

## 32: Participatory discourse analysis workshops in South Asia

Sara du Preez

**Abstract:** This case study describes the implementation and modification of Bartsch’s discourse analysis method over several workshops that were held in South and Southeast Asia. Each workshop was attended by 5-8 language teams each with 1-4 members with a broad range of computer knowledge, formal education, and linguistic experience. Bartsch’s method was designed to be participatory, directly involving native speakers in the data collection, analysis, discovery, and description of their own language. Although this method may be run in a “non-participatory” style for linguists who are not native speakers or a part of the community of the language they are analyzing, the attendees may struggle to complete assignments that require native speaker intuition. Aspects of the workshop that affect the outcomes include the language of instruction, the venue of the workshop, and the linguistic abilities of the participants. Previous attendees have found this workshop to be beneficial to their translation projects and have given suggestions about what might be changed in future iterations of these workshops. Modifications can be made to both the materials and the workshop schedule to increase interactions among attendees and to accommodate the unique set of attendees’ abilities.

**Keywords:** online training, method modifications, narrative and non-narrative discourse, language communities, native speakers, natural translation

### 1 Introduction

This paper describes practical aspects of implementing Bartsch’s participatory discourse analysis method (Chapter 29 this volume) based on observations from four different workshops held in South and Southeast Asia at which I lectured and facilitated. These workshops were attended by small groups of people who were either actively translating texts into minority languages, had translated texts in the past, or were hoping to translate texts in the future. The goal of the workshops was to help each team produce a more natural-sounding translation by discovering and understanding the functions of the discourse features of the target language.

This first section describes why Bartsch’s method was selected, the participatory aspects of her method, and relevant traits of past workshop attendees that influence the implementation of the workshops. The second section describes variations and modifications to the workshop that fall within the typical range of execution while the third section describes more significant modifications that were made during a workshop led by Oliver Kroeger.<sup>1</sup> The fourth section recounts feedback from the attendees, including topics they found helpful and recommendations for future workshops, and the fifth section concludes the paper.

#### 1.1 Why Bartsch’s method?

The purpose of Bartsch’s discourse method is to equip native speakers with knowledge of their own language’s discourse structures for practical application when translating. The trainings are offered in a workshop format, with many groups of native speakers or *language teams*<sup>2</sup> attending concurrently.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kroeger’s grammatical analysis method is described and reviewed in Chapter 21 this volume.

<sup>2</sup> Multiple attendees working with the same language data and completing assignments together as a team.

Many language teams in South Asia looking to receive instruction on discourse analysis use Bartsch's method. The only available, or perhaps known, alternative to her method is Levinsohn's pair of volumes: *Self-Instruction Materials for Non-Narrative Discourse Analysis* (2008) and *Self-Instruction Materials for Narrative Discourse Analysis* (2015). However, even translation consultants with advanced formal linguistic training have admitted that trying to complete these materials without previous experience in discourse analysis can be daunting.<sup>3</sup> The main reason that Bartsch's method is preferred in this region is because it was designed *in situ* for those with "limited education, education based on rote-learning, little or no linguistic training, and/or limited knowledge of the language of instruction" (Bartsch 2021: 1) and so has a relatively low barrier to entry. Another reason it remains popular is its workshop style, which allows for interaction on several levels: among attendees on the same language team, between language teams and consultants from outside the language community, and between members of different language teams. Having a knowledgeable facilitator who can guide the attendees through the materials reduces the cognitive load on the attendees.

In my experience, attendees learned of Bartsch's workshops by word of mouth, and then usually through someone with connections to SIL. For one national minority language society, Bartsch's workshops have become a touchstone of their translation workflow.

## 1.2 In what way is this method "participatory?"

The fundamental difference between running a workshop in a *participatory* mode rather than a *non-participatory* one is that the native speakers are the main actors in analyzing their own language, applying the lectures to their own data, and any consultants who are not a part of the language community have a passive role, discussing topics with the teams as needed, becoming "*linguistics resource people*" as it were. In contrast, in a non-participatory mode, the outsider is the main actor and occasionally calls upon "*language resource people*" in order to access their native speaker intuition.

As mentioned previously, Bartsch's method is designed with a participatory mode in mind – for teams of native speakers to investigate their language together, with anyone present from outside of the language communities in a supporting role. It is possible to run Bartsch's workshops in a non-participatory mode as well, with outside linguists working through the materials with a language that they do not speak. Therefore, it is the composition of the attendees rather than the curriculum that determines whether a workshop is participatory or non-participatory. There may even be a mix of modes in the same workshop with some language teams in a participatory mode and other teams in a non-participatory mode. Teams with native speakers have the advantage in that they intuitively understand social implications of certain language use. Teams with linguists may have an edge on understanding technical linguistic concepts. But teams without native speakers are at a definite disadvantage and may not be able to complete some assignments until they can consult a speaker from the language community.

---

<sup>3</sup> It seems that the inclusion of "self-instruction" in the title has led some people to believe that they must attempt discourse analysis by themselves. Several linguists of my acquaintance have admitted that they found working through Levinsohn's materials on their own to be daunting. I imagine if those linguists were to undertake his method with some support, even with the company of another linguist who has no experience in discourse analysis, Levinsohn's method might be significantly less intimidating.

### 1.3 Characteristics of past attendees

The workshops that inform this case study were each attended by 5-8 language teams. Most language teams had 3-4 members, but one workshop was entirely attended by “teams” consisting of only one member each.

The languages represented at each workshop belonged to a variety of language families. In two of the workshops there had been an effort to involve teams from related languages or languages from the same area, but there were always teams at each workshop from languages that were unrelated to each other. Most of the languages represented were from the Tibeto-Burman or Indo-Aryan language families, with an isolated Dravidian, Tai-Kadai, or Khmer language in attendance at each workshop. All of the languages were minority languages in their respective countries. All languages had an established orthography. Some teams reported having local radio programs, newspapers, or other printed materials in their own languages. In a couple of cases, the language team attending the workshop had created the first literacy or published materials in that language.

The individual team members at each workshop possessed a widely varying range of formal education and linguistic experience. Although a few language teams had a member with a bachelor’s degree or linguistic training, a majority of the attendees had not gone far beyond secondary education. In some cases, one member of a team would have formal linguistic education. Prior to the workshop, most native speakers had previous experience in analyzing their own languages during orthography development or while producing a grammar sketch. Some attendees had been involved with translation projects of other languages.

Computers are becoming a much more common sight at these workshops. Still, a team might only have one computer to share between them or only one member who is comfortable with typing. Occasionally, there is a team in which no members have knowledge of basic computer best practices, such as giving their documents uniquely identifying names.<sup>4</sup>

## 2 Implementation of Bartsch’s method

This section discusses some practical aspects of implementing Bartsch’s materials based on the observation of four workshops. The workshops used for the examples in this chapter were generally held in the spring or autumn, outside of the monsoon season, so that travel was safer for the attendees. The workshops were all ten days long, held over two weeks with a weekend in the middle. They typically followed a schedule from about 8 or 9 in the morning to 4 in the afternoon, with two tea breaks and a lunch break.

Several different roles are necessary to conduct a workshop: an operations manager to arrange the venue, register attendees, and recruit people to the various other roles; a facilitator<sup>5</sup> to set the schedule of topics and manage the workshop flow; lecturers to teach the topics; a translator if the lecturers and attendees do not share a language; and consultants to help the attendees understand the topics and apply them. It may also be necessary to have

---

<sup>4</sup> One team, comprised of an older gentleman and a younger couple, was very diligently using a computer. It was the personal computer of the older man, so he was the one operating it. A couple of days into the course, he accused one of the facilitators of deleting his work. Upon inspection of his files, he was saving each document “document 1, document 2, document 3...” in a file folder as well as on his desktop. We had to set a significant amount of time aside from the discourse assignments to hunt through his documents for the necessary files as well as coach him through some basic file management.

<sup>5</sup> Until recently, a Bartsch workshop was facilitated by Carla Bartsch herself. She would give most of the lectures and then delegate a few of the lectures to future facilitators that she was mentoring. She would negotiate the schedule with an on-site operations manager.

someone to set up the required technology and someone to make sure the food and snacks arrive each day.<sup>6</sup> Several of these roles may be filled by one person; the facilitator might also give lectures and also be available as a consultant during the analysis phases between lectures. Ideally there would be a consultant available for each language team, but in all of the workshops I have seen, consultants have needed to float between 2-3 teams.

Small modifications are needed at any workshop to accommodate the unique range of skills and the abilities of the attendees. Some aspects of the workshop as well as the group composition predictably affect the implementation of the course. These include whether or not the workshop is participatory, the language families that are represented, the language of instruction, the type of venue, and the linguistic ability of the attendees. Each of these aspects is discussed in their respective subsections.

## 2.1 Participatory or non-participatory

It is possible to use Bartsch's teaching materials in a workshop setting where the attendees are not speakers or members of the community of the language they are analyzing. A workshop that was held entirely online in English for linguists and consultants would not count as a participatory workshop. The greatest drawback to running Bartsch's materials in a "non-participatory" way is that the assignments given throughout the workshop are geared to native speakers of a language. As a consultant noted concerning one of the analysis assignments, "The handout states, 'Exhortations in a text can be listed in the order of their forcefulness.' This may be easy for a native speaker but may take some effort for a non-native speaker" (Feedback 2021b). While judgments requiring native-speaker intuition may be difficult for non-native speakers, they may be impossible for consultants who do not speak the language with any proficiency. Indeed, the only reason this style of workshop was possible for non-native speakers is because the attendees were able to consult with native speakers between sessions. I observed the same behavior in a Text Analysis course held at a university. The students were not native speakers of the languages they were analyzing and had to confer with native speakers at least weekly to complete the analysis assignments.

Since the desired outcome is not just that the language team discovers the discourse structures but also internalizes them to use during translation or to defend their translation choices, a participatory approach may decrease the total time needed for the translation project. In at least two cases, a consultant attended the workshop instead of the translation team they were consulting. The consultants were better able to keep up with the flow of information, determine which topics were relevant to their translation projects, and then further trim the workshop materials to be useful for their team. However, the consultants then had to spend as much time relaying the information to the team as they had spent in lectures and performing analysis on their own.

## 2.2 Multiple language families represented at one workshop

Bartsch's workshops are capable of catering to multiple language families at once. She has her own collection of texts from different language families from which she draws examples to illustrate the various discourse-level phenomena depending on the language families represented at the workshop. She is currently in the process of editing her workshop materials into a polished *Manual of Discourse Workshops for Mother Tongue Translators* with 3 different volumes for different geographical areas: volume 1 for Niger-Congo and Nilo-Saharan

---

<sup>6</sup> Do not underestimate the morale boost that a simple tea-break may provide.

languages (Bartsch 2021), volume 2 for South Asian languages, and volume 3 for Southeast Asian languages.<sup>7</sup> Although the volumes are already geared toward certain areas, Bartsch recommends further trimming the examples depending on the language families represented in the workshop.

### 2.3 Language of instruction

The language of instruction greatly affects the amount of time needed for teaching the workshop. When the lectures are given in English and translated consecutively, the day's schedule runs for 8 hours with two 15-minute breaks and an hour lunch break. In order for the lectures to be understood, the translator needs to have knowledge of linguistic terminology; it is important to make sure that the translator can select vocabulary appropriately<sup>8</sup> and that key terms are being used consistently.

When the lectures are given in one language only, the material can be taught in about 3 hours per day, with one 15-minute break.

### 2.4 Type of venue

The venue of the workshop has a direct impact on the attendees' ability to complete the materials. If this course is to be compressed into two weeks, engagement with the materials and interaction outside of class time are vital. The physical separation from other responsibilities afforded by a campus-style workshop is priceless.

One workshop was held on a campus. The language team members had traveled from other provinces to participate in the workshop and stayed in dorms a few buildings away from where the workshop was held. All meals were included in the workshop, and the attendees had no other duties while on campus. This arrangement is the ideal situation, as the team members can continue to interact with each other outside of the lecture hours and work on unfinished assignments in the evenings. These attendees produced the most complete write-ups.

In two of the workshops, attendees opted to commute to the workshop rather than pay to stay at a hotel in the neighborhood, and so in some cases had over an hour of travel in one direction. This decreased cost per attendee but eliminated discussion outside of the workshop and the team members' ability to finish assignments as homework, since they were busy with family matters in the evenings. There were also issues with finishing the write-up, since the team computer went home with one team member, who got bogged down with more work than the other team members. Overall, this arrangement resulted in the least engagement with the course materials and between team members outside of the workshop hours.

The last workshop was conducted entirely online. Even though the attendees all had high levels of linguistic knowledge, the lectures were given in their first language, and they had more time for analysis assignments, this arrangement had the most sporadic level of engagement. Some teams devoted all extra time to the analysis assignments, but others seemed to be preoccupied with other aspects of life and often had incomplete assignments.

---

<sup>7</sup> She also mentioned informally that she has materials for the Caucasus region.

<sup>8</sup> Bartsch uses the English word "story" as a less-technical alternative to *narrative discourse*. However, when "story" is translated into Hindi or Nepali, it gives the impression that what is being discussed is a fictional story or fairy tale rather than someone's personal account, when both belong to the narrative genre. Another example, from the analysis of clause order, is that deductive and inductive reasoning are referred to as "logical" and "non-logical." It might be necessary to check that non-logical is not being translated as "illogical."

## 2.5 Degree of linguistic knowledge

As previously mentioned, Bartsch designed her workshop for those with minimal linguistic experience. This can be seen in several aspects of the structure, including the terminology and the assignments. However, I can attest to the fact that “[o]thers with more advanced education and linguistic training have also benefitted from participation in these workshops” (Bartsch 2021: 1) as I have personally heard feedback to that effect from attendees holding advanced degrees in linguistics. For workshops attended entirely by people with advanced formal linguistic training, adjustments may be made to the terminology used, topics covered, and the rate at which analysis assignments are given.

One of the ways Bartsch’s program caters to teams who have minimal linguistic training is by replacing linguistic jargon with layman’s terms. For example, *imperatives* are referred to as “strong commands” or, when talking about plot structure, Longacre’s (1996: 36) *finis* is simply called “finish.” Bartsch has retained the technical terms in curly brackets in her materials for those who are interested, so it is an easy matter to revert to the technical terms for audiences that understand them.

At many points in the material, grammatical concepts are taught or reviewed. These sections may be skipped, depending on the audience. For example, in one assignment the teams must search for imperatives in their texts. Someone with linguistic training may already be familiar with imperatives and so will not need to be taught how to identify them. One of the attendees recommended that, for advanced workshops, it might be beneficial to develop a pre-workshop checklist to determine which concepts the attendees were already familiar with. “The participants were probably too polite to say, ‘we know this stuff, move on already.’”<sup>9</sup>

Another way that the workshop can be modified for attendees with advanced linguistic training is that analysis assignments may be grouped together. Bartsch designed the analysis assignments already broken down into manageable steps. For teams in which all of the members have advanced linguistic training, these smaller steps may be tedious or unnecessary, and it may be possible to recombine some of them into one larger analysis assignment. For example, in the assignment in which teams are looking for peak or theme markers,<sup>10</sup> there is a short lesson on each marker. After 2-3 markers have been taught, attendees look through their texts to identify the markers and determine whether their use is markedly different in the peak than in the rest of the text. Then the process is repeated for the next 1-3 markers. For attendees who are already familiar with the concepts, these analysis assignments may be self-directed; the full list of theme-markers may be introduced at once, the attendees can choose which topics they would like a refresher on, and then the attendees can set their own pace for how they search for the markers in their texts.

## 3 Significant modifications: The Kroeger experience

Although there may be slight modifications at any Bartsch workshop, the most dynamic and drastic deviations by far occurred during a non-narrative discourse workshop that I co-facilitated with Oliver Kroeger. Kroeger and his wife, Heidi Kroeger, have extensive experience with participatory grammar workshops in Mozambique and Nigeria (Kroeger 2009). I cannot speak to how many of the techniques Kroeger brought to the discourse analysis workshop from his grammar workshop experience, but I imagine that the resulting workshop could be

<sup>9</sup> Evaluation form b. Personal communication.

<sup>10</sup> The entire list of markers is about 25 items long and includes concepts such as superlatives, word order, and tail-head connections.

described as a hybrid method, retaining the essence of equipping members of the language community to discover the natural structures of their language while increasing the opportunity for attendees to share their findings. Each of these modifications is described below with comments on how they might be utilized in future workshops.

### **3.1 Opportunities to perform**

More opportunities were given for the attendees to display their knowledge, both physically and verbally. As an icebreaker, each team was asked to give a summary of one of the texts they brought from their language. Where Bartsch's original materials include at least one day with a skit activity, there were three days that included skits, one including props. At the end of each major topic, as a part of the final analysis step, rather than immediately typing up their findings, teams were asked to share with the class a brief summary of what they had found. This could happen once or twice a day, depending on the number of topics completed. This process was also often accompanied by a visual aid, as described in the next subsection. Since each subsequent person who shares tends to go longer and longer, a somewhat strict time-limit should be established, especially in workshops with many attendees.

### **3.2 Posters**

To accompany their verbal analysis summaries, teams were asked to create a poster of their findings using large sheets of paper and markers. Each team would tape their finished poster up at the front of the room and then choose one person to briefly explain what they had found.

Sometimes the team would draw their poster from scratch, but sometimes it was possible to prepare some of the materials in advance. For example, after the clause-order lesson and analysis, each team was given a large poster paper and eight smaller pieces of paper labeled with the types of clause relationship they were investigating, e.g. "reason," "result," etc. They had to find an example of each default ordering, and then physically tape the two pieces of paper in the order that the clauses appeared in their text. Since the smaller papers happened to be multi-colored, we were able to color-code the labels based on "logical order." This has a really satisfying effect of being able to visually compare the clause orders of every language in the room with little effort; if a language followed logical order, the labels would be blue then orange, but if a language followed non-logical order, the labels would be orange then blue.

After this time of sharing was finished, the posters would be moved to the walls closest to where the team was sitting. Since the room was not being used by any other groups over the weekend, we were allowed to leave the posters up for the remainder of the workshop. It is unknown if this gave the attendees a greater sense of accomplishment from their analyses or if they were simply more verbal about their achievements than previous workshop attendees.

This increase in sharing was also beneficial for giving more team members the chance to participate in presenting data. In other workshops, the burden of formulating linguistic examples for the assignments tended to fall on whichever team member had the task of operating the computer. The poster-making process drew more of the team into the task of determining which examples to include and how to display them, and then the computer operator simply had to make an electronic version.

### **3.3 The shell book**

Bartsch's lectures are carefully crafted to lead up to small analysis assignments. If the lecture is altered or the topics are presented in a different order, the analysis steps will need to be altered

as well. Somehow, this was not anticipated during the workshop led by Kroeger, and significant changes to the lectures rendered the detailed analysis instructions useless. The language teams were still asked to do analysis tasks, but the instructions now lacked detail, and many follow-up questions were needed before the teams could act on them. In order to provide more structure for their write-up, a “shell-book” was created. Each day of the workshop, the teams received a worksheet with guiding questions<sup>11</sup> or empty charts to fill out. In some cases, the prompts were Bartsch’s instructions verbatim, but typed into the worksheet with a designated space after each, so that attendees knew that an actual answer was expected and where to give it. Also, rather than asking teams to copy or paste charts from the handouts, a blank chart would already be in the worksheet. On the final day of the workshop, these worksheets were compiled into one document to produce the workshop write-up for each language team.

Although the shell-book was helpful for this workshop, it may not be for everyone. For teams with previous linguistic experience or advanced experience with formal education, the assignments sprinkled throughout the teaching material provide enough guidance.

### 3.4 The teaching day

Whereas the last day of a typical workshop is used for finishing lectures and write-up assignments and giving teams a chance to share what they have learned for 10 minutes or so, Kroeger cleared the schedule to give each language team the chance to be teachers themselves. The teams were told to choose one of the topics from the previous two weeks, and then they taught it to the other attendees. Some teams split the lecturing duty; others chose one member to give the entire lecture. The result was that a few of the workshop topics got an extra review, and it was easy to see how well the team had understood their chosen topic.

## 4 Post-workshop feedback

During the closing hours of a typical Bartsch workshop, the attendees are given the opportunity to verbally share which topics were the most interesting or had showed them features of their language that they had not been aware of. After the online workshop, attendees were asked to fill out a written evaluation form by rating the value of each topic with a numbering system and leaving comments. Language teams from two of the workshops were asked follow-up questions two and a half years after their respective workshops.

There was a general consensus that the workshops were helpful, but no consensus about which topics were the most impactful on the participants’ translation projects. I am unaware of any correlation between attendees’ characteristics and topics they find most useful.<sup>12</sup> Some feedback from language teams was too general to be useful; they listed nearly every topic as helpful or important. The feedback that was more specific is included below.

---

<sup>11</sup> Careful consideration of these questions is necessary in order to provide guidance while not limiting the answers that a team could possibly give.

<sup>12</sup> Presumably the topics that teams identify as most useful could depend on amount of previous training, which topic was easiest to remember, which language family their language belongs to, the quality or engaging nature of the lesson, which topic was encountered most recently, or a point where their language contrasts with the national or other language.



## 4.1 Testimonials

One consultant's evaluation was that the workshop was "well worth the time." The workshop covered phenomena which would not surface in a grammatical analysis, which helped to clarify a lot of translation issues the team had encountered. For example, after studying the topic of participant reference, the team members realized they were using proper nouns far too frequently for the main character of a narrative. In the oral stories of their language, the main character is assumed to be the one doing the action, so it is only necessary to use a pronoun or even zero-marking (null reference) to reference the main character. Despite having analyzed the grammar of their language, the team had not noticed this before and would not have found that pattern without the discourse analysis training. The workshop also helped to highlight discourse structure or marking differences between their language and Greek or Thai, the source languages they were translating from. "[J]ust becoming aware of the differences [was] a huge help." The workshop had enabled the consultant to advise the team, "your language actually works differently than Thai, so we are actually allowed to change [certain linguistic elements] around so it sounds a lot more natural."<sup>13</sup>

A consultant in Southeast Asia appreciated "all the effort that was put into finding examples from languages in the area."<sup>14</sup> Other consultants and linguists have mentioned that seeing examples from similar languages is helpful since the examples can give clues or direction regarding what to look for in the language they are working with, as there may be shared areal features.

A mixed team of native speakers and non-native speakers were hopeful that the resulting analysis would help them defend their translation decisions to pushy stakeholders<sup>15</sup> who wanted the resulting translation to look more like the local majority language's translation.

Another consultant learned "that even though languages have default clause ordering patterns, they can use other arrangements for different discourse purposes."<sup>16</sup>

Looking back after two and a half years, a team of native speakers reported that the narrative discourse workshop they attended was "a turning point in their translation"<sup>17</sup> and that because of the workshop, they revised some of their previously translated materials. Another team of native speakers from the same workshop listed various plot structure elements as helpful, but word order as the most useful topic that informed their translation process. The word order of their language could be changed to draw attention to a participant or an event, or to highlight the theme of the text. This team discovered that they had been following the national language's word order and ended up changing their translation style because of this discovery.<sup>18</sup>

## 4.2 Recommendations

Some of the feedback included recommendations that could be applicable to anyone.

---

<sup>13</sup> Greg Block, Post-workshop feedback. Personal communication.

<sup>14</sup> Evaluation form a. Personal communication.

<sup>15</sup> I do not remember if the stakeholders were from a certain denomination or a Bible society in this particular case. Another team at that workshop echoed this sentiment. It is possible for stakeholders – whether they be from cultural societies, Bible societies, or certain denominations – to hold strong opinions about what a translation should look like while simultaneously knowing nothing about what makes a good translation. Bartsch has even noted that pressure to conform to the discourse patterns of the source text can come from translation consultants.

<sup>16</sup> Evaluation form b. Personal communication.

<sup>17</sup> 2022 Post-workshop feedback, B Team. Personal communication.

<sup>18</sup> 2022 Post-workshop feedback, M Team. Personal communication.

One consultant suggested that it is not necessary to identify whether a language has clausal relations that generally follow inductive or deductive reasoning. This is a middle step that could be eliminated without affecting the final goal of describing the clause order and comparing it to that of the source language. He also found it helpful to read through the course materials before the online session so that more of the time in the online sessions could be devoted to discussion.

Another consultant recommended investing time in the pre-workshop stages to “make sure your stories are good... even though it is a bit of work... I wish we [would have] had more [stories]. That [is] where everything comes together.”<sup>19</sup>

Yet another consultant mentioned that “theme and peak are difficult to define. [Mother tongue translators may benefit from a hands-on approach where they identify theme-marking and peak-marking features (without introducing the terms “theme” and “peak”) before trying to define and identify these zones.”<sup>20</sup>

## 5 Conclusion

Bartsch’s method of discourse analysis is very versatile; it is suitable for a variety of logistical arrangements and highly customizable to the needs of the attendees. The workshop method is designed to be participatory, giving the role of analyst to the native speakers of the language, while language consultants who are outsiders to the language community fill supporting roles. However, it is possible to run the workshop in a non-participatory manner for linguists who are not a part of the language-speaking community and still produce useful findings. Conducting this workshop in a participatory manner, for native speakers of a language, has an advantage over a non-participatory manner in that it directly equips the native speakers who want to put the information to use. The topics and examples may be altered based on the language families that are represented at each workshop. People who administer this method can choose to utilize Bartsch’s layman’s terms or revert to linguistic terminology for attendees with linguistic training. Analysis assignments may also be grouped for attendees with advanced linguistic training. Modifications may be made to increase the interaction between attendees throughout the workshop. Whether with or without the variations noted in this paper, attendees have found Bartsch’s workshops beneficial for their understanding of their language and the quality of their translations.

## References

- Bartsch, Carla. 2021. *Manual of Discourse Workshops for Mother Tongue Translators: Niger-Congo and Nilo-Saharan Languages*, vol 1. SIL International.  
<https://www.sil.org/resources/publications/entry/92109> (accessed 20 May 2023).
- Kroeger, Oliver. 2009. Bridging the Gap: Bantu grammar workshops as a means to support community-based language development.. *Annuário Lusófono*. 2008: 157-180.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236996374\\_Bridging\\_the\\_gap\\_Bantu\\_grammar\\_workshops\\_as\\_a\\_means\\_to\\_support\\_community-based\\_language\\_development](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236996374_Bridging_the_gap_Bantu_grammar_workshops_as_a_means_to_support_community-based_language_development) (accessed 20 May 2023)
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. 2015a. *Self-instruction materials on narrative discourse analysis*. Manuscript. <https://www.sil.org/resources/archives/68643> (accessed 20 May 2023).

<sup>19</sup> Greg Block, Post-workshop feedback. Personal communication.

<sup>20</sup> Evaluation form b. Personal Communication.

- Levinsohn, Stephen H. 2015b. *Self-instruction materials on non-narrative discourse analysis*. Manuscript. <https://www.sil.org/resources/archives/68640> (accessed 20 May 2023).
- Manuscript. <https://www.sil.org/resources/archives/68640> (accessed 20 May 2023).
- Longacre, Robert. 1996. *The Grammar of Discourse*. New York: Plenum Press.