

THE INTERVIEW GENRE UNDER A DISCOURSE-BASED VIEW OF LANGUAGE

Gabriela Quatrin Marzari©

RESUMO[©]

Este artigo apresenta uma análise sucinta do gênero textual *entrevista*, a partir de uma concepção de linguagem que considera a noção de discurso. Ao estudar este gênero, parto do princípio de que a análise textual pura e simples de uma dada entrevista seria insuficiente para justificar seu(s) propósito(s) de produção. Deste modo, considero também fundamental a análise das interações sociais que, apesar de materializadas através de recursos lingüísticos, compreendem os participantes do discurso e suas ações comunicativas (verbais e não-verbais). Com base na identificação e sistematização das regularidades desse gênero, que considera tanto os aspectos lingüísticos quanto os extralingüísticos, proponho seu entendimento e análise no intuito de possibilitar aos usuários da língua, especialmente entrevistadores e entrevistados, um melhor desempenho durante esse evento comunicativo.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: interação verbal, gênero textual, Análise do Discurso

INTRODUCTION

Considering that language is used to express different ideas and interests, one could characterize it as being *systemic* and *functional* (Christie, 1999: 759). In other words, language is *systemic* because it offers different and significant systems for the realization of specific meanings. However, Christie (idem: ibidem) states that rather than being considered *systemic*, language should be seen as *polysystemic* since speakers and writers may combine its available linguistic structures, involving many systems simultaneously, to construct particular and purposeful meanings.

In addition, language is said to be *functional* because its organization reveals "the purposes for which any natural language came into being" (Christie, idem: ibidem). As Christie (idem: 759-60) asserts, the functional nature of language is theorized in terms of three *metafunctions*: the *ideational*, which is related to the events represented through language, or the content of the message; the *interpersonal*, which refers to the way people linguistically interact

with each other; and the *textual*, which is based on the principle of language as coherent messages.

To sum up Christie's arguments, when people make use of language, they make choices within the various linguistic systems. By doing that, they represent the *ideational*, *interpersonal*, and *textual* meanings of language. Thus, language should be understood as a *text*, that is, a piece of language that attends a social purpose (Christie, idem: 760).

According to Bhatia (1993: 19), "the structures and forms of the conventionalized occasions themselves signify the functions, the purposes of the participants, and the desired goals of that occasion". Having asserted that, I have observed that there is an inherent relationship between language use and its specific situations. That means that each communicative context requires the use of language in a particular way.

What is more, written or spoken language is associated with different linguistic products. In accordance with McCarthy & Carter (1994), they reveal different *modes*, "the choices that the sender makes as to whether features normally associated with speech or writing shall be included in the message, regardless to the medium in which it is to be transmitted" (idem: ibidem: 04), or "types of language use which are conventionally related to different contexts and different types of discourse" (idem, ibidem: 08).

As a result, language has to be classified in different *genres*. The term *genre* can be understood, based on Bhatia's studies (1993: 13-4-5), as

a recognizable communicative event characterized by a set of communicative purpose(s) identified and mutually understood by the members of the professional or academic community in which it regularly occurs. (...) it most often is a highly structured and conventionalized communicative event. (...) various genres display constraints on allowable contributions in terms of their intent, positioning, form and functional value. (...) these constraints are often exploited by the expert members of the discourse community to achieve private intentions

within the framework of socially recognized purpose(s).

Considering what has been mentioned, the term genre can be defined as a communicative event where either speakers or writers express different purposes through linguistic and discursive resources that are possibly decoded by their hearers or readers. Thus, one might observe that genres are determined by their *communicative purpose(s)*.

Bhatia (idem: 13) states that

although there are a number of other factors, like content, form, intended audience, medium or channel that influence the nature and construction of a genre, it is primarily characterized by the communicative purpose(s) that it is intended to fulfill.

Taking into account Bhatia's genre research (idem: 16), each genre structures the world of experience or reality in a particular way; and the same experience or reality will require a different way of structuring if one were to operate in a different genre. Recurrent characteristics may be found in particular communicative structures, and those regular features allow us to arrange different texts in relatively precise categories of genres. According to Bhatia (idem: 21),

these regularities must be seen as cognitive in nature because they reflect the strategies that members of a particular discourse or professional community typically use in the construction and understanding of that genre to achieve specific communicative purposes.

Since there is an *inevitable* connection between the communicative purpose of a particular genre and its typical cognitive structuring (Bhatia, idem: *ibidem*), this paper aims to identify recurrent linguistic as well as extra-linguistic features that define the *interview genre*. That way, I will examine the linguistic forms within a framework that considers relevant features of the situation – *field, tenor* and *mode* – as well. First of all, however, I intend to present definitions of *Discourse Analysis* and the term *genre*.

1 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Discourse Analysis

Before trying to define the term *genre*, which is relevant for us to understand the role of language within any verbal interaction, the term *Discourse Analysis* is going to be explained. As one could find in *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language* (Crystal, 1995: 116), *Discourse Analysis* deals with the analysis

of a conversation. It “focuses on the structure of naturally occurring spoken language, as found in such ‘discourses’ as conversations, interviews, commentaries, and speeches”. In addition, Crystal asserts that *Discourse Analysis* can be understood in a broader sense because it can include “all language units with a definable communicative function, whether spoken or written”.

According to Yule (1996:83), *Discourse Analysis*

covers an extremely wide range of activities, (...). When it is restricted to linguistic issues, discourse analysis focuses on the record (spoken or written) of the process by which language is used in some context to express intention.

In that sense, *Discourse Analysis* considers the way speakers and writers explore particular language features; how they arrange structures in order to reach intended goals. *Discourse Analysis* defines how the participants involved in any linguistic interaction express their thoughts through words, either through spoken or written discourse.

Based on Demo (<http://www.cal.org/ericcll/digest/0107demo.html>),

Discourse analysis is the examination of language use by members of a speech community. It involves looking at both language form and language function and includes the study of both spoken interaction and written texts. It identifies linguistic features that characterize different genres as well as social and cultural factors that aid in our interpretation and understanding of different texts and types of talk. A discourse analysis of written texts might include a study of topic development and cohesion across the sentences, while an analysis of spoken language might focus on these aspects plus turn-taking practices, opening and closing sequences of social encounters, or narrative structure.

In short, *Discourse Analysis* refers to attempts to study the organization of language in linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written texts, larger than simple sentences or clauses. It follows that, according to Slembrouck, *Discourse Analysis* is also concerned with “language use in social contexts”, and in particular with “interaction” or dialogue between speakers, as in the interview genre. Consequently, as *Genre Analysis* constitutes a recent, but very significant development within the *Discourse Analysis* field (Bhatia, idem: 16), it is necessary to define the term *genre* as well.

Genre

According to Swales (1990: 33), *genre* is characterized as a “class of communicative events”, that is, a particular situation in which language plays both a significant and an indispensable role; it has a set of communicative purposes, since “genres are communicative vehicles for the achievement of goals”; and “other properties, such as form, structure and audience expectations operate to identify the extent to which an exemplar is *prototypical* of a particular genre”.

In order to discuss the concept of genre, Swales (idem: 38-9) cites authors like Saville-Troike (1982), who takes genre “to refer to the typical type of communicative event and offers the following as examples: jokes, stories, lectures, greetings and conversations”; and Hymes (1974), who affirms that:

genres often coincide with speech events, but must be treated as analytically independent of them. They may occur in (or as) different events. The sermon as a genre is typically identified with a certain place in a church service, but its properties may be invoked, for serious or humorous effect, in other situations.

In the light of McCarthy & Carter’s studies about genres (1994: 24), one can conclude that genre is associated to “the idea that there may be underlying recurrent features which are prototypically present in particular groups of texts”. In other words, one could assert that there is a clear correlation between language use – written or spoken language and its particular features – and specific situations, that is, communicative contexts, such as *at the post office, in the bank, in a funeral*, and so on.

Another important definition of genre comes from Freedman (1999: 764), who states that genres “are best understood not so much as text types, to be defined by their textual regularities, but rather as typified actions in response to recurring social contexts.” After analyzing diverse ways of defining *genre*, one can conclude it has to deal with specific communicative events, in which spoken or written language is developed, obeying special rules and purposes.

After trying to define the terms *Discourse Analysis* and *genre*, it seems relevant to consider how *Discourse Analysis* has contributed to formulating ways of dividing up and classifying the everyday manifestations of language in use. As I have mentioned, language has to be understood as a *text*, because its *context of production* works as an essential factor to its comprehension.

Every text is thus strictly related to its context of existence. According to Christie (idem: 760), it can be well understood *only* if the context that *gives life to it* has been considered. For that reason, the nature of the text one produces at any time depends upon its *context of situation*, and the different choices people make to produce different texts are those involving *field of activity, tenor of activity, and mode of activity*. It seems relevant to mention that such choices are not only determined by the language structure, but also and essentially by the social relations that regulate the speaker’s social acts, through a communicative event.

Considering what was previously stated, one could infer that *language, text and context* are intimately involved in the process of creating meaning, and those three components of the context of situation – *field, tenor and mode* – are related to those three essential functions of language – the *ideational, the interpersonal and the textual*. Those metafunctions of language are the basis of the organization of the whole linguistic system since the text itself indicates an instant of language in use, revealing a certain function in a particular context of situation. Therefore, from a discourse-based view, language has to be analyzed in terms of linguistic features and social aims as well.

Before analyzing the linguistic features usually found in the *interview genre*, in order to relate the linguistic choices made by both speakers to fulfill the social purposes of such a communicative event, the terms *field, tenor and mode* will be briefly defined.

Field, tenor and mode

As descriptive terms, *field, tenor and mode* of discourse help to explain how language users describe social contexts. In other words, in view of what Halliday and Hasan (1985) state about these three concepts, one may understand they serve to interpret the social context of a text, “the environment in which meanings are being exchanged”. Such a social context should be analyzed in terms of *what is happening* – the field of discourse, *who is taking part* – the tenor of discourse, and *what part language is playing* – the mode of discourse.

In that sense, Halliday and Hasan (idem: 12) define those three features of the context of situation as follows: a) the *field* of discourse refers to the “nature of the social action that is taking place”; b) the *tenor* of discourse refers to the “nature of the participants, their statuses and roles”; c) the *mode* of

discourse refers to “how language can supply the participants’ interests in a particular situation”. It also includes the *channel* – that can be spoken, written or a combination of the two – and the *rhetorical mode* – what is being achieved by the text, considering its aims such as persuasive, expository, didactic purposes, and so on.

Thus, as I have already mentioned, the concepts of *field*, *tenor* and *mode* are essential to the analysis and understanding of any communicative event, that is, any *genre* (especially the *interview genre*) since those concepts are related to the functions of language – the *ideational*, the *interpersonal* and the *textual*. Since it represents the relationship between a social environment and the functional organization of language.

2 METHODOLOGY

If we see language as a functional system, according to Halliday and Hasan (*idem*), we can use it in distinct contexts to fulfill special purposes. The different choices in terms of vocabulary, grammar and discourse structure reveal a different relationship between the *sender* and the *receiver* of the text (McCarthy and Carter, *idem*). In Halliday and Hasan’s words (*idem*: 15), “(...) people do different things with their language; that is, they expect to achieve by talking and writing, and by listening and reading, a large number of different aims and different purposes”.

With this in mind, I have tried to identify relevant features in the *interview genre*. The *corpus* of this study includes extracts from the verbal interaction between the first American lady Laura Bush and the well-known interviewer Larry King, placed in his TV program *Larry King Weekend Program* on CNN. Linguistic and extra-linguistic features have been analyzed in order to verify the noticeable differences between spoken and written discourses, and to reveal how language users can make appropriate choices to express their purposes and ideologies.

To sum up, I have examined this interview, following a discourse-based view of language, in order to point out the functions of language throughout every social interaction. Therefore, not only lexical and grammatical patterns have been taken into account, but also the participants of discourse, that is, how they react towards their interlocutor’s opinions and how they use language to accomplish their personal interests. That way, the present analysis has been narrowed to the study of

the relationship between the text and its context of production in terms of field, tenor and mode.

3 ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVIEW

Source of the transcript:
<http://www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0104/29/lklw.00.html>

Encore Presentation: Laura Bush Discusses Her New Role as First Lady

LARRY KING, HOST: Tonight: on her husband’s 100th day as president, a very special hour with first lady Laura Bush, next on *LARRY KING WEEKEND*.

KING: Thanks for joining us. Earlier this month I had the privilege of sitting down with Laura Bush for an hour-long interview. The venue: the diplomatic reception room at the White House. As we began, President George W. Bush was choppers off to an education event in Connecticut.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

KING: Do you get used to that helicopter sound?

LAURA BUSH, FIRST LADY OF THE UNITED STATES: I do get used to it, but it’s such a thrill to be upstairs...**KING:** To see it come in.**BUSH:** ... and see the helicopter come in and land on the lawn.

KING: Did you and the president watch it come in and then you run downstairs and he takes off?

BUSH: No. He’s over in the Oval Office, so he didn’t watch it. But a lot of times I’m here -- upstairs here and see it come in. I’ve even been up on the third floor on the parapet that goes around the top of the White House where you can stand outside and you’re on a level with the helicopter before it starts to land and that’s exciting.

KING: Does he call to say goodbye before he goes?

BUSH: Oh, he said goodbye this morning when he went over to the office.

KING: Well, you knew a lot about this building where your...

BUSH: Well, I did.

KING: (‘Cause) ... your father-in-law lived here.

BUSH: That’s right. We stayed here some, not a lot, but we lived in Dallas when they were

here. But, but I did know a lot, and it was huge advantage to know...

KING: Obviously.

BUSH: ... to at least know my way around upstairs. I noticed the first few weeks my assistants, who would come upstairs to work on various issues, would walk by the elevators, miss the elevators. [Laughs] And my mother's staying with me right now, and I'll see she turns the wrong direction when she goes out of her bedroom, because it is big. It's beautiful and awesome, and, but it was a huge advantage to at least (ah) know my way around upstairs.

KING: And tonight while we're on, you're at the Holocaust Museum, right?

BUSH: That's right.

KING: Visiting with friends?

BUSH: That's right. We've invited some friends of ours in from around the country to go to the Holocaust Museum with us tonight.

KING: Where you've been.

BUSH: And then for the Day of Remembrance Ceremony tomorrow.

KING: You've been there. Your husband hasn't?

BUSH: I've been there, he has not. I visited a few years ago when we were in town for the national governors.

KING: He's in for an experience.

BUSH: I know it. It's a very, very affecting museum.

KING: Very.

BUSH: Yes.

KING: Before we talk all about the first 100 days in your life here, the one thing that immediately comes to mind is -- and everyone's talking about it, there are wags saying if it were Reagan or Clinton, they'd have gone to Washington to greet those Navy men.

BUSH: Uh-uh. (She agrees with him, expressing body language-agreement).

KING: The Bushes went to Texas. How did you feel about that decision?

BUSH: Well, I think George felt like that was a time for them to be with their own families. Ah, that it was a time for them to come back to the

country and greet their families with a little bit more privacy than they would have been allowed if the president had also been there.

KING: Did you agree?

BUSH: I do agree. I think that's the right thing. George met with one of the families before they got home on his last trip to North Carolina. I think there...

KING: Is that typical of him, because usually politicians like the spotlight and there's no better spotlight than returning service men?

BUSH: Well, that's right. And, of course, George likes the spotlight, ...

KING: Mm-hmm.

BUSH: but, at the same time, I think he thinks there are certain times that families ought to be afforded privacy and the opportunity to hug each other in privacy.

KING: Are they going to be invited to the White House?

BUSH: I'm sure we'll invite them here to the White House and, of course, he's talked to them on the phone. I think he said to the pilot -- George knows a little bit about being a pilot since he was a jet fighter pilot -- that he wanted to congratulate him on such a safe landing in such a very, very difficult situation.

KING: During those days, those two weeks, what was it like for you?

BUSH: Well, we were nervous about it, of course. But also my husband is very focused. And he was focused on the outcome that he wanted, which, of course, was what we all wanted, and that was for our service men and women to get home safely. He also was patient. He knew that because of the leadership in China, it would take a while, that it was slow. We were at a 12-hour time difference.

KING: We're a country used to...

BUSH: But I think he also knew that it would come out like we wanted it to, with our people home.

KING: We're used to rushing things, though, aren't we, Laura? We want it yesterday.

BUSH: That's right. We're very impatient.

BUSH: You know, as a whole, our whole country is an impatient country.

KING: Is he patient?

BUSH: He has to work on his patience. That's one of the...

KING: Because if you're a baseball fan, it's hard to be patient.

BUSH: That's right. Well, of course, baseball has a very long season.

(LAUGHTER)

BUSH: You know, you learn patience.

KING: I know.

(The following question is relevant to this analysis because it is, to a certain extent, the essential part of this verbal interaction).

KING: OK. What about this job, since you know the place, or knew the place, what about being first lady has surprised you?

BUSH: Well, I think I've had a lot of surprises. One is just I'm surprised and overwhelmed with the support that we get from around the country; the letters we get from people.

I'm also, and I don't know why this surprises me, I should have known this, but I'm also thrilled with the forum that I have to talk about issues that are important to me. I'm a former schoolteacher and school librarian. And I'm just amazed, really, that I have this opportunity, because my husband is president. I guess I knew it, but I guess I didn't really realize the full impact of it. For instance, when I was in California a couple of weeks ago at the San Diego Naval Yard, talking about the Troops to Teachers program, which is a program that tries to encourage retired military, who retire at a very young age to

KING: To help

BUSH: become teachers. It's a federally funded program. (...)

As previously mentioned, the interview I have analyzed is the one involving Laura Bush and Larry King.

3.1 The participants

First of all, I would like to draw attention to the asymmetry of such an interaction. Clearly Larry King, who is the interviewer, plays a central role in this interview.

Speakers: the first American lady Laura Bush and the well-known interviewer Larry King.

Listeners: Larry King and the audience in general.

3.2 The participants' actions: verbal as well as non-verbal actions

Verbal action: Larry King and Laura Bush interact with each other mostly through verbal communication, that is, through speaking. The intonation and the choices of words, which they apply to express their purposes and make them comprehensible, determine the development of discourse.

Non-verbal action: they both make use of *body language* to help them to expose their thoughts, expectations and beliefs. For example, when they agree with each other, understand their interlocutor's point of view, or even when they are able to make inferences, they nod their heads signaling awareness. They also express their agreement with their interlocutor's utterances through smiles and other sorts of facial expressions. They usually make use of their hands and arms when they are talking about something that is engaging, or when they need some further information.

3.3 Situation: relevant features

Place of production: this interview takes place on CNN (in North America), at *Larry King Weekend Program*.

Time of production: it was produced on April 18th, 2001, a hundred days after George W. Bush's election.

The participants' social roles: as it has been mentioned, the first American lady interacts with the well-known interviewer Larry King.

Aims of the text: to bring to light the way President George W. Bush has been dealing with specific political issues, but specially Laura Bush's opinion regarding her new role as First Lady.

Content: Political and ideological issues. How the first American lady has considered such changes in her own life as well as towards all over the world. In addition, it seems important to show how Larry King has considered it. He qualifies this verbal interaction as "a very special hour-long interview with Laura Bush".

3.4 Verbal action effects (Yule, 1996: 71-82)

After analyzing this interview, one may conclude that the two participants of such a verbal interaction are able to communicate mostly because

they can understand each other. One may even realize they both make use of *predictions*, *implicatures* (done by the speaker), *inferences* (done by the hearer), *presuppositions*, and *follow deictic expressions* since they share the same context of production.

In that sense, sometimes the speaker communicates meaning only through *implicatures* and the hearer is able to recognize those meanings making *inferences*. Therefore, one could assert that these two participants can communicate, that is, can interact linguistically with each other, understanding and being understood, because they apply the cooperation principle. They cooperate in the process of constructing meaning due to the fact that they consider each other's intentions and go beyond simple utterances.

Furthermore, according to Yule (1996: 76), this "dialogue" could be characterized in terms of *high involvement style* since participation can be considered very dynamic, the speaking rate is relatively fast, with almost no pausing between *turns*, which refer to the speaker's control of the *floor*⁷ at any time, and with some *overlap*⁸ or even completion of the other's turn. An example of completion of the other's turn can be observed in the following situation, where King tries to guess the complement of a Laura Bush's assumption:

BUSH: ... a program that tries to encourage retired military who retire at a very young age to

KING: To help

BUSH: ... become teachers. It's a federally funded program.

Concerning the *floor* of the conversation, both the interviewer and Laura Bush have control of their own *turns*. They cooperate and share the floor of this conversation. One can also observe unusual pauses, some overlapped talk, which often expresses closeness in conveying similar opinions during the interview. Usually, both speakers employ overlap as a strategy to reinforce what their interlocutor has just said, or to agree on a special point through linguistic expressions of solidarity.

One discourse feature that is easy to study is listener response behavior, also known as *backchannels*. They are defined as brief verbal responses that a listener uses while another individual is talking, such as *yeah*, *that's right*, *of course*, *mm-hmm*, *ok* and *oh wow*. Listener response can also be

non-verbal, as, for instance, head nods. Considering backchannels, one can notice that they have been overused throughout this interview. It seems that the speakers have the need to know whether their conversational partners are listening to them, or rather, following the meaning of their utterances. Making use of *backchannel signals*, the participants indicate that the conversation is going on, and its message has been recognized. The adverb *obviously* can be seen as a sort of *backchannel* too since it shows that the interlocutor has gotten the other's assumption, and has agreed with it.

Not only vocal indicators are used in that communicative event, but also head nods, smiles, and other facial expressions and gestures. According to Yule (idem: 75-6),

these types of signals provide feedback to the current speaker that the message is being received. They normally indicate that the listener is following, and not objecting to, what the speaker is saying.

Therefore, those signals are relevant in the sense that they maintain the required coherence during the discourse. Similarly, markers like *oh* and *well*, which are identified as *prefaces*, are important for the participants to express their real ideas through language. They can work as a means to keep cohesion throughout speakers' verbal interaction as well as an attempt to soften their own arguments after refusing or opposing previous statements. The expression *well* has also been used to make the beginning of the main topic, that is, as a means to open the following sequence(s).

On the other hand, the use of *ah* usually reveals delay or hesitation in the process of building meaning through language. Expressions like *you see* and *you know* mean that the interlocutor's understanding is invoked. They are frequently used as a strategy to appeal for understanding, according to Yule (idem: 81).

The overuse of *but* and *and*, during this communicative process is clearly associated with the spoken mode, since it has been identified by *repetitions*, *pauses*, *overlap* and *backchannels*. Usually, *repetitions* are done in order to emphasize the idea just mentioned, or as a means to show cooperation towards what has been said by the interlocutor. The following extract reveals something about *repetition* (*very, very*), which is part of the cooperation principle in the sense it reinforces the other's opinion:

KING: You've been there (*Holocaust Museum*). Your husband hasn't?

BUSH: I've been there, he has not. I visited a few years ago when we were in town for the national governors.

KING: He's in for an experience.

BUSH: I know it. It's a very, very affecting museum.

KING: Very.

BUSH: Yes.

Expressions like *before we talk* and *the one thing that immediately comes to mind is* reveal the speaker's ability of guiding discourse in his/her own style, based on his/her intentions. In this case, they are used in terms of ordering events, as a way of stating what should be uttered before. That way, *conversational implicatures* are produced because much more was communicated than explicitly said.

These expressions *I don't know why*, *I should have known this* (but I did not know) and *I think* as well as *I guess* represent the way found by the speakers to make evident that they have doubts on a particular subject/topic, or at least, as in the second case (*I think, I guess*), that they are not totally sure about their opinions. Such forms communicate the speaker's concern that their listeners judge them to be cooperative conversational partners.

Finally, the use of *deictic expressions*, such as *here* and *there* are closely associated with the spoken mode because, as Yule (idem: 09) asserts, "all these expressions depend, for their interpretation, on the speaker and hearer sharing the same context. (...) they have their most basic uses in face-to-face spoken interaction."

Similarly, according to McCarthy and Carter (idem: 15), the contracted verb-forms, which have been constantly used, might appear as markers of intimate spoken mode. Moreover, something that has to be considered as well, in accordance to McCarthy and Carter (idem: 13), is that despite the fact that there are markers of spoken mode throughout the extracts from the interview, it does not mean that the interview genre, for instance, is less "literary". The following assumption reinforces that idea:

(...) Therefore, on the long cline representing the admixing of modes that will be founding different products of the spoken and written media, products will be archetypically more 'written' or more 'spoken' in their features of mode than others. (McCarthy and Carter, 1994:9)

CONCLUSÃO

To sum up, based on what some linguists have asserted about *language in action*, one could conclude that language is a *socio-semiotic system* because it realizes the context of situation in which discourse occurs. From the context of situation, in turn, it is possible for us to guess the type of language used in a specific instance of communication.

REFERÊNCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

- BHATIA, V. K. *Analysing Genre: Language use in professional settings*. London: Longman, 1993.
- CHRISTIE, F. (1999). *Genre Theory and ESL Teaching: A Systemic Functional Perspective*. *TESOL Quarterly*. University of British Columbia, v. 33, n. 4, p. 759-761, winter 1999.
- CRYSTAL, D. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge. 1995.
- DEMO, Douglas A. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers* (Disponível em <http://www.cal.org/ericcll/digest/0107demo.html>).
- FREEDMAN, A. (1999). *Beyond the Text: Towards Understanding the Teaching and Learning of Genres*. *TESOL Quarterly*. London, v. 33, n. 4, p. 764-767, winter 1999.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K. *An introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold, 1985.
- MCCARTHY, M. and CARTER, R. *Language as Discourse: Perspective for Language Teaching*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1994.
- SWALES, J. M. *Genre Analysis: English in academic and researching settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- YULE, G. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

NOTAS

® Mestranda em Lingüística Aplicada da Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, aluna na disciplina "Gêneros do Discurso" e orientanda da Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Désirée Motta-Roth (2003/1). Trabalho apresentado à disciplina de Inglês VIII como quesito parcial de avaliação do segundo semestre de 2001, sob a orientação da Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Désirée Motta-Roth, base do anteprojeto para a seleção do Mestrado em Lingüística Aplicada da Universidade Federal de Santa Maria.

ⁱ The right the speaker has to speak.

ⁱⁱ Both participants trying to speak at the same time.