



Book reviews

Discourse Studies
13(5) 655–668

© The Author(s) 2011

Reprints and permission: sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1461445611411687

dis.sagepub.com



Maggie Charles, Diane Pecori and Susan Hunston (eds), *Academic Writing: At the Interface of Corpus and Discourse*. London: Continuum, 2009, xi + 303 pp., US\$150.00 (hbk).

Reviewed by: Helen Basturkmen, *Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, University of Auckland, New Zealand*

Academic Writing: At the Interface of Corpus and Discourse is a collection of chapters reporting studies that have combined discourse and corpus analytic approaches in investigations of academic writing. The chapters have been written by experts in the field and they serve to illustrate how the two approaches can be complementary. The work has been motivated by multiple concerns, including the wish to provide detailed linguistic analysis of features of academic writing and to provide research that can be used by practising teachers. As indicated by the title, the work has also been motivated by a concern to examine the interface between the discourse and corpus analytic approaches, a topic that is important, argue the editors, as the two approaches are becoming increasingly ‘meshed in practice’ (p. 1).

The book is organized into three parts titled ‘Focus on Genre and Disciplinary Discourses’, ‘Focus on Interpersonal Discourse’ and ‘Focus on Learner Discourse’, with studies in the third part focusing on how research in applied linguistics can be used to support the language learning process, as well as on features of learner discourse. Each part begins with a preliminary introduction written by one of the three editors, followed by five chapters reporting empirical investigations of academic writing. There are two additional chapters: the first chapter, co-written by the three editors, which serves as an overall introduction, and the ‘Afterword’, written by John Swales.

The first chapter, ‘Exploring the Interface between Corpus Linguistics and Discourse Analysis’, is a key chapter and a highlight of the work. Like nearly all introductions to edited works, the chapter overviews the topics and themes covered by the individual chapters. However, this chapter goes far beyond this brief. It situates the work in relation to three approaches to analysis (discourse, corpus and integrative approaches) and provides classificatory content of particular interest. With reference to research studies in the wider literature, the chapter offers definitions of the different approaches, examines the commonalities and points of divergence between discourse analysis and corpus linguistics, and suggests a categorization of sub-types of research within each broad approach. The coherence of the collection relates to the central argument presented in

this chapter. It is argued that discourse and corpus approaches should not be viewed as opposing approaches, but rather as a continuum along which individual studies can be situated. At one end of the continuum are the more top-down, discourse-analytical approaches which are concerned with whole texts and their contexts, and at the other end are the more bottom-up, corpus-based approaches concerned with small-scale items such as words and grammatical features. The editors situate the studies collected in the present volume along the continuum.

The diversity of focus of the studies brought together in this volume is considerable and the chapters provide an impressive breath of topics (as illustrated below with reference to two chapters). The studies in this volume include investigations of writing in particular disciplines (such as biology, business or economics) and multi-disciplinary comparisons; investigations into undergraduate, postgraduate and expert writing; and studies into the lexical or grammatical features of academic writing and of the structural or rhetorical patterns underlying academic written text. Chapter 5, 'Formulaic Language in Biology: A Topic-specific Investigation', focuses on expert writing in one discipline. The chapter, written by Diane Pecori, is situated towards the corpus end of the continuum presented in the introductory chapter, 'discourse-informed corpus studies' (p. 6), and reports the use of n-gram analysis in identifying lexical bundles (a type of multi-word unit) in a half-million word corpus of research articles on one topic in biology, *Candida Albicans*, and the metatextual and referencing functions played by the bundles. Chapter 14, 'Using the Revision Process to Help International Students Understand the Linguistic Construction of the Academic Identity' by Suganthi John, focuses on undergraduate writing and is situated at the discourse end of the continuum. This study is concerned with the effects of the linguistic choices students make in writing the methods sections of their theses on their visibility and positioning as the writer. This chapter reports a case study showing supervisors working with students in revising their texts and selecting language to 'alter the visibility levels' of the students' identities (p. 288).

Since there is considerable diversity of topics and themes investigated in the various chapters, readers will almost inevitably be drawn to some chapters rather than others according to their research or professional interests. However, at a more general level, researchers will find the collection as a whole of great value in illustrating a range of ways approaches have been combined and methodologies developed. Although the work focuses on the interface of corpus and discourse approaches, it is perhaps surprising that Chapter 1 does not set out the advantages of combining approaches beyond alluding to the possibility of 'enriched analysis' (p. 1) or explain why there has been 'considerable interpenetration of the two approaches' (p. 4). Nor does it examine any potential difficulties in attempts to 'merge both sets of research ideologies' (Baker, 2006: 6). However, the merging of the two approaches has been problematized in the 'Afterword'. In a discussion of the 'complementarity of the two approaches' (p. 294) in this thought-provoking section, Swales remarks that it is generally easier for discourse analysts to draw on corpus linguists than for corpus analysts to broaden their focus to the level of discourse.

Given the growing importance of the discourse and corpus analytic approaches in combination, the examination of the interaction between the two approaches in this volume provides an important addition to the emerging body of literature in the area. The individual research reports provide important insights into features of academic writing,

and the collection of research reports richly illustrates ways corpus and discourse analytical approaches can be fruitfully combined.

Reference

Baker P (2006) *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Uli Sauerland and Kazuko Yatsushiro (eds), *Semantics and Pragmatics: From Experiment to Theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, xvi + 325 pp., US\$151.20 (hbk).

Reviewed by: Wu Yicheng, *Centre for the Study of Language and Cognition, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, P.R. China*

Linguistic communication has long been a major concern of theoretical linguistics and experimental psychology. In recent years, a field of experimental semantics and pragmatics, which marks the marriage between deeply theoretical and purely experimental research, has emerged since the publication of Noveck and Sperber (2004), and has been growing since then because of the development of sophisticated methods and the refinement of experimental techniques. This volume, which is based on the 2007 conference 'Experimental Pragmatics' held at Humboldt University in Berlin, provides an overview of the field to theoretical linguists and experimental psychologists.

The volume is divided into three parts, which centre around key areas of current semantics and pragmatics, namely implicature, negation and presupposition. Part I is introduced by Krifka and has five contributions on implicatures, the best-known cases of which are perhaps scalar implicatures (SIs). Bott examines whether SIs alter the attention allocated to different elements of a discourse in the same way that explicit negation does. He points out that SIs increase the attention paid to the element that is implicitly negated. Hendriks et al. present their grand-scale experimental study on scalar items in Dutch, which attracts more than 4000 subjects with a large span of age groups (from 5 to 64 years). They report that participants generally tend to generate SIs with items such as numerals, existential quantifiers and the indefinite article. Katsos evaluates underinformative utterances (UIUs) with context-dependent and context-independent scales. His work shows that i) both children and adults object at the same rate to UIUs, and ii) adults think that UIUs with context-independent scales would give rise to more severe violations than those with context-dependent scales. Larson et al. investigate whether speakers are able to distinguish between what is said and what is implicated in an experimental setting. Their findings suggest that participants are in general capable of differentiating implicatures from the truth-conditional meaning of an utterance and that the availability of an objective third-person perspective enhances this capability. Zondervan probes how the bigger-than-sentence-level contextual property of Question under Discussion and the corresponding focus structure affect the SI-calculation. His experimental results confirm the effect of contextual property on SIs, posing a challenge for exhaustivity-based accounts of SIs.

Part II, introduced by Noveck, has four contributions on negation. Bezuidenhout et al. address the role of grammar in scalar inferences. Their findings suggest that in specific

grammatical environments known as upward entailing, SIs are more likely to arise, and at a low cost. Gualmini addresses the scope of negation, a downward entailing environment, in child language. His experimental results show that all subjects, children or adults, can select either reading of scopally ambiguous sentences, suggesting that the Isomorphism account should be abandoned. Kaup deals with how pragmatic differences between positive and negative sentences are captured in processes and representations during language interpretation. Her findings show that participants process both the 'negated state of affairs' and the 'actual state of affairs'. Drury and Steinhauer study the neurological effects of negative polarity items. Noting how inconsistent results yielded by previous studies could be due to experimental design, they attempt to reconcile those differences by manipulating target-word differences and contextual factors.

There are four contributions on presupposition in Part III, introduced by Sauerland, one of the volume editors. Heller et al. examine how ground information is used in restricting domains of reference. They demonstrate that knowledge of the distinction between common ground and private information affects online language interpretation in adults without delay, while construction of the common ground is difficult for children. Chemla aims to compare adverbial modification to presuppositions and SIs. His work shows that the inferences triggered by adverbial modification are intermediate between bona fide presuppositions and SIs, for which he argues that a unified analysis of presuppositions and implicatures should be sought to allow such an intermediate category. Klein et al. investigate the presuppositions triggered by some definite noun phrases. Their experimental results demonstrate that even the triggering of a presupposition involving uniqueness existence by the well-discussed definite article is not simply lexicalized. In the final chapter, Berkum presents a review of several ERP studies of human language processing, with a focus on the two measures that are correlated with presuppositions, namely the N400 and the Nref effects, both of which are attested in examples regarding presupposition failures. His report indicates that not all presuppositional violations display the same neurological pattern.

Overall, this is a tightly integrated, coherent volume which shows nicely where current experimental work on the interface between semantics and pragmatics stands and how much room there still is for future research. The various contributions in the volume will doubtless advance our understanding of pragmatic processes and human pragmatic competence. There are, however, some inadequacies that need to be addressed in future work. From a theoretical perspective, some terms appear to be confused. In Part III, for instance, presuppositions are sometimes incorrectly described as inferences. Presupposition is an implicit assumption or belief about the world, which is often backgrounded and taken for granted by the speaker to be true. It is derived by, but not equated with, inference. From an experimental perspective, the same methods sometimes seem to yield quite different results when the experimental setting is slightly changed, which would naturally cast some doubt on the validity of the research. Nevertheless, the contributions presented here will encourage scholars to build a stronger link between various lines of research that concern themselves with the major topics of semantics and pragmatics: theoretical, psychological, neurological, developmental and processing.

Reference

Noveck I and Sperber D (eds) (2004) *Experimental Pragmatics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Richard F. Young, *Discursive Practice in Language Learning and Teaching*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, xii + 267 pp., US\$39.95 (pbk).

Reviewed by: Eric Hauser, *University of Electro-Communications, Tokyo, Japan*

Expanding on his arguments in Young (2007), in this book the author makes the case for viewing language learning as participation and changing participation in discursive practices. The book consists of seven chapters, through which Young reviews theoretical perspectives and provides examples to support this case. In the brief first chapter, Young explains what he means by the terms 'practice' and 'discursive practice' and how discursive practice is related to language learning and teaching. The brief concluding chapter summarizes the argument. The five chapters in between move from theoretical foundations to applications to language learning and teaching.

Chapter 2 reviews the theoretical foundations and antecedents of practice and discursive practice, before moving into a discussion of practice theory and discursive practice. Young argues that the strength of practice theory is that it 'goes beyond the primary focus of language' (p. 44) and that studying 'talk-in-interaction as practice expands that field beyond a consideration of what we can observe in an interaction' (p. 44). In Chapters 3 and 4, Young reviews different approaches to the study of context and discursive resources, which include verbal resources, interactional resources, and nonverbal resources. Much of Young's argument can be summed up by the last words of Chapter 5: 'what is learned is not the language but participation in the practice' (p. 179). Young argues for conceptualizing language learning as change in participation in interaction. Chapter 6 is devoted to discursive practice in language teaching and testing.

This book has two major strengths. First, Young argues for the importance of context in the study of language learning and teaching. Second, he provides a useful review of the development of approaches to the understanding of language in context. Unfortunately, though, in my view there are several problematic aspects of the book.

One has to do with what the ethnomethodologist Garfinkel called, following Mannheim, the documentary method of interpretation. Young incorrectly sees Garfinkel as proposing the documentary method as an optional methodological tool. As Heritage (1984) puts it: 'Although Garfinkel's discussion of [the documentary method] has sometimes been interpreted as a recommendation of it as a special sociological technique, it is clear that this interpretation is incorrect. . . . Garfinkel endorses the phenomenological treatment of acts of cognition and proposes the documentary method as an invariant and unavoidable feature of all acts of mundane perception and cognition' (p. 85).

The second is Young's negative characterization of conversation analysis (CA). He states, for example, that CA rejects questions about where, how, when, and who 'as irrelevant unless they are apparently and overtly raised by speakers' (p. 85). What is important in CA, though, is whether these questions can be shown to be relevant to the

participants (Schegloff, 1992), not that the participants overtly raise them. Young also incorrectly claims that '(a)ct sequences longer than adjacency pairs are not generally recognized by conversation analysts' (p. 30). While much sequential conversation analysis does focus on adjacency pairs, there is also work on longer sequences.

The third involves confusion over what is learned, practices or resources. At several points in his argument, Young states that learning is the learning of a (discursive) practice. He recognizes, though, that in such learning, resources from other discursive practices may be utilized and new resources may be learned. It follows, then, that learning is not only the learning of (discursive) practices.

The fourth is Young's attempt to utilize situated learning theory (Lave and Wenger, 1991). This theory, which conceptualizes learning as movement from more peripheral to fuller participation within a community of practice (CoP), may or may not be useful for understanding learning in certain contexts, such as contexts of apprenticeship. However, there are serious problems with trying to force observable changes in participation within interaction (rather than within a CoP) into this framework. For example, in the data that Young analyses from writing conferences, there clearly is change in how the student participates in the interaction, with the student taking more control across time, and this can be viewed as learning. However, it is not clear how this involves movement from more peripheral to fuller participation. From the first conference, the student is a full participant in the interaction. The lens of situated learning theory, designed to focus on participation within a CoP, only distorts when it is used to attempt to focus on participation in interaction.

The fifth, and the most fundamental problem, has to do with context and the necessity and/or advisability of moving beyond the transcript to adopt a broader and, according to Young, more useful view of context. Young is not alone in advocating such a move, as dissatisfaction with CA often takes the form of complaints about its narrow view of context. However, any description of context is infinitely extendable and incomplete, though participants are generally not bothered by this and unproblematically 'see' what the relevant context is (Lynch, 1993). For the analyst/researcher, the problem can be formulated as the 'paradox of proximateness' (Schegloff, 1992); that is, 'if some "external" context can be shown to be proximately . . . relevant to the participants, then its external status is rendered beside the point; and if it cannot be so shown, then its external status is rendered equivocal' (p. 197). As argued by Schegloff (1997), to impose relevance amounts to 'academic imperialism'. In advocating movement beyond the transcript, Young is also advocating the primacy of the analyst's/researcher's concerns.

It is certainly important to study language learning and teaching in context. However, it is equally important that the relevant context of interaction is what is relevant to the participants and the interaction, not what is relevant to the analyst/researcher.

References

- Heritage J (1984) *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lave J and Wenger E (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch M (1993) *Scientific Practice and Ordinary Action: Ethnomethodology and Social Studies of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Schegloff EA (1992) In another context. In: Duranti A and Goodwin C (eds) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 191–227.
- Schegloff EA (1997) Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society* 8(2): 165–187.
- Young RF (2007) Language learning and teaching as discursive practice. In: Hua Z, Seedhouse P, Wei L and Cook V (eds) *Language Learning and Teaching as Social Inter-action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 251–271.

Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap (eds), *Perspectives in Politics and Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, x + 416 pp., US\$149.00 (hbk).

Reviewed by: Paolo Nino Valdez, *De La Salle University-Manila, Philippines*

This edited volume containing 20 chapters coherently leads to the central aim of expanding the analysis of political discourse from a multitude of perspectives. The editors introduce the volume (Chapter 1) by tracing the emergence of Analysis of Political Discourse (APD) from a rich tradition in Political Linguistics. They claim that the works in the book do not necessarily challenge existing frameworks in critical discourse analysis (CDA) in examining political discourse. Rather, the chapters attempt to expand the existing methodological tools of CDA without compromising objectivity in data collection and analysis, and systematic rigour in teasing out power relations in different contexts. The editors have strategically classified the chapters into four thematic strands.

The first strand, which delves into the processes that underlie naming and classification in political rhetoric, is presented in Chapters 2 to 5. Papers in this strand not only employ a range of theoretical perspectives (critical historiography, philosophy and discourse analysis) which trace the discursive processes that shape labelling practices in political discourse, but also introduce new integrated frameworks that lead to a better understanding of the influence of history, context and society on language use in politics. Moreover, the papers here suggest a departure from viewing traditional metaphorical constructions in political rhetoric (political system vis-a-vis health/body) to a much more realistic framing of political realities as a product of a complex struggle among different sectors of society.

The second strand is devoted to critical insights on political communication. Unlike the other papers featured in the volume, Chapters 6 to 10 report findings from investigations grounded in conventional critical discourse analytic approaches (Fairclough, 1993; Van Dijk, 1993, 1995) coupled with new methodological tools (corpus methods and diachronic analysis) to unravel the subtle workings of power through language in different political settings. Specifically, the papers address the need to systematically account for language features in political communication that effectively perform manipulative and legitimizing functions which privilege certain groups while disenfranchising others.

In the third strand, Chapters 11 to 15 account for the increasing role of different forms of media and media practices in shaping political discourse. Through varied accounts of political events, the contributions in this section highlight the ideological practices among media practitioners as institutional practices in this domain lead to mediated voices concerning politics. To exemplify, contributions in this section critically examine

the discursive practices in news reporting (Chapters 11 and 15), advertising and blogging (Chapter 12), voting behaviour (Chapter 13), and translation (Chapter 14) in reinterpreting the truth in political statements/events for consumers of media.

In the final thematic strand of this volume, ‘Politicizing “Linguistic Human Rights”’, Chapters 16 to 19 account for ideologies embedded in language practices situated in macro- and micro-domains of society. A central theme in these papers is issues concerning multilingualism (policy formulation in immigration, labour and education) and its implications for development in society. One prominent issue is the oppressive nature of institutional practices (testing, employment opportunities and racial prejudice) on the basis of language.

Summing up the volume in Chapter 20, the editors survey the theoretical and methodological contributions of the featured papers. Also, predictions are made in terms of the research directions APD will take in the coming years. It is felt that politics will continue to be mediatized and therefore will require more complex ways of grappling with the intersections of textual, discursive and social processes in political communication.

In evaluating this volume, I wish to make two caveats. First, though the chapters present several studies exploring analysis of political discourse, it would seem that some chapters are misplaced in terms of the thematic strands where they have been grouped. For example, Chapters 13 and 19 both deal extensively with cognitive dimensions of emotions and could have been placed as a separate thematic strand as this seems to be an emerging area in CDA. The second caveat is that the studies featured here require specialized knowledge to be understood. To concretize, since most papers combine other approaches in language study, it would be wise to familiarize oneself with concepts in corpus methodology, metaphor analysis and critical language policy. Perhaps, before engaging with this text, readers would need to have basic knowledge about CDA. Hence, Simpson and Mayr’s (2010) volume on language and power may help readers make sense of the papers in this book.

As a whole, the chapters present promising directions in the analysis of political discourse since they coherently connect the role of history, ideology and struggle in shaping not only language practices but also discursive practices embedded in society. Likewise, the varying contexts in which these studies have been conducted provide rich possibilities for replication studies, as the insights presented in this volume are bound to be confirmed or challenged. Finally, the greatest strength of this volume is its effective presentation of employing frameworks inherited from different fields (historiography, cognitive science and translation studies), giving readers a range of options in examining the intersections of language, politics and power.

References

- Fairclough N (1993) Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 133–168.
- Simpson P and Mayr A (2010) *Language and Power: A Resource Guide for Students*. New York and London: Routledge.
- van Dijk T (1993) Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 249–283.
- van Dijk T (1995) Power and the news media. In: Paletz D (ed.) *Political Communication and Action*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 9–36.

Mira Ariel, *Defining Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010, xviii + 330 pp., ISBN 9780521732031, £25.99/US\$44.99 (pbk).

Reviewed by: Akin Odebunmi, *Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies, University of Freiburg, Germany and Department of English, University of Ibadan, Nigeria*

In a preface to her book, Ariel highlights the diachronic difficulty in defining pragmatics along a grammar/pragmatics axis, leading to the establishment of influential pragmatic schools which she has christened ‘big-tent pragmatics’. *Defining Pragmatics* then has nine chapters, divided into four broad parts: an introductory chapter (‘What’s Under the Big-Tent Pragmatics’), Part I (‘Deconstructing Pragmatics’), Part II (‘Reconstructing Pragmatics’) and Part III (‘Mapping the Big-Tent Pragmatics’).

In the introductory chapter, Ariel presents a preliminary picture of the foci of pragmatic researchers and the importance of pragmatic phenomena in society, and surveys the birth of ‘big-tent pragmatics’ through the explorations of problem solvers and border seekers. She proposes to define pragmatics through the code/inference criterion, a yardstick that rejects a topic-based practice of pragmatics, having found existing definitional approaches wanting.

The two chapters in Part I are committed to examining 10 criteria utilized in the literature in defining pragmatics. Ariel divides the criteria into three groups: a) meaning, b) analytical and c) cognitive criteria. She objectively accounts for the conception and principles of the theories without critical judgements at this level: *meaning criteria* consider pragmatic meaning as context-dependent, non-truth conditional, and implicit and secondary; *analytical criteria* define pragmatics with respect to discourse units, extragrammatical accounts, acceptability judgements and naturalness; and *cognitive criteria* work on pragmatics as relating to performance, right hemisphere specialization and inference. Problematising the criteria, the author argues that the grammar/pragmatics distinction does not lie in being respectively context-insensitive or context-sensitive, as the two criss-cross; that both pragmatics and grammar could contribute to truth conditionality, making the distinction unsustainable; that it cannot be consistently demonstrated that pragmatic meaning is implicit and secondary, as some grammatical elements do the same; that ‘inferential pragmatic phenomena may be grammatical and grammatical phenomena may be extragrammatical’ (p. 75); that acceptability judgements cannot be sustained as they fail intuition tests; that performance is not an exclusive pragmatic property; that not all grammatical/pragmatic outputs can be distinguished by the right hemisphere specialization arguments; and that inference cannot be sustained all the way as a strictly pragmatic tool.

Having rejected all the criteria as mostly canon-based and pre-emptive of pragmatic engagements, in Part II Ariel reconstitutes the grammar/pragmatics distinction by defending the candidacy of a code/inference criterion. She appeals to the innovativeness of inferences, non-automation of successful inferential communication, deniability of inferences, the indirect nature of inferences, and optionality of enriching linguistic codes, all of which may occur conversely with respect to coded meaning. She identifies three inference-based pragmatic theories: Gricean, neo-Gricean and Relevance theories, defining ‘a theory of pragmatics [as] a theory about pragmatic inferencing in the service of linguistic communication’ (p. 120). While all the theories ‘define grammar as a set of codes and pragmatics as inference’ (p. 120), account for the same set of inferences, albeit

sometimes differently, and draw the grammar/pragmatics distinction the same way, they differ in their application of Grice's maxims.

Having established that defining pragmatics is impossible with canonized topics, Part III applies the code/inference criterion. Ariel submits that classical pragmatic topics such as deixis and reference, speech acts, meaning determination, presupposition, intonation, topicality and discourse structure, and implicatures and explicated inferences are both pragmatic and grammatical; that while functional syntax is essentially placed with pragmatics, several aspects of it have grammatical applications; and that particular topics such as politeness, conversation analysis, sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics belong to both grammar and pragmatics domains. Finally, Ariel comments on the difficulty in distinguishing grammar from pragmatics and the problem with Occam's razor, the grand design behind grammar and behind pragmatics, the quantitative availability of grammar and pragmatics, and the status of grammatical pragmatics. She concludes by recommending further research on the code/inference distinction and pragmatic inferences, the interaction between codes and inferences and 'a reexamination of the methodology for drawing the grammar/pragmatics division of labour' (p. 273).

Defining Pragmatics is an excellent review of definitions of pragmatics and a state of the art, critical, representation of the field. Its major strength and distinction inhere in its introduction of the code/inference yardstick that has not only been able to delineate pragmatics, but has also been able to set pragmatics apart from other context-exploiting linguistic disciplines such as sociolinguistics, stylistics and discourse analysis. The same tool presents a more systematic and acceptable settlement of the differences between neo-Gricean and Relevance theorists, the proposal of Saul (2002) being controversial (see Carston, 2005). The author masterfully gradates her theoretical engagements with the same topics across the different sections of the book with no banal repetitions.

However, in discussing Neo-Gricean pragmatics, more space is assigned to Levinson's contributions than those of Horn, and the differences within the group are underdeveloped as if the theorists present a single voice (see Carston, 2005; Horn, 2005). Deixis and reference are taken together, resulting in the former being generalized as indexicals (see Allott, 2010). 'Beyond Pragmatics', a chapter in Part III, seems confusing as the extrapragmatic state, prior to Ariel's book, seems truer for interactional patterns, sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics than for politeness. This makes the heading rather broad.

Defining Pragmatics is an authoritative pragmatics text which has properly seated pragmatics in linguistic studies. It presents an unprecedented coherent pragmatic programme, which can be conveniently fleshed out from existing pragmatics texts, and which needs full development for further systematicity. Professional pragmatists and other linguists should therefore find the text an invaluable working tool.

References

- Allott N (2010) *Key Terms in Pragmatics*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Carston R (2005) Relevance Theory, Grice, and the neo-Griceans: A response to Laurence Horn's 'Current issues in neo-Gricean pragmatics'. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 2(3): 303–319.
- Horn L (2005) Current issues in neo-Gricean pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 2(2): 191–204.
- Saul JM (2002) What is said and psychological reality: Grice's project and relevance theorists' criticisms. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25(3): 347–372.

Miguel F. Ruiz-Garrido, Juan C. Palmer-Silveira and Immaculada Fortanet-Gomez (eds), *English for Professional and Academic Purposes*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2010, vi + 237 pp., €49.00/US\$74.00 (pbk).

Reviewed by: Marilyn Lewis, *University of Auckland, New Zealand*

Three editors from the Universitat Jaume I in Spain have collected 14 articles on the topic of English for Professional and Academic Purposes (EPAP). Their book has three sections, one each for the 'professional' and 'academic' parts of the title and one for EPAP pedagogy. However, the distinctions are not watertight, since there are messages for discourse analysts and for teachers throughout, with 'many different areas and fields of interest and research' involved in the two broad fields (p. 2).

In the first chapter of Section One, 'Discourse Analysis of English for Academic Purposes', Mendis (University of Colombo) tests the hypothesis that although phrasal verbs are infrequent in the academic writing of native speakers, they are frequent (if frowned on) in Sri Lankan writing. It appears that is the case. Local disapproval of this frequency illustrates the point that 'gatekeeping mechanisms . . . are not confined to Western academia' (p. 22). It was easy to be absorbed in the details that emerged in this and many of the chapters, such as the mention of 100 years of literature in English from Sri Lankan writers. Still in Section One, three contributors go beyond the 'English' of the book's title by investigating the concept of relative 'intellectual indebtedness' in Spanish, French and English. They examine medical research papers to see which of the three language groups make most use of ritualized polite expressions in acknowledging support of various kinds. In the spirit of a good film reviewer, let's not reveal the finding. The remaining two chapters in this section examine modality in academic writing and take an intercultural look at research publication. The data sources used by the researchers will be of interest to readers of this journal. As well as the medical research articles already noted, Mendis analyses data from the Sri Lanka section of the ICE (International Corpus of English), and two chapters draw on material from English and Spanish sources.

In Section Two, 'Discourse Analysis of Professional English', contributors are concerned with the language of academic and industrial research (one chapter), corporate values statements (one chapter), and health-related topics (two chapters). Askehave and Zethsen, from two Danish universities, examine the language of health promotion leaflets randomly selected from *Boots the Chemists*. While acknowledging methodological shortcomings such as not taking into account features like graphics and font size, the authors nevertheless produce thoughtful results. For instance, it seems the pamphlet writers make attempts to be open and promote confidence through their messages. A very different genre, the American Corporate Values Statement, is studied by Garces-Conejos Blitvitch (University of North Carolina at Charlotte). Even the headings in these statements make fascinating reading because (to this reviewer at least) they are a reminder of how all-pervasive corporate language has become. This second section of the book also includes an article on research reports in academic and industrial research and language aspects relating to patients with diabetes.

Although the results reported in Section Three, 'EPAP Pedagogy', are addressed to teachers and teacher educators, for discourse analysts the research methods may be more

appealing. Thus in the first chapter, 'Evaluating and Designing Materials for the ESP Classroom', Bocanegra-Valle searched for existing measures of authenticity as the basis for her analysis. I was particularly interested in her opening claim that 'at some universities, materials development may be regarded as a key merit for [job candidates] and on the same level as a PhD degree' (p. 141). The author has details of the process and the product of materials development, with an emphasis on both authenticity and in-house productions. In three figures and tables, authentic and simplified texts on the same topic are compared. Swales and Feak take analysis a step further by investigating how the findings of discourse analysis may be applied to materials and activities for students. Next, Breeze compares two ways of teaching writing, one based on textual analysis and the other on rhetorical analysis. A different research approach is used by Gimenez (University of Nottingham), a student survey and case studies. The final chapter is by Orr, whose career has been divided between the USA and Japan, and whose special interest is ESE (English for Science and Engineering). In fact his motivation for writing the chapter is 'the enormous gap between human supply in ESE and world demand' (p. 213). Reading his suggested profile for someone who could fill this gap illustrated the cause of the problem. His list includes such demands as an understanding of 'the culture, activities, and English of science and engineering' (p. 215) plus 15 other general and specific interests and abilities.

Collectively and individually, the articles will interest several groups of readers: researchers, teachers, teacher educators and materials designers. Researchers can examine a range of methods: genre analysis and contrastive rhetoric most frequently, but also corpus linguistics and textual analysis and others. For more depth, references to further sources are scattered throughout the articles. Amongst these are a few names of long standing in the field. Not surprisingly, Swales and Connor are front runners in the number of appearances they make in the literature reviews. As one example, the work by Swales and Feak on 'abstracts and the writing of abstracts' (referenced on p. 8) would be worth recommending to people wanting to publish in international journals.

Of course, like many edited collections, this book lacks an index, but that is a small disadvantage. Even more trivially, but on the plus side, it has an attractively designed cover in avocado green. The volume is recommended both to teachers who are interested in the applications of the research findings and to discourse analysts who could borrow and build on the steps used by researchers to reach their findings.

Richard Fitzgerald and William Housley (eds), *Media, Policy and Interaction*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009, xii + 229 pp., ISBN 9780754674146, £55.00 (hbk).

Reviewed by: Yves Laberge, *Département de sociologie, Université Laval, Québec, Canada*

A collection of 10 case studies plus an Introduction, *Media, Policy and Interaction*, features various approaches to discourse analysis, despite what its (too short) title indicates in more general terms. In their Introduction, Richard Fitzgerald (University of Queensland, Australia) and William Housley (Cardiff University, Wales) explain the chapters will 'focus on language and talk-in-interaction' (p. 1), but also 'on the situated

practices of policy presentation and discussion as part of a *mediated* public sphere' (p. 2). The editors present their book as 'an examination of the discursive relationship between the public and policy articulated in and through mediated forms of public space' (p. 2). Following the salient works of Harvey Sacks (1935–75) (Sacks, 1974), two main methodological approaches are used thoroughly, but not exclusively, in this book: Conversation Analysis (CA), and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) (see p. 3).

The first five chapters discuss the dynamics of talk-in-interaction and public debates, for example, in radio phone-ins and talkbacks, but also on current affairs programs on TV and even on scrums (see pp. 16 and 19). As for topics, we learn about issues related to national identities, moral attributes and values.

In possibly the most rewarding chapter in methodological terms, Emo Gotsbachner (Chapter 4) uses the concepts of 'interpretative frames' and 'slots' borrowed from Erving Goffman and Gregory Bateson in order to analyze political events (the 2001 Referendum in Austria) as featured in Austrian television news programs (p. 50). The author aptly explains many core elements required for the study of the political narrative (p. 68). The main concept used here is 'interaction' (p. 51).

Interestingly, Chapters 10 and 11 discuss policies related to education in two different ways. Chapter 10 studies through a textual analysis how the Hong Kong government asked their numerous teachers to 'move' to the position of learners of English as a second language, using the media as an advocate for this purpose (p. 185). Similarly in Chapter 11, the Australian federal government used a daily newspaper, *The Australian*, as a privileged place for public debates about the quality of education and the Australian education policy (p. 205). In this case, the debate was touchy and perhaps inappropriate because it questioned *in the media* and over a few months the trustworthiness of Australian teachers and the 'falling standards of teachers'. Combined together, these two attitudes could lead to a loss of trust in teachers and education in general (p. 215).

I liked the fact that each chapter of *Media, Policy and Interaction* is structured according to the same logical steps, always with a strong insistence on the methodological choices and the highlighting of a detailed conceptual framework. Therefore, from a methodological perspective, this book is very well constructed: each author provides a theoretical framework plus some accurate definitions each time a new concept is brought in. For example, in Chapter 7, Patrick Watson and Christian Greiffenhagen understand 'news' as not being 'a neutral product', but rather see it as 'a sequence of socially manufactured messages, which carries many of the culturally dominant assumptions of our society' (p. 116). In this case, this useful definition of 'news' was borrowed from the Glasgow University Group (1976). However, the impressive variety of countries studied here (from Belarus to Egypt, Switzerland, Finland, Canada, and others) should not lead any reader to wrongly conclude that this book might be too far from one's own region or reality. Quite the opposite; because of the variety of political contexts (like the almost totalitarian regime in Belarus), the analysis which emerges is perhaps easier to follow and the methodological frameworks used in these chapters could probably be adapted and re-used elsewhere in different contexts for other research purposes.

I do not have major quibbles with this book. However, given the book's topic, I was surprised and slightly disappointed not to find much discussion about ideologies.

Incidentally, the term 'ideology' itself does not even appear in the index, although Chapters 4, 7, 9 and 10 use it as well as the concept of 'dominant ideology' (see pp. 9, 50, 68, 69, 116, 117, 198–200). On this point, the authors of Chapter 10 quote Gee's salient book, *Sociolinguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses* (2007), in which he wrote about the links between language and ideologies: 'language is inherently ideological, that is, that any use of the language is both an assessment and expression, in both form and function, of ideology' (Fitzgerald and Housley, p. 200). As well as the too short index (we would have needed more than five pages), I would have liked to find a general conclusion or afterword at the end of this collection.

Clearly not a book to be used as an entry point for newcomers or undergraduates in these domains, *Media, Policy and Interaction* might help some graduate students in their efforts to situate their research question within a relevant body of possible avenues and works. Fitzgerald and Housley have produced a rigorous collection with many interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary contributions that will be useful for graduates in discourse studies and political communication, but also in social sciences, geopolitics, media and cultural studies.

References

- Gee JP (2007 [1990]) *Sociolinguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*, 3rd edn. London: Routledge.
- Glasgow University Group (1976) *Bad News*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Sacks H (1974) On the analyzability of stories by children. In: Turner R (ed.) *Ethnomethodology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 216–232.