

ESF SCSS Strategic Workshop on

**FOLLOW-UPS ACROSS
DISCOURSE DOMAINS: A CROSS-
CULTURAL EXPLORATION OF
THEIR FORMS AND FUNCTIONS**

Würzburg (Germany), 31 May – 2 June 2012

Convened by:
Anita Fetzer^① and Elda Weizman^②

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

1. Executive summary

The exploratory workshop was held at the University of Würzburg over 3 days, starting Thursday afternoon (31 May 2012 at 14.15h) and ending Saturday noon (2 June 2012 at 12h). Participation numbered 23 people (12 female and 11 male) from 13 countries.

One invited participant from Germany cancelled on the first day of the workshop, and because of that short notice we could not invite any alternates. Most of the participants invited to the workshop accepted the invitation with great pleasure, and the ones who could not attend provided very sound reasons (e.g. national research assessments, recent parenthood). One colleague, who cancelled due to serious illness, was replaced.

All of the participants (except for the local organiser) stayed in the same hotel located in the down-town area of Würzburg, and travelled to the campus on Hubland together. All of the participants had lunch and dinner together. All of them enjoyed the local hospitality of the city of Würzburg and different varieties of the local food. Both the location of the hotel and the restaurants allowed for additional informal interactions about the topic of the workshop and other research options. To ensure further collaboration, some of the participants have decided to organize a full-day panel on the topic at the International Pragmatics Conference held in New Delhi in September 2013, and others are considering organizing panels or workshops at other relevant national and international conferences. Additionally, an email list and a virtual space hosted by the University of Turku (Finland) is to be initiated by one of the participants, in which the participants of the exploratory workshop have the possibility to enhance their research contacts. The proceedings of the workshop, including all papers presented by participants, will be published online on the OPUS Publication Server hosted by the University of Würzburg by September 2012.

The general atmosphere of the workshop was very friendly and participants were eager to engage in constructive discussions in order to achieve a commonly shared definition of the theoretical construct of the communicative act of a follow-up, which is uncontroversial in its commons-sense meaning. Accordingly, every presentation was discussed in detail based on prior reading of the discussants and other participants, providing the presenters with relevant feedback and future research options in a very constructive and collaborative manner. The exchange of comments on the presentations in the run-up to the workshop was felt to be especially helpful by the participants. The workshop as a whole was highly interactive and the participants attempted to identify relevant features and conditions of the concept of a follow-up, which has not been explored in depth in the research communities presented in the workshop. Everybody agreed that the atmosphere was cooperative and friendly – despite some controversies over methodological issues and not always mutually shared theoretical frameworks and premises. The key scientific objectives had been to find working definitions of ‘follow-up’ and of political discourse which could be applied to various contexts and various research communities. These goals have been met.

Follow-ups have been differentiated with respect to a narrow definition anchored to the micro context of the communication, and a wider definition anchored to the macro context which entails other discourses. While a local follow-up, viz. the narrow definition, is a constitutive part of a local discursive sequence which is responsive by definition and argumentative in nature, a global follow-up has the function of intensifying the pragmatic force of an argument and thus of the overall argumentation. Global follow-up from the same discourse are employed strategically to index credibility, while global follow-ups from different discourses are used to align or disalign with some political ideology. There has been overall agreement that the communicative function of a follow-up is highly context-dependent. Its pragmatic

force depends on (1) the source of the follow-up, (2) its propositional content, (3) its location in the flow of discourse (second-position or other), (4) the initiator of the follow-up, (5), the audience design, (6) its cohesive markers, and (7) its interactional power *vis-a-vis* the initiation.

The second key scientific objective has been to agree upon a definition of political discourse which goes beyond the common-sense notion of 'discourse produced by politicians'. In our post-modern society, political discourse is produced by a diverse set of speakers, viz. politicians as well as lay persons and semi-lay persons, journalists as well as lay journalists and semi-lay journalists, "experts" (political scientists, etc.) and semi-lay experts, and ordinary people, organized in grassroots politics. Because of the ever-increasing impact of the internet, politics is not only done in the traditional arena of political institutions and the so-called traditional media (TV, radio) but also in the so-called new media (online discussion fora, facebook, twitter).

The analysis of the key scientific objectives by researchers from the social sciences and the more traditional domains of arts & humanities brought to light differences in how the questions may be approached. While there has been the claim to adopt more corpus-based quantitative frameworks supported by statistical rigidity to the analysis of follow-ups across discourse domains, discourse-analytic frameworks from the humanities argue for more qualitative-based examinations of follow-ups. Both paradigms, however, expressed the need to account for the changes in the production and reception processes of political discourse, and in the explicit accommodation of the so-called new media.

2. Scientific content of the event

2a. The meeting included short, 15-minute presentations (cf. 2b below), interactive 30 minute discussions with the floor at the end of each session, and two 45-minute round table discussions (cf. 2c. below). Comments and discussions largely relied on prior reading of the papers, distributed to the participants in advance. Each round-table discussion was based on a list of questions submitted to the participants before the workshop. All of the discussants were well-prepared and contributed original questions and comments to the overall topics of follow-up, political discourse in the (new) media, and methodological issues. The questions and comments were received in a collaborative spirit, and all of presenters agreed that their research goals have been further refined with stimulating insights and exciting perspectives. The multi-disciplinary nature of the exchange provided important insights from political science, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, pragmatics, translation theory, corpus studies, rhetorics and communications. The in-depth discussions were enriched by the accommodation of wide range of cultural contexts and languages explored, i.e. British and American English, Austrian, Dutch, French, Finnish, German, Hebrew, Russian and Spanish.

2b. In what follows, short summaries of the papers presented at the workshop will be provided.

In his paper on "Follow-ups in Prime Minister's Questions" (PMQs), *Peter Bull* conceptualised follow-up moves as both verbal (The follow-up questions of the leader of the opposition in parliament) and non-verbal (consequential events/actions taken out of parliament). He concluded that follow-ups in PMQs are an effective tool of the opposition to create political realities.

Relevant feedback consisted of the two main issues: (1) is it valid to generalize from one single occurrence of a follow-up in the context of PQT to another context, viz. the societal context, and (2) how the researcher accounted for the – alleged – causal connectedness

between a verbal action in one specific context (parliament) and some delayed non-verbal response in a different context: the 'real world' of society and media. Furthermore, the issue of the underlying political-decision-making process was raised and hotly debated.

That feedback illustrates well the different methodological orientations between qualitative and quantitative paradigms as well as between the effectiveness of different types follow-up strategies as regards thematic relatedness, face-threatening potential, situatedness of the follow-up, and institutional and non-institutional follow-ups.

Liudmila Mikalayeva in her paper on "Strategic follow-ups in diplomatic communication" was concerned with the strategic import of verbal, written follow-up statements (and their absence) in negotiations between European states. States were conceptualized analogously to model persons in Brown and Levinson's terms and thus furnished with information wants and face wants. Against that background, diplomatic communication needs to address both their face and information wants.

Relevant feedback consisted of (1) clarification questions as regards the – possibly multiple – production framework of those communicative exchanges, and (2) the perlocutionary effects and possible consequences of the communicative acts under investigation, e.g. sanctions. The statuses of the diplomatic texts at hand, of their authors, and of English-as-an-International-Language were clarified, and the relevance of follow-up as both a communicative move and a move for political action was acknowledged by all of the participants.

In contrast to all other papers at the workshop, it was claimed in *Piotr Cap's* contribution on "Monologic follow-ups in political legitimization discourse" that follow-ups may not necessarily form second or third actions in a sequence of discursive moves but they may also constitute political speeches on a timeline which respond to changes of a particular political situation and thus form a coherent chain of actions as regards their chronology and contents. The focus on the macro domains of communication was supplemented by an explicit reference to the axiological dimension of ideology.

Relevant feedback consisted of queries whether a political speech as a whole could be considered as a communicative act, and how the researchers intended to account for the connectedness between the communicative acts constituting a speech and the speech as a whole. Another query tackled the impact of the socio-historic contexts. As had been the case with Peter Bull's hypotheses, the researcher was asked to account for his claim of a thematic, if not causal connectedness between the speeches. The overall reaction was that speeches could be seen as communicative units and as possible follow-ups but that it is – indeed – difficult to account for that kind of connectedness. And yet another issue to be solved surfaced for a definition of follow-up, namely that of the delimitation or boundedness of a follow-up.

Christina Schäffner's paper on "Interpreting and identity construction in news interviews" offered a discussion of the multiple levels of analysis of follow-ups produced *in situ* of the interpreting process and of their construction in retrospect in newspaper discourse. Similarly to Peter Bull's study, it showed that in political discourse, the concept of follow-ups is not immediately tied to the communicative situation in which the first move on which they follow up is produced.

Relevant feedback consisted of requests for clarification as regards the statuses of simultaneous and consecutive translation. Furthermore, all of the participants appreciated the very informative input. Hardly anyone had been familiar with the selection process of the translation procedures and the necessary consequences for the more and less biased

representation of information in different languages, and of the construction of political identities and ideologies in the media.

There was general consensus that translations and their source- and target languages need to be considered in the examination of follow-ups in the international political arena.

In her paper on “The reciprocal positioning of journalists and experts in broadcast television news discourse”, *Michal Hamo*, using a narrow definition of the term “follow-up”, showed that experts’ follow-ups to journalists’ talk are characterised by metalinguistic comments which construct the follow-up as moves doing symmetry, alignment and support of the journalists’ position.

Relevant feedback consisted of the acknowledgement of the important differentiation between explicit and implicit follow-ups, and of the communicative function of follow-up as regards the expression of different degrees of affiliation and non-affiliation. Furthermore, the researcher showed that follow-ups played an important role in the construction of authority, and that they were indispensable for the construal of coherence. These issues had been addressed more and less explicitly in almost all of the other contributions as well, and it has been generally agreed upon that that interpersonal orientation and discursive coherence need to be accommodated explicitly in a definition of the forms and functions of both local and global follow-ups.

Similarly, *Elisabeth Reber’s* paper on “Evidential positioning in follow-ups in news interviews” treated follow-ups as a place for the construction of alignment/disalignment between interviewer and interviewee. Her discussion of evidential constructions prefaced by English *so* showed that these may serve for the interviewer to claim/maintain evidential authority over his / her line of argument.

Relevant feedback consisted of acknowledging the importance of distinguishing between follow-ups and ‘simple responses’, which may accept or reject a prior communicative action. The researcher showed the function of the adverb *so* in the construal of discursive coherence as regards cognitive completion and the construal of evidentiality on the local domain of discourse. There were queries whether the adverb *so* had similar functions in other domains of discourse and other types of discourse, and whether it was a demarcation marker. The researcher demonstrated that *so* was a demarcation marker on the local domain of discourse both for the unit of a move and for the unit of an episode.

Christoph Sauer’s paper on “Framing in broadcast talk and its visualisation” approached the topic of follow-ups from multimodal perspective. His analysis of a political talk show illustrated how visual elements in the studio, such as colours, pictures etc., may fulfil the function of framing devices for the talk of the hosts and guests.

Relevant feedback consisted of the question whether visualization could be assigned the status of a follow-up, and how the complexity of the modalities involved in the production of political talk shows could be captured systematically. Further queries targeted the issues of newsworthiness and of how it is recycled in talk shows. In spite of the rather controversial argumentation – at times going back to the beginnings of discourse analysis, pragmatics and media studies, and arguments regarding more recent directions in these research paradigms, all of the participants agreed that there was more to communication, and thus more to the theoretical construct of follow-up, than just plain linguistic strings / linguistic acts/ verbal communication produced by participants and directed at other participants.

Titus Ensink in his paper on “Framing as a continual process in political communication” proposed to distinguish between the different communicative levels and actors in political discourse for the description of follow-ups, illustrating examples of these various levels on

the basis of a politicised discussion of a hat worn by Queen Beatrice on a state visit to Oman.

Relevant feedback consisted of controversial stands taken by the participants of the workshop formatted as a heated discussion about the nature of the connectedness between relevance – and the question of what ‘relevance’ actually was and how it could be accounted for - and follow-ups. The issues under debate became more controversial and thus more challenging by the explicit accommodation of the communicative status of follow-ups in different types media (tweet, weblog, traditional newspaper), a topic that was to be examined in more detail in a number of other presentations (e.g., Atifi and Marcoccia, Janney, Bull). Moreover, the explicit references to different types of media allowed for a fruitful examination of 2nd and 3rd order follow-ups, and of the social and discursive roles of the producers of the follow-ups and the statistical likelihood of having responses to follow-ups.

Most members of the workshop agreed that relevance was of prime importance to the examination of follow-ups, and they agreed that the position put forward, viz. follow-ups are constrained by the principle of relevance, was valid.

In *Richard W. Janney's* paper on “Columbine revisited. Follow-ups and the fractalization of events in the modern media”, it was observed that the production of (verbal) follow-ups on mediatised, extralinguistic events may become a process with its own (internal) dynamics, detached from what actually happened and feeding on each other.

Relevant feedback consisted of a discussion about the necessity of differentiating between positioning and framing, and between institutional and non-institutional follow-ups. The inherent distinction between private and public spheres of communication, and between institutional and non-institutional domains connects well with the likelihood of possible responses to 2nd, 3rd and further higher-order follow-ups. Again, all of the participants agreed upon the importance of approaching the theoretical construct of follow-up, which needs to be differentiated from the interactional concepts of response and reply, from different perspectives and in different contexts.

In *Noam Ordan and Ehud Alexander Avner's* presentation on “Question-answer interaction as a translation process: studying questionese and answerese” the questions of whether the concept of follow-up could be examined from a quantitative perspective were discussed in great details, pointing out the advantages huge amounts of data may bring into the primarily qualitative approaches discussed in the workshop. Furthermore, issues concerning the compilation and analysis of an internet corpus were discussed.

Relevant feedback consisted of the fundamental issue whether qualitative aspects could be implemented in that kind of research design, what status should be assigned to qualitative issues, and how qualitative aspects could be accommodated in their design. The discussion also addressed the query of how context can be included and implemented in huge corpora, and how the wider definition of a follow-up spanning across different time spans and different discourse domains could be accounted for.

Hassan Atifi and Michel Marcoccia, in their paper on "Follow-ups in online political discussions", relied on a narrow definition of follow-ups as the third move (by A), preceded by initiation (by A) and reaction (by B). Five realizations of online political discussions in French context are explored: discussion fora, participatory journalism website, online newspapers articles and comments, facebook and twitters of French politicians. The presence or absence of follow-up messages are analysed as markers of dialogic action. Relevant feedback consisted of the differentiation between follow-ups in the traditional media and the new media, and whether the internet promoted the use of follow-ups, and – what seems even more important – the reaction of politicians to follow-ups produced by

professional participants, e.g. journalists or experts, and follow-ups produced by ordinary people. The research result that twitter was the ideal medium for follow-ups was seen as a very important issue in further analyses of follow-ups.

All participants of the workshop saw the need to refine and contextualize the concept of internet, and to distinguish between the different formats and outlets used in the web. Against that background, the claim that follow-ups in the internet are participatory by definition was debated hotly, and the researchers agreed upon the necessity to include the perlocutionary effects, e.g. the Austinian concept of uptake, in the analysis. Thus, the accommodation of a 3rd order communicative move in the analysis of follow-ups, viz. the question if follow-ups produced by ordinary citizens are followed up by political agents, is a necessary condition for a felicitous analysis of follow-ups. In a similar vein, it is necessary to contextualize Goffman's concept of footing and adapt it to the contextual constraints and requirements of the different types of media and to the production and reception format of a follow-up.

Maria Sivenkova's presentation on "Metacommunicative follow-ups in British, German and Russian political webchats and blogs" ...identified two types of follow-ups in her corpus: 1) "single follow-ups referring to [one specific] preceding communicative act", 2) "multiple follow-ups that comment on several exchanges or the whole transaction". Her analysis revealed similarities and differences linked to differences in genre (political webchats vs. blogs) and differences in culture (British, German and Russian).

Relevant feedback consisted of the question whether follow-ups could be defined from a structural perspective as third moves, or whether content- and action-based features would be further necessary features. Moreover, it was pointed out that the structural definition does not allow for a wide definition of follow-ups, accommodating interdiscursive follow-ups. There was general agreement that there should be some typology of follow-ups to enable contrastive and inter- and trans-cultural comparison.

In her contribution "Follow-ups as communicative acts in discussion forums", *Marjut Johansson* extended her interest to three languages - French, Finnish, and British online newspapers, and enlarged the definition of follow-ups to include not only responsive but also initiative communicative acts, which negotiate new meanings, mostly challenging, and representing (inter)subjective stances.

Relevant feedback consisted of the acknowledgement that – from a sequential perspective – follow-ups could be assigned the status of an initiating move within a sequence in which the communicative status of a follow-up is negotiated. However, almost all of the participants felt the need to point out that that very local status was not of prime importance. While the structural observation of follow-ups as initiating moves was not really accepted, the claim that follow-ups were used strategically to signify stance and various degrees of alignment was wholeheartedly accepted. Furthermore, the argument that follow-ups are a means to express subjectivity and intersubjectivity was also accepted widely.

Again, the participants in the workshop were very happy with the different perspectives offered on the theoretical construct of follow-up, and all of them benefited immensely from the very focused discussions and analyses.

Zohar Livnat ("The pragmatic effectiveness of figurative analogy in political discourse") adopted a rhetorical approach to the study of follow-ups. Studying the coverage of a single event in a number of op-eds in various Hebrew newspapers and sites, she focused on responses to analogy, and explored their rhetorical efficiency in terms enhancing new argumentative directions.

Relevant feedback consisted of a discussion about the status of argumentation theory as an appropriate frame of reference for the investigation of follow-ups, promoting the use of a 'loose argumentative context'. It was generally accepted that the theory could be used for both wide and narrow definitions of follow-ups, depending on possible extensions of the definition of argument, viz. argument as a local move and argument as a global move referring to a whole discourse / text / sequence. Against that background, the use of formal devices, e.g. quotation marks and quotation markers, and of their function in analogical reasoning seem very useful tools for the examination of follow-ups and of their pragmatic effectiveness.

As has been pointed out above, the different theoretical perspectives, in which follow-ups can be approached, meet in both formal aspects, for instance the formal device of quotation mark, which can be quantified in corpus analyses, and in their function in discourse, e.g. the expression of irony or the importation of relevant contextual information through quotes.

Helmut Gruber's contribution ("Establishing intertextual references in Austrian parliamentary debate") was concerned with the discursive and rhetorical mechanisms in the MP's contributions to the inaugural speech parliamentary debate. Two (tentative) genres of follow-up moves were identified, 1) the "alternative policy focused statement" (by opposition party speakers), 2) the "evaluation focused statement":

Relevant feedback consisted of the general acceptance that the contextual constraints and requirements of present-day political discourse need to be accommodated in the theoretical frameworks employed. That holds for the differentiation of illocution as split illocution addressing the primary audience (or face-to-face audience) and the secondary audience (or mediated audience). Moreover, all of the participants agreed that Goffman's frame of reference was well suited to account for that. Firstly, the distinction between front-stage and back-stage, and the refinement of participant role need to be integrated in a felicitous analysis of political discourse, as was mentioned in a number of other presentations (e.g., Fetzer, Ensink, Sauer, Reber). Another possible frame of reference, which may be employed in the analysis of political discourse in a fruitful manner, is Bakhtin's differentiation between primarily monologic and primarily dialogic discourse.

In her contribution on "Metadiscourse revisited: bridging the micro-macro divide", *Cornelia Illie* observed three main types of metadiscursive speech acts in her analysis of PMQs: challenging acts, parenthetical acts and evaluative acts, which may be positioned on different levels (turn-initial, turn-medial, turn-final).

Relevant feedback consisted of the acknowledgement of the need to make explicit what is meant by 'macro' and 'micro', concepts which are fundamental to an analysis of follow-ups, as is reflected in the differentiation between a narrow definition anchored to the micro (or local) domain of discourse, and a wide definition anchored to the macro (or global) domain. After a heated debate about a classification of follow-ups as speech acts or as pragmatic acts (in Mey's terms), there was some agreement that a follow-up could be described as some kind of communicative act along the lines of Austin's notion of expositive.

Elda Weizman ("Negotiating irony through follow-ups") studied readers' comments of various types –meta-comments, literal and ironic comments on the dictum and the implicatum – to ironic op-eds. In her analysis, meta-comments showed that readers tend to be aware of shifts in keying within the text, and that the use of irony is evaluated as undesirable and inefficient. She further argued that ironic op-eds trigger a large variety of ironic responses. This finding was interpreted in terms of culture-specific tendency towards reciprocity. Relevant feedback consisted of the acknowledgement that features needed to be identified which made a communicative act count as a follow-up. Almost all participants agreed that

necessary features are an explicit initiation of some form of talk-back, and some kind of chronological order. The relevance of context to the discussion was highlighted again.

Gloria Alvarez Benito (with Isabel M. Inigo-Mora) on “Redundancy in parliamentary discourse: repetition and reiteration in oral questions” showed that the main functions of redundancy are 1) “to emphasize or give more prominence to a word or idea, generally to make the speaker’s position clear.” and 2) to establish a cohesive relation between sentences in discourse (creating a cohesive chain) and observed differences in the production of redundant forms across parties and gender groups.

Relevant feedback consisted of a very controversial discussion whether redundancy based on formal features, e.g. simple repetition, morphosyntactic redundancy, are functionally equivalent to communicative redundancy. Prototypical examples for redundancy – in the presenters viewpoints - were the politically correct use of language. There has been almost general agreement that that kind of redundancy has interpersonal functions, such as indexically appealing to a particular category of the electorate.

Anita Fetzer (“Quotations in monologic and dialogic political discourse”) contextualized the concept of political discourse by making explicit its status as public discourse, institutional discourse, mediated discourse, and sometimes also professional discourse, and it analysed quotation as a prototypical follow-up. It explicated the communicative function of quotations in political discourse, e.g. alignment with party delegates and secondary audience, challenging ideologies, promoting ideologies, and re-establishing credibility.

Relevant feedback consisted of a heated debate about the different footings of political agents in the different types of electronic media, and about the claim that political discourse being conceptualized along the lines of a cognitive prototype with core features (public, institutional, mediated) and peripheral features (professional). Another point of discussion was the observation – shared with Helmut Gruber’s research – that the communicative function of quotations is highly context-dependent, and participant-dependent. One and the same quotation can be used to challenge an ideology and its supporters in one context, and it can be used to align with an ideology and its supporters in another context.

2c. Round-table discussions

In the first round-table, "studying form and function - methodological aspects", four participants - Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg, Marjut Johansson, Elisabeth Reber and Elda Weizman – commented on the following: (a) Methods for the assessment of functions assigned to forms by the researcher; (b) Possibilities and limitations of the use of large corpora: Is quantification required? Does it help to establish functions? Do we start with theoretical hypotheses about form and function or with large-scale occurrences of textual phenomena? The discussion was then open to the floor, and referred also to the presentation " Question-answer interaction as a translation process: studying questionese and answerese" by Noam Ordan and Ehud Alexander Avner, who proposed an integrated view relying on cohesive ties between follow-ups and initiations, traced in large electronic corpora.

In the second round-table, ‘Political discourse and the (new) media’, the overall topic of the workshop was discussed. Participants discussed the following topics: (a) What are new media and how are they used in political discourse? (b) In what way do the so-called new media change the production and presentation of political discourse? (c) What methodological tools do we need to analyse political discourse in the (new) media in an appropriate manner?

3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field, outcome

Results

The most important results and issues of discussion can be summarised as follows:

1. There was a tendency to treat the notion of follow-ups in a rather loose way, i.e. as (any) response to a prior move (e.g. Alvarez Benito, Bull, Gruber, Johansson, Mikalayeva, Ordan and Avner, Reber), or to define them in more narrow terms, i.e. as comment or subsequent action rather than response, relating to a preceding action (e.g. Cap, Hamo, Janney)
2. The theoretical construct of follow-up can be operationalized as some kind of communicative act, which undergoes context-specific particularization. That is to say, in the domain of political discourse, follow-ups follow particularized specification, such as follow-ups being public acts, institutional acts, mediated acts, targeting public and mediated domains, addressing public and institutional domains of communication. Additionally, follow-ups undergo discourse-domain-specific and genre-specific particularization. That is to say, follow-ups in political discourse are formatted differently in primarily dialogic and primarily monologic genres, and they undergo further particularization in the new media and the formats employed there.

Subsequent actions

- (a) A panel on follow-ups involving some of the participants has been submitted to the International Pragmatics Conference held in New Delhi in September 2013. Submission to other relevant international and conferences is envisaged.
- (b) An email list and a virtual space hosted by the University of Turku (Finland) are to be initiated in which the participants of the exploratory workshop have the possibility to enhance their research contacts.
- (c) In accordance with the requirements of the ESF to publish proceedings of the workshop online, all papers are published on the publication server of the University of Würzburg OPUS (http://opus.bibliothek.uni-wuerzburg.de/frontdoor.php?source_opus=7165). In addition, a volume of selected publications will be published with John Benjamins in the *Pragmatics and Beyond New Series*. The publication of a second volume in the John Benjamins series *Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture* will be published depending on submission.
- (d) We intend to submit a proposal for a ESF Research Networking Programme

4. Final programme

Thursday, 31 May 2012

Morning / noon	<i>Arrival</i>
14.15-14.30	Welcome by Convenors Anita Fetzer (English Linguistics, Würzburg, Germany) Elda Weizman (Translation Department, Bar-Ilan, Israel)
14.45 -18.30	Afternoon Session: The dynamics of political discourse
14.45-15.00	Presentation 1 "Follow-ups in Prime Minister's Questions" Peter Bull (Department of Psychology, York, UK)
15.00-15.15	Presentation 2 "Strategic follow-ups in diplomatic communication" Liudmila Mikalayeva (BIGSSS Bremen, Germany)

- 15.15-15.30 **Presentation 3 "Monologic follow-ups in political legitimization discourse"**
Piotr Cap (Institute of Pragmatics, Lodz, Poland)
- 15.30-16.00 **Discussion of Presentations 1-3**
Chair: Anita Fetzner (English Linguistics, Würzburg, Germany)
- 16.00-16.30 *Coffee / Tea Break*
- 16.30-16.45 **Presentation 4 "Interpreting and identity construction in news interviews"**
Christina Schäffner (Translation Studies, Birmingham, UK)
- 16.45-17.00 **Presentation 5 "The reciprocal positioning of journalists and experts in broadcast television news discourse"**
Michal Hamo (School of Communication, Netanya academic college, Israel)
- 17.00-17.15 **Presentation 6 "Evidential positioning in follow-ups in news interviews"**
Elisabeth Reber (English Linguistics, Würzburg, Germany)
- 17.15-18.00 **Discussion of Presentations 4-6 & general discussion of the overall topic 'The dynamics of political discourse'**
Chair: Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg (English Linguistics, Ghent, Belgium)
- 19.15 – 21.00 *Dinner in Italian Restaurant – La Fenice (Würzburg, next door to Hotel Amberger)*

Friday, 1 June 2012

- 08.45-09.00 **Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)**
Algis Krupavicius (Standing Committee for Social Sciences - SCSS)
- 09.00-12.30 Morning Session: Political discourse and the (new) media I**
- 09.00-09.15 **Presentation 1 "Framing in broadcast talk and its visualisation"**
Christoph Sauer (Center of Language and Cognition, Groningen, Netherlands)
- 09.15-09.30 **Presentation 2 "Framing as a continual process in political communication"**
Titus Ensink (Speech Communication and Discourse Analysis, Groningen, Netherlands)
- 09.30-09.45 **Presentation 3 "Columbine revisited. Follow-ups and the fractalization of events in the modern media"**
Richard W. Janney (English Linguistics, Munich, Germany)
- 09.45-10.15 **Discussion of Presentations 1-3**
Chair: Piotr Cap (Institute of Pragmatics, Lodz, Poland)
- 10.15-10.45 *Coffee / Tea Break*
- 10.45-11.00 **Presentation 4 "Question-answer interaction as a translation process: studying questionese and answerese"**
Noam Ordan & Ehud Alexander Avner (Department of Computer Science, Haifa, Israel & Department of Linguistics, Potsdam, Germany)
- 11.00-11.45 **Round-table: studying form and function - methodological aspects**
Marjut Johansson (School of Languages and Translation Studies, Turku, Finland)
Elisabeth Reber (English Linguistics, Würzburg, Germany)
Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg (English Linguistics, Ghent, Belgium)
Chair: Elda Weizman (Translation Department, Bar-Ilan, Israel)
- 11.45-12.15 **General discussion of methodology**
- 12.30-13.45 *Lunch in a Greek Restaurant Am Hubland (<http://www.Restaurant-Hubland.de>)*
- 13.45-18.30 Afternoon Session: Political discourse and the (new) media II**
- 13.45-14.00 **Presentation 5 "Follow-ups in online political discussions"**
Hassan Atifi & Michel Marcoccia (Equipe Tech, Troyes, France)

- 14.00-14.15 **Presentation 6 "Metacommunicative follow-ups in British, German and Russian political webchats and blogs"**
Maria Sivenkova (Department of Communication Studies, Minsk, Belarus)
- 14.15-14.30 **Presentation 7 "Follow-ups as communicative acts in discussion forums"**
Marjut Johansson (School of Languages and Translation Studies, Turku, Finland)
- 14.30-14.45 **Presentation 8 "The pragmatic effectiveness of a figurative analogy in political discourse"**
Zohar Livnat (Department of Hebrew and Semitic Languages, Bar-Ilan, Israel)
- 14.45-15.15 **Discussion of Presentations 5-8**
Chair: Christina Schäffner (Translation Studies, Birmingham, UK)
- 15.15-15.45 *Coffee / tea break*
- 15.45-16.00 **Presentation 9 "Establishing intertextual references in Austrian parliamentary debates"**
Helmut Gruber (Institute of Linguistics, Vienna, Austria)
- 16.00-16.15 **Presentation 10 "Metadiscourse revisited: bridging the micro-macro divide"**
Cornelia Ilie (Faculty of Culture and Society, Malmö, Sweden)
- 16.15-16.30 **Presentation 11 "Follow-ups of ironic op-eds: readers' comments in the daily press"**
Elda Weizman (Translation Department, Bar-Ilan, Israel)
- 16.30-17.00 **Discussion of Presentations 9-11**
Chair: Elisabeth Reber (English Linguistics, Würzburg, Germany)
- 17.00-18.30 **Round-table discussion of the overall topic 'Political discourse and the (new) media'**
Peter Bull (Department of Psychology, York, UK)
Michal Hamo (School of Communication, Netanya, Israel)
Cornelia Ilie (Faculty of Culture and Society, Malmö, Sweden)
Liudmila Mikalayeva (BIGSSS Bremen, Germany)
Noam Ordan (Department of Computer Science, Haifa, Israel)
Christina Schäffner (Translation Studies, Birmingham, UK)
Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberghe (English Linguistics, Ghent, Belgium)
Convenors: Anita Fetzer (English Linguistics, Würzburg, Germany)
Elda Weizman (Translation Department, Bar-Ilan, Israel)
- 20.00 *Dinner in a local Restaurant – Bürgerspital Würzburg*
(<http://www.buergerspital-weinstuben.com>)

Saturday, 2 June 2012

- 09.00-12.30 Morning Session: Political discourse across contexts**
- 09.00-09.15 **Presentation 1 "Redundancy in parliamentary discourse: repetition and reiteration in oral questions"**
Gloria Alvarez Benito (English Linguistics, Seville, Spain)
- 09.15-09.30 **Presentation 2 "Quotations in monologic and dialogic political discourse"**
Anita Fetzer (English Linguistics, Würzburg, Germany)
- 09.30-10.15 **Discussion of presentation 1-2**
Chairs: Helmut Gruber (Institute of Linguistics, Vienna, Austria)
- 10.15-10.45 *Coffee / Tea Break*
- 11.00-12.00 **Discussion on follow-up activities/networking/collaboration**
- 12.30 *End of Workshop and departure*

5. Final list of participants (name and affiliation is sufficient; the detailed list should be updated on-line directly)

1. Alvarez Benito, Gloria (Universidad de Sevilla, Spain)
2. Avner, Ehud Alexander (University of Potsdam, Germany)
3. Atifi, Hassan (Université de Technologie de Troyes (UTT), France)
4. Bull, Peter (University of York, UK)
5. Cap, Piotr (University of Lodz, Poland)
6. Ensink, Titus (University of Groningen, Netherlands)
7. Fetzer, Anita (University of Würzburg, Germany)
8. Gruber, Helmut (University of Vienna, Austria)
9. Hamo, Michal (Netanya Academic College, Israel)
10. Ilie, Cornelia (University of Malmö, Sweden)
11. Janney, Richard (University of Munich, Germany)
12. Johansson, Marjut (University of Turku, Finland)
13. Krupavicius, Algis (ESF representative, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania)
14. Livnat, Zohar (Bar-Ilan University, Israel)
15. Marcocchia, Michel (Université de Technologie de Troyes (UTT), France)
16. Michalayeva, Luidmila (University of Bremen, Germany)
17. Ordan, Noam (University of Haifa, Israel)
18. Reber, Elisabeth (University of Würzburg, Germany)
19. Sauer, Christoph (University of Groningen, Netherlands)
20. Schäffner, Christina (Aston University, UK)
21. Simon-Vandenberg, Anne-Marie (University of Ghent, Belgium)
22. Sivenkova Maria (Minsk State Linguistic University, Belarus)
23. Weizman, Elda (Bar-Ilan University, Israel)

6. Statistical information on participants

M/F repartition

12 females + 11 males

Countries of origin

13 countries of origin (Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Israel, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden, UK)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| - Austria (1 representative) | Belarus (1 representative) |
| - Belgium (1 representative) | Finland (1 representative) |
| - France (2 representatives) | Germany (5 representatives) |
| - Israel (4 representatives) | <i>Lithuania: ESF representative</i> |
| - Netherlands (2 representatives) | Poland (1 representative) |
| - Spain (1 representative) | Sweden (1 representative) |
| - UK (2 representatives) | |

Age bracket

Age bracket was 38 with around 40 % postgraduate researchers with a recent PhD, and around 60% firmly established researchers with a strong record in (political) discourse analysis, pragmatics and sociopragmatics, and sociolinguistics.