

angl C1 écrit réponse argumentée opérations d1-d3

[Editer la page](#)

C1 écrit

réponse argumentée à une question

opérations de compréhension, d'analyse, de critique et de synthèse

descripteurs 1-3

descripteur 1

<p>le <u>contexte</u>, les <u>arrière-plans</u> impliqués par la question sont situés</p>	<p>In what way do interactions between participants in the backstage influence stances adopted in the frontstage?</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The distinction between public and private space is often clearly marked by discrete physical locations that seem purpose built to house them. An example is the staff-room in educational institutions (Richards 2010; Vaughan 2007). However, <u>in other organisations such locations do not exist and it is up to the participants involved to style interactions as public or private using the interactional resources available to them</u>. Such events are often not only related to the focal activity of the organisation, but to each other as well. In other words, <u>public and private events</u>, or to use the terminology of Goffman's (1959) dramaturgical model, <u>frontstage and backstage, can be viewed as two sides of the same coin</u>. This paper explores the linked nature of frontstage and backstage interactions in the context of an organisation in which most activities take place in the same space: a rugby team. In doing so it <u>seeks to decouple the notion of front and backstage discourse from that of physical location</u>, and examines how <u>the participants style the events they take part in as front or backstage</u>, in reaction to an ever-changing participation framework (Goffman 1981; Goodwin 2007; Kendon 1990; Rae 2001). Since this paper focuses on the discourse of two leadership figures in the rugby team, a <u>further implication is that the division of communicative events into front and backstage allows an analysis of the preparation of leadership and the performance of leadership</u>.</p> <p>Wilson N. 2013. Interaction without walls: Analysing leadership discourse through dramaturgy and participation. <i>Journal of Sociolinguistics</i> 17. 2, 180-199.</p>	<p>☒ ☒ ☒</p>
---	--	--------------

descripteur 2

<p>le <u>plan</u> de la réponse <u>est formulé</u></p>	<p>The section that follows explains <u>how stance and identity is used in this paper, with a discussion of the existing treatments of frontstage and backstage in interactional research then provided</u>, outlining how Goffman's dramaturgical model of interaction can be applied to spatially dynamic organisations. This is linked to frames, footing, and participation framework (Goffman 1981; Goodwin 2007; Kendon 1990; Rae 2001) and the utility of retaining the division between front and backstage (Wittenberg-Lyles et al. 2009). <u>The main body of the paper then presents analyses of three linked communicative events in a rugby team</u>. These analyses demonstrate how the participants move seamlessly between front and backstage events as the participation framework changes. <u>The examples provided also demonstrate how the main participants, the coaches, use backstage events to prepare for how they will act in the corresponding frontstage event</u>.</p> <p>Wilson N. 2013. Interaction without walls: Analysing leadership discourse through dramaturgy and participation. <i>Journal of Sociolinguistics</i> 17. 2, 180-199.</p>	<p>☒ ☒ ☒</p>
--	--	--------------

descripteur 3

<p>la réponse est structurée en suivant le plan annoncé</p>	<p>IDENTITY AND STANCE</p> <p>This research adopts the social constructionist paradigm that <u>identity is not static; it is recreated dynamically, with reference to situation, context, interactional goals and the evaluation of interlocutors</u> (e.g. Benwell and Stokoe 2006; Bucholtz and Hall 2005; De Fina 2007; Holmes 2006; Kiesling 2001). <u>Furthermore, identity may be viewed as an accumulation of stances over time, where stance is a momentary snapshot of the identity that is constructed in a given interaction</u> (Jaffe 2009).</p> <p>...</p> <p>FRONTSTAGE AND BACKSTAGE</p> <p>Research that views communicative events as frontstage or backstage has tended to focus primarily on <u>backstage discourse, which is analysed as a site of off-record identity construction in which individuals are able to take greater risks with the stances they adopt</u> (e.g. Coates 1999; Hughey 2011).</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>One of the motivations for analysing communicative events as frontstage or backstage is that it relates to the division between preparation and performance, with these closely following the distinction between public and private space</u> (Tanner and Timmons 2000).</p> <p>...</p> <p>FIELDWORK METHODOLOGY</p> <p>The data used in this research is drawn from a larger investigation into the discursive realisation of leadership and team identity in a rugby club. Using an ethnographic approach to fieldwork, I gained full, <u>unrestricted access to a rugby team in New Zealand over the course of one rugby season, (from March to August)</u>.</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>In their backstage discourse, the coaches construct a shared identity as leaders in the rugby team through the stances they take towards each other and the future frontstage stances they negotiate. By updating Tommo on the stance he has so far taken with the players (Example 1), not only does Parky make the first move in the negotiation of stance (i.e. he claims the role of 'bad cop'), but he defines this interaction as backstage</u>. In confiding to Tommo that the players are 'not liking him' (Example 1, lines 3 and 5), and telling Tommo that they are 'not switched on' (line 14), Parky initiates a discussion about the players[.]</p> <p>...</p> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>As noted in the introduction to this paper, the underlying rationale behind describing organisational discourse in terms of front and backstage, rather than simply as a series of different frames (Goffman 1974), is that it provides a link with the way in which leadership identities are constructed and performed.</p> <p>...</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>... The reason for distinguishing two different types of interactional frame as frontstage and backstage is not simply to emphasise a public/private distinction, however. It also serves to link events together so that a communicative event that takes place within a wider participation framework (i.e. a public interaction) can be analysed in conjunction with a prior event in which a subset of the participants prepare the stances that they will take (Wittenberg-Lyles et al. 2009).</p> <p>Wilson N. 2013. Interaction without walls: Analysing leadership discourse through dramaturgy and participation. <i>Journal of Sociolinguistics</i> 17. 2, 180-199.</p>	<p>☒ ☒ ☒</p>
---	--	--------------