1. Introduction

2. Conflict and Society
   Nader, L & H Todd (eds)
   1978 The disputing process. Intro plus Canter (Zambia) or Witty (Lebanon)
   Moore, Sally Falk
   1978 Law as Process. chap 2 Law & social change

3. Rules and Processes
   Merry, S.
   Yngvesson, B.
   Nader, Laura

4. Rules and Processes: Case Study
   Merry, S.
   1990 Getting justice and getting even.
5. **Language in disputes**  
Conley, J.M & O’Barr, M.  
1998 Just Words chaps 1, 2, 5  
Felstiner, W., R. Abel, & A. Sarat  
Materials on transcription

6. **Language, Gender and Disputing**  
Hirsch, Susan  
1998 Pronouncing and persevering  
Mendoza-Denton, N.  

7. **Small Claims Court**  
Sarat, A.  
Conley & O’Barr  
1990 Rules vs. Relationships  
1998 Just Words chap 4

8. **Narrations and narrated selves 1**  
Goffman, E.  
1955 On face-work.  
1979 Footing, reprinted in Forms of Talk.  
Scheppele, K.  
Ochs, E. & L. Capps  
1996 Narrating the Self. Annual Review of Anthropology  
Ochs, E. et al,  
Ochs, E. et al.  

9. **Narrations and narrated selves 2**  
Labov, W.  
Labov, W.  
1984 "Intensity..." Georgetown Univ. Round Table  
Labov, W.
1981  Speech actions and reactions in personal narratives. GURT

10. Evidence, Explanations, Responsibility, Morality
Shiffrin, D.  
Philips, S U  
Pomerantz, A.  
Drew, P.  

11. Evidence, Responsibility and Discourse Markers
Fraser, B.  
1996 Pragmatic markers. Pragmatics 6,2:167-190
Schiffrin, D  
1987 So and because: markers of cause and result. In Discourse Markers. CUP.

12. Language, Law, Interpretation/Consequences
Tiersma, P. and Solan, L.  
2002 The linguist on the witness stand. Language 78.2:221-239.
Prince, E.  
1991 The use of social conversation as evidence... In Levi & Walker
Green, G.  
1991 Linguistic analysis of conversation as evidence .. In Levi & Walker
Gumperz, G.  
Walker, A.G.  
1991 Language at work in the law...court reporting. In Levi & Walker
Haviland, J.  
Lippi-Green, R  
Hale, Sandra  
**Requirements:**
Please be on time for class, active participation is expected.

The focus in the class is on:
1. Critical analysis of readings.
2. Data collection and transcription. Students will do fieldwork in Lower Manhattan's small claims court early in the semester, one or two fieldtrips (6-9pm). Class members will tape record arbitration cases. Each person will choose a case, or if the case is lengthy (more than 15 minutes), two people can work on a case together. If you are interested in a bilingual case, that may be possible to tape record one and use it for your project.
3. Analysis of court cases using several different approaches to discourse analysis and ideas about dispute resolution.
4. Class is run as a combination of lectures and lab sessions on data transcription, management, analysis.

There are 3 essay papers (6-8 pages). No late papers.

Essay 1. Draws on Merry's book and readings relevant to it.
Essay 3. Final Paper  Social and legal implications of language practices

There are 5 data-based analysis papers that draw on specific readings and are applied to your case data:

Data Paper 1 - Application of Conley & O'Barr's Rules vs Relationships model to your case - strengths/weaknesses of this analytical model.
Data Paper 2 - Discourse analysis à la Ochs - what insights does this provide into your case?
Data Paper 3 - Labov's narrative model - can it work in small claims cases?
Data Paper 4 - Meta-talk framework - what work does meta-talk do?
Data Paper 5 - Discourse markers: Evidence and Morality.

In terms of grading - all papers are weighted equally.