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1. Introduction
1.1 Perspectives and new discourses

- functional perspectives
  - discourses
    - data compilation
      - corpora
      - experiments
      - academic writing
      - social media
      - human-humanoid interaction
1. Introduction

1.1 Perspectives and new discourses
1.2 Functional Approaches

1.2.1 Halliday/Matthiessen 2014 (SFG)
1.2.2 Functional Approaches: SFG Expansions by Martin

Martin (2011): 14
1.2.3 Functional Approaches: SFG Expansions by Rose

Rose (2014): 3
1.3 Changing media discourses and genres

general definition of discourse from an empirical perspective:
Media is the collective communication outlets or tools used to store and deliver information or data.
dynamic discourse developments over the last 25 years:
computer-mediated communication \(\rightarrow\) all discourse is digital
convergence “new” > “social” > “digital” media

multiple categorisations in different communities of practise:
- new platforms for multi-purpose discourses (blogs)
- old discourse media replaced or transformed:
  - letters \(\rightarrow\) email
  - print \(\rightarrow\) on-line newspapers
- new discourses with different text functions / :
  - focus on knowledge construction & dissemination: Wikipedia
  - focus on community building/maintenance: Facebook
  - focus on affiliation: Twitter
hybrids and multi-channels/multimodal, etc.
2. Academic Writing

2.1 Discourses in science communication

discourse community approach (Hyland 2006, 2012; Schmied 2011) = a writer/speaker appeals to shared knowledge to create a community of discourse incl. general and specific linguistic clues: of course, as we know from …

---

research discourse → instructional discourse

popularisation
specialised -> popular discourse

popular academic novice discourse
2.2 Cohesion

In addition to reference, ellipsis, and lexical organization, conjunctions are 1 of 4 major ways of explicit cohesion (Halliday/Matthiessen 2014: 604)

“conjunction is concerned with rhetorical transitions — transitions between whole ‘messages’, or even message complexes” (ibid: 608)

...“elaborating, extending and enhancing conjunctions mark relations between semantic domains, i.e. between text segments. These text segments are simultaneously ideational and interpersonal; they construe experience as meaning” (ibid: 611).

→ not the real “global perspective yet, but we can experiment ...
2.1.1 Resultative *as a result* (in ChAcEMA)

As a result, it is sincerely hoped that...
### 2.1.2 Frequency of semantic conjunct classes in ChAcEMA vs. ChemCorpBA/MA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>conjunct type</th>
<th>ChAcEMA (total frequency)</th>
<th>ChAcEMA (per 1M)</th>
<th>ChemCorpBA (total frequency)</th>
<th>ChemCorpBA (per 1M)</th>
<th>ChemCorpMA (total frequency)</th>
<th>ChemCorpMA (per 1M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listing/enumerative</td>
<td>21090</td>
<td>4149</td>
<td>3275</td>
<td>4551</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>3337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing/additive</td>
<td>17223</td>
<td>3388</td>
<td>3711</td>
<td>5157</td>
<td>2584</td>
<td>4867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appositive</td>
<td>10508</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>9580</td>
<td>13315</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>2401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resultative/inferential</td>
<td>27423</td>
<td>5395</td>
<td>3131</td>
<td>4351</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>4307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrastive/concessive</td>
<td>16768</td>
<td>3299</td>
<td>4376</td>
<td>6082</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>5462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>95325</strong></td>
<td><strong>18756</strong></td>
<td><strong>24557</strong></td>
<td><strong>34132</strong></td>
<td><strong>11203</strong></td>
<td><strong>21101</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>13617</strong></td>
<td><strong>2679</strong></td>
<td><strong>3508</strong></td>
<td><strong>4876</strong></td>
<td><strong>1600</strong></td>
<td><strong>3014</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.1.3 Resultative/inferential conjuncts in ChAcEMA vs. ChemCorp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>conjunct</th>
<th>ChAcEMA (total frequency)</th>
<th>ChAcEMA (per 1M)</th>
<th>ChemCorpBA (total frequency)</th>
<th>ChemCorpBA (per 1M)</th>
<th>ChemCorpMA (total frequency)</th>
<th>ChemCorpMA (per 1M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(and) so</td>
<td>10660</td>
<td>2097</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accordingly</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a result</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequently</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for this reason</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hence</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in this case</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in this respect</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in this way</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of course</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so that</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>4685</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therefore</td>
<td>4229</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thus</td>
<td>3268</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27423</td>
<td>5395</td>
<td>3131</td>
<td>4351</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>4307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.4 Conjuncts (enumerative) quantitative: ChemCorp vs. ChAcEMA

detailed data distribution not good for hard tests, so (courtesy M. Hofmann):
- frequencies transformed into ranks (Sheskin 2011)
- assumptions: gvlma (=Global Validation of Linear Models Assumptions; Peña & Slate 2006)
- Kruskal-Wallis test
  (non-parametric equivalent to ANOVA): \( \chi^2 = 7.86, \text{df} = 2, p = 0.02 \)
- Dunn’s posthoc test (incl. adjustment of p-values in multiple comparisons according to Holms (1979):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>corpus</th>
<th>Z statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChemBA → ChemMA:</td>
<td>0.653504</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChemBA → ChAcEMA:</td>
<td>-2.034776</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChemMA → ChAcEMA:</td>
<td>-2.688280</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.5 Cohesive devices (linking, connectors, etc.)
e.g. clause adverbials, characterised by “,”

coherence = extralinguistic factors contributing to the creation of texture (=implicit)
cohesion = linguistic means creating texture (=explicit)

1. It is **unfortunately** not the case that knowledge of the mechanical 
2. **Unfortunately**, an instantaneous comparison was not possible 
3. **Unfortunately**, exact information on gas usage is unavailable 
4. **Unfortunately**, one has no a priori way of predicting 
5. **Unfortunately**, neither easily works. 
6. **Unfortunately**, there are as yet no reliable calculations that 
7. **Unfortunately**, our experience is confined to an equilibrium ... 
8. **Unfortunately**, the energy resolution of a neutrino telescope is ... 
9. ... technique to obtain black hole masses which, **unfortunately**, is unfeasible 
10. **Unfortunately**, lack of information about the collective ... 
11. **Unfortunately**, the complexity of each subprocess also grows ... 
12. **Unfortunately** these theorems tell us practically nothing about ... 
13. **Unfortunately** there are very few analytic results available 
14. **Unfortunately**, all recent experiments are, in principle, 
15. **Unfortunately**, all those exciting recent experiments are 
16. **Unfortunately**, those prior art solutions require daunting experiments 
17. **Unfortunately**, the NID is uncomputable since the constituent ... 
18. **Unfortunately**, in many places such information is getting harder ... 
19. it's a good protective barrier," says Hildebrand, "**unfortunately.**" 
20. **Unfortunately**, because of the rarity of plant data from this ...
2.1.6 Conjunct *because* in 6 Cameroonian, Chemnitz/German, Chinese MA theses
### 2.2 „flow of discourse“ as rhetorical-relational organization

IMRAD structure in 20 lang./lit. MA samples from Cameroon, Germany, China

| disc. | Corpus | Abs | I | IN | IR | IF | M | ML | MC | MT | M RQ | RH | MD | MT | A | AE | AT | AS | C | CS | CI | CC | CL | CO |
|-------|--------|-----|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Lang. | CamC  | 8   | 10| 2  | 8  | 9  | 9 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 9  | 9  | 9  | 6  | 9  | 3  | 10 | 10 | 6  | 1  | 3  | 10 |
|       | ChemC | 4   | 10| 4  | 4  | 9  | 10| 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9  | 10 | 7  | 10 | 10 | 9  | 7  | 7  | 9  |
|       | ChinC | 10  | 10| 3  | 8  | 9  | 5 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 5  | 5  | 10 | 8  | 9  | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7  | 8  | 9  |
| Lit./Cult. | CamC | 10  | 10| 4  | 4  | 9  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 10 | 10 | 0  | 0  | 10 | 10 | 10 | 3  | 2  | 6  |
|        | ChemC | 3   | 10| 1  | 5  | 9  | 3 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 3  | 3  | 10 | 8  | 5  | 9  | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8  | 1  | 3  |
|        | ChinaC| 10  | 10| 0  | 1  | 1  | 1 | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 10 | 10 | 0  | 0  | 10 | 9  | 10 | 0  | 1  | 0  |

---

I = **issue**  
IN = new  
IR = relevant  
IF = focussed  
M = **methodology**  
ML = literature review  
MC = key concepts  
MT = theories  
MRQ/MH = research questions  
MD = database  
MT = tests/procedure  
A = **analysis**  
AE = examples as evidence  
AT = statistical tables  
AS = significance  
C = **conclusion**  
CS = summary  
CI = interpretation  
CC = contextualisation  
CL = limitations  
CO = outlook
**Main topic and issues:** (IF?) The main topic of my dissertation is to establish the validity of two writing tasks in a C1 level English for Academic Purposes (EAP) test. (I) When designing a new academic test, validity evidence is needed in order to see whether the results reflect reliable scores and unbiased marking. The aim of this research is to find evidence for the validity of the two proposed writing tasks (formal transactional email and discussion essay). The research covers (a) the development stage; (b) the completion of the specifications and the test items; (c) the piloting and pre-testing of test items; and it aims (d) to collect and analyse data to establish scoring validity. (IR) The research has relevant implications for the different stakeholders of the test: development teams of EAP tests, students pursuing university studies in English language higher education, and university admissions staff.

**Methodology:** (MT) The methodology of generating validity evidence follows Weir’s (2005) proposed validation stages using a mixed-method approach. (MT) Literature review, expert judgement, student interviews and textual analysis are to be used for context validity. For scoring validity, apart from establishing validity for the rating procedure, a further objective is to design a checklist-based marking scheme for the writing tasks. (ML) The benefits of a checklist over a scale, and its suitability for level testing are present in the literature (Kim 2011; Struthers et al. 2013). (MT) The dissertation wishes to adapt the methods applied in Lukácsi (2018), and aims at developing two task specific writing checklists for the EAP exam.

**Results obtained so far:** (MT) As for context validity in the development stage, a small scale research was carried out in connection with the transactional writing task to complement expert judgement. (A/AE/AT) The research through semi-structured student interviews revealed evidence for target language use and tried to map the different topics and the writing demands of English language correspondence in a university context.
C1S: Representation of Society in Media Discourse: Media Discourse on Teachers and their Role in Society in Selected British Periodicals

The study will look at the media coverage afforded to teachers and educators and their changing role in society in selected British periodicals. It aims to explore the attitudes of selected newspaper articles on the portrayal of teachers. It strives to inspect the language used to shape public perception and construction of beliefs and attitudes to teachers and their community role in the face of social changes.

The goal is to investigate the media coverage afforded to the notions of educational issues concerning teachers in UK and their role in society in politically opposed newspapers in order to elucidate the ideological representation of the teacher’s profession and to examine the approach which reflects the nature of the selected newspapers representing opposite ends of the political spectrum as well as different qualitative content.

The research focuses on articles published between 2015 and 2018 when the Conservative Party secured a surprise victory and a majority single-party government was formed. In order to do the analysis, a collection of newspaper articles selected from the primary sources will be chosen to create a corpus. The research is aimed at two quality newspapers – The Guardian with its centre-left orientation and The Daily Telegraph with a pro-Conservative position. In terms of the popular newspapers the research looks at the left-oriented Daily Mirror and the right-oriented Daily Mail.

A combination of an interpretative approach to newspaper discourse with a comparative cross-analysis method supported by the corpus-driven methods of Critical Discourse Analysis will be used to detect particular language patterns of collocations and concordance lines which enable the researcher to choose a key word and see patterns in representation as well as view the context that the word falls in.

The use of the above-mentioned methods should prove the hypothesis that portrayals of teachers and teachers’ issues are stereotyped and manifested with an explicit and implicit, predominantly negative connotation, regardless of the occurrence in quality or tabloid, liberal or conservative press.

The exploration of the image of the teacher via the press could provide another source for the thematic study of media culture, school culture, pedagogy, stereotyping in media, human rights and power relations.
**Introduction**

**Methodology**

**Cameroon**

Lit/Cult theses have no methodology

Lang may have no abstract

all tend towards detailed conclusions
**Introduction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>ChemMA2016f_001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>ChemMA2016f_002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>ChemMA2013f_004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>ChemMA2012f_006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>ChemMA2012f_015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>ChemMA2016m_003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>ChemMA2012m_014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>ChemMA2012m_016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>ChemMA2016m_017</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>ChemMA2009m_018</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methodology**

Chem

some Lit/Cult theses have little methodology
many have no abstract
all tend towards very detailed conclusions
# Introduction

## Academic Writing

- social media
- human-humanoid interaction

## Conclusion

- Chinese

Lit/Cult theses have no methodology
all have an abstract
Lang tend towards more detailed conclusions

### IMRAD structure in 10 language and 10 literature MA samples from China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>CMAC05ME_23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>CMAC05PR_21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>CMAC05RE_18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>CMAC05SE_22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>CMAC05SY_18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>CMAC05WR_20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>CMAC06MO_18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>CMAC06PH_19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>CMAC06SP_14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>CMAC12PH_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis/Culture</td>
<td>CMAC05LIT_28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis/Culture</td>
<td>CMAC09LIT_32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis/Culture</td>
<td>CMAC10LIT_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis/Culture</td>
<td>CMAC10LIT_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis/Culture</td>
<td>CMAC10LIT_15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis/Culture</td>
<td>CMAC10LIT_21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis/Culture</td>
<td>CMAC11LIT_16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis/Culture</td>
<td>CMAC12LIT_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis/Culture</td>
<td>CMAC12LIT_12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis/Culture</td>
<td>CMAC12LIT_17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lis/Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 20 20 3 9 10 6 0 1 1 0 5 5 10 18 9 10 20 19 20 7 9 9
3. Social Media
3.1 National discourses & norms from Twitter data

Akinwunmi Ambode @support4ambode - 6 Apr 2015

Re-tweet if you believe that irrespective of Tribe or Religion, the prosperity of Lagos is a prosperity for all.

Akinwunmi Ambode, Holuseun, Mr. JAG and 5 others
2.1 Data collection from Twitter in Nigeria (Lagos, Kano)
2.2 National discourses in Nigerian elections: “good governance”
4. Human-humanoid interaction

4.1 From Alexa to Sophia

Calling All Robot Bachelors: Sophia the Robot Might Want to Start a Family
4.2 Nov. 2018: New Humanoid reading the news in Chinese and English
4.3 Humanoid Teachers Research questions and interface

1) Can success in human-machine and machine-human discourses be maximized by using deep artificial neural networks to generate and employ digital personae?

2) Can virtual conversational pedagogical agents gain credibility as discourse partners? Are they accepted by human learners as valuable discourse partners?
4.4 Iteration of four research stages of the Humanoid teacher

**Research Stage 1 – Corpus Compilation**
- Existing corpora
  - Classroom recordings and interviews
  - Specialized corpus
  - Interactive multimedia learning environment

**Research Stage 2 – Baseline System**
- Specialized corpus
  - Linguistic features
  - Neural text generation
  - Text assessment

**Research Stage 3 – Baseline Persona**
- Refined corpus
  - Refined linguistic features
  - Neural persona creation
  - User modeling techniques

**Research Stage 4 – Conversational Pedagogical Agent**
- Persona-specific corpus
  - Text-to-speech synthesis
  - Conversational pedagogical agent
  - Wizard-of-Oz/Matched-guise assessment

**Higher Credibility of Pedagogical Agent, Better Learning in Hybrid Society**
5. Conclusions

5.1 New discourse data from digital media

new discourse genres replace traditional ones (letters \(\rightarrow\) emails)
easy digital access to difficult discourses, half-way to spoken

5.2 Old and new research

new digital discourses, tools and techniques offer new research opportunities
• to pick up old research questions and
• to raise new ones;
• to demonstrate that we can all make a contribution to DH and
• to “advertise” humanities’ discourses as an important contribution to our universities and societies
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