

## Abstract

### **Hierarchy in Legal Discourse: Dominant Role in the Talk of Professional and Subordinated Role in the Talk of Lay Participants (on the materials of legal TV show «*Час суда*»)**

The purpose of the research is to examine how power relations come into existence in a specific kind of judicial discourse – the so called Russian people’s tribunal. Specific attention is paid to particular language practices that indicate asymmetry in talk. In the present dissertation I investigate four phenomena, where we can capture expressions of power position: the ones occurring in simultaneous talk, topic management, repair and irony.

The corpus contains 6 parts of a legal TVshow transmitted on NTV in which seats of people’s tribunal are presented. These texts were recorded and transcribed (in 1800 lines of transcription) following the traditions of conversation analysis. In the present analysis we can distinguish four type of phenomena in which we could inevitably observe different behaviour in case of speakers with different institutional identity as result of establishing powerful or powerless positions.

On the base of text analysis we can see significant difference in the behavior of speakers that follows from their institutional roles, rights and obligations. The participants follow specific goals according to their institutional identity, which determines their language use as well. For instance, overlaps were made both by professional and lay participants of tribunal seats but reactions to different kinds of overlapping talk were crucially different. And what is more: in the case of formally equivalent overlapping items speakers with different institutional roles accomplished different actions.

Topic management was dramatically different in comparison to topic management in everyday talk-in-interaction. Profession participants highly controlled topic development, whereas lays accepted control under their topic initiations and oriented to that topic leading.

On examining repairs occurring in texts we noticed that in the judges’ talk a certain kind of dispreferred repair often occurs, however we can observe acceptance of that kind of dispreferred repair by other participants.

As regards the examination of irony in the transcribed texts of the legal TVshow we can observe different motivation and accomplishment of different speech acts by participants with different institutional identity. Through the text analysis we present that irony in professional talk works like a discourse organising power.

We can draw the inference that power relationship is created by the mutual activity of discourse participants in the process of accomplishing their specific purposes in talk-in-interaction. We can describe the power relations in discourse through the understandings and orientations of speakers to their institutional roles.