

21. Schulz, Winfried. Nachricht/ Winfried Schulz. In: Noelle-Neumann, Elisabeth / Schulz, Winfried / Wilke, Jürgen (Hrsg.): Fischer Lexikon Publizistik Massenkommunikation. Fischer. Frankfurt am Main 2009. S. 359-396.
22. White, David Manning. The Gate Keeper: A Case Study in the Selection of News/ David Manning White. In: Journalism Quarterly 27/1950. S. 383-390.
23. Wittwen, Andreas: Infotainment. Fernsehnachrichten zwischen Information und Unterhaltung / A. Wittwen. – Bern; Berlin; Frankfurt a.M. 1995. – 236S.
24. Zubayr, Camille. Die Informationsqualität der Fernsehnachrichtenaus Zuschauersicht/ Camille Zubayr, Stefan Geese. In: Media Perspektiven 4/2009. Seite 158-173.
25. Zubayr, Camille. Die Informationsqualität der Fernsehnachrichtenaus Zuschauersicht / Camille Zubayr, Stefan Geese. In: Media Perspektiven 6/2013. Seite 322-338.

Summary

This article deals with the main features and concepts of broadcast and television news. The concept of "news" has many definitions. One definition has interpreted "news" as follows: a form of journalistic message that informs us about the events, things, and thoughts of others. TV news is a transfer of information at an appointed time in a prescribed space that relays important current events about the world. Television news channels come in various form, presentation, and content. All of these forms of television are socially significant and relevant topics to the public.

APPLIED LINGUISTICS, DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND PRAGMATICS: A RELATIONSHIP

CEHAN ANCA

“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași (Romania)

Applied linguistics and discourse analysis

Applied linguistics, discourse analysis and pragmatics have had a multifaceted relationship due the variety of perspectives used by all three in a diverse range of contexts. Both discourse analysis and pragmatics specialists recommend the incorporation of an awareness of these two fields in language education alongside the teaching approach, be it communicative or eclectic. Such a perspective can ensure the enhancement of the teaching of linguistic knowledge, from pronunciation to grammar and vocabulary.

Discourse analysis with a focus on application occupies an important position in applied linguistics as it makes possible the analysis and understanding of real language

data. At the same time, the constantly expanding focus of applied linguistics makes its ties with discourse analysis closer as one recognizes the latter's potential to specify how important language is in the constitution and maintenance of social phenomena. Discourse analysis has led to a trend in language education which moves focus from grammar to language in use and from language analysis to teaching for communication. Moreover, it has often been used as a methodology for investigating the language of instruction (e.g. Cehan, 2008, 2007, 2005). Thus it has become one of the most fully developed interfaces between applied linguistics and language teaching. As such it has been applied to subfields of applied linguistics such as language classroom-based research and interlanguage (e.g. Hatch, 1992; Coulthard, 1977; Cehan, 2002). These perspectives include a range of topics such as: form – function relations of grammatical features, lexical and grammatical characteristics of texts, spoken and written text structure, speech act organization, and others.

Generally speaking, discourse analysis originates in different academic disciplines (i.e. sociology, sociolinguistics, philosophy and linguistics), and studies texts – spoken or written – and is interested in the relationship between texts and the context in which they arise and operate. (For our purposes, context can be defined as the factors and elements that are non-linguistic and non-textual but affect communicative interaction). Discourse analysis deals only with real texts, and in this respect it differs from formal linguistics that deals with constructed examples. It also tends to work with longer passages of text, above sentence level.

Discourse analysis has taken at least two different directions: one is the extension of grammatical analysis to include functional objectives and the other is the study of institutionalized language use within specific contexts. The former, theoretical in nature, is often related to formal linguistics (e.g. van Dijk's 'text linguistics' or Bhatia's 'genre analysis'). The second direction is concerned with describing actual communication within institutionalized contexts (e.g. doctor – patient interaction or classroom interaction), focusing on the participants in the discourse and their relationship, their goals, the meaning that is built in the given context, and the factors that contribute to meaning making.

Through its target on the natural, 'real life' language uses, discourse analysis has been influenced in its turn by communicative language teaching. This approach has always striven for 'authenticity' in classroom communication which could reproduce natural speech events and activities outside the classroom. Benefiting from a better understanding of the classroom and outside-the-classroom language, and developing expectations for materials developers to reflect this concern, language education has gained in the understanding and use of natural language.

Although initially convergent, discourse analysis and communicative language teaching were never articulated to a common research agenda. This explains why in time the original strong link between applied linguistics and communicative language teaching has lost importance. Discourse analysis research has focused more on written language and the teaching of writing, as the written genres can be taught more easily through routine classroom interaction. A sub-discipline of discourse analysis,

conversation analysis has concerned itself with the organization of everyday interactions. It offers elements of fine-grain analysis of conversation exchanges, patterns in turn-taking such as adjacency pairs, the opening and closing moves, the topic-launching and shifting moves, the transition from one turn to the next. In the 1970s, Sinclair and Coulthard tape-recorded L1 English classes, from which they built a model for the analysis of classroom discourse with different levels, from exchanges, to moves and acts. They pointed out that a typical exchange in the lockstep lesson is the 'elicitation' turn, with its three characteristic moves: initiating, responding, follow up (the 'IRF model'). This type of research brought a new awareness of classroom discourse and reinforced the tendency towards naturalness, and the wish to overcome the limitations of the classroom interactional environment. More recent research in classroom discourse analysis focused on typical classroom discourse turns such as clarification requests, confirmation checks, repair sequences and recasts (e.g. Gass, 2003).

In spoken language instruction, the classroom environment affects the characteristics of the language used (cf. Cehan, 2007b, 2008). The analysis of the spoken classroom exchanges reveals what impact the communicative tasks have on classroom interaction and how this compares with out-of-the classroom authentic interaction. As a matter of fact, the IRF sequence, with the teacher initiating and framing most of the turns, makes classroom discourse widely different from authentic conversations. Consequently communicative language teaching, in an attempt to introduce more non-classroom situations and patterns of speech, has adopted patterns of interaction such as pair and group work and activities such as role plays, information gap and jigsaw that allow the participants to assume a variety of interactional roles.

Inspired by recent theoretical and methodological perspectives, classroom discourse analysis has geared towards the link between spoken discourse and other related issues such as cultural expectations, bilingualism, or the immigrants' experience, reflecting the increasingly diverse contexts within which L2 learning occurs. In fact, the only assumption that unifies classroom discourse analysis is that language use is inextricably linked with features of the context, in the sense that language and context are mutually constitutive phenomena [*apud* Goodwin and Duranti, 1992]. Moreover, the notion of context has been expanded to embrace institutional, historical, ideological and cultural dimensions which are reflected and sustained through features of language use.

In conclusion, although not all work in discourse analysis has purposes that converge with those of applied linguistics, discourse analysis remains a central focus within applied linguistics. Much of the work done by discourse analysts is on learner and classroom language, taking into account the ever growing complexity of the contexts in which language learning and use take place.

A few concepts inspired by discourse analysis that have had a significant impact on the design of learning materials and classroom practices include: differences between the written and spoken texts; differences in register (level of formality); genre (communicative purpose, audience, conventionalized style and format) characteristics;

transactional vs. interactional discourse; cohesion; coherence; information structure (theme and rheme or topic and comment); shared knowledge; turn-taking; context, etc.

Moreover, the insistence of discourse analysis on the importance of context has led to a reconsideration of the learning environment together with a redefinition of the teachers' and learners' roles. The former have become more reflective and the latter more autonomous and responsible. The effects of discourse analysis on educational materials are seen in a better modelling of different written and spoken genres with which the learners engage, a more precise delineation of their contexts of use, improved flexibility, enhanced learner autonomy and maximized pedagogic choices. In brief, discourse analysis has offered more true-to-life, context-sensitive descriptions and guidelines for the use of language in the materials, course books, pedagogic grammars and dictionaries.

Applied linguistics and pragmatics

If formal analyses of syntax or semantics do not consider the users of the linguistic forms, pragmatics deals explicitly with the relationships between language forms and their users. It also deals with the language users' beliefs, assumptions, intentions, goals and actions that are performed while using language. Like discourse analysis, pragmatics is also concerned with the situations, contexts and settings in which language is used. Communicative competence includes *pragmatic competence*, which is a set of internalized rules concerning socioculturally appropriate language use, taking into account the participants and the features of the context within which an interaction takes place.

Language, however, is not only a vehicle for exchanging thoughts and ideas; it is also used to perform other social functions. Such social functions performed via utterances as apologizing, complaining, requesting, threatening, and so forth, are part of a situation that provides contextual elements which help one interpret the speaker's intentions. Contextual and social information make it possible for the participants to interpret each other's intentions. Even if terms like 'locutionary', 'illocutionary' and 'perlocutionary meaning' or 'presupposition' and 'implication' have not made their way into the learning materials, these concepts need to be familiar to practitioners. In other words, the combined knowledge of linguistics and pragmatics may ensure a more effective use of language.

All cultures have strategies for maintaining social harmony and rules of politeness comprised in the rules of speech that one acquires as part of communicative competence. A certain amount of pragmatic information concerning politeness is present today in the language of the learning materials and the teachers' job is to raise the learners' awareness and sensitivity to the major features of politeness of L2. Grice's cooperative principle, consisting of the four maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner, has explained what are the expectations of the participants and the basic assumptions that people follow in their interaction, at least in the Anglo-American culture. Successful communication is seen as taking place when the participants share knowledge, beliefs, and assumptions and when they obey similar rules of cooperative interaction.

Due to pragmatics, notions such as ‘speaker meaning’ and ‘contextual meaning’ have made their way into applied linguistics and teaching materials. ‘Appropriacy’, seen not as correctness but as a conventional, culturally appropriate and socially acceptable use of language has also become a goal of the classroom practice. The materials have been reconsidered from the standpoint of the users’ selection of forms in the negotiation of the mutual understanding of a situation.

Over the last forty years, pragmatics has developed into a science whose definition, like that of applied linguistics, has remained elusive, so that there is no consensus as to the coverage of its domain. However, there is agreement among pragmaticians that the following aspects do fall within the domain of pragmatics: communication involves more than word, phrase or sentence meaning; linguistic choices result in various interpretations; the perception of contextual factors has an influence on the production and interpretation of language.

In terms of influence on language education, and especially on learning materials, pragmatics has underlined the importance of context, the roles and relationships of the interlocutors, the number of people present, the setting of the interaction, and the goal of the communicative event. By identifying such contextual information, learners can become aware of the influence of context on language use. For instance, in the current textbooks one can no more find tasks like “Write an essay about spring”, where the writing purpose and target audience are unclear. Rather, tasks are normally contextualized, with detailed information about the role the writer should assume, the audience, the goal and the context of the writing. Actually, the wealth of information that many recent course book rubrics contain and the abundance of images that accompany the tasks suggest the complexity of communication and help to clarify meanings.

To conclude, as far as L2 education is concerned, it is as important to understand the pragmatics of the target culture as it is to understand its grammar and vocabulary. In other words, discourse and pragmatic competence has to match linguistic competence.

Bibliography

1. Bardovi-Harlig, K. 2010. Pragmatics and Second language Acquisition. In Kaplan, R. B. (ed.). (2nd edn.) *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, 232-243. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Brumfit, C. J., and Johnson K. 1979. *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Bygate, M. 2005. Applied Linguistics: A Pragmatic discipline, a generic discipline? *Applied Linguistics* 26, 568-581.
4. Cazden, C. 1987 *Classroom Discourse*. Portsmouth: NH: Heinemann.
5. Cehan, A. 2008. Knowledge and Power in Classroom Discourse. In *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, nr.5/2008, Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest.
6. Cehan, A. 2007a. Language Metafunctions in Classroom Discourse. In *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, 4/2007, Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest.
7. Cehan, A. 2007b. Public and Private in Classroom Discourse. In *Communication*

and Agumentation in the Public Sphere, Galați University Press.

8. Cehan, A. 2005a. Mapping Past and Present in Classroom Discourse Analysis. In *Mapping the Future*, Iași: Universitas XXI.
9. Cehan, A. 2005b. The distinctiveness of foreign language classroom discourse. *Analele Universității "Dunărea de Jos" din Galați*, Fascicula XIII, 43-48.
10. Cehan, A. 2002. *Perspectives on EFL Classroom Discourse*, București: Matrixrom.
11. Cook, G. 2003. *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
12. Davies, A. 1999, 2007. *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics. From Practice to Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
13. Gass, S. M. 2003 Input and interaction. In C. Doughty, and M. H. Long (eds.). *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. 224-255. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
14. Goodwin, C., and Duranti A. 1992. Rethinking context: An introduction. In C. Goodwin, and A. Duranti (eds.), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. 1 -42. New York: Cambridge University Press.
15. Kaplan, R. B. (ed.). 2010. *Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, 2nd edn. Oxford University Press.
16. Larsen-Freeman, D. (ed.). 1980. *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
17. Widdowson, H. G. 1998. The theory and practice of critical discourse analysis, *Applied Linguistics*, 19/1, 136-151.

Summary

The article is an overview of the relevance of discourse analysis and pragmatics for applied linguistics and particularly for second and foreign language education. It also looks at the influence of these two disciplines on materials design and teaching philosophy.

TEN KEYS TO IMPROVING DOCTOR–PATIENT COMMUNICATION

Černý M.

University of Ostrava (Czech Republic)

Introduction

Looking back to the initial and preparatory stages of my research on doctor–patient communication [Černý 2012], it would be right to say that I was bold to choose a research subject of such broad scope. The plan that I devised was to examine communication between doctors and patients during English medical consultations. The first main objective of the study was to explore to what degree the present-day style of doctor–patient communication reflects on-going social transformations; in this way I