

# CREATING KWIC-SEARCHABLE CORPORA THROUGH TAGGING ARGUMENTATIVE TEXTS WITH LOGICAL RELATIONS USING RHETORICAL STRUCTURE THEORY: RELATION DEFINITIONS AND DISCOURSE UNIT DIVISION PROTOCOLS

## HOW TO CITE THIS WORK:

Cresswell, Andy. 2013. 'Creating KWIC-searchable corpora through tagging argumentative texts with logical relations using rhetorical structure theory: relation definitions and discourse unit division protocols'. Unpublished research document, University of Bologna, Department of Interpreting and Translation.

## CONTENTS

<b>1. Protocols for segmentation of argumentative texts into discourse units ...</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. The role of punctuation in segmenting into discourse units.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3. Logical Relation Definitions (alphabetical).....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Example citations: List of references.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>References to notes and comments in Appendices.....</b>	<b>26</b>

**KEY.** Y = Yes, N = No. Square brackets show discrete discourse units.

LANGUAGE CATEGORY OR DEVICE	DISCOURSE UNIT?	COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS, EXAMPLES
Clauses (unless otherwise specified – see below)	Y	<p>A preliminary survey of the material, and pilot RS analyses, showed that most of the relations likely to produce results in terms of the research questions are constituted at the dependent or independent clause level .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example (independent clause): <i>[There appear to be some counter-arguments to the above argument.]</i> (essay 02860149)</li> </ul>
Rank-shifted clauses (as in Halliday & Hasan 1976:221), i.e. clausal subjects and objects.	N	<p>In line with most previous applied RST analysis (e.g. O’Brien, 1995:447), rank-shifted clauses will be considered as part of larger independent clause units, and so will not be segmented off.</p> <p>* Exception: When an object-clause involves a replacive relation, the second clause is separated off . E.g., from essay 00010046:  <i>[Meanwhile, what people want nowadays is ((ql))"do business in English, study abroad or make friends" ((/ql))(Prodromou, 2000:p. 3)] [ rather than deliberate on boring adventures of the Smiths]</i></p>

LANGUAGE CATEGORY OR DEVICE	DISCOURSE UNIT?	COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS, EXAMPLES
Clausal Complements	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example: <i>[which set out to investigate the pattern of medical student teaching about sleep and its disorders in the UK]</i> (Williams, 2004)</li> </ul> <p>Note: although projected clauses can be considered as clausal complements, they are considered in the subsequent section.</p>
Projecting clauses (Halliday 1994:250-72)	N	<p>I followed Stuart-Smith (1998) in ignoring projecting clauses during segmenting (i.e. they were not segmented off), except that I made no exception when projection involved citing an authority. Some of these instances will however be captured by use of O'Brien's "Reported Evaluation" relation (O'Brien, 1995).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example 1: <i>[Thus, we can say that making money is the dominant value in this modern world.]</i> (essay 02860174)</li> <li>• Example 2: <i>[Further, Hyltenstam and Abrahamsson claim that these near-native speakers should be differentiated from the native speakers]</i> (Marinova-Todd et al., 2001)</li> <li>• Exception: projecting clauses that have two co-ordinated projected clauses. In this case, the first projected clause, together with the projecting clause, are considered as one discourse unit, while the second projected clause is considered as another discourse unit. This permits capture of rhetorical relations of listing and reinforcement, as follows:</li> </ul> <p>Example 1: <i>[Secondly, they claim that our central relationship between consensus democracy and corporatism is a function of our particular measure of corporatism] [ and, in addition, driven by two outlying cases: Italy and Austria.]</i> (Crepaz and Lipjhart, 1995).</p> <p>Example 2 <i>[I would like to take a peek beyond some of the 'walls' which the paper sets up for itself] [ and to relate the issue of learner development to broader and more critical views of both 'learning' and 'development'.]</i> (Palfreyman, 2003).</p> <p>However, application of the rank-shifted rule means the exception does not apply if the co-ordinated projection is part of the sentence subject.</p> <p>Example 3 : <i>[According to Wallace the fact that in the past the foreign language teachers did not see reading as a way of learning languages and that the English language instructional programme was based on a highly structured audiolingual approach ((£...)) denied the learners crucial exposure to English...]</i> (essay 00010061).</p> <p>Note: The specific phrase <i>as they say</i> is not technically a projecting clause, but because it has the same semantic effect, it is equally not segmented off.</p> <p>Example: <i>[As they say, the practical conclusions from it ((£...)) depend upon political and ideological values.]</i> (Newton, 1997)</p> <p>Similarly: <i>[It is not at all the case that Austria and Italy 'drive' the statistical relationship as they claim.]</i> (Crepaz and Lipjhart, 1998).</p>

LANGUAGE CATEGORY OR DEVICE	DISCOURSE UNIT?	COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS, EXAMPLES
Subordinate Clause with subordinator functioning as a discourse cue	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example: <i>[although money does not always make people happy.]</i> (essay 02860166)</li> </ul>
clauses functioning as adverbials	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example: <i>[The revolutionaries in 1789 ((£...)) used the language of the ancien regime] [to overthrow it]</i> (Widdowson, 1998)</li> </ul>
Coordinated main clauses	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example: <i>[The second criticism from Keman and Pennings deals with the empirical relationship between corporatism and consensus democracy] [and consists of two parts]</i> (Crepaz and Lipjhart, 1995)</li> </ul>
Coordination in Subordinate Clauses	Depends	<p>If a given construction is not normally segmented in the single clause case, then it is not segmented off as a co-ordinated clause either.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exception 1: Projected clauses after <i>that</i>: co-ordinated projected clauses are separated off.</li> <li>• Example: <i>[one would have to argue that there was, and still is, some inherent quality in the language itself which gives it an advantage over any other,] [and that its spread is a measure of its intrinsic superiority]</i> (Widdowson, 1998)</li> <li>• Exception 2: The second of two Co-ordinated restrictive relative clauses, if finite, is segmented off.</li> <li>• Example: <i>[These are the processes that would integrate women and gender into a transformed discipline to the satisfaction of feminists,] [ and revitalise and reinvigorate traditional subjects of study in IR].</i> (Carver, 2004)</li> </ul>

LANGUAGE CATEGORY OR DEVICE	DISCOURSE UNIT?	COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS, EXAMPLES
Bracketed citation references *	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example 1: <i>[which is widely considered to be “the world’s lingua franca” (Prodromou, 2000)]</i> (essay 00010009).</li> </ul> <p>Although technically clauses, references with non-finite citation verbs in brackets are not segmented off.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example 2: <i>[A survey which was conducted by Stanley (cited in Skousen, 2000) shows the results in favour of making money. ]</i>(essay 02860149)</li> <li>• Exceptions: Imperative verbs such as <i>see</i> or their equivalents (like <i>c.f.</i>), and linking expressions such as “e.g.”. Since these indicate a relation beyond that of citation, they are taken as indicating the need for a separate discourse unit.</li> <li>• Example: <i>[Let us consider the increasing evidence against a rigid ‘critical period’][ (see summaries in, for example: Aitchison, 1989; Scovel, 1988; Singleton, 1989)].</i> (Aitchison, 1993)</li> </ul>
Syntactic Focusing Devices (Cleft, pseudo-cleft, extraposition)	N	<p>Here I applied Carlson and Marcu's rule: “When a syntactic focusing device, such as cleft, pseudo-cleft or extraposition creates two clauses out of a single clause, the resulting construction is regarded as a single [discourse unit]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example: <i>[It is hard for the company to dismiss several hundred employees.]</i> (Carlson and Marcu, 2001:40).</li> <li>• Exception: very occasionally, the syntactic focusing device clause creates a rhetorical relation with the clause it projects. In such cases it is segmented off.</li> <li>• Example: <i>[It is because of the convenience of money] [that many people in the developed countries can take part in the development of the Third World relatively easily as a form of donation.]</i> (essay 02860186).</li> </ul>
“Dummy” or “pro” clauses	N	<p>i.e. syntactic focusing clauses with referents or substitutes as complements - these are not given discourse unit status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example: <i>[This is so because the norms of reciprocity that reduce the risk of co-operative endeavours with fellow network members will have the simultaneous effect of making co-operative ventures with non-network members comparatively risky...]</i> (Boix and Posner, 1998)</li> </ul>

LANGUAGE CATEGORY OR DEVICE	DISCOURSE UNIT?	COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS, EXAMPLES
		This category is taken to include <i>Bearing this in mind, in doing so, to do so.</i>
Clauses within comparisons	N	Verbless elliptical clauses were not analysed separately when they formed part of a simple comparison. Example: <i>[but value it... more highly than their own indigenous language]</i> (Kamwangamalu, 2002)
Temporal Clauses	Y	In line with Carlson and Marcu (2001), “clausal temporal expressions are [considered to be discourse units]. Temporal clauses triggered by <i>before, after,</i> may have a number of modifiers that are included in the [discourse unit]: • Example: <i>[Just months before dismissing several hundred employees,] ...”</i> (Carlson and Marcu, 2001:40).
Correlative subordinators	Y	• Example: <i>[Breaking the rules is so common in some countries] [that people cannot see the line between what is wrong and what is right].</i> (essay 010016)
Relative clauses, nominal postmodifying clauses, parentheticals, appositive clauses	Depends	Because of application of the “rank-shifted” rule, restrictive relative clauses were not segmented off. However, non-restrictive relative clauses (as defined in Huddleston 1988:155), nominal postmodifiers, appositives, and parentheticals were treated as discourse units. • Restrictive relative clause example: <i>[Until now there has not been such thing as a law which would enable foreign residents to maintain their cultural identity nor the possibility to acquire dual citizenship in a nation-state which is at the centre of Europe.]</i> (essay 240050)  • Nominal postmodifier, non-defining, parenthetical example: <i>[To suite (sic) this new concept of European federalism,] [which is a blend of devolution and autonomy,] [there needs to be a new, enlarged spirit of the nation,]</i> (essay 100043)  • Non-defining appositive example: <i>[The first concern is illustrated aptly in Tom McArthur's (1998) book The English Languages] [, in which the author wonders whether English can be considered a family of languages in its own right, like the Romance languages.]</i> (Kamwangamalu 2002)

LANGUAGE CATEGORY OR DEVICE	DISCOURSE UNIT?	COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS, EXAMPLES
		When in doubt as to whether a clause was restrictive or non-restrictive, it was classified as non-restrictive and segmented off.
Topicalising clauses	Depends	<p><i>Concerning, As far as ... is concerned, Regarding.</i> These (and their objects) are analysed as separate discourse units when fronting a sentence and thus having topicalising function, but when in the predicate, they are not segmented off.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topicalising example: [Concerning simultaneous bilingualism,] [Umbel et al. (1992) state that the question persists whether someone can learn two languages as good (sic) as people generally learn one.] (essay 99240086)</li> <li>• Non-topicalising example: [Many experiments have been conducted concerning this problem...] (essay 00010017)</li> </ul>
Two verbs with the same object or complement	N	Where two verbs have the same complement, this is considered to be a single clause: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example: <i>[whereas the former tolerates and, sometimes, even suggests the open expression of aggressiveness and force in the same situations]</i> (essay 00100004)</li> </ul>
“Discourse-Salient” Phrases	Y	Phrases beginning with the following are considered to be discourse units: <i>Because of, but rather, despite, due to, e.g., for example, for instance, i.e., in response to, in spite of, regardless, such as, whatever, whoever, etc.</i> The rule is NOT applied when discourse salient elaborating expressions, e.g. <i>such as</i> , are used in restrictive postmodification. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example of exception : <i>[a poststructuralist analysis of discourse (cf. Foucault 1977; Fairclough 1992) would highlight the contingency and the ideological potential of terms such as 'development' (cf. Crewe and Harrison 1998), 'strategies' and 'autonomy'.]</i> (Palfreyman 2003)</li> </ul>
Phrasal elaborations*	Y	These were segmented off, except within rank-shifted clauses .

LANGUAGE CATEGORY OR DEVICE	DISCOURSE UNIT?	COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS, EXAMPLES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example : <i>[To this distinction, they add a third aspect][: social partnership.]</i> (Crepaz and Lipjhart 1995)</li> <li>• Exception: Phrasal elaborations of <i>role</i> were not analysed down as far as non-phrase-level .</li> <li>Exception: Unbracketed phrasal apposition within subjects or agents is not segmented off. For the following categories, the exception also applies to bracketed information: brief term translations, dates of lifespan, proper nouns, such as names and titles, and nouns of role.</li> <li>• Example: <i>[The Leichester (sic) researchers' study and conclusion have been harshly criticised by Gary Armstrong and Rosemary Harris (1991), two anthropologists of the University College, London .]</i> (essay 00100004)</li> <li>• Bracketed example: <i>[Hans Keman's and Paul Pennings's critique ('Managing Political and Societal Conflict in Democracies: Do Consensus and Corporatism Matter?'), this Journal, preceding pages) of our attempt to link corporatism and consensus democracy falls essentially into three parts.]</i> (Crepaz and Lipjhart 1995)</li> </ul>
Nuclear phrases*	Y	<p>On very rare occasions, when a noun phrase is postmodified by a non-defining relative clause (which has discourse unit status), the diagram cannot be constructed unless the noun phrase is also given discourse unit status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example : <i>[ which are physiological arousal, ] [ such as crowding, noise, and heat, ] [ and social cognitive processes ] [ which include the categorisation of others into ingroup or outgroup members, the degree of identification with a group or team, and the core concept of self-esteem maintenance. ]</i> (essay 00100004).</li> </ul>
Prepositional phrases of reason and result*	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example 1: <i>[ but value it, ... [for the reasons adduced above, ] ... more highly than their own indigenous language.]</i> ( Kamwangamalu 2002)</li> <li>• Example 2: <i>[ Besides this, joining the NAFTA would imply leaving the European Union] [(as the Treaty of Rome states),] [ with enormous losses in terms of foreign investment and dramatic consequences in tariff barriers (Britain in Europe Group 2000).]</i> (essay</li> </ul>

LANGUAGE CATEGORY OR DEVICE	DISCOURSE UNIT?	COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS, EXAMPLES
		03100079) • Example 3 : <i>[This concern arises against the backdrop of the emergence of new varieties of English in former British and American colonies] [as a result of the nativization of English] (Kamwangamalu 2002)</i> • Example 4: <i>[We criticized these researchers] [for providing information about the brains of individual subjects] (Marinova-Todd et al. 2001).</i>
Prepositional phrases of means or purpose*	Y	• Example 1: <i>[who has also attempted to argue for the essential compatibility of Islam and democracy ] [ through his concept of 'religious democratic government',]</i> (Goddard 2002) • Example 2 : <i>[Part of the answer lies in the presence in the South of an external power that ... [ in its quest for absolute political control,] ... did everything it could to uproot associations and sabotage co-operative activities that might pose a threat to its security.] ( Boix and Posner 1998)</i>
Other prepositional phrases with a discourse function	Y	Prepositional phrases functioning as adverbials of circumstance with non-restrictive status consisting of a prepositional phrase were given discourse unit status when they contained a verb postmodifying the noun. • Example: <i>[in a quantitative study examining the perceptions of a group of foreign language students toward various teaching methods] (Ellis 1996).</i>  When grammatical metaphors are used instead of verbs in time-conditional clauses, these are treated as separate discourse units. • Example: <i>on realisation of how much power they have</i> (essay 00010007)
Certain lexicalised verb phrases	N	While technically clauses, the following lexicalised verb phrases are not taken as having discourse unit status: <i>All things considered, emphasis added, one might say, to begin with, what is more, what is worse</i>
Verbless references to text apparatus*	N	• Example: <i>[Overall, the correlation coefficients between corporatism and the other five elements of consensus</i>

LANGUAGE CATEGORY OR DEVICE	DISCOURSE UNIT?	COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS, EXAMPLES
		<i>democracy (in the bottom row of Table 4) are about as strong as the ten correlation coefficients among these other five elements]</i> (Crepaz and Lipjhart 1995).
“Long quotations”	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example:  <i>[Foreign language learners probably know it best that “We learn new words and structures largely through reading; we do not learn words in order to read” (Wallace, 76).]</i></li> </ul>
Verbless clauses	depends	If other elements of the description permitted discourse unit status, verbless clauses were accepted as discourse units. However, as Huddleston (1988:169) warns, it is sometimes difficult to decide what is or is not a verbless clause. In practice, being the nucleus of other relations or containing an adverb swayed the decision in favour of clause and discourse unit status.

## 2. The role of punctuation in segmenting into discourse units

1. Full stops at the end of sentences are always taken as discourse unit boundaries, unless used apparently erroneously (e.g., as happens with some student writers, the sentence has two full stops, or bracketed information (especially citations) is erroneously placed outside the stop).
2. All other factors being equal, brackets sway the decision in favour of making a discourse unit boundary.
3. All other factors being equal, colons and dashes are usually interpreted as indicating discourse unit boundaries, unless they appear to be used erroneously.
4. If semicolons are used to mark off each of a list of phrases or clauses, it is taken that the writer intended them to be interpreted as separate discourse units. Thus such constructions are segmented off even if they are part of a rank-shifted clause.
5. Since commas are often used to mark off noun phrases rather than clauses, they do not alone play a decisive role in marking discourse unit boundaries.
6. When intraposed sections are moved, the punctuation which marks them off at the beginning and end will be moved with them. This makes the relevant “matrix” clause easier to read on the diagram. The rare exception is when a correct reading of the matrix clause depends on retention of the punctuation.
7. Since they play a role in signalling certain relations, dashes and colons will be placed at the beginning of discourse units, which will mean they will be in the same discourse unit as the relevant relation-tag. For parenthetical statements, only the opening dash will be placed systematically at the beginning of discourse units – closing dashes will be at the end of discourse units (if otherwise appropriate).

### 3. Logical Relation Definitions (alphabetical)

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
Addition (d)		N appears to have been conceived as the main point while S appears to have been added as an afterthought, or as an adjunct	R recognises the comparability of the linked items	<N> What may seem even more astonishing, <S> <b>yet at the same time disquieting</b> , </S> is the .. widespread conviction that ... </N> ( essay 00010033)
Addition: emphasis (a, i)	S is the focus of the emphasis.	Similar to "Addition"	R is surprised by the comparability of the linked items	<N> That is why bribery became an extremely wide-spread phenomenon</N> <S> <b>and even the most honest people turned to corruption as to the only solution.</b> </S> (essay 00010072)
Addition: emphasis (multinuclear) (a, i)		In terms of the role of their content, N1 and N2 have the same relation to the rest of the argumentation	R is surprised by the comparability of the linked items	<N1> <b>English receives a lot of support not only from the minorities</b> , </N1> <N2> <b>but also from two key constituencies, including many Afrikaans-speaking parents</b> ,... </N2> (Kamwangamalu 2002)
Addition - reinforcement (b, i)	In terms of the role of their content, N and S both support claim C	R's willingness to accept C is increased by N and further increased by S, or increased by S1 and further increased by S2 (or S3, etc).	R's willingness to accept C is increased by N/S1 and further increased by S2 (S3, etc), in a sort of cumulative effect	<C> <b>Undoubtedly, law infringement is most rampant in Eastern Europe</b> , <C> ... <S1> <b>Indeed, there has been ample evidence of high-ranking civil servants either accepting substantial payments or becoming involved in illegal practices with a view to deriving benefits.</b> </S1> <S2> <b>Moreover, banks are also said to be seized by corruption.</b> </S2> (essay 10p0044)
Addition-reinforcement (multinuclear) (b, i)		In terms of the role of their content, N1 and N2 both support claim C	R's willingness to accept C is increased by N1 and further increased by N2, in a sort of cumulative effect (me)	<N1> <b>According to them, prestige is likely to be conferred on males who show courage, fighting skill as peer-group loyalty in confrontations.</b> </N1> <N2> <b>Moreover, the conferral of prestige is liable to make a tendency to aggressiveness as the central feature of personality and identity, and hence enjoyable.</b> </N2> (essay:00100004)

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
Analogy (mononuclear or multinuclear) (f, i)	N is more crucial to overall coherence than S.	N and S are dissimilar, but are set in correspondence in some respect. R's willingness to accept N is increased by S. In multinuclear Analogy, instead of N and S, there are N1 and N2.	W expects R to infer that if N & S (or n1 and N2) correspond in some respects, they will correspond in other respects too	<N> A drug that alleviated the symptoms of Alzheimer's disease would add significantly to health-care budgets but would reduce the costs of residential care, to the extent that entry into such accommodation was avoided or postponed. </N> <S> <b>Advances in medical understanding and practice over the past half-century have allowed the closure of both the sanatoria for infectious diseases and the asylums for those with mental illness.</b> </S> (Metz 2002)
Antithesis (c)	on N: W has positive regard for N	N and S are in contrast ; i.e. are (a) comprehended as differing in a few respects, and (b) compared with respect to one or more of these differences; because of an incompatibility that arises from the contrast, <b>one cannot have positive regard for both the situations presented in N and S;</b> comprehending S and the incompatibility between the situations presented in N and S increases R's positive regard for the situation presented in N.	R's positive regard for N is increased	<S> so an ageing population might naturally be thought to imply a bigger burden for individuals, families and society.</S> <N> <b>However, it turns out that the main reason why average health care costs appear to rise with age is not that we need much more care on account of our advancing chronological age, but rather that the most substantial requirement for health and social care occurs in the final year or two of life, regardless of the age of death.</b> </N> (Metz 2002)
Antithesis-Complexification (i)	On N: W has positive regard for N	N and S are incompatible insofar as S creates the impression of closure, but N re-opens the debate.	W expects R to think first that S completes the discourse on x , then to have this expectation confounded in N	<S> Thus, we may conclude that reading is one of the major sources of learners' knowledge and that teachers should promote extensive reading because it can lead to greater grammar and vocabulary growth than any programme of explicit instruction alone ever could.</S> <N> <b>However, one must think</b>

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
				<i>of the type of texts which should be used for teaching.</i> </N> (essay 00010061)
Background (c)	on N: R won't comprehend N sufficiently before reading text of S	S increases the ability of R to comprehend an element in N	R's ability to comprehend N increases	<S> <b>History of money dates back to the ancient time. BC 9000-6000.</b> </S> ... <N> As time goes on, we have moved into the modern world, when making money has become a critical and crucial part of our lives. </N> (essay 70S8908)
Cause-nonvolitional (c)	on N: N is not a volitional action	S, by means other than motivating a volitional action, caused N; without the presentation of S, R might not know the particular cause of the situation; a presentation of N is more central than S to W's purposes in putting forth the N-S combination.	R recognizes S as a cause of N	<N> In Britain, for instance, the number of those aged 75 and over is set to double over the next fifty years - from four million now to eight million in 2050. </N> <S> <b>This increase in the numbers and proportion of older people arises from the steady trend of increasing life expectancy among the old, the ageing of the post-war baby boom generation, and low fertility.</b> </S> (Metz 2002)
Cause-volitional (c)	on N: N is a volitional action or else a situation that could have arisen from a volitional action	S could have caused the agent of the volitional action in N to perform that action; without the presentation of S, R might not regard the action as motivated or know the particular motivation; N is more central to W's purposes in putting forth the N-S combination than S is.	R recognizes S as a cause for the volitional action (or situation that could have arisen from a volitional action) in N	<N> According to Easterlin (2001), 'more educated persons are typically happier than less educated through the life cycle',</N> <S> <b>because ' [they] make more money and are thus better able to buy the things they want than are less affluent, poorer-educated persons'.</b> </S> (essay 02860192)
Circumstance (c)	on S: S is not unrealized	S sets a framework in the subject matter within which R is	R recognizes that S provides the framework for interpreting N	<N> This statement, made in an interview in a government-sponsored magazine, <S> <b>at a time when the government was seeking to establish its</b>

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
		intended to interpret N		<b>democratic credentials,</b> </S> provoked a considerable furore.</N> (Goddard 2002)
Concession (c)	on N: W has positive regard for N  on S: W is not claiming that S does not hold;	W acknowledges a potential or apparent incompatibility between N and S; W regards the situations presented in N and S as compatible; recognising the compatibility between the situations presented in N and S increases R's positive regard for the situation presented in N.	R's positive regard for N is increased	<S> It can be inferred from the data that although the communism in Poland has been toppled, </S> <N> <b>corruption not only stayed but it is also developing.</b> </N> (essay 00010072)
Condition-hypothetical (a, c, e)	on S: S presents a hypothetical situation (relative to the situational context of S)	Realization of N depends on realization of S	R recognizes how the realization of N depends on the realization of S	<N>or maybe the situation would improve </N> <S> <b>if people were given better living conditions?</b> </S> (essay 00010053)
Condition-open (a, c, e)	on S: S presents a future, or otherwise unrealized, situation (relative to the situational context of S)	Realization of N depends on realization of S	R recognizes how the realization of N depends on the realization of S	<S> <b>If we agree that authentic texts are interesting and captivating for the learner,</b> </S> <N> we can safely assume that they are a good means of input in the classroom. </N> (essay 00010105)
Condition- time (e, i)	on S: S presents a view of time as conditioning the situational context of S)	Realisation of N depends on the time-determined realization of S.	R recognizes how the realization of N depends on the realization of S	<S> <b>In conclusion, so long as there are cases of travesty of justice along with corruption in judiciary system</b> </S> </N> Poland will nor(sic) achieve success </N> (essay 00010008)
Contingency (e, f)	On S: S presents an abstract notion of recurrence	(S and N: ) the expression of time, place, or condition is	R recognises the abstract and recurrent/habitual nature of S	<S> <b>And whenever an immigrant is seen as transient,</b> </S> <N> it is automatically implied that full membership, which

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
	or habituality	not the primary focus.		<i>guarantees human and civil rights of being part of a community, is impossible to achieve</i> </N> (essay 99240050)
Contrast (multinuclear) (c)		no more than two nuclei; the situations in these two nuclei are (a) comprehended as the same in many respects (b) comprehended as differing in a few respects and (c) compared with respect to one or more of these differences	R recognizes the comparability and the difference(s) yielded by the comparison is being made	<N1> <i>Some students happen to be very successful from the beginning</i> </N1><N2> <b>whilst others are not.</b> </N2> (Essay 00010056)
Contrast: specular (multinuclear) (i)		The relationship between 2 elements in the first nucleus is reversed in 2 comparable elements in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> nucleus	R recognises the specular relation between the 2 nuclei	<N1> <i>Repeated co-operation increases the available stock of social capital.</i> </N1> <N2> <b>And high stocks of social capital, in turn, make it possible to sustain social co-operation.</b> </N2> (Boix and Posner 1998)
Disjunction (multinuclear) (a, e, i)		An item comparable to others linked to it in a list, but in a relation of non-antithetical choice or alternatives.	R recognises that each of the items could substitute any of the other items	<N1> <i>which are useful when one orders a meal in a restaurant</i> </N1> <N2> <b>or asks the way to the restaurant.</b> </N2> (essay 0010005)
Disjunction : contrastive (multinuclear) (a, i)		An item comparable to others linked to it in a list, but in a relation of antithetical choice or alternatives.	R recognises that each of the items could substitute any of the other items	<N1> <i>Is it only the evil human nature to blame for such state of affairs</i> </N1> <N2> <b>or maybe the situation would improve if people were given better living conditions?</b> </N2> (essay 00010053)
Elaboration : abstraction-instance (a, i)	In Crombie 1985b, a generalisation is followed by another proposition which is presented	N is a generalisation, S presents further details in the form of an instance or example.	R 's perception of N is clarified by the instance or example in S	<N> <i>Moreover, to maintain their political and economic privileges, the rich will manoeuvre to undermine any collective efforts that the poor may undertake to better their lot.</i> </N> <S> <b>To illustrate this point, we turn to the puzzle of why social trust varies so widely across</b>

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
	as an exemplification of it (p.24). If			<i>the Italian peninsula.</i> </S> (Boix and Posner 1998)
Elaboration: classification (i)	On S: is a class	N contains content justifying its classification as S	R recognises that N is an instance of the class S	<N> Italian speaking people, for example, often tend to use the present perfect instead of the simple past </N> <S> <b>(grammatical interference)</b> </S> (essay 98240014)
Elaboration : contrast (i)	S asserts dissimilarity to N	S and N are different in at least some respects	R recognises that S is different in some respect from N, and that this difference is significant. Whether R recognises N as more important than S (as in "antithesis") is immaterial at this juncture.	<N> On the bases of their empirical data, Armstrong and Harris noticed that <S> ((/ £)), <b>unlike the model described by the Leicester authors,</b> </S> the BBC group has a leaderless or acephalous structure; </N> (essay: 00100004)
Elaboration: definition (elab-defin) (i)	On N: does not contain detail; contains a relatively specialised reference	S presents additional detail about the situation or some element of subject matter which is presented in N or inferentially accessible in N	W assumes N needs explanation; R recognises S as a relatively specialised way of referring to N	<N> Table 2 provides the studentized residuals <S> <b>(residuals divided by their estimated standard deviations),</b> </S> which obviously follow a t-distribution,) and the 'leverage points' <S> <b>(the values of the diagonal 'hat'-matrix)</b> </S> for eighteen countries. </N> (Crepaz and Lipjhart 1995)
Elaboration: equating (mononuclear) (a, i)	A comparison of two things or abstractions (Crombie 1985a), in terms of some respect in which they are similar.	S and N are different in some respects	R recognises that S is similar in some respect to N , and that this similarity is significant .	<N> Indeed, the study by Thompson et al. (2000) cited above <S> , <b>like the studies cited in our original article,</b> </S> did not test language proficiency. </N> (Marinova et al. 2001)
Elab-equating (multinuclear) (a, i)		A comparison of two things or abstractions , in terms of some respect in which they are similar (Crombie 1985a) .	R recognises that N/S1 is similar in some respect to N/S2 , and that this similarity is significant (me)	<N> This means that the principal aim of both politics and television is to attract supporters;</N> <S1> <b>the media look for higher ratings,</b> </S1> <S2> <b>politicians look for more voters through television.</b> </S2> (essay 04200041)
Elaboration : exception (a, i)	none	Either N is more general	R recognises one segment as	<N> In conclusion, I am

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
		than S, or vice-versa; N is expected to apply to S, but does not	constituting a generalisation, in terms of which the related segment is an exception (based on Crombie 1985b:24)	<i>convinced what Jacob (Dake 2001) said that money in itself is not bad, &lt;/N&gt; &lt;S&gt; only when it destroys or replaces what is precious in our lives / does it become a bad influence. &lt;/S&gt; (Essay 02870117)</i>
Elaboration : generalisation-specific (a, c, i)	On N: does not contain detail; contains a general reference which cannot be equated with the name of a set, and which may be abstract (e.g. a labelling noun) or grammatical (e.g. a pronoun) rather than lexical .	S presents a specific additional detail about the situation or some element of subject matter which, in more general terms, is presented in N or inferentially accessible in N	R recognises that S represents in particular terms what is stated in more general terms in N ; R recognises that S is a development of N in terms of detail.	<i>&lt;N&gt; If anything, the other official languages &lt;S&gt; especially the African languages, &lt;/S&gt; are likely to see some of their traditional domains, &lt;S&gt; particularly in urban communities, &lt;/S&gt; taken over by English, ...&lt;/N&gt; (Kamwangamalu 2002)</i>
Elaboration: naming (i)	S names the phenomenon; there is no name in N, only a paraphrase	S and N are the same phenomenon.	R recognises that the name given in S is the proper way to refer to the phenomenon described in N .	<i>&lt;N&gt; They point to the difference between the institutional aspect of corporatism within the strategic actors, labour and capital, and the concertation aspect of corporatism between the strategic actors&lt;/N&gt; &lt;S&gt; - a distinction which Schmitter referred to as 'corporatism 1' and 'corporatism 2'. &lt;/S&gt; (Crepaz and Lipjhart 1995)</i>
Elaboration: object-attribute (c, i)	none	S presents an additional detail about the situation or some element of subject matter which is presented in N or inferentially accessible in N, in the sense of an attribute (not an example or explanation)	R recognizes S as providing additional detail for N., in the sense of an attribute. R identifies the element of subject matter for which detail is provided.	<i>&lt;N&gt; The main bodies speaking out on behalf of older people in Britain are the two charities, Age Concern and Help the Aged.&lt;/N&gt; &lt;S&gt; Both are run by professional staff under the oversight of boards of trustees,&lt;/S&gt; (Metz 2002)</i>
Elaboration: process-step (c, i)	none	S presents additional detail in terms	R recognizes N as a process and S as a	<i>&lt;N&gt; First of all, reading is an exercise dominated by the eyes and the brain.&lt;/N&gt;</i>

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
		of steps about the process which is presented in N or inferentially accessible in N .	component step in that process	<b>&lt;S&gt; The eyes receive messages&lt;/S&gt; &lt;S&gt; and then the brain has to work out the significance of these messages.&lt;/S&gt;</b> (essay 00010056)
Elaboration: set-example (a, c, i)	On N: contains a term constituting a category with a theoretically limited number of members, in the thinking of the writer at that point; on S: includes at least one term which is a member of a limited set , but not all the members of the set are present, either in this or in adjacent segments .	S presents additional detail about the situation or some element of subject matter which is presented in N . Here there are terms in S more particular than one of the terms in N, and which can be seen as examples of that term.	R recognises the specific term(s) of or in S as belonging to the general category of or in N (me)	<b>&lt;N&gt; the claim that the mind is composed of a number of relatively independent components or 'modules', which interact.&lt;/N&gt; &lt;S&gt; Language itself may be one such module&lt;/S&gt;</b> (Aitchison 1993)
Elaboration : set-member (c, i)	On N: contains a term constituting a category with a theoretically limited number of members, in the thinking of the writer at that point; on S: includes at least one term which together with other terms, named in the same or adjoining satellites, constitutes the COMPLETE set.	S presents additional detail about the situation or some element of subject matter which is presented in N or inferentially accessible in N. Here there are terms in S more particular than one of the terms in N.	R recognises the specific term(s) of S as belonging to the general category in N.	<b>&lt;N&gt; by looking at the four major features of bilingualism&lt;/N&gt; &lt;S&gt;: degree, function, alternation and interference (Mackey 1986).&lt;/S&gt;</b> (essay 98240014)

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
Elaboration: whole-part (c)	N is complete; N is not a set. S is a part.	S presents additional detail about part of the situation or some element of subject matter which is presented in N.	R recognises S as a part of N.	<N>: he cites as an example a book published in 1937 by J. K. Heydon, entitled <i>Fascism and Providence</i> ,</N> <S> <b>which included the statement that English Catholics should not condemn Nazism, and those who do 'may be found to be fighting against God'.</b> </S> (Goddard 2002)
Enablement (c)	on N: presents an action by R (including accepting an offer), unrealized with respect to the context of N	R comprehending S increases R's potential ability to perform the action or investigate the subject-matter in N	R's potential ability to perform the action in N increases	<N> This deficit, moreover is not corrected by later postgraduate training </N> <S> – <b>see also Dement, a leading US sleep expert,</b> </S> (Williams 2004)
Evaluation: negative (c, d, i)	On N: W has negative regard for the situation presented in N; on S: none	on N + S: S relates N to degree of W's negative regard toward all or part of N. .	R recognizes that S assesses N (or part of N) and recognizes the value it assigns	<N> According to this method language is regarded purely as the means to perform certain functions.</N> <S> <b>Yet, such a "materialistic" view of the language can work only for the elementary students and proves to be insufficient when it comes to teaching more advanced students.</b> </S> (essay 00010022)
Evaluation: positive (c, i)	none	on N + S: S relates N (or part of N) to degree of W's positive regard toward N (or part of N).	R recognizes that S assesses N (or part of N) and recognizes the value it assigns	<N> Several such processes are contemplated in the four articles that follow.</N> <S> <b>In their diversity, they provide a good cross-section of the issues at stake and of the various research perspectives relevant to the subject.</b> </S> (Reis 2004)
Evaluation: reported, negative (c, i)	On S: W1 reports W2 who has negative regard for the situation presented in N; on S: none	on N + S: S relates N to degree of W2's negative regard toward all or part of N.	R recognizes that S relates N to a framework of ideas not involved in the knowledge presented in N itself, and that this shows N (or part of N) in a negative light	<N> There is little doubt that making money based on capitalism is one of the characters of the modern societies.</N> <S> <b>Some people argue that this is quite dominant and most harmful value in the modern world.</b> </S> (essay 02860111)
Evaluation: reported, positive (c, i)	On S: W1 reports W2 who has positive regard for the situation presented in N; on S: none	on N + S: S relates N to degree of W2's positive regard toward N (or part of N).	R recognizes that S relates N (or part of N) to a framework of ideas not involved in the knowledge presented in N itself, and that this shows N (or part of N) in a positive light	<N>According to Lietaer (2001), the modern monetary system has played a key role in the substantial achievements of the Industrial Age.</N> <S> <b>This system has been highly effective in encouraging and prompting the Industrial Age around the globe.</b> </S> (essay 02870908)

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
Evidence* /Evidence-grounds (a, c)	on N: R might not believe N to a degree satisfactory to W; on S: R believes S or will find it credible	R's comprehending S increases R's belief of N ; a deduction in N is drawn on the basis of some observation in S (including both empirical, or logical grounds, or reason)	R's belief of N is increased	<b>&lt;S&gt;Health and social care costs ... increase with age, &lt;/S&gt;</b> <N> so an ageing population might naturally be thought to imply a bigger burden for individuals, families and society. </N> (Metz 2002)
Evidence-grounds + Irony (i)	On S: S is surprising, given N	W expects that though R regards S and N as true, the information in S alone would in other circumstances have <i>decreased</i> belief in N	R's readiness to accept N is increased	<N> one would have to argue that there was, and still is, some inherent quality in the language itself which gives it an advantage over any other, and that its spread is a measure of its intrinsic superiority.</N> ... <S> <b>Deneire cites Bourdieu as saying that 'authority always comes to language from the outside.'</b> </S> Precisely so: from the outside, not the inside. (Widdowson 1998)
Interpretation (c)	none	on N + S: S relates N to a framework of ideas not involved in N itself and not concerned with W's positive or negative regard	R recognizes that S relates N to a framework of ideas not involved in the knowledge presented in N itself	<N> ) "Africa would if Africa could. America could if America could. But Africa can't and America ain't. (Smitherman, 1977: p. 3)</N> <b>&lt;S&gt; The Reverend Jackson, in this case, preferred to use the rhythm of Black English variety because he was speaking to the black community and, mostly, to be more direct and forceful in that situation.&lt;/S&gt;</b> (essay 04100119)
Interpretation: reported (c, i)	On S: W1 reports W2	on N + S: S relates N to a framework of ideas not involved in N itself and not concerned with W's positive or negative regard	R recognizes that S relates N to a framework of ideas not involved in the knowledge presented in N itself	<N> Such electronic searches might plausibly be interpreted as evidence of alienation from, or at least doubt in the professional competence of, orthodox sources of health expertise, e.g. general practitioners, as Beck would predict.</N> <b>&lt;S&gt; On the other hand, as Richardson observes, the availability of such information, in a context of increased lifestyle choice, is an unprecedented development.&lt;/S&gt;</b> (Horlick-Jones 2003)
Joint (multinuclear) (c)		None; a joint links a matrix relation to two segments or schemas which share that relation but are otherwise unrelated.	none	N/A

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
Justify (c, d)	none	R's comprehending S increases R's readiness to accept W's right to present N	R's readiness to accept W's right to present N is increased	<b>&lt;S&gt; As Wally Olins has observed, &lt;/S&gt; &lt;N&gt; you can see this in any collection of Victorian portraits of politicians and writers.&lt;/N&gt;</b> (Metz 2002)
List (multinuclear) (c)		An item comparable to others linked to it by the List relation	R recognises the comparability of the linked items	<b>&lt;N1&gt; To think purely in terms of linear causation is to do injustice to the interconnectedness of these two variables &lt;/N1&gt; &lt;N2&gt; and to fail to capture the stability of social capital stocks over the long term.&lt;/N2&gt;</b> (Boix and Posner 1998)
Means (c)	on N: an activity	S presents a method or instrument which tends to make realization of N more likely	R recognizes that the method or instrument in S tends to make realization of N more likely	<b>&lt;N&gt; We argue for the relevance of a sociocultural perspective on teacher learning&lt;/N&gt; &lt;S&gt; by showing how the central constructs of the theory provide insights into teacher development.&lt;/S&gt;</b> (Johnson and Golombek 2003)
Motivation (c)	on N: N is an action in which R is the actor (including accepting an offer), unrealized with respect to the context of N	Comprehending S increases R's desire to perform action in N	R's desire to perform action in N is increased	<b>&lt;S&gt; As Europe moves on towards an ever-growing unification,&lt;/S&gt; &lt;N&gt;it becomes of the uttermost importance to spend a few words on the hot issue of nationalism within the European Union.&lt;/N&gt;</b> (essay 01100043)
Non-result (i)		The state presented in S is due to the lack of effect of N	R recognises that N could theoretically cause an effect antithetical to that in S	<b>&lt;N&gt; It is the inevitability of punishment that can possibly prevent people from breaking the binding rules.&lt;/N&gt; &lt;S&gt; Hence the deteriorating situation in Poland&lt;/S&gt;</b> (essay 00010039)
Otherwise (c, h)	on N: N is an unrealized situation on S: S is an unrealized situation	realization of N prevents realization of S	R recognizes the dependency relation of prevention between the realization of N and the realization of S	<b>&lt;N&gt; One therefore wonders whether the efficacy of these warrants has a degree of risk-specificity.&lt;/N&gt; &lt;S&gt; Otherwise, the warrants for trustworthiness reflect patterns of practical reasoning uncovered by recent research into risk perception (e.g. Petts et al. 2001; Horlick-Jones, Sime and Pidgeon 2003).&lt;/S&gt;</b> (Horlick-Jones 2003)
Preparation (c)	none	S precedes N in the text; S tends to make R more ready, interested or oriented for reading N	R is more ready, interested or oriented for reading N	<b>&lt;S&gt;As far as countries from the former Soviet block are concerned,&lt;/S&gt; &lt;N&gt;the situation is different&lt;/N&gt;</b> (essay 11p1043)
Presentational sequence (multinuclear)		There is a succession relationship	R recognizes the succession relationships	<b>1. &lt;N&gt; Keman's and Pennings's first criticism is that producing a composite</b>

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
(c)		between the situations in the nuclei ( in terms of their arrangement in the text)	among the nuclei.	<b>measure of corporatism is unwarranted,...</b> </N> (Crepaz and Lipjhart 1995)  2. <N> <b>Genesee starts by defining the term "mixing"</b> </N> (essay 99100128).
Problem-Solution (c, f)	On either N or S, or multinuclear	N is a solution to the problem presented in S; or vice versa, or N2 is a solution to the problem in N1, or vice versa	R recognizes N or S as a solution to the problem presented in S or N	With Problem as nucleus: <N> <i>At this point one could argue that authentic texts are too ambitious or even too difficult for an average foreign language learner to study.</i> </N> <S> <b>Nonetheless, there is a way to solve this problem: simplifying the texts and making them appropriate for students of various levels to read and learn from.</b> </S> (essay 00010005)  With Solution as nucleus: <S> <b>to understand thoroughly the way infant bilinguals' pattern of speech works,</b> </S> <N> <i>it may be necessary to account for quantitative description and for assumptions such as parameter setting</i> </N> (essay 99100128)
Proportion (e, i) (mononuclear)	On S: it is presented as a fact .	N and S can plausibly be in a relation of proportionality or degree; The effects or results in N depend on the circumstances or condition in S .	R recognises that there is a "proportionality or equivalence of tendency or degree" (Quirk et al. 1985:1111) between N and S.	<S> <b>The less coherent the law system of a given country is,</b> </S> <N> <i>the more citizens are willing to take advantage of a situation.</i> </N> (Essay 00010039)
Proportion (multinuclear) (e, i)		N1 and N2 can plausibly be in a relation of proportionality or degree; The effects or results in N2 depend on the circumstances or condition in N1.	R recognises that there is a "proportionality or equivalence of tendency or degree" (Quirk et al. 1985:1111) between N1 and N2.	<N1> <b>The more that the government is made aware of the wishes of the community, it is assumed,</b> </N1> <N2> <b>the greater the likelihood that its policies will reflect them.</b> </N2> (Boix and Posner 1998)
Purpose (c)	on N: N is an activity; on S: S is a situation that is unrealized	S is to be realized through the activity in N. Occasionally, when a circumstantial	R recognizes that the activity in N is initiated in order to realize S	<N> <i>It has been invoked by scholars working in the health-care sphere,</i> </N> <S> <b>to seek to understand, for example, the individualized patterns of certain contemporary discourses of illness prevention.</b> </S> (Horlick-

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
		clause provides a sentence topic, you have the situation where N is to be realised through S.		<i>Jones 2003)</i>  An example of the reversal of roles of N and S (see on left): <b>&lt;S&gt;</b> <i>When the decision to televise Parliaments was taken by some European countries, &lt;S&gt; &lt;N&gt; those favouring the reform argued that it would inform and educate the public &lt;/N&gt;</i> (Essay 04200041)
Question-answer (f)	On N or S: one of them poses a question (not necessarily in interrogative form), and the other answers the question.	None.	R recognises the reciprocal relation of question and answer between N and S (or vice versa).	<i>&lt;N&gt; Should we promote authentic, difficult texts or rather their simplified versions?&lt;/N&gt;</i> <b>&lt;S&gt;</b> <i>Taking into consideration the fact that students acquire vocabulary and spelling more efficiently by receiving comprehensible input, we may assume that simplified texts would be more suitable, especially for beginners.&lt;/S&gt;</i> (essay 00010061)
Question: rhetorical (i)	S is a question, not requiring an answer; N is material that provoked the question	N and S: the answer to the question S about N should be obvious.	R recognises that the question in S should be interpreted as a conclusion drawn about N	<i>&lt;N&gt;In his article "Corruption", Piotr Golik states that both state and local government is open to bribery.&lt;/N&gt;</i> <b>&lt;S&gt;</b> <i>Who is then to become the paragon of morality?&lt;/S&gt;</i> (article 10p0008)
Reinforcement* – see under "Addition-reinforcement"				
Replacive (a, d, i, j)	<b>on N: W has positive regard for N</b>	As for Antithesis, except that the incompatibility is such that (W) intends (S) to be rejected by I, and (N) to substitute it, whether externally or internally .	R's positive regard for N is increased by establishing the unacceptability or untruth of S or an element in S	<i>&lt;N&gt; Moreover, methodologist seem to do their best to bring the real world to the classroom,&lt;/N&gt;</i> <b>&lt;S&gt;</b> <i>and not any obscure pieces of material that is no longer relevant.&lt;/S&gt;</i> (essay 00010064)
Restatement (mononuclear) (c)	none	on N + S: S restates N, where S and N are of comparable bulk; N is more central to W's purposes than S	R's acceptance Of N is increased by the repetition of N in S	<i>&lt;N&gt; There is no doubt that making money is indispensable for one's life.&lt;/N&gt;</i> <b>&lt;S&gt;</b> <i>It is difficult to imagine to achieve something without money.&lt;/S&gt;</i> (essay 02860192)

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
Restatement (multinuclear) (c)  (in diagrams, may be called "Reiteration" for tactical reasons connected with the RST Tool)		on N 1 and N2: N2 restates N1, where N1 and N2 are of comparable bulk	R recognizes the re-expression by the linked items; either R's acceptance of N1 is increased by the repetition of N1 in N2, or R's acceptance of N2 is increased by the repetition of N1 in N2	<b>&lt;N1&gt; employees will drag their feet &lt;/N1&gt; &lt;N2&gt; and work only as hard as they must to avoid discovery and punishment.&lt;/N2&gt;</b> (Boix and Posner 1998)
Restatement: emphatic (c, i)	none	on N + S: S restates N, where S and N are of comparable bulk; N is more central to W's purposes than S is; S makes R more likely to accept N.	R's estimation of the significance of N is increased by the emphasis given in S	<b>&lt;N&gt;... "Politics no longer exists as a reality taking place outside the media" (Dahlgren, 2001: 85).&lt;/N&gt; &lt;S&gt; In fact, there is no politician today who can escape the constant glare of media. &lt;/S&gt;</b> (Essay 04200041)
Result: non-volitional (c)	on S: S is not a volitional action	N caused S; presentation of N is more central to W's purposes in putting forth the N-S combination than is the presentation of S.	R recognizes that N could have caused the situation in S	<b>&lt;N&gt; Thus it can be said that the modern monetary system has become so powerful&lt;/N&gt; &lt;S&gt; that it creates a serious environmental problem in our modern society.&lt;/S&gt;</b> (essay 02860903)
Result: volitional (c)	on S: S is a volitional action or a situation that could have arisen from a volitional action	N could have caused S; presentation of N is more central to W's purposes than is presentation of S.	R recognizes that N could be a cause for the action or situation in S	<b>&lt;N&gt; many of the worlds religions, from Judaism to Islam, has worned (sic) about the negative impact money and greed can have on the structure of society.&lt;/N&gt; &lt;S&gt; As a result, money has been discredited and associated with bad notions.&lt;/S&gt;</b> (essay 02890907)
Sequence (multinuclear) (c)	None.	There is a succession relationship between the situations in the nuclei (in terms external to the text)	R recognizes the succession relationships among the nuclei.	<b>&lt;N1&gt; After we had established an empirical link between corporatism and consensus democracy,&lt;/N1&gt; &lt;N2&gt; the next logical step was to integrate the corporatist/pluralist system of interest representation into the cluster of consensus/majoritarian political institutions.&lt;/N2&gt;</b> (Crepaz and Lipjhart 1995)

Relation Name (source of definition)	Constraints on either S or N individually	Constraints on N + S (or N + N, or S+S)	Intention of Writer (W)	Examples
Summary (c)	on N: N must be more than one unit	S presents a restatement of the content of N, that is shorter in bulk	R's willingness to accept N is increased by seeing N restated in a more assimilable form	<Nucleus too long to include in table> <b>&lt;S&gt;These are good examples to prove that pursuing money can have negative impacts on environment... &lt;/S&gt;</b> (essay:02860174)
Unconditional (c)	on S: S conceivably could affect the realization of N	N does not depend on S	R recognizes that N does not depend on S	<N> Therefore, <b>&lt;S&gt; whatever the consequences,&lt;/S&gt;</b> students try to help themselves in passing difficult examinations or writing long research papers.</N> (essay 00010016)
Unless (c)	none	S affects the realization of N; N is realized provided that S is not realized	R recognizes that N is realized provided that S is not realized	<b>&lt;S&gt; Unless the citizens undergo a profound mentality change,&lt;/S&gt;</b> <N> they will continue to bend their principles and money will change hands.</N> (essay 00010044)
<p><b>KEY TO DEFINITIONS</b>  C = Claim. N = Nucleus. &lt;N&gt; Beginning of nucleus. &lt;/N&gt; End of nucleus. R = Reader. S = Satellite. &lt;S&gt; = Beginning of satellite. &lt;/S&gt; = End of Satellite. W = Writer. <b>In the Examples column, segments signalling the illustrated relation are in bold.</b> * later version of the tag</p> <p><b>KEY TO SOURCES OF DEFINITIONS</b>  (a) Crombie (1985a,b) (b) Martin 1992:221 (c) Mann and Taboada 2005, 2012 (d) Stuart-Smith (1998) (e) Quirk et al. 1985 (f) Carlson &amp; Marcu 2001 (g) Mann &amp; Thompson (1988) (h) O'Brien (1995) (i) the current author (j) Halliday &amp; Hasan 1976:254)</p>				

### Example citations: List of references

- Aitchison, J. 1989. *The articulate mammal: an introduction to psycholinguistics*. (3rd edn). London: Unwin Hyman/Routledge. (a)
- Aitchison, J. 1993. 'Birds, bees, and switches: psycholinguistic issues 1967-2017', *ELT Journal*, 47(2) pp107-116.
- Armstrong, G. and R. Harris. 1991. 'Football hooligans: theory and evidence', *The Sociological Review*, 39(3) pp. 427-458.
- Beck, U. 1992. *Risk society: towards a new modernity*. London: Sage.
- Boix, C., and D. Posner. 1998. 'Social Capital: Explaining Its Origins and Effects on Government Performance', *British Journal of Political Science*, 28(4) pp 686-693. (b)
- Carver, T. 2004. 'War of the worlds/ invasion of the body snatchers,' *International Affairs*, 80(1), pp 92 - 94. (c)
- Crepaz, M., and A. Lipjhart. 1995. 'Linking and integrating corporatism and consensus democracy: theory, concepts and evidence', *British Journal of Political Science*, 25(2) pp281-288. (b)
- Crewe, E. and E. Harrison. 1998. *Whose development? An ethnography of aid*. London: Zed Books.
- Dahlgren, P. 2001. 'The transformation of democracy?', in B. Axford and R. Huggins (eds.), *New Media and Politics*. London: Sage.

- Dake, M. 2001. 'The meaning of money in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. An interview with Jacob Needleman'. <http://www.paraview.com/features/needleman.htm>
- Dement, W. 2000. *The Promise of Sleep: the Scientific Connection between Health, Happiness and a Good Night's Sleep*. New York/London: Delacourt Press/Macmillan.
- Deneire, M. 1998. 'A response to H. G. Widdowson's "EIL, ESL, EFL: global issues and local interest"', *World Englishes*, 17 pp 393–395
- Easterlin, R. 2001. 'Why rising incomes make us no happier'. <http://www.res.org.uk/media/easterlin.htm>
- Ellis, G. 1996. 'How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach?' *ELT Journal*, 50(3), pp213-218. (d)
- Fairclough, N. 1992. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Foucault, M. 1977. *Madness and civilisation: a history of insanity in the age of reason*. London: Tavistock.
- Genesee, F. 1989. 'Early bilingual development: one language or two?' *Journal of Child Language* 16 pp 161-79.
- Goddard, H. 2002. 'Islam and Democracy', *Political Quarterly*, 73(1), pp3-9. (c)
- Golik, P. 1999. 'Corruption'. *The Warsaw Voice*, 18 April.
- Horlick-Jones, T.(2003). 'Managing risk and contingency: interaction and accounting behaviour'. *Health, Risk and Society* 5(2), 222-227. (f)
- Kamwangamalu, N. 2002. 'English in South Africa at the millennium: challenges and prospects', *World Englishes*, 21(1), 161-163. (c)
- Keman, H. and P. Pennings. 'Managing Political and Societal Conflict in Democracies: Do Consensus and Corporatism Matter?' *British Journal of Political Science*, 25(2) pp 271-281.
- Lietaer, B. 2002. *The future of money*. London: Century.
- Marinova-Todd, S., D. Marshall, and C. Snow. 2001. 'Missing the Point: A Response to Hyltenstam and Abrahamsson', *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1) pp 171-176. (e)
- Mackey, W.F. 1986. 'The polyglossic spectrum', in J. Fishman et al (eds.) *The Fergusonian Impact*. Vol 2. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp 237-43.
- McArthur, T. 1998. *The English languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Metz, D. 2002. 'The politics of population ageing', *Political Quarterly*, 73(3), 321-327. (c)
- Newton, K. 1997. 'Residential Mobility in London: Rational Choice Fairy Tale, Utopia or Reality', *Br Journal of Political Science*, 27(1), pp148-151. (b)
- Palfreyman, D. 2003. 'Expanding the discourse on learner development: a reply to Anita Wenden', *Applied Linguistics*, 24(4) pp 243-248. (a)
- Petts, J., T. Horlick-Jones, and G. Murdoch. 2001. *Social amplification of risk: the media and the public*. Sudbury: HSE Books.
- Prodromou, L. 2000. 'Bring back the bard', *Guardian weekly: Learning English* (supplement), 18 May p.3.
- Richardson, K. 2003. 'Health risks on the internet: establishing credibility on line', *Health, Risk and Society* 5(2), pp171-84.
- Schmitter, P.C. 1982. 'Reflections on where the theory of corporatism has gone and where the praxis of neo-corporatism may be going', in G. Lehmbruch and P.C. Schmitter (eds.), *Patterns of Corporatist Policy Making*. London: Sage.
- Scovel, T. 1989. *A time to speak: a psycholinguistic examination of the critical period for language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Singleton, D. 1989. *Language acquisition: The age factor*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Skousen, M. 2000. 'In Defense of the rich', *The Freeman* 50(6), June.
- Smitherman, Gena 1997 'Black English and the Education of Black Children: One Mo Once', *The Black Scholar* 27 (1) p30.
- Stanley, T.J. 2000. *The Millionaire Mind*. Kansas City : Andrews & McMeel.

- Thompson, P. M., Giedd, J., Woods, R., MacDonald, D., Evans, A., & Toga, A. 2000. 'Growth patterns in the developing brain detected by using continuum mechanical tensor maps', *Nature*, 404, pp190–193.
- Umbel V., B.Z. Pearson, M.C. Fernández, and D. K. Oller. 1992. 'Measuring Bilingual Children's Receptive Vocabularies', *Child Development*, 63 (4), pp. 1012-1020.
- Wallace, C. 1992. *Reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. 1998. 'EIL: Squaring the circles. A reply', *World Englishes*, 17(3) pp 397-401. (c)
- Williams, S. 2004. 'Beyond medicalisation-healthicisation? A rejoinder to Hislop and Arber', *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 26(4) pp 453-459. (c)

## References to notes and comments in Appendices

- Carlson, L., and D. Marcu. 2001. *Discourse Tagging Reference Manual*. On-line document. University of Southern California Information Sciences Institute. <ftp://128.9.176.20/isi-pubs/tr-545.pdf> Last accessed 15/12/12.
- Crombie, W. 1985a. *Discourse and Language Learning: a Relational Approach to Syllabus Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crombie, W. 1985b. *Process and Relation in Discourse and Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M., and R. Hasan, R. 1989. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huddleston, R. 1988. *English Grammar: an Outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Brien, T. 1995. 'Rhetorical Structure Analysis and the Case of the Inaccurate, Incoherent Source-Hopper', *Applied Linguistics*, 16 pp 442-482.
- Mann, W. and M. Taboada. 2005, 2012. The RST Web Site. <http://www.sfu.ca/rst/>. Last accessed 15 December 2012.
- Mann, W. C. and S. Thompson. 1988. 'Rhetorical structure theory: Towards a functional theory of text organisation', *Text* 8(3) pp 243-281.
- Martin, J. 1992. *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Stuart-Smith, V. 1998. 'Constructing an argument in psychology: rhetorical structure theory and the analysis of student writing' in C. Candlin and G.A. Plum (eds.) *Researching Academic Literacies. Framing Student Literacy: Cross-cultural Aspects of Communication Skills in Australian University Settings*. Sydney: NCELTR.

## Notes: acknowledgements

- (a) Reproduced in CRANE by kind permission of the author and of Oxford University Press.
- (b) Reproduced in CRANE by kind permission of Cambridge University Press.
- (c) Reproduced in CRANE by kind permission of John Wiley and Sons/Blackwell Publishing.
- (d) Reproduced in CRANE by kind permission of Oxford University Press.
- (e) Reproduced in CRANE by kind permission of TESOL Publications.
- (f) © 2003 Taylor & Francis Ltd., <http://www.informaworld.com>, reproduced in CRANE by permission of the publisher.