

3

**A Study of the Textualisation Process through Linguistic Analysis of the
Written Performances**

Prof. (Dr) Paresh Joshi

Professor, Dept. of English,

Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, Surat

Abstract:

In this paper, the authors take a multidisciplinary approach to textualisation, combining linguistic, textual genetic, and psycholinguistic theories and methods to examine how a text is formed or the textualisation process. They concentrate their efforts on the linguistic exploration of bursts of written language (i.e., the sequences of texts created between two pauses), which are regarded as performance units in and of themselves. In order to conduct their analyses, they use keystroke logging tools to record the writing process in real-time. This results in two corpora: the first contains social reports about children at risk written by professional writers, and the second contains academic reports written by students for a Discourse Analysis course. The first part introduces some of the theoretical issues that serve as the foundation for the Authors' point of view. The second part introduces the criteria for categorising bursts and the theoretical foundations on which they are based. The data are analysed in the third and fourth parts, including a detailed description of the burst classifications. Finally, during the fifth chapter, we examine the possibility of bursts as prefabricated performance units that may be routinely repeated and the variations between production and revision bursts.

Keywords: Textualisation, Textual analysis, Linguistic, Writings

Production and revision peaks and valleys

An introduction that briefly describes the methodological and theoretical issues related to real-time recording and analysis of the textualisation process is followed by a discussion of the conceptual and theoretical frameworks that serve as a foundation for the analysis of textualisation through bursts of written language in Chapter 1. In their definition of writing,

Cislaru and Olive describe it as an interactive and nonlinear dynamic activity, with the written word representing the outcome of a recursive usage of cognitive processes. As a result, they view texts as relational networks with topological and chronological dimensions: the process of writing a text is chronologically linear, but it is nonlinear in terms of the topological dimension.

They distinguish between macro and micro-segmentation to further examine the dynamic nature of written communication. In-text analysis, micro-segmentation refers to text sequences that result in variations between different versions of a text, whereas micro-segmentation refers to the different segments of text that are produced in a single session, i.e. the bursts (*jets textuels* in French), which are based on the writers' behaviour and are independent of how the analyst segments a text in a text analysis session. As a result, micro-segmentation makes it possible to trace the gradual creation of a text with pinpoint accuracy (i.e., textualisation).

Chenu, Pellegrino, Jisa, and Fayol (2014) determined that a 2-second pause threshold should be used to segment texts because there was no consensus in the literature on what should be utilised to separate texts. According to them, this threshold appears to be adequate for the study of burst content since it allows for identifying levels of combinatorial complexity in burst material.

Finally, the writers distinguish between bursts of output and bursts of revision: Production bursts follow both the chronological and topographic linearities, whereas revision bursts are both historically and topologically linear, but not both at the same time. Following these considerations, Chapter 1 describes the key properties of the corpus and the characteristics of the bursts that the authors will analyse in the following chapters.

Because of the dynamic and non-fixed nature of bursts of language, it is difficult to establish a theoretical framework that can be used to analyse the content of bursts of language in isolation. As a result, in Chapter 2, the authors go over the hypotheses that may be relevant to the study of bursts and how they came to be. It is discussed, for example, the concepts of chunking and automatism as well as entrenchment and prefabricated units, with the transversal idea that textualisation is dependent on two main general mechanisms of language production: direct retrieval from long-term memory of pre-constructions and generation of

new units of language. Furthermore, in order to properly grasp textualisation, Cislaru and Olive assert that it is essential to distinguish between a text and its texture (i.e. all relations between the units of a text which contribute to the configuration of the final text as a single unit). To this end, it is critical to examine how burstits are organised and interconnected and how they may serve as a primer for subsequent bursts.

Bursts have an internal structure that can be observed.

Bursts are the subject of Chapter 3's first section, which questions their internal linguistic structure. Because of their high heterogeneity, Cislaru and Olive categorise bursts according to their syntactically saturated degree. Unsaturated bursts (which do not have a complete syntactic form) are not considered unfinished segments that need to be completed but rather primes that offer various possibilities. For evidence, the authors give several frequent unsaturated bursts with a syntactical opening, such as bursts that end with a preposition, a determinant, or a verb, to support their thesis. These bursts, in reality, serve as opening bounds for a variety of semantic, syntactic, and lexical options, all of which predict the relationships between bursts that the researcher will have to discover in the future. Furthermore, writing establishes a hierarchy between different parts. After that, the authors show that, rather than constructing grammatical categories for bursts, bursts can alternatively be categorised according to their functional qualities, which they call functional characteristics (e.g., theme-rheme dimensions, grammatical functions).

Bursts with heterogeneous contents or forms are the subject of Chapter 4. Such bursts are formed with pieces that would normally be analysed individually in linguistics (for example, elements separated by a point) but which prepare relations with prior or forthcoming bursts, which are referred to as junction attractors by the authors of the paper (*attracteurs de jonction* in French). Specifically, Cislaru and Olive look for bursts that contain punctuation (e.g., a comma or a period), textual organisers (e.g., conjunction), or anaphoric references in order to achieve their goal of increasing comprehension (such as demonstrative and possessive pronouns). The bursts examined in this chapter are primarily concerned with text cohesiveness and coherence characteristics, two of the most important parts of what makes a text unique. Because pre-constructions for priming content will be incrementally added in the following burst, it is possible that a burst structure will overlap with another burst structure in

the future. According to the authors, this shows that the semantic goals of textualisation support the writers' writing performance.

Routinisation

In the continuation of this chapter, focusing on the process-product interface, Cislaru and Olive investigate how bursts of language may be the expression of lexical packages, linguistic routines, automatisms, prefabricates, or pre-constructions, which should be retrieved as a block in long term memory (i.e. as entrenched constructions) in order to be retrieved as a block in long term memory (Chapter 5). They begin by determining whether bursts of written language contain repeating segments of texts, which have been characterised in the literature as prefabricated structures. If they do, they proceed to the next step. According to the Authors, writing does not take place on a blank slate; rather, it makes use of what they refer to as *déjà-là* (already there), the concept that some units of language are ready to be used and that writers rely on their knowledge of the genre and domain they are writing about, rather than starting from scratch. They demonstrate a minimal correlation between bursts and repeated segments, implying that repetition or frequency alone is insufficient to induce routinisation in the brain. They then compare the content of bursts to specific lexical bundles that are known to behave similarly to routines. They demonstrate that these types of linguistics procedures are in fact frequently developed in short bursts of time. The researchers also demonstrate that some bursts function as procedural routines, such as those that conclude with consequence connectives (e.g., hence, therefore). While exploring the *déjà-là* of text composition, the Authors conclude this chapter by presenting some studies of revision bursts, which they believe are important.

Conclusion

To summarise, the novel and extremely intriguing technique that the authors have used to identify the analysable linguistic units distinguishes this book from others. First and foremost, they have carried out a linguistics analysis of portions of texts that have been recognised by examining writers' actions. To begin with, Cislaru and Olive examine the language in the context of usage grammar and employ an inductive method to determine the distinctive linguistic characteristics of bursts of written language. As a result, they explained how the link between the bursts results in creating a text and how a text is not simply the sum of its

elements but the product of a global communication endeavour that is semantically guided and syntagmatically restricted.

References

- Chenu, F., Pellegrino, F., Jisa, H., & Fayol, M. (2014). Interword and interword pause threshold in writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 189.
<http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00182>