

University of Tikrit

College of Education for

Humanities English Department

Ph.D. Candidates



**Discourse Analysis and Applied Linguistics
Part One**

Prof. Istabraq Tariq Alazzawi (Ph.D.)

2025-2026

Introduction

Discourse analysis and applied linguistics are the essence of this article. Since their initial convergence in the 1970s, their relationship has been fluid and multifaceted, driven by various theoretical perspectives across increasingly diverse contexts. From its initial—and still central—focus on second language learning, applied linguistics is now more widely seen as relevant to any real-world, language-related problem that an interdisciplinary approach can address. This article focuses on some of the varied contexts and strands of discourse analysis methodology as developed in applied linguistics. Discourse analysis initially converged with second language concerns in relation to various subfields, especially communicative language teaching. The following discussion focuses on some of the varied contexts and strands of discourse analysis methodology as they have developed in applied linguistics. To begin, we focus on ways that discourse analysis has been employed in the traditional second language focused areas of applied linguistics. Though narrower than the whole, this work remains one of the most fully developed areas of interface between the two areas (cf. Kaplan and Widdowson, 1992).

1- Language Learning and Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis initially intersected with second language (L2) concerns within several applied linguistics subfields, including communicative language teaching, English for specific purposes, contrastive rhetoric, classroom-based research, and interlanguage pragmatics. Applied linguists working in these areas utilized diverse perspectives for analyzing language use, such as speech act theory, functional linguistics, conversation analysis, the ethnography of speaking, and text linguistics. Hence, the types of analyses have varied widely and included a range of foci such as the following:

- Form-function relations of grammatical features
- Lexical and grammatical characteristics of texts
- Written text structure
- Sequential organization of talk in speech activities

- Frequency, scope, and distribution of specific interactional sequences or speech acts

A unifying objective across these L2 discourse inquiries has been deriving pedagogical implications from research on actual language use. Focusing on learner goals and target discourses, communicative language teaching (CLT) and related movements constituted the most significant initial influence of discourse analysis on L2 teaching. Early CLT, particularly in oral/aural skills, pursued a pedagogical "authenticity" mirroring speech events outside the classroom, which required the analysis of such authentic contexts. To develop syllabi and pedagogy reflecting this, language teaching theory turned to perspectives on extra linguistic language use, especially the work on speech act theory and systemic-functional linguistics. Speech act theory, in particular, motivated functional-notional syllabi, which were later incorporated into a broader communicative approach informed by Hymes's communicative competence and Halliday's view of language as a meaning potential system. The principles and methodologies of the communicative approach remain the dominant paradigm in English and much L2 teaching. However, although CLT pedagogical theory was originally based on existing discourse theories and analyses, it was not connected to a well-articulated research agenda. As a result, the original link between discourse analysis and communicative language teaching diminished in importance, and comparative analyses of both recommended classroom practices and the authentic communication they are based on have been less common than initially intended.

2- Discourse Analysis and English for Specific Purposes

A contrast to the relationship of spoken discourse analysis and L2 classroom teaching is found in developments in language for specific purposes (LSP). Swales (2000) traces the descriptive base for LSP pedagogical materials to an early call for linguistic studies of specialized registers. The field of English for specific purposes (ESP), a prominent part of LSP, has been characterized by systematic analyses of the discourses of

target communities. The nature of these discourse analyses has varied, with early studies focusing on grammatical and lexical elements, followed by a shift to the organization of genres through rhetorical moves, and then a renewed interest in lexico-grammatical features via corpus analytic tools. As Belcher (2004) notes, the means and ends of ESP and genre studies are very similar, and genre analysis is a tool of ESP. Consequently, most studies of target discourses employ genre analysis, heavily inspired by Swales's (1990) work. These studies identify the rhetorical moves and steps that characterize how texts fulfill communicative purposes, along with the lexical and grammatical realization of these moves. Corpus analytic techniques have facilitated discourse analyses not common in early ESP research, shifting focus to lexico-grammatical features to explore issues like hedging and writer stance. Another development is the consideration of genre sets and networks, exploring discourse structure relationships across related genres. Influenced by new rhetoric, recent ESP genre analyses have given social context a more significant role, informed by the views of disciplinary experts and an acknowledgment of the heteroglossia in academic discourses. The pedagogical motivation for these careful discourse analyses has led to the creation of materials strongly influenced by the results, such as in the volumes by Swales and Feak (2000, 2004). These materials transform analytical results into pedagogical content to raise students' rhetorical consciousness. Findings on discourse variations across genres have led scholars to advocate training students to discover the discursive practices of their own disciplines. The effects of genre-based instruction on reading and writing development have received serious attention recently, with studies providing growing support for its efficacy and a nuanced understanding of student literacy development.

3- Discourse Analysis and Contrastive Rhetoric

Research in contrastive rhetoric, which includes some of the earliest connections between discourse analysis and applied linguistics, represents a complementary body of work that has become more closely linked to ESP/LSP. Because of its aim to contribute to the teaching of ESL and EFL

writing, many studies in contrastive rhetoric over the last 30 years have been discourse analyses of ESL and EFL student writing, contrastive studies of academic and professional genres, and studies of the acculturation of L2 writers into academic and professional communities. The overlap in the pedagogical aims of ESP and contrastive rhetoric can be seen as reason for the growing convergence of research methodologies in ESP and contrastive rhetoric. In particular, recent research in contrastive rhetoric has also included the analysis of various academic and professional genres and considerations of the social contexts that give rise to these genres. Although the field was characterized by "more or less decontextualized text analytic models" in the 1980s, the last 20 years have seen a greater use of genre analysis, corpus linguistics, and ethnographic approaches. As Connor (2002) points out, the increasingly context-sensitive research approach often involves studying the talk that surrounds text production and interpretations as well as writing processes and written products themselves. The change in discourse analytic methodologies has been paralleled by a change in the kinds of discourses analyzed, with a growing interest in contrastive analysis of particular genres, such as the book review or letter of recommendation, instead of analyses of student texts which characterized earlier studies.

4- Discourse Analysis and Instruction in L2 Spoken Interaction

Consideration of ESP/LSP and contrastive rhetoric approaches highlights the fact that for purposes of L2 pedagogy, discourse analysis research has traditionally focused more on written language, though a renewed focus on spoken language has taken hold in recent years. The comparatively greater focus on the teaching of writing can be viewed in light of the classroom as a social context. Written genres can be taught through the practice of routine classroom interaction, so that the norms of classroom speaking are largely unaffected. In spoken language instruction, however, inherent differences characterize the authentic language representing the goals of instruction and the authentic interactional environment of the classroom. The analysis of classroom discourse has the potential to address this contradiction by

revealing how 5 communicative tasks affect interaction and how that interaction compares with traditional activities or more authentic contexts beyond the classroom. A sizable body of classroom discourse work has existed for some time, which acknowledges the basic IRF sequence of classroom interaction—what Cazden has termed the “default” script. In the default script, the teacher constructs the overwhelming proportion of initiating and responding turns. The teacher also has the right to determine when and how to relinquish the floor to a student. In such a sequence, the student's verbal role can be a limited one, so that the full repertoire of communicative acts needed for L2 competence becomes difficult to practice and thus unlikely to be achieved. For CLT, the relevance of the default pattern similarly lies in its differences from interaction beyond the classroom. In face-to-face conversation, initiations and responses are shared between and among interlocutors, a speaker can select him- or herself as next speaker, and a single turn often includes both a response and subsequent initiation. Interaction in communicative classrooms bore little resemblance to conversations but was characterized by more typical teacher-talk features such as display questions. As a result, Long and Sato suggested that communicative use of the target language makes up only a minor part of typical classroom activities. The attempt in CLT to facilitate language learning useful for non-classroom contexts has most often been represented using role plays, jigsaw activities, and various types of pair and small-group work, because these allow students to assume interactional roles outside those afforded by the default script. The problem, however, is that much of CLT practice draws from materials developers' intuitive notions of interaction beyond the classroom but is not tied to a research base in the analysis of spoken discourse. However, the result is that the findings have largely been addressed in the SLA rather than in the pedagogical literature, without a significant impact on L2 classroom practice.