

Mykhaylenko V. V.,

Doctor of Philology,

Professor, Dept. of Translation and Philology

Ivano-Frankivsk King Danylo Galatsky University of Law

## ON CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL-LAY DISCOURSE

**Summary.** Using text fragments reflecting professional genres of physics, history of arts and religious iconology this study focuses on the correlation of speakers' professional and lay discourse employing analytic paradigms from systemic-functional linguistics, pragmatics, text analysis, sociology and anthropological linguistics. The analysis of the text fragments representing professional and lay speakers' discourse in the novel structure has revealed that markers of discourse coherence are essential linguistic devices for discourse continuity. They are devices that make the current and preceding discourse coherent. This examination of the correlation of professional-lay discourse, and its important role in society, will be of interest to researchers in applied linguistics, to professionals who want to understand the role of language in their work, and to teachers of English for specific purposes.

**Key words:** discourse, professional-lay discourse, function, semantic, pragmatic, context, situation, marker of discourse coherence.

**Formulation of the problem.** A more comprehensive notion of professional discourse is provided by Per Lindell [19, p. 143–158] who argues that professional discourse [8, p. 55–75; 10, p. 1–8.] can be divided into three categories: (1) intraprofessional discourse, or discourse within a specific profession, such as communication among academics [1, p. 826–851; 17]; (2) professional-lay discourse, such as communication between lawyers and their clients, or between advertisers and their potential customers; (3) interprofessional discourse, or discourse between individuals from or representatives of different professions [2, p. 1–32; 15, p. 38–64], such as communication between medical doctors and pharmaceutical sales persons, or between accountants and engineers [19, p. 143–158; 3; 17]. At present the professional-lay discourse must be in focus of scholars of different areas and different synchronic periods [7, p. 387–398; 21], primarily, linguistics, communication, psychology and a great variety of disciplines about human [24, p. 55–59], because this type of discourse is the basis of exchange of ideas, information and free movement of labour, goods, services and persons.

First, the formation of the global community on different levels much depends upon world-wide discourse, otherwise the world may be divided into professionals and laymen without any mutual understanding. Evidently, both groups can be further classified into N-number of subgroups according to their professions. Therefore the mapping of the speaking community onto professionals and laymen is possible for the investigation only in a certain field.

We shall take some text fragments from "Angels and Demons" by Dan Brown to validate our ideas on professional → lay discourse. The success or failure of the CERN project much depends on the relationship of the group of professionals and the 'lay' community which serve as a model of two groups collaborating.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** Discourse analysts do what people in their everyday experience of language do instinctively and largely unconsciously: notice patterning's of lan-

guage in use and the circumstances (participants, situations, purposes, outcomes) with which these are typically associated [22]. For many researches the interest in discourse is beyond language in use [14, p. 3] to "language use relative to social, political and cultural formations, language reflecting social order but also language shaping social order, and shaping individuals' interaction with society [9, p. 95–135; 14, p. 3–6] explain why so many areas of academic study have become so gripped by enthusiasm for discourse analysis. The question of how we build knowledge has come to the fore, and this is where issues to do with language and linguistic representation come into focus Charles Goodwin [13, p. 606–633; 12, p. 7–16] characterizes "professional vision" in terms of three discursive components. Firstly, "coding" what is observable, with the assumption that this activity will be different for different professions; even within a given profession the differences in professions may lead to coding observables differently. Secondly, following coding, "highlighting" what might be significant/salient – a kind of figure-ground marking – in light of prevailing professional expertise. This is where functional expertise in context-sensitive ways, as discussed earlier, comes to the fore. Thirdly, professionals articulate representations of their understandings for the benefit of others, especially their peer group.

**Presentation of the main research material.** Characteristics of lay versus professional discourse are little known about pragmatic differences between lay and professional discourses in various registers of I communication. It is clear that lay people and professionals often express themselves differently, but the majority of the differences have been attributed to lexical-semantic choices (such as complex terms and abbreviations), and lengthy sentences. However, layman's vocabulary may be more similar than different from professional vocabulary. Calling it physician "adaptability" in language use, or "lexical entrainment" R. Bromme et al. found that advanced medical students adapt their level or content of language to the language found in patient questions posed [6, p. 572]. Prior research suggests that "the difference between the lay (consumer) and professional knowledge base of health and disease is likely to extend beyond simple term labels, into the underlying concepts that are the basis for (the use of) these terms" (O. Kesselman et al., 2008). *Empirical research (conducted by the author and others), discourse theory and pedagogical practice in professional writing strongly suggest that at least three categories of professional writing exist: engineering, administrative, and technical/professional writing. The author demonstrates this claim* [25, p. 371–394]. The application of scientific knowledge to solve "the real world problems in which language is a central issue" [5, p. 169] constitutes the "jobbing linguist" – "someone who offers technical skills in the service of somebody else's activity" [7, p. 387–398; 4, p. 556–571]. This applied, "jobbing" linguistic mentality of "problem solving" which implies that a given profession is aware of the salience of its language-centred practices is some guarantee for the continuing rel-

evance of applied linguistics. With this comes the recognition that some professional contexts are more language-centred than others, and within a specific professional context, certain sub-specialities may profess different degrees of language fronts (e.g., psychotherapy vs. neurosurgery [3]. In other words, if we were to take a problem-solving approach to language-based professions, then the frontiers of applied linguistics, to use D. Crystal's metaphor (2008), can extend beyond its mainstream engagement with language education.

Kenneth Kong added to these categories the regulatory professional discourse which is used to regulate or control a profession, for example, the codes of practice issued by a hospital to doctors and nurses [17, Ch. 1]. Regulatory professional discourse, usually taking an occluded form, should belong to the categories of intraprofessional or interprofessional discourse. Certainly, regulatory discourse can be written by peers or professionals of other categories but there is a very significant difference comparing with other kinds of communication, mainly in that regulatory discourse has a very strong normative function in shaping and forming the profession in question [5]. Another important dimension that should be added to conceptualizing of professional discourse is the interactional or affective function of language in professional contexts, where interpersonal negotiation of meaning is always at stake in addition to exchange of information.

The main linguistic premise in this study is that language is typically used to achieve various goals in human communication (N. Bonvillain, 2008). Speakers (or writers) generally convey various information or meaning to those who listen (or read) with a goal in mind. The pragmatic level of discourse specifically seeks to explain the meaning of linguistic messages or information in terms of the context of use [18, p. 441–446]. Pragmatics facilitates consideration of how each information sharing group uses language "to convey desires, beliefs, and intentions" [4, p. 557] or other.

In the first Text fragment "A" SPEAKER 1, a professor of religious iconology, in the role of a layman and SPEAKER 2, a pilot of the X-33, in the role of a Professional.

TEXT FRAGMENT "A": SITUATION – at the airport. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SPEAKERS – unfamiliar. The purpose of communication of SPEAKER 1 is to start communication and then support it; the SPEAKER 2 is to give some information about the plane.

SPEAKER 1 [+ layman in aviation, + professional in religious iconology] → RECIPIENT [+ professional in aviation]: e.g.: Langdon stared a long moment. – What the hell is it?

SPEAKER 2 [+ professional in aviation] → RECIPIENT [+ layman in aviation, + professional in religious iconology], e.g.:

A hundred fifty thousand kilos fully fueled, the pilot offered, like a father bragging about his newborn. – Runs on slush hydrogen. The shell's a titanium matrix with silicon carbide fibers. She packs a 20:1 thrust/weight ratio; most jets run at 7:1. The director must be in one helluva a hurry to see you. He doesn't usually send the big boy.

(1) SPEAKER 1 [+ layman in aviation, + professional in religious iconology] → RECIPIENT [+ professional in aviation]: e.g.: – This thing flies? Langdon said. (2) SPEAKER 2 [+ professional in aviation] → RECIPIENT [+ layman in aviation, + professional in religious iconology], e.g.: – Oh yeah. He led Langdon across the tarmac toward the plane. Looks kind of startling, I know, but you better get used to it. In five years, all you'll see are these babies – HSCT's – High Speed Civil Transports. Our lab's one of the first to own one.

The purpose of communication of SPEAKER 1 is to start communication and then support it: with simple questions emotionally marked. The purpose of communication of SPEAKER 2 is to give some information about the plane: first, many terms, but then in the second turn he uses colloquialisms, simple constructions just for the RECIPIENT'S easier comprehension [20, p. 243–281; 14, p. 1–12].

TEXT FRAGMENT "B": SITUATION – on campus (As the two men ascended the stone path toward the entry, they passed under a gateway formed by a pair of marble columns. Someone had put a sticky-note on one of them. This column is Ionic. Physicist graffiti? Langdon mused, eyeing the column and chuckling to himself. ). SPEAKER 1 is a professor of religious; SPEAKER 2 is General director of CERN, physicist; RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SPEAKERS – uncomfortable, newly introduced. PURPOSE OF COMMUNICATION – to support communication

SPEAKER 1 [+ professional in history of arts, + layman in physics] → RECIPIENT [+ layman in history of arts, + professional in physics], e.g.: I'm relieved to see that even brilliant physicists make mistakes.

SPEAKER 2 [+ layman in religious iconology, + professional in physics], e.g.: Kohler looked over. – What do you mean?

SPEAKER 1 [+ professional in history of arts, + layman in physics] → RECIPIENT [+ professional in physics, + layman in history of arts], e.g.: – Whoever wrote that note made a mistake. That column isn't Ionic. Ionic columns are uniform in width. That one's tapered. It's Doric – the Greek counterpart. – A common mistake.

SPEAKER 2 [+ professional in physics, + layman in history of arts] → RECIPIENT [+ layman in physics, + professional in history of arts], e.g.:

Kohler did not smile. – The author meant it as a joke, Mr. Langdon. Ionic means containing ions – electrically charged particles. Most objects contain them. As I understand Langdon wanted to show that he was professional too in his field, but he did not know a physical term "ionic". Thus, instead of supporting communication there was an uncomfortable lapse in communication.

Again Speaker in the role of "layman" uses a special question that his co-speaker could clarify his utterance [16, p. 39–41]. There must be some differences in discourse organization, for instance, prevailing rhetorical identifiers of the professional → lay discourse, e.g.: SPEAKER 1 [+ layman in physics, + professional in religious iconology] uses the phrase: "I'm relieved to see that ..." which is a kind of communicative gambit to link the preceding situation and environment in order to initiate his own speech [20, p. 243–281].

TEXT FRAGMENT "C": SITUATION in the room; SPEAKER 1 is a professor of religious iconology; SPEAKER 2 is General director of CERN, physicist; PURPOSE OF COMMUNICATION of SPEAKER 1 to give a comprehensive information; Purpose of communication of Speaker to get to the core and find the answer. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SPEAKERS – uncomfortable, SPEAKER 1 [+ professional in religious iconology, + layman in physics] → RECIPIENT [+ layman in religious iconology, + professional in physics], e.g.: Langdon frowned. The Illuminati history was by no means a simple one. I'll freeze to death trying to explain it. He gazed again at the brand, feeling a renewed sense of awe. Although accounts of the Illuminati emblem were legendary in modern symbology, no academic had ever actually seen it. Ancient documents described the symbol as an ambigram – ambi meaning "both" – signifying it was legible both ways. And although ambigrams were common in symbology – swastikas, yin yang, Jewish

stars, and simple crosses – the idea that a word could be crafted into an ambigram seemed utterly impossible. Modern symbolologists had tried for years to forge the word “Illuminati” into a perfectly symmetrical style, but they had failed miserably. Most academics had now decided the symbol’s existence was a myth.

SPEAKER 2 [+ layman in religious iconology, + professional in physics], → RECIPIENT [+ professional in religious iconology + layman in physics], e.g.: – So who are the Illuminati? Kohler demanded.

The special question on the SPEAKER’s part becomes a dialogical gambit to clarify the information and International and makes discourse as successive coherent sentence, spoken or (in most usage) written [22]. It could be a novel, a speech by a politician or a lecture to students, an interview or any other series of speech events in which successive sentences or utterances hang together.

TEXT FRAGMENT “D”: SITUATION: at the lab; SPEAKER1 (Vittoria) is a researcher in bio-physics; SPEAKER 2 (Langdon) is a professor of religious iconology. PURPOSE OF COMMUNICATION of SPEAKER 1 is to give some information on the Big Bang Theory from the Biblical point and from the scientific point; PURPOSE OF COMMUNICATION of SPEAKER 2 to understand the points under discussion. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SPEAKERS – formal.

SPEAKER 1[+ professional in physics, + catholic, + layman religious iconology] → RECIPIENT [+ in physics layman, + professional in religious iconology], e.g.: – The Bible, of course, states that God created the universe, she explained. – God said, “Let there be light”, and everything we see appeared out of a vast emptiness. Unfortunately, one of the fundamental laws of physics states that matter cannot be created out of nothing.

– Mr. Langdon, Vittoria said, turning, – I assume you are familiar with the Big Bang Theory?

The sentence “Mr. Langdon, I assume you are familiar with the Big Bang Theory?” points out that there is a dialogue between a professional and a layman that is proved by the following response of SPEAKER 2 [+ layman in physics, + professional in religious iconology] → RECIPIENT [+ professional in physics, + layman in religious iconology], e.g.: Langdon shrugged. – More or less. The Big Bang, he knew, was the scientifically accepted model for the creation of the universe. He didn’t really understand it, but according to the theory, a single point of intensely focused energy erupted in a cataclysmic explosion, expanding outward to form the universe. Or something like that.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines that a layman is “a man who is an “outsider” or a non-expert in relation to some particular profession, art, or branch of knowledge (esp. with reference to law and medicine)”. The discourse analysis [23, p. 156] stresses the feature “a non-expert in relation to some particular profession”, for instance, Langdon was not an expert in physics, and aviation, Kohler and Vittoria in the history of illuminati and the history of arts. Nevertheless, they could understand each other and using a number of discourse gambits or supporters [18, p. 441–446], they tried to get into the know and enrich their background. And the language in use always reveals new functions of utterances in discourse structure.

**Conclusions.** In this professional → lay discourse a number of questions are raised for scholars to reflect on. The analysis of the text fragments in the corpus has revealed that discourse markers are essential linguistic devices that guide the reader to the direction of the discourse continuum. In particular, the sentences the laymen use to clarify, to understand, etc. develop an additional

function in discourse – that of a discourse starter (gambit) or a discourse supporter.

The analysis of the text fragments representing professional and lay speakers’ discourse in the novel structure has revealed that markers of discourse coherence are essential linguistic devices to discourse continuity. They are devices that make the current and preceding discourse coherent. Whichever name these linguistic units can bear we have studied them in discursive-pragmatic function.

The findings suggest different communicative goals expressed in lay and professional discourse. Laymen appear to be more motivating, or activating, and more polite (linguistically) than professionals because they try to comprehend and acquire new facts, ideas – information.

We would like to continue the search of common correspondences of markers of discourse coherence in various discourse registers in professional and lay varieties and the way of transferring speaker’s ethnic-cultural features from English into Ukrainian.

#### *Literature:*

1. Abrahamson J.A., Rubin V.L. Differences over discourse structure differences: A reply to Urquhart and Urquhart / J.A. Abrahamson, V.L. Rubin // *Journal of Documentation*. – 2012. – Vol. 68. – Issue 6. – P. 826–851.
2. Bargiela-Chippini F. Business Writing as Social Action / F. Bargiela-Chippini, C. Nickerson (eds.) // *Writing Business: Genre, Media and Discourses*. – Harlow : Longman, 1999. – p. 1–32.
3. Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical school / [H. Becker, E. Geer, E.C. Hughes, A.L. Strauss]. – Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1961. – 456 p.
4. Bickmore T. Health Dialog Systems for Patients and Consumers / T. Bickmore, T. Giorgino // *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*. – 2006. – Vol. 39. – Issue 5. – P. 556–571.
5. Bhatia V.K.. Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View / V.K. Bhatia. – London ; New York : Continuum, 2004. – 228 p.
6. How to Refer to ‘Diabetes? Language in Online Health Advice [R Bromme, R. Jucks, T. Wagner] // *Applied Cognitive Psychology*. – 2005. – Vol. 19. – No 5. – P. 569–586.
7. Brumfit C. Coping with Change in Applied Linguistics / C. Brumfit // *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. – 2004. – Vol. 1. – Issue 3. – P.387–398.
8. Burns T. Sociological Explanation / T. Burns // D. Emmet and A. MacIntyre (eds). *Sociological Theory and Philosophical Analysis*. – New York : Macmillan, 1970. – P. 55–75.
9. Candlin C.N. (ed.) *Research and Practice in Professional Discourse* / C.N. Candlin. – Hong Kong : City University of Hong Kong Press, 2002. – P. 95–135.
10. Candlin C.N. Sarangi S. Making Applied Linguistics Matter / C.N. Candlin // *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. – 2004. – Vol. 1. – Issue 1. – P.1–8.
11. Couture B. Categorizing Professional Discourse. Engineering, Administrative, and Technical / Professional Writing / B. Couture // *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*. – 2008. – Vol. 22. – P. 38–64.
12. Academic and Professional Discourse Genres in Spanish / [P. Giovanni, I. Romualdo, V. Rene]. – Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing, 2010. – 255 p.
13. Goodwin C. Professional Vision / C. Goodwin // *American Anthropologist*. – 1994. – Vol. 96. – Issue 3. – P. 606–633.
14. Gunnarsson Britt-Louise, Linell Per, Nordberg Bengt. Introduction. / Britt-Louise Gunnarsson et al. // *The Construction of Professional Discourse*, eds. B.-L. Gunnarsson, P. Lindell, B. Nordberg. – London ; Longman, 1997. – P. 1–12.
15. Gunnarsson B.-L. *Professional Discourse* / B.-L. Gunnarsson. – London ; New York : Bloomsbury Publishing, 2009. – 288 p.



16. Jaworski A. Discourse: Meaning, Function and Context / A. Jaworski, N. Coupland // *The Discourse Reader*. 2nd Edition. – London : Routledge, 2006. – P.39–41.
17. Kong K. Professional Discourse / K. Kong. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. – 304 p.
18. Leech G. Generic Speech Act Annotation for Task-Oriented Dialogue / G. Leech, M. Weisser // *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2003 Conference*, eds. D. Archer, P. Rayson, A. Wilson, A. McEnery. – Lancaster: UCREL Technical Papers, 2003. – P. 441–446.
19. Lindell P. Discourse across Boundaries: On Recontextualizations and the Blending of Voices in Professional discourse / P. Lindell // *Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*. – 1998. – Vol. 18. – Issue 2. – P. 143–158.
20. Mann W.C. Rhetorical Structure Theory: Towards a Functional Theory of Text Organization / W.C. Mann, S.A. Thompson // *Text*. – 1988. – Vol. 8. – Issue 3. – P. 243–281.
21. Maruenda-Bataller S. Multiple Voices in Academic and Professional Discourse: Current Issues in Specialized Language Research, Teaching and New Technologies / S. Maruenda-Bataller, B. Clavel-Arroitia (eds.). – Cambridge : Cambridge Scholar Publishing, 2011. – 700 p.
22. Mathew P.H. Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics / P.H. Mathew. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1997. – 464 p.
23. Mykhaylenko V. Glossary of Linguistics and Translation Studies: English-Ukrainian / V. Mykhaylenko. – Ivano-Frankivsk : King Danylo Galtskiy University of Law, 2015. – 528 p.
24. Mykhaylenko V. On the Way to Professional Discourse // V. Mykhaylenko // *Материалы IV Международной научной конференции «Когнитивно-прагматические исследования профессиональных дискурсов»*. – X. : ХНУ ім. В. Каразіна, 2014. – С. 55–59.
25. S. Srikant. Conditions and Consequences of Professional Discourse Studies / S. Sarangi // *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. – 2005. – Vol. 2. – Issue 3. – P. 371–394.

#### **Михайленко В. В. Кореляція фахового/нефахового дискурсу**

**Анотація.** Використання текстових фрагментів, які відображають фахові (професійні) регістри фізики, історії мистецтва та релігійної іконології в структурі одного

роману важливо для дослідження, яке спрямоване на взаємодію фахового та нефахового дискурсів, для чого були дібрані аналітичні парадигми функціонального мовознавства, прагматики, текст-аналізу, соціолінгвістики та антропології. Ми описуємо маркери когерентності у межах дискурсивно-прагматичної теорії. Наше дослідження взаємодії фахового та нефахового дискурсу у структурі роману має певне значення для прикладного мовознавства, для фахівців у різних галузях науки, мистецтва, економіки, для яких важлива кооперація, та викладачів англійської мови за професійним спрямуванням.

**Ключові слова:** дискурс, фаховий/нефаховий, функція, семантичний, прагматичний, контекст, ситуація, маркер зв'язності дискурсу.

#### **Михайленко В. В. Корреляция профессионального/непрофессионального дискурса**

**Аннотация.** Использование текстовых фрагментов, отражающих профессиональные регистры физики, истории искусства и религиозной иконологии в структуре одного романа необходимо для исследования, которое фокусируется на корреляции специального (профессионального) и неспециального дискурсов, для этого привлечены аналитические парадигмы системно-функциональной лингвистики, прагматики, анализа текста, социолингвистики и антропологической лингвистики. Мы описываем маркеры когерентности в рамках дискурсивно-прагматической теории. Наше исследование корреляции специального (профессионального) и неспециального дискурсов представляет определённый интерес для исследователей в области прикладной лингвистики, для специалистов в различных областях науки, искусства, экономики, которым жизненно важна кооперация, а также преподавателей английского языка в специальных целях.

**Ключевые слова:** дискурс, профессиональный/непрофессиональный, функция, семантический, прагматический, контекст, ситуация, маркер когерентности дискурса.