

Título: TRANSITIVITY, NO STONE LEFT UNTURNED: INTRODUCING FLEXIBILITY AND GRANULARITY INTO THE FRAMEWORK FOR THE ANALYSIS OF COURTROOM DISCOURSE

Nombre: Bartley, Leanne Victoria

Universidad: Universidad de Granada

Departamento: Filología inglesa y alemana

Fecha de lectura: 30/05/2017

Mención a doctor europeo: concedido

Programa de doctorado: Programa de Doctorado en Lenguas, Textos y Contextos por la Universidad de Granada

Dirección:

> **Director:** ENCARNACION HIDALGO TENORIO

Tribunal:

> **presidente:** ÁNGEL MIGUEL FELICES LAGO

> **secretario:** BELÉN SORIA CLIVILLÉS

> **vocal:** LAURA ALBA JUEZ

> **vocal:** JOSÉ LUIS ONCINS MARTÍNEZ

> **vocal:** THOMAS BARLETT

Descriptores:

> LINGUISTICA

El fichero de tesis ya ha sido incorporado al sistema

> <http://0-hera.ugr.es.adrastea.ugr.es/tesisugr/26567143.pdf>

Resumen: This PhD thesis, entitled TRANSITIVITY, no stone left unturned: Introducing flexibility and granularity into the framework for the analysis of courtroom discourse, considers four main areas, to include Critical Discourse Analysis, Corpus Linguistics, Forensic Linguistics (FL) and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). As features of SFL, the two transitivity models put forward to date, i.e. the Sydney model (Halliday, 1985, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, 2014) and the Cardiff model (Fawcett, 1987, 2000; Neale, 2002) are critiqued here and, in turn, a revised transitivity network is proposed. Using the new framework, we analyse a piece of courtroom discourse in which a man finds himself accused and, subsequently, wrongly convicted of raping a minor. Thus, the intention is to determine the language patterns employed by particular individuals involved in the court case (i.e. the lawyers for both sides and the victim) as a means to verify the impact that their questioning and/or testimony may have had on the defendant's untimely fate. To add to this, a well established SFL theory, namely Appraisal, is also employed here for the analysis of the lawyers' closing arguments. This is aimed at gaining further insights into the types of evaluation that emerge in their discourse and, thus, uncover the potential bearing this may have had on the outcome of the trial at hand. We hope that this study will serve as

a contribution to the current shortage of SFL research within the field of FL.

En la tesis doctoral *Transitivity, no stone left unturned: Introducing flexibility and granularity into the framework for the analysis of courtroom discourse*, estudiamos cuatro áreas principales de la lingüística: el Análisis Crítico del Discurso, la Lingüística de Corpus, la Lingüística Forense y la Lingüística Sistémico-Funcional (LSF). Dentro del ámbito de la LSF, se han presentado dos modelos de la transitividad hasta el momento: el modelo de Sidney (Halliday, 1985, 1994; Halliday y Matthiessen, 2004, 2014) y el modelo de Cardiff (Fawcett, 1987, 2000; Neale, 2002). Tras considerar ambos, proponemos un modelo revisado de la transitividad. Aplicando esta propuesta, analizamos el discurso en un juicio en el que un hombre fue condenado por violar a una menor a pesar de no haber cometido el delito. Es nuestra intención determinar los patrones lingüísticos empleados por los abogados y la víctima de este caso para verificar el impacto que su interrogatorio y/o testimonio puedan haber tenido sobre el resultado del juicio. Además de observar los patrones de la transitividad en el corpus que hemos creado, empleamos la teoría de valoración, también perteneciente a la LSF, para analizar los alegatos finales de los abogados, con el fin de obtener más información sobre los tipos de evaluación que surgen en su discurso y establecer lo que éstos revelan de la postura de cada uno. Por último, esperamos que este estudio sirva como contribución a las investigaciones en LSF y en Lingüística Forense.

Bibliography / Bibliografía

- Alba-Juez, L. (2014). The many faces and phases of evaluation. In G. Thompson, & L. Alba-Juez (Ed.), *Evaluation in context* (pp. 3-24). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Bednarek, M. (2008). *Emotion talk across corpora*. Basingstoke & New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Butler, C.S. (2003). *Structure and function: A guide to three major structural-functional theories. Part 1: Approaches to the simplex clause*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2010). *The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics*. Abingdon & New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ehrlich, S. (2001). *Representing rape: Language and sexual consent*. London & New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Second edition*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fawcett, R.P. (1987). The semantics of clause and verb for relational processes in English. In M.A.K. Halliday, & R.P. Fawcett (Eds.), *New developments in systemic linguistics, Vol 1: Theory and description* (pp. 130-183). London: Pinter.
- Fawcett, R.P. (2000). In place of Halliday's verbal group Part 1: Evidence from the problems of Halliday's representations and the relative simplicity of the proposed alternative. *Word* 51(2), 157-203.
- Fontaine, L., Bartlett, T., & O'Grady, G. (2013). *Systemic functional linguistics: Exploring choice*. Cambridge University Press
- Fontaine, L., & Gwilliams, L. (2015). Indeterminacy in process type classification. *Functional Linguistics* 2(8), 1-19.
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar*. London & New York, NY: Routledge.
- Macken-Horarik, M., & Isaac, A. (2014). Appraising Appraisal. In G. Thompson, & L. Alba-Juez (Eds.),

- Evaluation in context (pp. 67-92). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Martin, J.R., & White, P.R.R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke & New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1999). The system of TRANSITIVITY: An exploratory study of text-based profiles. *Functions of Language* 6(1), 1-51.
- Neale, A.C. (2002). *More delicate TRANSITIVITY: Extending the process type system networks for English to include full semantic classifications*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Cardiff University. Retrieved from: http://www.itri.bton.ac.uk/~Amy.Neale/thesis_online/final_thesis.pdf. (May 1, 2013).
- O'Donnell, M. (2016). *The UAM CorpusTool 3.3*. <http://www.corpustool.com/>.
- O'Donnell, M., Zappavigna, M., & Whitelaw, C. (2009). "A survey of process type classification over difficult cases". In C. Jones, & E. Ventola (Eds), *New developments in the study of ideational meaning: From language to multimodality* (pp. 47-64). London: Continuum.
- Thompson, G., & Hunston, S. (2000). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, G., & Alba-Juez, L. (2014). *Evaluation in Context*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tucker, G. (2014). Process types and their classification. In K. Kunz, E. Teich, S. Hansen-Schirra, S. Neumann, & P. Daut (Ed.), *Caught in the middle - Language use and translation. A Festschrift for Erich Steiner on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (pp. 401-416). Saarbrücken: Verlag universaar University of the Saarland.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods for critical discourse analysis*. Second edition. London: Sage.