Rich features, in other words, are the basis for conventions of meaning and interpretation in context. Features can be as small as individual sounds, as in an analysis of alliteration in rap music lyrics, or features can be large as the types of narratives male and female academics use in lectures. A feature is rich, though, because it conventionally connects to meaning in context. Meaning arises in part out of the repetitive and patterned use of rich features: If a feature is repeated within and across texts, it is likely to be typified and conventionalized as to appearance and significance, and these conventional relations between features, patterns, and meanings are the ways that rich features both reflect and shape the context of its text.

Methodologically, rich feature analysis utilizes a recursive and circular process of bottom-up (or data-based) and top-down (or theory-based) analysis as discourse analysis is often practiced in composition studies. Bot-
tom-up discourse analysis seeking rich features involves looking at texts, inductively identifying their rich features and associated conventions, and then using these features and conventions as examples in a descriptive argument in support of some generalization(s) or claims(s) about the interpretive relations between features, conventions, texts, and their contexts. Top-down discourse analysis interpreting rich features and their conventions of significance associates these descriptions with larger social, political, and cultural frameworks, such as gender theory, organizational communication, social construction, or other theoretical frameworks that are described in this volume (cf. chapters in this volume by Bazerman and by Prior). Rich feature analysis is not already embedded within a particular theoretical framework, so it is (compatible with many theories) and approaches now available. Rich feature analysis is also a method that can be used in original research by students newly trying out discourse analysis, as is shown in the following examples of rich feature analysis that lead to the practice activities at the end of this chapter.

EXAMPLES OF RICH FEATURE ANALYSIS

Rich feature analysis is particularly useful in the analysis of academic discourse, particularly in the analysis of student writing and in the comparison of texts written by inexperienced writers (students, or new members of a disciplinary community) and experienced writers (established members of a disciplinary community). It should be noted that it is not uncontroversial in composition studies to use categories like inexperienced and experienced writers. Susan Miller (1992), for instance, argued that these categories are reductive and regressive, but I would argue that they are categories of significant intuitive value, especially within considerations of composition theory and pedagogy. Further, it should be acknowledged that it has been a popular practice, particularly in composition studies, to debate the existence of such a thing called academic discourse (Cooper, 1989; Harris, 1989; but cf. Swales, 1998), given that the kinds of writing done in the university vary from basic writers in remedial classes to research writing by teams of scientists to performance art created by a poet-in-residence in a fine arts program. But the applied linguist Ann Johns (1997) provided a contextually based characterization of academic discourse that also has considerable intuitive value:

There may be some general academic discourses, language, values, and concepts that most academics share. Thus faculty often identify themselves with [the academy] and its language and values, as well as with the more specialized areas of interest for which they have been prepared.... [Within] this
broad academic identification, . . . many faculty believe that there is a general academic English as well as a general set of critical thinking skills and strategies for approaching texts. (p. 56)

Specific professional and pedagogical genres—the personal essay, the summary, the research paper, the critical essay, the argument, the research article, and so on—fit under this broad characterization of writing and texts within the context of the academy, a context that includes both experienced and inexperienced members who write different kinds of texts. Like the concept of continuum for oral–written language, however, with its acknowledgment that features and types of language are not absolutely defined, the concept of academic discourse may be best characterized by a continuum, perhaps thought of in the philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein's well-known concept of family resemblance, where it is not specific shared features that deterministically define the category but general resemblances across different texts that underlie what we intuitively call academic discourse.

Given these caveats, studies of student writing and of texts by inexperienced or experienced writers are nevertheless of special interest in composition studies (Huckin's first and third criteria above), and discourse analysis is an excellent method for investigating bodies of texts produced in the context of the academy. Let me introduce two studies from my own work that serve as examples of rich feature analysis. Both of these studies arose out of my own experience in working with student writing. In my early years as a composition teacher, I had two bothersome questions about the ways students typically wrote: I wondered why they wrote such awkward sentences, and I wondered why they wrote in such general form.

Awkward sentences, as any composition teacher will agree, are one of the most common and most vexing problems in student writing. Awkward sentences are not sentences with simple grammatical mistakes that can be corrected with a quick reference to a handbook (e.g., sentence fragments, comma splices, subject-verb agreement). Awkward sentences seem to have grammatical problems, but they defy easy description: As a composition teacher, when I encountered one of these sentences I would usually either rewrite the sentence or simply mark it with the correction symbol Awk, neither of which was instrumental either in my understanding the nature of awkward sentences or in my helping the student writer learn to recognize and revise them. The analysis of awkward sentences, then, seemed like a good focus for an interdisciplinary project in linguistic discourse analysis and composition studies, in part because their description involved grammatical analysis and in part because their explanation would be interesting and important for composition pedagogy.
Developing a discourse analysis of awkward sentences led me to form a small research team of composition teachers to identify and analyze exactly what kind of sentences were labeled awkward in student writing and why (Barton, Halter, McGee, & McNeilley, 1998). We began with a collection of 100 student essays written for a university proficiency examination, and we identified awkward sentences by each reading the corpus separately and marking sentences with the correction symbol Awk. The rich feature of the analysis, then, was this feature Awk, with its conventional categorization of a sentence with serious syntactic problems in the context of academic discourse. Through our reading, we created a corpus of almost 300 sentences that reflected the intuitive categorization of awkward sentences among composition teachers. Sentences marked awkward included the following examples:

(a) Many years go by and sons and daughters do not even live in the same state any more only to come back for the holidays.

(b) I say this because the candidates that have no extracurricular activities, he/she may only want the title to glamorize themselves.

(c) Normally these discussions involve insights on who is the prettiest girl on campus, who is the most popular guy with the girls and if they are outgoing or not.

(d) Father[s] started out poorly in the 1970's make up only 1.1% of the “head of household.”

We then moved from data collection to analysis by using a descriptive grammar of English (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985) to categorize and code each individual awkward sentence, and we combined similar sentences into what turned out to be four major categories:

(a) Problems in Embedding Dependent Clauses
   College student[s] have a lot of pressure on them being high achievers.

(b) Problems in Predication
   The data represents /eighty-five percent of the automobiles/ are moving or obeying the laws of driving an auto.

(c) Problems in Parallel Structure
   Family life is eroding because of gender liberation, divorce [sic], teenage sex, and lastly, because of people[’]s morals just aren’t what they used to be.

(d) Problems in Incorporating Source Material
   Single-parent headed households, 24.0% which includes mother only
with 21.6% and father only 3.1%, so sadly to say that with the divorce rate on the rise [and] high unemployment[,] some fathers are choosing to leave their families so that they can find employment in other places.

In general, we determined, awkward sentences could be defined overall as sentences in which clausal syntax and semantics were mismanaged; in other words, students wrote awkward sentences when they mismanaged sentences with multiple grammatical embeddings or multiple ideas. The four categories identified the specific ways in which sentences were mismanaged. For example, a sentence like (a) above has problems in embedding its dependent clause: the sentence is awkward because the second idea in the sentence is in the dependent clause being high achievers, but it is not grammatically established either as an initial ( participial) modifier which should be moved close to its subject (Being high achievers, college students have a lot of pressure on them) or as a modifier ( infinitival) for pressure (College students have a lot of pressure on them to be high achievers). A sentence like (b) has a problem in predication called a syntax shift: the sentence begins with one subject, the data represents, but instead of moving into a predicate for that subject, the sentence shifts into another entirely different subject–predicate structure, with a different subject, eighty-five percent of the automobiles, followed by its own predicate, are moving or obeying the laws of driving an auto. A sentence like (c) violates the convention of parallel structure, in which items in a list are in similar syntactic form: the list here begins with three noun phrases, gender liberation, divorce, and teenage sex, but the final element is an awkward subordinate clause because of people’s morals just aren’t what they used to be. Finally, a sentence like (d) has an awkward integration of source material: the material from the question here is incorporated in incomplete syntactic forms, 24.0% [of] which include [a] mother only, with 21.6%, and father only 3%. In sum, the analysis showed that awkward sentences resulted from the mismanagement of clausal syntax and semantics, two key features of written language (recall Chafe’s earlier description of the sentences of written language as syntactically and semantically complex). The analysis of the study developed detailed grammatical descriptions of the kinds of awkward sentences students wrote when they mismanaged syntax while trying to embed multiple ideas into one sentence.

This discourse analysis was based on a relatively straightforward relationship between structure and function. The grammatical structure of these sentences led to their functional categorization as awkward (by composition teachers, at least). The value of identifying the grammatical structures of awkward sentences was in the connection between the awkward sentences and their significance in the context of academic writing: Student
writers write infelicitous sentences under the specific circumstances of managing multiple, closely connected ideas, and these infelicities and their circumstances, once identified and explained, can be addressed in pedagogy. A pedagogy to identify and edit awkward sentences, we then argued, would need to teach students what dependent clauses are and how to embed them within sentences grammatically.

To recap this study, then, in terms of the steps of discourse analysis in general and the method of rich feature analysis in particular, the methodology of the study was basically qualitative, though with quantitative verification (the report of the full study included tables with numbers for each category, showing how the analysis covered all of the data). We began with a corpus of interesting texts (student writing) with an interesting problem (awkward sentences), holistically identified a salient pattern by looking at sentences to identify those with the rich feature *Awk*, analyzed a corpus (using grammatical description) to develop categories that account for the data (types of awkward sentences), verified the coding through multiple codings by different researchers, and described the structural–functional relationship of the study (the functional category awkward sentences can be defined as sentences in which student writers mismanage multiple clauses or multiple ideas).

The other question I had about student writing, however, the question of why student writers so often write in such general form, required a rich feature analysis with a much more complicated relationship between structures and functions (Barton, 1993). For this project, I wanted to focus comparatively on essays written by inexperienced student writers and experienced academic writers, because of my intuitive sense that student writers write in much more general terms than experienced writers in an academic context. Selecting a corpus for the comparison of inexperienced and experienced writers, however, is a difficult matter, as these writers typically write very different kinds of texts in very different contexts. I eventually chose texts based on the criteria of genre and audience: I selected persuasive essays that were written for that well-worn clichéd group, “a general academic audience.” That is, I selected texts by both experienced and inexperienced writers that were not addressed to specific disciplinary communities, such as chemists, or ESL teachers, or marketing professors, because I wanted to investigate how these different writers presented their ideas and evidence when they were writing in an academic context defined broadly. I thus chose as my corpus a set of writing proficiency examinations that asked for persuasive argumentative essays and a set of opinion essays written by academics for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, a weekly publication aimed at university and college faculty and administrators. So that my work would be based on a good sampling, I collected 100 *Chronicle* essays and 100 proficiency essays. As I read my sets of texts over and over, looking induc-
tively for salient patterns of rich features and conventions of presenting ideas in more or less general form, I found contrasting ways of using what linguists call evidentials.

In linguistics, evidentials are defined as words that express a writer's attitude toward knowledge. Evidentials are a particularly interesting unit across languages. Many non-Indo-European languages have specific words, suffixes, prefixes, or particles that express speakers' attitudes toward what is said and their evaluation of its reliability. In Central Pomo, for instance, a Native American language spoken by only a small remaining number of speakers in Northern California, there are a variety of suffixes that express evidentiality by attaching to a verb: The suffix -ka, for instance, indicates knowledge arising from an inference (in English, translated something like must have), the suffix -ma indicates factual, general knowledge, and the suffix -ʔdo indicates knowledge via hearsay rather than direct observation (Mithun, 2001, pp. 45–48). English, however, does not have specific lexical units or grammatical structures that exclusively express evidentiality, as noted by Wallace Chafe (1986), who proposed a functional definition: “everything dealt with under this broad interpretation of evidentiality involves attitudes toward knowledge” (p. 262). Chafe (1986) identified three general categories of evidentials. First, degree-of-reliability evidentials evaluate the reliability of knowledge, with expressions such as probably, certainly, generally, and virtually. Second, evidentials specifying the mode of knowledge—belief, induction, deduction, sensory evidence, and hearsay—cover a range of expressions. Evidentials indicating knowledge based on belief, for instance, include I think, I believe, and in my opinion. Evidentials indicating type of reasoning include seem (induction) and thus (deduction). In written language, evidentials of hearsay include the conventions of citation. Third, contrast evidentials mark contrasts between knowledge and expectation, and include hedges and other contrastive expressions such as of course, in fact, oddly enough, but, however, nevertheless, and actually. In this discourse analysis, then, identifying evidentials was a matter of moving from function to structure, reading sentences to find words or phrases being used to express attitudes toward knowledge. The identification of an evidential was thus not an exact or absolute matter: A word like clearly can be used to express an attitude toward knowledge, as in a sentence like Clearly the evidence pointed to the butler, in which case it is functioning as an evidential, but not all uses of the word clearly are evidentials, as, for example, in the sentence The butler could see clearly that the door was open.

As in the previous project, the move from intuitive observation (that evidentials are used differently by experienced and inexperienced writers in academic discourse) to analysis involved identifying all of the evidentials in the corpus of essays and inductively formulating categories that account for this particular data. Contrasting examples below illustrate the use (or
non-use) of evidentials in three categories (the first sentence in each set was taken from a Chronicle essay, the second from a student essay):

(a) Editorials and commentaries from the political left, right, and center seem to agree on at least one point—that a crisis exists in the way we determine the collective priorities and policies that make up our public culture.... There is little agreement, however, on how to revitalize public debate in the United States. (Kaye, 1991, p. A40)

(b) Nicholas Xenos states the character of political figures is an important factor in their ability to responsibly judge political issues. Therefore, journalists attempt to reveal personal information about political figures and reference “the Character Factor” to justify their inquiries. “The Character Factor” is overused and the relevance of personal actions by political figures is overestimated.

(c) As a developmental psychologist, I believe that ... (Damon, 1990, p. A48)

(d) I think we as mature adults who enjoy sports should all take part in non-aggressive sports.

(e) Some critics of corporate relationships assert that.... The view seems to assume that ... (Gray, 1990, p. A48)

(f) In Johan Huizinga’s excerpt from Homo Ludens, he states.... Huizinga also states ...

In (a), the evidential of contrast however is used by the experienced writer to emphasize the contrast between background sentences and his perspective on those sentences, but in (b) there is no evidential of contrast despite the same pattern of background and contrasting sentences written by the student writer. In (c) and (d) there are evidentials of certainty which describe how certain a writer is about his or her statement (I believe, I think). In (e) and (f), there are evidentials of citation (assert, seem to assume, state). In academic discourse these different evidentials served different functions in academic discourse (yet another layer of structural-functional complexity in the analysis): Evidentials of contrast emphasized the author’s problematization, as in (a); evidentials of certainty function within the author’s persona, as in (c) and (d); evidentials of citation, as in (e) and (f), establish the critical (assert, seem to assume) vs. descriptive (state) perspective of the author in talking about the work of others. The study moved further into the analysis by coding the data to see how many evidentials of each type were used by experienced writers and inexperienced writers within the functional categories of problematization, persona, and citation.
In this analysis, evidentials became a rich feature because their use systematically established a difference in the ways that epistemological stance is conventionally expressed by experienced vs. inexperienced writers in academic writing. Epistemological stance is a perspective on knowledge or knowledge-making. Experienced writers use evidentials to point to their epistemological stance that knowledge is oppositional, the product of contrast and competition. For example, in (a), the experienced writer uses however as an evidential of contrast to problematize previous knowledge and emphasize the need for a new perspective (his own); in contrast, the inexperienced student writer in (b) uses no evidential of contrast to highlight his third sentence either as the identification of a problem or as a comparison of a general view to his own view. Experienced writers use other kinds of evidentials to establish a focus on knowledge as specialized: In using evidentials of certainty like I believe, the experienced academic writer in (c) embeds the evidential within his credentials (as a developmental psychologist) so that the I believe carries the full authority of his academic persona within his discipline; in contrast, the inexperienced student writer in (d) embeds his use of I think within the set of general members of society (we as mature adults). Grammatically, there is not too much difference between I believe and I think, but the effect of the statements in (c) and (d) is quite distinct, based on their embedding within a specialized or general persona. Experienced writers keep their focus on oppositional knowledge throughout their essays; in (e), for example, the author uses evidentials of citation to emphasize his critical perspective on the opposing literature, which asserts or seems to assume, two rather non-complimentary terms within the domain of academic argumentation where authors are supposed to prove and explain; in (f), however, the inexperienced writer simply describes the literature in a summary with neutral citation forms like state, not establishing his own perspective on the literature as critical in any way.

In sum, although experienced writers use evidentials to point to their epistemological stance that knowledge is oppositional and specialized, inexperienced writers use evidentials to point to their epistemological stance that knowledge is general, the product of shared agreement by all members of society. Hence, ideas, claims, arguments, and evidence are presented generally by inexperienced writers rather than critically or argumentatively as they are by experienced academic writers. So evidentials became a rich feature in this analysis not simply because they are a type of repeated linguistic form but also because the conventionalized patterns of their use point to an important aspect of meaning in an academic context—epistemological stance, how writers express their attitudes toward knowledge. Experienced academic writers use their epistemological stance to establish and maintain their authority as individual knowledge-makers. Inex-
experienced academic writers, in contrast, use their epistemological stance to establish and maintain general society as the authority over knowledge. This conclusion was an interesting one for the field of composition because it proposed an understanding of how student writers express attitudes that are in contrast to the assumptions of the academy, a contrast which can lead to their writing being misunderstood and devalued. This contrast between inexperienced writers' identification with general society and experienced writers' identification with the academic community is one of the classic conflicts between professors and students, experts and lay people, town and gown.

In conclusion, then, a rich feature analysis of academic discourse looks at texts with the idea of identifying rich features that are significant in the context of academic writing. The method identifies a rich feature or a set of related rich features; defines the feature(s) linguistically by focusing on structure, function, or both; describes the conventional meaning or significance of the feature(s); establishes and verifies the patterns of the feature(s) within a set of texts; and explains how the resulting discourse analysis is interesting for the field of composition theory and pedagogy. It is a method of discourse analysis that focuses closely on the investigation of language in texts and contexts, and it holds the promise of uncovering new knowledge about what written language does and how it does it.

PRACTICE ANALYSIS

Now it is time for you to practice rich feature analysis. Following is a reprinted essay written by an experienced academic writer and published in the Chronicle of Higher Education (see Fig. 3.1). Figure 3.2 is a reprint of an essay written by a student writer for a common writing genre in the college years, an argumentative essay written for a writing proficiency examination (this essay is reprinted from the coursepack of advice for students preparing to take the proficiency examination). Read these essays slowly and carefully, trying to identify rich features and their conventionalized meaning and significance in the context of academic discourse.

You may look for rich features that were discussed in the chapter, such as features of oral–written language, awkward syntax, or evidentials. Or you may look for other rich features you may be familiar with from the research literature (e.g., features mentioned in other chapters in this volume). You may also look to identify rich features inductively by yourself, perhaps features that have not been previously identified or discussed in detail. You may work bottom-up, by focusing on structural features in order to develop functional explanations, or you may work top-down, by looking in the texts for rich features that reflect your functional expectations of texts in this
POINT OF VIEW
For Students on Welfare, Degrees Pay Dividends

By W. Ann Reynolds

Two years ago, Linda Howard was homeless, riding the New York City subways at night to keep her children out of dangerous city shelters. Through her determined efforts over eight months, the two children were kept clean, never missed a day of school, and never went hungry. Ms. Howard went on public assistance after she was laid off from her job and her unemployment benefits ran out; she became homeless when her welfare payments did not cover her rent. But her grit and determination led her to apply to a special certificate program in practical nursing, designed for parents on welfare, at Medgar Evers College of the City University of New York. She recently completed the 18-month program and began a full-time job as a licensed practical nurse at Jamaica Hospital. Her annual salary: $30,000.

Ms. Howard was luckier than others in her situation today. The federal welfare law enacted in August makes little mention of education and training, in contrast to the 1988 Family Support Act, which encouraged welfare recipients to attend college. The new law makes getting an education much more difficult. It requires welfare recipients to perform "work activities" for at least 20 hours a week to maintain their benefits. Although one permissible activity is enrollment in "vocational educational training" for up to 12 months, this would not permit a student to earn even an associate's degree. Because the law does not mention "higher education" specifically, it is unclear whether enrollment in a college program will be permitted under this 12-month clause.

The provision effectively forces student recipients to make a Hobson's choice between remaining on welfare so that they and their families can survive financially, and gaining the credentials that can get them off the welfare rolls forever. This feature of the law is jeopardizing the careers and futures of hundreds of thousands of students striving for degrees at colleges and universities across the country.

To call national attention to this critical issue, 65 presidents and chancellors of colleges and universities have joined with me to form the National Coalition for the Education of Welfare Recipients. We have come together out of concern for the students and would-be students whose careers are being truncated or jeopardized by welfare reform, not only by the federal provisions but also by state and local interpretations that can further restrict opportunities. For example, in the absence of federal regulations stating otherwise, in some localities welfare recipients who want to pursue higher education have been told that they can enroll only in short-term vocational training, not in programs that lead to an associate's or bachelor's degree.

FIG. 3.1. (Continued)
Many members of the coalition head institutions in urban areas and other poor communities. We all share a sense of urgency and concern about the draconian aspects of the federal law, and we intend to speak out wherever possible about the shortsightedness of these policies. Coalition members are urging elected officials at all levels of government to work to modify the federal law, and we are recommending that the Department of Health and Human Services issue regulations that will allow welfare recipients to pursue college degrees. We also will press for local rules that make it easier for student recipients to fit the work assignments they must perform into their college schedules.

For those able to earn them, college credentials offer the best hope for permanent freedom from a lifetime cycle of poverty. Allowing welfare recipients to earn degrees will pay dividends, as is demonstrated by the former welfare recipients who are working in virtually all fields, from health care and business management to academia and the law. Denying degrees to public-assistance recipients imperils our national economic health by condemning countless individuals to low-paying, dead-end jobs.

At CUNY, this national predicament plays out daily for about one in 10 of our students -- for nearly 20,000 students who, like Linda Howard, receive welfare. The new welfare law, formally known as the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunities Act of 1996, also haunts teen-agers hoping to go on to college from New York City public schools, where 450,000 students -- approaching half of the public-school population -- come from families that currently receive welfare benefits. Yet many studies confirm that higher education is the best way to break the cycle of welfare dependency and help recipients achieve self-sufficiency. Our research shows that people with bachelor's degrees from CUNY earn $690,000 more over their lifetimes than high-school graduates -- and, obviously, pay much more in taxes.

As written, the welfare law is replete with hidden obstacles to success. It erects barriers to education for women, since the majority of A.F.D.C. recipients are female. Unfortunately, it is still the case that women frequently need bachelor's degrees to get jobs that men can obtain with less education. The law also will inhibit the success of members of minority groups by assuring that they remain in low-paying, unskilled positions -- the only ones available to individuals lacking postsecondary education and training. In terms of class, the law promises to widen the growing income gap between rich and poor that threatens our society's stability.

Several changes are needed in the federal welfare-reform law, as well as in state and local policies, to assist disadvantaged students who are seeking broadened career opportunities through higher education:

* Even if the provision in the statute referring to 12 months of vocational education is interpreted to allow a year of community-college study, this is not enough time to earn an associate's degree. Thus, students making satisfactory academic progress should be given enough time to complete that degree while still receiving benefits.

FIG. 3.1. (Continued)
Welfare recipients who gain associate’s degrees and who qualify academically should be encouraged to work for bachelor’s degrees, which are essential for the best jobs. Under the law, recipients must perform mandatory work assignments for at least 20 hours a week, and although the law may not consider such advanced study a “work activity,” as it does “vocational educational training,” student recipients could be allowed to perform work assignments on their campuses, similar to the jobs that students receiving payments from the federal College Work-Study program perform.

Such work assignments now are often located at sites far from a welfare recipient’s campus or home, causing problems in attending scheduled classes and taking up hours in transportation time, thus preventing progress toward a degree. All campuses should be designated as work sites at which students may fulfill their work requirements and retain their benefits. College job sites also can offer work that relates to students’ career goals, unlike the low-skilled jobs to which welfare recipients are usually assigned.

* Just as child care is made available to welfare recipients during their mandatory work assignments, it should be available when recipients attend college classes not designated as a “work activity.”

* Legal immigrants must not be penalized by welfare rules that are different from those applied to native-born citizens. Now, under the federal law, native-born recipients of welfare can receive food stamps and temporary-disability insurance, but legal immigrants cannot. Clearly, this can undermine the immigrants’ ability to continue college studies. At CUNY, some 30 per cent of students on welfare are legal immigrants. Many other institutions enroll similarly large numbers of immigrants.

President Clinton is insisting in his fiscal-1998 budget proposals that two years of postsecondary education should become the norm in this country, so that all citizens can secure a stable niche in the labor market.

In fact, the 1,400 community colleges throughout the United States are well equipped to offer education and training in many fields to welfare recipients who want to gain marketable skills. Many two-year colleges already have experience and solid track records of success in doing this. The nearly 2,200 baccalaureate-granting institutions offer even greater options for academically qualified students. A few simple revisions in the new welfare law could open doors to individuals eager to escape public assistance — and strengthen our nation’s work force in the years ahead.

W. Ann Reynolds is Chancellor of the City University of New York.

We unemployed share a social stigma similar to that of the rape victim. Whether consciously or unconsciously, much of the work-ethic-driven public feels that you’ve somehow “asked for it,” secretly wanted to lose your job and “flirted” with unemployment through your attitude—possibly dressed in a way to invite it . . .

But the worst of it isn’t society’s work-ethic morality; it’s your own. . . . You find out how much self-satisfaction was gained from even the most basic work-related task: a well-worded letter, a well-handled phone call—even a clean file. Being useful to yourself isn’t enough.

Student Response

The Out of Work Stigma

As Jan Halvorsen says in the article “How it feels to be out of work,” the unemployed share a social stigma not unlike that of a rape victim. Society views those out of work as having asked for it. Whether it is conscious or unconscious this attitude of the work-ethic driven public persists. It is as if they believe those without a job secretly sabotage their own employment. Whether this is in the form of on-the-job attitudes, or dress style or attendance. Though what’s worse than societies moralizing judgment is that of the out of work themselves. One finds out when unemployed just how much self-satisfaction was obtained from the simplest work related tasks. A minor thing such as: a well written letter, a nicely handled phone call or even orderly clean files can come to mind when unemployed. One thinks if there were something they might have done better.

Society doesn’t help this second guessing. One can’t get rid of the feeling emitted that somehow “you” were at fault. Not unlike a crime victim today, no compassion or understanding for the situation is extended. It is a social problem which isn’t seen as such. Just as the rape victim doesn’t seek being raped, so also the jobless don’t seek unemployment.

A factor not mentioned in the article abstract is that of regaining a job once one has been lost. A job for the sake of a job is nothing. Though society appears to feel any job is okay, as long as there is employment. This isn’t true. If one comes from a position which paid more than what is now offered, an employer who will hire is hard to find. Again a case of no-fault unemployment, but society still treats you like a pariah.

FIG. 3.2. (Continued)
This work-ethic driven attitude is part of us all, even the job-less. This can be the hardest part of being without work, even meaningful work. The thought comes into the mind “Did I do all that I could to keep my job?” It is a very difficult question to answer. In most cases you are too close to the situation to be objective. Social conditions or economic situations may have taken precedent, and unemployment results.

Without a job one has time to reflect on what their own work ethic is, how much did the job mean. Was there a sense of satisfaction in doing even mundane tasks. Was there a feeling that only what was asked would be done, or was there a willingness to do a bit more even if not recognized. This the part that cuts the deepest. Then self-recrimination whether justified or not.

Society is constantly judging the jobless. This pressure to succeed is always at the heels of the unemployed. Perhaps this pressure is good to some extent, but it can be devastating if not coupled with compassion and understanding. Society has to stop generalizing and view each case of joblessness individually. This will take unnecessary blame from the shoulders of the out of work. Enough blame and recrimination is generated by those people themselves.

I disagree with the tone of the last sentence in Jan Halvorsens article. The idea “of being useful to yourself isn’t enough” seems to imply the author in some way does blame the work ethic of the jobless. It seems to say society demand one to extend in order to keep one’s job. Thus shifting the burden back onto those out of work. Again fueling self doubt.

Being out of work is a social problem as much as an individual one. Society must become aware that it is a shared blame. As in crime the victim isn’t a victim because he wants to be, he doesn’t do it by himself.

FIG. 3.2. From “How It Feels to Be Out of Work” by Jan Halvorsen. Sample essay from proficiency examination preparation materials.

genre and context. You may wish to use some of the following questions to guide your analysis:

- How can you describe the rich feature(s) linguistically, that is, as units or structures of language (sounds, words, phrases, sentences, discourse features)?
- What is the pattern of the rich feature(s) and conventions of meaning and significance in these texts?
- How can you describe the conventions of interpretation for these features?
- How are these features distributed across the texts written by the experienced and inexperienced writer?
- From this initial analysis, can you formulate a claim or generalization?
• Given this claim, can you point to some representative examples of rich features and their conventions of meaning in the texts?
• Are there any counterexamples to the pattern you’ve identified?
• What are the implications of your study for writing effective persuasive essays? For teaching writing? For the description of academic discourse? For thinking about writing in the context of the academy?

FOR FURTHER READING


For more on language as a social object, see any introductory text on sociolinguistics or anthropological linguistics. Peter Trudgill’s (2001) *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society* is a standard text, as is Allessandro Duranti’s (1997) *Linguistic Anthropology*. For further reading on standard and non-standard dialects, see *Dialects in Communities and Schools* (Wolfram, Adger, & Christian, 1999). For a sociolinguistic approach to discourse analysis, see John Gumperz’s (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. For a classic description of language in context by an anthropological linguist, see Shirley Brice Heath’s (1983) *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*.

For more on systemic linguistics, begin with Halliday’s (1998) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Additional texts include Eggins’s (1994) *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. To read about Halliday’s use of social semiotics in systemic grammar, see his *Language as Social Semiotic* (Halliday, 1978).

For more on discourse analysis in linguistics, see *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction* by Barbara Johnstone (2002) and *Approaches to Discourse* by Deborah Schiffrin (1994), which provide comprehensive overviews of the field of discourse analysis within linguistics. A shorter introduction is Deborah Cameron’s (2001) *Working with Spoken Discourse*. For an excellent collection of essays on the various theoretical approaches to the analysis of

For more detail on Chafe’s work on oral–written language, see his articles cited in the References and the volume *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time* (Chafe, 1994).


For an excellent methodological description of discourse analysis within composition studies, see Thomas Huckin’s “Context Sensitive Text Analysis” in Kirsch and Sullivan’s (1992) *Methods and Methodology in Composition Research*. Keith Grant-Davie (1992) has a thoughtful article on the process of coding discourse data in the same collection. For examples of a variety of approaches to discourse analysis in composition studies, see my collection co-edited with Gail Stygall, *Discourse Studies in Composition* (Barton & Stygall, 2002). For further description of rich feature analysis, see my chapter there entitled “Inductive Discourse Analysis: Discovering Rich Features.”