

Module One

PARTICIPANT PROCESSES AND THE REPRESENTATION OF SOCIAL ACTORS

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

This module introduces one of the means by which a larger study will be undertaken, a study comprising a thesis concerned with characterising the nature of a specific *written speech community* by reference to its norms of interaction. These norms are conceived as being realised at both the 'expression' and 'content' plane of text construction; that is, by both institutionalised conventions of staging texts, and at the same time, by means of adopting or resisting perceived local ways of interacting with one's audience. The overall means through which this characterisation is conducted in the thesis are:

- i), an examination of patterns of the speech community's intra-textual and inter-textual devices, such as rhetorical staging or 'phase shifting' which will enable the characterisation of a local *rhetorical structure potential* to be made, and,
- ii), an examination of aspects of the construction of textual identity, as a function of the ways in which different writers (*Addressers*) use the resources of the lexicogrammar, particularly in realising the TENOR of the interaction. This will be effected by tracing the co-positioning moves which writers make within, and in the creation of, the social practices, or 'norms of interaction' constituting the context of situation itself.

Module 1 first outlines the general theoretical background in which this thesis is located, in order to locate the present study in its broader context of overall purpose. The main sections of this module then report on a preliminary study focussed on the analysis of grammatical participant processes and the representation of social actors. This analytical approach is shown to provide one of the means by which the overall aims of the thesis can be achieved. The report discusses, and illustrates with examples, the analysis of two *posts* from

an email discussion *list*¹ (*written speech community*, or *Community of Practice*²) on which the larger study is based. In this module, for example, I show how this type of analytic approach can help in accounting for generic patterning of rhetorical units within each of the two sample texts, as well as addressing an aspect of *poster*-specific ways of representing social actors, what I refer to as *textual identity*, which I see as an aspect of what is sometimes referred to as 'style'. One of my overall aims is to demonstrate that each text's discourse organisation can be viewed as an instantiation of its own *logonomic*, or local value system (discussed in more detail in section 3 below): as a means of relating the microstructure of individual texts to the macro structures of social institutions and their practices. The specific social institution investigated here is an electronic mail discussion list, whose stated purpose is to discuss the nature of group dynamics in such a discussion list. This social institution is, of course, constituted out of the wider cultural contexts from which its members are drawn, and so the thesis will also refer to elements of its discourse which demonstrate relationship to context of culture.

1.1.1 Basic theoretical assumptions

The analytic approach adopted in this investigation views transitivity Processes and Participants as observable at the level of the lexicogrammar, while the representation of social actors is realised at the level of the Discourse Semantic¹, and so the study reported in this module is concerned with the interrelationship of these two levels of analysis in discourse, particularly in this mode of interaction, that is, an electronic mailing list. As will be touched upon further in section 3 of this module, and implicated in the analytical models discussed in Modules 2 and 3, such a perspective incorporates a conceptual model of 'particle-wave-field' (c.f. Young et al 1970: pp122-123), with the unit of analysis shifting between the particle: clause, the wave: exchange, and the field: written speech community, depending on the aspect of interaction under focus. This means that while the

¹ A glossary of terms such as 'post', 'list', 'Addresser', etc, which are related to computer mediated communication (hereafter CMC) in the context of this thesis, is included at the end of this module: Appendix 1: "Notes on Texts and Participant Posters" The first appearance of any terms discussed in Appendix 1 will be highlighted in the text in *italics*.

² After Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1998

tools of analysis for any of the studies comprising the thesis may be those of the lexicogrammatical stratum, their findings are focussed on accounting for the meanings made by parts of texts in relation to whole texts, and in turn, how these texts function as an instantiation of a network of interrelated community practices and meaning-making resources.

The analytic framework outlined here contributes to the larger study reported on in Module 3, where, together with the analytic resources outlined in Module 2, an examination of 'textual identity' is undertaken. For example, the ways in which the texts written by different posters regularly use the resources of lexicogrammar and discourse semantic patterns will be analysed for this purpose, and such textual identity, or style, will then be 'measured' against patterns common to texts of other posters, in terms of rhetorical staging within and between posts, and the construction of a textual identity and its relationship to its projected/co-constructed audience. In order to test whether such conventions are particular to this list only, or common to other contexts of interaction, such typical patterns as discovered here, should also be compared to other socially 'normative' or recognised conventions of textual patterning (or genres) such as reports, interviews, arguments, casual conversation, and various forms of narrative. Because this is written interaction, some conventions of written genres are readily apparent, but due to the relatively more interactive nature of text construction, many elements typical of spoken interaction are also obvious. This matter will be addressed in Module 2.

It is envisaged that through the approach outlined here, a means of characterising the norms or conventions valorised within the group can be identified through analysis of the linguistic strategies used to dis/affiliate participant-posters with each other via intertextual reference, assumed ideological constructs, or common-sense 'topoi'. I contend that such strategies, seen from the perspective of the textual organisation of whole post, is a function of the construction of the relationship between Addresser and Addressees, which in turn is a function of the accumulated positioning moves that are made throughout any (sets of) text(s). These strategies may be seen as forming list/community 'boundaries' or conventions if they are

¹ This refers to a level of meaning which is dependent on discourse co-text, as distinct from, for example, the meanings of specific lexical items or grammatical structures. This term is discussed further in section 3. See also Appendix 3.

commonly used, or in some cases, where they are flouted and policed. This means that the particle nature of the positioning that may be effected at the level of the clause, is ultimately implicated in the construction of norms or conventions - through the dynamics of the interaction itself.

The analyses in Module 1 are able to demonstrate poster specific means of self-representation - as, for example, a particular type of *narrator* - in the ways in which they co-position themselves in relation to their *implied readers*, or *projected audience* members. The nature of such a projected, or 'constructed' audience will also therefore form a recurrent theme in each of the three modules which comprise this thesis. In the two texts examined in this study, many common generic features are identified, but at the same time, their construction of a *self* as Addresser and *others* as ideal and/or implied readers (or *Overhearers*), can be shown to differ in subtle ways which become apparent only when a variety of analytic approaches are used on the experiential values identified through an initial transitivity analysis. It is acknowledged that within systemic functional linguistics, which informs the main tools of analysis in this thesis, experiential meanings of Participant and Process are not normally used to identify aspects of either Tenor or Mode, but it is my contention that such linguistic resources are also implicated in both interpersonal meanings and textual meanings in any text. It is the aim of this module to demonstrate one of the means through which this may be done, and it is the concurrent aim of the thesis to show in what ways textual identity is regularly constructed in this community of practice, through the analysis of a set of representative texts.

My earlier research into norms of interaction in the context of electronic mailing list communicative events (Don 1997), focussed on the interpersonal metafunctional aspects of the tenor of the texts, and the discourse processes that seem to constrain their readings. This was guided by the notion common in systemic linguistics that the ongoing negotiation over social relationships that are enacted in any mode must be best revealed through analysis at the level of the interpersonal metafunction. However, my interest in the relationships enacted in this context has led me to see tenor as being construed by all metafunctional

resources in an interrelated network of 'feedback loops' at the discourse semantic, ideological, and cultural levels¹. The overall purpose of this research thesis, then, is in part aimed at demonstrating such a variety of means of representing the construction of tenor in text, through an examination of the interaction of a particular discourse community and its norms of interaction (c.f. Hymes 1974: 60, Stubbs 1996: 16-34ff) as realised in linguistic behaviour.

1.1.2 Summary

To summarise, in this research, I am concerned to locate the characterisation of the interaction of an email list as a written speech community within a wider context of culture. This written speech community² is also envisaged as construing its own context of situation (or sets of registers) and ideological alignments, via its interaction, which constitutes and is constituted by, its negotiation of meanings and norms. Because such a community's interaction is almost wholly conducted in writing³, its context of culture and context of situation can, in some senses, be regarded as constructed entirely by written practices, the products of which are all written texts in the graphic channel. Individual members of the list - the speech community - who post to the list therefore act to construct not only a textual identity for themselves, but engage in the constitution of the texts which comprise the very speech community itself. Context of situation then, is conceived as constructed semiotically via a network of mainly linguistic resources incorporating Field, Tenor and Mode⁴. In this way, the location of the speech community within wider cultural and ideological contexts is viewed as realised via the registerial context of situation (after Halliday & Hasan 1985; see also Don 1997), in which MODE is particularly salient. The nature of the technological mediation of this means of interaction, as constraining and enabling different types of meaning-making specific to this mode, is taken up in more detail in Module 2.

1.2 Specific aims of this study

1 See Appendix 3

2 Appendix 1 further discusses the nature of the 'written speech community' as it is defined for this study

3 Again, refer to Appendix 1 which discusses the nature of the Speech Community as it is constituted via membership in an electronic forum: some aspects of the speech community itself are realised by means other than written verbal interaction c.f. section 1.2: Interface.

4 Throughout this thesis, a Systemic Functional Linguistic approach is assumed.

There were three specific aims for this preliminary study:

- i) to investigate whether an analysis of grammatical participant roles and verbal processes can reveal any significant patterns of identity construction and rhetorical staging in two similar texts
- ii) to determine whether transitivity analysis could be enhanced through an application of van Leeuwen's (1996) classification of the representation of social actors.
- iii) to determine how social actors were represented in each text generally, and whether such a comparison between texts would prove useful in fulfilling some of the overall aims of the research: to characterise local norms of discourse management, or rhetorical structure potential, in this context of interaction.

My contention that such norms of interaction are evident in the recurrent patterns revealed by textual analysis, appears to be borne out in this study. For example, an 'unmarked' or 'stylistic' *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1991: 81ff) of specific participants may be revealed by their use of consistent patterns of positioning of themselves as Addresser in relation to specific audience members or social actors and practices. The results of this study suggested that such systematic differences in positioning may be identified within texts in this type of written speech situation, and that further analysis of a larger corpus of posts would allow a more detailed account of whether or not such discourse strategies are common to all representative texts, or confined to those of specific posters/textual identities¹. Rhetorical staging that is common to both sample posts will show how each poster in the study uses the resources of the discourse semantic to co-position themselves and audience members in specific and identifiable ways. This is seen as effected at the level of the discourse semantic via lexicogrammatic resources, as will be outlined in more detail in the following sections. This study suggests that the norms prevalent in this written speech community may indeed be identified by reference to strategies of co-positioning, since they may signal both the expectations of posters as to value system and a view of reality not/shared by Addressees (see section 3 below), as well as the regular means by which a post organises its argument via such co-positioning strategies. The limits of

¹ Because it is relatively easy to set up an email account and adopt an assumed posting identity, the terms 'poster' and 'textual identity' may not ultimately refer to the same thing. It is not uncommon for a poster to assume a number of textual identities or 'personae' on the same list. This is meat for another study.

this study in which only two sample texts have been used, do not allow an analysis of any uptake of such positioning strategies in responses to these texts. This will be undertaken in Module 3.

2. The texts

2.1 *Background to the texts*

The texts chosen for the research thesis as a whole, are taken from the *archives* of the email list under investigation. This email discussion list can be characterised as open subscription, unmoderated (McElhearn 1996), and to some degree topic-focussed. It has been in operation since October 1995, when I first became a member, originally drawn by its position statement (see Appendix 2: Valued Texts) which referred to an experiment in group dynamics online. Several of the members who also joined at that time are still active as *posters* (or *participants*¹) in discussions onlist. Others, while still members of the list, do not post contributions to the public list, but may remain in contact with other members via *backchannel* communication (Appendix 1: 'Notes on Texts and Participant Posters' further discusses the terms in *italics* here).

In order to investigate stylistic similarities among posters, or norms of interaction, as well as poster-specific stylistic variations of interaction (or 'textual identity'), I chose to concentrate on a set of texts produced by three different posters, whose 'style' of interaction or textual identity construction was felt to be distinctive. The original motivation for this choice, therefore, was to attempt to account for this perceived difference in textual style, or 'narrator voice'. As stated earlier, because a large part of this narrator voice is believed to be related to the manner in which the Addresser of any text constructs an ideal reader, or projects an audience, the means by which posters represent their Addressees and any other implied readers, is also a recurrent theme in this research.

For the purpose of comparing the stylistic choices made by these three posters, I made 3 corpora comprising five separate posts written by each of these three posters. Therefore, the larger study of 'poster style' and norms of interaction, which is the focus of Module 3, is a function of both each poster's overall use of the textual resources within each corpus, and of a comparison of patterns of use in the texts/corpora of the other two posters.

¹ The term 'participant' is common in ethnographic research, but, as discussed in Appendix 1, due to possible confusion with grammatical participant roles, the term 'poster' has been adopted for Module 1.

As well, because any norms of interaction must be seen as a generalisation of both poster styles and the actual means of interaction itself - its instantiation of 'rhetorical structure potential' - I also decided to investigate a set of three approximately 20-post *threads* (or conversations) contributed to the list over varying periods of time, and to which at least one of these three posters also contributed. Textual identity is examined via the ways in which each of these posters regularly used the resources of lexicogrammar and discourse semantic patterns, measured against patterns common to all three posters in terms of rhetorical staging both within and between posts (as textual entities) themselves. In this way, I attempt to incorporate a dynamic perspective of the texts into the thesis.

2.1.1 Description of the texts

The two texts which were chosen for this preliminary study appear below as Appendix A: "text1" (SIMON) and "text2" (SARAH). Only those clause-complexes of each original post which form the focus of this preliminary study have been numbered. However, in the case of **text2**, the clause complex where the text under analysis begins, is numbered as 2 (the start of the *body* of the post), since the post itself actually starts with an *opening framer*¹:

Ex 2.1: Susan, and (Roy - I just got your post) (2:1)

This also functions as a '*turn*' since it locates the material which follows (an excerpt from a previous post, to which the post then responds) through a grammatical proposition, as well as calling on the attention of named Addressees (as previous Addressers). This is therefore considered as both the first rhetorical unit² and clause complex, and is numbered as 1³. It forms a type of *orientation* or *setting* for the quoted material, which in turn, initiates the main utterance, or *body* of the post. In other words, it is this 'main utterance' only which forms the material for **text2**.

1 The elements of rhetorical structure potential used in analysing the (rhetorical) staging of posts will be discussed in more detail in Modules Two and Three

2 The term 'utterance' was not used here since its meanings are difficult to define. In this thesis, the term 'rhetorical unit' will be preferred for any proposed semantic chunk of text. See also Appendix 1, section 1 for further discussion.

3 All references to the texts will take the form of (text#:sentence#).

On the other hand, the body of the post from which **text1** is taken, begins with a *greeting* or *call* to the writer of the quoted material, and this is not considered as having taken a 'turn'. It is considered as acting only as the *framer* for the main utterance which follows the quoted 'turn', and therefore **text1** begins with sentence number 1. The reader is asked to read the texts which appear in Appendix A before proceeding in order that the context for the following discussion is made clear.

2.1.2 Choice of texts

The two posts themselves were chosen for their relative lack of overt interactivity, such as *extra-vocalised insertions*¹ (direct quotations), and for their approximate similarity in terms of length and topic, as well as their apparent differences in orientation to that topic.² The texts (numbered clause-complexes) in Appendix A represent the largest sections, or units, of these two posts³. They were written four months apart, by two of the three posters referred to above. Rhetorical units which comprise the texts were determined using mainly orthographic means: for example, each writer's formatting of paragraphs is used as the fundamental sign of their intended text organisation (cf. Hoey 1991, Martin, Matthiessen and Painter 1997: 174-175, and Appendix 1 for further discussion, **Eden ?**). This formatting, in turn, is relevant to the investigation of conventional and poster-specific rhetorical staging within and between these texts, since it signals, in terms of this thesis, the basic writer-selected rhetorical unit boundary against which other discourse-semantic rhetorical staging may be 'measured'. The nature of such staging is a function of discourse prosody and cohesive devices, and analysis of the texts is used to identify textual patterns common to all the texts - and also therefore, to identify phase boundaries as 'marked' in co-text.

For both texts, the nature of group and list behaviour was the topic of discussion, but I felt that each text's orientation to this somewhat similar field was at variance. The approach was one of comparison and contrast - both inter-textually, and to some degree, intra-textually: within the texts

1 This refers to the manner in which some texts in this Mode try to simulate a dialogic context by means of inserting utterances from other posts, to which they then respond as if taking a 'turn'.(see also Appendix 1 for discussion). This topic is taken up in more detail in Module 2

2 The same two texts have been concurrently subjected to an Appraisal analysis which seems to highlight a difference in evaluative stance. Module 2 will contain a report on this framework of analysis.

3 A *structural unit* termed the *body* of the post: see Appendix 1 section 1 for further discussion

themselves. The tools, or approaches, which were used here consisted of an application of a version of Hasan's (1985) notion of a cline of participant dynamism, and van Leeuwen's (1996) categorisation of the representations of social actors. These notions, and the means they provide for investigating positioning within the texts, will be discussed further in sections 3 and 4 below.

2.2 Setting up the analysis

As stated earlier, the two texts in this study appear at the end of this module in Appendix A, and are named for convenience after their writers: **text1** (SIMON), and **text2** (SARAH). Reference to the texts will incorporate the text number, **1** or **2**, as well as the clause complex (sentence) number. This was determined by the writer's formatting, or use of full stops and capitalisation. It must be noted, however, that in the examples which appear in the discussion below, references are usually made to clauses, rather than whole sentences, since, for this study in particular, the clause is the unit of analysis¹.

Text2 was slightly longer than **text1** originally, and so the last section of **text2**, formatted as a paragraph, was left out of the analysis. This means that **text1** is comprised of 30 clause-complexes, and **text2** is comprised of 28 clause-complexes. However, the word and clause count for each text differs more markedly: **text1** is comprised of 595 words and 64 clauses which contain 21 embedded clauses, while **text2** has 783 words making up 78 clauses containing 17 embedded clauses. This information is summarised in the table below:

¹ This distinction will become significant for discussion of the unit of analysis in determining values of Appraisal in Modules Two and Three, where the unit of analysis is a semantic rather than a grammatical unit, and is referred to elsewhere as a *rhetorical unit*.

	Text1	Text2
clause complexes	30	28
words	595	783
clauses	64	78
embedded clauses	21	17
lexical density/clauses	3.5	3.9
lexical density/words	38%	39%

Table 2.1: Preliminary comparison

It appears that **text2** consists of longer clause complexes than **text1**, but this may be accounted for by sentence 2.24 which comprises four run-on points each beginning with a number followed by a non-capitalised to-infinitive. However, in terms of intricacy, **text1** with 21 embedded clauses appears more complex than **text2**. The lexical densities of the texts are quite close in range, both as a ratio of lexical items to word count as well as ratio of lexical items to clause count, especially when the lexical densities of texts are seen as locations within a common range. In the matter of range, mean lexical densities of 38 - 39%, and 3.5 - 3.9 per clause, are on the borderline of what is normally expectable of written and spoken texts (see for example Stubbs 1996: 71-74, Ure 1971, Halliday 1985: 80). However, Stubbs (op cit) makes the point that the significant differences in the densities of the corpus he investigated were not found between spoken versus written texts, but rather as a function of what Hasan (Halliday & Hasan 1985) calls 'process-sharing': the possibility of immediate feedback. This is one area of my research into contextual factors related to mode, and is discussed in more detail in Module 2.

3. Theoretical background

3.1 *Basic assumptions*

Variations in the field and mode of discourse register are realised at the level of lexicogrammar by textual and experiential meanings respectively, but in turn, I believe that field and mode also constrain the interpersonal meanings that can be made in any text, and thus have implications for the construal of tenor via a type of discourse semantic 'meta-redundancy' (Lemke 1995: 166-174). In turn, such meanings are part of the text's location in social space and time, the context of situation and culture in which readings - instantiations of system - take place. Given the multi-stratal nature of Text, as instantiation of Context (see for example Halliday & Hasan 2000, Martin 1992, 2000), tenor can be glossed as an aspect of the level Register, which is at once construed by interpersonal metafunctional realisations, but also constrained by both field and mode variations affecting what happens, or indeed can happen, at the discourse semantic level of analysis.

For example, in the following excerpt from **text2**, some idea of the tenor of the text may be gained by examining features of the interpersonal metafunctional resources used to construct the relationships in this small fragment of a larger text (although the whole text must remain the basic meaning unit following *Principle 2*, Stubbs 1996: 32). However, this short extract also serves to demonstrate an aspect of the meta-redundancy mentioned above. In terms of a hierarchy of levels of construal of meanings, the experiential metafunctional aspects of the lexicogrammar are said to typically realise the field of the discourse, and construe ideological and cultural assumptions which inform the view of reality in which discussion is located. In this fragment of **text2**, it can be observed that the experiential meanings, and hence the field of discussion also have implications for the construal of tenor:

Ex 3.1:

26 My only regret since I have been here is that, in knowing that I had to jump into the water, that I wasn't more careful where I landed - instead of landing beside Eileen as I had planned, I landed on top of her. **27** I have never been a particularly graceful diver. **28** But someone with her courtesy, honesty and courage did not deserve this and my

innocent intent does little to change the fact. 29 My behavior henceforth might.

While it might be obvious from the experiential metafunctional resources here that the field is not actually 'diving' or 'water sports' even if some of the (mixed) metaphors might suggest that it is, and that the field is more the topic of 'my behaviour here', this field of discussion would then to a large degree constrain the nature of the interpersonal meanings that could be interpreted by (*Overhearers* in) the audience. If the field *were* 'water sports', then completely different relationships would be enacted between Addresser and audience members (Addressees / Ideal Readers, and Overhearers: c.f. Appendix 1). The 'here' which is salient in this field of discussion is not revealed or explained as a place anywhere in the whole text, and yet this deictic is used by writers of both **text1** and **text2** to refer to the speech situation itself. Understanding what 'here' refers to depends on extra-textual and contextual knowledge, in effect, on the actual participation of the reader in this speech situation. The mode, in this case its technological mediation, both allows and constrains meanings that can be made: it allows ambiguities to be created, but often does not allow their easy resolution unless one has been a member of the community over a period of time. It allows for example, a great array of intertextual reference to be made via orthographic means (spelling, formatting), not available in the phonic channel. At the same time it constrains the meanings that could be made via gesture and intonation. In the excerpt quoted above, there was no actual jumping or landing. These issues will be taken up in more detail in Module 2; in the meantime, this study will demonstrate that experiential metafunctional resources can also contribute to an account of the construal of tenor in this text and others in this type of 'speech situation'. As Hunston (1989: 76) observes "there is no one-to-one determination between, say, Field and experiential meaning, but that Field will influence all meanings, particularly the experiential one."

3.1.1 Ideology, register and interpersonal meanings

My contention is that tenor, field, and mode together, both construe and realise an ideological dimension or stratum, what Hodge and Kress (1988) have termed a *logonomic system*, between context of situation (register) and context of culture (see Appendix 3: 'Interpersonal Discourse Semantic'). It is

at this level that local norms of interaction are 'located', and these norms, or sets of practices developed within any community over time, constrain the meanings that can be made between participants in any communicative event. In this sense, the model of ideology and the idea of a *local* logonomic system is here treated as a dynamic interactive set of practices, rather than a static construct which might then be seen as, for example, a 'false' ideology. In the short extract quoted above (Example 3.1), the Addresser alludes to a personal value system in which people with 'courtesy, honesty and courage' do not deserve to be jumped on, even by accident. Her statement is in the way of an apology, and future interaction - 'my behaviour' - needs to change in view of these unwritten (until they are stated here in this way) norms. This future *behaviour*, encoded as a proposition, although functioning as a proposal, or undertaking - *my future behaviour might [do (something) to change the fact that I landed on top of Eileen]* - must be understood to be *written verbal behaviour*, as distinct from any material physical action¹. In the two texts examined in this study, for example, the analysis will show that both posters attempt to define the nature of the discussion group (the speech community) and its social practices, and thus attempt to act in effecting the construction of a local logonomic system.

Thus, in my view, any analysis of norms of interaction will need to take into account this ideological dimension, and so will need to consider participants' alignment with, or resistance to ideas and propositions as to the nature of reality, as well as their attempts to constitute such norms by contributing to the textual speech situation itself, especially that of field. These ideas as to the nature of reality, as to what is "going on", or the purpose of interaction in general, determine, to a large extent, who can say what to whom, and thus relate specifically to interpersonal variables in the context of situation. At the same time, 'who does (can say) what to whom under what circumstances' is almost a catch phrase summarising how the resources of the experiential metafunction operate to construe meanings (cf Butt et al 2000: 46). These norms of interaction are related to a definition of the speech community as a set of social practices.

¹ This distinction is relevant to a discussion of 'exchange' structure both within and between texts when analysis uses Berry's (1981) notions of Actor and Knower. This topic will be addressed further in Module 3, and contributes towards the discussion of a possible rhetorical structure potential.

3.2 Power and solidarity

In this way, notions of tenor invoke dimensions of power and solidarity, where power relations may be construed as more or less equal/unequal, and solidarity may depend on a dimension of close/distant along two axes which could be termed 'social contact' (or 'familiarity', after Poynton, 1985) and 'axiology' (or 'value system'/ 'affiliation') respectively (c.f. Appendix 3). Analysing these dimensions of tenor in the texts necessitates not only an investigation into the lexicogrammar of mood and modality, but also the way in which grammatical participants and processes are co-patterned in representing 'reality' in social context. For this reason, part of my research involves an investigation of the resources of the experiential, as outlined here.

3.2.1 Role, relationship, and position

Tenor can also be glossed as a registerial construct concerned with mapping the nature of the interpersonal roles, relationships, and co-positionings which occur in communicative events, which in turn are dependent on resources of a discourse semantic level comprised of four major regions of analysis: IDENTIFICATION, CONJUNCTION, NEGOTIATION and IDEATION (Martin 1992). Against this background, the precise nature of 'roles', 'relationships' and 'position' can be said to exist at different logical levels of analysis, with roles seen as somewhat stable sets of allowable positions and institutionalised relationships at the level of culture and ideology, while relationship retains its dialogic dimension in that it speaks of relative positioning (or sets of co-positionings), within communicative events¹, with 'position' itself a particle-like concept which may be said to track interpersonal moves at the level of lexicogrammar and materiality.² In this study, the area usually related to the mapping of interpersonal resources for meaning, that of Negotiation, will be backgrounded in favour of examining the discourse semantic resources of Identity and Ideation in tracing occurrences of co-positioning. These I would

1 'communicative event' and 'utterance' are co-terminous in this thesis, since these are both viewed as rhetorical, or semantic units, and are thus variable in terms of linguistic 'length' c.f. Appendix 1, section 1 for further discussion.

2 Again, this is due to tenor being seen as realised by units which are variable in length and not based on one specific grammatical unit: in this case, the unit of analysis might be termed the 'prosod' (from prosody). Here, so-called positioning moves may be as short as one word, or as long as the cumulative evaluative positioning effected in a whole text. More generally however, such interpersonal units of analysis, will overlap - in words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs which are inter-related: as interpersonal metaphor stretched. This will be taken up again in Module2.

see as feeding back into tenor via their relationship to ideological contexts of culture.

Issues of Negotiation are related to Ideation and Identity, especially in the type of written speech community under investigation, and local norms of interaction for any group need to be absorbed and followed or resisted in the effort to claim an identity within or at variance with such group norms. It is here that issues of politeness and 'face' come into play via the nature of culturally accepted means of displaying deference and distance, or solidarity, affiliation and contact/familiarity. This issue also will be taken up in later modules.

3.3 Related work

Hasan (1985: 37-49) proposes that participants may be cast as Agents in *-er* roles, or Goals in *-ed* roles, and that these roles may be further 'activated' or 'passivized' through relationship with their associated transitivity processes, which she locates along a 'cline of dynamism', a notion that has been used in approaching textual analysis in at least two previous studies. For example, in an investigation of two thematically-related, longitudinal medical case histories, Francis and Kramer-Dahl (1992) used participant-process realisations as a means of uncovering some of the stylistic variation in these texts. In another study, Candlin (2000) has effectively shown that this approach can demonstrate how lexicogrammatical indicators of tenor can be used in analysis of nurse-patient interaction. The Francis & Kramer-Dahl study found that there were regular lexicogrammatical means whereby two patients were characterised differently in notes made by two different medical researchers. One researcher described his patient as Agent in many more participant roles associated with material and verbal processes in which others were affected or implicated, and this constructed the identity of the patient as an active participant in his own life. In the work associated with the more 'objective' researcher, on the other hand, this researcher's patient was cast in many more *-ed roles*¹ as well as Agent in processes in which no one was affected or engaged, thus constructing her as an object of study rather than as a self-actualising agent. In the Candlin study, it was found from examining

¹ Hasan (1985) contrasts *-er roles* with *-ed roles*: the *-er* roles are those that take the 'active' or more dynamic role in participant processes - such as Actor in material processes, Senser in mental processes, and Sayer in verbal processes, etc

transcripts of nurse-patient interviews, that there were consistent tendencies on the part of older patients to refer to themselves in *-ed* roles.

4. Social actors as participants in processes: a comment on the analysis from both perspectives.

4.1 Introduction

Although this preliminary study focuses on aspects of the construction of identity at micro level, as a function of the ways in which different writers use the resources of the discourse semantic to co-position themselves within social practices, another overall aim for my research is to attempt to discover patterns of interaction which might help to characterise the context of situation as a whole, at the macro level. As mentioned earlier, two related areas which I wanted to investigate here in order to characterize the tenor of stretches of interaction, are closely related to the nature of both social, and participant roles: in other words, the 'representation of social actors' (following van Leeuwen 1996) as semantic values which may act, in turn, to construe local dimensions of power and solidarity.

4.1.1 Theoretical background

Hasan's notion of the cline of dynamism relates to van Leeuwen's framework for identifying the representation of social actors most closely at the point where social actors are said in his system to be represented as either activated or passivated:

Like activation, subjection can be realised in various ways. It is realised by 'participation' when the passivated social actor is Goal in a material process, Phenomenon in a mental process, or Carrier in an effective attributive process...It can also be realised by 'circumstantialisation' through a prepositional phrase with for instance, *against*...and it can also be realised by 'possessivation'. Usually in the form of a prepositional phrase with *of* postmodifying a nominalisation or a process noun...(van Leeuwen 1996: 44-45)

In comparison, Hasan (1985) describes her model in this way:

"If we define effectuality – or dynamism – as the quality of being able to affect the world around us, and of bringing change into the surrounding environment, the semantic value of the various –er roles must be seen as

distinct. This distinction correlates with two factors: (1) the nature of the Process configuration into which the –er role enters, ie, what other transitivity functions there are within the same clause; and (2) the nature of the carriers of roles, other than the –er role under focus...a human carrier of –er role appears more dynamic than a non-human animate, and the latter appears more so than an object..(p.45)

This means that being a (grammatical) participant Actor related to a process is not sufficient for the construal of dynamism. For example, an Actor in a Goal-less process is less 'dynamic' than an Actor which operates on a participant Goal or Beneficiary, or where the Agent has the role of Sayer. In Hasan's scheme, the least dynamic role is that of Carrier, with the Attributive being suggested as less dynamic (or 'effective') than the possessive.

At the time of writing it is not expected that further correlations will be regularised between the two systems since they refer to different levels of analysis; the lexicogrammatical and the discourse semantic:

..there need not be congruence between the roles that social actors actually play in social practices and the grammatical roles they are given in texts. Representations can reallocate roles, rearrange the social relations between the participants. (van Leeuwen 1996:43)

Nevertheless, such interrelationships were investigated as of interest for this preliminary study, and the findings are discussed further below and in subsequent sections of the module.

4.2 Defining 'Social Actors'

Following van Leeuwen (1996), the representation of social actors is taken to mean any one, or group, referred to - including those not necessarily participating in the immediate conversation as Addressees - extending to those considered 'hidden' in circumstantial and interpersonal adjuncts, grammatical metaphor which may have originated in human activity, or by reference to tools with which human actors might participate in activities. Thus, social actors in some sense need not be realised as human or animate even, since they are constructed in texts as participating in, being subjected to, or affecting social practices in some way. This allows a generous

interpretation of social actors as being potential in all nominal groups, especially those whose meanings involve human activities or processes of some kind.

4.2.1 Impersonalisation

As an example and starting point, van Leeuwen's system of categorisation points out the possibility of *impersonalising* social actors. One of the dimensions he outlines is the dimension *personalisation* <-> *impersonalisation* (1996: 59-60) in which *impersonalisation* involves a further subcategorization of *abstraction* and *objectivation*. *Abstraction* is said to occur when social actors are represented by means of a quality assigned to them by the representation, when represented through qualities or attributes, and usually dependent on endophoric reference. He gives the example 'problems', as a category representing those human actors referred to previously in a text. *Objectivation*, on the other hand, is said to occur when social actors are represented by reference to a place or thing associated with their person or their 'activities': metonymical reference. The main categories van Leeuwen identifies in relation to objectivation are: *spatialisation*, *utterance autonomisation*, *instrumentalisation*, and *somatisation*.

He goes on to point out that *impersonalisation* can have the effect of backgrounding the identity and/or role of social actors, lending impersonal authority or force to the activity or quality of the social actor, or adding positive or negative connotation to an act or utterance of the social actor. In subsequent sections of this module, such realisations of social actors will be examined against other aspects of analysis of the texts. In the following example, it can be seen that the social actors represented in this way can also function to lend a degree of *passivation* to the grammatical Actor in the clause, as Hasan (ibid.) hints at above.

Ex 4.1: *I do feel under the microscope* (2:2)

In van Leeuwen's model, 'under the microscope' objectivates the activities of unspecified people via *instrumentalisation* - the microscope is the instrument which represents a means of intense scrutiny by someone(s). At the same time it serves to *activate* these 'social actors' through its effect on the Subject. Grammatically, the Subject in this clause is Carrier (+ Attribute), and

so the *passivated* "I" takes a relatively less dynamic position [12] on a cline from most active [1] to least active [18] (c.f. Hasan op cit: 46; and below, Tables 4.1 and 4.2). In this case, it would seem that a relatively low degree of dynamism might correlate positively with *passivation*, but it is not always so clearly related in this way. Van Leeuwen would also see the Addresser "I" in this clause as *activated* in relation to the Mental process in which it seems to be involved, and in which it might also be seen to take a Participant role of Senser. In this case, 'double' readings of either strictly grammatical categories and/or more semantically-oriented experiential values have been noted, as explained below.

For the purposes of this study I have produced a slightly amended version of Hasan's cline of dynamism. Please refer to the tables (4.1 and 4.2) which appear below. The values on the cline, or scale, for each Participant-Process relationship found in the respective texts are found in the extreme left hand column of the tables, while the second column from the left, shows the number of clauses (No*) in which each such relationship was found.

In the column displaying the No* of occurrences of Participant-processes in the table below, some numbers appear in parentheses denoting 'shared or double coding' types. This reflects the fact that in cases such as example 4.1 above, and the following 4.2, for example,

Ex 4.2: *Attending a seminar would be viewed suspiciously [as..] (1:20)*

the borderline was hard to maintain between seeing the embedded clause 'Attending a seminar' as a Phenomenon without the Senser, and a strictly relational process reading. These so-called 'shared' participant-processes are therefore separated from the unproblematic occurrences by parentheses. There are a number of these types of non-finite clauses taking a role in the discourse of these texts, which tend to background agency, and suppress the social actors involved. 'Attending a seminar' is something that people do, but these people are not specified, which, in van Leeuwen's model could be termed as *exclusion*, or *indetermination*, since the activity could be undertaken by anyone. In this case, the indetermination might be classed rather, as *inclusion* - of anyone and everyone - which has important implications for the construction of solidarity with the audience.

As well, square [brackets] in the analysis tables are used to denote that a participant-process occurred in an embedded or minor clause. For example, in Ex 4.3 below, there was no process (i.e. a moodless clause), and so the Participant was given a value of 17 on the cline - as Identifier without Identified:

Ex 4.3: *Seminars, maybe, instead of diners.(1:18a)*

*(shared or double codings)

[in embedded clauses]

numbers for **examples** refer to sentence No. in the text.

Table 4.1: Cline of dynamism and text1

value	No *	Transitivity relationship	example
1	1 (1)	Actor + animate Goal	10: *I must fit myself [into]
2	7[1]	Actor + inanimate Goal	8: I must unload some trucks
3		Sayer + Recipient	
4		Sayer + Target/ Verbiage	
5	3 [1]	Actor - Goal	6: I set out [to work]
6	3 [1]	Senser + Phenomenon	29: I can resolve to enjoy the day
7	1	Sayer	27: [as] our quiet emlowe suggests
8	3	Senser	18: I wonder [if it...]
9	2	Behaver	14: We must converse [in writing]
10	5	Carrier + possessed Attribute	1: the concept of task has a rich history
10aa		Beneficiary / Recipient animate Goal - Actor	
11	2[1]	Phenomenon - Senser	12: one (a plan)[that will most likely materialise]
12	22[2]	Carrier + Attribute	13: the concept becomes even more difficult
13		Identified as animate	
14	4 (1)	Identified as inanimate	18: the nature of task [..is to create...]
15	12[5]	Range / Goal - Actor	19: the management meetings are held
16	27[4]	Circumstance	21: [for]not sticking to its task
17	4[2]	Existent / Attribute - Carrier	2: there is a common sense meaning of task [as]
18	17[3]	Qualifier	11: [my goal] for this day

value	No *	transitivity relationship	example
1	2 (1)	Actor + animate Goal	14: [until] Simon set me straight
2	11 (1) [2]	Actor + inanimate Goal	19: [that] I must squeeze some interest [from]
3		Sayer + Recipient	
4	1	Sayer + Target/ Verbiage	12: I have written two passages in posts
5	6 [3]	Actor - Goal	25: I landed on top of her
6	12 (2) [1]	Senser + Phenomenon	20: his Diane child saw the false security in that approach
7	5 (1)	Sayer	19: I would like to talk [about..]
8	8 (2) [1]	Senser	17: I have been surprised [that]
9	1 (1)	Behaver	16: [how] a family responds to its new babies
10	2	Carrier + possessed Attribute	19: I have boring reports
10a	4 [1]	Beneficiary / Recipient animate Goal - Actor	24.1: [one of her posts stated ...to] me
11	2 (1) [1]	Phenomenon - Senser	12: [the choice of a disrupted family] is to wish [..] this possibility
12	20[1]	Carrier + Attribute	13: it is a closed system
13	1	Identified as animate	7: they are the new babies of that family
14	5	Identified as inanimate	13: this was my first observation
15	6 (1) [4]	Range / Goal - Actor	20: [an opportunity] to work out the changes
16	37[3]	Circumstance	23: in such a powerful list
17	3(1)	Existent / Attribute - Carrier	15: [why] there were fears [among the group]
18	26	Qualifier	15: [of] its eventual self absorption

In the tables above there is no category of Identifier minus Identified, but it was felt that at the lower levels of degree of dynamism, such a representation would be akin to Attribute minus Carrier, or Existent, and that therefore, these types of grammatical relationship do not effect a great degree of 'dynamism'. If my perspective were to focus more specifically on the -er roles and less dynamic end of the cline, such categories would perhaps need more delicate distinction. At this point, I do not see the grammatical categorisation as problematic here, mainly because such a representation of grammatical categories as more or less dynamic, needs to be seen as a tendency, rather than as an absolute, and as having fuzzy boundaries. As long as such categorisations are able to highlight textual patternings, and the point of departure is consistent, I believe such categorisation to be useful.

4.3 Moodless clauses

Sentence 1:18a (example 4.3 above) is also interesting for me in its use of ellipsed Subject and Mood elements. This is typically a marked construction in a normal written context, and points to a textual feature of the Mode related to Medium. At the same time, it seems to have value in drawing attention to 'the rhetorical structure of the situation, specifically the roles of speaker and listener' (Halliday 1994: 63). It seems that the nominal group comprising sentence 1:18a, hovers between what Halliday (ibid.) calls anaphoric and exophoric ellipsis, in that it does seem as if 1:18a presupposes the whole of the clause complex which precedes it, but at the same time uses what could easily be seen as a hanging Residue, with Mood understood by reference to context. The rhetorical function of such a move does seem to relate to the construction of the tenor of the text. The degree of 'spokenness' in texts of this type, exemplified in such things as Subject and Mood ellipsis, is not able to be addressed in detail in this module. However, it will be used in discussion of rhetorical staging and the nature of the mode of interaction in Modules 2 and 3.

5. The cline of dynamism: a closer look at the texts

5.1 Overview

These two texts obviously have several similarities in terms of their use of experiential resources. As might have been expected in contexts where language is used reflectively rather than as constitutive of the material context, a prevalence of relational processes is evident in both texts. The texts construct a fairly abstract world of ideas in relationships, rather than overt social actors in relationships.

For this reason, it was decided to make an examination of the types of social actors represented as Participants in clauses other than relational, i.e. as perhaps marked in context, as well as what types of social actors are *impersonalised* in constructing identifications in processes which do relate ideas. What follows is a brief look at these patterns.

5.1.1 Three ranges of dynamism in the texts

In order to get a clearer idea of the relative weightings that each writer gave to the various participant-processes, the values were first grouped into three ranges:

1 - 9:	dynamic range
10 - 14:	relational range
15 - 18:	circumstantial range

The summarised weightings are tabulated in Table 5.1 below.

Table 5.1: Groupings and Values for Participant-Processes in the Texts
Table 5.2: Range of relatively higher weighting in text2

range	Text1	%	Text2	%
1 - 9	20	18.3	44	29
10 -14	29	26.6	34	23
15 - 18	60	55	72	48
	109		150	

Text2	6: Senser + Phenomenon		7: Sayer		8: Senser	
	realisation	No	realisation	No	realisation	No
	I	8	I	2	I	6
	his Diane child	1	it (thinking)	1	my older siblings (metaphor for group members)	1
	she (his Diane child)	1	one of her (Eileen's) posts	2		

Table 5.2: Range of relatively higher weighting in text2

With reference to Table 5.1 above, **text2** appears comparatively more 'active' than **text1** in that values in the more dynamic range are higher for **text2**, while values in the less dynamic ranges are higher for **text1**. Therefore it is in the range of the comparatively higher occurrence of dynamic processes that I begin the discussion.

Reference to all tables already cited will show that most of the categories are fairly evenly weighted, with the greatest difference between the texts evident in the **range 6 - 8** (c.f. above: Tables 4.1 and 4.2). In the case of **text1**, 7 Participant-processes fall into this range, while **text2** evidences 20 occurrences for this same range. What type of Participant-processes, and

what sort of social actors are being highlighted - 'activated' - by these more 'dynamic' realisations? It would appear that, at the level of the lexicogrammar, this writer is constructing herself as more activated in relation to mental processes of sensing, since she is activated as "I" in 14 of these processes.

As a comparison, the same range of participant-process realisations is summarised in Table 5.3 for **text1**.

Firstly, with reference to Table 5.2, representation of the writer as "I" in **text2** relatively frequently realises Senser in mental processes. The same participant-role is also realised by what van Leeuwen calls *specified* social actors - all of whom are members of the group which forms the main topic of the discussion in this text. There is also one representation which van Leeuwen would designate as *collectivised: my older siblings* - which is at the same time functioning at the level of *overdetermination* in an extended metaphor likening the mailing list as 'group', to a 'family' (this area will be explored in more detail below). The one marked Participant from this perspective, is the 'thinking' which is made to function as Sayer.

Table 5.3: Cline values 6 - 8 for text1

Text1	6: Senser + Phenomenon		7: Sayer		8: Senser	
	realisation	No	realisation	No	realisation	No
	I	2	our quiet emlowe	1	I	2
	everyone	1			one	1

In comparison, **text1** is very parsimonious in its use of these mental / verbal participant-roles. One of these is realised by reference to another list member in a similar fashion to that done in **text2**: *our quiet emlowe* (1:27).

Unlike **text2**, however, the two Participant functions in this 'Sensing-Saying' range not otherwise activated by the authorial 'I', are accorded to *indeterminate* social actors: *everyone* and *one*.

5.2 Examples at the dynamic end of the cline

At the more dynamic end of the cline, although both texts do not vary much in their use of Actor +/- Goal participant-processes, they do vary as to what or who are focussed on as dynamic or passivated Participants (and hence, social actors) in these clauses.

At the upper end of the cline, 'Actor + animate Goal', both texts employ reflexive constructions, with themselves (the writer-as-self) in the Goal position:

Ex 5.1: *I must fit myself [into..] (1:10)*

Ex 5.2: *I got myself involved [in..] (2:23)*

These two clauses represent the social actors, the writers themselves, slightly differently, however, and this seems partly the effect of the tenses used. Whereas in **text1**, (Ex 5.1)1:10 uses the habitual present tense to indicate continued 'necessity' through the use of modulated 'must', and a direct action upon himself, **text2**'s use of a similar verbal relationship, employing the past tense, constructs the writer as having been subjected to the involvement by herself, as if she is passive to her own actions. This clause (Ex 5.2), from 2:23, has also been double coded as a relational process (causation), which would place the Addresser's self-positioning here at the less dynamic end of the cline (i.e. a value of [12] - cf Tables 4.1 and 4.2 above), thus helping to contribute to a different overall construction of identity for the writer across the text as a whole. Indeed, in the other (higher dynamic value) Actor + animate Goal clause in **text2**, the writer is in the Goal (or *-ed*) position:

Ex 5.3: *[..until] Simon set me straight (2:14)*

As for processes with Actor + inanimate Goal it is instructive to compare the social actors which occupy Participant positions within these two texts. This is shown in Table 5.4.

(an asterisk* denotes that the process was double-coded)
 [occurred in embedded clause]

Table 5.4: Comparison of Actor + inanimate Goal participant-processes

Text1 SIMON			TEXT2 SARAH		
Actor	Process	Goal	Actor	Process	Goal
I	unload	some trucks	I	(must) squeeze	some interest
I	help	the company	I	(attempted to) do	four things
[it (the Co)	make	a profit	I	(can't) find	the damn thing
we	address	things	*my innocent intent	does little [to change	the fact]
			[mutual love	supports	radical changes
we	produce	academic papers	they (people in exchanges)	risk	the truth
we	maintain	a large data collection	they (babies)	refresh	the group dynamic
we	use	it (task)	they (babies)	disrupt	the pairings
			they (babies)	force	realignment
			[Roy (as father or elder brother)	was assigning	roles
			my innocent intent	does little to change	The fact

Table 5.4: Comparison of Actor + inanimate Goal participant-processes

Whereas the Actors in **text1** are unproblematically acting upon their Goals and are realised by either the Addresser or inclusive-we (specific actors which are *collectivised* in van Leeuwen's terms), the Actors in **text2** construe the world in relatively less straightforward ways. In other words, **text1** positions its Actors as both identified with the Addresser himself, and as effective in relation to material Goals. **Text2**, on the other hand, is a little more complicated in its identification of the Addresser's place in the material world. Where the Addresser (or something *activated* to stand in for Addresser) appears in Participant Actor positions, these are all modalized or modulated to some extent. These 4 clauses are set out below.

Ex 5.4: [*..that*] *I must squeeze some interest from.*(2:19)

Ex 5.5: *I attempted to do four things:* (2:24)

Ex 5.6: *I can't find the damn thing.*(2:24.1)

Ex 5.7: *my innocent intent does little to change the fact.*(2:27)

The clause (example 5.4) from sentence 2:19 is modulated by a high value of obligation, while example 5.5 shows some degree of modulation by an operator of high inclination, *attempted*, since it uses the past tense. In the example 5.6, the Addresser is also cast in the role of having attempted but failed to achieve some goal, while 5.7 uses a type of metaphor of negation - *does little to change* - in other words, one more example of something the Addresser failed in doing.

Apart from the one embedded clause instance of a specified social actor, 'Roy', who was 'assigning roles to members of the group', the rest of the Actors in **Text2** are realised by what van Leeuwen refers to as *genericised* social actors, which are at the same time represented as outside the group, and, in the case of 'new babies', as having power to effect change within groups:

Ex 5.8: *They refresh the group dynamic* (2:8)

Such genericised social actors are generally represented through the use of accompanying 'habitual or universal present tense' (see van Leeuwen 1996: 48) as is evidenced in these examples. The marked Participant here is also

interesting. 'Mutual love' is an abstract quality, and thus not really a human social actor, yet it is *activated* by being 'felt by family members' and accorded supporting power within a family undergoing the changes brought on by the 'new babies' (c.f. appendix A: 2:10). Once more, this use of the extended metaphor of family, is related to the theme of *overdetermination* by *symbolisation* used in the text, which will be discussed in further detail in section 6 below. The use of this metaphor is also indicative of the assumed value system of the addressees, one in which the value of the family as a group is valorised.

It is evident that while the two texts have somewhat similar weightings on the dynamic end of the participant-process cline, the nature of the social actors involved in realising these roles helps to construct textual identities which vary in their way of construing both their experience and the Addresser's relationships with other elements of this experience. This is most evident in the ways that the writers position themselves as 'active' in relation to the other entities referred to in the texts, and especially those entities who are constructed as part of the audience. Whereas the writer of **text1** *affiliates* himself with members of the audience he is addressing by identifying himself as part of various groups including the one he is addressing, and as active in relation to their identified goals, the writer of **text2** *disaffiliates* herself with the group addressed, through identifying herself, in active clauses, with 'new babies' who have the potential to, for example, 'force changes' in the group.

5.3 Relational processes

I now turn to consider the nature of relational processes which form the main clause type evident in both texts, and concentrate on an examination of the types of ideas or things which are construed as being related. In an overall initial comparison, the most obvious difference appears to lie in the large proportion of Carrier roles realised by 'I' in **text2**.

Table 5.5 sets out these relationships for both texts. They are listed in order of most prevalent Carrier type for each text. For this set of examples, the actual processes are not listed since all these processes tend to act in bringing new information and attitudes into the discussion via this attribution.

Text1		Text2	
Carrier	Attribute	Carrier	Attribute
meaning of task	technical term	I	glad
task	an onerous tribute	I	information
[task	analogy]	*I	under the microscope
the concept of task	more difficult	I	ignorant [of B. A.]
posts	like that	I	not ignorant [to life]
the work of our members	partially group product	*I	not very veteran [to..]
task	physicist's 'force'	I	here
task	Susan's 'power'	I	not a graceful diver
force	roots in action [of]	[I	wasn't careful]
force	base analogy [of science]	this (in my experience)	unique [to..]
task	like power and pornography	[I usually find that] exchanges between 2 people	largely superficial
discussion of task	never on task	[it] that I have written 2 passages	not in jest
it	hard to mesh	[it] for me to have [...]	wiser
it	[why that	the choice [of..]	to remove intruder
[that	all important	the choice [of..]	to wish this possibility
all	well		
cup	on the floor	ND	not a dysfunctional family
I	one to see task [as	it (ND)	a closed system
we	on task	it (ND)	a by-invitation-only group
we	very productive	he	honest
being a work group	morally healthy and good	*no one	the presence [of..]
*being part of a collection [in..]	a promotion earned		

(an asterisk* denotes that the process was double-coded)
[occurred in embedded clause, or is not part of Participant]

Table 5.5: Carrier and Attribute realisations in the two texts

It seems obvious that the two texts differ in their representations of Carrier in relational processes. In **text1**, the only occurrence of the authorial 'I' in this participant-role is made in order to make further definitions of the 'nature of task', which in turn is part of the extended metaphor favoured in this text. Most of the Carrier roles are indeed taken up with ideas or concepts in **text1**, *abstractions* (or perhaps *objectivations* dependent on whether 'task' is seen as a quality or an instrument. cf. van Leeuwen 1996: 59), which are related finally to the notion of task. **Text2**, on the other hand, allocates 9 Carrier roles to 'I', and a further 4 to Carriers responsibility for which is concurrently located in the Addresser. In Appraisal terms these might be labelled as ENGAGEMENT: intra-vocalisation - *in my experience; for me; if I had learned*. Examples 5.9 and 5.10 below, show that the other Carrier roles are also related to the Addresser in some way.

Ex 5.9: *I even assumed that it had been an invitation-only-group [until..] (2:14)*

Ex 5.10: *I was surprised that no one identified the presence of an Active New member [as..] (2:17)*

These two examples clearly demonstrate that even some relational processes in **text2** could be categorised grammatically as projected Phenomena by the Addresser in the role of Senser. Furthermore, in the example 5.10 above, the 'Active New member', in representing a social actor as a *functionalised* category, also alludes to the Addresser herself as that 'active new member'. Although nowhere in the text does it explicitly identify the writer as having this function in the group, the interrelationship of *overdetermination* of social actors teamed with the high degree of self reference in the text makes it more than likely that these are co-referential (cf Appendix A: **text2** and Table 6.2 below). The nature of *overdetermination* in each of the two texts will be taken up in the next section in more detail.

5.4 Summary

Within these two short texts at least, and to the extent that the commentary has extended so far, an examination of participant-processes as more or less dynamic in nature has revealed a number of tendencies on the part of each of the writers in their construction of personal identity as a

function of experiential values. Although weightings accorded to process types within each text were not extremely differentiated, the types of social actors occupying these grammatical roles in the discourse did serve to show some differences in self and other positioning in the texts of the respective writers: **text1** positioned the writer himself and the other group members as effective in the work and tasks which they undertook, while **text2** positioned the writer as subjected to outside influences and as concerned with the inner world of feelings and thoughts. In this way, the overall relationship construed between the Addresser and the audience in **text1** is one of solidarity and equal status, as opposed to that construed in **text2** in which relationships of unequal status and a low degree of contact are prevalent. Their respective orientation to ideas and associations of ideas was revealed to some extent in their choice of Carrier in relational processes, which figured prominently in both texts: **text1** was concerned to more precisely consider the connotations of the notion of 'task' in general and 'common sense' terms, while **text2** was more concerned to exteriorise the writer's personal experience of her participation in groups.

The nature of the representation of these *overdetermined* social actors - Addresser, groups, and individual group members - will form the main area of examination in the next sections.

6. Overdetermination and the representation of social actors.

6.1 The nature of Overdetermination

According to van Leeuwen, "*Indetermination* occurs when social actors are represented as unspecified 'anonymous' individuals or groups, *determination* when their identity is, one way or another, specified" (op cit: 51), and *overdetermination* represents social actors as occupying several social roles, or being responsible for a great array of social practices. Such means of introducing social actors into a text will have consequences in the overall construction of these actors as significant or as relatively backgrounded. It is important here to distinguish the notion of *backgrounding* from that of 'relative significance'. Writers of any text may have strategic goals in mind when they background certain (sets of) social actors in specific ways. Analysing the ways in which certain social actors are introduced into a text may highlight particular patterns of social actor construction and point to stylistic or conventional means of referring to such social actors. Relative significance, on the other hand, is related to 'markedness', and so it is conceivable, for example, that a specific social actor may be 'backgrounded' and at the same time be made significant in a text where similar/different social actors have not been backgrounded in the same way.

As already noted, **text1** displays a number of occurrences of *indetermination*; for example, when the writer refers to '*everyone* knows what it (task) is' (1:27) and 'if we use it (task) correctly, *all* will be well' (1:27). These appear in some of the examples in tables in the last section. The 'everyones' referred to are not *nominated* or specified, and are therefore *suppressed* in van Leeuwen's terms. In another example, one of the writer's stated 'goals for the day' is 'to hurt *no one* on purpose'(1:11). **Text2** has a similar small amount of undifferentiated social actors, but as the text unfolds, these *indetermined* anonymous social actors take on a metaphorical importance in *overdetermining* the activities they are portrayed as undertaking, as well as drawing a symbolic relationship between these distant fictional characters and the members and activities of the mailing list to which **text2** refers. (the nature of *overdetermination* in the two texts is

discussed in detail in section 6.2 which follows). For example, a relationship between anonymous *indetermined* social actors is effected in the following relational identifying clause, in which *new members in any group* are made the Identifier for the Identified value.

Ex 6.1: *New members in any group are the lifeblood of the group.*(2:7)

In this clause 'the lifeblood of the group' is identified with a definite article as a given value which only needs identifying. The lexical item *lifeblood*, a metaphor - or *abstraction* - is understood to carry with it positive connotations, and it is by this method that *new members in any group*, a fictional *indetermined* category in van Leeuwen's terms, are positively evaluated. Relationships between similar sets of social actors are made repeatedly within the text and such repetition sets up a series of parallel associations and relationships in which the social actors involved are *overdetermined* through the use of what van Leeuwen (op cit: 62) categorises as *symbolisation*. This type of strategy, of setting up an evaluative stance towards social actors and/or practices by means of repetition and parallelism, appears related to Labov's (1972: pp 378-392) categories of evaluative elements, especially that of *correlative*. The discussion will return to the textual relationships construed in **text2**, after first outlining the means by which **text1** also constructs its significant actors against a background of *overdetermined* practices, but with a slightly different orientation.

6.2 Overdetermination in text1

Overdetermination operates in **text1** in a similar fashion to that outlined above with reference to **text2**, that is, by repetition and association. For **text1**, however, the means by which this is achieved is more akin to what van Leeuwen terms *connotation*, together with what he calls *distillation* "which connects social actors to several social practices by abstracting the same feature from the social actors involved in these social practices" (op cit: 64). **Text1** abstracts the discussion to such an extent that the *distillation* process appears in reverse. Indeed, the most prominent 'social actor' in **text1** is not, strictly speaking, a social actor at all, but the *distilled* and *abstracted* notion of 'task'. Those social actors who fulfil 'tasks' are not

entirely *backgrounded* or *suppressed*, however. They are generally *activated* in the service of *overdetermining* the nature of task as something which all human agents undertake, and hence, as representing 'common experience'. At the same time, these social actors are represented in *genericised* classes, and via the use of *objectivation* in many instances. In the following example, **text1** uses a similar device to that employed in example 6.1(2:7) above:

Ex 6.2: *Not only is there a common sense meaning of task as the job to be done, but it is a technical term in Bion's group psychology.(1:2)*

In this example, 'a common sense meaning of task' is said to exist, and it is further circumstantialised as something which social actors do: 'the job to be done', suggesting that there is always such a job in existence, however, the social actors - those who undertake the job - do not need to be *specified*. This *job to be done*, is sourced outside the text in a generic meta-phenomenon, realised as an *abstraction*, or perhaps as an *aggregation* of many people's understanding of the world (cf. van Leeuwen op cit: 49; since van Leeuwen defines 'aggregation' as referring to groups with a numerative, then perhaps *common sense* is better classed as a metaphor of connotation). This refers to the nature of reality, perhaps, according to most people - an *abstraction*, a *commonplace* or *topoi*. In any case, at the same time, an expectation is set up by the textual Theme *not only*, so that we expect there to be more than one *meaning of task*. 'Task' is then given the status of a technical term in the group psychology of the *specified* and *nominated* Bion, who is thereby *activated* in his role as originator and possessor of a technical field of expertise. Bion then becomes the extra-vocalised attributed source of the idea that

Ex 6.3: *..being a work group in accomplishment of a task is not only healthy but morally good. (1:4)*

Throughout **text1**, the writer manages to authorise his propositions regarding the nature of task by reference to intertextual and extra-textual entities, thus creating an ideological affiliation with an array of social actors with which he knows the audience is also able to affiliate - via his long membership in the group alluded to in the first clause complex. In Table 6.1

below, these referents (identified as *conduits*) are made more obvious - for example: *here* (the mailing list); *Bion*; *common sense*; *seminars*; *my company*; *Netdynam* (the mailing list); *we* (members of the mailing list); *science*; and so on. The 'concept of task' continues as theme and Carrier of attributes which line up according to which social actors are said to partake in tasks, in what way, and where. The idea of 'task' having already been valorised at the beginning of the text (Ex 6.3), the writer then goes on to associate a variety of entities and persons with this concept. In the following table (6.1) some of these notions, social actors, and the processes which help define them, are grouped in sets which the writer of this text relates through a variety of associative devices. The notions are generally all either synonymous with 'task' or made comparable to 'task' in some way. What I have here called 'conduits' are the means, actors or places and events which activate or 'authorise' propositions defining the 'doing of tasks' in the text, and which are then further defined by activities undertaken at these places, events or circumstances, which further help to define the 'nature of task' for the reader. Hoey (1991 [1983]: pp 115-133) describes this form of textual cohesion as the construction of matching patterns set up throughout a text, which act to relate sets of actors in particular ways. I believe that such matching patterns are both a means of structuring a text, and at the same time, a means of defining the groups so associated. This is discussed in more detail in the following section, but it can be seen that in such a way, the writer's value system is being set out in this text through the construction of his alignment with certain sets of social practices related to the valorised notion of 'task'. Audience members are therefore 'interpellated', even if not explicitly nominated, as being in alignment with this ideological framework, and this is explicitly foregrounded in the first clause of this text, when the writer makes reference to the previous discussion of task by listmembers 'here' (cf below section 6.3).

Table 6.1: Overdetermination of 'task' as a positively evaluated social activity in text1

notions	conduits	defining activities and attributes
The concept of task	here	has rich history
" "	common sense meaning	the job to be done
technical term	in Bion	being a work group in accomplishment of a task
The nature of task	" "	healthy and morally good
" "	a certain ambience	use technical or academic words, words associated with pain and work and paying our dues
(task as)analogy	I	tax or onerous duty to be paid
attending a seminar	seminars	=
tasks	=	which activities
" "	=management meetings	being part of the collection in the diner across the street
"	our company	=
"	diners	promotion earned
"	=	keeping one's nose to the grindstone
"	the forklifts	=
my job	I	have tasks, unload trucks, fit myself
our task	Netdynam (the name for group)	=
"	we (us)	address things like the net, ourselves on the net, groups on the net, must converse in writing
the concept of task	on email	more difficult
=	the work of our members	Write academic papers, have web page, IRC channel, maintain extensive data collection
=	"	partially group product
our job	this day	to survive
my goal	this day	a fluid plan
"	"	to have a pleasant day, to tell no lies, to hurt no one, to be a good citizen
concept of task	=	discussion of task
=	posts like this	on task
=task		defies definition
base analogy	science	pointing at circumstances
power	Susan	
force	physicist	
force of gravity	on the floor	cup fell
	our quiet emlowe	follow Wittgenstein
what it (task) is	everyone	knows
it	roots	in the action of human muscle

6.3 Favoured representations of social actors in text1

An examination of the main actors in the table above will show that many social actors are either not mentioned or *objectivated* by reference to places

or instruments that stand in for the human participants who might act at such places, or in using such instruments. *Spatialisation* is realised by *here* (1:1), *there* (1:10) (co-referring to *my company* (1:9 & 1:19)), and perhaps *the net* (1:16), *on email* (1:13), *seminars*, and *diners* (1:18a - 20), although these might overlap with representation by *instrumentalisation*. Grammatically speaking, none of these are Participants, and appear in Circumstances of Location, as might be expected.

At the same time, 'here' is, strictly-speaking, nowhere. It appears in the centre column of the table above, which shows the relationships engendered between the different relevant actors or 'conduits' in *text1*'s argument. This central column is generally made up of actors - or events, places, or generic collections representing actors - which have been backgrounded in some way, which seems strange given their status as extra-vocalised authorities for many of the argument's propositions. They appear, as with 'here', as conduits, or exemplars for the main qualities that they share in representing tasks or related notions - for example, *science*, *physicists*, in *Bion* (a theory), *seminars* and so on. When they represent specific individuals, they are usually *activated* through *possessivation*, e.g. *Susan's 'power'* and *Bion's group psychology*. Although 'our quiet emlowe' has been *passivated* (*subjectivated*) through being represented as a possession of the group, he has also been *activated* through being represented in a relatively dynamic Participant-process as Sayer, a role that is marked as far as this text is concerned (cf. Table 5.3).

Thus, 'here' functions to *objectivate* and *background* the members of the group who the writer is addressing 'here' as well. Coming as it does in the initial sentence of the text, in some ways it acts to *spatialise* what in fact is located nowhere and everywhere - an occasional semantic oddity, or common metaphor, in texts in this mode - and it serves thereby to locate the discussion of this concept amongst these group members, as its overall theme - and also with an acknowledgement of its 'rich history' within the group. In other words, the whole initial clause functions in the context of the post as what I would call (stretching White, 1998) ENGAGEMENT: extra-vocalisation - operating in this instance heteroglossically (although perhaps not *dialogistically* - Module 2 will take up point) to allude to other voices, as well as to project the potential response of the audience members he is

addressing - many of whom had previously contributed to the conversations which together comprise this 'here'.

6.3.1 The nature of the constructed relationships in text1

Whereas the middle column in the table above tends to list the main *social* actors represented in the text, the column on the far left¹ is comprised of those entities which are represented as more or less analogous with 'task'. The activities or qualities associated with being 'on task' are listed in the column to the far right. This has been done in order to show the means by which the *distillation* of qualities associated with 'task' has been achieved using ideas, statements and reports from a variety of vaguely specified social actors, represented in turn by means of *spatialisation* or *instrumentalisation*, or in some cases, a mixture, such as *posts* (1:17) and *science* (1:26) which might also be considered *utterance automisation* in van Leeuwen's model. The general argument seems to be that in these places, or under these people's authority, the concept of 'task' functions in related capacities, with this array of identifying features.

6.3.2 The nature of 'task' in text1

The 'concept of task' is mainly realised throughout the body of the text as either Carrier or Attribute in relational attributive processes (cf. Table 5.5 above) or as Identified in relational identifying processes. In the final paragraph, however, it occupies the grammatical role of Phenomenon and Goal, with *everyone* and *we* as the respective Sensors and Actors. This seems significant for the overall discourse structure, or rhetorical staging of the text as a whole, since it is therefore marked intra-textually. This is also teamed with, as mentioned previously, the only occurrence in the text of a Sayer (minus Verbiage or Recipient - i.e. a value of [7], cf. Table 5.4 above) which would tend to concentrate textual 'tension' in this area of the text and contribute to its significance in terms of rhetorical staging.

¹ Most of them also have roughly an 'of' semantic relationship to the term to the immediate left (*possessivated*), for example, 'the power *of* Susan', the base analogy *of* science', 'the technical term *of* Bion', i.e. n *of* n

The only unambiguous use of *instrumentalisation*, in reference to a place (or activity which occurs there), rather than a social actor at all, also occurs in the final clause complex, with a reference to the writer's workplace by the use of *the forklifts* (1:30), and this seems to have a genuine metaphoric orientation, coming as it does at the end of the text, as a type of coda.

Strangely, given that this text focuses on the idea of task, workgroup, and achievement, there is no great disparity between, or favouring of, the representation of the social actors involved in terms of either *functionalisation* or *identification* (cf. van Leeuwen op cit: 55). In his model, *functionalisation* is a means whereby social actors are referred to in terms of what they do, such as their professional status or job, rather than what they are. In other words, when human social actors do appear at all in **text1**, representation is fairly evenly divided between each of these 2 means.

6.4 Overdetermination in text2

As mentioned earlier, **text2** *overdetermines* its social actors via what van Leeuwen calls *symbolisation*, effected by means of the introduction of fictional classes of social actors who are then identified with relatively more specific entities. The second passage in the text in particular, operates by constructing an extended metaphor based around new babies and families as generic classes which are then identified with new members in any group, and further linked to the writer's status as new member of 'this' group.

Ex 6.4: *New members in any group are the lifeblood of the group...they are the new babies of that family. They refresh the group dynamic. But like new babies they disrupt the pairings and interrelatedness of pairings in the family and force realignment of its habitual patterns. (2.7-8)*

The table below sets out these relationships.

Table 6.2 Groups overdetermined by association in text2

individuals/ individual quality	nature of group/ area of activity	conditions, qualities of relationship
any new member	any group	
new babies	that family	
myself	this group	
lifeblood	the group	
they (new babies)	groups/ families	refresh group dynamic
new babies	any family	disrupt pairings
		force realignment of habitual patterns
new baby	some families + mutual love	change without pain
new baby	some families + underlying hostilities / scarcity of fulfilling interactions	baby seen as usurper of comfort and security
	choice of disrupted family	remove (baby) intruder/ wish or fantasise removal
	Netdynam ≠ disrupted family	
	Netdynam = closed system	
(new baby)	family = open system	how responds (to new baby and outside influences)
active new member	group (Netdynam)	source of new list activity, discussions and threads
myself	list protocol, list jargon, the net	ignorant
myself	life	not ignorant
myself	the water	jumped in
myself	Eileen	landed on top

6.5 The metaphor of 'family' and possessivation in text2

The overall aim of this text seems to be to draw parallels between the writer in her role as new member of the email group, and the role of new baby in a family. The new baby role is linked with positive attributes, while the fictional family group with 'underlying hostilities' wish to remove the new baby who is seen as 'intruder', and is therefore negatively evaluated via implication, together with the construction of a value system in which such families are assumed to be negatively evaluated.

This metaphor is further extended in the roles given to those social actors who are specified either as individuals via *nomination* in the text, or as *collectives*, for example,

Ex 6.5: *[..] Roy, as father or elder brother, was assigning roles for the purpose of helping my older siblings feel safer, more important and loved, but his Diane child saw the false security in that approach [..] (2:20)*

In this manner, the email list as family is explicitly *determined*, and through this metaphor, veteran list-members are *passivated* through *possessivation* as *my older siblings*. At the same time, this *activates* the writer, who positions herself as the younger sibling, and hence, the new baby influence who may have necessitated the reassurances that Roy, in his role *as father or brother*, is dealing out to those older siblings. Another listmember is positioned here as part of the family, but is yet *subjectivated* in relation to Roy: *his Diane child*. This whole clause complex is projected by *my assumption*, however, and this is one of the most prevalent ways in which the writer is *activated* in the text - through *possessivated* nominal groups which refer to her intentions or behaviour: *my expectation*, *my identity*, *my experience* (2:3); *my indignation* (2:6); *my first observation*, *my former observerhood* (2:13); *my Systems Theory* (2:15); *my impressions* (2:19); *my veteran ways at list talk* (2:21); *my first post* (2:24); *my buttons* (2:24.2); *my only regret* (2:25); *my innocent intent* (2:27); *my behaviour* (2:28). In terms of the experiential, very few of these *possessivated* nominal groups take Participant roles, and those that do are in relational identifying clauses (cf. Table 5.5 above, and appendix C: text2 - Nominal groups). Most of these groups are part of either Qualifiers or Circumstantials, as might be expected, and in some ways, this serves to undermine any effective dynamic

social role such *activation* might have suggested. It is therefore interesting to note which realisations of this type are marked to the extent that they *do* take Participant-process roles.

6.5.1 Aspects of the rhetorical staging of text2

In 2:16, 'my Systems Theory' is analysed as the Phenomenon that the writer has forgotten most of, if *most of* is classed as *enumerator*. This clause complex (2:16) does seem to function in the staging of the text as a boundary, where her previous conjectures on the nature of the 'list as group' are completed, and the writer wants to make a more explicit evaluative statement using *Systems Theory* as her extra-vocalised authority, which she does in the next and final clause complex of this section (paragraph) in the text:

Ex 6.6: *An open system is not defined by public archives and open subscription, it is defined by how a family responds to its new babies and external influences. (2:17)*

The writer's strategy here seems directed at the list in particular, and indirectly the listmembers themselves, since the link between *any family* and *any group* has already been plainly drawn, as well as the link between the writer and the putative new baby/new member of this group, the email list itself. Furthermore, the list (Netdynam) has already been explicitly labelled as 'in many ways a closed system'.

In this clause complex alone, the representation of social actors via

- *genericisation* - 'a family', 'its new babies';
- *abstraction* - 'an open system', 'external influences'; and
- *objectivation* - 'public archives' (instrumentalisation? utterance automatisaion?)

is quite evident, and points to the construction of an experiential world in which human actors are only referred to indirectly. The function of this use of reference to social actors, especially at this juncture of the text, may prove to be a recurrent pattern of this writer's style (investigated in Module 3). The social actors referred to in this way are certainly *backgrounded* or *suppressed*, and yet this clause complex is located in a pivotal position in the development

of the text overall, as it refers to actors which form its main topic: the list and its older members, as well as its newer members - of which the writer is the most salient.

6.5.2 Definition, staging and interpersonal meanings: an example from text2

The writer's interactive orientation here is what I propose to term 'veiled directive' in that it makes predictions about the way in which behaviour of represented social actors may be judged in future if they do not do what is suggested, or if they do not heed the 'advice' given. In other words, the group, and the members who comprise it, are liable to be evaluated negatively in future, if their response to 'new babies and external influences' does not meet the criteria of definition for 'an open system'. The implications are clear, but the way it is phrased is not. One of the interesting features of the grammar in this clause-complex is its use of negative polarity in the first finite clause. In Appraisal terms, this signals an ENGAGEMENT value (outlined in greater detail in Module 2) which both acknowledges the existence of the alternative view, and at the same time operates to shut it down. Such an alternative view is thus indirectly attributed to the 'Ideal Readers' of this text, and this view is then defined as wrong in the light of the correct definition given in the following clause. This pattern: A is not defined by 'x', A is defined by 'y' would probably operate to construe the Addresser's *disaffiliation* with the Ideal Readers (Hearers) in most contexts.¹ This is mainly due to the effect that negation has in implying counter-expectation, or denial of presuppositions on the part of projected audience members (see for example, Jordan 1998 and Pagano 1994).

Therefore, it is possible that members of the group so addressed, and indirectly chided for their response to new members, might respond in turn with some form of displeasure, a need to account for themselves, or the group to which they have been assigned membership. This is because the paragraph in context can be seen to function as negatively evaluating the group, and as making some claims to direct or command the future behaviour

¹ Although, there would no doubt be areas in which co-textual signals would act to clearly disambiguate the intended Addressees, and thus the disaffiliation might be directed elsewhere. The query 'not+1,2by' was investigated in the whole cobuild corpus, which gave 43 instances of the expression 'not defined by', only three of which matched the pattern in the example sentence. However, even in cases where an alternative 'definition' was not offered, the negative did appear to deny a position constructed as held by 'ideal readers'.

of its members. Such a stance can be seen as encoding an interpersonal relationship of unequal power at the level of tenor: the writer constructs herself as having the power to influence and disrupt the pairings and stability of the family/group, as well as to threaten the future characterisation of its members should they continue to behave in such negatively evaluated ways.

She thus 'dis-aligns' her own value system with that represented by the social practices of the group members, and this serves to distance herself from them along the axis of value system (axiology) (c.f. Appendix 3: Interpersonal discourse semantic network). This is plainly different from the positioning adopted in **text1** as seen above. At the same time, she constructs herself as a new baby, as a younger sibling in this sense, with all the lack of power that this position might entail. Within this family-role functionality at the level of culture and institutions, she also constructs a tenor relationship of close *contact*, or *familiarity*, with Roy (as *father* or *older brother*: a power figure) and Eileen (highly valorised via characterisation as 'honest', 'courteous', 'courageous'). This helps to show that in these texts at least, such tenor relationships are to some degree effected via positioning moves in both experiential participant-process patterning, and participant-role realisations in social actor roles.

6.5.3 Indicators of pre-closing stage in text2

The final two clause-complexes in **text2** also use *possessivated* nominal groups as Participants - more interestingly, as Actors in material processes. This last clause (2:28) is also marked by Residue ellipsis. A temporal adjunct, *henceforth*, teamed with a modal finite element *might* orients towards the future, with *my behaviour* is cast as an Actor with a somewhat low probability of success. Other studies under the rubric of 'Conversation Analysis' (c.f. Antaki 1994: 89) have shown that conversations tend to incorporate a pre-closing sequence in which *phase shifts* occur through a change of orientation from past or present events, to that of future possibilities. The *pre-closing* rhetorical unit of the proposed exchange structure of the email list posts in Don (1997) was also noted to display this feature¹.

¹ In further more extensive studies of a variety of email texts of this type - in Module 3 in particular, I hope to find correlative patterns between the lexicogrammar of section/paragraph/post-pen/ultimate clause complexes, and their evaluative positioning, as a function of both intra- and extra-textual 'rhetorical structure potential'. In effect, 'boundary moves'.

6.5.4 Summary of findings for text2

As pointed out earlier (cf. Table 5.2 above) this writer tends to favour positioning herself as the active Participant in processes of Sensing and Saying - these participant-roles are realised by 16 instances of first person pronouns. Furthermore, the writer (as 'me', 'myself') also realises some Recipient, Beneficiary, or Goal roles in this text. The types of social actors realising grammatical Actor roles in material processes with inanimate Goals was discussed earlier in relation to the nature of the processes in which the writer positioned herself (cf. Ex 5.2 above). In most of these, the writer positions herself as attempting, though not necessarily achieving Goals. The writer also represents herself as Actor in Goal-less processes, which are at the same time linked with passive or unsuccessful behaviour: [- from] *where I sit* (2:22); [*in knowing that*] *I had to jump [into the water(list conversation)]*; *I wasn't more careful [where I landed]*; *I landed on top of her* (2:25).

Altogether, this writer, by a series of moves in which she positions the self-as-Addresser as ineffective except in the role of Senser, and as likened to a new baby in a vaguely hostile family, constructs herself as somewhat powerless and dependent in relation to other group members, even those with whom she claims solidarity, such as Eileen and Roy. However, this is contrasted by her covert construction of herself as having the power to effect changes via the functional and institutionally-constituted role of new baby. In effect, she constructs herself as a threat to those list members with whom she disaffiliates, and this threat is made overtly in the final rhetorical unit¹ of the whole text, which appears in appendix A, but which has not been analysed for this study:

Ex 6.7: *I know there are people here who fear me, they have reason to, I am not safe. I am as dangerous as anyone here who is willing to be honest. (2:33 - 2:34)*

1 As referred to earlier, precise grammatical boundaries of the 'rhetorical unit' (or 'prosod') have not been determined in this module: this term is used as superordinate for those moves and move complexes which may be short statements, or longer stretches of text, effecting some positioning strategy on the discourse semantic level. This topic will be addressed in later modules. Meantime, see Appendix 1, section 1, for discussion.

7. Conclusion

7.1 Characterisation of other participants

In terms of positioning and the construction of interpersonal relationships, this study has concentrated on the Addresser, or writer of the text, as the main node of interest. However, similar analyses of these same texts can also provide more detailed characterisations of the projected audience and its members - as either ideal Addressees (and therefore ideal 'respondees': the next Addresser), or Ideal Readers (Overhearers: ratifiers and/or potential next Addressers) as the point of departure. Texts may be analysed by looking at the ways in which solidarity is claimed via positioning moves which attempt to construct relationships of close CONTACT or ALIGNMENT, or areas for contention and DISAFFILIATION. Any addressed or referred-to participants might be characterised, or positioned, by consistent means, and analysis of these types of textual patterns would allow a textual 'identikit' to be constructed of the imagined (i.e. 'ideal') other participants, contributors, or interlocutors. The positioning moves and tenor relationships enacted by one writer/contributor's texts, or a more general set of contributions, could be used to build up such a construction of the 'other'.

The following tables show where such an analysis might begin, by defining a certain set of groups of social actors, and then noting how they are named or referred to in each text. The analysis below could be further refined by reference to patterning in terms of transitivity and related 'dynamism', or effectuality, as has been outlined in earlier sections of this module. In other words, the same types of analysis conducted here, need only be approached from a different starting point.

Several lines of investigation would prove fruitful from such a starting point. For example, the ways in which individual listmembers are represented or positioned in each text - as part of a comparison between sets of texts, or as a set of representations of specific listmembers/participant-posters. The representation of specific posters in these texts could then be compared with how these same posters tend to position or represent themselves in their own contributions. In this way, an insight could be gained into how list identities are constructed over time, or how listmembers might feel the need to resist

perceived representations of themselves.

Table 7.1: Text1 - 6 group-types and their occurrence

	included	backgrounded	suppressed
self	10: [3;6;7;8;10;11;18; 24; 25; 29]	3: [5; 11; 12]	
inclusive-we , assumed knowledge/ agreement	(12?)	3: [13; 18; 23]	4: [1; 2; 13; 17]
ND /the group	6: [14; 16; 17; 23; 21; 22; 23]	6: [1; 14; 17; 23; 23; 23]	1: [27]
other groups , institutions	9: [2; 4; 4; 9; 16; 16; 16; 19;24]	6: [6; 10; 10; 19; 23; 30]	6: [11; 12; 18; 18; 18a; 24]
individual listmembers	2:	1: [23]	
other individuals	1: [27]	7: [11; 11; 25; 26; 26; 26; 27]	3: [11; 20; 20]

Table 7.2: Text2 - 6 groups and their occurrence

	included	backgrounded	suppressed
self	24	14	1
inclusive-we , assumed knowledge/ agreement			
ND/ this group	2	14	8
other groups , institutions	9	5	
individual listmembers	6:	10	
other individuals	8	3:	

7.1.2 Comment on example tables

In the two texts analysed, the same individual listmembers and social actors are not all referred to, but some idea of the way each writer or text represents the listmembers-as-a-group may be judged by listing the attributes assigned to the group. As a start, a difference in alignment may easily be seen by observing that in **text1**, the group itself is often referred to by the use of the first person plural, inclusive-we, while reference to the listmembers in **text2** is more often effected by the use of second and third person forms (you, your, they) and metaphors which refer to collectives (family, closed system).

7.1.2.1 Inclusive versus exclusive 'we'

In this area, a problem of categorisation presented itself in the case of **text1**: in Table 7.1 above, there was a question over the number of occurrences of inclusive-we (12). Some difficulty was encountered in deciding whether the instances of 'we' in **text1**, while obviously referring to the group as a whole, also assumed 'agreed knowledge' - or whether 'we' referred to the group more 'objectively' (the difference between "culture" and "society")¹. The writer, in other words, occasionally seems to distance himself from the group, which becomes, in these cases, the object of his own commentary much in the way that a *homodiegetic* participant in a narrative can also operate as an *extradiegetic narrator* (Genette 1980, 1988). In this way, the Addresser acknowledges participation in the group so represented, but speaks as if he were an observer of 'us'/'our behaviour'. This style of extradiegetic narration where the narrator or 'real writer' is also a character or participant in her/his own story, I believe is a significant feature in the construction of textual identity in the contexts of these types of written speech communities, and therefore needs to be taken into account in future studies.

7.2 Summary

Of course, any characterisation of other participants or Addressees, must, at the same time act to characterise writers themselves since audience

¹ The problem of how to differentiate between inclusive and exclusive 'we' has been addressed in many studies in the past (see for example Mühlhäusler & Harré 1990), and this is not the place to address the wider implications here.

members, and all social actors, only come into 'existence' in relationship. This module has shown that analysis of patterns of transitivity and identification of social actors in any text can provide one of the means for characterising the relationships constructed between the identities it creates, and beyond this, provides one of the means for construing the nature of the social practices or norms of interaction which are negotiated in the constitution of any community of practice.

Module 3 will use this framework of analysis, amongst others, in a study of several texts by each of three posters in order to show patterns of self and other positioning which will contribute to a characterisation of poster style, as well as to a model of common text organisational patternings, or local 'rhetorical structure potential'. This framework will also be used to highlight ways in which ideological assumptions are presented as common or expected in this particular written speech community.