2.1 Discourse in linguistics

In linguistics, discourse refers usually to the study of speech patterns and the usage of language etc. To understand the speech patterns one need to be clear about the term ‘discourse’ and ‘text’. Discourse, put simply, is structured collections of meaningful texts (Parker, 1992). A text is a part of the process of discourse. It is the product of any communication by writer/speaker. A text consists of cues for interpretation processes and traces of production processes. As Fairclough (1989) says this process includes in addition to the text the process of production, of which the text is a product, and the process of interpretation, for which the text is a resource. As a resource for the interpreter, the text consists of lexico-grammatical realisations of three kinds of meaning relating to three basic language functions (the ideational, interpersonal and textual functions of systemic linguistics). These lexico-grammatical cues to ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings are interpreted with the help of other resources beyond the text.

In using the term text, we refer not just to the written transcriptions but to “any kind of symbolic expressions requiring a physical medium and permitting of permanent storage” (Taylor & Van Every, 1993: 109). For a text to be generated, it must be spoken, written, or depicted in some way. Only when such an activity happens a text takes a shape, Taylor, Cooren, Giroux, & Robichaud, (1996: 7) say that when such an activity happens text takes on material form and becomes accessible to others. Therefore, talk is also a kind of text Fairclough(1995); van Dijk (1997a), and, in fact, the texts that make up discourses may take a variety of forms, including written documents, verbal reports, artwork, spoken words, pictures, symbols, buildings, and other artifacts (e.g., Fairclough, 1995; Grant, Keenoy, & Oswick, 1998; Taylor et al., 1996; Wood & Kroger, 2000). Discourses cannot be studied directly they can only be explored by examining the texts that constitute them (Fairclough, 1992; Parker, 1992).
A ‘text’ means the observable product of interaction i.e. a cultural object and ‘discourse’ means the process of interaction itself i.e. a cultural activity. The distinction between ‘text’ and ‘discourse’ is an analytical one i.e. between the observable materiality of a completed product and the ongoing process of human activity Widdowson (1979); Brown and Yule (1983); Halliday (1985). Text is the fabric in which discourse is manifested, whether spoken or written, whether produced by one or more participants. Text refers to the observable product of interaction (whether language production or interpretation). As already mentioned a text may be either written or spoken. In the actual production and interpretation of a stretch of language (a simple example being a conversation) the interactants have access to historically prior texts. These are products of previous interaction, which make up the interactional history and thus produce discourse. In reporting previously uttered speech, for instance, a fragment of an earlier text is embedded in the current text. Text, then, is a frozen observable substance, a concrete cultural object. This does not mean that the text-product actually exists as marks on paper or impulses on magnetic tape. It may only exist in the possibly mistaken memories of people; indeed, with the texts of previous conversations this is usually the case. This interrelation of texts produces discourse.

Parker’s defines discourse as “a system of statements which constructs an object” (1992: 5). Discourse “‘rules in’ certain ways of talking about a topic, defining an acceptable and intelligible way to talk, write or conduct oneself” and also “‘rules out’, limits and restricts other ways of talking, of conducting ourselves in relation to the topic or constructing knowledge about it” (Hall, 2001: 72). In other words, discourses “do not just describe things; they do things” (Potter & Wetherell, 1987: 6) through the way they make sense of the world for its inhabitants, giving it meanings that generate particular experiences and practices (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 1997b).

Discourse is produced and interpreted by specific people in specific institutional and broader societal contexts. Language users may not be seen as unitary subjects who produce intended meanings in discourse but also as decentered subjects who are constituted by their actions. In presenting the decentred subject there is no
clear division between a person and her actions and she is not their inventor or sole creator. In producing discourse, she is constrained by what has gone before. In production and interpretation people draw upon a wide range of what Fairclough (1989:24-25) refers to as “members resources”, or MR. These MR include “their knowledge of language, representations of the natural and social worlds they inhabit, values, beliefs, assumptions, and so on.” In this view, MR are both cognitive and social, “The MR which people draw upon to produce and interpret texts are cognitive in the sense that they are in people’s heads, but they are social in the sense that they have social origins, they are socially generated, and their nature is dependent on the social relations and struggles out of which they were generated - as well as being socially transmitted and, in our society, unequally distributed.” Production and interpretation, then, are cognitive processes related to social practices. Discourse has been a very controversial term and different critiques have given various definitions of discourse. It will be difficult to discuss all of them but I would briefly describe Fairclough and Foucault as they are related to my study.

2.2 Foucauldian discourse

Production and interpretation are key aspects in this study also. This study follows C.D.A. which has its root in Foucault and many others schools of thought. Discourse as understood in C.D.A. is quite similar to Foucauldian discourse thus a brief review of Foucauldian discourse follows to make discourse in C.D.A. clear.

Discourses in Foucault’s work are structures of possibility and constraint, which impinge on, and indeed bring about social practices. A number of linguists use this sense of discourse from social theory. Fairclough employs the term discourse in a Foucauldian sense, to mean systematically organised sets of conventions forming practices, in accounting for how language use is socially conditioned. A similar, apparently unacknowledged conception underlies the work of Pecheux. A third linguist, Gunther Kress, refers to the work of Foucault in characterising discourse as sociocultural practice. Kress (1985) draws upon Foucault in describing the defining and delimiting quality of discourse and mentions that discourses are systematically organised sets of statements, which give expression to the meaning, and values of an
institution. Beyond that, they define, describe and delimit what it is possible to say and not possible to say (and by extension what it is possible to do or not to do) with respect to the area of concern of that institution, whether marginally or centrally. A discourse provides a set of possible statements about a given area, topic, object, process that is to be talked about. In that, it provides descriptions, rules, permissions and prohibitions of social and individual actions. Discourses for Foucault are historically constituted social constructions in the organisation and distribution of knowledge. Knowledge does not arise out of things and reflect their essential truth; it is not the essence of things in the world. Foucault argues that dominant members of institutions maintain control through discourses by creating order, i.e. by being the ones who make boundaries and categories.

Foucault produced historical analysis of discourse and power. He investigated the exercise of social power in/through discourses, through the definition of objects and social subjects themselves. His approach is anti-humanist. As post-structuralist feminist, Weedon (1987:107), says “It is in the work of Michel Foucault that the poststructuralist principles of the plurality and constant deferral of meaning and the precarious, discursive structure of subjectivity have been integrated into a theory of language and social power which pays detailed attention to the institutional effects of discourse and its role in the constitution and government of individual subjects”.

In his work, Foucault attends to discourses of the social sciences, which he argues have contributed substantially to what people are. That is, practices and relations between people are brought into being as a result of the socially constructed bodies of knowledge, which are the social sciences. He writes about how the discourses of the social sciences have impinged physically on people, constructing them as patients, legal subjects and sexual subjects and so on. In his archaeologies he writes that the domains of knowledge, which form social subjects in taking human beings as their subject, are not timeless but historical constructions. In The History of Sexuality, for instance, his focus is the discursive constitution of sexual subjects in the judicial system, in medical texts etc.. In The Birth of the Clinic, he examines medical writing, exploring shifts in what it is to ‘do medicine’, what illness is, both clinically and socially.
In contrast with the analysis of discourse in linguistics, Foucault does not analyse concrete text samples (Fairclough (1988)). However, in the *Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972) he makes brief but interesting observations about the notion of a concrete whole text. “The materiality of the book”, he says, is only one kind of unity, and not the most significant; for example, a missal and an anthology of poems are both books but the unity each derives from discourse is what constitutes them as missal and anthology. The unity a single actual text has is weaker than the “discursive unity of which it is the support”. The “discursive unity” is not homogeneous; to illustrate this point he contrasts the relation between Balzac’s novels with the relation between Joyce’s *Ulysses* and the *Odyssey*. There is more to a text than the concrete book; it only exists in relation with other texts “The frontiers of a book are never clear-cut it is caught up in a system of references to other books, other texts, other sentences: it is a node within a network. ...It indicates itself, constructs itself, only on the basis of a complex field of discourse.”

Foucault proposes that discourses consist of sets of statements whose unity is based on objects, style, concepts and themes; but with an important proviso that their unity is not fixed but constructed through dispersion and discontinuity. In this way, Foucault avoids presenting a discourse as though it were a single continuous book, naturally unfolding through time. For instance, in saying that a set of statements has unity in terms of the objects/referents it describes we cannot assume a “well defined field of objects” outlined in discourses. In discourses on madness, for example, madness is not a single object; it is constructed in interplay of conditions enabling its appearance as an object and subject of constant displacement. Objects are shaped in social practices. Objects and statements cannot exist by themselves but rather exist in an associated social field. A statement can only exist in connection with other statements that it repeats, opposes, comments on etc. The associated field is made up of all the formulations to which the statement refers (implicitly or not), either by repeating them, modifying them, or adapting them, or by opposing them, or by commenting on them. There can be no statement that in one way or another does not reactualize others.
Foucault then, proposes the examination of discourses as systematically organised sets of statements by locating discontinuity and dispersion. He refers to a particular system of dispersion between a group of statements and to a specific regularity between object, types of statement, concepts and thematic choices as a “discursive formation”.

2.3 Discourse formations

Following Foucault, discourses in his account are both historically constituted and consisting of practices enacted by subjects. The substance of concrete discourse is not spontaneously created, but pre-determined by “discourse formations”, which are described as follows in Haroche C. (Henry and Pecheux (1971:102): “discourse formations determine what can and must be said (articulated in the form of an argument, a sermon, a pamphlet, a paper, a political statement etc.) from a given position at a given conjuncture”.

This concept of “discourse formation” relates to Foucault’s “discursive practice”. The discourse formation is the site of the constitution of meaning and also the site of the constitution of the subject. He explains this with the mechanism of interpellation; “individuals are “interpelled” as speaking-subjects (as subjects of their discourse) by the discursive formations which represent “in language” the ideological formations that correspond to them”.

2.4 Discourse as Social Practice (Fairclough)

A recent linguistic combination of the two senses of discourse as action and convention is found in Norman Fairclough’s presentation of critical language study in Language and Power (1989). He remarks on the “felicitous ambiguity” of the term discourse, and the more general practice, to refer both to an actual enactment and to a social convention governing actions: “the individual instance always implies social conventions - any discourse or practice implies conventional types of discourse or practice” Fairclough (1989:28).

He also plays on this ambiguity to underline the way social practices, including discourse, are both enabling and constraining, providing the social
conventions within which it is possible to act. “The ambiguity also suggests social preconditions for action on the part of individual persons: the individual is able to act only in so far as there are social conventions to act within. Part of what is implied in the notion of social practice is that people are enabled through being constrained: they are able to act on condition that they act within the constraints of types of practice or of discourse” Fairclough (1989:28).

The importance placed on the category subject in Fairclough’s model is evident in the detailed consideration of interpersonal meaning and his emphasis on the subject positioning of language-users. Social positions are set up in discourse-types and subjects are constrained to act within them. These constraints are what make action possible; subjects are enabled by being constrained. Fairclough points out another felicitous ambiguity in the term subject. The subject is both an active agent and passively shaped, Fairclough (1989:39) “In one sense of subject, one is referring to someone who is under the jurisdiction of a political authority, and hence passive and shaped: but the subject of a sentence, for instance, is usually the active one, the doer, the one causally implicated in action.”

Fairclough splits the interpersonal dimension of meaning into two closely related but distinct considerations, the social identities of interactants and their social relationships. These enter into the process of discourse as in features with expressive and relational value respectively. These two aspects of interpersonal meaning are closely related but it is sometimes useful to distinguish between them. Subject positions and relations between them are set up in discourse-types. A single individual is placed in a wide range of subject positions. He/She is not an autonomous entity who exists independently of these positions and social relations, but constituted in the act of working within various discourse-types. From the beginning of her entry into social life she is positioned within varied institutional and societal structures, which bestow upon her specific social roles. As Fairclough (1989:108) says “The social process of producing social subjects can be conceived of in terms of the positioning of people progressively over a period of years indeed a lifetime in a range of subject positions. The social subject is thus constituted as a particular configuration
of subject positions. A consequence is that the subject is far less coherent and unitary than one tends to assume.”

Fairclough aims to account for how people are constituted in social struggle through discourse, i.e. he is ultimately interested in social subjects; discourse is the focus of attention because that is what subjects are constituted in. Like Foucault, he attends to how the practices of the social sciences have shaped, and continue to shape, the institutional discourses forming subjects. His contribution is in constructing a model of discourse as social practice allowing detailed linguistic analysis of the interaction of individuals as realisations of these subject-shaping practices.

A social order according to Fairclough is “a structuring of a particular social space into various domains associated with various types of practice.” From a discoursal perspective, a social order is an order of discourse. It is here we can see the Foucauldian sense of discourses as conventional, as systematically organised sets of conventions forming practices. Just as a social order determines types of practice, (conventions) which in turn determine actual practices (actions); orders of discourse determine the types of discourse that establish actual discourses.

Discourses, then, are structured in orders of discourse. This emphasises the shaping of actual discourse production and interpretation by higher level structures beyond the immediate situation of utterance and amounts to an expansion of the notion of context to include the social formation. This three level structuring relating orders of discourse, types of discourse and the actual activity of discourse also enables Fairclough to account for the presence of more than one discourse-type in discourse. He emphasises that discourses are not simply mechanical implementations of discourse-types but the creative extension-through-combination of existing resources. Indeed, actual discourses, which draw on a single discourse-type, are “limiting cases rather than the norm” Fairclough (1989:31).

2.5 Resources for production and interpretation

Discourse is determined by the social conditions in which it is produced and interpreted. Institutional and societal structures always impinge upon discourse,
bestowing specific social identities and power relations upon interactants and giving
them different access to language, to representations of knowledge/beliefs, etc. (MR).

In discourse interpretation, features of text and context serve as cues which
activate specific MR. Interpretation is achieved in the dialectical interplay of cues and
MR. It is a complex of different processes in which MR serve as interpretive
procedures for both the language-user and the analyst. Fairclough identifies six major
elements of MR functioning as interpretive procedures which relate to features of text
and context. He distinguishes between MR for interpreting the situational context, for
which subjects need knowledge of social orders, and MR for interpreting the
intertextual context, for which knowledge of interactional history is needed.

The situational context provides external cues which have to be interpreted on
the basis of MR: (Fairclough 1989:114) “Participants arrive at interpretations of
situational context partly on the basis of external cues - features of the physical
situation, properties of participants, what has previously been said: but also partly on
the basis of aspects of their MR in terms of which they interpret these cues -
specifically, representations of societal and institutional social orders which allow
them to ascribe the situations they are actually in to particular situation types.”

Participants interpretations of what the situation is determine the discourse-
types drawn’ upon. These in turn determine the kinds of procedure drawn upon for
interpretation of the text. Fairclough (1989:145) distinguishes between situational and
intertextual context. In addition to “what has previously been said” in the same stretch
of discourse, interactants also need to refer explicitly or implicitly to previous
discourses: “we also need to refer to intertextual context: participants in any discourse
operate on the basis of assumptions about the previous (series of) discourses to which
the current one is connected to, and their assumptions determine what can be taken as
given in the sense of part of common experience, what can be alluded to, disagreed
with, and so on.”

The four remaining elements of MR functioning as interpretive procedures
relate to the text. Conventions of phonology, grammar and lexis are resources which
provide procedures for interpreting the surface of utterance. Other kinds of resource
are semantics, pragmatics and cohesion, which provide procedures for interpreting the meaning of utterance and its local coherence. Other resources are schemata, which provide procedures for interpreting a text’s structure and ‘point’: its global coherence.

These six domains of interpretation are interdependent. At any given point, among the resources for interpretation are previous interpretations; for example, interpretation of ‘higher level’, global elements of text are dependent on interpretation of local elements “for instance, to interpret the global coherence and ‘point’ of a text, you draw upon interpretations of the local coherence of parts of it; and to arrive at these, you draw upon interpretations of utterance meanings; and to arrive at these, you draw upon interpretations of the surface forms of utterances.”

The interdependency of interpretation in different domains is not one directional: it is ‘top-down’ as well as ‘bottom-up’ (as in the example above): (Fairclough 1989:145) For instance, interpreters make guesses early in the process of interpreting a text about its textual structure and ‘point’, and these guesses are likely to influence the meanings that are attached to individual utterances, and the local coherence relations set up between them”. This interdependency leads to what is called the intertextual context.

2.6 Intertextual context

Interpretation of the intertextual context involves the historical series to which a text belongs. Here the interpreter draws upon MR relating to interactional history. This means that common presuppositions are created for readers so that come to common interpretations. Fairclough’s (1989:152) mentions that “the interpretation of intertextual context is a matter of deciding which series a text belongs to, and therefore what can be taken as common ground for participants, or presupposed. As in the case of situational context, discourse participants may arrive at roughly the same interpretation or different ones, and the interpretation of the more powerful participant may be imposed upon others. So having power may mean being able to determine presuppositions.”

Producers of mass media texts are placed in a position of power in having to construct an ‘ideal reader’. Through presupposition, they are able to present specific
intertextual experiences as common ground, thus postulating an ‘audience with shared moments in interactional histories which are taken as given rather than asserted. As well as presupposing elements of the intertextual context, producers can contest them. By negating assertions in a text, a producer can assume that these assertions “are to be found in antecedent texts which are within readers’ experience.”(Fairclough 1989:155).

Intertextual context adds a historical dimension to “discourse as social practice by placing a single text, a product of discourse, in a historical series with other texts: “The concept of intertextual context requires us to view discourses and texts from a historical perspective, in contrast with the more usual position in language studies which would regard a text as analysable without reference to other texts, in abstraction from its historical context.”

2.7 Tendencies in discourse change

Fairclough points to certain tendencies in discourse in contemporary society, which I think, are of particular importance for women. There is a high degree of integration among social institutions in modern capitalist society and these institutions are responsible in legitimising certain kinds of social identity. This is significant because particular kinds of ‘social identity and relationship are likely to appear commonsensical and natural when they span across institutional orders of discourse; i.e. when people are placed in them in all kinds of diverse institutions. Some general tendencies are an increasing sophistication of discourse technologies, the use of synthetic personalisation in addressing mass audiences and an increasing tendency for the formation of subjects as consumers. I intend to draw upon these observations in my sample analysis.

In examining how discourse practices shape subjects, Fairclough points to an increasing tendency for subject formation through strategic, manipulative discourses. This tendency is marked by a sophistication of subject-shaping practices, informed by discourses of the social sciences: the development of discourse technologies. Discourse technologies are discourse-types which span across institutional orders of discourse, ‘colonising’ new areas (key examples being interviewing and counselling).
These scrutinising discourses construct the object of their scrutiny, bringing into being the social subjects defined by the expertise of the human sciences, such as psychology. A characteristic of these forms of discourse is to present the interests of the dominant bloc as the interests of the population as a whole, so that existing social conditions are legitimised. One such manipulative kind of discourse, which is spreading, is advertising. As Fairclough says advertising firmly embeds the mass of the population within the capitalist commodity system by assigning them the legitimate and even desirable role of consumers.

Social subjects are positioned as consumers in an increasing variety of social situations as commodification expands into new areas of social life. Fairclough mentions that the capitalist economic domain has been progressively enlarged to take in aspects of life which were previously seen as quite separate from production. The commodity has expanded from being a tangible ‘good’ to include all sorts of intangibles like educational courses, holidays, health insurance, and funerals are now bought and sold in the open market in ‘packages’, rather like soap powders.

An increasingly common feature of types of discourse used to address mass audiences is synthetic personalisation that is a compensatory tendency to give the impression of treating each of the people addressed in mass as an individual. This synthetic personalisation is extremely common in the mass media, especially in magazine advertisements and articles, leaflets, front page headlines, etc. It involves the construction of an ideal subject as if it were an actual individual and also the construction of a persona or ideal subject for the producers.

This construction of a social subject and study of social practices or discourse to unveil the hidden ideologies or motives behind any discourse is called discourse analysis. What follows is a brief description of discourse analysis.

2.8 Discourse Analysis

The term discourse analysis has come to be used with a wide range of meanings which cover a wide range of activities. It is used to describe activities at the interaction of disciplines as diverse as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics,
philosophical linguistics and computational linguistics. So there are many versions of discourse analysis (van Dijk 1997).

One major division is between approaches which include detailed analysis of texts and approaches which do not. Fairclough (1992b) used the term ‘textually oriented discourse analysis’ to distinguish the former from the latter. Discourse analysis in social sciences is often strongly influenced by the work of Foucault (Foucault 1972, Fairclough 1992b). Social scientists working in this tradition generally pay less attention to the linguistic features of texts. Fairclough’s approach (2003) to discourse analysis (a version of critical discourse analysis) is based upon the assumption that language is an irreducible part of social life, dialectically interconnected with other elements of social life, so that social analysis and research always has to take account of language. This means that one productive way of doing social research is through a focus on language, using some form of discourse analysis. His approach to discourse analysis has been to transcend the division between work inspired by social theory which tends not to analyse texts and work which focuses upon the language of texts but tends not to engage with social theoretical issues. So, text analysis is an essential part of discourse analysis, but discourse analysis is not merely the linguistic analysis of texts. Fairclough (2003: 2) sees discourse analysis as “oscillating between a focus on specific texts and a focus on the order of discourse, the relatively durable structuring of language which is itself one element of the relatively durable structuring and networking of social practices”. However there are different views of discourse analysis by different linguists. The focus of discourse analysis, as Jaworski and Coupland (1999: 7) argue, will usually be the study of particular texts (e.g. conversations, interviews, speeches, etc. or various written documents), although discourses are sometimes held to be abstract value system which will never surface directly as texts.

van Dijk (1985b: 2) argues that “what we can do with discourse analysis is more than providing adequate descriptions of text and context. That is, we expect more from discourse analysis as the study of real language use, by real speakers in real situations, than we expect from the study of abstract syntax or formal semantics. Together with psycho- and sociolinguistics, discourse analysis has definitely brought linguistics to the realm of the social sciences”.
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Taking a primarily linguistic approach to the analysis of discourse, Brown and Yule (1983) examine how humans use language to communicate and, in particular, how addressers construct linguistic messages for addressees and how addressees work on linguistic messages in order to interpret them. They (1983: 1) suggest, “the analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which those forms are designed to serve in human affairs”.

Stubbs (1983: 1) uses the term discourse analysis to refer mainly to the linguistic analysis of naturally occurring connected spoken or written discourse: “Roughly speaking, it refers to attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause and therefore, to study larger linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written texts. It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with language in use in social contexts and in particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers”. Hatch (1992: 1) defines discourse analysis as “the study of the language of communication spoken or written”.

For Gee (1999: 92) a discourse analysis essentially involves asking questions about how language, at a given time and place, is used to construe the aspects of the situation network as realized at that time and place and how the aspects of the situation network simultaneously give meaning to that language. A discourse analysis involves, then, asking questions about the six building tasks. The tasks through which one uses language to construct and/or construe the situation network, at a given time and place, in a certain way, are:

1. Semiotic building, that is, using cues or clues to assemble situated meanings about what semiotic (communicative) systems, systems of knowledge and ways of knowing, are here and now relevant and activated.
2. Word building, that is, using cues or clues to assemble situated meanings about what is here and now (taken as) ‘reality’, what is here and now (taken as) present and absent, concrete and abstract, ‘real’ and ‘unreal’, probable, possible and impossible.
3. Activity building, that is, using cues or clues to assemble situated meanings about what activity or activities are going on, composed of what specific actions.
4. Socioculturally-situated identity and relationship building that is, using cues or clues to assemble situated meanings about what identities and relationships are relevant to the interaction, with their concomitant attitudes, values, ways of feelings, ways of knowing and believing, as well as ways of acting and interacting.

5. Political building, that is, using the cues or clues to construct the nature and relevance of various ‘social goods’ such as status and power and anything else taken as a ‘social good’ here and now (e.g. beauty, humor, verbalness, specialist knowledge, etc.).

6. Connection building that is using the cues or clues to make assumptions about how the past and future of an interaction, verbally and non-verbally, are connected to the present moment and to each other after all, interactions always have some degree of continuous coherence Gee (1999: 85-6).

van Dijk (1985b:1) argues that discourse analysis is essentially a contribution to the study of language in use: “Besides - or even instead - of an explication of the abstract structures of texts or conversations, we witness a concerted interest for the cognitive and especially the social processes, strategies and contextualization of discourse taken as a mode of interaction in highly complex socio-cultural situations”.

These different views show that discourse analysis has now emerged as a diverse area of study, with a variety of approaches in each of a number of disciplines and scholars working in different disciplines that tend to concentrate on different aspects of discourse.

2.9 A Historical Overview

A brief historical overview to the study of discourse analysis shows that it grew out of work in different disciplines in the 1960s and early 1970s, including linguistics semiotics, psychology, anthropology and sociology. Discourse analysts study language in use: written texts of all kinds and spoken data, from conversation to highly institutionalized forms of talk.

At a time when linguistics was largely concerned with the analysis of single sentences, Zellig Harris published a paper with the title “Discourse analysis” (Harris
1952). Harris was interested in the distribution of linguistic elements in extended texts and the links between the text and its social situation, though his paper is a far cry from the discourse analysis which is used nowadays. Also important in the early years was the emergence of semiotics and the French structuralist approach to the study of narrative. In the 1960’s Dell Hymes provided a sociological perspective with the study of speech in its social setting (e.g. Hymes 1964). The linguistic philosophers such as Austin (1962), Searle (1969) and Grice (1975) were also influential in the study of language as social action, reflected in speech-act theory and the formulation of conversational maxims, alongside the emergence of pragmatics, which is the study of meaning in context (Levinson 1983, Leech 1983).

British discourse analysis has been greatly influenced by M.A.K. Halliday’s functional approach to language (e.g. Halliday 1973), which in turn has connections with the Prague School of linguists. Halliday’s framework emphasises the social functions of language and the thematic and informational structure of speech and writing. Also important in Britain were Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) at the University of Brimingham, who developed a model for the description of teacher-pupil talk, based on a hierarchy of discourse units. There exists that similar work deals with doctor-patient interaction, service encounters, interviews, debates and business negotiations, as well as monologues. The British work has principally followed structural-linguistic criteria, on the basis of the isolation of units and sets of rules defining well-formed sequences of discourse.

American discourse analysis has been dominated by work within the ethnomethodological tradition, which emphasises the research method of close observation of groups of people communicating in natural settings. It examines the types of speech events such as storytelling, greeting rituals and verbal duels in different cultural and social settings (e.g. Gumperz and Hymes 1972). What is often called conversation analysis within the American tradition can also be included under the general heading of discourse analysis.

Alongside the conversation analysts, working within the sociolinguistic tradition Labov’s investigations of oral storytelling have also contributed to a long history of
interest in narrative discourse. The American work has produced a large number of
descriptions of discourse types, as well as insights into the social constraints of politeness
and face-preserving phenomena in talk, overlapping with British work in pragmatics
(McCarthy 1991: 5-6).

Michel Pecheux at the Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale, University of Paris MI
(1969, 1975, has developed a heavily theorized account of discourse in France Pecheux et
al. 1979, Robin 1973) as a tool for ideological struggle. He states as his objective the
need to provide “the basis for a scientific analysis of discursive processes by articulating
through historical materialism the study of ideological superstructures, psychoanalytical
theory and linguistic research” (Pecheux 1975: 234). As part of this design and drawing
on Althusser’s work on the theory of ideology, he has reformulated the Saussurian
dichotomy ‘langue-parole’ as ‘langue/ processus discursifs’.

This shift foreshadowed in the work of Volosinov and Bakhtin (Bennett 1979: 75-
82) and their critique of Saussure (see also Guespin in Gardin, Baggioni and Guespin
1980), takes into account the distinct systems of linguistic value that exist in a single
language community, in langue (Haroche, Henry and Pecheux 1971). In other words, it
focuses on the different meanings that words and expressions (signifiers) can have
according to the ideological position of the users and the determining effects of the socio-
historical conditions (or ‘ideological formations’) in which the utterances are produced
that are themselves constitutive of meaning. Discursive processes are thus seen as part of
an ideological class relation Pecheux( 1975: 82), Pecheux et al. (1979: 23-24), Seidel
(1985: 46-7).

Also relevant to the development of discourse analysis as a whole is the work of
text grammarians, working mostly with written language. Text grammarians perceive
texts as language elements strung together in relationships with one another that can be
defined. Linguists such as van Dijk (1972), De Beaugrande (1980), Halliday and Hasan
(1976) have made a significant contribution in this area. The Prague School of linguists,
with their interest in the structuring of information in discourse, has also been influential.
Its most important contribution has been to show the links between grammar and
discourse.
Discourse analysis has grown into a wide-ranging and heterogeneous discipline, which 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. It is also now, increasingly, forming a backdrop to research in applied linguistics and second language learning and teaching in particular (McCarthy 1991: 6-7).

2.10 Approaches to Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis has become increasingly popular in recent years, across a range of disciplines. This must be seen against the background of what is often referred to as the linguistic turn in philosophy and the social sciences, which has shaped much twentieth century thought. Diverse developments can be included under this heading: the emergence of symbolic logic in the work of Frege, Russell and Whithead, of structuralism in linguistics and elsewhere, of philosophical hermeneutics and of the so-called linguistic philosophy of Wittgenstein, Austin, Ryle and others.

Of course, discourse analysis is itself a term that covers a multitude of different approaches. Coulthard (1985) identifies four versions: anthropological work on the ethnography of speaking; speech act theory; ethnomethodological conversation analysis; and the systemic linguistics-based approach associated with John Sinclair and himself. This by no means exhausts the field: Levinson (1983) and Brown and Yule (1983) adopt more pragmatics-based approaches; conversational analysis has been extended beyond its original concerns by researchers working in social studies of science and other areas of sociology and social psychology (see for example Potter and Wetherell 1987) and there are quite distinct forms of discourse analysis associated with French structuralism and post-structuralism (Macdonell 1986).

These different kinds of discourse analysis vary in several important ways: in their focus, in what sorts of claim they make and in the kinds of technique they deploy. At one extreme there are approaches focusing on language above the level of the sentence, which rule ‘non-linguistic’ action out of account and rely on some established form of linguistic analysis as a model. At the other end of the spectrum, ethnomethodologists, structuralists and others see language as constituting social reality, although in different ways. For them, the study of discourse is a way of studying society and the analytic techniques they use reflect this.

Eggin and Slade (1997: 24) classified the different approaches to discourse according to their disciplinary origins:

- Sociology
  - Conversational analysis
    - Ethnography
  - Sociolinguistics
    - Interactional sociolinguistics
    - Variation theory
  - Philosophy
    - Speech act theory
    - Pragmatics
  - Linguistics
    - Structural-functional
    - Systemic functional linguistics
    - Social semiotic
    - Systemic functional linguistics
    - Critical discourse analysis

Approaches to discourse analysis according to disciplinary origins (adopted from McCarthy et al. 2002: 60).
Although each of the approaches listed above has made a significant contribution to the understanding of discourse, however the present study will review only those that are currently playing a major role in various contexts of applied linguistics.

### 2.10.1 Speech Act Theory

Speech act theory focuses on the fact that by saying something one is also doing something. Discourse analysts working in this tradition have elaborated complex typologies of different sorts of speech act and have tried to explain different aspects of communication, such as psychiatric interviews, by trying to identify the intended meanings of a speaker’s utterance and the responses of hearers, Howarth (2002: 6-7).

John Austin and John Searle, developed speech act theory from the basic belief that language is used to perform actions and thus, its fundamental insights focus on how meaning and action are related to language. Although speech act theory was not first developed as a means of analyzing discourse, some of its basic insights have been used by many scholars to help solve problems basic to discourse analysis Schiffrin (1994: 49). An elaboration of speech act theory was offered by Labov and Fanshel (1977) in their examination of psychiatric interview. Although their prime concern was with the identification of speech acts and specifying the rules governing their successful realization, they broadened the view that an utterance may only perform one type of speech act at a time.

Labov and Fanshel (1977) explain communication in terms of hearers accurately identifying the intended meaning of the speaker’s utterance and responding to it accordingly. However, given the multifunctionality of utterances, one cannot be sure that a hearer always picks up the right interpretation of an utterance, i.e., the one that was intended by the speaker. In general, the problem of internationality and variability in people’s discourse rules precluded developing a coherent framework for explaining communication, beyond producing an inventory of such rules and speech act types, Jaworski and Coupland (1999: 16).
Much of the speech act theory has been concerned with taxonomising speech acts and defining felicity conditions for different types of speech acts. For example Searle (1969, 1979) suggested the following typology of speech acts based on different types of conditions which need to be fulfilled for an act to obtain: representative (e.g., asserting), directives (e.g., requesting), commissives (e.g., promising), expressives (e.g., thanking) and declarations (e.g., appointing). This taxonomy was one of many and it soon became clear in speech act theory that a full and detailed classification would be unwieldy given the multitude of illocutionary verbs in English. Stipulating the felicity conditions for all of them appeared to be not only a complex procedure but also an essentialising one - relying too heavily on factors assumed to be essential in each case, when reality shows us that they are variably determined by the precise social context, Jaworski and Coupland (1999: 16).

Speech act theory is basically concerned with what people do with language and with the functions of language. Typically, however, the functions focused upon are those akin to communicative intentions (the illocutionary force of an utterance) that can be performed through a conventional procedure and labeled. Even within this relatively well-defined set of acts, the act performed by a single utterance may not be easy to discover: some utterances bear little surface resemblance to their underlying illocutionary force.

Despite the emphasis on language function, speech act theory deals less with actual utterances than with utterance-types and less with the ways speakers and hearers actually build upon inferences in talk, than with the sort of knowledge that they can be presumed to bring to talk. Language can do things - can perform acts - because people share constitutive rules that create the acts and that allow them to label utterances as particular kinds of acts. These rules are part of linguistic competence, even though they draw upon knowledge about the world, including an array of “social facts” (e.g. knowledge about social obligations, institutions, identities), as well as knowledge about the grammar of language Schiffrin (1994: 60).
2.10.2 Pragmatics

Pragmatics deals primarily with the detailed study of meaning in language. Closely related to semantics, which is primarily concerned with the study of word and sentence meaning, pragmatics concerns itself with the meaning of utterances in specific contexts of use. It deals with three concepts: meaning, context and communication, Levinson (1983).

Morris (1938: 30) defines pragmatics as “the science of the relation of signs to their interpreters”. Pragmatics is defined by him as a branch of semiotics, the study of signs (see Givon (1989: 9-25), for discussion of its earlier roots). Morris (1938: 81) views semiosis (the process in which something functions as a sign) as having four parts. A sign vehicle is a sign: a designatum is that to which the sign refers: an interpretant is the effect in virtue of which the sign vehicle is a sign; an interpreter is the organism upon whom the sign has an effect. To put it the other way something is a sign of a designatum for an interpreter to the degree that the interpreter takes account of the designatum in virtue of the presence of the sign. Morris identifies three ways of studying signs i.e. ‘syntax’ is the study of formal relations of signs to one another, ‘semantics’ is the study of how signs are related to the object to which they are applicable, pragmatics is the study of the relation signs to interpreter. Thus, pragmatics is the study of how interpreters engage in the taking-account-of designate (the construction of interpretants) of sign-vehicles Schiffrin (1994: 191).

Grice’s ideas (1957) about the relationship between logic and conversation lead to Gricean pragmatics. Gricean pragmatics provides a set of principles that constrains speakers’ sequential choices in a text and allows hearers to recognize speakers’ intentions by making it easy to relate what speakers say (in an utterance) to its text and contexts. It provides a way to analyze the inference of speaker’s meaning: how hearers infer intentions underlying a speaker’s utterance.

The approach that Gricean pragmatics offers to discourse analysis is based on a set of general principles about rationally based communicative conduct that tells speakers and hearers how to organize and use information offered in a text, along with background knowledge of the world (including knowledge of the immediate social context), to
convey (and understand) more than what is said - in brief, to communicate. The operation of these principles leads to a particular view of discourse structure in which sequential dependencies - constrains imposed by one part of a discourse on what occurs next - arise because of the impact of general communicative principles on the linguistic realization of speaker meaning at different points in time. Thus, what Gricean pragmatics offers to discourse analysis is a view of how participant assumptions about what comprises a cooperative context for communication (a context that includes knowledge, text and situation) contribute to meaning and how these assumptions help to create sequential patterns in talk (see Schiffrin (1994: 191-227).

Thomas (1995) distinguishes three types of meaning:

- abstract meaning (the meaning of words and sentences in isolation, e.g., the various meanings of the word grass);
- contextual or utterance meaning (e.g., when two intimate persons hold their faces very near each other and one says ‘I hate you’ while smiling, the utterance really means I love you’);
- utterance force (i.e., how the speaker intends his/her utterance to be understood: e.g., when X says to Y are you hungry?, X may intend the question as a request for Y to make X a sandwich) (Jaworski and Coupland 1999: 15).

Thomas (1995: 22) focuses on utterance meaning and force, which are central to pragmatics, which she defines as “the study of meaning in interaction” with the special emphasis on the interrelationship between the speaker, hearer, utterance and context.

Spencer-Oatey and Zegarac (2002: 74-5) indicate that pragmatics is concerned not with language as a system or product *per se*, but rather with the interrelationship between language form (communicated) messages and language users. It explores questions such as:

- How do people communicate more than what the words or phrases of their utterances might mean and how do people make these interpretations?
• Why do people choose to-say and/or interpret something in one way rather than another?

• How do people’s perceptions of contextual factors (for example, who the interlocutors are, what their relationship is and what circumstances they are communicating in) influence the process of producing and interpreting language?

Pragmatics thus, questions the validity of the ‘code-model’ of communication that was developed within the discipline of semiotics. According to this view, communication is successful to the extent that the sender and the receiver pair signals and messages in the same way, so that the message broadcast in the form of a given signal is identical to the one received when that signal is decoded.

Modern approaches to pragmatics recognize that human communication largely exploits a code (a natural language), but they also try to do justice for the fact that human communicative behavior relies heavily on people’s capacity to engage in reasoning about each other’s intentions, exploiting not only the evidence presented by the signals in the language code, but also evidence from other sources, including perception and general world knowledge.

2.10.3 Interactional Sociolinguistics

International sociolinguistics as an approach to discourse is inextricably linked to the names of the sociologist Erving Goffman (e.g., 1959, 1967, 1981) and the anthropological linguist John Gumperz (e.g., 1982a, 1982b). International sociolinguistics gives an approach to discourse that focuses upon situated meaning. What Gumperz contributes to this approach is a set of concepts and tools that provide a framework within which to analyse the use of language during interpersonal communication; Gumperz views language as “a socially and culturally constructed symbol system that both reflects and creates macro-level social meaning and micro-level interpersonal meanings. Speakers use language to provide continual indices of who they are and what they want to communicate” Schiffrin (1994: 133).
The work of Erving Goffman also focuses upon situated knowledge, the self and social context in a way that complements Gumperz’s focus on situated inference: Goffman provides a sociological framework for describing and understanding the form and meaning of the social and interpersonal contexts that provide presuppositions for the interpretation of meaning. As Goffman’s work shows, for example, all interactive activity is socially organized at multiple levels: all utterances are situated within contexts such as ‘occasions’, ‘situations’, or ‘encounters’ that not only provide structure and meaning to what is said, but may themselves be organized by what is said (e.g. Goffman 1963). What Gumperz stresses is the interpretive importance of contexts, including, of course, the occasion in which an utterance is produced Schiffrin (1994: 133-4).

Much of Gumperz’s research has concentrated on ‘intercultural interaction’ and especially, on the mechanisms of ‘miscommunication’. For example, he demonstrates how seemingly irrelevant signaling details, such as falling rather than rising intonation on a single word, can trigger complex patterns of interpretation and misinterpretation between members of different cultural groups (see also Roberts et al. 1992). These patterns of (mis)interpretation, which he labels ‘conversational inferencing’ depend not only on the ‘actual’ contents of talk, but to a great extent on the processes of perception and evaluation of a number of the signaling mechanisms, based on details of intonation, tempo of speech, rhythm, pausing, phonetic, lexical and syntactic choices, non-verbal signals and so on. Gumperz calls such features contextualisation cues and he shows that they relate to what is said the contextual knowledge that contributes to the presuppositions necessary to the accurate inferencing of what is meant (including, but not limited to, the illocutionary force) Schiffrin (1994: 99-100).

In sum, Schiffrin (1994: 134) states that, “interactional socioloinguistics views discourse as a social interaction in which the emergent construction and negotiation of meaning is facilitated by the use of language”. Although the interactional approach is basically a functional approach to language, its focus on function is balanced in important ways. The work of Goffman forces structural attention to the contexts in which language is used: situations, occasions, encounters, participation frameworks and so on, have forms and meanings that are partially created and/or sustained by
language. Similarly, language is patterned in ways that reflect those contexts of use. Thus, language and context co-constitute one another: language contextualizes and is contextualized, such that language does not just function in context, language also forms and provides context. One particular context is social interaction. Language, culture and society are grounded in interaction: they stand in a reflexive relationship with the self, the other and the self-other relationship and it is out of these mutually, constitutive relationships that discourse is created.

2.10.4 Ethnography of Communication

The ethnography of communication is an approach to discourse that is based on anthropology and linguistics. It focuses upon a wide range of communicative behaviors and built into its theory and methodology is an intentional openness to the discovery of the variety of forms and functions available for communication and so the way such forms and functions are part of different ways of life. According to Hymes (1974a: 20) the ethnography of communication is not an approach that can “simply take separate results from linguistics, psychology, sociology, ethnology, as given and seek to correlate them”. Rather, it is an approach that seeks to open new analytical possibilities. It seeks to do so by analyzing patterns of communication as part of cultural knowledge and behavior: this entails a recognition of both the diversity of communicative possibilities and practices (i.e. cultural relativity) and the fact that such practices are an integrated part of what people know and do as members of a particular culture (i.e. a holistic view of human beliefs and actions) Schiffrin (1994: 137).

In anthropological tradition of ethnography of communication, as Gumperz (1982a: 154) states, “socio-cultural knowledge is seen as revealed in the performance of speech events defined as sequences of acts bounded in real time and space and characterized by culturally specific values and norms that constrain both the form and the content of what is said”. The key figure responsible for the development of the ethnography of communication is Dell Hymes. Hymes’s definition of the ethnography of communication consists of four elements:

- whether and to what degree something is grammatical (linguistic competence);
• whether and to what degree something is appropriate (social appropriateness);
• whether and to what degree something is feasible (psycholinguistic limitations);
• whether and to what degree something is done (observing actual language use).

(Jaworski and Coupland 1999: 25-6)

This far broader conceptualization of language and indeed of the purpose of language study imposes a radically different methodology from Chomsky’s linguistics, which is based on introspection and intuition. The object of inquiry for Hymes is no longer the structure of isolated sentences, but ‘rules of speaking’ within a community. Consequently, the sentence is replaced as a basic unit of analysis with a three fold classification of speech communication (Hymes, 1972):

• speech situations, such as ceremonies, evenings out, sports events, bus trips and so on; they are not purely communicative (i.e., not only governed by rules of speaking) but provide a wider context for speaking.
• speech events are activities which are “par excellence” communicative and governed by rules of speaking, e.g., conversations, lectures, political debates, ritual insults and so on.
• speech acts are the smallest units of the set, e.g. orders, jokes, greetings, compliments, etc.: a speech act may involve more than one move from only one person, e.g., greetings usually involve a sequence of two ‘moves’.

Hymes argues that ethnographers can analyze communicative patterns using the traditional method of anthropological research i.e. participant observation. By participating in a wide range of activities common to the life of a particular group of people, one attempts to replace one’s own way of thinking, believing and acting with a framework in which what is done by the members of another group starts to seem ‘expected’ and ‘natural’. The challenge faced by an anthropologist is thus, in some ways, similar so that faced by any neophyte’ an anthropologist has to learn what native members already know about how to “make sense out of experience” Schiffrin (1994: 140).
Linguists ignored the study of communicative patterns and systems of language use for reasons quite different from those of anthropologists. Chomsky’s (1957, 1965) reformulation of the goals of linguistic theory excluded the analysis of performance, focusing theoretical interest instead on competence, i.e. tacit knowledge of the abstract rules of language. Rather than concentrating linguistic theory on competence, Hymes proposed that scholarship focus on communicative competence. Knowledge of abstract linguistic rules is included in communicative competence. But also included is the ability to use language in concrete situations of everyday life: the ability to engage in conversation, to shop in a store, to interview (and be interviewed) for a job, to pray, joke, argue, tease, warn and even to know when to be silent. Furthermore, the study of language in use i.e. the study of how people are communicatively competent and this contributes “in an empirical and comparative way (to) many notions that underlie linguistic theory proper” Hymes (1974a: 20), also Hymes (1981), simply because “it is not easy to separate areas of language that are insulated from cultural and social processes, from those that are vulnerable to such processes” Ochs (1988: 3).

2.10.5 Variation Analysis

Variationist approach stems largely from studies of variation and change in language i.e. fundamental assumptions of such studies arc that linguistic variation (i.e. heterogeneity) is patterned both socially and linguistically and that such patterns can be discovered only through systematic investigation of a speech community. Thus, variationists try to discover patterns in the distribution of alternative ways of saying the same thing, i.e. the social and linguistic factors that are responsible for variation in ways of speaking (see McCarthy et al. 2002).

Both the initial methodology and the theory underlying such studies are those of William Labov (who has also developed a speech act approach to discourse). Although traditional variationist studies have been limited to semantically equivalent variants (what Labov (1972a) calls “alternative ways of saying the same thing”), such studies have also been extended to texts. It is in the search for text structure, the
analysis of text-level variants and of how text constrains other forms that a variationist approach to discourse has developed.

Although the linguistics in which this approach is grounded is ‘socially realistic’ (a term used by Hymes (1974c: 196), Labov resists the term sociolinguistics “since it implies that there can be a successful linguistic theory or practice which is not social” (1972c: xiii). Furthermore, although social factors (e.g. social stratification) are considered in actual analyses and in more general formulations of patterns and explanations of distributions, the influence of sociology (its assumptions, concepts and theory) was not heavily incorporated into early studies of language variation and change. Thus, the influence of linguistics pervades the variationist approach to discourse.

Labov (1972d) and Labov and Fanshel (1977, Chap. 3), propose rules that connect actions and meanings to words. This is a major task of discourse analysis and should be pursued in formal terms: “Linguists should be able to contribute their skill and practice in formalization to this study. ... Formalization is a fruitful procedure even when it is wrong: it sharpens our questions and promotes the search for answers” (Labov 1972d: 298). Variationist formalizations of discourse rules include social information with linguistic primitives because discourse is an area “of linguistic analysis in which even the first steps towards. Rules cannot be taken unless the social context of the speech event is considered” (Labov 1972e: 252).

Labov (1972b, Labov and Waletsky 1967) provided a systematic framework for the analysis of oral narrative - a framework that illustrates quite well the variationist approach to discourse units. This framework, as indicated by Schiffrin (1994: 283), defines a narrative as a particular bounded unit in discourse and it defines parts to narrative as smaller units whose identities are based on their linguistic (syntactic, semantic) properties and on their role in the narrative.

Labov argued that a fully formed narrative (as summarized by Mesthrie et al. 2000: 193) may include the following:

1. Abstract, which summarizes the events to come or offers a preliminary assessment of the significance of those events;
2. Orientation, which identifies the setting, characters and other background and contextual details relevant to narrative;
3. Complicating action, a series of narrative clauses - the basic details of the storyline;
4. Evaluation(s), which indicate the point of the story, or the reason(s) why the speaker thinks the story is worth (retelling. Such material may occur at the end, but may also be included at any point within the narrative;
5. Result or resolution, which resolves the story;
6. Coda, which signals the end of the narrative and may bridge the gap between the narrative and the present time.

Variationists require data that allow the discovery of the highly regular rules of language and the social distribution of variants governed by those rules. This type of data-a variety of language termed the vernacular - emerges only during certain social situations with certain interactional conditions. One such condition is when a speaker tells a narrative of personal experience. Thus, the same discourse unit that is useful for variationists because of its regular textual structure and because it enables the definition of environments in which to locate specific linguistic variants, is also useful as a source of vernacular speech in which patterns of linguistic variation and change maybe discovered (Schiffrin 1994:290).

A variationist approach to discourse is thus, a linguistic approach that considers social context under certain methodological and analytical circumstances.

2.10.6 Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis (CA) offers an approach to discourse that has been extensively articulated by sociologists, beginning with Harold Garfinkel who developed the approach known as ethnomethodology and then applied specifically to conversation, most notably by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (Gumperz 1982a).

Ethnomethodology means studying the link between what social actors ‘do’ in interaction and what they ‘know’ about interaction. Social structure is a form of order and that order is partly achieved through talk, which is itself structured and orderly.
Social actors have common-sense knowledge about what it is they are doing interactionally in performing specific activities and in jointly achieving communicative coherence. Making this knowledge about ordinary, everyday affairs explicit and finding an understanding of how society is organized and how it functions, is ethnomethodology’s main concern (Garfinkel 1967, Turner 1974, Heritage 1984).

Conversation analysis differs from other branches of sociology because rather than analyzing social order it seeks to discover the methods by which members of a society produce a sense of social order. Conversation is a source of much of our sense of social order, e.g. it produces many of the typifications underlying our notions of social role (Ciccourel 1972). Conversation also exhibits its own order and manifests its own sense of structure.

Conversation analysis is like interactional sociolinguistics in its concern with the problem of social order and how language both creates and is created by social context. It is also similar to the ethnography of communication in its concern with human knowledge and its belief that no detail of conversation (or interaction) can be neglected a priori: as unimportant. All three approaches also focus on detailed analysis of particular sequences of utterances that have actually occurred. But conversation analysis is also quite different from any of the approaches discussed thus far: conversation analysis provides its own assumptions, its own methodology (including its own terminology) and its own way of theorizing (Schiffrin 1994: 232).

C.A views language as a form of social action and aims, in particular, to discover and describe how the organization of social interaction makes manifest and reinforces the structures of social organization and social institutions (Zimmerman 1991, Drew and Heritage 1992, Schegloff 1999. Hutchby and Wooffit; 1998). Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 14), point out that talk in interaction is now commonly preferred to the designation ‘conversation’, define C.A as follows: “Conversation analysts were the first to provide systematic evidence for the cooperative nature of conversational processes and to give interactional substance to the claim that - to use Halliday’s expression - words have both relational and ideational significance”. (Gumperz 1982a: 160). The emphasis
in C.A in contrast to earlier ethnomethodological concerns has shifted away from the patterns of ‘knowing’ towards discovering the ‘structures of talk’ which produce and reproduce patterns of social action.

One central C.A concept is ‘preference’, the idea that, at specific points in conversation, certain types of utterances will be more favored than others (e.g. the socially preferred response to an invitation is acceptance, not rejection). Other conversational features which conversation analysis has focused on, as Jaworski and Coupland (1999: 20) indicate, include:

- openings and closings of conversations (Schegloff and Sacks 1999).
- adjacency pairs (i.e. paired utterances of the type summons-answer, greeting-greeting, compliment-compliment response, etc.);
- topic management and topic shift;
- conversational repairs;
- showing agreement and disagreement;
- introducing bad news and processes of troubles-telling;
- (probably most centrally) mechanisms of turn-taking.

Conversation analysts drawing largely on Garnfinkel’s (1967) sociological method of ethnomethodology, which is “the study of the way in which individuals experience their everyday activities, endeavors to deduce from observation that speakers are doing and how they are doing it” (Trask 1999: 57).

In sum, conversation analysis approaches to discourse consider the way participants in talk construct systematic solutions to recurrent organizational problems of conversation. The existence of those problems and the need to find such solutions arises out of the ethnomethodological search for members’ knowledge of their own ordinary affairs, knowledge that reveals and produces a sense of order and normalcy in everyday conduct. Since, the sense of order that emerges is publicly displayed through ongoing activity, one can examine the details of that activity for evidence of its underlying order and structure searching not just for evidence that some aspect of conversation ‘can’ be viewed in a certain way, but that it is viewed that way by participants themselves, Levinson (1983: 318-19).
2.11 Critical Discourse Analysis

A brief introduction about C.D.A. must be given before I explain in detail the model of C.D.A. that I am following in this study. The roots of C.D.A. lie in classical rhetoric, text linguistics and sociolinguistics as well as applied linguistics and pragmatics. The notions of power, ideology, hierarchy and gender together with sociological variables are all seen as relevant for an interpretation and explanation of text. Gender issues, issues of racism, media discourses, political discourses, organizational discourses or dimensions of identity research have become very prominent now. C.D.A. takes a particular interest in relation between language and power. The term C.D.A. is now used to refer more specifically to the critical linguistic approach of scholars who find the larger discursive unit of text to be the basic unit of communication.

Critical Discourse Analysis (C.D.A.) stems from a critical theory of language which sees the use of language as a form of social practice. All social practices are tied to specific historical contexts and are the means by which existing social relations are reproduced or contested and different interests are served. It is the questions pertaining to interests: How is the text positioned or what is its positioning? Whose interests are served by this positioning? Whose interests are negated? What are the consequences of this positioning? All these relate discourse to relations of power. C.D.A. seeks to understand how discourse is implicated in relations of power. Critical discourse studies stem from three overlapping intellectual traditions, each emphasizing the linguistic turn in the social sciences. These traditions are discourse studies (e.g., Benveniste, 1958/1971; Derrida, 1974; Foucault, 1969/1972; Pecheux, 1975), feminist post-structuralism (e.g., Butler, 1990; Davies, 1993), and critical linguistics (e.g., Fowler, Hodge, Kress, & Trew, 1979; Halliday & Hasan, 1989; Hodge & Kress, 1979/1993; Pecheux, 1975; Pennycook, 2001; Willig, 1999). Critical Discourse Analysis focuses on how language as a cultural tool mediates relationships of power and privilege in social interactions, institutions, and bodies of knowledge (see, for example, Bourdieu, 1977; Davies & Harre, 1990; Foucault, 1969/1972; Gee, 1999; Luke, 1995/1996).
Gee (2004) makes the distinction between the capitalized term “Critical Discourse Analysis” (which the abbreviation C.D.A. represents) and “critical discourse analysis” in lowercase letters, a distinction that is quite relevant to this review. He argues that C.D.A. refers to the brand of analysis that has been informed by Fairclough, Hodge, Kress, Wodak, van Dijk, van Leeuwen, and followers. Lowercase “critical discourse analysis” includes a “wider array of approaches” Gee’s own form of analysis (1992, 1994, 1996, 1999), that of Gumperz (1982), Hymes (1972), Michaels (1981), and Scollon, & Scollon (1981), and the work of other discourse analysts in the United States and elsewhere. These scholars are conducting critically oriented forms of discourse analysis but do not specifically call their work C.D.A.. Gee (2004:33) points out that critical approaches to discourse analysis “treat social practices in terms of their implications for things like status, solidarity, distribution of social goods, and power”. As language is a social practice and because not all social practices are created and treated equally, all analyses of language are inherently critical.

C.D.A. however is not a single theory or methodology. Rather researchers of C.D.A. rely on different theories. There are various definitions of discourse, in relation to ‘text’, ideology and power and all this makes C.D.A. dynamic. It is an interdisciplinary approach to language and social study that explores the social interaction which is manifested in linguistic forms. C.D.A. views discourse as a form of social practice, which is in turn effected by and effects the discursive practices. Discursive practices are shaped and affected by social institutions and social structures. Discursive practices as part of discourse affect ideologies that are further responsible for power relations.

C.D.A. has its roots and tenets in various traditional theories. It is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power; abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context, van Dijk (2003). It is one of the approaches within D.A that blends a textual linguistic analysis and a detail social analysis. Thus, C.D.A. focuses on social problems and societal issues. It explains the social and discursive
structures. C.D.A. follows a unique approach to social issues since; it endeavors to make visible explicit power relations, which normally are backgrounded in the social relations and does this by emphasizing specially on the context of the text. C.D.A. refers to extra linguistic factors as culture, society and ideology. The notion of context thus, holds a lot of significance. Context encompasses all social psychological and cultural dimensions. The notion of context gives rise to the assumption of relationship between language and society. This relationship between society and language is viewed as dialectical which is a substantive point that makes C.D.A. so very distinct and fruitful. Critical linguistics supports a similar viewpoint.

Critical linguistics was the approach developed by a group at the University of East Anglia in the 1970s (Fowler et al. 1979, Kress and Hodge 1979). They tried to marry a method of linguistic text analysis with a social theory of the functioning of language in political and ideological processes, drawing upon the functionalist linguistic theory associated with Michael Halliday (1978, 1985) and known as systemic functional linguistics, Fairclough (1992b: 25-6).

The differences between critical discourse analysis (C.D.A.) and other sociolinguistic approaches may be most clearly established with regard to the general principles of C.D.A.. First of all the nature of the problems with which C.D.A. is concerned are different in principle from all those methods which do not determine their interest in advance. It is a fact that C.D.A. follows a different and a critical approach to problems, since it endeavours to make explicit power relationships which are frequently hidden and thereby helps deriving results that are of practical relevance.

One important characteristic that arises from the assumption of critical discourse analysis is that all discourses are historical and can therefore, only be understood with reference to their context. In accordance with this, critical discourse analysis refers to such extra linguistic factors as culture, society and ideology. In any case, the notion of context is crucial for critical discourse analysis, since this explicitly includes social, psychological political and ideological components and thereby postulates an
interdisciplinary procedure. Beyond this, critical discourse analysis, using the concepts of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, analyses relationships with other texts whereas this is not pursued in other methods. Wodak (2001) mention that from the basic understanding of the notion of discourse it may be concluded that critical discourse analysis is open to the broadest range of factors that exert an influence on texts.

From the notion of context a further difference emerges concerning the assumption about the relationship between language and society. C.D.A. does not take this relationship to be simply deterministic but invokes an idea of mediation. There is a difference between various approaches to discourse. Norman Fairclough (1992b) defines the relationship in accordance with Halliday’s multifunctional linguistic theory and the concept of orders of discourse according to Foucault, while Ruth Wodak (2001a,b) and Paul Chilton (2004), like Teun van Dijk, introduces a sociocognitive level. This kind of mediation between language and society is absent from many other linguistic approaches, such as for example, conversation analysis.

A further distinguishing feature of critical discourse analysis is the specific incorporation of linguistic categories into its analyses. As Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999: 93) state “to capture some contradictory character of discourse on late modernity, critical discourse analysis should be open in its analysis to different theoretical discourses which construct the problem in focus in different ways”.

Another characteristic of critical discourse analysis is its interdisciplinary claim and its description of the object of investigation from widely differing perspectives, as well as its continuous feedback between analysis and data collection. Compared with other linguistic methods of text analysis, critical discourse analysis seems to be closest to sociological and socio-psychological perspectives, although these interfaces are not well defined everywhere (Meyer 2001: 15-6).

In sum, as Scollon (2001a: 140) argues “C.D.A. is a programme of social analysis that critically analyses discourse that is to say language in use as a means of addressing problems of social change. The programme of C.D.A. is founded in the
idea that the analysis of discourse opens a window on social problems because social problems are largely constituted in discourse”.

In the next section I discuss some foundational principles that are relevant in any discussion of Critical Discourse Analysis. The discussion is structured around the key constructs: “critical,” “discourse,” and “analysis” and what is Critical in C.D.A.?

The Frankfurt school, the group of scholars connected to the Institute of Social Research at the University of Frankfurt, focused their attention on the changing nature of capitalism and its relation to Marxist theories of economic determinism. Adorno, Marcuse, and Horkheimer, the scholars most commonly connected with the Frankfurt School initiated a conversation with the German tradition of philosophical and social thought of Marx, Kant, Hegel, and Weber. While rejecting the strict economic determinism (the view that economic factors determine all other aspects of human existence) associated with Marxism, they continued the view that injustice and oppression shape the social world. The Frankfurt school and scholars from across disciplines engaged with critical theory and attempted to locate the multiple ways in which power and domination are achieved, Kinchloe & McLaren (2003).

Thus, the Frankfurt school and other neo-Marxist scholars of society and language (e.g., the Bakhtin Circle) opened the debate about whether language belongs to the economic base or the cultural superstructure, and whether it is determined by material conditions or, in fact, determines these conditions Ives (2004). It is important to remember that at the same time that the Frankfurt school was rising in academic popularity, the works of W. E. B. DuBois (1903/1990) and Carter Woodson (1933/1990) also mounted serious challenges to the dominant Euro-American scholarly paradigm. However, Horkheimer, Adorno, and Marcuse are commonly associated with critical theory, whereas DuBois and Woodson remain invisible in the scholarly canon in critical theory (Ladson-Billings, 2003). This is important because critical theory, a set of theories that attempt to locate and confront issues of power, privilege, and hegemony, has also been critiqued for reproducing power knowledge relations and constructing its own regime of truth.
Or, as Yancy (1998) puts it, critical theory is often “the words of white men engaged in conversations with themselves”. Evidence of this can be seen in the striking absence of issues of race in much of critical theory. Critical theory is not a unified set of perspectives. Rather, it includes critical race theory, post-structuralism, post-modernism, neo-colonial studies, queer theory, and so on. Critical theories are generally concerned with issues of power and justice and the ways that the economy, race, class, gender, religion, education, and sexual orientation construct, reproduce, or transform social systems. Although there are many different “moments” when research might be considered critical, the various approaches to critical research share some assumptions. Critical theorists, for example, believe that thought is mediated by historically constituted power relations. Facts are never neutral and are always embedded in contexts. Some groups in society are privileged over others, and this privilege leads to differential access to services, goods, and outcomes. Another shared assumption is that one of the most powerful forms of oppression is internalized hegemony, which includes both coercion and consent Gramsci (1973); Ives (2004). Critical researchers are intent on discovering the specifics of domination through power. However, power takes many forms and they are ideological, physical, linguistic, material, psychological and cultural. Critical theorists generally agree that language is central in the formation of subjectivities and subjugation.

Post-structuralism, the intellectual movement with which Michel Foucault is often associated was a rejection of the structuralist movement of the earlier 20th century and is intimately related to critical theory. Structuralism assumed that relationships existed between structures in systems and that examining those relationships could help us to understand the entirety of a system. The theory of structuralism permeated across disciplines and could be seen in studies of the economy (Marx), language (Saussure), psychology (Freud), and anthropology specifically, culture and kinship relations (Levi-Strauss). Foucault, once himself a structuralist, broke from structuralism and argued that we cannot know something based on a system of binaries and static relationships. Post-structuralism pointed out
the inevitable slipperiness of social constructs and the language that constructed and represented such constructs, Peters & Burbules (2004). Foucault’s (1969/1972) concept of discourse and power has been important in the development of C.D.A., as discussed in the next section.

Critical discourse analysis regards language as social practice, Fairclough and Wodak (1997) and takes consideration of the context of language use to be crucial Wodak (2000); Benke (2000). Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 271-80) have put forward an eight-point programme to define critical discourse analysis as follows:

1. Critical discourse analysis addresses social problems.
2. Power relations are discursive.
3. Discourse constitutes society and culture.
4. Discourse does ideological work.
5. Discourse is historical.
6. The link between text and society is mediated.
7. Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory.
8. Discourse is a form of social action.

In Wodak’s (2001: 2) term, critical discourse analysis may be defined as fundamentally concerned with analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. In other words, C.D.A. aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signalled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use (or in discourse). Most critical discourse analysts would thus endorse Habermas’s claim that “language is also a medium of domination and social force. It serves to legitimize relations to organized power. In so far as the legitimations of power relations, ... are not articulated, ... language is also ideological” Habermas (1977: 259).

Among all the approaches, models and methods of critical discourse analysis, Fairclough’s (1989) C.D.A. model is apt and most suitable for the present project.
2.11.1 Fairclough’s Approach to C.D.A.

Fairclough (1989) sets out the social theories underpinning C.D.A. and, as in other early critical linguistic work, a variety of textual examples are analyzed to illustrate the field, its aims and methods of analysis. Later Fairclough (1992b, 1995a, 1998, 2003) and Chouliariki and Fairclough (1999) explain and elaborate some advances in C.D.A., showing not only how the analytical framework for investigating language in relation to power and ideology developed, but also how C.D.A. is useful in disclosing the discursive nature of much contemporary social and cultural change. Particularly the language of the mass media is scrutinized as a site of power, of struggle and also as a site where language is apparently transparent.

Fairclough considers discourse as a form of social practice. This implies firstly that language is a part of society and not somehow external to it. Secondly, that language is a social process. And thirdly, that language is a socially conditioned process, conditioned that is by other (non-linguistic) part of society. Since, this approach to discourse can fulfill the objectives of this research project, in the following sections; Fairclough’s models of discourse analysis will be explained in detail.

Three - Dimensional Model

Corresponding to his three-layered model of discourse (text, discursive practice, social practice), Fairclough (2001c:21) distinguishes three dimensions, or stages, of critical discourse analysis:

- **Description:** the stage which is concerned with formal properties of the text.
- **Interpretation:** This is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction, with seeing the text as the product of a process of production and as a resource in the process of interpretation.
- **Explanation:** which is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context. It is related to the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation and their social effects.
These three stages will be discussed in detail as parts of a procedure for doing critical discourse analysis.

**DESCRIPTION**

In the case of description, analysis is generally thought of as a matter of identifying and labelling formal features of a text (features of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, turn-taking, types of speech act and the directness or indirectness of their expression) in terms of the categories of a descriptive framework. Fairclough (2001c:92-3) lists ten main questions (and some sub-questions) that can be asked of a text to find the set of textual features which tend to be most significant for critical analysis.

A. **Vocabulary**

1. What experiential values do words have?
   - What classification schemes are drawn upon?
   - Are there words which are ideologically contested?
   - Is there ‘rewording’ or ‘over wording’?
   - What ideologically significant meaning relations (synonyms, hyponyms, and antonyms) are there between words?

2. What relational values do words have?
   - Are there euphemistic expressions?
   - Are there markedly formal or informal words?

3. What expressive values do words have?

4. What metaphors are used?

B. **Grammar**

1. What experiential values do grammatical features have?
   - What types of ‘Process’ And ‘Participant’ predominate?
   - Is the agency unclear?
   - Are processes what they actually seem to be?
   - Are nominalizations used?
   - Are sentences active or passive?
   - Are sentences positive or negative?
2. What relational values do grammatical features have?
   • What modes (declarative, grammatical question, imperative) are used?
   • Are there important features of relational modality?
   • Are the pronouns we and you used and if so, how?

3. What expressive values do grammatical features have?
   • Are there important features of expressive modality?

4. How are (simple) sentences linked together?
   • What logical connectors are used?
   • Are complex sentences characterized by ‘coordination’ or subordination?
   • What means are used for referring inside and outside the text?

C. Textual structures
   1. What interactional conventions are used?
      • Are there ways in which one participant controls the turns of others?
   2. What larger-scale structures does the text have?

The significance and interest of each of these questions are explained by Fairclough (2001c:94-116) in details.

INTERPRETATION

The relationship between text and social structure is an indirect, mediated one. It is mediated first of all by the discourse which the text is a part of, because the values of textual features only become real, socially operative, if they are embedded in social interaction, where texts are produced and interpreted against a background of commonsense assumptions (part of members' resources) which give textual features their values. These discourse processes and their dependence on background assumptions are the concern of the second stage of procedure, interpretation. The stage of interpretation is concerned with participants’ processes of text production as well as text interpretation. From the point of view of the interpreter of a text, formal features of the text are cues which activate elements of interpreters’ members resources and that interpretations are generated through the dialectical interplay of
cues and members resources. In their role of helping to generate interpretations, Fairclough refers to members resources as interpretative procedures.

The following diagram gives a summary view of the process of interpretation:

![Diagram of interpretation process](image)

**Interpretation (from Fairclough 2001c:l19)**

In the right-hand column of the diagram, under the heading ‘Interpreting’, six major domains of interpretation have been listed. The two in the upper section of the diagram relate to the interpretation of context, while those in the lower section relate to four levels of interpretation of text. In the left-hand column (Interpretative procedures) are listed major elements of members resources (MR) which function as interpretative procedures. Each element of MR is specifically associated with the level of interpretation which occurs on the same line of the diagram. The central column identifies the range of ‘Resources’ which are drawn upon for each of the domains of interpretation on the right. Notice that in each case these resources include
more than the interpretative procedure on the left i.e. there are either three or four inputs to each box.

The upper section of the diagram relates to the interpretation of context. Participants arrive at interpretation of ‘situational context’ partly on the basis of external cues, but also partly on the basis of aspects of their members resources in terms of which they interpret these cues. How participants interpret the situation determines which discourse types are drawn upon and this in turn affects the nature of the interpretative procedures which are drawn upon in textual interpretation. But one also needs to refer to ‘intertextual context’ participants in any discourse operate on the basis of assumptions about which previous (series of) discourses the current one is connected to and their assumptions determine what can be taken as given in the sense of part of common experience, what can be disagreed with, alluded to and so on.

The boxes in the central column in the figure represents the ‘contents’ of each box as a combination of the various ‘inputs’ (identified by the arrows) which feed into it. Notice, firstly that linking each box with the domain of interpretation identified to its right is a double-headed arrow. What this means is that, at a given point in the interpretation of a text, previous interpretations constitute one part of the ‘resources’ for interpretation. This applies for each of the domains of interpretation.

Notice, secondly, that the boxes in the central column are also linked vertically with double-headed arrows. What this means is that each domain of interpretation draws upon interpretations in the other domains as part of its ‘resources’. This interdependence is in part obvious for the four levels of text interpretation for instance, to interpret the global coherence and ‘point’ of a text, one draws upon interpretations of the local coherence of parts of it; and to arrive at these, one draws upon interpretations of utterance meanings; and to arrive at these, one draws upon interpretations of the surface forms of utterances. But there is also interdependence in the opposite direction. For instance, interpreters make guesses early in the process of interpreting a text about its textual structure and ‘point’ and these guesses are likely to influence the meanings that are attached to individual utterances and the local coherence relations set up between them. One may capture this by saying that
interpretations have the important property of being ‘top-down’ (higher-level interpretations shape lower-level) as well as ‘bottom-up’.

There is a similar situation with the relationship between interpretations of context and interpretations of text, interpreters quickly decide what the context is and this decision can affect the interpretation of text; but the interpretation of context is partly based upon and can change in the course of, the interpretation of text.

Interpretation can be seen as a complex process with various different aspects. It is partly a matter of understanding what words or sentences or longer stretches of text mean, understanding what speakers or writers mean (the latter involving problematic attributions of intentions). But it is also partly a matter of judgment and evaluation: for instance, judging whether someone is saying something seriously or not, judging whether the claims that are explicitly or implicitly made are true; judging whether people are speaking or writing in ways which accord with the social institutional set up etc. relations within which the event takes place, or perhaps in ways which mystify those relations. Furthermore, there is an explanatory element to interpretation one often tries to understand why people are speaking or writing as they do and even identify less immediate social causes. Having said this, it is clear that some texts receive a great deal of more interpretative work than others, some texts are very transparent, other more or less opaque to particular interpreters; interpretation is sometimes unproblematic and effectively automatic, but sometimes highly reflexive, involving a great deal of conscious thought about what is meant, or why something has been said or written as it has been (Fairclough 2003:11).

For interpreting the situational context, Fairclough (1989: 147-8) suggests four; questions which relate to four main dimensions of situation:

1. **What is going on?** This can be subdivided into 'activity', 'topic' and 'purpose' (one could certainly make finer discriminations, but these will suffice for our purposes). The first, activity, is the most general; it allows us to identify a situation in terms of one of a set of activity types, or distinctive categories of activity, which are recognized as distinct within a particular social order in a particular institution. The activity types are likely to constrain the set of
possible topics, though this does not mean topics can be mechanically predicted given the activity type. Similarly, activity types are also associated with particular institutionally recognized purposes.

2. **Who is involved?** The question of 'who's involved' and 'in what relations' is obviously closely connected, though analytically separable. In the case of the former, one is trying to specify which 'subject positions' are set up; the set of subject positions differs according to the type of situation. It is important to note that subject positions are multi-dimensional. Firstly, one dimension derives from the activity type. Secondly, the institution ascribes social identities to the subjects who function within it. And thirdly, different situations have different speaking and listening positions associated with them: speaker, addressee, hearer, over hearer, spokesperson and so forth.

3. **In what relations?** When it comes to the question of relations, one looks at subject positions more dynamically, in terms of what relationships of power, social distance and so forth are set up and enacted in the situation.

4. **What is the role of language?** Language is being used in an instrumental way as a part of a wider institutional and bureaucratic objective. The role of language in this sense not only determines its genre but also its channel, whether spoken or written.

Answering these questions helps interpreters arrive at interpretations of the situational context and the way in which this determines decisions about which discourse type is the appropriate one to draw upon.

What has been said about interpretation can be summarized in the form of three questions which can be asked about a particular discourse:

1. **Context:** what interpretation(s) are participants giving to the situational and intertextual contexts?

2. **Discourse type(s):** what discourse type(s) are being drawn upon (hence what rules, systems or principles of phonology, grammar, sentence cohesion, vocabulary, semantics and pragmatics; and what schemata, frames and scripts have been drawn upon)?
3. Difference and change: are answers to questions 1 and 2 different for different participants? And do they change during the course of the interaction?

The stage of interpretation corrects delusions of autonomy on the part of subjects in discourse. It makes explicit, what for participants is generally implicit: the dependence of discourse practice on the unexplicated common-sense assumptions of members resources and discourse type. What it does not do on its own, however, is explicate the relations of power and domination and the ideologies which are built into these assumptions and which make ordinary discourse practice a site of social struggle. For this, analyst needs the stage of explanation.

EXPLANATION

The objective of the stage of explanation is to portray discourse as part of a social process, as a social practice, showing how it is determined by social structures and what reproductive effects discourses can cumulatively have on those structures, sustaining them or changing them. These social determinations and effects are mediated by members resources, that is social structures shape members resources, which in turn shape discourses and discourses sustain or change members’ resources, which in turn sustain or change structures.

The stage of explanation involves a specific perspective on members resources as they are seen specifically as ideologies. That is, the assumptions about culture, social relationships and social identities which are incorporated with members resources, are seen as determined by particular power relations in the society or institution and in terms of their contribution to struggles to sustain or change these power relations they are seen ideologically. The social structures which are in focus are relations of power and the social processes and practices which are in focus are processes and practices of social struggle. Explanation is a matter of seeing discourse as part of processes of social struggle, within a matrix of relations of power.

Depending on whether the emphasis is upon process or structure, upon processes of struggle or upon relations of power, explanation has two dimensions, discourses can be seen as parts of social struggles and contextualize them in terms of these broader (non-discoursal) struggles and the effects of these struggles on structures. This puts the
emphasis on the social effects of discourse, on creativity and on the future. On the other hand, the power relationships which determine discourses; can be shown as relationships that are themselves the outcome of struggles and are established (and, ideally, naturalized) by those with power. This puts the emphasis on the social determination of discourse. Both social effects of discourse and social determinants of discourse should be investigated at three levels of social organization: the societal level, the institutional level and the situational level. This is represented in figure below.

![Diagram showing the relationship between societal, institutional, and situational levels with discourse in the middle.](image)

**Fig. Explanation (from Fairclough2001c:136)**

The stage of explanation can be summarized in the form of three questions which can be asked of a particular discourse under investigation:

1. **Social determinants:** what power relations at situational, institutional and societal levels help shape this discourse?
2. **Ideologies:** what elements of members’ resources which are drawn upon have an ideological character?
3. **Effects:** how is this discourse positioned in relation to struggles at the situational, institutional and societal level? Are these struggles overt or covert? Is the discourse normative with respect to members resources or creative? Does it contribute to sustaining existing power relations, or transforming them?

Following the conception of discourse which involves an interest in properties of texts, the production, distribution and consumption of texts, social practice in various institutions, the relationship of social practice to power relations and hegemonic projects at the societal level, Fairclough (1992b) explains that discourse analysis ought ideally to be an interdisciplinary undertaking. These facets of discourse impinge upon the concerns of various social sciences and humanities,
including linguistics, psychology and social psychology, sociology, history and political science.

2.11.2 The Model of the Present Study

Considering the three dimensions of discourse analysis (i.e. (i) analysis of discourse practices, (ii) analysis of texts and (iii) analysis of the social practice of which the discourse is a part), Fairclough (1992b: 225-238) suggests a guideline for doing discourse analysis as follows:

(i) Discourse Practice

Each of the three dimensions of discourse practice is represented below. Interdiscursivity and manifest intertextuality focus upon text production, intertextual chains upon text distribution and coherence upon text consumption (see Fairclough 1992b, Chap. 3-4).

- **Interdiscursivity:** The objective is to specify what discourse types are drawn upon in the discourse sample under analysis and how. If it is not clear whether something is a genre, activity type, style, or discourse, The general term of discourse type can be used. Main way of justifying an interpretation is through text analysis, by showing that one’s interpretation is compatible with the features of the text and more compatible than others (see Fairclough 1992b: 124-30).

  – Is there an obvious way of characterizing the sample overall (in terms of genre if so, what does it imply in terms of how the sample is produced, distributed and consumed?)
  – Does the sample draw upon more than one genre?
  – What activity type(s), style(s), discourse(s) are drawn upon”? (can you specify styles according to tenor, mode and rhetorical mode?)
  – Is the discourse sample relatively conventional in its interdisscursive properties, or relatively innovative?

- **Intertextual Chains:** The objective here is to specify the distribution of a (type of) discourse sample by describing the intertextual chains it enters into,
that is the series of text types it is transformed into or out of (see Fairclough 1992b: 130-2).

- What sorts of transformation does this (type of) discourse sample undergo?
- Are the intertextual chains and transformations relatively stable, or are they shifting, or contested?
- Are there signs that the text producer anticipates more than one sort of audience?

- **Coherence:** The aim here is to look into the interpretative implications of the intertextual and interdiscursive properties of the discourse sample. This could involve the analyst in ‘reader research’, that is, research into how texts are actually interpreted (see Fairclough 1992b: 83-4).

  - How heterogeneous and how ambivalent is the text for particular interpreters and consequently how much inferential work is needed? (This leads directly to intertextual dimensions of the construction of subjects in discourse: see ‘Social practice’ below.) Does this sample receive resistant readings and from what sort of readers?

- **Conditions of Discourse Practice:** The aim is to specify the social practices of text production and consumption associated with the type of discourse the sample represents (which may be related to its genre: see the first question under ‘Interdiscursivity’ above) (Fairclough 1992b: 78-80).

  Is the text produced (consumed) individually or collectively? (Are there distinguishable stages of production Are animator, author and principal the same or different people?) What sort of non-discursive effects does this sample have?

- **Manifest Intertextuality:** Manifest intertextuality is a grey area between discourse practice and text it raises questions about what goes into producing a text, but it is also concerned with features which are ‘manifest’ on the surface of the text. The objective is to specify what other texts are drawn upon in the
constitution of the text being analysed and how. Genres differ in the modes of manifest intertextuality with which they are associated and one aim here is to explore such differences (see Fairclough 1992b: 117-23, 128).

- **Discourse Representation:**
  - Is it direct or indirect?
  - What is represented aspects of context and style, or just ideational meaning?
  - Is the represented discourse clearly demarcated? Is it translated into the voice of the representing discourse?
  - How is it contextualized in the representing discourse?

- **Presupposition:**
  - How are presuppositions cued in the text?
  - Are they linked to the prior texts of others, or the prior texts of the text producer?
  - Are they sincere or manipulative?
  - Are they polemical (such as negative sentences)? Are there instances of metadiscourse or irony?

(ii) **Text**

- **Interactional Control:** The objective here is to describe larger-scale organizational properties of interactions, upon which the orderly functioning and control of interactions depends (see Fairclough 1992b: 152-8). An important issue is who controls interactions at this level to what extent is control negotiated as a joint accomplishment of participants and to what extent is it asymmetrically exercised by one participant?
  - What turn-taking rules are in operation? Are the rights and obligations of participants (with respect to overlap or silence, for example) symmetrical or asymmetrical?
  - What exchange structure is in operation?
– How topics are introduced, developed, established and is topic control symmetrical or asymmetrical?
– How are agendas set and by whom? How are they policed and by whom? Does one participant evaluate the utterances of others?
– To what extent do participants formulate the interaction? What functions do formulations have and which participant(s) formulate(s)?

• **Cohesion:** The objective is to show how clauses and sentences are connected together in the text. This information is relevant to the description of the ‘rhetorical mode’ of the text (Fairclough 1992b: 127) its structuring as a mode of argumentation, narrative, etc. (Fairclough 1992b: 174-7).
  – What functional relations are there between the clauses and sentences of the text?
  – Are there explicit surface cohesive markers of functional relations? Which ‘types of marker (reference, ellipsis, conjunction, lexical) are most used?

• **Politeness:** The objective is to determine which politeness strategies are most used in the sample, whether there are differences between participants and what these features suggest about social relations between participants (Fairclough 1992b: 162-6).
  – Which politeness strategies (negative politeness, positive politeness, off record) are used, by whom and for what purposes?

• **Ethos:** The objective is to pull together the diverse features that go towards constructive selves, or social identities, in the sample. Ethos involves not just discourse, but the whole body. Any of the analytical categories listed here may be relevant to ethos (Fairclough 1992b: 166-7).

• **Grammar:** Three dimensions of the grammar of the clause are differentiated here: ‘transitivity’, ‘theme’ and ‘modality’. These correspond respectively to the ‘ideational’, ‘textual’ and ‘interpersonal’ functions of language (Fairclough 1992b:64).
• **Transitivity:** The objective is to see whether particular process types and participants are favoured in the text, what choices are made in voice (active or passive) and how significant is the nominalization of processes. A major concern is agency, the expression of causality and the attribution of responsibility (Fairclough 1992b: 177-85).

  – What process types (action, event, relational, mental) are most used and what factors may account for this?
  – Is grammatical metaphor a significant feature?
  – Are passive clauses or nominalizations frequent and if so what functions do they appear to serve?

• **Theme:** The objective is to see if there is a discernible pattern in the text’s thematic structure to the choices of themes for clauses (Fairclough 1992b: 183-5).

  – What is the thematic structure of the text and what assumptions (for example, about the structuring of knowledge or practice) underlie it?
  – Are marked themes frequent and if so what motivations for them are there?

• **Modality:** The objective is to determine patterns in the text in the degree of affinity expressed with propositions through modality. A major concern is to assess the relative import of modality features for (a) social relations in the discourse and (b) controlling representations of reality (Fairclough 1992b: 158-62).

  – What sort of modalities are most frequent?
  – Are modalities predominantly subjective or objective?
  – What modality features (modal verbs, modal adverbs, etc.) are most used?

• **Word Meaning:** The emphasis is upon ‘key words’ which are of general or more local cultural significance; upon words whose meanings are variable and
changing; and upon the meaning potential of a word - a particular structuring of its meanings - as a mode of hegemony and a focus of struggle (Fairclough 1992b: 185-90).

- **Wording:** The objective is to contrast the ways meanings are worded with the ways they are worded in other (types of) text and to identify the interpretative perspective that underlies this wording (Fairclough 1992b: 190-4).
  - Does the text contain new lexical items and if so what theoretical, cultural or ideological significance do they have?
  - What intertextual relations are drawn upon for the wording in the text?
  - Does the text contain evidence of overwording or rewording (in opposition to other wordings) of certain domains of meaning?

- **Metaphor:** The objective is to characterize the metaphors used in the discourse sample, in contrast to metaphors used for similar meanings elsewhere and determine what factors (cultural, ideological, etc.) determine the choice of metaphor. The effect of metaphors upon thinking and practice should also be considered (Fairclough 1992b: 194-8).

(iii) **Social Practice**

The analysis of social practice is more difficult to reduce to a checklist, so the following heads should be seen only as very rough guidelines. The general objective here is to specify: the nature of the social practice of which the discourse practice is a part, which is the basis for explaining why the discourse practice is as it is; and the effects of the discourse practice upon the social practice.

- **Social Matrix of Discourse:** The aim is to specify the social and hegemonic relations and structures which constitute the matrix of this particular instance of social and discursive practice; how this instance stands in relation to these structures and relations (is it conventional and normative, creative and innovative, oriented to restructuring them, oppositional, etc.?); and what effects it contributes to, in terms of reproducing or transforming them.
• **Orders of Discourse:** The objective here is to specify the relationship of the instance of social and discursive practice to the orders of discourse it draws upon and the effects of reproducing or transforming orders of discourse to which it contributes. Attention should be paid to the large-scale tendencies affecting orders of discourse Fairclough (1992b, Chap. 7).

• **Ideological and Political Effects of Discourse:** It is useful to focus upon the following particular ideological and hegemonic effects (Fairclough 1992b: 86-96).

  1. Systems of knowledge and belief;
  2. Social relations;

**TEXTUAL ANALYSIS**

The textual analysis consists of investigating the following aspects in a text.

1. **Social Events:**
   – What social event and what chain of social events, is the text a part of?
   – What social practice or network of social practices can the events be referred to, be seen as framed within?
   – Is the text part of a chain or network of texts?

2. **Genre:**
   – Is the text situated within a genre chain?
   – Is the text characterized by a mix of genres?
   – What genres does the text draw upon and what are their characteristics?

3. **Intertextuality:**
   – Of relevant other texts/ voices, which are included, which are significantly excluded?
   – Where other voices are included? Are they attributed and if so, specifically or non-specifically?
– Are attributed voices directly reported (quoted), or indirectly reported?
– How are other voices textured in relation to the authorial voice and in relation to each other?

4. **Assumptions:**
– What existential, prepositional, or value assumptions are made?
– Is there a case for seeing any assumptions as ideological?

5. **Semantic/ Grammatical Relations between Sentences and Clauses:**
– What are the predominant semantic relations between sentences and clauses (causal-reason, consequence, purpose; conditional; temporal; additive; elaborative; contrastive/concessive)?
– Are there higher-level semantic relations over larger stretches of the text (e.g. problem-solution)?
– Are grammatical relations between clauses predominantly paratactic, hypotactic or embedded?
– Are particularly significant relations of equivalence and difference set up in the text?

6. **Exchanges, Speech Functions and Grammatical Mood:**
– What are the predominant types of exchange (activity exchange, or knowledge exchange) and speech functions (statement, question, demand, offer)?
– What types of statement are there (statements of fact, predictions, hypotheticals, evaluations)?
– Are there metaphorical relations between exchanges, speech functions, or types of statement (e.g. demands which appear as statements, evaluations which appear as factual statements)?
– What is the predominant grammatical mood (declarative, interrogative, imperative)?
7. Discourses:
   - What discourses are drawn upon in the text and how are they textured together?
   - Is there a significant mixing of discourses?
   - What are the features that characterize the discourses which are drawn upon (semantic relations between words, collocations, metaphors, assumptions, grammatical features—see immediately below)?

8. Representation of Social Events:
   - What elements of represented social events are included or excluded and which included elements are most salient? How abstractly or concretely are social events represented?
   - How are processes represented? What are the predominant process types (material, mental, verbal, relational, and existential)?
   - Are there instances of grammatical metaphor in the representation of processes? How social actors are represented (active/passive, personal impersonal, named/classified, specific/generic)?
   - How are time, space and the relation between space-times represented?

9. Styles:
   - What styles are drawn upon in the text and how are they textured together?
   - Is there a significant mixing of styles?
   - What are the features that characterize the styles that are drawn upon (body language, pronunciation and other phonological features, vocabulary, metaphor, modality or evaluation, see immediately below for the latter two)?

10. Modality:
    - What do authors commit themselves to in terms of truth (epistemic modalities)? Or in terms of obligation and necessity (deontic modalities)?
– To what extent are modalities categorical (assertion, denial etc.), to what extent are they modalized (with explicit markers of modality)?
– What levels of commitment are there (high, median, low) where modalities are modalized?
– What are the markers of modernization (modal verbs, modal adverbs, etc.)?

11. Evaluation:
– To what values (in terms of what is desirable or undesirable) do authors commit themselves?
– How are values realized as evaluative statements, statements with deontic modalities, statements with affective mental processes, or assumed values?

During discourse analysis there is a constant alternation of focus from the particularity of the discourse sample, to the type(s) of discourse which it draws upon and the configurations of discourse types to which it is oriented. Analysis should be directed at both: it should show features, patterns and structures which are typical of certain types of discourse, restructuring tendencies in orders of discourse and ways of using these conventional resources which are specific to this sample.

There are always alternative possible analyses for discourse samples and the question arises of how analysts can justify the analyses they propose (how they can ‘validate’ them). There is no simple answer and all one can do is decide, given alternative analyses, which seems to be preferable on the balance of evidence available.

It was the goal of the preceding sections to give a brief outline of the core procedures applied in the different approaches to C.D.A.. Finally, it should be pointed out that, although there is no consistent C.D.A. methodology, some features are common to most C.D.A. approaches: firstly they are problem oriented and not focused on specific linguistic items. Yet linguistic expertise is obligatory for the selection of the items relevant to specific research objectives. Secondly theory as well as methodology is eclectic: both are integrated as far as it is helpful to understand the social problems under investigation.
Considering all above mentioned models for doing critical discourse analysis, this research will follow more closely the models of Fairclough (1989) for analyzing the corpus data from women magazines. However, C.D.A. cannot be restricted to any one particular model but rather it’s a whole paradigm of interrelated aspects. Before I begin with the analysis of the collected data, a detailed review of the studies conducted using C.D.A. is very important.