

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS/INGLÊS E LITERATURA CORRESPONDENTE

MILITARY DISCOURSE:

*An Analysis of Media Representations and Spoken Interactions
in Battalions of the Brazilian Army*

JOSÉ OSVALDO SAMPAIO BUENO

Dissertação submetida à Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina em cumprimento
parcial dos requisitos para obtenção do grau de

MESTRE EM LETRAS

FLORIANÓPOLIS

Abril de 2005

Esta dissertação de José Osvaldo Sampaio Bueno, intitulada “Military Discourse: An analysis of media representations and spoken interactions in battalions of the Brazilian Army”, foi julgada adequada e aprovada em sua forma final, pelo Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras/Inglês e Literatura Correspondente, da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, para fins de obtenção do grau de

MESTRE EM LETRAS

Área de concentração: Inglês e Literatura Correspondente
Opção: Língua Inglesa e Lingüística Aplicada

Mailce Borges Mota Fortkamp
Coordenadora

BANCA EXAMINADORA:

Viviane M. Heberle
Orientadora e Presidente

Aleksandar Piasecka-Til
Examinadora

Ana Cristina Ostermann
Examinadora

Florianópolis, 11 de abril de 2005.

A meu pai, meu maior ídolo, pelos exemplos de dedicação e coragem em tudo que se faz; e a minha mãe, pelo exemplo de força e serenidade. Amo vocês.

“A disciplina militar prestante,
Não se aprende, Senhor, na fantasia,
Sonhando, imaginando ou estudando,
Senão vendo, tratando e pelejando”.

(Camões)

AGRADECIMENTOS

Há um ditado brasileiro que diz: “Atrás de um grande homem, existe sempre uma grande mulher”. Não sei se sou um grande homem, mas durante os anos de 2003/2004 enfrentei um grande desafio, que foi cursar mestrado em Língua Inglesa. Nessa batalha, pude constatar o quanto que o ditado acima é verdadeiro, e mais do que isso, percebi que Deus me abençoou não apenas em colocar uma mulher atrás de mim. Percebi sim, que tive a graça de estar cercado por várias mulheres importantes, apoiando-me na execução desse desafio e que me fizeram sentir grande a cada passo dado. Foram verdadeiras guerreiras a me incentivar, entendendo minha ausência e, às vezes, meu péssimo humor e nervosismo. Assim, agradeço de coração a cada mulher especial abaixo enunciada e celebro com vocês essa vitória, lembrando um trecho de uma música de Erasmo Carlos: “... mulher, mulher, na escola em que você foi ensinada, jamais tirei um 10. Sou forte, mas não chego a teus pés...”:

Inicialmente, Dra. Viviane Heberle, minha orientadora, exemplo de competência e dedicação, por ter acreditado em mim, e pela paciência em me orientar e em entender meus problemas particulares. A você, como forma de resumir meus agradecimentos, deixo um pensamento militar: “A palavra conduz. O exemplo arrasta”.

As “meninas” que me deram a honra de ser bendito fruto entre as mulheres no Minter: Célia, Mônica, Caroline, Neide, Lídia, Raquel, Sanae, Ivete, Sara, Débora, Ana Lúcia e Mariese. Só nós sabemos o quanto foi sofrido chegar até aqui, mas os exemplos de garra, determinação e abnegação que vocês me passaram, jamais serão esquecidos. Agora, vamos curtir juntos mais essa etapa vencida.

A Coordenadora do Minter na UFSC, Dra. Mailce Borges Mota Fortkamp, por toda a atenção dispensada, em todos os momentos do curso.

A Coordenadora do Minter na UNICENTRO, Dra. Maria Natália Ferreira Gomes Timóteo, pelo incentivo e luta em me fazer chegar até aqui.

A Professora Ms. Maria Aparecida Crissi Knüppel, pela amizade, atenção e por todos os conselhos nos momentos mais difíceis.

As amigas Dani, Ethel e Joseli, da UNICENTRO; Valdene, Angélica, Mariane e Ana Luísa da FEMM, por toda a ajuda durante o curso de Letras. Afinal, não é fácil fazer a graduação junto com o mestrado!

A minha filha, Giovana, fonte da minha inspiração, por sempre me receber com um sorriso e um beijo, mesmo quando eu não podia dar atenção para você.

A minha namorada Marcela, pelo apoio incondicional, companheirismo, amor e compreensão, deixando-me sempre tranquilo para concluir o curso. Juntos vencemos a distância e a falta de tempo. Agora, temos todo o tempo do mundo! Te amo muito!

E a maior de todas as guerreiras: minha vóinha, Dona Hildeth, de quem eu tenho muito orgulho e que cada vez mais me surpreende com sua força, coragem, determinação e serenidade, e por ter sido minha mãe e meu pai, em todas as vezes que precisei.

Amo todas vocês! Que Deus ilumine sempre os seus caminhos!

Florianópolis, 11 de abril de 2005.

ABSTRACT

MILITARY DISCOURSE:

AN ANALYSIS OF MEDIA REPRESENTATIONS AND SPOKEN INTERACTIONS IN BATTALIONS OF THE BRAZILIAN ARMY

JOSÉ OSVALDO SAMPAIO BUENO

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
2005

Advisor: Viviane M. Heberle

This thesis investigates military discourse, comparing media representations and spoken interactions in battalions of the Brazilian Army. Considering the Brazilian Army as a closed environment, most of media representations tend to convey issues of authoritarianism and rudeness in relation to interactions between superiors and subordinates. Thus, I analyze one song, one TV program, two films, three magazine articles, and two comic strips from the media, and eight excerpts of spoken interactions between superiors and subordinates, recorded in two battalions of the Brazilian Army, in two different states in Brazil. I formulate the following research questions: 1) how does the media represent military discourse? 2) how does the Brazilian Army represent military discourse, in relation to issues of power, authority, discipline and politeness? 3) what are the main characteristics of institutional and casual conversation found in spoken interactions in the army? and 4) in what circumstances can casual conversation occur, involving superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army?. To answer my questions, I analyze the selected data according to the interpersonal metafunction and register, mood choices, modality, and characteristics of casual and pragmatic conversations, as proposed in Systemic Functional Linguistics and to the concepts of power, social order and social changes, presented in Critical Discourse Analysis. Results suggest that superiors modalize and modulate commands, in order to reduce the effects of power and authority; superiors do not use offenses to command subordinates; superiors consider and respect subordinates' opinions, since subordinates use a high proportion of declarative clauses in interactions; and occurrences of informality are permeated by minor clauses, slang, jargon, swearing and vocatives, reducing the effects of hierarchy. This thesis serves to demystify pre-judgments related to military discourse, and to distinguish it as an unknown, interesting and vast field to be studied.

Key words: military discourse, Systemic Functional Linguistics, Critical Discourse Analysis, media representations, spoken interactions.

Number of pages: 116

Number of words: 34.326

RESUMO

DISCURSO MILITAR:

UMA ANÁLISE DE REPRESENTAÇÕES PELA MÍDIA

E DE INTERAÇÕES VERBAIS EM BATALHÕES DO EXÉRCITO BRASILEIRO

JOSÉ OSVALDO SAMPAIO BUENO

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
2005

Orientadora: Viviane M. Heberle.

Esta tese investiga o discurso militar, comparando representações pela mídia e interações verbais em batalhões do Exército Brasileiro. Considerando o Exército Brasileiro como um ambiente fechado, muitas das representações pela mídia tendem a transmitir questões relativas a autoritarismo e aspereza em relação a interações entre superiores e subordinados. Assim, analiso uma música, um programa de TV, dois filmes, três artigos de revista e duas tiras de histórias em quadrinhos e oito extratos de interações verbais entre superiores e subordinados, gravadas em dois batalhões do Exército Brasileiro, em dois estados diferentes do Brasil. Formulo as seguintes perguntas de pesquisa: 1) como a mídia representa o discurso militar?; 2) como o Exército Brasileiro representa o discurso militar, em relação às questões de poder, autoridade, disciplina e educação?; 3) quais são as principais características das conversações institucionais e casuais encontradas em interações verbais no exército?; e 4) em quais circunstâncias pode ocorrer a conversação casual, envolvendo superiores e subordinados no Exército Brasileiro?. Para responder minhas perguntas, analiso os dados conforme a metafunção interpessoal e registro, escolhas de modo, modalização e características de conversações pragmáticas e casuais, de acordo com a Linguística Sistêmica Funcional e os conceitos de poder, ordem social e mudanças sociais, apresentados na Análise Crítica do Discurso. Os resultados sugerem que superiores modalizam e modulam os comandos, para reduzir os efeitos de poder e autoridade; os superiores não usam ofensas para comandar subordinados; os superiores consideram e respeitam as opiniões dos subordinados, uma vez que os subordinados usam uma alta proporção de orações declarativas nas interações; ocorrências de informalidade são permeadas por orações mínimas, gírias, jargões, palavrões e vocativos, reduzindo os efeitos da hierarquia. Esta tese serve para desmistificar pré-julgamentos em relação ao discurso militar, e para destacá-lo como um campo desconhecido, interessante e vasto a ser estudado.

Palavras-chave: discurso militar, Linguística Sistêmica Funcional, Análise Crítica do Discurso, representações da mídia, interações verbais.

Número de páginas: 116

Número de palavras: 34.326

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| ABSTRACT..... | vii |
| RESUMO..... | viii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | v |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | ix |
| LIST OF FIGURES..... | xii |
| CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1. The Brazilian Army as an Institution..... | 1 |
| 1.2. General Hypotheses..... | 4 |
| 1.3. Research Questions..... | 4 |
| 1.4. Objectives of this Study..... | 5 |
| 1.5. Value of the Research..... | 6 |
| 1.6. Organization of this Thesis..... | 7 |
| CHAPTER 2 GENERAL THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES..... | 9 |
| 2.1. Introduction..... | 9 |
| 2.2. Systemic Functional Linguistics..... | 10 |
| 2.3. Critical Discourse Analysis..... | 20 |
| CHAPTER 3 MILITARY DISCOURSE: REPRESENTATIONS BY THE MEDIA..... | 30 |
| 3.1. Introduction..... | 30 |
| 3.2. Media Representations..... | 31 |
| 3.3. Methodology..... | 35 |
| 3.4. Data Analysis..... | 36 |
| 3.5 Answering research question 1 (RQ 1)..... | 48 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS OF INTERACTIONS IN BATTALIONS..... | 53 |
| 4.1. Introduction..... | 53 |
| 4.2. Hierarchy, discipline, politeness, authority and power: the military viewpoint..... | 54 |
| 4.2.1. Hierarchy and discipline..... | 55 |
| 4.2.2. Politeness, authority and power..... | 58 |
| 4.3. Methods..... | 63 |
| 4.4. Discourse Analysis..... | 66 |
| 4.4.1. Analysis focused on the scope of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)..... | 66 |
| 4.4.1.1. Register, speech roles and commodities..... | 66 |
| 4.4.1.2. Mood choices and modality..... | 79 |
| 4.4.1.3. Pragmatic and casual conversations..... | 89 |
| 4.4.2. Analysis focused on the scope of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)..... | 95 |
| 4.5. Answering research questions..... | 99 |
| 4.5.1. Answering research question 2 (RQ 2)..... | 99 |
| 4.5.2. Answering research question 3 (RQ 3)..... | 102 |
| 4.5.3. Answering research question 4 (RQ 4)..... | 104 |
| CHAPTER 5 FINAL REMARKS..... | 106 |
| 5.1. Summary..... | 106 |
| 5.2. Remarks on findings..... | 108 |
| 5.3. Main difficulties..... | 112 |
| 5.4. Suggestions for further research..... | 113 |
| REFERENCES..... | 114 |

| | |
|-----------------|-----|
| APPENDIX A..... | 118 |
| APPENDIX B..... | 119 |
| APPENDIX C..... | 121 |
| APPENDIX D..... | 123 |
| APPENDIX E..... | 127 |
| APPENDIX F..... | 129 |
| APPENDIX G..... | 150 |
| APPENDIX H..... | 153 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|---|----|
| FIGURE 2.1 – SPEECH ROLES AND COMMODITIES..... | 12 |
| FIGURE 2.2 – MOOD AND MODALITY..... | 15 |
| FIGURE 2.3 – PRAGMATIC AND CASUAL CONVERSATION..... | 18 |
| FIGURE 2.4 – SOCIAL ORDERS AND ORDERS OF DISCOURSE..... | 26 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“Senhor, umas casas existem no vosso reino, onde homens vivem em comum, comendo do mesmo alimento, dormindo em leitos iguais. De manhã, a um toque de corneta se levantam para obedecer. De noite, a outro toque de corneta se deitam, obedecendo. Da Vontade fizeram renúncia como da Vida. Seu nome é Sacrifício. Por ofício desprezam a morte e o sofrimento físico. (...) Quando eles passam juntos, fazendo barulho, os corações mais cansados sentem estremecer alguma coisa dentro de si. A gente conhece-os por militares...”

(Fragment of a letter to the king of Portugal, written by Moniz Barreto, in 1893, published in the Journal of Portuguese Army, number 306).

1.1. The Brazilian Army as an Institution

The Brazilian Army, a solid permanent institution, has its origins in 1648, during an event known as “Guararapes Battle”, which occurred in the Brazilian state of Pernambuco. This battle was important because, for the first time, three different races in Brazil – black, white and Indians – fought together against the Dutch invader, defending the national territory and characterizing the foundation of the army with national identity and ideals. Nowadays, the Brazilian Army has as its constitutional duties the defense of the nation and of its territory and the enforcement of law and order in the country. In order to accomplish these incumbencies, it is organized based on hierarchy and discipline, under the authority of the President of the Federative Republic.

From its beginning until now, the Brazilian Army has taken part in the main historical events in Brazil, no matter if they happened in moments of peace or war. From an initial analysis, this participation of the Brazilian Army may be due to its constitutional incumbencies, since it is one of the armed forces in the country. However, more than this, that participation may reflect the national identity of the army, because it

is compounded not only by members of the three races mentioned before, but also by citizens of all the races, social levels and religions in Brazil. Thus, the former reason may characterize the Brazilian Army as a democratic institution in the country, represented by a significant part of the Brazilian society. The army participates in the main events in the country, evolving together with the nation, and attempting to develop the best environment to reach the main aspirations of the Brazilian society, inside and outside the headquarters.

In 2004, the “Associação Nacional dos Membros do Ministério Público” [National Association of Members from Public Ministry-my translation] ordered a survey to the “Instituto Brasileiro de Opinião Pública e Estatística” -IBOPE [Brazilian Institute of Public Opinion and Statistics-my translation], in order to verify among citizens in Brazil the institution which presents the best image. IBOPE analyzed data collected in 145 cities of Brazil, from February 7th to 11th and pointed the Armed Forces, including the army, as the second institution in Brazil which most presents credibility to the society. This result can corroborate the pledge of the army in the presence of society, and in addition, it can distinguish the army as one of the most important, traditional and conservative institutions in the country.

Such traditionalism and conservatism can be seen as positive aspects for any institution. However, sometimes it can be seen in a pejorative manner, as if those characteristics could represent something retrograde. In the case of the Brazilian Army, the former view can be reinforced for its structure, discipline and hierarchy, especially if the issue is related to the discourse involving superiors and subordinates in that environment. One example could be the following: “Maria é me sargentona” [Maria is like a sergeant-my translation]. In Brazil, when a speaker states a sentence like that, s/he is trying to explain that Maria is a person who has the tendency to give orders and to

control situations in general. In this sense, that statement could represent a process of stereotyping, because it represents the image of a rude sergeant in the army giving orders to his soldiers, projected to a common situation in the civilians' world.

The process of stereotyping mentioned above could be due, among many factors, to media influence, while trying to produce verbal interactions related to the military environment. It is common to verify interactions related to the relationship between superiors and subordinates in the army in comic strips, TV programs, films, Internet, music, and articles presented in newspapers and magazines. It is also feasible to conclude that those interactions frequently refer to issues of authority, politeness, power, hierarchy and discipline, which could lead civilians to understand the military discourse as only related to extreme obedience and power, without the occurrences of informality, especially when involving superiors and subordinates as participants in the interactions.

Thus, it seems that there is a tendency in the media to consider only verbal interactions concerned about power and rudeness, when the subject is military discourse. This could happen probably due to historical issues, such as what is called the 'dictatorial regime' in Brazil and to some exaggerations related to discipline and hierarchy in the army. Indeed, it seems that it is not interesting for the media to convey informal or symmetrical interactions related to the army. Accordingly, Fairclough (1995), while explaining media tendencies, assumes that the media presents a social function, which is "to legitimize and reproduce existing asymmetrical power relationships by putting across the voices of the powerful as if they were the voices of 'common sense'." (p. 63), which can reinforce my viewpoint.

Considering the perspectives related to historical issues in Brazil, media tendency in only presenting asymmetrical and authoritarian relationships, and my

twenty-three-year experience as an army officer, I intend to investigate a different and not widely known field, namely military discourse. It is not an ideological or political discussion, but a different approach of a specific institutional discourse in Brazil, with all its particularities. In this sense, my intention is to verify media productions on this theme and to compare them to interactions in battalions of the Brazilian Army, involving only superiors and subordinates. It is worth noting that both interactions will be based on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). To my knowledge, it seems that a study based on this previous structure will serve, at the same time, to provide information about a different environment and to demystify some pre-judgment on military discourse.

1.2. General Hypothesis

My hypothesis arises from the fact that the media may convey verbal interactions, involving superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army, only considering issues of power, authority, hierarchy and discipline. Thus, this fact could develop a process of stereotyping, which could lead civilians to associate the military discourse only to authoritarian and rude relations, without considering informality and respect that could also happen in an environment like that, even if it is permeated by formality.

1.3. Research Questions

The research questions below will provide the necessary support to my hypothesis:

- 1) Based on the collected data in the media, how does the media represent military discourse?

2) How does the Brazilian Army represent military discourse, in relation to issues of power, authority, discipline and politeness?

3) What are the main characteristics of institutional and casual conversation found in spoken interactions in the army?

4) In what circumstances can casual conversation occur, involving superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army?

1.4. Objectives of this Study

To accomplish this research, three objectives need to be reached. The first one will discuss issues of power, discipline, politeness and authority, which are related to discourse in the Brazilian Army and, throughout this discussion, it will be interesting to verify at the same time the effects of these factors on the meanings of the interactions in the media and in the army. The second objective is to discuss the development of institutional and casual conversations between superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army, based on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). It is important here to note that my approach is focused on the two possible kinds of interactions, institutional and casual, which can confirm my intention in searching for transparency. The last objective is to investigate the main characteristics of military discourse that can be responsible for showing informality in a conversation between superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army.

Thus, with these objectives in mind, it will be possible to answer the research questions presented above, and see if there is a process of stereotyping by the media on military discourse, based on possible wrong interpretations of the effects of power, authority, politeness and discipline in interactions in that special environment. Furthermore, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Critical Discourse Analysis

(CDA) provide the necessary theoretical support to analyze casual and institutional conversations in the Brazilian army and issues of power, authority and discipline.

1.5. Value of the Research

While reading the theoretical material necessary for this research, I have verified many studies based on discourse analysis on different environments, such as police stations, hospitals, schools, universities, and companies, among others. However, studies on military discourse are rare, perhaps because research based on military discourse is difficult to develop, as the armed forces form a kind of closed environment.

In addition, I have read material in the media, which consider the relationship between superiors and subordinates as something rude and based only on power, hierarchy and discipline, as if there were no occurrences of informality in the military environment. It seems difficult to understand that very little is known about military discourse, and at the same time, military discourse is only expressed by verbal interactions related to issues of discipline, authority and lack of politeness. To my knowledge, this contradiction could justify my thesis, because it seems that there is a process of stereotyping, based on, at least, a lack of knowledge.

Thus, I would rely the value of my research on two main reasons. The first, is the novelty of the subject itself, since there are no registers on the military discourse; or at least, to my knowledge, on verbal interactions in the Brazilian Army. Secondly, because I believe that, since it is possible to verify occurrences of institutional and casual conversation in different environments studied so far, it is also possible to verify how these occurrences happen in the army. In this sense, this thesis will not only serve to describe interactions in military discourse, but in addition, it would be useful to demystify a possible process of stereotyping.

1.6. Organization of this Thesis

Besides the introductory part presented in this first chapter, I have divided my thesis in four chapters, from theoretical perspectives to data analysis. Thus, the second chapter will present the selected theoretical approach, firstly based on the concepts of discourse and its dimensions, ideology and institution. In addition, the second chapter will discuss the importance of concepts mentioned before for institutions in general.

Furthermore, I will develop in Chapter 2 a study based on the main disciplines related to discourse analysis. It is worth noting that I will give a special attention to SFL and CDA, because, as the title of my research suggests, those two disciplines together will serve as the basis to analyze my data, to verify the implications of such studies in each verbal interaction, and to test my hypothesis. From the perspective of SFL, it is important to study the Hallidayan three metafunctions, besides some important and elucidatory concepts, such as register with its dimensions (field, tenor and mode), mood, modality and polarity. In the section separated to CDA, I will verify and discuss the three dimensions of CDA, the meaning and consequences of orders of discourse and of social changes, and finally, I will verify the main tendencies on the relationship between discourse and power.

Chapter three is responsible to introduce the second part of my research, which is the data analysis. In this sense, I will first verify the concept of media and its tendencies, and analyze how its tendencies could influence the public opinion. In a sequence, I will analyze verbal productions conveyed by the media related to military discourse, based on the theory presented in CDA and SFL, in order to verify if those productions could confirm a process of stereotyping related to military discourse, according to my hypothesis.

In chapter four, I will first present the military's viewpoint on issues of authority, discipline, hierarchy, power and politeness, according to principles presented in manuals and regulations of the Brazilian Army. Secondly, based on the material collected during the research, I will try to characterize the main particularities of military discourse. In addition, I will use again SFL and CDA to analyze verbal interactions-institutional and casual-between superiors and subordinates during the main activities in battalions of the Brazilian Army, such as encampments, instructions and administration. It is worth noting that during the analyses in chapters three and four, I will verify and discuss issues of hierarchy, discipline, authority, power and politeness, and the occurrences of formality and informality in conversations, with their corresponding classification, according to Eggins' (2000) studies.

The last chapter will serve to summarize the main theoretical aspects related to the subject, particularly those that can support my hypothesis. Furthermore, it can be useful to compare verbal interactions in battalions (Chapter 4) to productions conveyed by the media, in chapter three; first, because it may provide important aspects, which can be useful to demystify a probable stereotyped view conveyed by the media; and second, because it can clarify and reinforce many points related to specific environment of the Brazilian Army and to military discourse.

CHAPTER 2

GENERAL THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

“Quando o general é moralmente fraco e a disciplina não é estrita, quando as instruções e orientações não são esclarecidas, quando não existem regras consistentes para guiar os oficiais e soldados e as formações são desleixadas, o exército entra em desordem.”

(Fragment of the book “A Arte da Guerra”, by Sun Tzu).

2.1. Introduction

In this chapter I will discuss the main aspects related to theory that provide the necessary support to my data analysis in the following two chapters. Thus, I have divided this chapter in two more sections, responsible for studying the characteristics of the main disciplines that will support my research, which are Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).

More than study the main characteristics of each discipline mentioned before, it is important to select the main concepts in each of them, which can be related to my research. In this sense, while studying SFL, I will discuss the three metafunctions, but giving a special attention to the interpersonal one. In addition, the study of register with its dimensions (field, tenor and mode), mood, modality and polarity will be developed in order to relate their main particularities to the interpersonal metafunction.

The last section will be focused on the main aspects related to CDA. Firstly, I will explore the term “discourse”, especially its three dimensions, according to Van Dijk (1997), and the term “institution”, trying to establish the relationship between them. Secondly, I will verify and discuss the three dimensions of CDA, the meaning and consequences of orders of discourse and of social changes, and finally, I will verify the main tendencies on the relationship between discourse and power. The other main

issues related to my research, such as discipline, hierarchy, power, authority, politeness, formality and informality will be discussed during the analysis of media representations and army productions, in chapters three and four, respectively.

2.2. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)

Recognizing the social nature of discourse and its relationship with institutions in general could be a first step in order to understand the occurrence of interactions in each social group. Since we have different ideologies associated to several ways of expressing their social influence upon the development of discourse in any institution, it seems important not only to describe, but also to explain the occurrence of verbal interactions, according to the social context. Thus, a possible second step could be the theoretical approach to be selected, in order to accomplish that complex task. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) represents, in this sense, an important approach responsible for developing a study based on description and explanation of interactions, considering the specific case of each institution or each occurrence.

Based on the principles that the use of language is dynamic and that each conversation expresses a different situation to be analyzed, Halliday (1994) has developed SFL theory, understanding that the speaker selects what he/she wants to say, depending on the meaning he/she wants to express with his/her utterances.

Halliday's (1994) theory is seen as a grammar, because it can be understood as a system, since it represents a codification of rules to be followed (Thompson, 1996). In this sense, the grammar or the system developed by Halliday (1994) can be related to a system of choices, since the speaker selects his options (words), searching for a desirable effect (meanings) during the conversation. In addition, this arrangement of

words and meanings will influence a previous response by the listener, which can represent the speaker's expectations. That is the probable reason why we can consider SFL as a system of meanings as a choice according to the context of situation, because it studies the functions of meanings selected by the speaker in a clause, and the effects of those choices in each conversation.

But there is more to explore during the study of SFL. According to the use of language by the speaker, Halliday (1994) has organized the system of meanings (functions) in three different categories: ideational, interpersonal and textual. These categories are named by Halliday as metafunctions, because each of them is related to a specific function of language. Thus, Thompson (1996) explains that the ideational metafunction refers to the use of language as "an experience of the world"; the interpersonal meaning investigates the use of language as "interaction"; and the textual kind of meaning deals with the use of language in the ways to "organize the message" (p. 28).

After analyzing the three metafunctions cited above, I have chosen to adopt the interpersonal metafunction as the basis of my analysis in Chapters 3 and 4. This choice relies on the fact that the interpersonal metafunction refers to language as a dialogue, because it involves two speech roles: the speaker's and the listener's. Using the study of this metafunction implies analyzing the interactions in a social context, verifying how the speaker uses structures in clauses in order to negotiate, to state, to ask, to offer, to command or to provoke an expected response from the listener. This metafunction represents the study of the speaker-listener relationship itself, because in investigating the role of each participant in a conversation and their choices, it will be possible to understand how the attitude of one interactant can influence or even change the behavior of the other.

It is worth noting that the interpersonal metafunction involves other relevant ideas. One important component in studying the interpersonal metafunction is mood. According to Halliday (1994), “The mood is the element that realizes the selection of mood in the clause” (p.74). In other words, depending on the structure of the clause (order of subject and finite), selected by the speaker, another structure will be used by the listener in his clause, as a corresponding response. In this sense, each choice of structure in clause (mood) will correspond to one specific function assumed by the speaker, named as speech role, which will provoke an expected response, according to the speaker’s initiation, thus characterizing speaker/listener interaction itself.

In a complement, Halliday (1994) divides speech roles assumed by the speaker in two possible types, which are, giving and demanding; associating for each of them, two possible commodities to be exchanged: goods & services and information (p. 68). Figure 2.1 below summarizes the relationship between speech roles and commodities exchanged, with the respective initiations and expected responses in an interaction, according to Halliday’s theory:

| Speech roles | Commodities | Initiation | Expected Response |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Giving | Goods-&-Services | Offer: “Would you like to come along?” | Acceptance: “Of course, I would.” |
| | Information | Statement: “He wants to come with me.” | Acknowledgement: “Oh, really! Great!” |
| Demanding | Goods-&-Services | Command: “Come with me!” | Undertaking: “OK. Right now!” |
| | Information | Question: “Will he go with you?” | Answer: “Yes, he will.” |

Fig 2.1 Speech roles and Commodities (Adapted from Halliday, 1994, p. 69)

As can be seen in Figure 2.1, the two broad speech roles assumed by the speaker are giving and demanding, each of them with a corresponding commodity of goods-&-services or information, according to the speaker’s choices. Thus, when the

speaker uses the structure “Would you like to come along?” (Finite -Subject structure), he is assuming, through a typical interrogative structure (an offer), the speech role of giving goods-&-services, which will provoke an expected response by the listener (Acceptance: “Of course, I would.”). On the contrary, while using the structure “Come with me!” (Finite-no subject structure), the speaker assumes, through a typical imperative structure (a command), the speech role of demanding goods &-services, expecting undertaking by the listener (“OK. Right now!”). By analogy, the same reasoning can be used in relation to the speech role of giving or demanding information.

Therefore, it seems that, depending on the role and on the consequent commodity selected, we can associate, for example, an imperative mood in a structure corresponding to “command” in “goods -&-services”; whereas a declarative mood will be associated to the one corresponding to “statement” in “information”. The structure to be classified in relation to the figure above will vary, according to the mood structure, which is compounded by Subject (a nominal group) and by Finite (part of a verbal group). Martin, Matthiessen & Painter (1997) exemplify that, in a declarative structure, the Finite element will follow the Subject, whereas in the imperative structure, there will be neither subject nor the Finite (p.11), reinforcing the importance of structure choices in interactions.

In this sense, mood with its typical structures and speech roles can be a useful instrument in my research, since it will help to identify and classify the clauses in interactions produced by the army, in order to analyze the roles assumed by participants and the effect in exchange (declarative, imperative or interrogative), and to verify if military discourse is only permeated by commands (imperatives). Furthermore, this task will be accomplished if I use two other important concepts, which are polarity and modality. Halliday (1994) defines polarity as the “choice between positive and

negative”, and modality as an “intermediate degree between positive and negative” (p. 88). Since limits of polarity in a clause are automatically defined and easy to analyze, it seems important to understand how Halliday deals with the transition between positive and negative, expressed by modality.

In fact, Halliday (1994) establishes that modality can be analyzed in terms of “modalization (probability and usuality) and modulation (obligation and inclination)” (p.89). As Thompson (1996) explains, the former is related to the information commodity presented in Fig.2.1, and it explains the validity of information, in respect to a proposition; and the latter is related to goods-&-services commodity, indicating a degree of confidence between the speaker and the listener, and related to proposals.

In addition, Halliday (1994) explains that the speaker can use modalization through probability and usuality, in three different manners. The first is using a modal verb; secondly, using a modal adjunct; and third, using modal verbs and adjuncts. And he concludes that, since modulation expresses obligation or inclination, these two possible variants will be represented according to the use of specific verbs and/or structures responsible to indicate the occurrence of situations related to commands or to offers, depending on the case.

Both of the concepts are important because depending on the verbs and adjuncts used in the structure of a clause, added to the analysis of mood choices, I can verify the intention and the speech role assumed by the speaker. As can be seen, mood and modality should be applied together to the productions by the army in my research, in order to better understand how the structure of a clause can influence the use of language as interaction. Figure 2.2 below represents a summary of Table 4(5) presented

by Halliday (1994) to explain the relationship between mood and the types of modality (p. 91):

| Mood | | Modality | | |
|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Commodity | Speech Function | Type | | Typical Realization |
| Information | Statement | Modalization (Proposition) | Probability | Modal verb Modal adjunct Both |
| | Question | | Usuality | |
| Goods-&-services | Command | Modulation (Proposal) | Obligation | Modal verb Passive verb |
| | Offer | | Inclination | Modal verb Adjective |

Fig 2.2 Mood and Modality (Adapted from Halliday; 1994, p. 91).

In Figure 2.2 above, it can be seen that, on the one hand, modalization refers to propositions, according to commodity of information, represented by a statement or a question (see Figure 2.1). Therefore, modalization varies from probability to usuality, according to typical realizations (modal verbs, modal adjuncts, or both). Modulation, on the other hand, refers to proposals, now related to commodity of goods-&-services, represented by offers or commands (see Figure 2.1), thus indicating inclination or obligation, according to typical realizations, respectively.

But according to Halliday (1994), there is one difference between modalization and modulation that would be important to consider in my data analysis. He explains that modalization expresses the speaker's opinion if related to statements, or a requesting for the listener's opinion if related to questions. In this sense, depending on subordinates' utterances, I can evaluate if superiors are allowing subordinates express their opinion (confirming a question, or stating a comment, for example).

Modulation, on the contrary, as referring to commands or offers, will normally express force in a speaker-listener interaction, which can be useful in order to evaluate how superiors in the army are giving their orders to subordinates (p. 89).

I have mentioned that SFL could be an important instrument to describe and to analyze a speaker's utterances. These tasks can be accomplished in analyzing the structures of clauses, as explained by the use of mood and modality in interpersonal metafunction. Mood and modality are related to the context of situation, thus following the principle of the social nature of discourse, included in SFL theory. Furthermore, in studying the applications of SFL in a clause, from a social view, concepts of register and its dimensions increase in value.

If we search for a definition of register in research, we can find a common sense, recognizing register as a linguistic or stylistic variation. Thompson (1996) calls our attention to the Hallidayan definition of the term, which is "variation according to use" (p.36). Thus, it seems that, no matter if we are studying a stylistic or linguistic variation, the fact is that the concept of register implies in understanding that the speaker-listener relationship, besides the choices of words and meanings, will involve the use of these elements according to the social context in which the speaker and listener are interacting. In this sense, it is worth noting that the interactants are always selecting their meanings and responses, concerned with the variation demanded by each situation in development.

The speaker and listener's flexibility in interactions is the probable reason why Halliday (1994) presents register unfolded in three dimensions. Thus, Montgomery (1986), referring to Halliday's (1994) theories on the subject, explains that the first dimension is the field, related to the description of the activity in development, which is "the subject matter of the text". Tenor, the second dimension, is responsible to

describe the “kind of social relationship within which communication is taking place”. Thirdly, we have the mode, referring “to the means adopted for communication” (p. 103-105-107). But we can summarize these explanations by trying to answer three questions related to each dimension, during the process of description, which are “what?” for field; “who?” for tenor and “how?” for mode.

Despite the fact that the three dimensions cited above can give a complete description related to the social context of an interaction, I prefer to analyze the conversations in the Brazilian Army, mainly analyzing descriptions from the tenor dimension, because of the purposes of my thesis. Since I will analyze interactions between superiors and subordinates, it seems that tenor can provide sufficient information to understand how formality and informality can happen in the military discourse and how participants express their roles in each situation. Furthermore, if tenor is related to the relationship between interactants, this can be an important instrument in order to analyze their speech functions in relation to important issues, such as discipline, hierarchy and politeness. In this sense, the interpersonal metafunction added to register with its dimensions provide relevant descriptions focused on the social nature of discourse.

In addition to the application of the interpersonal metafunction, mood, modality and register on interactions in battalions of the Brazilian Army, another useful study, which may provide the necessary support to understand and classify choices as formal or informal, could be the one developed by Eggins (2000). Considering Hallidayan theory, and based on the principle that language and context establish an important relationship, Eggins (2000) claims that “researching everyday talk allows us to uncover how we jointly construct the social reality within which we live.” (p. 130). In depicting that social reality, Eggins (2000) classifies everyday talk as pragmatic or

casual conversation, according to formal or casual occurrences in interactions, respectively. Figure 2.3 summarizes the main characteristics of each kind of conversation described by Eggins (2000):

| Pragmatic Conversation | Casual |
|--|--|
| Functionally motivated: to achieve some social purpose (jobs, appointments, information). | The objective is to talk itself. |
| Spontaneity phenomena: hesitations or incompletions. | Spontaneity phenomena: more than pragmatic |
| Everyday vocabulary and colloquial expressions: ordinary, rather than technical or elevated. | Colloquial language (slang, swearing, jargon) |
| Brief, elliptical clauses: ritualized expressions. | Multilogue: the pressure to get a turn. |
| Congruent language: more accessible, not as dense as written form. | Colloquial language: more informal than pragmatic. |
| <u>Role differentiation</u> : one role carries a higher status or is hierarchically superior to the other (mood choices and exchange structure). 1) Mood choices: enact different social rights and obligations of each role. 2) Exchange structure (interpersonal metafunction): cultural and social context. | <u>Functional identities of roles</u> : the same social role (mood choice, expressions of attitude, and of involvement and humour). 1) Mood choices: more equal social roles. 2) Expressions of personal attitude: concerned with the swapping of opinions, the sharing and disputing of attitudes. 3) Expressions of involvement: vocatives, slang and swearing. 4) Humour: function of entertaining. |
| Relative brevity of the interaction. | The sustained nature of casual conversation: long conversation |
| Discernible generic structure: following schematic structure enables interactants to achieve their purposes co-operatively, in a stress-free, economic way. | Limited generic structure: Absence of schematic structure (alternating chat and chunks). |
| Stability of field, tenor and mode. | Ranging topic choice: impression of topic continuity. |

Fig 2.3 Pragmatic and casual conversation (Adapted from Eggins, 2000, pp. 133-146).

As can be seen, Figure 2.3 indicates important characteristics, which can be useful in evaluating data collected in battalions. Discussing some of them, while applying pragmatic characteristics in my analysis, it would be possible to verify if conversation is functionally motivated, thus indicating formality and consequently, suggesting distance between speaker and listener (superior and subordinate). In

addition, brief or elliptical clauses, brevity of interaction and discernible generic structure of conversation might reinforce the idea of distance between superiors and subordinates. Role differentiation, expressed by mood choices (see Figure 2.2) and social context; added to stability of field, tenor and mode and to incompletions or hesitations mark formality in conversation. Therefore, these latter characteristics serve to identify superior and subordinate involved and how superiors keep distance from subordinates; to verify if the purpose of conversation and hierarchical distance does not change; and to analyze if superior and subordinate are planning what to say, respectively.

Casual characteristics, on the contrary, might serve to support my hypothesis, since it suggests informality. In this sense, it will be possible to confirm informality in data collected, by verifying that there is no purpose to guide conversation than the act of talking itself, even involving superiors and subordinates. That is the reason why spontaneity increases in value, associated to colloquial language. Furthermore, the dispute for audience by interactants, characterizing multilogue, might serve to evaluate if subordinates have the opportunity to express their opinion. In a complement, all those characteristics mentioned before can be summarized by mood choices, expressions of personal attitudes, expressions of involvement and humor, reflecting informality and a certain equality between participants, useful to my aim of demystifying a probable pre-judgment in relation to military discourse.

As a partial conclusion, I can use all the ideas mentioned in this section to explain my choice in using SFL as one of the theoretical perspectives in my research. If SFL studies the use of language (words plus meanings) and the speaker-listener relationship (tenor), this study serves, through analysis of clauses, to confirm my hypothesis. Furthermore, if the speaker's choices depend on the social and cultural

context, it seems that SFL would be a useful instrument in describing, explaining and understanding verbal interactions occurred in the specific case of an institution such as the Brazilian Army.

2.3. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

It could be obvious to discuss the main aspects related to discourse and its possible relation to institutions in general. However, this discussion is important because discourse cannot be simply considered a talk or a speech, as if it occurred as an isolated fact or act. Indeed, discourse involves a speaker-listener relationship and, consequently, it will involve expectations, opinions, experiences, divergences, agreements and commands, among many other attitudes. In a sum, all those attitudes express interaction between two or more participants, thus giving a social nature to discourse.

Van Dijk (1997), for instance, argues that it is important to study more than simple dictionary definitions while studying discourse, because it involves three different dimensions. Thus, he enumerates as a first dimension, discourse as “language use”, concerned with not only describing the fact of using the language itself, but also explaining its occurrence. Secondly, van Dijk (1997) cites discourse as “communication of beliefs (cognition)”; expressing a social perspective, since it leads us to notice the act of changing information between two or more participants. The third dimension, “discourse as interaction in social situations”, serves as a compliment to the other two dimensions, since it involves the speaker-listener relationship based on specific purposes or expectations.

Another example of this social nature of discourse can be discussed while studying theories on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Fairclough (1995), for

example, firstly defines texts as social processes, compounded by cognition and social interaction (p. 6), and later assumes ‘My view is that ‘discourse’ is use of language seen as a form of social practice, and discourse analysis is analysis of how texts work within sociocultural practice” (p. 7). Thus, this statement is aligned with Van Dijk’s (1997) three dimensions of discourse, now reinforced by the concept of the sociocultural aspect.

Therefore, it seems important to recognize discourse inserted in a social context, as Fairclough claims:

Discourse, then, involves social conditions, which can be specified as *social conditions of production*, and *social conditions of interpretation*. These social conditions, moreover, relate to three different ‘levels’ of social organization: the level of the social situation, or the immediate social environment in which the discourse occurs; the level of the social institution which constitutes a wider matrix for the discourse; and the level of the society as a whole (Fairclough, 1989, p. 25).

The statement above is important in considering interactions according to different environments. Furthermore, it is possible to realize the presence of one implicit term in quotation above, which is the concept of ideology, also discussed in Thetela’s (2001) article (as cited in Van Dijk, 1995), defined below:

Ideologies are basic frameworks of social cognition, shared by members of social groups, constituted by relevant selections of sociocultural values, and organized by an ideological schema that represents self-definition of a group. Besides their social function of sustaining the interests of groups, ideologies have the cognitive function of organizing the social representations (attitudes, knowledge) of the group, and thus indirectly monitor the group-related social practices, and hence also the text and talk of its members. (Thetela, 2001, p. 349).

The definition of ideology distinguishes some relevant words, such as cognition, social groups and interests of groups, which may reinforce the three dimensions of discourse, cited by Van Dijk (1997). In addition, words as social representations, attitudes and social practices can confirm Fairclough’s (1989) concept on discourse. Thus, the definitions quoted above may lead us to deduce that ideology

can embody the social aspects of discourse. At the same time, it can serve as a reference to discourse, since the language used by a social group, may, gradually, represent a set of common attitudes and aspirations of that group, which can represent ideology itself. In a sum, discourse can represent the ideological identity of a social group.

In a complement, Fairclough (1995) not only recognizes the interrelationship between discourse, ideology and institution, but also assumes that ideology serves as an important factor, which can influence the attitude of a social group, including the discourse, as the following statement can confirm:

(..) institutions construct their ideological and discursal subjects; they construct them in the sense that they impose ideological and discursal constraints upon them as a condition for qualifying them to act as subjects. (Fairclough, 1995, p. 38).

From the principle that discourse and institution have some social aspects in common, as the previous quotations suggest, it is worth noting that ideology represents a link between discourse and institution, since it summarizes the main social concepts embodied by each of them. Since ideology represents the main beliefs of any kind of institution, it seems that those beliefs will be reflected on discourse, thus characterizing the particularities of each social group. Thus, those particularities should be studied in different ways, considering and respecting the different ideology presented by each institution.

In addition, based on McCarthy's (1991) concept on discourse analysis, which states that it "is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used." (p. 5), I can study the specific case of interactions in the Brazilian Army, considering the interpretation and the context of that institution. Furthermore, if those interactions seem to be different from the occurrences suggested by the media, they will confirm different interpretations on the same subject, which

should be respected, as Fairclough (1995) suggests ‘particular ways of talking are based upon particular ‘ways of seeing’...’ (p. 38).

Thus, if SFL is concerned with the meanings of a speaker’s utterances in a clause, considering the functions of each term, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) represents the essence of social aspects in interactions. Van Dijk (1997), for example, corroborates that assertive, while discussing the role of discourse analysis, which is to move “from macro to micro levels of talk, text, context or society, and vice-versa”. He explains that “discourse analysis provides the theoretical and methodological tools for a well-founded critical approach to the study of social problems, power and inequality.” (Van Dijk, 1997, p. 32). McCarthy (1991), also concerned with that issue, states that discourse analysis “finds its unity in the description of language above the sentence and an interest in the contexts and cultural influences which affect language in use.” (p. 7).

But it was Fairclough (1995) who developed an interesting approach to CDA, considering that it ‘is viewed as integrating (a) analysis of text, (b) analysis of processes of text production, consumption and distribution, and (c) sociocultural analysis of the discursive event (be it an interview, a scientific paper, or a conversation) as a whole.’ (p. 23), referring to the processes of description, interpretation and explanation, respectively, which will be followed in my data analysis.

For critical discourse analysts, the study of discourse considers ‘texts, interactions and contexts’ (p. 26), as suggested by Fairclough (1989). Thus, the social essence of CDA, and its relationship with discourse itself, can be summarized by the definition below presented in Wodak’s (1996) studies (as cited in Fairclough; 1992; Fairclough/Wodak 1996):

Critical discourse analysis sees discourse – the use of language in speech and writing – as a form of social practice. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation, institution and social structure that frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them. (Wodak, 1996, p. 15).

As can be seen in the quotation above, CDA is focused on the occurrence of interaction as a social event inserted in a social context, considering what, how and why interaction is happening in one particular case. In addition, Wodak (1996) mentions an important dialectical relationship between discourse and context, since one can shape the other, probably due to the dynamic characteristic of language and to the evolution of society and consequently, its institutions, reinforcing the social essence and the importance of CDA.

Furthermore, Wodak (1996) discusses some important principles of CDA, most of them related to the arguments cited above. But, three of them may deserve a distinguished analysis: “1. CDA addresses social problems”; “2. Power relations are discursive”, and “4. Discourse does ideological work” (p. 17 -18). These three principles emphasize the relationship between CDA and power relations. Since CDA presupposes social practice, it seems difficult to imagine verbal interactions occurring every time in circumstances of equality between participants, due, most of the times, to a hierarchical organization of social groups in general, which will not always allow that equality. In formal situations, for example, it seems obvious that one participant will keep the control of a conversation for many reasons, such as social position, knowledge, respect, among others. But, even in informal situations, participants are always searching for and changing their positions in controlling the conversation, a phenomenon defined by Eggins (2000) as “competition for turns” and called “multilogue” (p.141).

In fact, independently of the formality or informality of a situation, the search for controlling the conversation will always happen, but with one difference. In casual conversation, participants’ social positions are usually equal, there is a certain involvement between them, their purpose is only to report facts, and the control happens

as a form of obtaining other participants' attention. In a formal situation, on the other hand, there is a social distance between interactants and specific purposes that guide the conversation, which can lead, most of the times, to analyze these verbal interactions focused on issues of power, because of inequality of social positions. Another important point to be considered in relation to power is that, since this discussion refers to social groups, it presupposes that each group will present different ideologies. Consequently, ideology seems to be enough to reflect the power of one participant over the other, especially if a formal conversation is happening. Wodak's (1996) study (as cited in Fairclough & Wodak, 1996) can summarize this concern of CDA about power relations in discourse:

Since discourse is so socially consequential, it gives rise to important issues of power. Discursive practices may have major ideological effects – that is, they can help to produce and reproduce unequal power relations (...) through the ways in which they represent things and position people. (Wodak, 1996, p. 15).

In this sense, it seems that power and ideology may exercise a relevant influence in conversations involving unequal social positions, establishing a set of social conventions. Fairclough (1989) explains that those conventions represent for each social group what he calls "orders of discourse" (following Foucault), and these orders are responsible to guide interactions, or as that scholar claims "(...) the individual is able to act only in so far as there are social conventions to act within." (p. 28). Thus, social orders and orders of discourse are "interdependent networks" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 29). Whereas the term social order refers to "a structuring of a social space into various domains associated with various types of practice" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 29), orders of discourse refer to the kinds of discourse related to the social orders, as can be seen in the figure below:

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Social order | Order of discourse |
| Types of practice | Types of discourse |
| Actual practices | Actual discourses |

Fig 2.4 Social orders and orders of discourse (Fairclough, 1989, p. 29).

Thus, orders of discourse can be represented by several types of discourse occurring in a specific institution. Social order reflects several institutions presented in society, each one corresponding to a specific type of social practice, which are responsible for providing the occurrences of orders of discourse. In a sum, orders of discourse can be considered as a projection of social order in discourse; and consequently, power relations and ideology are also projected in discourse. In a complement, actual practices and actual discourses will represent, for example, the way that an institution deals with a specific type of practice and with a type of discourse, respectively.

These concepts are relevant because they can be used in my research to verify, for example, the projection of social practice over military discourse. In addition, it is also possible to analyze the influence of hierarchy, power, discipline and formality, which are typical characteristics of the Brazilian Army ideology, to types of military discourse, and later compare that influence to other types of discourse in the military environment, which can be influenced by informality and humor. All the results could be later compared to types of discourse conveyed by the media in relation to military discourse, in order to confirm my hypothesis.

As can be seen, the effects of power in discourse, added to the dynamic characteristic of discourse itself and to the social order in institutions, can imply different combinations and, as a consequence, each occurrence requires different analysis, which should be carefully studied. That could be one reason why Fairclough (1989) studies influences and consequences of power in the use of language, dividing

his study in two views: “power in discourse” and “power behind discourse”. Power in discourse suggests the study of how participants control an interaction, similarly to the study of field-tenor-mode dimensions of register in SFL. In this sense, it is possible to study that viewpoint, considering three important types of constraints: contents, related to the occurrence itself; relations, related, as the name suggests, to the interaction; and subjects, concerned with the position occupied by each participant in a conversation.

Power behind discourse implies studying the influences of ideology (social order) over discourse (orders of discourse). As Fairclough explains, power in discourse and power behind discourse can be hidden, usually not apparent to people. Thus, power in discourse expresses power relations as an action itself, whereas power behind discourse is related to power relations as effects originated from strategies of controlling interactions.

Power in and behind discourse can serve as important tools in the analysis of interactions between superiors and subordinates in battalions of the Brazilian Army. Since SFL studies the structure of clauses focused on mood and modality, those aspects from CDA can provide a social analysis of texts and its consequences to interactions, which can, in fact, complement the SFL analysis.

Even if formal situations suggest an implicit influence of power, it does not mean that participants will not search for a pleasant conversation, in order to diminish a possible negative influence of power. Fairclough (1989) calls it “contradictory pressures”, and this search can be considered as contradictory, because power-holders try to reduce the effects of power in conversations in a sensitive way and, at the same time, keep the control of the interaction, in order to maintain his/her power. In this sense, that can be an interesting event to be analyzed in my research, since there is a possibility for superiors in battalions to interact with subordinates, using the

contradictory pressures, even under the influence of strong discipline and hierarchy. This concept can also serve to deconstruct and to demystify the way in which the media conveys military discourse.

In addition, the deconstruction of discourse can be due to the dynamic characteristic of language, and it can provoke what can be called social changes in discourse. Thus, power relations can change every time, because, as Fairclough (1989) suggests “power behind the conventions of a discourse type belongs not to the institution itself (whatever that would mean) but to the power-holders in the institution” (p. 61). This assertive indicates that, using the Brazilian Army as an example, utterances which could be considered offensive to hierarchy and discipline, by superiors in the past, can be now considered as common utterances, because power-holders can have a different viewpoint in relation to the subject, keeping discipline and hierarchy as forms of maintaining the necessary organization of the institution.

Wodak (1996) reinforces my viewpoint, while assuming that “I do not view agents as completely powerless and subjected to action by elites” (p. 12). Thus, that assumption suggests that social order, orders of discourse and power can change over the time, and this can be due to an institutional “transformative capacity”, as suggested by Wodak (1996). Furthermore, one statement that can be important to keep in mind during text analysis, because it can serve to distinguish a positive effect of power in interactions, is the one claimed by Wodak (1996): “Organizations are not simply viewed as constraints on action, but also function in an enabling capacity, allowing members of the organization to reach goals, develop value systems, etc.” (p.11-12).

All the concepts studied in this section serve to confirm that discourse analysis is a complex task, because it is related to structures, contexts, ideologies, and

cultural aspects, among other important factors. But the main difficulty in analyzing texts is that, since it involves social aspects, each interaction represents one different case to be studied in different approaches. That is the reason why I have selected SFL and CDA to support my research. On the one hand, SFL provides the necessary resources to analyze meanings, sentences and structures, considering social context. On the other hand, CDA and its social essence provide a social analysis of implications of power and ideology in discourse, thus serving to complement SFL. The effect of this combination is simple to verify: the application of a set of rules from SFL in a sentence, inserted on several possibilities related to sociocultural factors, thus providing a lexicogrammatical analysis and interpretation, considering and respecting the reality of facts in the social context.

CHAPTER 3

MILITARY DISCOURSE: REPRESENTATIONS BY THE MEDIA

*“Marcha, soldado!
Cabeça de papel.
Se não marchar direito,
Vai preso pro quartel!”*
(Brazilian popular rhyme).

3.1. Introduction

Chapter 3 marks the beginning of data analysis in my research. Thus, in this chapter, I will explore the different kinds of material produced by the media, in order to analyze media tendency when referring to special occurrences of verbal interactions in the army.

In Chapter 1, I have mentioned my hypothesis, which is focused on the fact that the media may convey verbal interactions, involving superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army, considering that kind of discourse as impolite and authoritarian. Thus, this fact could develop a process of stereotyping, which could lead civilians to associate military discourse to asymmetrical power relations, without considering the informality that could also happen in an environment like that. In addition, the media may reinforce civilians' negative belief, which sees hierarchy and discipline as the tools for the occurrences of abuse of power and disrespect by superiors, in relation to their subordinates.

Thus, this chapter is divided in three sections. The first section will discuss representations by the media regarding military discourse. Secondly, I will explain, through the section focused on methodology, the general idea to select and to analyze

specific material conveyed by the media. The last section is based on data analysis of the selected material itself, in order to verify the media representations in the collected material. This section is relevant, because issues of power, discipline, hierarchy, authority, politeness and formality will be discussed, and will be later compared to verbal interactions in the Brazilian Army, in Chapter 4.

3.2. Media Representations

I have decided to distinguish a Brazilian popular rhyme as the introduction of this chapter, in order to depict how a simple rhyme can produce a distorted view of the army and, consequently, of military discourse. It is curious to observe how in four innocent and simple verses, issues of power, politeness and authority can be found. Even though those issues occur in a rhyme, they may influence children to create a distorted view on military environment. In fact, verses like those may influence a negative view of hierarchy and discipline in military discourse.

In a simple analysis, according to SFL theory, the first verse ‘*Marcha, soldado*’ represents a typical imperative clause, since there is no subject and no finite in its structure. In addition, if that clause is imperative, it can be associated to the demanding speech role, presented in Figure 2.1 (Chapter 2), which is related to the command goods-&-services, presented in the same figure. In this sense, it can reflect a superior’s order, with no modulation, because it is a command, and consequently, the expected response by the listener, is the accomplishment of the order.

The other three verses can represent, together, a probable power relation that can occur between superior and subordinate in a military environment. Thus, those three verses suggest that a superior is ordering a subordinate, which is, in that case, a private, the lowest rank in military hierarchy (see Appendix A). In applying CDA concepts of

power in and behind discourse on those verses, it will be possible to verify that power in discourse can be represented by contents and relations, while suggesting an interaction between a superior and a subordinate in a military environment. In addition, a third type of constraint presented in power in discourse - subject - depicts the position of each participant in the interaction, or at least, suggests in a complement to the first verse, that the superior is ordering and the subordinate is obeying. Besides, the effect of power relations can be expressed by power behind discourse, considering that the superior used as strategies to command his soldier, an offense ('Cabeça de Papel'), a threat ('Se não marchar direito, vai preso pro quartel'), and a consequent punishment (prison). Thus, considering power behind discourse perspective, as suggested by Fairclough (1989), it is possible to verify how powerful, impolite and authoritarian the superior was in the interaction.

If a simple rhyme might project important issues of power, influencing children, by only considering the negative side of hierarchy and discipline, it is also possible to establish an analogy, now considering media representations of military discourse and its probable effects over the mass. Considering the importance and influence of the media in the modern world, Heberle (2001) recognizes that the media 'has the potential to reinforce or attenuate prejudices, stereotyped attitudes, and inequalities of different social groups' (p. 91). Likewise, Fairclough (1989) suggests a hidden power of the media, which can lead the reader to adopt a position, thus reinforcing that:

Thus through the way it positions readers, for instance, media discourse is able to exercise a pervasive and powerful influence in social reproduction because of the very scale of the modern mass media and the extremely high level of exposure of whole populations to a relatively homogeneous output. (Fairclough, 1989, p. 54).

Despite the fact that it is a difficult task to measure the effects of media productions over the mass, it is possible, instead of that, to study and to preview media effects, considering its own discourse. Thus, since the media can be considered as an instrument of mass information, and the population is constantly receiving a great number of all kinds of information, it is possible to imagine the negative and sometimes irreversible projections of a tendentious article on a stereotyped attitude, published in a newspaper or in a magazine, for example. In this sense, Fairclough (1995) suggests that media discourse should be concerned with answering questions related to the world represented, to the identities involved and to the relationship between producers and audience, or in a summary, identifying representations, identities and relations presented in media discourse (p. 5).

In addition, Fairclough (1995) states that the media is concerned with “transmitting the voices of social power-holders” (p. 63). This assertive can lead us to preview the influence of media discourse in relation to the reproduction of discourses in general and, especially, to military discourse, if only the voices of authorities are represented in programs, films, advertisements and articles. This tendency can give a false impression of what really occurs in an environment like the Brazilian Army, because, as Fairclough (1995) suggests, the real context, represented by “feelings, circumstances, qualities of social and interpersonal relationships” (p.64), could not be considered, and they are, indeed, important, because they represent the context of an interaction. In short, Fairclough (1995) reinforces the media interest on the voices of the most powerful, through the statement below:

But whatever the motivations of media personnel, the social function of the media in effecting such transformations as a part of the trend identified by Hall et al. is to legitimize and reproduce existing asymmetrical power relationships by putting across the voices of the powerful as if they were the voices of ‘common sense. (Fairclough, 1995, p. 63).

Considering media tendency in reproducing only asymmetrical interactions as if they represented a common sense, institutions such as the Brazilian Army, which are based on hierarchy and discipline, can be seen as authoritarian and sometimes obsolete, since the media conveys a negative view of discipline and hierarchy. But there is one factor presented in the assumption above, which can be relevant: motivations of media personnel. If the trend in transmitting asymmetrical relationships is added to a tendentious motivation of media personnel, the negative effects over military discourse can increase, thus creating the process of stereotyping cited in my hypothesis. Those two factors added may explain why, in Brazil, one officer can be seen as a threatening authority; a sergeant's image is associated to an extremely rude and impolite personality; salute (the common greeting between military) can be seen as a form of humiliating subordinates, and Duque de Caxias (the Brazilian Army patron) is seen as a mere accomplisher of orders.

Despite the fact that the media presents some tendencies, it is worth noting the importance of the media as a vehicle for information, since it can reach millions of citizens. It is also important to recognize that it would be unfair to judge if a media personnel is being tendentious in reporting any event, even though discourse analysis might show his/her tendency. However, depending on media motivation in transmitting information, especially in relation to asymmetrical interactions, the negative consequences over the population could be cumulative and sometimes harmful to persons or institutions, if those interactions refer to stereotyped images.

Thus, the media itself should evaluate its relevance to modern society, considering and respecting the different social practices presented in each social group, and also trying to answer questions related to representations, identities and relations, as cited by Fairclough (1995), while conveying social relationships. Furthermore, the

media should consider that, if social practices in institutions can evolve through the years, it is important to develop an updated form of transmission, in order to observe and to correct distortions.

3.3. Methodology

In order to accomplish the task of analyzing the possible process of stereotyping developed by the media in its transmissions, I have selected a Brazilian rhyme, which has been analyzed in the last section and a Brazilian song composed by Raul Seixas. In addition, I also analyze the military discourse presented by ‘Rede Globo’, a Brazilian broadcast group, on the TV program ‘A Turma do Didi’. Films are also an important form for reinforcing the process of stereotyping by the media, and it will be possible to examine this tendency, while analyzing excerpts of the discourse presented in two American films, ‘Basic’ (‘Violação de Conduta’, in Brazil) and ‘We Were Soldiers’ (‘Fomos Heróis’, in Brazil).

But it is not only in relation to verbal transmissions that it is possible to verify the occurrence of a pre-judgement related to military discourse. During the discourse analysis of three fragments of articles presented in ‘Revista Veja’, one of the most famous and important vehicles of written information in Brazil, it will be possible to confirm media representations in distinguishing hierarchy and discipline in a negative perspective. Furthermore, following the example of that Brazilian rhyme cited before, I will analyze the military discourse presented in two comic strips, ‘Beetle Bailey’ (‘Recruta Zero’, in Brazil), by Mort Walker, published in ‘O Globo’, one of the most important newspapers in Brazil. Despite the fact that this comic strip refers to the American military environment, it is a common and well-accepted strip by children,

teenagers, and even by some adults in Brazil, thus capable of influencing a great number of people.

Finally, it is important to distinguish that the selected material in this chapter will be analyzed according to the concepts of CDA, presented in the second chapter of this research. CDA will be the basis of media discourse analysis because my analysis will involve more considerations related to sociocultural aspects than the study of clause structures, which is the central point in SFL. In fact, while using CDA to analyze media discourse, it will be possible to discuss many important issues at the same time. It is worth noting to mention that my choice in using only CDA in the data analysis of this chapter represents just a strategy to reinforce the negative perspective presented by media in its transmissions. However, in the fourth chapter, I will analyze verbal interactions in battalions of the Brazilian Army, applying the concepts of SFL and CDA together, because it will represent a more complete data analysis, developing a relevant comparison between media representations and spoken interactions in the army.

3.4. Data Analysis

In chapter one, I have exemplified the natural occurrence of a probable process of stereotyping by civilians, in relation to military image, and consequently, to military discourse. Thus, two statements are commonly uttered in Brazil, which can give at least a pejorative image of military in general. Firstly, in saying a sentence like “**Maria é uma sargentona**”, the image that could be associated to Maria is the one related to a severe sergeant, one rank in the military hierarchy, which is always in contact with privates, teaching and charging them to act according to the right procedures in the army. But besides the simple use of this rank in the statement cited before, there is the use of the term sergeant in its augmentative form, which can contribute to project the

image of a presumably rude sergeant over an authoritarian woman's personality, which orders her husband or sons to do something, without accepting responses on the contrary. In fact, this example reflects an erroneous association of one military rank and its attributions to the fact of giving orders in an impolite form.

The other common utterance in Brazil is "**José é um Caxias**". Luís Alves de Lima e Silva (Duque de Caxias, or simply Caxias) is the Brazilian Army patron, which is recognized for his extremely organized methods in planning each battle, dedication to his duties, and discipline in obeying his superiors' orders and regulations. All these attributes could be considered as positive procedures, but this is not the real connotation in the example cited above. Caxias, in an utterance like that, is normally an adjective headed to a person that is a mere accomplisher of orders, only concerned about doing the right thing, in order not to hinder his/her career. In this example, there is the occurrence of a probable inversion in values, since an orderly life is seen as a negative characteristic. In addition, a military personality was used to represent the "negative" procedure in obeying authorities and regulations, instead of a famous civilian personality, which could act in the same way as Caxias did.

The examples cited before present one point in common, which is the use of ranks and attitudes in the army referring to comic situations in real life, but more than this: both of the examples consider hierarchy as a form of obtaining power and being impolite, and discipline as an instrument to reach this intent. Despite the fact that it is a difficult task to verify the origin of the examples mentioned before, if they are commonly used by Brazilian citizens in a pejorative way, and if the media tries to reinforce those asymmetrical situations, it will be difficult to state which means is influencing the other. However, it is possible to present at least one feasible perspective, which is the occurrence of a vicious cycle, where civilians' beliefs on military discourse

and image influence media transmissions, which can reinforce those beliefs, by adopting that negative view of military procedures, thus creating a stereotyped view of the military environment, which can influence or reinforce civilians' beliefs on the subject.

Keeping in mind that my hypothesis represents, in fact, one among many viewpoints on the subject, and considering the perspective mentioned above, I analyze the following text by the media. But instead of employing the concepts of power in and power behind discourse in this analysis, I prefer to apply some questions suggested by Fairclough (1995), which can serve to verify if there is an implicit tendency working ideologically, and consequently, creating a stereotyped perspective of an specific subject. Thus, Fairclough (1995) presents three questions: “(a) what are the social origins of this option? Where and who does it come from? (whose representation is it, for instance?) (b) what motivations are there for making this choice? (c) what is the effect of this choice, including its effects (positive or negative) upon the various interests of those involved?” (p. 15). In this sense, there is a fragment of a song (see Appendix B) performed by Raul Seixas (1984), a Brazilian rock star. Seixas, who was a controversial rock star in the 1970's, composed a song that can provide necessary elements to reinforce my hypothesis:

Mamãe eu não queria
 Mamãe eu não queria
 Mamãe eu não queria
 Servir o exército

Não quero bater continência
 Nem para sargento, cabo ou capitão
 Nem, quero ser sentinela
 Que nem cachorro vigiando portão

Considering that the central idea in the text is a criticism to military service, it seems that Raul Seixas was emphatic in exposing his opinion, which can be considered

as a motivation. But there is another important factor, related to Fairclough's questions. Despite Seixas' polemic characteristics, he lived in a period when Brazil was governed by the military from the Army (1964-1984), known by civilians as a dictatorial period. Since many artists were persecuted and exiled by the military government, many artistic productions in that historical period, especially from 70's to 80's, criticized the military government, and everything related to the military environment.

In this sense, it is possible to verify, by analyzing the first two stanzas, Seixas' radicalism on the subject. Firstly, he affirms three times that he does not want to serve the Army ("Mamãe eu não queria servir o Exército"). Besides denying the military service, Seixas reinforces his negative view in specifically serving the Army, probably influenced by historical motivation cited above. In the second stanza, the composer explains that he does not want to serve the army, using two reasons. One refers to the salute, a characteristic greeting in military environment, which can be pointed as a common sense, and the other is a common activity practiced by the military, especially by privates, which is sentry duty.

Thus, Seixas explains that it is impossible for him to greet superiors with that gesture ("Não quero bater continência para sargento, cabo ou capitão"), suggesting a criticism to hierarchy in the army and to common senses in that institution. Furthermore, he compares the sentinel or the sentry duty in the army with a dog guarding a house ("Nem quero ser sentinela, que nem cachorro vigiando o portão"), blindly obeying its owner's orders as a private obeys his superior's orders. As can be seen, the composer employed as a strategy the criticism to a common activity in the army, considering it a negative reference to the military service as a whole, associating it to responses under extreme pressure or abuse of power. Moreover, Seixas refers to the salute as an example of authoritarianism in the army, and sentry duty as a form of

humiliating privates, since this is an activity specifically exercised by them. However, besides criticizing the military service, Seixas' song reflects civilians' common fears related to military attitudes and practices, which can project a negative view on military discourse.

In a sequence, there is the third stanza, which is ironic in relation to formality and to the hierarchy in the army, as can be seen in the following passage:

Desculpe vossa excelência
A falta de um pistolão
É que meu velho é soldado
E minha mãe pertence ao Exército da Salvação

Reading this passage, it is possible to interpret that the author tried to play with formality in military discourse, while using the pronoun “vossa excelência”, ironically, in the first verse, in a clear reference to the mode of address employed by the military while talking to a general. Probably, the intended effect, which may have been to discredit the respect demonstrated by military discourse in relation to authorities, was influenced by the facts which occurred during the military government, when generals were the authorities in many segments of society. Furthermore, Seixas also plays with hierarchy in the army, suggesting that neither his father, nor his mother belong to a high rank in the army, and therefore he does not have the necessary influence (“pistolão”) to be free of military service. This statement could provoke a negative effect, since it can suggest an inappropriate use of hierarchy in military discourse in order to exercise influence in the army, which can reinforce the vicious cycle mentioned before.

The last two stanzas reinforce the author's opinion against military service and military attitudes. In this sense, firstly Seixas applies the Brazilian popular rhyme presented in the introduction of this chapter. He may have decided to use that rhyme to mark his position, but more than this, he provoked a negative effect on military

discourse. When he applies those simple verses analyzed in the second section, if the subject is controversial as the military service is in Brazil, issues of authority and punishment will appear in a more negative way than while analyzing the rhyme as a simple song for children. That is the negative influence that I have mentioned before, since the author ironically diminishes issues related to military discourse. In addition, he finishes his lyrics by deducing that if the military service was important, it would not be obligatory (“Se fosse tão bom assim, mainha, não seria imposição”), thus summarizing his criticism and creating a negative perspective about everything related to the military environment, and as a consequence, to military discourse.

If the lyrics of Seixas’ song criticize military attitudes, considering some of them as authoritarian and humiliating, it seems that TV programs and films are more concerned with offenses and punishment. Thus, while analyzing a sketch presented in the Brazilian TV program “A Turma do Didi” (see Appendix C) and especially headed for children, it is possible to verify that a sergeant is represented as someone rude and impolite, who is always threatening the soldiers, as can be seen in his discourse. In addition, it seems that the higher the rank of one officer in the military hierarchy, the higher the level of association to an authoritarian person by the media.

In this sense, in scene one it is possible to confirm the negative image of a sergeant, when he uses in his discourse a threat to privates (“..eu acho bom vocês se comportarem muito bem”); and the authoritarian image of a colonel, one of the highest ranks in the army, when the sergeant refers to that officer as one of the most severe commanders in the army (“..um dos comandantes mais durões do nosso exército”), as if this condition were the most important in military discourse. Then the sergeant demonstrates nervousness and fear with the colonel’s presence, while presenting the

troop (“Sargento Pincel às suas ordens! Meu coronel... Eu quero comunicar que é uma honra em recebê-lo aqui neste batalhão!”).

The colonel’s authoritarianism is reinforced when he states in a bad-tempered mood that the battalion is the worst in the eastern part of the country (“Este é o grupamento militar que é considerado o pior de todo o grupamento militar leste!”), which can be considered a kind of offense. The negative effect of the mentioned discourse relies on the fact that, since the colonel went to the battalion to inspect the soldiers (a common activity in the army), and starts insulting the privates, military discourse will be seen as authoritarian and impolite, because the sketch suggests that no responses are allowed.

If in scene one, issues of hierarchy and authority can be easily deduced, in scene two of the same sitcom, issues of politeness can be distinguished. This happens when the colonel starts to ask questions to the soldiers, and according to each wrong response by private Didi, the colonel and the sergeant become angry and start to insult the private. Thus, as can be seen in Appendix C, Sergeant Pincel insulted Private Didi twice, using “ídiota”, whereas Colonel Martins said that “ídiota é pouco!”. Of course that one can say that this is a humoristic program and that the situation described is just a sketch, but forgetting the origins and the motivation of the sketch, it is the effect of this kind of discourse that deserves a considerable analysis.

I would say that, if one simple and innocent rhyme was used in a song, reinforcing the impolite discourse of a superior in relation to a subordinate; a rude discourse transmitted on a TV program, filled with offenses and threats by superiors, could also influence the negative image that civilians associate to officers and sergeants in the army, and the impolite and authoritarian manner they talk to subordinates. No matter if there is one possible motivation for the media in conveying those asymmetrical

relationships, the fact is that they seem to be an exaggeration if compared to real occurrences in the army (Chapter 4), normally causing a pejorative or a negative association to military discourse.

Furthermore, in films, for instance, it is possible to verify those effects; but counting on one more important factor: the cultural aspect. Since Brazilians watch many productions by Hollywood, it is feasible to see military discourse transmitted in films with caution. One example is the fragment of a discourse transmitted in the film ‘Basic’, when a sergeant major, an important rank in the American Army hierarchy, is advising some privates. His choices are characterized by threats (“Those of you I deem unworthy will not remain”; “And those of you who refuse to quit will have a training accident”; “Are you talking?! Did you speak to me?!”), and swearing expressions (“I especially don’t give a rat’s fuck what four -star general’s dick you sucked”; “..Motherfuckin g..”), which can cause an extremely impolite and offensive character to military discourse. It is worth noting that the original discourse is so offensive, that the version in Portuguese omitted many swearing expressions and slang, probably in order to reduce the negative impact of such an aggressive and impolite discourse.

Another curious occurrence in that passage is the authoritarian and pedantic way the sergeant talks to the troop. Expressions such as “I do not care...”; “...to get the privilege of being able stand before me today”; and “Who the fuck told you to speak?!”, added to commands like “Give me a ‘hoo-ha, Sergeant”, may provoke a negative effect on the audience, since they represent commands carrying humiliating expressions to subordinates. Moreover, when Private Dumbar concludes his report, saying, “From the beginning, West had a chip on his shoulder for this guy named Pike...”, he creates an impressive image of persecution by superiors in the army, which can contribute to reinforce issues of authority.

The other selected film (“We were soldiers”) serves to reinforce issues of disrespect, politeness and authority in military discourse, since the sergeant major refused to answer the private’s greeting, using instead of that, the slang “goddamn”. But besides issues of politeness and authority discussed, those two films have in common cultural aspects that are different from ours. Firstly, sergeant major is a special rank in the American Army, reached only by distinguished sergeants, thus providing great power and authority, with no correspondence in the Brazilian Army. Secondly, “hoo-ha, sergeant!” does not represent a common expression to mark understandings by subordinates in the Brazilian Army, which rather prefers to use “Sim (não), senhor” or even a simple “Yes (No)”, as can be seen in Chapter 4. Thirdly, offenses, slang and swearing headed to subordinates are considered forms of disrespect, which are disapproved by the military in Brazil, since those offensive forms contradict regulations and pledges assumed by officers and sergeants.

Those cultural differences serve to reinforce concepts presented in “power in discourse” and “power behind discourse” concepts, discussed in Chapter 2. As explained in the paragraph above, and according to Fairclough’s (1989) theory, the military discourse presented in those two films involves one social practice, reflected on one specific order of discourse. Since the social practice studied is related to power relations and power strategies in an American military environment, the media should be careful in not reproducing power relations like those as if they occurred in the Brazilian Army, which involves another social practice, as can be seen in Chapter 4. In addition, civilians should not consider the military discourse analyzed above as a part of our culture, because, even in environments of extreme pressure, superiors in the Brazilian Army will not use those strategies applied in the film.

But there are also written texts, which can influence civilians' beliefs on military discourse, thus probably creating the vicious cycle discussed before in this section. Thus, it is possible to deduce that written texts are, most of the times, concerned about passing the image of military officers as extremely rude and impolite, as can be seen in the following examples (main words and expressions were underlined), extracted from "Revista Veja", one of the most important vehicles in constructing opinion in Brazil:

Example 1: "(...) Orientados aos berros, como se fossem soldados, os alunos rastejam pelo chão e são punidos com exercícios extras se não cumprirem as ordens do personal sargento...". (Revista Veja – Ed. 1.827 – Ano 36 – Número 44 – 05 Nov 03 – p. 76).

Example 2: "(...) As regras do instituto são severas. Os alunos estudam em tempo integral, precisam bater continência para o professor e, caso não sejam aprovados em alguma matéria, são instantaneamente expulsos...". (Revista Veja - Ed. 1847 – Ano 37 – Número 13 – 31 Mar 04 - p. 91).

Example 3: "Steinberg conta que decidiu escrever seu livro (...). Um exemplo que gosta de citar: alguns são permissivos quando suas crianças são pequenas e, para compensar essa leniência, tornam-se verdadeiros sargentos quando elas ficam mais maduras". (Revista Veja – Ed.1863 – Ano 37 – Número 29 – 21 Jul 04 – p.73).

As can be seen, in the first example, there is a clear tendency in suggesting asymmetrical relationships in military discourse, but only associated to yells ("Orientados aos berros..."), to punishment and threats ("... são punidos com exercícios extras se não cumprirem as ordens..."), and to the sergeant's image as a rude person ("sargento"), similarly to the utterance explained before in this section ("Maria é uma sargentona"). The second example serves to reinforce civilians' common beliefs in relation to the authoritarian image of salute as something hard ("severa"), and as a form of humiliating subordinates ("..precisam bater continência para o professor.."), in a similar approach as Raul Seixas distinguished in his song. In the last example, the text reinforces the sergeant's image as an authoritarian person ("..tornam -se verdadeiros sargentos.."), in opposition to a permissive characteristic.

Furthermore, it is important to analyze the possible motivation presented in the texts cited above. Thus, the first article describes a new physical exercise, developed according to the extremely hard conditions presented in every military environment. On the one hand, the author reaches his objective in characterizing the difficulties of that exercise, thus informing the reader. But on the other hand, the article may convey an erroneous and sometimes exaggerated image of that environment, activity and even discourse, thus provoking a negative image of the institution as a whole.

Similarly, the second and third articles reinforce civilians' negative beliefs on the sergeant's image and on salute as a humiliating gesture, but with another kind of motivation. In this sense, what is to be an article reporting the best post-secondary school degrees in Brazil (and one of them belongs to a military institute), and a study on parents' behavior in relation to their children's education, respectively, can also be transformed in material to reinforce civilians' negative beliefs on military environment, attitudes and consequently, on military discourse, since most of the examples above suggest authoritarian and impolite discourse practices. Thus, despite the fact that the main motivation in the three texts cited above was not to criticize military discourse or attitudes; indeed there is the occurrence of an additional and undesirable negative effect for the military institution, indirectly produced by the authors, with the association with military discipline, which can influence civilians' opinion.

As can be seen, depending on the motivation and on the choices to express this motivation, the media can, at least, contribute to reinforce beliefs on military discourse, as something only associated to rude commands and offenses. This can be due to the lack of knowledge about military practices, since the

Brazilian Army represents a kind of closed environment. However, while analyzing comic strips on military discourse, one could be distinguished because of the author's knowledge on that field, which is "Beetle Bailey" ("Recruta Zero", in Brazil). Mort Walker (1950) has created that character and the corresponding military environment, based on his own experience, from his draft period during the II World War to 2nd Lieutenant rank, serving in the American Army. In this sense, it is possible to realize that Walker (1950) could reproduce military discourse as close as possible to the real occurrences in the army, as can be seen in the following two passages below:

Example 1: Bailey is sleeping, when an angel comes to transform Bailey's dreams in reality.

| Original version in Portuguese. | [My translation] |
|---|---|
| Angel: O Zero é o primeiro da lista de novo! (when Bailey wakes up) Venha comigo e realizarei seus sonhos, Zero! | Angel: Bailey is the first name in my list again! (when Bailey wakes up) Come with me, and your dreams will come true, Bailey! |
| Bailey: Onde estamos indo? | Bailey: Where are we going? |
| Angel: Não é longe! Bem aqui embaixo! | Angel: It's not far! Right down there! |
| Bailey: Mas é o refeitório! | Bailey: But it's the canteen! |
| Angel: Muito chão para você esfregar e muita batata para descascar! | Angel: Much floor for you to sweep and many potatoes to peel! |
| Bailey: Hmm? Este não é o meu sonho! De onde você tirou esta idéia? | Bailey: Hmm? This is not my dream! From where did you take this idea? |
| Angel: Ah, do sonho do sargento! | Angel: Ah, from the sergeant's dream! |

Source: Globinho – Jornal O Globo – Sunday, January 11th, 2004.

Example 2: Lieutenant Escovinha asked for some coffee to Sergeant Cuca, who is the cook in the battalion. Beetle Bailey is observing their talk.

| Original version in Portuguese. | [My translation] |
|---|--|
| Lieutenant: Café! (after drinking the coffee) Argh! Este café está muito amargo! | Lieutenant: Coffee! (after drinking the coffee) Argh! This coffee is very bitter! |
| Sergeant: Quem ele pensa que é, para julgar o café! Se ele não fosse oficial, eu o derrubaria com um soco no estômago! (offering coffee to Bailey) Olha só! Toma um gole e me diz se este não é o melhor café que você já tomou! Que tal? | Sergeant: Who does he think he is to criticize my coffee! If he weren't an officer, I would hit him on the stomach! (offering coffee to Bailey) Try my coffee and say if it is not the best coffee you have ever drunk! And then, how did you like it? |
| Bailey: (disguising his disagreement) | Bailey: (disguising his disagreement) |

| | |
|--------------|--------------|
| Maaafilhoso! | Maaarvelous! |
|--------------|--------------|

Source: Globinho – Jornal O Globo – Sunday, January 4th, 2004.

Example 1 associates the act of sweeping the floor and peeling potatoes to the sergeant's dreams, since the sergeant is always ordering Bailey to do that in the strip. As can be seen, this first strip reinforces civilians' beliefs related to fatigue duties and to the activity of peeling potatoes, as humiliating tasks and punishment, respectively, ordered by superiors to privates, in military discourse. In addition, the second example suggests a possible problem in relationship between superiors and subordinates in the army, considering that the officer in the example is always ordering in a rude way, and that subordinates are always obeying, without discussing the corresponding commands.

That issue occurs in a first moment, when the sergeant criticizes the lieutenant's attitude, while recognizing that it is not possible to hit the officer because of hierarchy. In a second moment, the sergeant used the same criticism on the abusive use of hierarchy employed by the lieutenant, in order to persuade Bailey to answer that the coffee is marvelous, which is the sergeant's opinion. Thus, the second example suggests that hierarchy in the army is used in military discourse as a strategy to pressure subordinates, contributing to create a perverse relation involving issues of hierarchy and authority in military discourse.

3.5. Answering Research Question 1 (RQ 1): Based on the collected data in the media, how does the media represent military discourse?

After analyzing the selected material in this chapter, it is possible to present some conclusions on media transmissions related to military discourse, in order to answer my first research question. Firstly, the examples cited in this chapter corroborate Fairclough's (1995) statement related to media interest in reproducing asymmetrical relationships, discussed in the second section of this chapter. Moreover, besides

transmitting asymmetrical power relations, the media reproduces military discourse based on issues of hierarchy as a form of obtaining power in interactions, and at the same time, of pressuring, humiliating and insulting privates, as can be seen in the examples of military discourse discussed in the TV program “A Turma do Didi”, in the film “Basic”, and in texts from *Veja* magazine.

Another curious tendency by the media is the way it refers to some common activities in the Brazilian Army. Thus, references to fatigue duties, the act of peeling potatoes and sentry duties as humiliating, and the way that those activities are ordered by superiors to privates, are conveyed in a rude way as a kind of punishment, which can be related to a possible civilians’ belief that associates military service to the act of disrespecting privates, as if those issues were the only reference to the subject. Those references can be seen in the song analyzed before and in Example 1 of Beetle Bailey’s comic strip. In addition, unequal power relations reproduced by the media emphasizes, most of the times, the relationship between sergeants and privates. One possible explanation for these occurrences is the proximity of those two ranks in hierarchy, which presupposes that there will be more interactions involving those two ranks. Examples in this sense were discussed in the analysis of TV programs, American films, and texts from *Veja* magazine and from Beetle Bailey’s comic strip.

Furthermore, the media exposes authority in the army, by reinforcing the distance between two ranks, such as a captain/lieutenant and a private, or a commander and a private. No matter which superiors are used to represent this distance, privates are constantly presented in the other extreme of an interaction, probably in order to demonstrate that superiors can always be impolite and formal, because authority is used as a tool to keep discipline, to give rude commands and to control conversation, and that privates can only obey superiors’ orders. But there are also two important approaches by

the media in relation to issues of authority. One is the use of the salute as a form of demonstrating an officer/sergeant's superiority in relation to a private, presented by the media as an obsolete and sometimes humiliating gesture. Besides, when associated to military discourse, it can provoke a negative effect, probably influencing civilians' opinions.

The other approach is the use of the sergeant's image as a hard, impolite and authoritarian person in the army. Since the proximity to privates implies occurrences of more interactions in the army, when issues of hierarchy, authority, politeness and power are applied to that rank in military discourse, the effect seems to be exaggerated. Examples related to authority and salute can be seen in Raul Seixas' song and in the second example of *Veja* magazine, whereas examples of the sergeant's negative image can be seen in almost all of the data discussed before, in this chapter.

If the media is transmitting military discourse only considering negative sides of authority, politeness, power, hierarchy and discipline, it is worth noting to discuss the probable reasons for those occurrences. Considering my twenty-three year experience in the Brazilian Army, I suggest at least four possible reasons: motivation, influence of other cultures, occurrence of a vicious cycle and lack of knowledge. Motivation can be characterized by the probable influences of historical or ideological factors, or both together, as can be seen in Raul Seixas's song; and by necessity of reinforcing a criticism or exaggerating a specific behavior, according to Beetle Bailey comic strip, respectively.

It is noticeable to distinguish that even Mort Walker (1950), the author of Beetle Bailey comic strip and who deeply knows the military environment, is cited in one article for the American Forces Press Service ('Mort Walker still tickles military funny bones at 80', 2003, *American Forces Press Service*. Retrieved November 10,

2004, from http://www.defenselink.mil/news/sep2003/n09022003_200309027.html) that ‘he’s made very few changes to update the strip to reflect today’s military because being funny is his top priority – definitely more important than being accurate or current”, which can corroborate the influence of media motivation. Influence of other cultures can be related to the analysis of American films and Beetle Bailey’s comic strips in this chapter, when an American sergeant major’s image, which does not correspond to a sergeant’s image in the Brazilian Army, can be projected to a Brazilian sergeant, thus probably influencing, for example, Sergeant Pincel’s characteristics, in the Brazilian TV program “A turma do Didi”, and consequently, civilians’ beliefs.

The occurrence of a vicious cycle probably occurs as a consequence of civilians’ common beliefs on military discourse and attitudes, influencing media reproductions. Since the media is concerned with transmitting social knowledge, it seems that the media will reinforce those beliefs, which can explain occurrences of common utterances, such as “Maria é uma sargentona” and “José é um Caxias”, as discussed before in this chapter. Finally, lack of knowledge on military activities, attitudes and discourse, can lead both civilians and the media to imagine unreal situations or to create patterns based on occurrences in the past, forgetting that the Brazilian Army can evolve; or to follow examples presented in other cultural contexts, which can contradict real occurrences in the army.

In fact, the examples studied in this chapter serve to characterize a possible media tendency in transmitting military discourse, by only reinforcing negative sides of authority, hierarchy and discipline, and contributing to create a stereotyped view of military discourse. In addition, civilians should be careful in relation to media reproductions on the subject, since they do not correspond, most of the times, to real

occurrences in the Brazilian Army, as it will be possible to compare during the analysis of verbal interactions in the Brazilian Army, in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF INTERACTIONS IN BATTALIONS

*“Incorporando-me ao Exército Brasileiro,
Prometo cumprir rigorosamente
As ordens das autoridades
A que estiver subordinado,
Respeitar meus superiores hierárquicos,
Tratar com afeição meus irmãos de arma
E com bondade os subordinados
E dedicar-me inteiramente ao serviço da pátria,
Cuja honra, integridade e instituições
Defenderei com o sacrifício da própria vida.”*

(Oath of enlistment, uttered by every military, during the ceremony in celebration to the Soldier's Day, on August 25th.)

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter I will analyze military discourse, through conversations in battalions of the Brazilian Army. Thus, the collected data will be studied, according to SFL and to CDA theories (Chapter 2), and during the analysis of each conversation, I will classify them as pragmatic or casual, following Eggins' principles, which were exposed in Figure 2.3, also in the second chapter of this thesis.

It is worth noting that the studies in this chapter will provide a comparison to media representations, analyzed in Chapter 3, in order to verify if these representations express the real occurrences in military environment, and to answer the other three questions of my research, which are: what are some issues of power, discipline, and authority, which are related to discourse in the Brazilian Army?; what are the main characteristics of institutional and casual conversation found in spoken interactions in the army?; and in what circumstances can casual conversation occur, involving superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army? (see Chapter 1).

In this sense, I have divided this chapter in three more sections. The second section will try to expose the military view in relation to discipline, hierarchy, politeness, power and authority, in order to demystify some distorted viewpoints discussed in Chapter 3. The subsequent section, which is related to methodology, will explain the steps used to collect and to analyze data related to military discourse. The last section, which is divided in two subsections, will provide the analysis of each conversation (see Appendix F), according to SFL and CDA theories, respectively.

4.2. Hierarchy, discipline, politeness, power and authority: the military viewpoint

It would be sufficient to characterize the military viewpoint in relation to the main issues discussed in this thesis, by only exposing the principles presented in the oath distinguished in the introductory part of this chapter. As it occurs in any other career with a pledge to guide professionals, the Brazilian Army pledge can summarize the ideology, and mainly, the necessary behavior to face the difficulties in the military career. Nonetheless, the military career demands a complex challenge of dealing with human beings, since it will involve relationships between men and women from different regions in the country; thus bringing different cultures, religions, and expectations to the military environment every year.

Thus, it seems contradictory to imagine an environment with particular incumbencies and exigencies to accomplish the specific mission of defending the country and assuring the law and the order; counting on different personalities, without considering a solid and permanent discipline guiding its members. In this sense, the pledge above can approach the importance of discipline, while expressing the rigorous way of obeying authorities and regulations in the army (*‘Prometo cumprir rigorosamente as ordens das autoridades a que estiver subordinado’*). This principle

would imply an exaggerated form of discipline, and moreover, it would suggest that discipline would serve as an instrument of oppression by superiors over subordinates, establishing a perverse relation between discipline and hierarchy.

However, keeping in mind that the system and its regulations are simple and serious, I would use another sentence of the oath in reference, in order to dismantle that probable distorted relation. In analyzing the sentence ‘Respeitar meus superiores hierárquicos, tratar com afeição meus irmãos de arma e com bondade os subordinados’, it is possible to understand how serious is the system, since it presupposes that discipline and hierarchy should occur in all directions and levels, preserving the respect to authorities (‘Respeitar meus superiores hierárquicos..’) and, at the same time, assuring the respect to subordinates (‘Tratar ..c om bondade os subordinados..’). Therefore, considering this oath as the basis for the right procedures in the Brazilian Army, it is possible to discuss issues related to hierarchy, discipline, politeness, authority and power, according to the military view, in order to better understand the verbal interactions in that environment and to demystify a probable stereotyped view in relation to military discourse.

4.2.1. Hierarchy and discipline:

In Chapter 1, I have mentioned that hierarchy and discipline form the principal support to the armed forces. This assertive can explain why they are discussed together in this section. Furthermore, considering laws and regulations in the Brazilian Army, the assertive above can be reinforced, for example, while reading ‘Estatuto dos Militares’ [Military Statute -my translation], one of the most important laws, in guiding military attitudes and behavior in the armed forces, which distinguishes in its structure one chapter to describe the main principles of hierarchy and discipline. Furthermore, it

defines hierarchy as the authority organization, in different levels in the armed forces, according to ranks, and states that hierarchy can only occur in a complete respect to authority sequence (p. 8). In a sequence, discipline is defined as the rigorous respect to laws and norms, characterized by the perfect accomplishment of duties by all and by each one in the armed forces (p. 8).

Those two definitions can depict impersonality to hierarchy and discipline, thus demystifying the idea of using these two pillars in order to obtain advantages, since they suggest that hierarchy and discipline serve for all those involved and not for one person or for a specific group. This impersonality can be reinforced in the same statute, when it enumerates some of the principles of military ethics, such as: to accomplish and to demand the accomplishment of authorities laws, regulations, instructions and orders; and to avoid using ranks to obtain personal advantages (pp.14-15).

But it seems that an external view, from people who do not belong to that environment, can increase the value of impersonality in relation to hierarchy and discipline in the armed forces. One example could be Celso Romão (2003), writer and lecturer, in his article, published in “Revista Venda Mais”. Considering the complexity of the Brazilian Army mission, added to what he calls “uma antipatia de uma parte da população” (p.16) [an aversion of part of population -my translation], he recognizes that the army can change and even evolve, according to its programs (p.16). During two years, he visited several battalions in the army; in order to later report the main lessons he learned in that environment.

In describing all the lessons, Romão (2003) approaches an interesting evaluation of hierarchy and discipline. Firstly, while referring to hierarchy, he says that, in the army, hierarchy serves to give prestige for those who are more experienced (p.

18), which reinforces the idea that hierarchy does not only recognize authority. Furthermore, in relation to discipline, Romão (2003) characterizes it as an important instrument to accomplish goals and objectives, in order to focus on the results (p. 18). In fact, he sees hierarchy and discipline as important characteristics of the Brazilian Army, helpful in the accomplishment of missions; no matter if by superiors and subordinates, the result is what is considered.

From the discussion above, it seems that the Brazilian Army, as one body of the armed forces, sees hierarchy and discipline as positive instruments, useful not to keep the control of subordinates and to obtain authority, but instead of this, to provide a harmonic, impersonal, professional and productive environment focused only on the accomplishment of the missions by the institution as whole. In short, the institution and its mission represent the main cause for the military; and hierarchy and discipline provide the necessary environment to understand the mission to be accomplished and to serve the institution before serving individualities.

4.2.2. Politeness, authority and power:

If hierarchy and discipline can be analyzed together in the Brazilian Army, the same can be done in relation to power, authority and politeness, since they express and explain the occurrences of relationships in the army. In Chapter 3, I analyzed some representations by the media, and most of them depict hierarchy and discipline as instruments employed by superiors, especially sergeants and lieutenants, in order to impose their authority and to show how powerful they are. Thus, instruments to obtain power and authority were represented by insults, threats and swearing. However, while analyzing laws and regulations in the army, it is possible to verify that those instruments do not reflect the real strategy to interact with subordinates, or at least, it

can be seen that the directive in relation to the exercise of power, authority and politeness is different from what is presented by the media.

For instance, I would use again the Military Statute, while enumerating the precepts of military ethics, such as to respect the human being 's dignity and to be fair and impartial while judging subordinates' acts and merits (p.14). Furthermore, the same statute distinguishes that, besides the respect to norms and authorities, it is a military obligation for superiors to treat subordinates with dignity and courtesy (p.16). These two precepts are in accordance to the Brazilian Army pledge, thus demystifying the distorted view of superiors treating subordinates with offenses and disrespect, as conveyed by the media.

In addition, the Military Statute considers that authority, duties and responsibility, in conducting men, represent the act of commanding. Moreover, the statute is emphatic in saying that the act of commanding is related to hierarchical rank and it is an impersonal prerogative, reinforcing that subordination does not affect personal dignity and that it is a consequence of the hierarchical structure (p.17). Those two ideas can depict that, in the Brazilian Army, commanding subordinates represents a complex task, since it involves rights and duties, with an extra factor, which is the commander's responsibility for his/her acts and for his/her subordinates' acts. In this sense, the statute recommends the use of hierarchy and discipline to exercise authority, but also concerned with subordinates' expectations and problems, since keeping *esprit de corps*¹ is the main task, thus eliminating insults and swearing in relationships between superiors and subordinates.

Considering that laws and regulations enumerate what the military should do, these codes do not teach, in fact, how to exercise leadership over

¹ *Esprit de corps* is a common expression used in the military environment, which refers to preservation of main objectives of community (in this case, the troop), above all individual objectives.

subordinates. In this sense, the Brazilian Army, especially concerned with the relationship between superiors and subordinates, has published two instructional modules ‘Cadernos de Instrução’, which can give directions to superiors in how to deal with subordinates. Curiously, most of the instructions demonstrate awareness in stimulating commandants’ virtues in any level and with the maintenance of subordinates’ dignity. ‘Caderno de Instrução 20 -10/1’ (CI 20-10/1), for example, reinforces that authority is impersonal, but responsibility is personal, which characterizes that independently of the rank, the military will always be subordinate to someone, and this precept implies that to command and to obey represent two facets of the same duty, which is to serve (pp. 9-10).

Furthermore, CI-20-10/1 cites what are considered essential qualities for a commandant, such as competence, good character and dedication (p. 19). But since we are discussing influence of power, authority and politeness in relationships between superiors and subordinates in the army, it seems that good character increases in value. In this sense, instructions recommend commandants to be polite and not to use swearing and slang in their vocabulary, and to practice goodness without weakness, which can be related to issues of politeness (pp. 26-28). In addition, not to use the prestige of commanding to obtain benefits, to punish according to regulations, to recognize subordinates’ merits, to be frank and sincere with subordinates and superiors, to know subordinates well, and to develop *esprit de corps* represent good practices, which are related to the correct exercise of power and authority (pp. 27-34), and which differ from the media representations analyzed in Chapter 3.

‘Caderno de Instrução Experimental’, another publication in the army, specifically serves as advice to officers and sergeants working in troops, and which are constantly in contact with privates. Even though it is compounded by advice, it is

important to those professionals, since it uses an accessible language to better explain how relationships in troop should be. It considers, for example, that subordinates should be guided by superiors rather according to credibility and trust, than using force of regulations or authority (p. 7.00). In order to obtain credibility and trust, it is recommended that superiors should develop important attributes, such as competence, responsibility, loyalty, courage, honesty, discipline, decision, professional enthusiasm, justice, coherence and initiative (p. 8.00). As can be seen, some of these attributes are related to power and authority (responsibility, decision, enthusiasm and initiative), while loyalty, discipline, justice and coherence can be referred to politeness.

But one of the most important pieces of advice focuses on the relationship between superiors and subordinates. Thus, ‘Caderno de Instrução Experimental’ establishes that in the army (and it is possible to project it to other occupations), subordinates need firm orientation, and they will only find it in someone who they trust; and concludes that the superior should be subordinates’ friend, helping and guiding them in difficulties, even if they do not ask for help (p.11.00). In a sequence, it cites important attitudes that should be practiced by superiors in order to stimulate subordinates, as the following: to act developing subordinates’ self-confidence; to teach subordinates in searching for self-confidence; to support and stimulate subordinates’ initiative; and to stimulate subordinates to present solutions to problems (p. 12.00).

These pieces of advice mentioned above can reinforce that, in the army, a relationship based on trust, truth, examples, courtesy and dignity serve as references in developing a harmonic environment, which can also be projected on military discourse, even considering issues of hierarchy, discipline and authority. Furthermore, in relation to politeness, the main orientation is the opposite as seen in representations by the

media, as can be seen in this extract from “Caderno de Instrução Experimental” (p. 14.00):

- Dirija-se ao subordinado com correção e evite palavras de baixo calão.
- Só toque fisicamente no subordinado para retirá-lo de situações de perigo ou, excepcionalmente, para ajudá-lo na instrução.
- Mantenha o autocontrole, evitando perdê-lo, principalmente no relacionamento com seus subordinados.
- Converse com os subordinados. Mantenha-se informado e tenha sempre uma palavra positiva para a dizer à fração que você comanda.
- Fale sempre a verdade, mesmo que ela não lhe seja favorável. (Caderno de Instrução Experimental, 1999: 14.00).

It is worth noting from these instructions that all of them are related to politeness in military discourse and to respect to subordinates, no matter the military’s authority. Finally, and no less important, I present some extracts from *orders of the day*² in the army, which reinforce the awareness of the institution in preserving subordinates’ dignity. The first order of the day is written by the Brazilian Army Commander, and it is addressed to the new Officer Candidate (see Appendix 1). One fragment of that order says “...Corrija e oriente com firmeza, sem melindrar, sem se promiscuir e sem se afastar da bondade”, while the other states “...Considere que as estrelas apenas representam a autoridade de que está investido.”

Another order of the day is written by the same author, but now addressed to the new sergeants. It distinguishes the following fragment: “...Você passa à equipe que integra, sobretudo ao recruta, otimismo, confiança, espírito de luta, firmeza, respeito ao próximo e bondade que não é promíscua e não se aparta da disciplina.”. Considering both orders of the day, it is possible to verify by their fragments, that the institution and its main leaders are concerned with the accomplishment of laws and orders, but always respecting subordinates, in a clear accordance to the Brazilian Army pledge. Thus, if the main orientation is to dignify

² Order of the day is an official message, normally written by the Brazilian Army Commander, which refers to special or historical dates or events, to special personalities or to special features in the army. It expresses the official thought in the army and it should be read in specific ceremonies.

subordinates, and if discipline in the army is strong and it is focused on the effective accomplishment of laws, it seems that superiors will follow the precepts of the institution, which can contradict representations by the media”.

4.3. Methods

After analyzing the military view in relation to issues of hierarchy, discipline, authority, power and politeness, I realized that the military system is simple and serious, focused on a culture related to very important virtues in society, such as honesty, dedication, politeness, organization, discipline and dignity, among many others. Moreover, their culture is concerned about preserving the image of the institution and its own image, since one military officer may represent the Brazilian Army as a whole. In this sense, it seems contradictory that military discourse can be compounded only by rude orders, or by swearing and insults, specially involving interactions between superiors and subordinates, as it was seen in the media representations in Chapter 3.

If offensive and impolite attitudes still occur in that environment, they happen in very few cases, since the institution is evolving, and also are its members, relationships and consequently, military discourse. Thus, it seems important to verify if verbal interactions involving superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army are corresponding to what laws and norms recommend. In this sense, I decided to record verbal interactions between superiors and subordinates in battalions of the Brazilian Army. I selected battalions because they represent appropriate environment where instruction and administration occur in the same place, mainly involving privates, differently from other places, such as headquarters, for example, where administration activities occur in the majority of the cases, and privates represent a minority in places

like that. In this sense, I believe that in battalions, formal and informal interactions occur in equal conditions, which can corroborate my hypothesis.

Thus, I selected one battalion in the state of Paraná and one in the state of Minas Gerais. I recorded conversations in June 2003; from June to August 2004; and in January 2005. It is important to mention that two battalions seems to be enough to be studied, because battalions in the army follow the same periods of instruction and have the same administrative and operational procedures during the year. Furthermore, officers and sergeants are constantly transferred, a fact that reinforces common procedures.

The commandants in those battalions have authorized all of those recordings (see Appendix H). During those periods, I had difficulties in what to record. Firstly, I decided to record the common activities in battalions, but it became an impossible task, since it was so difficult to be present in most of the events. Later, I decided to ask some military to help me, but it was difficult because their evaluation of what was important to record for my research did not coincide with my own evaluation.

Thus, I decided to record conversations as much as possible, considering the type of activity to be developed; thinking that, in administration I would possibly find informal occurrences, whereas in instructions, I would probably find formal situations. Thus, recorded data involve several ranks of participants, such as commandant, majors, captains, lieutenants, sergeants and soldiers (see Appendix A), participating in instructions and administrative activities, and common chats.

Since commandants authorized me to record interactions, I decided to use different strategies in order to obtain spontaneity in conversations. In instructions and encampments it was easy to obtain spontaneity, even announcing my purpose, because the military are always concerned about using clear vocabulary and because

instructions follow several steps, giving a formal aspect to the situation. In administration, typically marked by informality, I had to wait for the right moment to record, or if I had advised participants about my purpose they would change vocabulary, thus creating an artificial conversation.

After recording interactions, eliminating those which were inaudible or which involve risk to security in the battalion, I got almost three hours of conversation to be transcribed. It is worth noting that, while transcribing interactions, names and schedules were changed in order to preserve institutions and participants' privacy. The interactions were analyzed according to SFL and CDA theories, discussed in Chapter 2. I have selected from the tapes eight interactions to be analyzed, according to the following (see Appendix F):

- Excerpt 1: An obstacle course.
- Excerpt 2: Patrol instruction 1.
- Excerpt 3: Patrol instruction 2.
- Excerpt 4: First aid instruction.
- Excerpt 5: An administrative problem.
- Excerpt 6: During a coffee break.
- Excerpt 7: Talking about soccer.
- Excerpt 8: Talking to a private.

For each excerpt transcription, I developed a corresponding table with analytical results of mood choices presented in each interaction, according to Eggins & Slade (1997). After that, I separated excerpt by excerpt for the SFL analysis of register, mood choices, modality and main characteristics of pragmatic and casual conversations, exemplifying my analysis with the most important results in each excerpt, necessary to demystify media representations. Then, I used the transcriptions of each excerpt to

discuss and to exemplify CDA concepts of “power in” and “power behind discourse”, social order and order of discourse, considering the most noticeable occurrence presented in each excerpt, in order to verify how superiors interact with subordinates. Finally, after analyzing the excerpts, according to SFL and CDA main concepts, I answered the other three research questions (RQ) in my research, from RQ 2 to RQ 4.

4.4. Discourse Analysis

4.4.1. Analysis focused on the scope of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL):

4.4.1.1. Register, speech roles and commodities

I have mentioned in Chapter 2 that register is related to the context of situation, and therefore, it will demand flexibility by interactants, since it will involve choices of meanings and responses, according to occurrence of different situations, which can characterize the “variation according to use” explained by Halliday (1994, p. 36). In this subsection, I analyze each excerpt presented in Appendix F, focusing on social nature of discourse, explaining each interaction, according to the concept of register and its dimensions (field, tenor and mode). I give a special attention to tenor, because it is related to interpersonal metafunction, which can be useful to explain roles and relationships by participants inside military discourse, and to verify occurrences of authority, politeness and discipline. In addition, speech roles and commodities (see Figure 2.1) can complement my analysis focused on register, thus serving to demystify some pre-judgments on military discourse, seen in media representations.

In Excerpt 1 (see Appendix F), the context of situation represented by field-tenor-mode, can characterize that the captain is worried about the assembly of the obstacle course by the lieutenant in a short time, since the course should be ready for the instruction of privates and for a special group of soldiers from Military Police. Thus,

that awareness can be confirmed by the sequence of questions asked by the captain in order to confirm the accomplishment of the mission by the lieutenant, according to the extract below:

Extracted from Excerpt 1 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|------------|---|
| 10 | Captain | (i) Que horas que você acha que vai dar o pronto da pista? |
| 11 | Lieutenant | (i) Olha, só falta montar é... (ii) A falsa baiana e o... lepar. |
| 12 | Captain | (i) 'Cê acha que [pause 3 secs] == |
| 13 | Lieutenant | == (i) Eu acho que vai até a hora do almoço. |
| 14 | Captain | (i) Montando? |
| 15 | Lieutenant | (i) Sim, senhor. (ii) Porque... (iii) Alguns – (iv) Alguns lugares lá teve que trocar uns pedaços de pau pra emendar na outra árvore (inaudible). |

In analyzing the passage above, it is possible to verify that the captain's discourse is marked by questions, and this fact can be related to commodity of information, corresponding to a demanding speech role (see Figure 2.1). Since the context of situation (register) suggests the captain's awareness about the accomplishment of the mission, the way used to confirm all the steps using questions explains, through the lieutenant's responses, the expected accomplishment of orders, without commanding. Furthermore, the captain did not use imperatives, which can reinforce the commodity of information, thus deconstructing the perspective of only using commands in the army to obtain results.

Another important conclusion is related to authority, hierarchy and discipline, in the fragment above. It is only possible to associate the occurrence of a relationship between a superior and a subordinate in the text, in three moments, characterized by two normal procedures in the army, which are to ask for permission before entering in a room and answer superiors' questions using "sim (não), senhor!", according to the examples below (underlined):

Example 1: extracted from Excerpt 1 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|------------|---|
| 1 | Lieutenant | (i) <u>Permissão</u> [salute gesture]. |
| 2 | Captain | (i) José, o seguinte (ii) Qual que é a tua instrução amanhã de manhã? |

Example 2: extracted from Excerpt 1 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|------------|---|
| 8 | Captain | (i) Ah! (ii) ‘Tá pensando em colocar na parte da manhã? |
| 9 | Lieutenant | (i) <u>Sim, senhor.</u> |

Example 3: extracted from Excerpt 1 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|------------|--|
| 12 | Captain | (i) ‘Cê acha que [pause 3 secs] == |
| 13 | Lieutenant | == (i) Eu acho que vai até a hora do almoço. |
| 14 | Captain | (i) Montando? |
| 15 | Lieutenant | (i) <u>Sim, senhor.</u> (ii) Porque... (iii) Alguns – (iv) Alguns lugares lá teve que trocar uns pedaços de pau pra emendar na outra árvore (inaudible). |

As can be seen in examples above, the lieutenant naturally respected hierarchy and the captain’s authority, through normal procedures in the army. It is also possible to verify that, even involving a superior and a subordinate, the interaction naturally flows, and the sequence of questions-answers suggests one main goal of changing information, and not of commanding. The example below can confirm that conclusion, considering that the lieutenant feels comfortable and not under pressure to answer the captain’s questions, when he uses ‘Olha’(underlined), for example, to explain his procedures to the captain:

Extracted from Excerpt 1 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|------------|--|
| 10 | Captain | (i) Que horas que você acha que vai dar o pronto da pista? |
| 11 | Lieutenant | (i) <u>Olha</u> , só falta montar é... (ii) A falsa baiana e o... lepar. |

But one may say that, in Excerpt 1, the interaction naturally flowed because of the proximity in hierarchical rank (see Appendix A). In this sense, I analyze Excerpts 2 and 3 to verify what can happen when a sergeant and a lieutenant, respectively, interact with privates in similar situations. Both excerpts are almost equal, since the tenor in each interaction is the same, which is the relationship of a superior teaching privates to adopt the right procedures in an assault course. In this sense, the structures of clauses in Excerpt 2 and 3 are different from Excerpt 1, because now there is a predominance of imperatives (underlined in the examples below), which are related to the same speech role of demanding in Excerpt 1, but with another commodity, which is “goods -&-services”, presupposing obedience by privates, as an expected response for superiors’ orders, as can be seen in the examples below:

Example 1: extracted from Excerpt 2 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | Sergeant | (i) <u>Presta atenção.</u> (ii) ‘Bora. (iii) <u>Acerta, acerta.</u> (iv) <u>Cerra pra cá a patrulha.</u> (v) <u>Presta atenção.</u> (vi) Os senhores agora vão passar por um ponto inimigo, certo? (vii) Nós vamos lançar vocês para buscar uma mensagem, que nós precisamos dela aqui, no final. (viii) Dúvidas nisso? |
| 2 | Privates | (i) Não, senhor. |
| 3 | Sergeant | (i) Para o – (ii) Para o inimigo não descobrir, nós lançamos em cada ponto um pedaço dessa mensagem. (iii) E cada mensagem dessas - (iv) O que que é a mensagem? (v) É a? |
| 4 | Privates | (i) Senha. |
| 5 | Sergeant | (i) A senha. (ii) Então, ‘cês vão ver que, no final da pista, nós vamos formar o que? (iii) Uma mensagem. (iv) E eu preciso dessa mensagem aqui, para vocês terem cumprido a missão no padrão. (v) Dúvidas nisso? |
| 6 | Privates | (i) Não, senhor. |
| 7 | Sergeant | (i) Então, ‘cês vão chegar aqui == [voices] (ii) ‘Cês vão chegar aqui com essa mens == [voices] (iii) <u>Então, vocês têm que chegar com essa mensagem.</u> (iv) Se chegar no final e esqueceu a primeira mensagem, o que que vai acontecer? (v) Vão ter que voltar lá, pra completar a mensagem. (vi) Dúvidas nisso? |
| 8 | Privates | (i) Não, senhor. |

Example 2: extracted from Excerpt 3 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|---------|------|
|------|---------|------|

| | | |
|----|------------|---|
| 13 | Lieutenant | (i) Se alguém se perder, você vai atrás, pra procurar esse pessoal que ficou perdido. (ii) Então 'tá bom. (iii) <u>Vamos lá.</u> (iv) Xerife. (v) <u>Quando eu falar 'vai', você vai pegar o seu pessoal, vai botar em coluna por um aqui.</u> (vi) <u>O subcomandante vai na frente, o senhor vai à retaguarda e os seus companheiros vão no centro.</u> (vii) <u>Você vai deslocar esse pessoal até a linha de cones.</u> (viii) Dúvidas? |
| 14 | Sheriff | (i) Não, senhor. |
| 15 | Lieutenant | (i) <u>Vai, xerife.</u> (ii) <u>Atua, xerife.</u> (iii) Vai. (iv) Controla, xerife. (v) <u>Vai.</u> (vi) <u>Manda, manda, xerife, manda...</u> |

Differently from Excerpt 1, the examples above suggest that the roles of each participant is well defined, since superiors' turns are full of orders, and subordinates are answering "sim (não), senhor!". Thus, authority and hierarchy are exercised under pressure, since negotiation is not allowed in those relationships, and obedience is the only accepted response. The structure command/undertaking can be explained by the context of situation, because the purpose in those cases is to follow steps to reach objectives in a combat simulation, and that is the probable reason why commands are firm, since the situation demands immediate responses.

In Excerpt 4, the register characterizes a different context than the other three excerpts analyzed before. Now, a sergeant is creating situations for soldiers to explain their procedures, situation that is similar to occurrences in schools, for example, when teachers check students' knowledge. Those situations created by the sergeant and soldiers' responses can be confirmed through the examples below:

Example 1: extracted from Excerpt 4 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------------|--|
| 1 | Sergeant | [while private 1 is helping the victim] (i) Levantou o quadril, saiu a água. (ii) Certo. (iii) Deitou a vítima de novo, do jeito que ela 'tava. (iv) E aí? |
| 2 | Private 1 (05) | (i) Aí, eu pego os braços dela por baixo da cabeça. (ii) Pego a cabeça dela por trás e... |
| 3 | Sergeant | (i) E se ela já tiver recuperado a consciência, já, nesse procedimento que o 05 falou...(ii) Levantar o quadril... (iii) E aí? |
| 4 | Private 1 (05) | (i) Aí, eu vejo se a pulsação dela está normal. |

Example 2: extracted from Excerpt 4 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|---------|------|
|------|---------|------|

| | | |
|------|----------------|--|
| 11 | Sergeant | == (i) ‘Tá. (ii) Então, vamos fazer mais um procedimento. (iii) Então... (iv) De pé um, dois. (v) Segurança. |
| NV 1 | - | [all the military move to another place, where, the simulation will occur]. |
| 12 | Sergeant | (i) Bom, 05 e 07... (ii) Você – (iii) Vocês dois, mais o soldado José estavam atravessando um curso d’água, e o soldado José começa a se afogar. (iv) Procedimentos. |
| 13 | Private 2 (07) | (i) Trago pra margem. |
| 14 | Sergeant | (i) Trouxe pra margem. |
| 15 | Private 2 (07) | (i) Depois, a gente confere se tem alguma coisa... (ii) Um galho (inaudible)... |
| 16 | Sergeant | (i) Confere aí, então. |
| 17 | Private 2 (07) | (i) Aí, não tem nada. (ii) Ele tá sem pulsação (iii) Aí, eu vou virar a vítima de bruços (inaudible)... |

From the examples above, it is possible to characterize the demanding speech role and the consequent commodity of information, marked by statements from both participants. In this sense, the structure in Excerpt 4 is characterized by the sergeant’s simulations (see turns 3, 11 and 12, above); the privates’ statements (see turns 2 and 4; and 13, 15 and 17, above); and the sergeant’s acknowledgements (see turns 1, 14 and 16, above), depicting that, differently from Excerpts 1 to 3, it was not necessary to use firm commands or questions to check procedures, characterizing variation in use and military’s flexibility, according to each situation.

In addition, the structure mentioned above serves to show that the sergeant is controlling interaction through situations and checks, and soldiers are implicitly controlled, since they are only answering the sergeant’s simulations, and because field (see Appendix F) points out that this specific interaction is related to an inspection, demanding procedures to be checked, and consequently, leading to conclude that at least one participant will control the conversation. However, that control is rather similar to a common teacher/student relationship, than the one related to TV program “A Turma do Didi” (see Appendix C), which was permeated by offenses, in a similar inspection. Thus, the register in this excerpt serves to demystify the sergeant’s role in the interaction, because there were no insults in conversation, authority was naturally

exercised by the structure of situation, and soldiers' responses were permeated by statements. The example below can corroborate my conclusion:

Extracted from Excerpt 4 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------------|---|
| 3 | Sergeant | (i) E se ela já tiver recuperado a consciência, já, nesse procedimento que o 05 falou...(ii) Levantar o quadril... (iii) E aí? |
| 4 | Private 1 (05) | (i) Aí, eu vejo se a pulsação dela está normal. |
| 5 | Sergeant | (i) Ahn... |
| 6 | Private 1 (05) | (i) E verifico se está tudo bem. |
| 7 | Sergeant | (i) Uai! (ii) Mas já recuperou a consciência, já... |
| 8 | Private 1 (05) | (i) Aí, eu vou procurar um médico pra (inaudible). |
| 9 | Sergeant | (i) 'Tá certo. (ii) E se não recuperou? |
| 10 | Private 1 (05) | (i) Aí faz a massagem nas costas dela... (ii) Contando... (iii) Pressionando e contando 2001, 2002, solta, 2003, 2004... (iv) Aí == |

The register in Excerpt 5 is marked by contradictions in relation to media representations (see Chapter 3). Firstly, while analyzing participants in this conversation (a colonel, a major, a sub lieutenant and a corporal), one may say that the colonel will control the interaction. On the contrary, the corporal, who is positioned in the other extremity of the hierarchical rank, expresses his opinion and advice to the colonel as if he controlled the conversation. Secondly, field (see Appendix F) is related to administrative problems, and therefore it suggests that more experienced military can express opinions and suggestions, independently of hierarchical rank, and the commander gives an opportunity for subordinates to act in that way. Thirdly, the context of situation shows that the commander is, in fact, collecting as many opinions as possible to solve the problem, since he is responsible to decide, an occurrence that is not common to consider, according to media representations. The examples below can confirm subordinates' opinions and advice (underlined) to the commander:

Extracted from Excerpt 5 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|---------|------|
|------|---------|------|

| | | |
|---|----------------|---|
| 1 | Corporal | (i) <u>O negócio é o senhor ir lá fardado, conversar com o cara.</u> (ii) “Ó, vamos estudar isso aqui”. (iii) “Vem comigo lá no quartel”. (iv) Você ganha nisso, eu te dou aquilo, e tal”... (v) “Não, mas não dá”... (vi) “Tá bom”. (vii) “Vamos lá pro hotel”. ..(viii) <u>Melhor...</u> (ix) <u>Falar com a pessoa.</u> (x) <u>Porque esse negócio por telefone...</u> (xi) <u>Ah, não é comigo, não.</u> (xii) É com o gerente do não-sei-o-que. (xiii) Os caras ficam passando a perna na gente. (xiv) “Ah, não sei quem, não sei quem”. (xv) É igual o senhor falou. (xvi) Quantos anos que a Phone Company já está aqui, dois anos, sei lá. (xvii) E a gente não ganhou nada com isso! |
| 2 | Sub lieutenant | (i) <u>E eles ganham, né.</u> (ii) Porque ‘tá seguro... (iii) <u>Todo o sistema aqui...’tá seguro.</u> (iv) Energia, tudo, né == |
| 3 | Corporal | (i) == (i) Qualquer problema que dá, o cara liga daqui lá na central (inaudible). (ii) Às vezes, até daqui já resolve lá. |
| 4 | Sub lieutenant | (i) Nós temos dez – (ii) <u>Nós temos doze linhas aqui, ó.</u> [showing a map] (iii) O CIA ‘tá aqui, ó. (iv) (inaudible). |
| 5 | Commandant | (i) A...A questão disso daí é o seguinte... (ii) É que... (iii) Isso aí não é TÃO importante pra Phone Company, entendeu == |

The context of situation indicates that the corporal and the sub lieutenant are trying to convince the commandant to accept their viewpoint and that the commandant is feeling insecure in what procedure to adopt, as can be seen in examples above. Later, the commandant demonstrates inclination to accept subordinates’ suggestions. One passage that may corroborate acceptance by the commandant is the following (underlined):

Extracted from Excerpt 5 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|-----------------------------|---|
| 15 | Commandant | (i) <u>Bom, quer dizer, quem é que está nessa história desse negócio do link?</u> |
| 16 | Sub lieutenant and Corporal | (i) É o Joel. |
| 17 | Commandant | (i) <u>Nós vamos conversar de novo com esse Joel e ver, de novo, essa questão de custo aí.</u> (ii) Porque eu... (iii) Eu cheguei a falar sobre isso com o João. (iv) O João deu uma desconversada e tal. (v) <u>Eu vou voltar à carga com ele.</u> |

Here, the commander shows a tendency to accept subordinates’ arguments, when he asks the name of the man who is responsible for the negotiation (Turn 15). Later, the commandant shows his acceptance, when he uses the pronoun “we” (“nós”, in turn 17), suggesting that he was convinced and that all of them will talk to the responsible in the phone company, since they have the same viewpoint. After, the

commander reinforces his acceptance, saying “Eu vou voltar à carga com ele” (turn 17), demonstrating that his decision is the same suggested by his subordinates. The context of those two extracts from Excerpt 5 serves to corroborate that superiors can normally respect and follow subordinates’ suggestions, according to experience on the subject matter, and that a decision is not a superior’s prerogative, which can serve to dismantle the authoritarianism represented by the media.

Register in Excerpt 6 serves to confirm that superiors can consider subordinates’ opinion, as it happens in Excerpt 5. One example could be the following extract, when the captain is not sure about the category of a specific driver’s license, and asks the lieutenant’s opinion (doubts and opinions are underlined):

Extracted from Excerpt 6 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|--------------|--|
| 1 | Captain | (i) <u>O certo seria E, né.</u> (ii) Unidade tratora, unidade acoplada, reboque, semi-reboque, articulações [pause 3 secs] (iii) <u>É ou não é?</u> |
| 2 | Lieutenant 1 | (i) <u>Eu acho que é D.</u> (ii) Porque aí, é só senhor ultrapassar a tonelagem aí.(iii) Acho que o Light Gun não ultrapassa essa – (iv) Acho que ele não chega a ultrapassar essa tonelagem. |
| 3 | Captain | (i) Meia dúzia toneladas? |
| 4 | Lieutenant 1 | (i) É. (ii) Só que é seis toneladas que ‘tá marcando aqui. |
| 5 | Captain | (i) <u>É, mas aí deve ser o conjunto inteiro, né?</u> (ii) Caminhão, gente e...a articulação. (i) <u>Eu acho que é a classe D, então.</u> (ii) <u>Eu ‘tava conversando com o pessoal do DETRAN e...cheguei a ver a fundo isso aí, né.</u> [pause 3 secs] (iii) Ficaria... (iii) Seria a D, né. (iv) Ficaria mais uns quinhentos e pouco aí [pause 3 secs] (v) E a D é fácil de tirar. (vi) O pessoal empresta o microônibus pra gente. (vii) O pessoal da PM. (inaudible) |
| 6 | Lieutenant 1 | |

The captain’s doubts can be seen in turns 1 and 5, when he tries to confirm his opinion, asking the lieutenant. The lieutenant, on the contrary, demonstrates certainty in his responses, which can be confirmed by turns 2 (“Eu acho que é D.”) and 5 (“...cheguei a ver a fundo isso aí, né.”). The context in this passage shows that, firstly, the captain is not sure and tries to support his viewpoint on the lieutenant’s opinion. Secondly, the lieutenant contradicts a superior’s viewpoint, based on his experience on

the subject, and the superior respects it. Thus, register is useful in this passage to demonstrate that military discourse is not only permeated by a blind obedience, since in Excerpt 5, a commandant was convinced to act according to his subordinates' suggestions, and in Excerpt 6, a subordinate disagrees of a superior's opinion.

Excerpt 6 is also marked by changes in the context, from formality to informality. This can happen because there are many interactants involved and because, even if the initial purpose is to discuss drivers' licenses categories, the title of the excerpt itself suggests informality (during a coffee break), even between superiors and subordinates, in opposition to media representations. One example which can illustrate that change in the context is the following:

Extracted from Excerpt 6 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|--------------|--|
| 23 | Captain | == (i) Vem cá, o que que a regra do jogo no Exército fala? |
| 24 | Sergeant 1 | (i) Tem que obedecer as normas do == [everybody talks at the same time]. |
| 25 | Captain | (i) Agora, a parada é a seguinte [pause 3 secs]. (ii) O cara pra pegar uma 2 e ½ e conduzir um obuseiro atrelado e a guarnição dele dentro, pô, tem que ter a D, pelo que tu tá falando. |
| 26 | Sergeant 1 | (i) Tem que ter a D. |
| 27 | Captain | (i) E não tem. (ii) Tem a C. (iii) Porque se essa viatura vira – (iv) Se a viatura vira, morrem cinco, #, quem é o culpado? (v) Há! (vi) Primeiro vão perguntar: “Tava de capacete?” (vii) Tava. (viii) “O motorista... tá amarrado” (ix) “Qual é a categoria dele? É C. Não, é C, mas ele tava carregando gente. Como é que pode ser C?”. [pause 4 secs]. |
| 28 | Sergeant 1 | (i) Eu concordo com o senhor. |
| 29 | Captain | (i) Capa preta vai vir de #, né cara. |
| 30 | Lieutenant 2 | (i) Ih! [laughs]. |
| NV 4 | - | [everybody laughs]. |
| 31 | Lieutenant 2 | (i) Que é isso? (ii) O senhor é Capitão do Exército, quase major == |
| 32 | Captain | == (i) ‘Rapa == |
| 33 | Lieutenant 2 | == (i) É sério... |
| 34 | Captain | (i) Isso é processo. (ii) É capa preta. [everybody laughs and talks at the same time]. |

From the extract above, it is possible to realize that from turns 23 to 28, the topic of the conversation sustains a formal interaction and the roles of participants are maintained, since the sergeant is using “senhor” while talking to the captain. After one funny comment by the captain (turn 29), the topics changes, and as it can normally happen in coffee breaks, officers and sergeants start to laugh and talk about other subjects. Curiously, even if the context suggests informality, in this example the captain’s authority is recognized, when the lieutenant 2, for example, even joking with the captain, uses “senhor” when referring to his superior. Thus, Excerpt 6 confirms that formality and informality can happen in military discourse, and authority is normally exercised.

Excerpt 7 typically marks an informal context, since the topic of conversation is the same all the time, and it is not related to a professional subject. In addition, turns are expressed in the majority to statements as initiation of conversations (underlined below), which demands an expected response of acknowledgement. In this sense, the speech role of giving, associated to the commodity of information can provide informality to the context of situation, as can be seen in the example below:

Extracted from Excerpt 7 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|-----------|---|
| 22 | Major | (i) Esse João. (ii) Não sei qual internet que ele entra, aí, que ele vê que tá vindo o Oliver Khan == |
| 23 | Captain | (i) É... |
| 24 | Major | (i) E com a venda do Maldonado, eles tão entrando num acordo, porque o Ronaldinho, depois que jogou o casaco pro alto, lá, diz que brigou com o Luxemburgo, aí parece que o Cruzeiro == |
| 25 | Soldier 1 | (i) O Cruzeiro <u>que revelou ele</u> . [laughs]. |
| 26 | Major | (i) <u>Quem revelou ele</u> foi o São Cristóvão. |
| NV 6 | - | [laughs]. |
| 27 | Soldier 1 | (i) <u>Foi igual ao Jussie</u> . (ii) Jussie ‘tava sendo vendido pelo Cruzeiro e ‘tava com medo de um time – (iii) Porque ele jogou num time lá do Rio, né. (iv) ‘Tava com medo que o time entrasse na justiça pra ganhar um bocado de dinheiro |

| | | |
|----|-----------|--|
| | | também. |
| 28 | Major | (i) <u>Hoje em dia, é fogo.</u> (ii) <u>O cara tem direitos federativos presos ao clube, o passe dele preso ao empresário.</u> (iii) Aí, não sei o que, direito de imagem preso ao clube. (iv) Quer dizer, o cara, às vezes, tem que negociar com três – (v) Negociar com três – (vi) Rescindir três contratos, se bobear. |
| 29 | Soldier 2 | (i) Ronaldinho deu entrevista uma vez, falando que o clube que ele queria jogar quando voltasse ao Brasil, era o Flamengo... |
| 30 | Soldier 1 | (i) É... |

The extract above is characterized by the participation of all the military involved in the interaction, each one using statements to express their opinions. The interaction naturally flows because of the subject itself, and due to each statement uttered by one participant, the other participant recognizes the comment and uses it to continue the conversation, as can be seen in the sequence from turns 25 to 28, for example (underlined). In addition, differently from Excerpt 6, when even in jokes, subordinates used “senhor” to refer to their superior; in this excerpt, it is almost impossible to determine who is the authority because the context of situation stimulates an informal relationship between participants, and therefore, in 66 turns there are only two references to authority (turns 21 and 39), which can reinforce the occurrence of informality in military discourse, even between soldiers and officers.

Finally, in Excerpt 8, analysis of tenor indicates the roles of a sergeant and a private interacting in an informal way. Even though it is a formal situation, because participants are talking about the last formation, the relationship between the two participants seems to be friendly, since the private feels comfortable to explain his plans for the future, and to describe problems in his family (underlined below), according to examples 1 and 2 below, respectively:

Example 1: extracted from Excerpt 8 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 22 | Sergeant | (i) Isso é bom. (ii) <u>Que cursos que ‘cê ‘tá fazendo lá?</u> |
| 23 | Private | (i) Qual deles? (ii) O da noite? (iii) (inaudible) (iv) Uai, sei lá – (v) <u>Colocar mais uns – (vi) Mais um – (vii) Um curso no meu currículo, né.</u> |

| | | |
|----|----------|---|
| 24 | Sergeant | (i) Pra quê? (ii) 'Cê não 'tá trabalhando bem? |
| 25 | Private | (i) Sim, senhor. |
| 26 | Sergeant | (i) Então. |
| 27 | Private | (i) Mas o meu currículo – (ii) <u>Um dia se eu sair daqui, uai, 'vô ficar mexendo com computador a vida toda.</u> |

Example 2: extracted from Excerpt 8 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 28 | Sergeant | (i) E a escola? |
| 29 | Private | (i) Na escola não 'tô estudando ultimamente, não, sargento. (ii) <u>Parei de estudar.</u> (iii) No terceiro ano. |
| 30 | Sergeant | (i) Por que? |
| 31 | Private | (i) <u>Por falta de tempo.</u> |
| 32 | Sergeant | (i) Tempo! |
| 33 | Private | (i) Trabalhava em rádio. (ii) Não tinha tempo, não. (iii) Mas, falei com meu pai, com minha mãe, e tal – (iv) Não concordou muito, não. (v) Mas, depois... (vi) <u>Era pra trabalhar, mesmo.</u> (vii) <u>Minha família necessita muito.</u> |
| 34 | Sergeant | (i) Seu pai e sua mãe concordaram? |
| 35 | Private | (i) Concordaram, porque era pra mim trabalhar, né. (ii) <u>E a minha mãe precisa de mim, também.</u> (iii) <u>Minha mãe –</u> (iv) <u>Ela não ganha um salário assim, né.</u> (v) <u>Minha mãe passa por dificuldades pra caramba.</u> (vi) <u>E eu ajudo ela em casa.</u> |

From the analysis of register and mood choices in each excerpt of Appendix F, it was possible to verify that the military can adapt their choices, according to the context of situation. In addition, this variation in use occurs in a natural way, and independently of the formality or informality of the situation, authority is respected. Furthermore, orders are firmly passed to subordinates, and opinions and suggestions by subordinates are respected, which can illustrate a view of military discourse, different from those presented in the media.

4.4.1.2. Mood choices and modality

In Chapter 2, register, mood and modality were studied as important instruments of SFL, while analyzing the context of situation. One part of mood was previously analyzed in the last subsection, through speech roles and commodities, in

order to complement analysis focused on register, since the main objective was to analyze the social context. In this subsection, I analyze the other part of mood, compounded by structures of clauses, considering transcriptions in Appendix F, with corresponding analytical results. In addition, modality, as an “intermediate degree between positive and negative” (Halliday, 1994, p. 88), involving modalization (occurrences of probability and usuality) and modulation (referring to obligation and inclination), can provide a complete structural analysis of clauses. Thus, in this subsection, I analyze the main characteristics of mood and modality in order to verify if superiors are rude and impolite when interacting with subordinates, as suggested by the media, in Chapter 3.

In Excerpt 1, the interaction between the captain and the lieutenant are marked by the structure question-answer, because the captain is interested in confirming the assembly of obstacle course, as I have mentioned in the last subsection. In this sense, the interaction is always initiated by the captain, through polar and wh interrogatives, as can be seen in the example below:

Example 1: extracted from Excerpt 1 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|------------|---|
| 4 | Captain | == (i) Quem que está contigo na pista de corda? |
| 5 | Lieutenant | (i) (inaudible) (ii) Sargento A, Sargento B, Sargento C, Sargento D, Sargento E, Sargento F, Sargento G, Cabo H, Soldado I, Cabo J, Cabo K, Cabo L, Cabo M, Cabo == |
| 6 | Captain | == (i) Esse pessoal amanhã, vão ‘tá contigo a partir de que horas? (ii) Só na parte da tarde? |
| 7 | Lieutenant | (i) A partir das 13:00 horas. (ii) E o pessoal que vai montar a pista de cordas, que são alguns desses aqui, na parte da manhã também. |
| 8 | Captain | (i) Ah! (ii) ‘Tá pensando em colocar na parte da manhã? |
| 9 | Lieutenant | (i) Sim, senhor. |
| 10 | Captain | (i) Que horas que você acha que vai dar o pronto da pista? |
| 11 | Lieutenant | (i) Olha, só falta montar é... (ii) A falsa baiana e o... lepar. |

As can be seen, the structure question-answer serves in fact, to characterize who is the authority in the relationship, since the captain is always

initiating the interaction. In a complement, the analytical results (see Table 1.3, in Appendix 6) can depict some important observations, and despite the relationship between a superior and a subordinate; the interaction is not heavy and not permeated by commands. As can be seen, the number of turns is equal for both participants (total of eleven), which indicates a certain balance in the conversation. In relation to the declarative aspect, the lieutenant produced seven clauses (full and elliptical), whereas the captain produced only four. This fact serves to clarify that, firstly, the lieutenant is answering the captain's questions corresponding to the obstacle course; and secondly, that the high number of declaratives demonstrates the lieutenant's assurance in what he is responsible to accomplish.

Thus, it is possible to verify that the superior is not giving orders to his subordinate. On the contrary, he is modalizing his questions (asking for probabilities), and the subordinate is feeling comfortable to negotiate the accomplishment of the mission. The following example can illustrate this relationship (modalizations are underlined):

Example 2: extracted from Excerpt 1 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|------------|---|
| 8 | Captain | (i) Ah! (ii) ' <u>Tá pensando</u> em colocar na parte da manhã? |
| 9 | Lieutenant | (i) Sim, senhor. |
| 10 | Captain | (i) Que horas <u>que você acha</u> que vai dar o pronto da pista? |
| 11 | Lieutenant | (i) <u>Olha</u> , só falta montar é... (ii) A falsa baiana e o... lepar. |
| 12 | Captain | (i) ' <u>Cê acha</u> que [pause 3 secs] == |
| 13 | Lieutenant | == (i) <u>Eu acho que</u> vai até a hora do almoço. |
| 14 | Captain | (i) Montando? |
| 15 | Lieutenant | (i) Sim, senhor. (ii) Porque... (iii) Alguns – (iv) Alguns lugares lá teve que trocar uns pedaços de pau pra emendar na outra árvore (inaudible). (i) E na quinta feira <u>tem condições de tu fazer essa pista?</u> (ii) Porque é o seguinte... (iii) A PM quer... ver se [pause 3 secs] (iv) Poderia passar treze soldados do grupamento especial deles, lá. (v) (inaudible). (vi) ' <u>Cê consegue</u> manter esse pessoal contigo? |
| 16 | Captain | |

- 17 Lieutenant (i) Se eu não conseguir, eu consigo outras pessoas para auxiliar na, na – (ii) É interessante o Cabo H, o J e o C ==

As can be seen, the captain modalizes his questions, while using expressions of medium probability, such as it happens in turns 8, 10, 12 and 16 (see underlined words above). The lieutenant only suggests a modalization, when he uses “Olha” (turn 11), indicating that he is trying to negotiate the term of accomplishment of mission. Later, the lieutenant demonstrates his assurance, when he uses “Eu acho..” (turn 14) and “..eu consigo..” (turn 17), which has a medium effect in probability. Thus, when the captain modalizes his questions, and the lieutenant expresses his assurance by full declarative clauses, the effects of authority and obligation seem to be reduced. Consequently, if obligation is reduced in the interaction, inclination becomes stronger, and that is the probable reason why the lieutenant is feeling comfortable to answer the questions (turns 14 and 17), because he is assuming responsibility in accomplishing the mission.

In this sense, it seems that, even if the context of situation involves the relationship between a superior and a subordinate, authority and discipline are only realized in clauses by the use of subject choices “Você” and “Tu” by the captain (see turns 8, 10, 12 and 16, in example 2, above) and by the mode of address “Sim, senhor” (turns 9 and 15, above), produced by the lieutenant, since there are no imperatives. This fact can also dismantle the authoritarian way of commanding suggested by media representations, because in a simple question-answer structure, the superior obtained everything he wanted to know and to be done, without being impolite or without using imperatives.

In the last subsection, I have discussed that social context in Excerpt 1 is different from Excerpts 2 and 3. The same happens in relation to the structure of clauses, because now, in Excerpts 2 and 3, there is a predominance of imperatives (six

by the sergeant and eight by the lieutenant, respectively), in contrast with the modalized/modulated clauses in Excerpt 1. The following examples can characterize imperatives (underlined) in each excerpt:

Example 1: extracted from Excerpt 2 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | Sergeant | (i) <u>Presta atenção.</u> (ii) 'Bora. (iii) Acerta, <u>acerta.</u> (iv) <u>Cerra pra cá a patrulha.</u> (v) <u>Presta atenção.</u> (vi) Os senhores agora vão passar por um ponto inimigo, certo? (vii) Nós vamos lançar vocês para buscar uma mensagem, que nós precisamos dela aqui, no final. (viii) Dúvidas? |
| 2 | Privates | (i) Não, senhor. |

Example 2: extracted from Excerpt 3 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|------------|---|
| 13 | Lieutenant | (i) Se alguém se perder, você vai atrás, pra procurar esse pessoal que ficou perdido. (ii) Então 'tá bom. (iii) Vamos lá. (iv) Xerife. (v) Quando eu falar 'vai', você vai pegar o seu pessoal, vai botar em coluna por um aqui. (vi) O subcomandante vai na frente, o senhor vai à retaguarda e os seus companheiros vão no centro. (vii) Você vai deslocar esse pessoal até a linha de cones. (viii) Dúvidas? |
| 14 | Sheriff | (i) Não, senhor. |
| 15 | Lieutenant | (i) <u>Vai, xerife.</u> (ii) <u>Atua, xerife.</u> (iii) <u>Vai.</u> (iv) <u>Controla, xerife.</u> (v) <u>Vai.</u> (vi) <u>Manda, manda, xerife, manda...</u> |

Another important result related to commands is the lack of declarative and interrogative clauses by the privates (zero in Excerpt 2 and only one in Excerpt 3), which can be explained by clear orders that are checked by superiors all the time, by using the question "Dúvidas?" (see in turns 1 and 13, in the examples above). One important difference between Excerpts 2 and 3 is the use of interpersonal adjuncts. In Excerpt 2, the sergeant did not use interpersonal adjuncts, whereas the lieutenant specially used vocatives "Xerife" (turns 3, 13, 15 and 17) and "Subcomandante" (turns 5 and 11), for example. This difference may suggest that the sergeant was only concerned about instructing privates, and the lieutenant tried to develop a certain level

of involvement, by using vocatives, probably to diminish the effects of authority, as can be seen in examples below:

Example 1: extracted from Excerpt 2 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 9 | Sergeant | (i) Visto a lâmpada do meio? (ii) A lâmpada do meio. (iii) Tem a da esquerda, a do meio e a da direita. (iv) Lá é o eixo? |
| 10 | Privates | (i) Dois. |
| 11 | Sergeant | (i) Eixo dois. (ii) Vocês podem ir para lá, e pegar já o azimute do eixo dois. |

Example 2: extracted from Excerpt 3 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|-------------|---|
| 11 | Lieutenant | == (i) Você controla o efetivo, você não comanda. (ii) Quem comanda é o comandante. (iii) Subcomandante, 'cê 'tá querendo dar o golpe? (iv) É...golpe de estado! (v) Dúvidas? |
| 12 | Sub sheriff | (i) Não, senhor. |
| 13 | Lieutenant | (i) Se alguém se perder, você vai atrás, pra procurar esse pessoal que ficou perdido. (ii) Então 'tá bom. (iii) Vamos lá. (iv) Xerife. (v) Quando eu falar 'vai', você vai pegar o seu pessoal, vai botar em coluna por um aqui. (vi) O subcomandante vai na frente, o senhor vai à retaguarda e os seus companheiros vão no centro. (vii) Você vai deslocar esse pessoal até a linha de cones. (viii) Dúvidas? |

In addition, a command itself may suggest rude orders if compared to media representations (see Appendix 3 and 4) and to civilians' beliefs. However, it is worth noting in both excerpts the mode of address "Senhor", used as subject choices by the sergeant (turn 1) and the lieutenant (turns 1, 3, 5 and 13). This use can cause a positive effect, since it can demystify the authoritarian and rude way of commanding, because, at least in these excerpts, the higher the hierarchical rank, the larger the use of the mode of address "Senhor" (one by the sergeant and five by the lieutenant). Furthermore, the subject choice "Você", which should be more related to imperatives in the army, was used eight times by the sergeant, whereas the lieutenant used it seven times, which can represent a certain balance, since the lieutenant used "Senhor" five times, thus deconstructing the perspective related to commands in the army as impolite.

Even though Excerpts 2 and 3 are permeated by orders, it is important to characterize that the privates' dignity were maintained, firstly, in relation to the use of "Senhor", by superiors, in dictating respect; and secondly, because in Excerpt 2, the sergeant did not use slang or swearing, and the only rude moment occurred in turn 12 ("CESSA O PAPO"), when the sergeant called privates' attention to keep silence. In addition, in Excerpt 3, even though the lieutenant equally used subject choices "senhor" and "você", and vocatives "xerife" and "subcomandante", he used some slang and jokes, which might contribute to reduce the distance between superior and subordinate, as suggested by Holmes (2000), while stating that humor "can be used to achieve the speaker's instrumental goal while apparently de-emphasizing the power differential" (p. 165). The examples (underlined) below can confirm this perspective:

Extracted from Excerpt 3 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Clause |
|------|--|
| 3 | (iv) Você é o único que não <u>passou a bola</u> para o subxerife. |
| 3 | (v) Mas o subxerife também é culpado, ou seja, acusou o xerife de <u>bisonho</u> porque vai perder o material. |
| 3 | (ix) O senhor e quem perdeu vai ficar procurando o material ali na pista, ao invés de ficar <u>torando</u> . |
| 11 | (iii) Subcomandante, <u>'cê 'tá querendo dar o golpe?</u> (iv) <u>É... golpe de estado!</u> |
| 17 | (iii) <u>Ih, xerife, você 'tava indo tão bem.</u> |
| 19 | (i) <u>'Tá parecendo uma escola de samba.</u> |

Excerpt 4 can also present some important results, which can corroborate that the discourse uttered by sergeants is not rude and impolite, as the media suggests. Firstly, there are occurrences of declarative clauses, when the sergeant produced six (three elliptical and three full) against four by each private. Since the privates and the sergeant produced almost the same number of declaratives, this fact suggests that they are, most of the times, initiating interaction, thus providing new information. However, while analyzing the interaction itself, it is possible to realize that most of sergeant's

declarative clauses were produced to check the right procedures by privates. Thus, this fact can lead to understand that, since the sergeant is checking the privates' procedures, the privates, in fact, initiate exchanges, while the sergeant repeats information in order to verify if procedures are correct. This can be seen in the example below:

Extracted from Excerpt 4 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------------|--|
| 12 | Sergeant | (i) Bom, 05 e 07... (ii) Você – (iii) Vocês dois, mais o soldado José estavam atravessando um curso d'água, e o soldado José começa a se afogar. (iv) Procedimentos. |
| 13 | Private 2 (07) | (i) Trago pra margem. |
| 14 | Sergeant | (i) Trouxe pra margem. |
| 15 | Private 2 (07) | (i) Depois, a gente confere se tem alguma coisa... (ii) Um galho (inaudible)... |
| 16 | Sergeant | (i) Confere aí, então. |
| 17 | Private 2 (07) | (i) Aí, não tem nada. (ii) Ele tá sem pulsação (iii) Aí, eu vou virar a vítima de bruços (inaudible)... |

Another important result to be analyzed is the high proportion of minor clauses produced by the sergeant (nine at all), compared to the privates (zero). The effect of that high proportion used by the sergeant suggests, more than a simple agreement with the privates' responses, that it serves to reduce the distance between participants, since minor clauses can be considered as one characteristic of casual conversation, as suggested by Eggins & Slade (1997, p. 94). In this sense, in Excerpt 4, since the sergeant is checking the privates' procedures, according to each right procedure, he demonstrates his agreement using minor clauses, as a teacher might do, while checking students' knowledge, thus reducing the hierarchical distance, since the objective is to check procedures and not give orders. The example below (underlined) can confirm this partial conclusion:

Extracted from Excerpt 4 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------------|------------------------------|
| 19 | Private 2 (07) | (i) Aí, eu comprimo assim == |

| | | | |
|----|----------------|-------|--|
| 20 | Sergeant | | == (i) Até o que? |
| 21 | Private 2 (07) | | (i) Até a água sair totalmente == |
| 22 | Sergeant | | == (i) 'Tá. (ii) Então, já saiu. (iii) E aí? |
| 23 | Private 2 (07) | | (i) Aí ele – (ii) Ele ainda não voltou a si. |
| 24 | Sergeant | E aí? | (i) 'Tá. (ii) Põe a cabeça escorada num braço, o outro esticado... (iii) |
| 25 | Private 2 (07) | | (i) Aí, vou fazer a massagem cardíaca. |
| 26 | Sergeant | | (i) 'Tá... |
| 27 | Private 2 (07) | | [private demonstrates the massage]. (i) 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 == |
| 28 | Sergeant | | == (i) Quantas vezes você vai fazer isso aí? |
| 29 | Private 2 (07) | | (i) De doze a quinze vezes. |
| 30 | Sergeant | | (i) 'Tá. |

Now analyzing Excerpt 5, it depicts a balanced number of turns, which can reinforce that all the military involved in the conversation had the opportunity of participating, through opinions and suggestions. In addition, the number of clauses can suggest that the commander controls the conversation (33 clauses). However, while comparing the number of clauses, it is important to realize that the lowest rank participating in the interaction (the corporal, in this case), contributed more than the other interactants (23 for the corporal, 19 for the sub lieutenant and only 7 for the major).

That proportion can contradict media representations, since they suggest total control of conversation by the most powerful interactant. In fact, the commander controls the interaction, according to the number of turns and clauses, but the context of situation can explain the corporal's high production of turns and clauses. Since the corporal is an expert on the subject, no matter the authority and hierarchical distance, his opinion will be at least considered and respected, and that is the reason why the corporal directly expresses his position, as can be seen in the example below:

Extracted from Excerpt 5 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | Corporal | (i) <u>O negócio é o senhor ir lá fardado, conversar com o cara.</u> (ii) “Ó, vamos estudar isso aqui”. (iii) “Vem comigo lá no quartel”. (iv) Você ganha nisso, eu te dou aquilo, e tal”... (v) “Não, mas não dá”... (vi) “Tá bom”. (vii) “Vamos lá pro hotel”...(viii) Melhor... (ix) Falar com a pessoa. (x) <u>Porque esse negócio por telefone...</u> (xi) <u>Ah, não é comigo, não.</u> (xii) É com o gerente do não-sei-o-que. (xiii) Os caras ficam passando a perna na gente. (xiv) “Ah, não sei quem, não sei quem”. (xv) É igual o senhor falou. (xvi) Quantos anos que a Phone Company já está aqui, dois anos, sei lá. (xvii) E a gente não ganhou nada com isso! |

In addition, there is one factor that can serve to reduce the distance between superiors and subordinates, in this excerpt, which is the number of declarative clauses. The commander produced eleven declarative clauses (7 full and 4 elliptical), whereas the corporal produced thirteen declarative clauses (5 full and 8 elliptical). This fact suggests that the commander controls the interaction, but the corporal had almost the same opportunity to express his ideas, since he produced five full declarative clauses against seven produced by the commander, which represents a certain balance in interaction, despite the commander’s authority. In short, the results analyzed until this moment point out that the commander is respecting the corporal’s opinion.

In relation to issues of power/authority and politeness, it seems that incomplete clauses, subject choices and imperatives may depict important observations. The commander produced fourteen incomplete clauses, whereas the corporal produced only seven. That proportion probably suggests that, according to the high position in battalion, the commander shows his awareness in keeping the distance from subordinates, by planning each clause before uttering it. The corporal, on the contrary, tries to reduce that distance, by producing seven incomplete clauses and thirteen declarative clauses, in order to clearly mark his position in relation to the subject. The example below can illustrate the difference (underlined) mentioned above:

Extracted from Excerpt 5 (Appendix F).

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|------------|---|
| 6 | Corporal | == (i) <u>Mas também, coronel, um link para eles não é nada.</u> (ii) Um link de 64 mega == |
| 7 | Commandant | (i) EU SEI. (ii) <u>É...eu sei...</u> (iii) O...O problema é que isso daí para eles é custo, para eles é dinheiro, né. (iv) <u>Agora, se eu tirar eles daqui...a Phone Company...</u> (v) Ela...ela vai fazer um armariozinho ali do lado da linha do trem. (vi) Depois, não vai dar certo de novo. (vii) <u>Aí, ela vai reagir de acordo com a –</u> (viii) Com o custo que ela vai ter. (ix) Ou seja, em vez de ela ter um custo fixo, ela vai ter um custo que vai estar esporádico == |

Subject choices serve to point out the unequal relationship in the interaction. Since the commander selected ‘Eu’ seven times as the subject of his clauses, it shows his awareness in centralizing conversation, thus demonstrating his authority. However, since the commander did not use imperatives, it may balance issues of power/authority. As a consequence, modality features tend to be related to probability and inclination, rather than obligation. In addition, the commander did not use obligation clauses in his utterances, thus suggesting that the commander is modalizing and modulating his clauses, thus reinforcing the idea of respecting subordinates’ opinions and naturally exercising authority.

Finally, the analysis of Excerpts 6 to 8 can be facilitated, because their analytical results suggest informality. In this sense, they present common characteristics, such as a high number of turns and clauses, declarative clauses and minor clauses by all the participants, as if they were trying to expose their ideas at the same time, and as if they suggested familiarity or proximity. In contrast, Excerpts 6 to 8 present a low proportion of clauses related to modalization and modulation, suggesting that participants are concerned with talking, rather than planning their choices. Thus, I prefer to discuss those characteristics, while classifying excerpts as casual or pragmatic, in the next subsection.

4.4.1.3. Pragmatic and casual conversation

The sequence of excerpts above is not a coincidence. I have selected them in this sequence because they may represent military representations in battalions, from the most formal to the most informal interactions, passing through intermediate productions. Thus, that sequence may provide a better idea of military discourse in battalions, since it will be gradually developed, from pragmatic to casual conversation (see Figure 2.3), and it can also provide the characteristics of each type of conversation in the army.

In this sense, this last subsection related to SFL will serve to classify excerpts presented in Appendix F as pragmatic or casual, according to Eggins' (2000) theory presented in Chapter 2, which can confirm my previous sequence. It is important to mention that not all the characteristics cited in Figure 2.3 will be interpreted in my study, but those that can serve to demystify the military discourse related to issues of authority, formality and rudeness.

In a first analysis, it is possible to realize that, from Excerpts 1 to 4, interactions vary according to distance in relation to authority. Thus, in Excerpt 1, there is certain proximity in hierarchical rank (captain-lieutenant); and in Excerpt 2, 3 and 4, the distance increases (sergeant-privates, and lieutenant-privates). Excerpt 5 probably marks the higher distance in this study, since it involves, among other participants, a commander and a corporal (see Appendix 1 to verify their position in hierarchical rank).

From Excerpts 6 to 8, the same effect was produced, since in Excerpt 6, there is certain proximity between participants (captain-lieutenant), whereas in Excerpts 7 and 8, the distance increases (captain-soldiers, and sergeant-private). Again, it is important to mention that it is not a coincidence, and since the object of this research is

to demystify relations of power and authority in the army, it seems that analyzing interactions involving military in opposite positions in the hierarchical scale may contribute to confirm my hypothesis.

After analyzing analytical results in the last subsection, it is also important to verify occurrences of formality/informality in each excerpt. In this sense, I would apply Eggins (2000) study in everyday talk, as can be seen in Chapter 2 (Figure 2.3), in order to classify interactions as pragmatic (formal) or casual (informal). Thus, it is possible to consider Excerpts 1 to 4 as pragmatic conversation, according to the main characteristics related to this kind of interaction. Firstly, because all of them were functionally motivated, since in Excerpt 1, the purpose is to verify if an obstacle course is ready; in Excerpts 2 and 3, the purpose is to instruct privates; and in Excerpt 4, the purpose is to verify soldiers knowledge. Secondly, there is a certain stability of field-tenor-mode, since after each question, there is a response in Excerpt 1; and after each command or situation, there is the corresponding execution by the privates, in Excerpts 2 to 4. This fact can characterize stability of those structures, pointing out that the participants are controlling interactions, from the beginning to the end.

In addition, Excerpts 1 to 4 present brief clauses, which is another characteristic of pragmatic conversation, normally following the structure question-answer or command-execution. Furthermore, those two types of structures can explain other two characteristics, which are relative brevity of interaction and discernible generic structure, because the structures are simple, direct and well defined, and once the objective is reached, conversation ends. In relation to role differentiation and mood choices, it is also possible to classify excerpts analyzed as pragmatic, because in Excerpt 1, a superior wants information, and in Excerpts 2 to 4, superiors want execution. As a consequence, their mood choices are carried out by means of

declarative, interrogative and imperative clauses, clearly establishing the main purpose of superiors in each interaction, as it was discussed during the analysis of results in each excerpt.

If Excerpts 1 to 4 can be classified as pragmatic, according to the reasons above, it seems that Excerpt 5, varies from pragmatic to casual conversation. I would say that because it presents a purpose (an administrative problem to be solved) and role differentiation is well defined, since the commander wants information to decide, which are characteristics of pragmatic conversation. However, it also presents characteristics of casual conversation, such as colloquial language, through the use of slang “cara” and “passando a perna” (corporal, in turn 1), “eu vou voltar à carga” (commander, in turn 17), and “chutou o pau da barraca” (sub lieutenant, in turn 18). Multilogue is also present in this excerpt, when the corporal directly tries to expose his ideas, using many comments as possible in order to convince the commander, thus dividing the audience and balancing the interrelation.

Excerpt 5 also presents differences in mood choices, if compared to Excerpts 1 to 4, since the corporal and the sub lieutenant almost presented the same number of declarative clauses as the commander produced. In this sense, even though the commander is recognizably the authority in the context of situation, the high number of declarative clauses by the corporal and the sub lieutenant suggests that they are, at least, initiating exchanges as the commander does, as can be seen in Table 1.11, where the results are almost equal (4 by the commander, 3 by the sub lieutenant and 2 by the corporal). The specific case of Excerpt 5 can confirm Drew & Heritage (1992) studies, when they recognize that the limits between pragmatic and casual conversation “can appear permeable and uncertain” (p.28), and in this sense, I would rather say that Excerpt 5 represents a transition from pragmatic to casual conversation.

Thus, I arranged the sequence of excerpts in Appendix F, in order to discuss formality and informality in the army. In this sense, after analyzing Excerpts 1 to 5, it is possible to verify, according to Eggins (2000) characteristics of pragmatic and casual conversation; that Excerpts 1 to 4 express characteristics of pragmatic conversation; Excerpt 5 seems to be an intermediate case; and Excerpts 6 to 8 suggest aspects related to casual conversation.

In Excerpt 6, even if the main topic of conversation seems to be about drivers' license categories, the context of situation (a coffee break) itself provokes a reduction of formality. Thus, this conversation initiates with a purpose (discussion about drivers' license, from turn 1 to 6), then it changes to the captain's jokes on lieutenant 2 (turn 7 to 17), then it changes again to the captain's comment on the lack of officers in that battalion (turn 18 to 21), returning to the topic of drivers' license (turn 22 to 28), changing to the lieutenant's joke on the captain's comments (turn 29 to 39), and finally ending in major 1's joke on sergeant 1 and returning to the topic of drivers' license by major 2 (turn 42 to 47).

Another typical characteristic is multilogue, specially represented by dispute for audience by lieutenant 2 (23 clauses) and the captain (39 clauses). The high number of clauses uttered by each of them can suggest their awareness in keeping the audience's attention. In addition, Excerpt 6 is permeated by slang, such as "esse cabeça" (turn 10), "cara" (turns 18 and 20), "saindo pelo ladrão" (turn 20), and "a parada é a seguinte" (turn 25); by swearing expressing sexual acts, such as "vai passar a mão ..." (turn 10) and "ca pa preta vai vir de #" (turn 29); and by typical jargon in the army, such as "regra do jogo" (turn 23), "guarnição" (turn 25), and "capa preta" (turn 34), which suggest that those expressions of involvement and humor can provide equality of social roles, another characteristic of casual conversation.

Curiously, the fact that the captain produced a high number of clauses (total of 39), added to his position in hierarchical rank (see Appendix A) lead us to expect the control of conversation (and he does, since he initiates many exchanges) and distance among participants of different ranks. However, multilogue combined with slang, jokes, swearing and jargon, serve to reduce distance and to dismantle the formality of the situation.

Excerpt 7 reveals the same characteristics presented in the last excerpt, but with two important differences: the topic of conversation and the context of situation. By analyzing these two aspects it is possible to conclude that Excerpt 7 represents a typical case of casual conversation, since field here refers to one topic, soccer, which is very common in military environment; and the analysis of tenor reveals that participants are closely related, through the use of colloquial language (slang, swearing, and typical terms of soccer), of multilogue (dispute for turns by the captain, the major and soldier 1), and of mood choices, permeated by vocatives, slang, and humor. In sum, it seems that Excerpt 7 is much more informal than all the other excerpts, because of the topic of conversation, which is the same through 66 turns, leading participants to act in a friendly way, thus breaking the stability of field-tenor-mode, which is an important characteristic in pragmatic conversation.

Finally, Excerpt 8 serves to oppose the formality presented in Excerpt 2, since both of them involve the sergeant and privates as participants, but in different contexts. In this sense, if in Excerpt 2, the sergeant is concerned about instructing soldiers; Excerpt 8 reveals the sergeant's awareness of privates' life in battalion and its probable consequences to privates' personal life. This context can explain why the soldier produced more clauses than the sergeant (37 to 32), in an equal relationship, due to the same number of turns (total of 17) for both participants; to the high number of

minor clauses (4 by the sergeant and 5 by the soldier); to the high number of declarative by the private (total of 7); and to the high number of subject choices ‘Eu’ by the private, thus centralizing interaction. The results above explain the reduction of the distance in hierarchy, contributing to classify Excerpt 8 as casual conversation, since the private’s productions were more equal to the sergeant’s than in Excerpt 2, thus provoking an equality in social roles.

Considering all the examples cited above, with their corresponding analyses based on SFL theory, reinforced by Eggins’ (2000) precepts in evaluating interactions as pragmatic or casual, it is possible to realize that formality occurs more frequently than informality, probably due to hierarchy, discipline and to an environment marked by instructions and encampments, which can mark authorities’ attitudes rather than subordinates’ responses or opinions. However, informality can also happen, and no matter if participants are superiors or subordinates, it seems that, when informality occurs, it gives opportunity for subordinates to express ideas, opinions, and even joke on superiors, as it can happen in other professional environments.

4.4.2. Analysis focused on the scope of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA):

In Chapter 3, I have mentioned that exaggerated media representations on military discourse may contribute to reinforce a negative perspective on the subject, and one probable reason to justify this hypothesis is the lack of knowledge, by civilians and by the media. Some beliefs are related to salute as a form of humiliating subordinates, to impolite orders as always permeated by yells and offenses, and to the image of some ranks, such as sergeant, lieutenant and colonel, which are normally in contact with privates, seen as authoritarian and impolite.

Thus, in this approach, I will consider my twenty-three year experience, working with subordinates and superiors, in order to evaluate Excerpts 1 to 8 (see Appendix F), and to demystify those stereotyped view mentioned in last paragraph above. It is worth noting that some of my comments will repeat the analytical study in last section, since most of the results lead to evaluate the social context. In addition, I would consider formality and informality, classified in the last subsection as pragmatic or casual conversation, according to the following: Excerpts 1 to 4 as pragmatic and Excerpts 5 to 8 as casual. It is also important to understand that my analysis will be now based on concepts of three dimensions of CDA, power in and power behind discourse, common sense, and orders of discourse (see Chapter 2), considering the strongest evidence in each excerpt.

Considering that Fairclough's (1995) three dimensions of CDA are description, interpretation and explanation, and that description was presented in last subsection, interpretation and explanation increase in value in this section. Thus, in Excerpt 1, one first fact to be interpreted and explained is the act of asking permission to superiors ("permissão, in turn 1) to enter or to exit in any place, and answering polar interrogatives, using "sim (não), senhor". Both of those acts should be interpreted as orders of discourse among military, since it is accepted and practiced in military discourse, and because regulations establish those procedures. Those procedures can be seen by civilians or by media personnel, as a form of oppression by superiors, in order to impose their authority to subordinates. However, it can be explained by the social order presented in precepts of discipline, in recognizing all the levels of authority, independently of the military's rank.

Thus, since discipline assures those procedures for all in the hierarchical scale, asking permission and answering "sim (não), senhor", suggests for military

discourse the respect of authority and even politeness, since in Excerpt 1, for example, the lieutenant is interrupting the captain's work, and at the same time, the lieutenant is announcing his presence to his superior. The same can be said in relation to salute, since it is considered as a greeting among the military and it is related to authority and not to a person, and that is the reason why the lieutenant used this gesture before entering the captain's room (see turn 1, in Excerpt 1).

Also important in Excerpt 1 is the effect of question-answer structure, during the development of interaction. In this case, I would use concepts of power in and power behind discourse. The use of that structure, which can be related to the act of controlling conversation (power in discourse), could represent a simple questionnaire to verify subordinates' knowledge on a specific subject. More than this, in using power behind discourse to explain that attitude, it is possible to understand that, since the captain is responsible to assure the accomplishment of a mission, he used several questions as a strategy. Thus, the effect of this strategy in the captain's discourse is the implicit awareness in verifying the accomplishment of his own orders, reflecting a common procedure in the military environment, which is to check the accomplishment of own orders by subordinates, instead of just giving orders, thus summarizing the exercise of authority in the army, since the superior is always responsible for the subordinates' acts.

Excerpts 2 and 3 are similar to Excerpt 1, in relation to orders of discourse, but different in structure (command-execution). In addition, it is worth noting to distinguish the strategy used by the superiors to call their subordinates using sometimes the mode of address "senhor". Since the sergeant and the lieutenant are authorities in each conversation, exercising it by many commands, the use of that term seems at least strange. However, if we apply the precepts of power behind discourse, it

can suggest an interesting strategy of keeping control of subordinates. Therefore, one probable explanation for the use of that strategy is that, if a superior respects the subordinate and demonstrates it, the subordinate can be influenced in respecting and recognizing the superior's authority as well.

In addition, Fairclough (1995) states that politeness also serves as constraint, since it recognizes "differences of power, degrees of social distance" (p. 66). But it seems that, the use of "senhor" by superiors can deconstruct this statement. I would say this because politeness is normally seen in occurrences from subordinates to superiors, and it is not the case in these two excerpts. On the contrary, the effect of that use by superiors suggests politeness in an inverse direction, and it can be explained by many recommendations in the army on treating subordinates with dignity and respect.

In fact, these attitudes in relation to subordinates can be related to social change, and it is a point in common in Excerpt 4. If we compare the development of interactions 1 to 4, it is possible to verify that politeness gradually diminishes in value from subordinates to superiors, and increased in an inverse proportion, from superiors to subordinates. Thus, in Excerpt 1, the lieutenant used politeness to recognize the superior's authority; in Excerpt 2, the sergeant diminishes the impact of commands by using "senhor" to privates; and the same occurs in a higher proportion in Excerpt 3, now involving the lieutenant and privates; and finally, privates in Excerpt 4 seem to be free to act, without using "sim (não), senhor" in their utterances. In this sense, military discourse in Excerpts 1 to 4 serves to demystify stereotyped view by the media and civilians, and it seems that social order is changing, and as a consequence, issues of discipline, authority and hierarchy seem to be used rather to keep a more sociable environment than an impolite and authoritarian one.

Finally, it is important to realize that, since Excerpts 5 to 8 suggest the occurrence of casual conversation, according to SFL theory, explaining the reason of those occurrences can be also important. Thus, according to CDA theory, those excerpts can demonstrate what Fairclough (1995) calls “contradictory pressure”, which is a strategy used by superiors to reduce constraints of authority, power and politeness in military discourse. In the army case, it is contradictory because discipline and hierarchy demand vigorous procedures by authorities, but at the same time, when regulations recommend respect to subordinates, it seems important to reduce the distance between superiors and subordinates. The fact is that contradictory pressure serves to show that the institution is evolving, and if its members follow main orientations related to discipline and hierarchy, it seems that military discourse will evolve together, as it was possible to verify in the excerpts analyzed in this chapter.

4.5. Answering research questions

4.5.1. Answering Research Question 2 (RQ 2): How does the Brazilian Army represent military discourse, in relation to issues of power, authority, discipline and politeness?

In order to answer this question, it is important to consider that, according to its laws and regulations, the Brazilian Army is concerned with the accomplishment of its constitutional mission, above any other particular interest. Thus, its ideology is focused on principles of preserving the image of a solid, serious and traditional institution, thus creating a social order based on principles of hierarchy and discipline to guide military attitudes, and consequently, discourse itself. In this sense, it seems that hierarchy and discipline together are responsible to provide essential

conditions to develop a harmonic and productive environment, which can be useful to reach institutional aims.

In addition, precepts of hierarchy and discipline are defined in manuals and regulations, and it seems that precepts are consciously followed by the majority of the military, since they are instructed to act according to those principles every year, specially in battalions, where the contact with privates demands caution in what should be said and done, and how it should be said or done. It is difficult to characterize if all military act according to principles of hierarchy and discipline, because, as any kind of occupation, probably, there are professionals that do not understand institutional ideology or do not correctly act because they simply are not interested in acting according the accepted social order. However, while analyzing discourse in battalions of the Brazilian Army, it seems that the majority understands and acts according to social order of the army, suggesting that principles of hierarchy and discipline are accepted and applied to military discourse as an order of discourse.

In this sense, power and authority are naturally exercised by superiors in military discourse, probably due to impersonality and responsibility, as the main characteristics related to those issues, as can be seen in the Brazilian Army regulations. Furthermore, it seems that subordinates recognize superiors' power/authority, probably because they understand and practice principles of hierarchy as a common sense. One typical example could be Excerpt 1 (see Appendix F), when the captain is naturally exercising power/authority by checking his orders through questions to the lieutenant, whereas the lieutenant recognizes the captains' power/authority by answering questions in a calm way, suggesting that he is accomplishing something that should be done, and which is coordinated by a superior. Furthermore, Excerpts 1 to 4 suggest that subordinates also recognize superiors' authority by using the term "senhor" while

talking to a superior, specially while answering polar questions, since regulations demand this kind of procedure.

Moreover, in Excerpts 2, 3 and 4, commands are given by superiors and obeyed by subordinates because there is an objective to be reached, and it is also possible to suggest that superiors and subordinates understood that they should be focused on the mission and not on the authority, because subordinates' responses are almost automatic, which can reinforce the occurrence of common sense. In Excerpts 5 to 8, power/authority almost disappears, since these excerpts were classified as casual conversation, and therefore, it seems that superiors are reducing the distance in relation to subordinates, using slang, jargon and swearing. However, even with the distance being reduced; it is possible to verify through the mode of address by subordinates ('senhor'), that respect is maintained.

Through the analysis of the excerpts, it is noticeable to understand that, even though power/authority should be practiced, it does not mean that superiors will impose it by force, being impolite. One example could be modalization and modulation in Excerpts 1 and 3, when superiors respect subordinates' dignity, by asking subordinates' opinion and by using "senhor", respectively. In short, according to military productions (as seen in Appendix F), it seems that power and authority can be represented in military discourse, through sensible and clear orders, since superiors are responsible for subordinates' acts; and firm but not impolite commands, since insults can characterize disrespect to subordinates (see section 4.2, in this chapter).

Discipline, according to regulations in the army, is related to strict obedience to law, authority and orders. Thus, it would suggest that superiors are always commanding and subordinates are always obeying in military discourse. However, in Excerpts 1 to 3, typically marked by commands, superiors explain their orders rather

than just giving them to subordinates (see turn 16, in Excerpt 1; turns 3, 5 and 7, in Excerpt 2; and turn 3, in Excerpt 3). This tendency can be related to advice in manuals referring to giving orders as clearly as possible. Furthermore, discipline in military discourse is not related to punishment, as can be seen in all the excerpts analyzed, when superiors were rather concerned with giving clear orders than threatening or insulting subordinates.

In sum, discipline is related to issues of power and authority, and it will be presented in formal and informal situations, in order to characterize the authority to be obeyed, but at the same time, it will define limits and responsibility to orders given by superiors, thus explaining why the military are careful in instructing subordinates in the accomplishment of tasks, commands and orders.

Politeness, in this sense, appears as a consequence of discipline in military discourse. Since military should respect norms and authority, and since most of the norms in the army recommend superiors to respect subordinates' dignity, it seems that military discourse will be permeated by politeness. Thus, considering the most formal situations in Appendix F (Excerpts 1 to 4), it is possible to verify that, besides firm commands, politeness appears in all of the excerpts considered. As can be seen in Excerpt 1, the captain considers the lieutenant's opinion, by modulating polar questions (turns 8, 10 and 12); in Excerpts 2 and 3, the use of "senhor" in commands diminishes the impact of orders; and in Excerpt 4, the sergeant reinforces politeness by accepting subordinates' explanations without considering "sim (não), senhor" as the only response (see turns 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 19, 25 and 29).

4.5.2. Answering Research Question 3 (RQ 3): What are the main characteristics of institutional and casual conversation found in spoken interactions in the army?

After analyzing occurrences in Excerpts 1 to 8, and following Eggins' (2000) characteristics of pragmatic and casual conversation (see Chapter 2), it is possible to realize that the excerpts analyzed present the characteristics of pragmatic or casual conversation.

In this sense, excerpts 1 to 4 were considered pragmatic conversations, since they are functionally motivated; they present many hesitations and incompletions, suggesting caution in selecting words and expressions to be said; interactions follow generic structures, which are simple, direct and brief; and authority is more marked, which reinforces the stability of field-tenor-mode.

But while analyzing Excerpts 5 and 6, one difference arises. In fact, Excerpts 5 and 6 present both pragmatic and casual characteristics. Thus, in a first moment, both excerpts suggest to be pragmatic, since they are functionally motivated (two administrative problems). However, during the development of interaction, they frequently vary from pragmatic to casual, leading us to a possible difficulty in classifying them. That difficulty can be explained by Drew & Sorjonen (1997), when they argue "...within a single encounter participants may engage in, and move between, 'sociable' and 'institutional' talk" (p. 93).

Finally, Excerpts 7 and 8 present the main characteristics necessary to be classified as casual, since participants are talking without specific purposes; slang, vocatives, swearing and humor are used; interaction does not follow patterns; the distance between interactants seems to be reduced, turning field-tenor-mode unstable; multilogue frequently occurs, most of the times involving dispute of turns between one

superior and one subordinate; and the use of expressions of personal attitude (see subject choices in tables of Appendix F). It is important to cite that those last characteristics also serve to depict that subordinates are concerned with expressing their opinions more than in pragmatic conversation, since they have the opportunity to act in this way.

4.5.3. Answering Research Question 4 (RQ 4): In what circumstances can casual conversation occur, involving superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army?

Considering Drew & Sorjonen's (1997) suggestion that pragmatic and casual conversation will not present stable limits, thus varying during the development of interaction, it leads us to understand that casual conversation in the army can occur all the time.

However, while considering the analysis of excerpts presented in Appendix 6, it is possible to notice that pragmatic conversation happens in higher frequency than casual. That can be probably due to issues of discipline and hierarchy, which guide the military social order, possibly influencing formal occurrences in military discourse, specially in battalions, where it seems that an environment permeated by instructions and encampments suggests the use of orders and commands in discourse, while involving superiors and subordinates in interactions.

It is also important to characterize that the higher probability of casual occurrences involving superiors and subordinates will probably take place in administrative situations or in specific situations, when superiors are interested in subordinates' personal problems (health, family, debts), as can be seen in Excerpts 5, 6 and 8, since the situation itself suggests proximity of interactants, in order to solve

problems. In addition, casual conversation can also happen when superiors and subordinates talk about different topics, which are frequently discussed in every environment, such as sex, soccer, politics among many other common subjects.

Finally, after analyzing all the excerpts in Appendix F according to the main concepts of SFL and CDA, and comparing those occurrences to transmissions by the media, it is possible to realize that media representations on military discourse involving superiors and subordinates do not correspond to what usually happens in the military environment.

Independently of the difficulty in confirming my hypothesis related to a possible stereotyped view on military discourse created by the media, as I now see that it would demand a different kind of research, the fact is that the selected spoken excerpts can contradict the media representations in this research. Despite the fact that especially in pragmatic conversations, unequal relationships may be developed, I believe in the institutional transformative capacity suggested by Wodak (1996), and the Brazilian Army can corroborate this idea. Moreover, I wish to cite another statement by Wodak (1996), which can explain the institutional transformative capacity, mentioned before: "Organizations are not simply viewed as constraints on action, but also function in an enabling capacity, allowing members of the organization to reach goals, develop value systems, etc" (pp. 11-12).

CHAPTER 5

FINAL REMARKS

“É fácil a missão de comandar homens livres: basta mostrar-lhes o caminho do dever”.
(Marshal Osório's order of the day, in Passo da Pátria, April 15th, 1866).

5.1. Summary

Concerned with investigating military discourse, this thesis arises from the fact that the media may convey verbal interactions, involving superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army, only considering issues of power, authority, hierarchy and discipline. This fact could develop a process of stereotyping, which could lead civilians to associate the military discourse to asymmetrical power relations, without considering the informality that could also happen in an environment like that.

In order to test and to investigate that hypothesis, I have developed four research questions (RQ), according to the following (see Chapter 1): (RQ 1) Based on the collected data in the media, how does the media represent military discourse?; (RQ 2) How does the Brazilian Army represent military discourse, in relation to issues of power, authority, discipline and politeness?; (RQ 3) What are the main characteristics of institutional and casual conversation found in spoken interactions in the army?; and (RQ 4) In what circumstances can casual conversation occur, involving superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army?.

Keeping in mind my research questions, I have raised three possible objectives to be reached, in order to investigate military discourse and to demystify a possible pre-judgment on the subject. Thus, the following objectives were raised: to discuss issues of power, authority, discipline and politeness in relation to military discourse, verifying at

the same time, the effects of those issues in media representations and in spoken interactions in battalions of the Brazilian Army; to discuss the development of institutional and casual conversations between superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army, based on SFL and CDA; and to investigate the main characteristics of military discourse that can be responsible for showing informality in a conversation between superiors and subordinates in the Brazilian Army.

Having raised research questions and objectives to be reached in my thesis, I have organized my thesis in five chapters. The first chapter, as an introductory chapter, presents the statement of the problem, hypothesis, research questions, objectives, value of the research and a brief summary of the contents in each chapter. Chapter 2 studies and discusses background knowledge, focused on main concepts of SFL and CDA. In Chapter 3, I analyze military discourse represented by the media, only focused on concepts of CDA, thus answering the first research question (RQ 1). Chapter 4 presents the analysis of spoken interactions in battalions of the Brazilian Army, based on SFL and CDA theoretical background. In addition, I discuss issues of power, authority, discipline and politeness, according to the army perspective and considering laws, regulations and manuals used in battalions; answering the other three research questions. Finally, Chapter 5 serves to present a summary of the steps followed to conclude this thesis and main findings, main difficulties and suggestions for further research.

Considering the research questions to be answered, objectives to be reached, and the organization of my thesis, I divided my methodology in three steps. Firstly, I collected theoretical material, books and articles, especially concerned with theories related to SFL and CDA. Secondly, I selected material related to military discourse produced by the media, verifying how the media represents military discourse and if a

process of stereotyping really occurs, thus answering my first research question. In this sense, I have collected representations of one song, one TV program, two films, three magazine articles and two comic strips, and analyzed them according to concepts of CDA. I have also tried to collect articles, which could provide analysis on how the media represents military discourse, but it was a difficult task, since most of the articles related to that subject refer to political or historical issues, which is not the focus of my study.

The last step of my methodology refers to data collection in battalions of the Brazilian Army. Thus, I recorded spoken interactions in two battalions, only considering superiors and subordinates as participants in interactions, considering different periods of instructions and main activities developed in that environment, such as encampments, administration and instructions. The main objective was to analyze formality and informality in battalions, according to SFL and CDA, and to answer the other three research questions. It is worth noting that I also analyzed laws and regulations followed by the Brazilian Army, in order to verify the perspective of the institution in relation to issues of power, authority, discipline and politeness, and to check if institutional recommendations are followed in spoken interactions in battalions. Finally, a comparison between results presented in media representations and in interactions in battalions, can provide the necessary elements to conclude my research, in this chapter.

5.2. Remarks on findings

After studying the theoretical background, specially based on Halliday (1994), Eggins (1997, 2000) and Fairclough (1989, 1995), it was possible to apply their main concepts in data analysis of representations by the media and spoken interactions in

battalions of the Brazilian Army. Thus, the data analysis provided important results, which can lead to some conclusions, exposed below.

Firstly, after applying CDA concepts to representations by the media, I verified that, as Fairclough (1995) suggests, media is concerned with “transmitting the voices of social power-holders” (p. 63). While analyzing media representations on military discourse, it seems that, for the media, the sergeant represents one of the probable power-holders in the army, since most of the representations analyzed in Chapter 3 refer to sergeants. In fact, the media transmits the sergeant’s image in military discourse as associated to yells, offenses and humiliation to privates, causing a negative effect, which can lead civilians to produce statements like “*Maria é uma sargentona*”, since the sergeant is seen as authoritarian and rude. It is not possible to verify the origin of that association, but one possible explanation is the fact that sergeants are always in contact with soldiers, giving orders and teaching, which can contribute to create that negative image.

Moreover, it was possible to realize that power, authority and discipline are normally associated to superiors’ threats and oppression over subordinates, and to forms of obtaining advantages. In this sense, it is common to verify in examples analyzed in Chapter 3 that power and authority in military discourse are related to officers and sergeants giving orders to privates, normally referring to fatigue and sentry duties, which are seen as forms of humiliating subordinates or as a kind of punishment. Hierarchy is normally represented as a form of superiors imposing their will and keeping distance from subordinates, according to examples in Appendices C, D and E. In this sense, most representations by the media reinforce the distance between superiors and subordinates, by producing interactions involving a colonel and a private or a sergeant and a private. Furthermore, military discourse is represented by

imperatives in those interactions, also reinforcing distance in relationships between superiors and subordinates, since it suggests an extreme formality in conversations.

As a consequence of implications of those issues mentioned before, politeness is seen as improbable to happen in military discourse, since officers and sergeants are normally giving orders, insulting or humiliating subordinates, thus characterizing an impolite image and attitudes of disrespect to subordinates. In sum, it seems that the media represents those issues in a negative perspective, which can provoke a stereotyped view on military discourse.

Having seen media representations, I raised four possible reasons to explain those occurrences. Firstly, media personnel motivation is normally related to historical, political or ideological issues, and to criticism of attitudes and activities in the army, such as military service. Another reason is the influence of other cultures, transmitting a different reality that happens in battalions, as can be seen in American films. Thirdly, the occurrence of a vicious cycle, when civilians' beliefs on military discourse can be conveyed by the media, thus reinforcing civilians' beliefs, as can be seen in examples related to sergeant's image. Finally, it is possible to cite lack of knowledge as one probable reason, since the Brazilian Army is considered a closed environment, thus creating many expectations on military discourse, and one of them could be the fact of media representations being only related to formality.

In relation to productions in the army, after analyzing interactions and applying SFL and CDA concepts, it was possible to verify a different reality than the one conveyed by the media. As can be seen in all excerpts presented in Appendix F, military discourse, in pragmatic conversations (see Figure 2.3), was permeated by commands, but there were no registers of insults or threats to subordinates, thus contradicting media representations. These results suggest that superiors are concerned with respecting

subordinates, thus indicating politeness, and in naturally exercising power and authority, searching for a balance between authority and respect.

Consequently, it seems that hierarchy and discipline serve to preserve authority, accomplishment of orders, and to establish goals to be reached. In addition, punishment and threats in military discourse are not seen as a consequence of discipline or authority, but as an extreme procedure adopted to preserve the accomplishment of orders. It is worth noting that laws and manuals recommend impersonality and responsibility, while commanding subordinates or exercising authority, in order to avoid abuse of power. As can be seen in Appendix F, especially in pragmatic excerpts (1 to 4), superiors followed advice, since they modalized their utterances most of the times, and also gave their orders through firm, but not impolite imperatives, which can reinforce the perspective of balance in relationships, mentioned above.

Another important result is the way that informality happens in military discourse. After analyzing Excerpts 5 to 8 (see Appendix F), it seems that spontaneity of interactants suggests that distance between superiors and subordinates can be reduced through vocatives, slang, swearing and jargons. In addition, the subjects discussed in each interaction can contribute to reduce the impact of hierarchy in the army, since subordinates had the opportunity of expressing their opinions and even advising superiors, which reflects a possible social change, important to provide a harmonic environment.

Thus, I believe that results can corroborate the main purpose of this thesis, which is to demystify a pre-judgment in relation to military discourse. Through the analysis of excerpts in Chapters 3 and 4, it is possible to point out that there is an exaggerated way of representing military interactions by the media, normally permeated by abuse of power, formality and rudeness. I recognize that it is impossible to verify, in

this research, if media representations can create a stereotyped view of military discourse, since it will demand a more accurate research only focused on effects of media representations and on civilians' opinions. Furthermore, despite the fact that a greater amount of data would better corroborate the findings of the present study, the results show that spoken interactions in battalions suggest a balance between respect and orders, formality and informality, thus demonstrating that discourse and institution can evolve together, which can contradict media representations and demystify possible distorted view on military discourse.

5.3. Main difficulties

I would mention two difficulties during the accomplishment of objectives in this thesis. The first one is related to theoretical background, since it is a difficult task to find articles analyzing media representations in relation to military discourse and military discourse itself. Most articles are related to historical or political issues, rather discussing the role of the Brazilian Army than issues mentioned in this thesis, which can contribute to keep the army as a closed institution.

The other difficulty refers to data collection of spoken interactions in the Brazilian Army. The military, as a general rule, feel embarrassed and sometimes uncomfortable when they know that they are the objects of a research. Thus, they normally change intonation and use affected vocabulary, even in casual conversations, when they know that tape recorders are used. Since I was authorized by commandants (see Appendix H) and also by participants to record spoken interactions in battalions, I hid the tape recorder as strategy to obtain spontaneity and to reduce my difficulty.

5.4. Suggestions for further research

Considering that the media can provide vast and important studies related to several subjects, my first suggestion refers to studies of origins and tendencies of media representations in relation to military discourse, and possible influences over the mass. In relation to military discourse itself, still considering the Brazilian Army as a closed environment, I would suggest themes related to social changes of the institution and of its discourse and to a broader discussion on possible influences of hierarchy and discipline in interactions between subordinates and superiors.

REFERENCES

ALBUQUERQUE, F. R. (2004, November 30). Saudações do Comandante do Exército aos Aspirantes (The Brazilian Army Commandant's Salute to Officer Candidates). *Noticiário do Exército*, 10.188, 1-4.

ALBUQUERQUE, F. R. (2004, November 30). Saudações do Comandante do Exército aos Novos Sargentos (The Brazilian Army Commandant's Salute to New Sergeants). *Noticiário do Exército*, 10.188, 1-4.

BOURY, A. (Director). (2004, April 25). *A Turma do Didi* [Television Broadcast]. Rio de Janeiro: Central Globo de Produções.

COMANDO DE OPERAÇÕES TERRESTRES (1999). *Caderno de Instrução: Liderança – conselhos aos oficiais e sargentos que servem na tropa – Edição experimental – CI 20- 10/2* (Instruction Notebook: Leadership – advices to officers and sergeants who serve in troop – Experiential edition – IN 20 – 10/2). Brasília: Estabelecimento General Gustavo Cordeiro de Farias (EGGCF).

DIJK, T. A. v. (Ed.) (1997). *Discourse Studies: a Multidisciplinary Introduction. Volume 1. Discourse as Structure and Process*. London: Sage.

DREW, P. & HERITAGE, J. (1992). *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

EGGINS, S. (2000). Researching everyday talk. IN: L. UNSWORTH (ed.), *Researching language in schools and communities*. London and Washington: Cassel, pp. 130-151.

EGGINS, S. & SLADE, D. (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.

ESTADO MAIOR DO EXÉRCITO (1986). *Caderno de Instrução: Comandante, chefe e líder – CI 20 – 10/1* (Instruction Notebook: Commandant, chief and leader – IN 20 – 10/1). Brasília: Estabelecimento General Gustavo Cordeiro de Farias (EGGCF).

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

FOUCAULT, M. (1987). *Vigiar e punir: nascimento da prisão*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes.

- GREEN, G. M. (1987). *Pragmatics and natural language understanding*. USA: LEA.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd Edn). London: Edward Arnold.
- HEBERLE, V. (2001). Questões de gênero e identidade no discurso da mídia. IN: M. Grigoletto & A M. Carmagnani (orgs) *Inglês como língua estrangeira: Identidade, práticas e textualidade*. (English as a foreign language: identity, practices and textuality). São Paulo: Humanitas/ USP, pp. 91-110.
- HOLMES, J. (2000). Politeness, power and provocation: how humor functions in the workplace. *Discourse Studies*, 2(2), 159-185.
- MARTIN, J. R., MATHIESEN, C. M. I. M. & PAINTER, C. (1997). *Working with Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- MCCARTHY, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for English Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MEDAVOY, M., MESSER, A., TADROSS, M. (Producers) & McTEERNAM, J. (Director). (2003). *Basic* [Motion Picture]. United States: Phoenix Pictures.
- MILLES, D. (2003, September 2). Mort Walker still tickles military funny bones at 80. *American Forces Press Service*. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from http://www.defenselink.mil/news/sep2003/n09022003_200309027.html.
- MINISTÉRIO DO EXÉRCITO (1980). *Estatuto dos Militares* (Military's Statute). Brasília: Estabelecimento General Gustavo Cordeiro de Farias (EGGCF).
- MONTGOMERY, M. (1986). *An Introduction to Language and Society*. London: Methuen.
- ROMÃO, C. (2003, June). Lições do tamanho do Brasil (Lessons of Brazil size). *Venda Mais*, 16-21.
- SEIXAS, R. (1984). Mamãe eu não queria. On *Metrô linha 473* [CD]. Rio de Janeiro: Som Livre.
- THETELA, P. (2001). Critique discourses and ideology in newspaper reports: a discourse analysis of the South African press reports on the 1998 SADC's military intervention in Lesotho. *Discourse & Society*, 12 (3), 347-370.
- THOMPSON, G. (1996). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- WALKER, M. (2004, January 4). Recruta Zero (Beetle Bailey). [Globinho]. *O Globo*, p. 2.

WALKER, M. (2004, January 11). Recruta Zero (Beetle Bailey). [Globinho]. *O Globo*, p. 2.

WALLACE, R. (Director). (2002). *We were soldiers* [Motion Picture]. United States: Paramount Pictures.

WEINBERG, M. (2004, March 31). As notas no provão dos 260 melhores cursos superiores (The grades in provão of the best 260 superior courses). (2004, March 31). *Veja*, 13, 91.

WODAK, R. (1996). *Disorders of Discourse*. London: Longman.

YULE, G. (1996). *The study of language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ZAKABI, R. (2004, July 21). Dez regras fáceis para educar seus anjinhos (Ten easy rules to educate your little angels). *Veja*, 29, 73.

(2003, November 5). Agora é malhar até cair (Now it is time to work out until fall). *Veja*, 44, 76.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

HIERARCHY IN THE BRAZILIAN ARMY

Marechal (em tempo de guerra) – Marshal (only in war periods).

General de Exército – Army General.

General de Divisão – Major General.

General de Brigada – Brigadier General.

Coronel – Colonel.

Tenente-Coronel – Lieutenant Colonel.

Major – Major.

Capitão – Captain.

1º Tenente – First Lieutenant.

2º Tenente – Second Lieutenant.

Aspirante a Oficial – Officer Candidate.

Subtenente – Sub lieutenant.

1º Sargento – First Sergeant.

2º Sargento – Second Sergeant.

3º Sargento – Third Sergeant.

Cabo – Corporal.

Soldado – Soldier (Private).

APPENDIX B

MEDIA INFLUENCE - MUSIC

Mamãe, eu não queria (Raul Seixas).

Mamãe eu não queria

Mamãe eu não queria

Mamãe eu não queria

Servir o exército

Não quero bater continência

Nem para sargento, cabo ou capitão

Nem, quero ser sentinela

Que nem cachorro vigiando portão

Não!

Mamãe eu não queria

Mamãe eu não queria

Desculpe vossa excelência

A falta de um pistolão

É que meu velho é soldado

E minha mãe pertence ao Exército da Salvação

Não!

Marcha soldado, cabeça de papel

Se não marchar direito, vai preso no quartel.

Sei que é uma bela carreira

Mas não tenho a menor vocação

Se fosse tão bom assim, mainha

Não seria imposição

Não!

Mamãe eu não queria

Mamãe eu não queria

Não, não, não. Servir o exército.

APPENDIX C

MEDIA INFLUENCE - TV PROGRAM

Program: “A Turma do Didi”.

Produced by: Central Globo de Produções.

Context: Sergeant Pincel is advising his soldiers about Colonel Martins’ visit to the battalion. Colonel Martins is going to evaluate the soldiers’ procedures by asking them some questions. Words in capital letters indicate speaker’s emphasis.

1. Scene 1:

Sargento Pincel: Olha aqui, EU ACHO BOM VOCÊS SE COMPORTAREM MUITO BEM, porque hoje nós vamos ter a honra de receber aqui no nosso quartel a presença de um dos comandantes mais DURÕES do nosso exército... Um homem DIGNIFICANTE... O nosso Coronel Martins!

(Coronel Martins arrives).

Sargento Pincel: Atenção Pelotão: Pelotão Sentido! Coronel Martins... Sargento Pincel ÀS SUAS ORDENS! Meu coronel... Eu quero comunicar que é uma honra em recebê-lo aqui neste batalhão!

Coronel Martins (talking in a rude manner): Este é o grupamento militar que é considerado o pior de TODO o grupamento militar leste!...

2. Scene 2:

Coronel Martins (very angry): Muito bem... Soldado Didi... Onde fica o Mar Morto?

Soldado Didi: No Ceará.

Sargento Pincel: Ahn... Comandante... Er... Perdão... Er... Perdão... Perdão... Com sua licença... O senhor me permite... DEIXA DE SER IDIOTA! O MAR MORTO FICA DO OUTRO LADO DO MUNDO!

Soldado Didi: Fica no Ceará.

Sargento Pincel: COMO NO CEARÁ?!

Coronel Martins: COMO VOCÊ PODE TER TANTA CERTEZA?!

Soldado Didi: (inaudible, because private used many regionalisms, difficult to understand).

Sargento Pincel: Com sua licença, Comandante... Se o senhor me permite... OLHA AQUI, se você disser mais uma besteira dessas, EU JURO QUE EU TE MATO, SEU IDIOTA!

Coronel Martins (very angry): IDIOTA É POUCO!

APPENDIX D

MEDIA INFLUENCE - FILMS

1. “BASIC” (“VIOLAÇÃO DE CONDUTA”, in Brazil):

With: John Travolta (Hardy), Connie Nielsen (Osborne) and Samuel L. Jackson (Sergeant West).

Context: Soldier Dumbar is reporting to detective Hardy (Travolta) and Captain Osborne (Nielsen) one passage occurred with the troop of ‘Rangers’, involving Sergeant West’s (Jackson) procedures in advising the troop of soldiers.

West: I do not care that you are triple volunteers. I do not care that you think you are hard. And I especially don’t give a rat’s fuck what four -star general’s dick you sucked to get the privilege of being able stand before me today. Those of you I deem unworthy will not remain. Is that understood? Can I get a ‘hoo-ha, Sergeant’?

Troop: Hoo-ha, Sergeant!

West: Those of you I find lacking will quit. And those of you who refuse to quit will have a training accident. This base suffers three training accident a year. Unfortunate accidents that I will not hesitate to repeat, if you cross me. Is that understood? Give me a ‘hoo-ha, Sergeant’.

Troop: Hoo-ha, Sergeant!

West: And what’s your name?

Pike: Sergeant, my name is Pike, Sergeant!

West: Pike, surrender your sidearm for inspection...

What the fuck are you doing? Have you lost your fucking mind?

Pike: Sergeant, you told me to relinquish...

West: Are you talking?! Did you speak to me?! Who the fuck told you to speak?! A ranger never relinquishes his weapon! If George S. ‘Motherfucking’ Patton rises from his holy grave and asks you for your weapon, you will not surrender your weapon! Everybody better give me a ‘hoo-ha, Sergeant’.

Troop: Hoo-ha, Sergeant!

West: Now, son, there are people in this world that will kill you for no damn reason other than something passing through their mind! I hail from Biloxi, Mississippi, where Vanilla motherfuckers like that (pointing to Dumbar) used to hang us from trees by our necks on a whim! Does that sound like the kind of fucking place you want to grow up?!

Pike: Sergeant, no, Sergeant!

West: Are you implying something negative about the great state of Mississippi?

Dumbar (telling the passage): From the beginning, West had a chip on his shoulder for this guy named Pike...

Subtitle Translation (English – Portuguese):

West: Não me importa que sejam voluntários. Não me importa que pensam que são durões. E pouco me importa de que general vocês puxaram o saco para terem o privilégio de estarem na minha presença. Aqueles de vocês que eu julgar inúteis, não irão ficar. Entendido? Quero ouvir um ‘viva o Sargento’!

Tropa: Viva o Sargento!

West: Os que eu considerar inaptos, pedirão dispensa. E os que se recusarem, sofrerão um acidente nos treinamentos. Ocorrem três acidentes por ano nesta base.

Tristes acidentes que não hesitarei em repetir se não me obedecerem. Entendido? Quero ouvir um ‘viva o Sargento’!

Tropa: Viva o Sargento!

West: Qual é o seu nome?

Pike: Meu nome é Pike, Sargento!

West: Pike, entregue sua pistola para inspeção...

O que está fazendo?! Está louco?!

Pike: Sargento...

West: Está falando?! Falou comigo?! Quem mandou você falar? Um soldado nunca entrega sua arma! Se o General George S. Patton sair do túmulo e pedir sua arma, você não deve entregar! Todos gritando ‘viva o Sargento’!

Tropa: Viva o Sargento!

West: Filho, algumas pessoas podem matar você sem razão alguma pelo simples motivo de sentir desejo! Eu sou de Biloxi, Mississippi, onde brancos bastardos costumavam nos pendurar em árvores por diversão! Parece o lugar ideal para ser criado?!

Pike: Não, Sargento!

West: Está falando mal do grande estado do Mississippi?

Dumbar: Desde o começo, West implicou com este cara chamado Pike...

2. “WE WERE SOLDIERS” (“FOMOS HERÓIS”, in B rasil):

With: Mel Gibson (Lieutenant Colonel Hal Moore), Sam Elliot (Sergeant major Basil Plumley).

Context: A soldier is going to greet sergeant major.

Soldier: Good morning, sergeant major.

Sergeant major: How do you know what kind of goddamn day it is?

Subtitle Translation (English – Portuguese):

Soldado: Bom dia, sargento.

Sargento: Como sabe que droga de dia é hoje?

APPENDIX E

MEDIA INFLUENCE – COMIC STRIPS.





APPENDIX F

MILITARY DISCOURSE – TRANSCRIPTIONS

In order to transcribe the excerpts in this Appendix, considering as much as possible rhythm and intonation and structural differences between Portuguese and English, I have adapted Eggins & Slade's (1997) summarized transcription key, according to Table 1.1 below:

Table 1.1 Summarized transcription Key (Adapted from Eggins & Slade; 1997: 5)

| Symbol | Meaning |
|-----------------------------|---|
| . | Certainty, completion (typically falling tones). |
| No end of turn punctuation | Implies non-termination (no final intonation). |
| , | Parcelling of talk; breathing time |
| ? | Uncertainty (rising tone, or questions). |
| ! | ‘Surprised’ intonation. |
| WORDS IN CAPITALS. | Emphatic stress and/or increased volume. |
| “” | Change in voice quality in reported speech. |
| () | Untranscribable talk. |
| (Words within parentheses). | Transcriber's guess. |
| [Words in square brackets]. | Non-verbal information. |
| == | Overlap (contiguity, simultaneity). |
| ... | Short hesitation within a turn (less than three seconds). |
| [Pause-4 secs] | Indication of inter-turn pause length. |
| # | Swearing |
| Dash – then talk. | False start/restart. |
| 1, 2, 3. | Turn numbers. |
| i, ii, iii. | Clause numbers. |
| NV | Non-verbal moves. |

1.1. Excerpt Transcriptions

Excerpt 1: An obstacle course.

Field: A Lieutenant is responsible to assemble an obstacle course for privates' instruction. In order to verify if everything is ready, a Captain is asking the Lieutenant some questions related to schedule and people involved in that mission.

Tenor: Since the Captain is responsible to coordinate the schedule of privates' instruction; he is worried about the obstacle course assembly by the Lieutenant.

Mode: Verbal interaction on an operational field.

Table 1.2 Transcription of Excerpt 1.

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|------------|---|
| 1 | Lieutenant | (i) Permissão [salute gesture]. |
| 2 | Captain | (i) José, o seguinte (ii) Qual que é a tua instrução amanhã de manhã? |
| 3 | Lieutenant | (i) Amanhã de manhã == |
| 4 | Captain | == (i) Quem que está contigo na pista de corda? |
| 5 | Lieutenant | (i) (inaudible) (ii) Sargento A, Sargento B, Sargento C, Sargento D, Sargento E, Sargento F, Sargento G, Cabo H, Soldado I, Cabo J, Cabo K, Cabo L, Cabo M, Cabo == |
| 6 | Captain | == (i) Esse pessoal amanhã, vão 'tá contigo a partir de que horas? (ii) Só na parte da tarde? |
| 7 | Lieutenant | (i) A partir das 13:00 horas. (ii) E o pessoal que vai montar a pista de cordas, que são alguns desses aqui, na parte da manhã também. |
| 8 | Captain | (i) Ah! (ii) 'Tá pensando em colocar na parte da manhã? |
| 9 | Lieutenant | (i) Sim, senhor. |
| 10 | Captain | (i) Que horas que você acha que vai dar o pronto da pista? |
| 11 | Lieutenant | (i) Olha, só falta montar é... (ii) A falsa baiana e o... lepar. |
| 12 | Captain | (i) 'Cê acha que [pause 3 secs] == |
| 13 | Lieutenant | == (i) Eu acho que vai até a hora do almoço. |
| 14 | Captain | (i) Montando? |

| | | |
|----|------------|---|
| 15 | Lieutenant | (i) Sim, senhor. (ii) Porque... (iii) Alguns – (iv) Alguns lugares lá teve que trocar uns pedaços de pau pra emendar na outra árvore (inaudible). |
| 16 | Captain | (i) E na quinta feira tem condições de tu fazer essa pista? (ii) Porque é o seguinte... (iii) A PM quer... ver se [pause 3 secs] (iv) Poderia passar treze soldados do grupamento especial deles, lá. (v) (inaudible). (vi) ‘Cê consegue manter esse pessoal contigo? |
| 17 | Lieutenant | (i) Se eu não conseguir, eu consigo outras pessoas para auxiliar na, na – (ii) É interessante o Cabo H, o J e o C == |
| 18 | Captain | (i) O C esquece. (ii) O C ‘tá no alvo aéreo. |
| 19 | Lieutenant | (i) Deixa pelo menos o Cabo H e o J, porque (inaudible). (ii) Porque o que eles vão fazer. (iii) É só auxiliar na segurança ali da == |
| 20 | Captain | (i) Não. (ii) ‘Tá. (iii) Também são poucos ali. (iv) São treze. (v) Pode dividir em três grupos de quatro, tipo == |
| 21 | Lieutenant | (i) Não. (ii) Sem problema. |
| 22 | Captain | (i) ‘Tá. |

Table 1.3 Mood choices in Excerpt 1: An obstacle course. (Adapted from Eggins & Slade; 1997: 110)

| Mood (clause type) | Captain | Lieutenant |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Number of clauses | 24 | 21 |
| (Incomplete clauses) | 4 | 8 |
| Number of turns | 11 | 11 |
| Declarative: | | |
| Full | 1 | 3 |
| Elliptical | 4 | 4 |
| Tagged | 0 | 0 |
| Polar interrogative: | | |
| Full | 2 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 3 | 0 |
| Wh-interrogative: | | |
| Full | 4 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 0 | 0 |
| Imperative | 0 | 0 |
| Exclamatives | 0 | 0 |
| Minor | 5 | 5 |
| Most frequent subject choice | Você (5) Tu (1) | Eu (3) |
| Negation | 0 | 0 |

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Adjuncts: | | |
| Circumstantial | 6 | 5 |
| Interpersonal | 8 | 2 |
| Textual | 1 | 4 |
| Modalization: | | |
| Probability | 5 | 2 |
| Usuality | 3 | 2 |
| Modulation: | | |
| (i) Obligation | 2 | 1 |
| (ii) Inclination | 0 | 0 |
| (iii) Capability | 1 | 0 |

Excerpt 2: Patrol Instruction 1.

Field: A sergeant is explaining to a group of privates the correct procedures to be accomplished, in a simulation occurred during a field exercise.

Tenor: The sergeant is responsible to control the groups of privates, which are going to pass in the simulation course. In addition, he has to explain all the procedures in a correct and precise way, in order to keep the security of the group and the silence during their passage, since the assault course demands silence.

Mode: Verbal interaction during an assault course.

Table 1.4 Transcription of Excerpt 2.

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------|---|
| 1 | Sergeant | (i) Presta atenção. (ii) 'Bora. (iii) Acerta, acerta. (iv) Cerra pra cá a patrulha. (v) Presta atenção. (vi) Os senhores agora vão passar por um ponto inimigo, certo? (vii) Nós vamos lançar vocês para buscar uma mensagem, que nós precisamos dela aqui, no final. (viii) Dúvidas nisso? |
| 2 | Privates | (i) Não, senhor. |
| 3 | Sergeant | (i) Para o – (ii) Para o inimigo não descobrir, nós lançamos em cada ponto um pedaço dessa mensagem. (iii) E cada mensagem dessas - (iv) O que que é a mensagem? (v) É a? |
| 4 | Privates | (i) Senha. |
| 5 | Sergeant | (i) A senha. (ii) Então, 'cês vão ver que, no final da pista, nós vamos formar o que? (iii) Uma mensagem. (iv) E eu preciso dessa mensagem aqui, para vocês terem cumprido a missão no padrão. (v) Dúvidas nisso? |
| 6 | Privates | (i) Não, senhor. |

| | | |
|------|----------|--|
| 7 | Sergeant | (i) Então, 'cês vão chegar aqui == [voices] (ii) 'Cês vão chegar aqui com essa mens == [voices] (iii) Então, vocês têm que chegar com essa mensagem. (iv) Se chegar no final e esqueceu a primeira mensagem, o que que vai acontecer? (v) Vão ter que voltar lá, pra completar a mensagem. (vi) Dúvidas nisso? |
| 8 | Privates | (i) Não, senhor. |
| 9 | Sergeant | (i) Visto a lâmpada do meio? (ii) A lâmpada do meio. (iii) Tem a da esquerda, a do meio e a da direita. (iv) Lá é o eixo? |
| 10 | Privates | (i) Dois. |
| 11 | Sergeant | (i) Eixo dois. (ii) Vocês podem ir para lá, e pegar já o azimute do eixo dois. |
| NV 1 | - | [privates start talking in a loud voice]. |
| 12 | Sergeant | (i) CESSA O PAPO. |

Table 1.5 Mood choices in Excerpt 2: Patrol Instruction 1. (Adapted from Eggins & Slade; 1997: 110)

| Mood (clause type) | Sergeant | Privates |
|-------------------------------------|--|------------|
| Number of clauses | 31 | 5 |
| (Incomplete clauses) | 4 | 0 |
| Number of turns | 7 | 5 |
| Declarative: | | |
| Full | 4 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 3 | 0 |
| Tagged | 0 | 0 |
| Polar interrogative: | | |
| Full | 1 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 4 | 0 |
| Wh-interrogative: | | |
| Full | 2 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 3 | 0 |
| Imperative | 6 | 0 |
| Exclamatives | 0 | 0 |
| Minor | 4 | 5 |
| Most frequent subject choice | Senhores (1) Vocês (8) Nós (3) Eu (1) | Senhor (3) |
| Negation | 0 | 0 |
| Adjuncts: | | |
| Circumstantial | 15 | 2 |
| Interpersonal | 0 | 0 |
| Textual | 6 | 0 |
| Modalization: | | |
| Probability | 2 | 0 |
| Usuality | 7 | 0 |
| Modulation: | | |
| (i) Obligation | 1 | 0 |
| (ii) Inclination | 3 | 0 |
| (iii) Capability | 0 | 0 |

Excerpt 3: Patrol instruction 2.

Field: A Lieutenant is giving instructions to privates of how to procedure in an assault course simulation, and of how to control the patrol, during the accomplishment of a mission.

Tenor: The lieutenant is responsible to teach the groups of privates, which are going to pass in the simulation course. Thus, he has to explain all the procedures in a correct and precise way, in order to keep the security of the group and the effective accomplishment of the mission by the privates. It is worth noting that the lieutenant is only explaining the procedures to the commandant (Sheriff) and to the sub commandant (Sub sheriff), because they are responsible to control the members of the patrol.

Mode: Verbal interaction during an assault course.

Table 1.6 Transcription of Excerpt 3.

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|-------------|--|
| 1 | Lieutenant | (i) E o senhor é o subxerife. (ii) Dúvidas? (iii) Então, 'tá bom. (iv) O senhor vai ver material e você, a parte de efetivo. (v) Se alguém perder material... |
| 2 | Sheriff | (i) A culpa é minha == |
| 3 | Lieutenant | (i) Só tua? (ii) (inaudible) (iii) Você é o primeiro – (iv) Você é o único que não passou a bola para o subxerife. (v) Mas o subxerife também é culpado, ou seja, acusou o xerife de bisonho porque vai perder o material. (vi) Mas a culpa não é só sua, não. (vii) É também do bisonho que devia estar controlando o seu material e perdeu. (viii) Sabe o que vai acontecer, xerife? (ix) O senhor e quem perdeu vai ficar procurando o material ali na pista, ao invés de ficar torando. (x) Dúvidas? |
| 4 | Sheriff | (i) Não, senhor. |
| 5 | Lieutenant | (i) Então, tá bom. (ii) Subcomandante. (iii) O senhor é o dono do efetivo. (iv) Se alguém se perder na pista, de quem é a culpa? |
| 6 | Sub sheriff | (i) Minha. |
| 7 | Lieutenant | (i) E de quem mais? |
| 8 | Sub sheriff | (i) Só minha. |
| 9 | Lieutenant | (i) Positivo. (ii) Por que só sua? |
| 10 | Sub sheriff | (i) Porque eu comando o efetivo. (ii) Eu == |
| 11 | Lieutenant | == (i) Você controla o efetivo, você não comanda. (ii) Quem comanda é o comandante. (iii) Subcomandante, 'cê 'tá querendo dar o golpe? (iv) É...golpe de estado! (v) Dúvidas? |

| | | |
|----|-------------|---|
| 12 | Sub sheriff | (i) Não, senhor. |
| 13 | Lieutenant | (i) Se alguém se perder, você vai atrás, pra procurar esse pessoal que ficou perdido. (ii) Então 'tá bom. (iii) Vamos lá. (iv) Xerife. (v) Quando eu falar "vai", você vai pegar o seu pessoal, vai botar em coluna por um aqui. (vi) O subcomandante vai na frente, o senhor vai à retaguarda e os seus companheiros vão no centro. (vii) Você vai deslocar esse pessoal até a linha de cones. (viii) Dúvidas? |
| 14 | Sheriff | (i) Não, senhor. (i) Vai, xerife. (ii) Atua, xerife. (iii) Vai. (iv) Controla, xerife. (v) |
| 15 | Lieutenant | Vai. (vi) Manda, manda, xerife, manda... |
| 16 | Sheriff | (i) À minha frente, por um, cobrir. (i) Hmm...(ii) Cobrir! (iii) Ih, xerife, você 'tava indo tão bem. (iv) |
| 17 | Lieutenant | Vai cobrir como, xerife? [voices] (v) Vai, xerife. |
| 18 | Sheriff | (i) Correndo, curto. [noise]. |
| 19 | Lieutenant | (i) 'Tá parecendo uma escola de samba. |

Table 1.7 Mood choices in Excerpt 3: Patrol Instruction 2 (Adapted from Eggins & Slade; 1997: 110)

| Mood (clause type) | Lieutenant | Sheriff | Sub sheriff |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---------|-------------|
| Number of clauses | 47 | 5 | 5 |
| (Incomplete clauses) | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Number of turns | 10 | 5 | 4 |
| Declarative: | | | |
| Full | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Tagged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Polar interrogative: | | | |
| Full | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Wh-interrogative: | | | |
| Full | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Imperative | 8 | 2 | 0 |
| Exclamatives | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Minor | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Most frequent subject choice | Senhor (5) Você (7) | 0 | Eu (1) |
| Negation | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Adjuncts: | | | |
| Circumstantial | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| Interpersonal | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Textual | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Modalization: | | | |
| Probability | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Usuality | 6 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|---|
| Modulation: | | | |
| (i) Obligation | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| (ii) Inclination | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (iii) Capability | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Excerpt 4: First Aid Inspection.

Field: During an inspection, a sergeant is asking questions to privates, in order to verify if they know how to rescue and to apply the first aid to a drowning victim. During the inspection, one officer from a brigade is observing the privates' procedures.

Tenor: This is a common instruction in encampments, used to reinforce specific procedures during the combat. Thus, the sergeant firstly reviewed privates' knowledge on the subject, and secondly, created a simulation, when a soldier represented a drowning victim and the privates would apply the right procedures previously reviewed. Meanwhile, an officer from a brigade is only observing the privates' procedures and taking notes. He will not ask questions to privates, since they are supposed to know the procedures, previously taught by the sergeant. In addition, the officer respects the conduction of inspection by the sergeant.

Mode: Verbal interaction during an inspection.

Table 1.8 Transcription of Excerpt 4.

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|-------------|----------------|--|
| 1 | Sergeant | [while private 1 is helping the victim] (i) Levantou o quadril, saiu a água. (ii) Certo. (iii) Deitou a vítima de novo, do jeito que ela 'tava. (iv) E aí? |
| 2 | Private 1 (05) | (i) Aí, eu pego os braços dela por baixo da cabeça. (ii) Pego a cabeça dela por trás e... |
| 3 | Sergeant | (i) E se ela já tiver recuperado a consciência, já, nesse procedimento que o 05 falou...(ii) Levantar o quadril... (iii) E aí? |
| 4 | Private 1 (05) | (i) Aí, eu vejo se a pulsação dela está normal. |
| 5 | Sergeant | (i) Ahn... |

- 6 Private 1 (05) (i) E verifico se está tudo bem.
- 7 Sergeant (i) Uai! (ii) Mas já recuperou a consciência, já...
- 8 Private 1 (05) (i) Aí, eu vou procurar um médico pra (inaudible).
- 9 Sergeant (i) 'Tá certo. (ii) E se não recuperou?
(i) Aí faz a massagem nas costas dela... (ii) Contando... (iii)
- 10 Private 1 (05) Pressionando e contando 2001, 2002, solta, 2003, 2004... (iv) Aí ==
== (i) 'Tá. (ii) Então, vamos fazer mais um procedimento. (iii)
- 11 Sergeant Então... (iv) De pé um, dois. (v) Segurança.
[all the military move to another place, where, the simulation will
- NV 1 - occur].
(i) Bom, 05 e 07... (ii) Você – (iii) Vocês dois, mais o soldado José
- 12 Sergeant estavam atravessando um curso d'água, e o soldado José começa a se afogar.
(iv) Procedimentos.
- 13 Private 2 (07) (i) Trago pra margem.
- 14 Sergeant (i) Trouxe pra margem.
- 15 Private 2 (07) (i) Depois, a gente confere se tem alguma coisa... (ii) Um galho
(inaudible)...
- 16 Sergeant (i) Confere aí, então.
(i) Aí, não tem nada. (ii) Ele tá sem pulsação (iii) Aí, eu vou virar a
- 17 Private 2 (07) vítima de bruços (inaudible)...
- 18 Sergeant (i) Ajoelhado! (ii) Ajoelhado!
- NV 2 - [private corrects his position].
- 19 Private 2 (07) (i) Aí, eu comprimo assim ==
- 20 Sergeant == (i) Até o que?
- 21 Private 2 (07) (i) Até a água sair totalmente ==
- 22 Sergeant == (i) 'Tá. (ii) Então, já saiu. (iii) E aí?
- 23 Private 2 (07) (i) Aí ele – (ii) Ele ainda não voltou a si.
(i) 'Tá. (ii) Põe a cabeça escorada num braço, o outro esticado... (iii)
- 24 Sergeant E aí?
- 25 Private 2 (07) (i) Aí, vou fazer a massagem cardíaca.

| | | |
|----|----------------|---|
| 26 | Sergeant | (i) 'Tá... |
| 27 | Private 2 (07) | [private demonstrates the massage]. (i) 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 == |
| 28 | Sergeant | == (i) Quantas vezes você vai fazer isso aí? |
| 29 | Private 2 (07) | (i) De doze a quinze vezes. |
| 30 | Sergeant | (i) 'Tá. |

Table 1.9 Mood choices in Excerpt 4: First Aid Inspection. (Adapted from Eggins & Slade; 1997: 110)

| Mood (clause type) | Sergeant | Private 1 | Private 2 |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|-----------------------|
| Number of clauses | 35 | 9 | 12 |
| (Incomplete clauses) | 8 | 4 | 6 |
| Number of turns | 16 | 5 | 8 |
| Declarative: | | | |
| Full | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Elliptical | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Tagged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Polar interrogative: | | | 0 |
| Full | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wh-interrogative: | | | |
| Full | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Imperative | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Exclamatives | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Minor | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Most frequent subject choice | Você (implicit) (7) Ela (implicit) (3) Nós (vamos) (1) | Eu (4) | Eu (5) A gente (1) |
| Negation | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Adjuncts: | | | |
| Circumstantial | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Interpersonal | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Textual | 13 | 5 | 6 |
| Modalization: | | | |
| Probability | 9 | 5 | 6 |
| Usuality | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Modulation: | | | |
| (i) Obligation | 8 | 8 | 5 |
| (ii) Inclination | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (iii) Capability | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Excerpt 5: An Administrative Problem.

Field: A commander of a battalion is talking to a Major, a Sub lieutenant and a Corporal about how to solve a problem involving a phone company.

Tenor: The commander is asking for subordinates' opinion about how to solve the problem with the phone company. It is worth noting that the Sub lieutenant and the Corporal are experts in that subject, and they want to advice the commandant to cancel the services of the Phone Company. However, the commander is trying to analyze all the perspectives, because the one suggested by the Corporal and the Sub lieutenant can bring some administrative prejudices to battalion.

Mode: Verbal interaction on an administrative problem.

Table 1.10 Transcription of Excerpt 5.

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------------|---|
| 1 | Corporal | (i) O negócio é o senhor ir lá fardado, conversar com o cara. (ii) “Ó, vamos estudar isso aqui”. (iii) “Vem comigo lá no quartel”. (iv) Você ganha nisso, eu te dou aquilo, e tal”... (v) “Não, mas não dá”... (vi) “Tá bom”. (vii) “Vamos lá pro hotel”...(viii) Melhor... (ix) Falar com a pessoa. (x) Porque esse negócio por telefone... (xi) Ah, não é comigo, não. (xii) É com o gerente do não-sei-o-que. (xiii) Os caras ficam passando a perna na gente. (xiv) “Ah, não sei quem, não sei quem”. (xv) É igual o senhor falou. (xvi) Quantos anos que a Phone Company já está aqui, dois anos, sei lá. (xvii) E a gente não ganhou nada com isso! |
| 2 | Sub lieutenant | (i) E eles ganham, né. (ii) Porque ‘tá seguro... (iii) Todo o sistema aqui... ‘tá seguro. (iv) Energia, tudo, né == |
| 3 | Corporal | (i) == (i) Qualquer problema que dá, o cara liga daqui lá na central (inaudible). (ii) Às vezes, até daqui já resolve lá. |
| 4 | Sub lieutenant | (i) Nós temos dez – (ii) Nós temos doze linhas aqui, ó. [showing a map] (iii) O CIA ‘tá aqui, ó. (iv) (inaudible). |

- 5 Commander (i) A...A questão disso daí é o seguinte... (ii) É que... (iii) Isso aí não é TÃO importante pra Phone Company, entendeu ==
- 6 Corporal == (i) Mas também, coronel, um link para eles não é nada. (ii) Um link de 64 mega ==
- 7 Commander (i) EU SEI. (ii) É...eu sei... (iii) O...O problema é que isso daí para eles é custo, para eles é dinheiro, né. (iv) Agora, se eu tirar eles daqui...a Phone Company... (v) Ela...ela vai fazer um armariozinho ali do lado da linha do trem. (vi) Depois, não vai dar certo de novo. (vii) Aí, ela vai reagir de acordo com a – (viii) Com o custo que ela vai ter. (ix) Ou seja, em vez de ela ter um custo fixo, ela vai ter um custo que vai estar esporádico ==
- 8 Corporal == (i) Esporádico...
- 9 Commander (i) É... se aqui tivesse um (inaudible). (ii) Mas não dá. (iii) (inaudible). (iv) O QUE NÃO PODE ACONTECER É ELES FICAREM UTILIZANDO A NOSSA ENERGIA. (v) ISSO DAÍ NÃO PODE MESMO. (vi) E é o que nós estamos... (vii) Estamos falando para o... (viii) Instalar o... (ix) Aquele... (x) Como é o nome dele?
- 10 Major (i) O que eu recebi e-mail, é José.
- 11 Commander (i) Sim, mas quando é que eles vêm instalar isso?
- 12 Major (i) Pois é... (ii) A gente mandou a resposta, né. (iii) Aquela consulta... (iv) Eu vou mandar um outro e-mail perguntando “è aí?”. (v) “qual foi a solução?”, né.
- 13 Commander (i) Depois você me vê o telefone desse João. (ii) Eu vou conversar com ele. (iii) Aquele papel tem – (iv) Eu vou... (v) Vou voltar a falar com ele...
- 14 Major (i) Sim, senhor.
- 15 Commander (i) Bom, quer dizer, quem é que está nessa história desse negócio do link?
- 16 Sub lieutenant and Corporal (i) É o Joel.
- 17 Commander (i) Nós vamos conversar de novo com esse Joel e ver, de novo, essa questão de custo aí. (ii) Porque eu... (iii) Eu cheguei a falar sobre isso com o João. (iv) O João deu uma desconversada e tal. (v) Eu vou voltar à carga com

ele.

- (i) 'Tá. (ii) Agora uma outra coisa. (iii) Uma notícia nova pro senhor. (iv) Não é TÃO simples igual o senhor... o senhor falou aqui agora. (v) Tão (inaudible). (vi) Porque o coronel [referring to the last commandant of the battalion] chutou o pau da barraca direitinho, né. (vii) Falou: 'Ó, amanhã às nove horas da manhã, se eles não virem aqui, eu vou desligar a energia elétrica'. (viii) "Acabou". (ix) No outro dia, tinha três diretores aqui. (x) Um do Rio de Janeiro, um de Belo Horizonte, e um (inaudible).
- 18 Sub lieutenant

Table 1.11 Mood choices in Excerpt 5: An Administrative Problem. (Adapted from Eggins & Slade; 1997: 110)

| Mood (clause type) | Commandant | Major | Subtenant | Corporal |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Number of clauses | 33 | 7 | 19 | 23 |
| (Incomplete clauses) | 14 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| Number of turns | 7 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Declarative: | | | | |
| Full | 7 | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| Elliptical | 4 | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| Tagged | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Polar interrogative: | | | | |
| Full | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wh-interrogative: | | | | |
| Full | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Imperative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exclamatives | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Minor | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Most frequent subject choice | Eu (7) Nós (3) | Eu (2) A gente (1) | Nós (2) | Senhor (2) |
| Negation | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Adjuncts: | | | | |
| Circumstantial | 9 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Interpersonal | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Textual | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Modalization: | | | | |
| Probability | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Usuality | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Modulation: | | | | |
| (i) Obligation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| (ii) Inclination | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| (iii) Capability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Excerpt 6: During a Coffee Break.

Field: During a coffee break, some military are discussing about categories of drivers' license and, at the same time, they are having a chat about other subjects.

Tenor: Two majors, one captain, two lieutenants and two sergeants are talking during the coffee break. Despite the fact of military of different ranks involved, they are having, in fact, a conversation on many subjects, also keeping the discipline and hierarchy.

Mode: Verbal interaction during a coffee break.

Table 1.12 Transcription of Excerpt 6.

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|--------------|---|
| 1 | Captain | (i) O certo seria E, né. (ii) Unidade tratora, unidade acoplada, reboque, semi-reboque, articulações [pause 3 secs] (iii) É ou não é? |
| 2 | Lieutenant 1 | (i) Eu acho que é D. (ii) Porque aí, é só senhor ultrapassar a tonelagem aí. (iii) Acho que o Light Gun não ultrapassa essa – (iv) Acho que ele não chega a ultrapassar essa tonelagem. |
| 3 | Captain | (i) Meia dúzia toneladas? |
| 4 | Lieutenant 1 | (i) É. (ii) Só que é seis toneladas que 'tá marcando aqui. |
| 5 | Captain | (i) É, mas aí deve ser o conjunto inteiro, né? (ii) Caminhão, gente e...a articulação. |
| 6 | Lieutenant 1 | (i) Eu acho que é a classe D, então. (ii) Eu 'tava conversando com o pessoal do DETRAN e...cheguei a ver a fundo isso aí, né. [pause 3 secs] (iii) Ficaria... (iii) Seria a D, né. (iv) Ficaria mais uns quinhentos e pouco aí [pause 3 secs] (v) E a D é fácil de tirar. (vi) O pessoal empresta o microônibus pra gente. (vii) O pessoal da PM. (inaudible) |
| 7 | Lieutenant 2 | [arriving in the kitchen]. (i) Fala, João. |
| 8 | Captain | (i) É assim que ele vai tratar os sargentos. [sneeze]. (ii) Acha que vai render João? |
| 9 | Lieutenant 2 | (i) Fala alguma coisa, João. |
| 10 | Captain | (i) Hein, João. (ii) Os alunos, que são recrutas lá na EsIE, vão encontrar com esse cabeça lá, vão ficar coma visão errada do Exército. (iii) Eles vão achar, hmm... (iv) Promiscuidade, um negócio assim do outro mundo. (v) O sargento aluno, recruta, vai passar a mão na bunda dele. (vi) Vai ver só como é que vai ser. (viii) Vai ser falado lá no Rio. |
| 11 | Lieutenant 1 | (i) Ele tá no espírito de ir embora, aí... |
| 12 | Lieutenant 2 | (i) 'Cê acha que eu vou ser um ruim instrutor? |

- 13 Lieutenant 1 (i) Acho que não, né.
- 14 Lieutenant 2 (i) Até lá ==
- 15 Captain == (i) Eu tenho CERTEZA que ele vai ser um bom instrutor.
- NV 1 - [laughs]
- 16 Sergeant 1 (i) As pessoas mudam, né. [laughs].
- 17 Lieutenant 2 (i) Que é isso, João. (ii) Que é isso...
- NV 2 - [participants talking at the same time] (inaudible).
- 18 Captain (i) #, Major. (ii) Tem gente saindo pelo ladrão de tudo quanto é lugar. (iii) Porque que falta oficial, cara?
- 19 Major 1 (i) Porque aqui é o exílio, né cara. (ii) Os caras não querem...
- NV 3 - [Lieutenant 2 laughs].
- 20 Captain (i) Pô, mas os caras tão tudo saindo pelo ladrão, cara!
- 21 Lieutenant 2 (i) João. (ii) Como é que a gente vai fazer? (iii) Que ‘cê quer aí? (iv) Fala aí, pro Capitão saber.
- 22 Sergeant 1 (i) Já que... o Capitão, Major e o senhor tão aí... (ii) Eu fiquei com uma dúvida de um negócio de fazer uns ofícios lá pra – (iii) Pra encaminhar os processos do pessoal do DETRAN, né ==
- 23 Captain == (i) Vem cá, o que que a regra do jogo no Exército fala?
- 24 Sergeant 1 (i) Tem que obedecer as normas do == [everybody talks at the same time].
- 25 Captain (i) Agora, a parada é a seguinte [pause 3 secs]. (ii) O cara pra pegar uma 2 e ½ e conduzir um obuseiro atrelado e a guarnição dele dentro, pô, tem que ter a D, pelo que tu tá falando.
- 26 Sergeant 1 (i) Tem que ter a D.
- 27 Captain (i) E não tem. (ii) Tem a C. (iii) Porque se essa viatura vira – (iv) Se a viatura vira, morrem cinco, #, quem é o culpado? (v) Há! (vi) Primeiro vão perguntar: “Tava de capacete?” (vii) Tava. (viii) “O motorista... tá amarrado” (ix) “Qual é a categoria dele? É C. Não, é C, mas ele tava carregando gente. Como é que pode ser C”. [pause 4 secs].
- 28 Sergeant 1 (i) Eu concordo com o senhor.
- 29 Captain (i) Capa preta vai vir de #, né cara.
- 30 Lieutenant 2 (i) Ih! [laughs].
- NV 4 - [everybody laughs].
- 31 Lieutenant 2 (i) Que é isso? (ii) O senhor é Capitão do Exército, quase major ==
- 32 Captain == (i) ‘Rapa ==
- 33 Lieutenant 2 == (i) É sério...
- 34 Captain (i) Isso é processo. (ii) É capa preta. [everybody laughs and talks at the same time].
- 35 Major 1 (i) Falou em #, o Junior: “Chamou, chamou!” [laughs].

| | | |
|------|--------------|---|
| 36 | Captain | (i) Hoje eu tô inspirado. (ii) #. |
| 37 | Lieutenant 2 | (i) O que que é isso! (ii) Eu vou até sair daqui... (iii) Pô, aí, eu vou escutar muito isso. [laughs] (iv) Eu vou escutar muito isso. |
| 38 | Major 1 | (i) É do teu papai, rapaz. (ii) ‘Papai, Marco, que bonito o seu ditado’. |
| NV 5 | - | [Major 2 arrives in the kitchen] |
| 39 | Lieutenant 2 | (i) É o coffee break. |
| 40 | Major 2 | (i) Tenente, é você o culpado. |
| 41 | Lieutenant 2 | (i) ‘Tá, ‘tá. (ii) ‘O capa preta de #’. [laughs]. |
| NV 6 | - | [Captain and Major 2 starts talking about the problem]. |
| 42 | Major 1 | (i) Olha o pacotinho surpresa. (ii) Dia 10 de setembro, esse cara com um pacotinho na mão, eu já fico preocupado, rapaz. (iii) Tirou o bigode, é rapaz, vai chegar amanhã no corredor aqui: “ALÁ!” (iv) Bum! [everybody talks and laughs at the same time] == |
| 43 | Major 2 | (i) Verifica quem tem no grupo carteira D. (ii) Eu, quem mais? |
| 44 | Sergeant 1 | (i) O senhor, o Cabo José [pause 3 secs] == |
| 45 | Major 2 | == (i) Só! |
| 46 | Lieutenant 2 | (i) Eu tenho a D. (ii) Eu acho que posso dirigir até avião. [laughs]. |
| 47 | Sergeant 2 | (i) Januário. (ii) Januário. |

Table 1.13 Mood choices in Excerpt 6: During a coffee break (Adapted from Eggins & Slade; 1997: 110)

| Mood (clause type) | Major 1 | Major 2 | Captain | Lt 1 | Lt 2 | Sgt 1 | Sgt 2 |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| Number of clauses | 9 | 4 | 39 | 15 | 23 | 8 | 2 |
| (Incomplete clauses) | 2 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Number of turns | 4 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 13 | 5 | 1 |
| Declarative: | | | | | | | |
| Full | 2 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 3 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Tagged | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Polar interrogative: | | | | | | | |
| Full | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wh-interrogative: | | | | | | | |
| Full | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Imperative | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Exclamatives | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Minor | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| Most frequent subject choice | Esse cara (1) Eu (1) (Ele) vai (1) | Tenente (1) | Eu (2) Ele (1) | Eu (5) O pessoal (2) Ele (1) | A gente (1) O senhor (1) Eu (5) | As pessoas (1) Eu (2) | 0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|
| Negation | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Adjuncts: | | | | | | | |
| Circumstantial | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Interpersonal | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Textual | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Modalization: | | | | | | | |
| Probability | 2 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Usuality | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Modulation: | | | | | | | |
| (i) Obligation | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| (ii) Inclination | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (iii) Capability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Excerpt 7: Talking about soccer.

Field: Participants are talking about soccer. They are comparing results and players of their teams, while discussing about regional championships. This is a typical subject in military environment, since there are many men from different regions in Brazil.

Tenor: One captain is talking to two soldiers, when a major comes to take part in the conversation. During the conversation, a lieutenant interrupts the major to ask about professional subjects.

Mode: Verbal interaction of a typical subject.

Table 1.14 Transcription of Excerpt 7.

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|-------------|----------------|---|
| 1 | Captain | (i) Flamengo vai meter três logo. (ii) É == |
| 2 | Soldier 1 | == (i) Flamengo e quem? |
| 3 | Captain | (i) Americano. (ii) No Maraca. |
| 4 | Soldier 1 | (i) É... (ii) Brasil – (iii) Copa do Brasil? |
| 5 | Captain | (i) NÃO. (ii) Carioca. |
| 6 | Soldier 1 | (i) Carioca? (ii) Uai! (iii) Pensei que hoje era só Copa do Brasil. |
| 7 | Captain | (i) É, mas tem carioca. |
| NV 1 | - | [Major comes and observes the talking]. |
| 8 | Soldier 2 | (i) Hoje é só para a primeira fase. |
| 9 | Captain | (i) Ah, é assim? == |

- 10 Soldier 2 (i) Flamengo é só na terceira fase.
- 11 Captain (i) Ah... (ii) Bom, é vice-campeão, né? (iii) Tu 'tá falando POR QUE? É O VICE-CAMPEÃO, né.
- 12 Soldier 1 (i) Não tem tradição, né. [laughs].
- 13 Captain (i) É, tudo bem... (ii) Ele é ==
- NV 2 - == [Soldier 1 laughs].
- 14 Captain == (i) Na Copa do Brasil, ele tem a tradição do vice ==
- NV 3 - == [Soldier 1 laughs].
- 15 Soldier 1 (i) Cruzeiro joga hoje, também. (ii) Sergipe. (iii) Sergipe e Cruzeiro.
- 16 Captain (i) Ah, é?
- 17 Soldier 1 (i) È... (ii) Sergipe e Cruzeiro. (iii) (inaudible).
- NV 4 - [Lieutenant comes to ask to major about some professional problems].
- 18 Lieutenant (i) Major, tem outro agravante, também – (ii) Porque é o seguinte... (iii) O negócio do gás ==
- 19 Major == (i) Não corta o papo assim. (ii) A gente falando de futebol, pô! [Everybody talks at the same time]. (iii) A gente tá aqui, #.., dialogando, e tal, tentando desestressar e tu vem – (iv) Já vem com uma carga de stress, aí. (v) Pô!
- NV 5 - [everybody laughs].
- 20 Major (i) Hein, Joel.
- 21 Captain (i) Senhor.
- 22 Major (i) Esse João. (ii) Não sei qual internet que ele entra, aí, que ele vê que tá vindo o Oliver Khan ==
- 23 Captain (i) É...
- 24 Major (i) E com a venda do Maldonado, eles tão entrando num acordo, porque o Ronaldinho, depois que jogou o casaco pro alto, lá, diz que brigou com o Luxemburgo, aí parece que o Cruzeiro ==
- 25 Soldier 1 (i) O Cruzeiro que revelou ele. [laughs].
- 26 Major (i) Quem revelou ele foi o São Cristóvão.
- NV 6 - [laughs].
- 27 Soldier 1 (i) Foi igual ao Jussê. (ii) Jussê 'tava sendo vendido pelo Cruzeiro e 'tava com medo de um time – (iii) Porque ele jogou num time lá do Rio, né. (iv) 'Tava com medo que o time entrasse na justiça pra ganhar um bocado de dinheiro também.

- 28 Major (i) Hoje em dia, é fogo. (ii) O cara tem direitos federativos presos ao clube, o passe dele preso ao empresário. (iii) Aí, não sei o que, direito de imagem preso ao clube. (iv) Quer dizer, o cara, às vezes, tem que negociar com três – (v) Negociar com três – (vi) Rescindir três contratos, se bobear.
- 29 Soldier 2 (i) Ronaldinho deu entrevista uma vez, falando que o clube que ele queria jogar quando voltasse ao Brasil, era o Flamengo...
- 30 Soldier 1 (i) É...
- 31 Major (i) MAS TODO MUNDO, rapa'==
- 32 Captain (i) == Aí, sabe o que vai acontecer? ==
- 33 Major == (i) TODO MUNDO ==
- 34 Captain == (i) No final da carreira dele, que ele 'tiver já podre, aí o Flamengo vai e pega ele.
- 35 Soldier 1 (i) Fazer igual ao Marcelinho Carioca. (ii) Jogando no Brasiense.
- 36 Major (i) Por onde anda o Marcelinho Carioca?
- 37 Soldier 1 (i) BRASILIENSE!
- 38 Major (i) Caramba...(ii) Mas também, 'tá com o que, 35 anos ==
- 39 Soldier 1 == (i) O senhor viu qual o primeiro jogo do Flamengo no Brasileiro? ==
- 40 Major == (i) O Cruzeiro ==
- 41 Captain == (i) Lá no Maracanã. (ii) Tem que dar logo uma CHIBATADA. (iii) Tem que dar uma entortada naquele Athirson. (iii) Chutar a bola lá na # ==
- 42 Major == (i) Não, mas aí os caras vão 'tá com o Oliver Khan, cara. (ii) É #...
- 43 Soldier 1 (i) Vamo 'tá bem, vamo 'tá bem, hein. (ii) Os caras vão 'tá jogando, hein. (iii) Olha, olha.
- 44 Major (i) Eles vão 'tá como Oliver Khan, lateral direito é aquele da Argentina, o...
- NV Soldier 1 [laughs].
- 45 Major (i) Como é que é, o...
- 46 Soldier 1 (i) O Sorin ==
- 47 Major (i) Não. (ii) O Sorin é o esquerdo. (iii) Não, o lateral direito. (iv) Aimar. (v) Pablo Aimar...
- 48 Captain (i) E o Sorin, cara?
- 49 Soldier 1 (i) O Sorin foi embora.
- 50 Captain (i) O Sorin foi embora, ué! (ii) De novo! (iii) Vem, volta e vem ==
- 51 Major == (i) Ele vem, passa as férias no Cruzeiro...

| | | |
|----|-----------|--|
| NV | - | [everybody laughs]. |
| 52 | Soldier 1 | (i) Onde tiver ganhando mais dinheiro ele vai. (ii) É #. |
| 53 | Major | (i) É assim: o clube não quer pagar ele lá, aí ele vem... [laughs]. (ii) Aqui recebe, aí quando 'tá a fim, pum, aí vai embora [laughs] == |
| 54 | Soldier 1 | (i) Aí o Cruzeiro (inaudible). (ii) É #. |
| 55 | Soldier 2 | (i) Pô, ele veio para o Cruzeiro numa época ruim, porque o Leonar – (ii) O Leandro, né, o lateral esquerdo, 'tava bem pra caramba. (iii) Já tinha até sido convocado para a seleção, né? |
| 56 | Major | (i) E foi barrado, né? |
| 57 | Soldier 2 | (i) Foi barrado pelo Sorin. |
| 58 | Captain | (i) Não foi o Leandro que fez aquele gol [pause 3 secs] (ii) Antológico. (iii) Pegou a bola no meio de campo, saiu driblando todo mundo. (iii) Foi ele? |
| 59 | Soldier 2 | (i) Não... |
| 60 | Captain | (i) Foi um lateral, não foi? (ii) Não lembra que == |
| 61 | Major | == (i) Foi o Maicon, Maicon. |
| 62 | Captain | (i) Ah, é. Foi o Maicon. (ii) Fez o gol igual ao do Maradona == |
| 63 | Major | (i) É, é. |
| 64 | Captain | (i) Ele driblou MAIS do que o Maradona, e foi parar == |
| 65 | Major | == (i) Um a mais, né. [laughs]. |
| 66 | Soldier 2 | (i) Foi comparado com o gol do Maradona. |

Table 1.15 Mood choices in Excerpt 7: Talking about soccer (Adapted from Eggins & Slade; 1997: 110)

| Mood (clause type) | Major | Captain | Lieutenant | Soldier 1 | Soldier 2 |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Number of clauses | 38 | 34 | 3 | 32 | 9 |
| (Incomplete clauses) | 16 | 10 | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| Number of turns | 21 | 20 | 1 | 18 | 7 |
| Declarative: | | | | | |
| Full | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| Elliptical | 5 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Tagged | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Polar interrogative: | | | | | |
| Full | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Wh-interrogative: | | | | | |
| Full | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Imperative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exclamatives | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Minor | 6 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Most frequent subject choice | A gente (2) Tu (1) Ele (3) O cara (2) | Flamengo (1) Ele (5) Senhor (1) | Major (1) | Eu (1) Ele (4) Sorin (1) Cruzeiro (2) | Flamengo (1) Ronaldinho (1) |

| | Sorin (1) Eu (1) Eles (2) Os caras (1) | | | | Ele (3) Leandro (1) |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| Negation | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Adjuncts: | | | | | |
| Circumstantial | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Interpersonal | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Textual | 10 | 8 | 2 | 7 | 1 |
| Modalization: | | | | | |
| Probability | 6 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Usuality | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| Modulation: | | | | | |
| (i) Obligation | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (ii) Inclination | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (iii) Capability | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Excerpt 8: Talking to a Private.

Field: A Sergeant arrives in the battery and sees a private typing on the computer. After seeing the private, Sergeant starts talking about the last formation in the battalion.

Tenor: Just for curiosity, the Sergeant is asking to private some questions about the last formation, especially about parents and relatives. During the conversation, the subject changes, and the private starts explaining his objectives in the future and problems in his family.

Mode: Verbal interaction of many subjects.

Table 1.16 Transcription of Excerpt 8.

| Turn | Speaker | Text |
|------|----------|--|
| 1 | Sergeant | (i) Soldado José. (ii) Como é que 'tá o serviço? (iii) Tranquilo? |
| 2 | Private | (i) (inaudible). |
| 3 | Sergeant | (i) É? (ii) Vem cá. (iii) Como é que 'tão as coisas? |
| 4 | Private | (i) Tranquilo, graças a Deus. |
| 5 | Sergeant | (i) Tranquilo lá? |
| 6 | Private | (i) Graças a Deus. |
| 7 | Sergeant | (i) E o curso do SENAC, lá? (ii) Beleza, lá? (iii) Aprendendo muita coisa? |
| 8 | Private | (i) Demais. |

- (i) Ah! (ii) Isso é bom. (iii) Isso é muito bom. (iv) Tua família - (v)
- 9 Sergeant 'Cê trouxe sua família aqui, quando 'cê recebeu a boina?
- 10 Private (i) Sim, senhor.
- 11 Sergeant (i) Trouxe?
- 12 Private (i) Só minha mãe. (ii) Meu pai não mora comigo não.
- 13 Sergeant (i) Ah! (ii) Seu pai não mora não?
- 14 Private (i) Mora em São Paulo.
- 15 Sergeant (i) Sua irmã, namorada? (ii) Trouxe não?
- 16 Private (i) Minha irmã não veio não.
- 17 Sergeant (i) Veio não?
- NV 1 - [Private answers the question using a sound with his lips, indicating a negative answer].
- (i) O curso lá de informática que 'cê 'tá fazendo lá - (ii) 'Cê 'tá fazendo em quais dias?
- 18 Sergeant
- 19 Private (i) Tô fazendo sábado.
- 20 Sergeant (i) Sábado?
- 21 Private (i) Sim, senhor.
- 22 Sergeant (i) Isso é bom. (ii) Que cursos que 'cê 'tá fazendo lá?
- (i) Qual deles? (ii) O da noite? (iii) (inaudible) (iv) Uai, sei lá - (v)
- 23 Private Colocar mais uns - (vi) Mais um - (vii) Um curso no meu currículo, né.
- 24 Sergeant (i) Pra quê? (ii) 'Cê não 'tá trabalhando bem?
- 25 Private (i) Sim, senhor.
- 26 Sergeant (i) Então.
- (i) Mas o meu currículo - (ii) Um dia se eu sair daqui, uai, 'vô ficar
- 27 Private mexendo com computador a vida toda.
- 28 Sergeant (i) E a escola?
- (i) Na escola não 'tô estudando ultimamente, não, sargento. (ii) Parei
- 29 Private de estudar. (iii) No terceiro ano.
- 30 Sergeant (i) Por que?
- 31 Private (i) Por falta de tempo.

| | | |
|----|----------|---|
| 32 | Sergeant | (i) Tempo! (i) Trabalhava em rádio. (ii) Não tinha tempo, não. (iii) Mas, falei com meu pai, com minha mãe, e tal – (iv) Não concordou muito, não. (v) Mas, depois... (vi) Era pra trabalhar, mesmo. (vii) Minha família necessita muito. |
| 33 | Private | |
| 34 | Sergeant | (i) Seu pai e sua mãe concordaram? (i) Concordaram, porque era pra mim trabalhar, né. (ii) E a minha mãe precisa de mim, também. (iii) Minha mãe – (iv) Ela não ganha um salário assim, né. (v) Minha mãe passa por dificuldades pra caramba. (vi) E eu ajudo ela em casa. |
| 35 | Private | |

Table 1.17 Mood choices in Excerpt 8: Talking to a Private. (Adapted from Eggs & Slade; 1997: 110)

| Mood (clause type) | Sergeant | Private |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Number of clauses | 32 | 37 |
| (Incomplete clauses) | 2 | 7 |
| Number of turns | 17 | 17 |
| Declarative: | | |
| Full | 0 | 7 |
| Elliptical | 3 | 13 |
| Tagged | 0 | 1 |
| Polar interrogative: | | |
| Full | 1 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 12 | 1 |
| Wh-interrogative: | | |
| Full | 6 | 0 |
| Elliptical | 2 | 1 |
| Imperative | 1 | 0 |
| Exclamatives | 1 | 0 |
| Minor | 4 | 5 |
| Most frequent subject choice | 'Cê (você) (5) | Eu (implicit) (8) |
| Negation | 0 | 2 |
| Adjuncts: | | |
| Circumstantial | 6 | 5 |
| Interpersonal | 0 | 0 |
| Textual | 4 | 5 |
| Modalization: | | |
| Probability | 3 | 2 |
| Usuality | 0 | 0 |
| Modulation: | | |
| (i) Obligation | 1 | 3 |
| (ii) Inclination | 0 | 0 |
| (iii) Capability | 0 | 0 |

APPENDIX G

GLOSSARY OF MILITARY TERMS AND EXPRESSIONS PRESENTED IN EXCERPTS 1 TO 8.

1. Excerpt 1:

Pista de cordas – a type of obstacle course, composed by cords, which are tied on between two trees, in order to be transposed by military in operational training.

Dar o pronto – common expression used by military to announce that mission is accomplished.

Falsa Baiana - obstacle composed of two cords, one in a high position and the other in a low position.

Lepar – obstacle composed by one cord in a mountain, which help military to climb mountains.

2. Excerpt 2:

Cerrar (Cerra) – a typical command in the army, which expresses “come here”.

Patrulha – patrol. A small group of military with a specific mission.

Senha – password.

Visto – a typical command in the army to designate points on the ground.

Azimute – an angle, which gives the right direction to follow.

Cessa o papo – a typical command, which expresses “Shut up”.

3. Excerpt 3:

Xerife – sheriff. It is a typical jargon in the army, referring to the commandant of a small group of men.

Subxerife – term, which designates the sub commandant of a small group of men.

Passar a bola – slang from soccer. It expresses the act of one man, which is responsible for something; and passes this responsibility to other man.

Bisonho – slang in the army. A pejorative way of calling someone as insecure, ingenuous or inexperienced.

Torar (ndo) – to sleep.

Dar o golpe (de estado) – to deceive in order to obtain advantages (dar o golpe), or, in this case, to assume the command by force.

Cobrir – a typical command.

Correndo, curto – a typical command.

4. Excerpt 4:

De pé, um, dois – a typical command.

5. Excerpt 5:

Voltar à carga – slang, in this case. A typical maneuver developed by Cavalry, in campaign.

Chutar o pau da barraca – slang. To take drastic steps, without evaluating consequences.

6. Excerpt 6:

Gente saindo pelo ladrão – slang. Expression referring to plumb in a water tank, which expresses a large quantity of something.

Obuseiro – howitzer. A kind of cannon.

Guarnição – a group of men responsible to operate a cannon.

Amarrado – to be supported by law.

Capa preta – slang. Reference to court or to judges.

7. Excerpt 7:

Cortar o papo – slang. To interrupt conversation.

APPENDIX H



MINISTÉRIO DA DEFESA
EXÉRCITO BRASILEIRO

Of s/nº

Sete Lagoas, 24 de agosto de 2004.

Do Maj José Osvaldo Sampaio Bueno.

Ao Sr Ten Cel Ricardo Souza Netto.

Assunto: apoio em pesquisa para tese de mestrado.

Anexo: cronograma de atividades 2004/2005;
proposta de conversação para gravação.

1. Versa o presente expediente sobre solicitação de apoio em pesquisa para conclusão de tese de mestrado.
2. O Curso de Mestrado Interinstitucional em Língua Inglesa (Minter) foi desenvolvido através de uma parceria da Universidade Estadual do Centro-Oeste (UNICENTRO), sediada em Guarapuava-PR e Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), sediada em Florianópolis-SC; e tem o objetivo de proporcionar o desenvolvimento da pesquisa em Língua Inglesa para os acadêmicos daquelas duas instituições.
3. O curso tem a duração de dois anos, sendo que, o primeiro ano é destinado ao aprendizado de disciplinas teóricas; enquanto que, o segundo ano é voltado para a preparação da tese, com base nos projetos apresentados por cada aluno.
4. A minha pesquisa tem como título: "A discourse analysis focused on spoken interactions in the Brazilian Army" ("Uma análise do discurso focada em interações verbais no Exército Brasileiro" - minha tradução). Tendo como hipótese o fato de que a mídia explora a hierarquia e a disciplina como fatores impeditivos de interações formais e informais entre superiores e subordinados, difundindo para o público civil um tipo de discurso militar baseado no autoritarismo, na ausência de justiça, na punição e na ofensa, o principal objetivo de minha pesquisa seria a desmistificação do discurso militar. A minha intenção é justamente mostrar o oposto do que a mídia divulga, já que o Exército Brasileiro, por ser uma instituição tradicional, fundamentada nos pilares da hierarquia e da disciplina, não pode ter o discurso militar

exposto da forma exagerada que se vê em filmes, musicas, artigos de jornais e revistas e em programas de televisão. O que se intenciona defender é que a hierarquia e disciplina servem como instrumentos de fortalecimento de um ambiente baseado no respeito mútuo, que propicia o cumprimento da missão e que, dependendo da situação, podem ocorrer até interações informais entre superiores e subordinados.

5. Dessa forma, este oficial intenciona analisar, numa primeira fase, o discurso militar difundido pela mídia. Em seguida, através da análise de interações verbais produzidas no Exército Brasileiro, seria feita uma comparação entre o que é explorado pela mídia e o que realmente acontece no ambiente militar, na busca de distorções e exageros produzidos pela mídia e tentando explorar em que situações ocorrem a informalidade nas conversações.

6. Do acima exposto, solicito a esse Comando a possibilidade de autorizar a gravação de conversações entre superiores e subordinados em diversas situações rotineiras dessa Organização Militar. Desde já, informo do meu perfeito entendimento quanto a não divulgação de assuntos reservados e aproveito para assegurar que; seguindo as normas impostas para execução de pesquisas envolvendo coleta de dados; nomes, entidades e outros dados que identifiquem pessoas e instituições serão omitidos, com vistas à preservação da imagem dos envolvidos. Além disso, coloco-me à disposição para, a qualquer momento, dar mostras sobre o andamento e análise do material coletado, com o objetivo de dar transparência ao processo de pesquisa.

JOSÉ OSVALDO SAMPAIO BUENO – Maj
Oficial Solicitante

CRONOGRAMA DE ATIVIDADES 2004/2005

1. Visitas de orientação (presencial do aluno):

- Local: UFSC – Florianópolis – SC;
- Período: 07(sete) semanas, até Fev/2005;
- Execução: mediante agendamento para finais de semana, conforme disponibilidade do aluno/ orientador, e sem prejuízo do serviço na OM.

2. Exposição da pesquisa em congressos nacionais (exigência da CAPES/MEC):

- Local: Universidade Federal de Uberlândia (UFU) – Uberlândia - MG;
- Período: de 20 a 22 Out 2004 (mediante dispensa para desconto em férias em caráter excepcional – férias relativas e 2004);
- Execução: Comunicação individual no 10º Simpósio Nacional de Letras e Linguística (SILEL), sobre o tema da pesquisa.

3. Defesa de tese:

- Local: UFSC, conforme agendamento da banca examinadora;
- Período: A partir de Fev 2005;
- Execução: Apresentação da tese, em data a ser agendada (mediante dispensa para desconto em férias).

JOSÉ OSVALDO SAMPAIO BUENO – Maj
Oficial Solicitante

PROPOSTA DE CONVERSACÕES PARA GRAVAÇÃO

1. Situações formais:

- Oficial dando aviso à tropa;
- Sargento dando aviso à tropa;
- Conversações em seções da área administrativa, envolvendo oficiais, sargentos, cabos e soldados;
- Oficial sanando dúvida de soldado em instrução;
- Sargento sanando dúvida de soldado em instrução.

2. Situação informais:

- Oficial conversando com sargento;
- Oficial conversando com cabo e soldado;
- Sargento conversando com cabo e soldado;
- Comandante de um batalhão conversando com um oficial, sargento, cabo e soldado.

JOSÉ OSVALDO SAMPAIO BUENO – Maj
Oficial Solicitante