

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-348-4-22>

METADISOURSE MOVES: A FUNCTIONAL TAXONOMY FOR AN ACADEMIC DISCUSSION

МЕТАДИСКУРСИВНІ ХОДИ: ФУНКЦІЙНА ТАКСОНОМІЯ ДЛЯ АКАДЕМІЧНОЇ ДИСКУСІЇ

Parashchuk V. Yu.

*Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of
the Germanic Languages, Foreign
Literature and their Teaching Methodology
Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian
State University
Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine*

Паращук В. Ю.

*кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри германських мов,
зарубіжної літератури та методик
їхнього навчання
Центральноукраїнський державний
університет
імені Володимира Винниченка
м. Кропивницький, Україна*

Well-structured talk builds the mind (Michaels, 2010).

The focus of this study is on the taxonomy for how metadiscourse functions in academic discussions for EFL (English as a foreign language) learners.

When engaged in discussions as a genre of spoken academic discourse, EFL learners are able to use academic vocabulary, clarify their understanding of various concepts and texts they read or hear, refine ideas, and revise claims.

The simplest generally accepted definition of metadiscourse is that it is discourse about discourse. Given that interlocutors pursue different aims and act under different circumstances, metadiscourse presumably varies across genres, that is why an issue of the functional taxonomy of metadiscourse moves for an EFL academic discussion (interactive communication) needs research attention.

Paraphrasing Ädel's definition of metadiscourse [1] for the academic discussion genre, it can be defined as “the evolving discourse itself or its linguistic form”, including references to the speakers in their roles as speakers and the participants in their role as participants of the current academic discussion. The references of the mentioned types are actualized in the ongoing academic discussion with the *metadiscourse moves*, i.e. “discoursal or rhetorical units performing coherent communicative functions” [5, p. 228–229].

Building on the previous research on metadiscourse from the move perspective [1; 3; 4], this paper aims to describe an inventory of the moves the academic discussion participants use to organise their messages and manage the interaction with other participants in EFL classroom settings.

An underlying model of an academic discussion of the above mentioned type is multi-party interactions managed by a *discussion leader* (main speaker) whose role can be performed by the teacher or a student nominated by the teacher. Given that an academic discussion as a form of classroom discourse is a “collaborative social action” in which speakers “jointly collaborate in the production of meanings and inferences” in relation to the context [2, p. 49], the discussion leader’s metadiscursive functions will involve the following categories: *organizing the message* (‘metamessage’) and *managing the interaction* between the discussion participants (‘participant interaction’). In each of these two superordinate categories, there are subcategories which primarily function either to organise the discourse/message or manage the interaction/orient the participants.

While the message is organized during the ongoing discussion, the following metadiscourse moves are in operation: 1.1) pressing for reasoning and clarification (e.g. *What makes you say that?/ Why do you think that?*); 1.2) encouraging to support ideas with examples/evidence (e.g. *Can you give an example of what you mean? What evidence do you have to support that?*); 1.3) building on and/or challenging an interlocutor’s idea/evidence (e.g. *Would someone like to add? /Is this always true?*).

While managing the interaction/orienting the participants, the following metadiscourse moves are at work: 2.1) revoicing, i.e. rephrasing some of what discussants said and asking them to verify (e.g. *So, let me see if I’ve got your thinking right. You’re saying...?*); 2.2) agreeing or disagreeing, that is to say, asking participants to apply their own reasoning to that of their interlocutors (e.g. *Do you agree or disagree with X and why?*); 2.3) marking, in other words, confirming and appraising good reasoning /contributions (e.g. *That’s an interesting idea, because ...*); 2.4) keeping the communication channels open, i.e. asking the participants to restate their interlocutors’ reasoning (e.g. *Can anybody put that in their own words?*); 2.5) keeping the goal or topic in mind, namely, getting the conversation back on track, maintaining focus (e.g. *Can you link this back to our question?*).

Participants can contribute substantively to their interlocutors’ responses applying the 3CQ model suggested by Stewart-Mitchell [6] that incorporates the following four moves: COMPLIMENT + COMMENT + CONNECTION + QUESTION. Given below are examples of sentence stems for the moves of the 3CQ model: *I like your idea/what you’ve said, because...*(COMPLIMENT). *To be more precise, I completely agree that... or “I might come to a different conclusion because...”* (COMMENT). *I also think that ...is important/crucial/complicated* (CONNECTION). *Overall, I wonder why...*(QUESTION).

O’Connor & Michaels [3] claim that there are many ways to verbalise talk moves, to get discussion participants to externalise their reasoning, but our

focus was solely on the types and formulaic ways metadiscourse moves are used in an academic discussion constituting a functional taxonomy. An important takeaway can be summarised as follows: in academic discussions as a genre of classroom verbal interaction in which discussants collaborate to co-construct meaning that is jointly produced, metadiscourse tools are crucial for *organizing the message* and *managing the interaction*, each of those macrofunctions as umbrella terms covering a number of sub-functions performed with specific moves. Organizing the message is done with the following essential metatalk moves (but not restricted to): pressing for reasoning and; encouraging to support ideas with examples/evidence; building on and/or challenging an interlocutor's idea/evidence. Managing the interaction is performed with (but not restricted to): revoicing; agreeing or disagreeing; marking; keeping the communication channels open; keeping the goal or topic in mind. In the ongoing discussion, metadiscourse moves can cluster within one speaker's turn as in the 3CQ model.

Further research perspectives of the academic discussion will focus on talk moves that manage the topical information flow and on the pedagogical applications of a functional taxonomy of metadiscourse moves for an academic discussion in EFL settings as part of EFL teacher interactional competence.

Bibliography:

1. Ädel A. Adopting a 'move' rather than a 'marker' approach to metadiscourse: A taxonomy for spoken student presentations. *English for Specific Purposes*. Volume 69, 2023. P. 4–18. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2022.09.001>.
2. Jaworski, A. & Coupland N. *The discourse reader*. New York: Routledge, 1999. 602 p.
3. O'Connor C. & Michaels S. Supporting teachers in taking up productive talk moves: The long road to professional learning at scale. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 2019. Vol. 97. P. 166–175. 10.1016/j.ijer.2017.11.003.
4. Michaels S. & O'Connor C. Conceptualizing Talk Moves as Tools: Professional Development Approaches for Academically Productive Discussions. In L. B. Resnick, C. Asterhan, & S. N. Clarke (Eds.), *Socializing Intelligence through Talk and Dialogue*. Washington DC: AERA, 2015. P. 333-347. https://doi.org/10.3102/978-0-935302-43-1_27
5. Swales J. M. *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827>

6. Stewart-Mitchell J. (n.d.). Making quality comments following the “3C & Q” Model. URL: http://transliteratelibrarians.weebly.com/uploads/3/7/4/2/37427333/publishing_sharing_and_commenting2.pdf

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-348-4-23>

THEORY OF VALUES-BASED SOCIODISOURSE

ТЕОРІЯ ЦІННИСНО-ОРІЄНТОВАНОГО СОЦІОДИСКУРСУ

Skrynnik Yu. S.

*Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department
of English Philology and Foreign Language
Teaching Methods
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
Kharkiv, Ukraine*

Скриннік Ю. С.

*кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри англійської філології
та методики викладання іноземної мови
Харківський національний університет
імені В. Н. Каразіна
м. Харків, Україна*

Значення цінностей у сучасному суспільстві визначаються широким спектром факторів, таких як культурні зміни, технологічний прогрес, глобалізація та соціально-економічні трансформації. Цінності є принципами, переконаннями та ідеалами, які визначають те, що людина вважає важливим і цінним в своєму житті. Вони грають важливу роль у формуванні поведінки людей, взаємодії між ними та орієнтації суспільства в цілому.

Актуальність дослідження зумовлена важливістю наявності цінностей і пріоритетів у сучасному суспільстві, які впливають на думки та поведінку людей та ініціюють подальші мовні, культурні, соціальні та політичні процеси. Ці тенденції сприяють розвитку теорії ціннісно-орієнтованого соціодискурсу. *Об'єктом* дослідження є теорія ціннісно-орієнтованого соціодискурсу як напрям розвитку теорії дискурсу та лінгвістичної науки в цілому. *Предметом* виступає дослідження методологічної бази, соціодискурсу зокрема, як основи виникнення теорії ціннісно-орієнтованого соціодискурсу. *Мета* дослідження – розробити основні положення теорії ціннісно-орієнтованого соціодискурсу.

У соціодискурсивному підході, який є основою теорії ціннісно-орієнтованого соціодискурсу, велику увагу приділяють контексту, соціальним практикам, соціокультурним нормам та цінностям, які впливають на способи використання мови. Він дозволяє дослідникам