Communication Yearbook 35

Edited by
Charles T. Salmon

(2011)

11 Critical Discourse Analysis and (U.S.) Communication Scholarship

Recovering Old Connections, Envisioning New Ones

Karen Tracy, Susana Martínez-Guillem, Jessica S. Robles, and Kimberly E. Casteline

University of Colorado, Boulder

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is committed to showing how talk and texts serve the interests of those with power in a society. From its initially European linguistic roots, CDA has become an influential international, interdisciplinary tradition. This chapter sketches CDA's background including its theoretical roots and key scholars. Six areas in current research are illustrated, along with a sampling of CDA work around the world. The focal criticisms that have been directed at CDA scholarship are described. In closing, we suggest CDA's potential in five areas of Communication (rhetoric, critical/cultural studies, mass communication, organizational communication, and language and social interaction) and provide an appendix of CDA vocabulary.

Introduction

What is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)?

1. It examines the "role of discourse in the (re)production and challenge of dominance" (van Dijk, 1993, p. 249).
2. It's about "demystifying ideologies and power through the systematic … investigation of semiotic data (written, spoken or visual)" (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 3).
3. It is a "resource for people who are struggling against domination and oppression in its linguistic forms" (Fairclough, 1995a, p.1).

CDA—or discourse analysis with a critical thrust, as we prefer to characterize the approach for reasons that will become apparent—is a well-established interdisciplinary research tradition. In just 20 years, whether one treats the appearance of Fairclough's (1989) *Language and Power* or the launching of *Discourse & Society* (D&S) in 1990 as the starting point, CDA has become enormously influential. There are journals devoted to or highly welcoming of critical discourse studies (*Critical Discourse Studies, Discourse &*

Communication, Discourse & Society, Journal of Multicultural Discourses, The Journal of Language and Politics, Visual Semiotics), as well as an increasing number of texts that offer guidance about CDA (e.g., Blommaert, 2005; Bloor & Bloor, 2007; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Gee, 1999, 2006; van Leeuwen, 2008). At the level of individual scholars, a perusal of journals reveals that CDA is increasingly a term authors use to describe their expertise.

Our aim in this chapter is to provide a thick, textured description-critique of CDA from the point of view of Communication scholars.[1] To accomplish our goals, we weave together writings about CDA, research examples, and the results of a content analysis we carried out on the last 10 years (286 articles) of D&S,[2] the most visible CDA journal. CDA is a vast area in linguistics, as evidenced by Toolan's (2002) four-volume handbook (see van Noppen, 2004, for a review). Our review focuses on critical discourse research that is most strongly linked to the field of Communication. Thus, in addition to studies from D&S, the examples of CDA studies come from the 130 article-set we identified using "critical discourse" as a keyword or as subject term in the database *Communication and Mass Media Complete*.[3]

Our chapter unfolds in the following manner: in the first section we provide background on CDA; its birth, key commitments, and current profile, its theoretical roots, and its current relationship to the field of Communication. In the second section we review the work of three key scholars, describe CDA studies in six key topical areas, and give a sense of the reach of CDA research both topically and geographically. In the third section we explore criticisms of CDA, including explication of several lively debates in journal colloquies. Finally, we suggest why scholarship in five areas of the Communication field would be strengthened if each gave serious attention to CDA work. As CDA is steeped in linguistic concepts that will be unfamiliar to some readers, the chapter concludes with an appendix that defines the most important terms.

Background on Critical Discourse Analysis

Its Birth, Key Commitments, and Current Profile

CDA, comments Norman Fairclough (1996), "developed in a particular location within a particular political situation—out of a tendency of the political left and within the new social movements (feminism, ecology, etc.) toward cultural and ideological forms of political struggle from the 1960s onward" (p. 52). A symposium among a small group of linguists (Wodak, Fairclough, van Dijk, Kress, and van Leeuwen), occurring in 1991 in Amsterdam, is often credited as the moment CDA crystallized into an intellectual approach bigger than any particular individual (Wodak & Meyer, 2009), although critically-inflected analyses of talk and text had been around for a while. In 1979 Kress and Hodge published the first edition of *Language as Ideology* in which they called upon linguists to recognize how language is an instrument of social control. Critical linguistics, the name they gave to their approach, melded

socialist political commitments with the language theory of systemic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1994).

From a Communication point of view, critical linguistics functioned to lead linguistics toward beliefs about language that have long been part of our field, such as seeing language "as an instrument of control as well as communication" (Hodge & Kress, 1993, p. 6). But what critical linguistics added to the Communication commonplace was a set of linguistic tools that enhanced noticing of interesting features of talk and text. Linguistic ideas such as modality, passive verb forms, nominalization, and intertextuality (see appendix) identified concrete language practices to examine. Additionally, critical linguistics' assumption that texts always have ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions resonated well with the Communication commonplace that all messages had both content and relational levels (Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967). In the second edition of *Language as Ideology,* Hodge and Kress (1993) treated CDA as a better, more interdisciplinary and inviting label for their research approach.

Critical analyses of discourse appeared in several influential books (e.g., van Dijk, 1984; Wodak, 1989) and in a variety of journals in the 1980s, but until D&S began in 1990, there was no outlet that treated CDA studies as central to its scholarly mission. D&S did, and continues to do so. The 2009 D&S mission statement says that it "studies society through discourse and discourse through an analysis of its socio-political and cultural functions and implications." The discourse that D&S refers to involves concrete manifestations of talk of all types and written or multimodal texts. The journal overview goes on to say that D&S "is a critical journal. It favours contributions that pay attention to the detailed analysis of social and political relations of power, dominance and inequality, and to the role of discourse in their legitimation and reproduction in society."[4] Although D&S favors critical discourse studies, it does not offer sharp definitional boundaries. In addition to studies that strongly and overtly position an author with the politically disenfranchised against the powerful, there are many studies in which authors adopt what we would describe as "soft critical" or a critically-inflected stance. By virtue of the social-political topic investigated, an author reveals subtle sympathies toward the less powerful, but, at the same time, his or her central claim is only slightly political.

CDA initially developed in Europe among scholars who were linguists, a fact reflected in today's scholarly progeny. Although CDA scholarship is carried out around the world and across disciplines, its center remains linguistic and European. Table 11.1 shows the disciplines and regions of authors resulting from an examination of D&S articles, 2000–2009.

CDA is often referred to as a "method," but it is better conceived as a theory/method (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999), an umbrella label for a loose federation of discourse approaches that share a progressivist political commitment and some theoretical roots. In 2004, in the opening editorial of the journal *Critical Discourse Studies*, the editors argued for "studies" as a more accurate description to capture this loose federation character, rather than

Table 11.1 Disciplines and Regions of Authors for 286 D&S Articles, 2000–2009

Academic Departments	
Linguistics/Languages	39.2%
Communication/Journalism/Media Studies	11.9%
Psychology	9.8%
Sociology	7.0%
Political Science or Anthropology or Business/Marketing	6.6%
Hybrid Departments	25.5%
Region of the World	
Europe, UK	27.6%
Europe, Continental	18.5%
North America	26.2%
Asia	9.1%
Australia/New Zealand	8.4%
Central/South America	3.5%
Other Regions (e.g., Russia)	2.8%
Multiple Regions (for co-authored works)	3.8%

"analysis," which suggests CDA involves a particular method (Fairclough, Graham, Lemke, & Wodak, 2004, p. 3).

Critical discourse analysis, similar to other critical approaches in communication, has an interest in exposing how inequalities are naturalized. Van Dijk (1986) suggested that any scholarly tradition that appended "critical" to its name was committing itself to asking "further questions, such as those of responsibility, interests, and ideology. Instead of focusing on purely academic or theoretical problems, it starts from prevailing social problems, and thereby chooses the perspective of those who suffer most, and critically analyses those in power" (p. 4). This is centrally true of the diverse types of critical approaches in communication. But, in contrast to other kinds of critical studies in Communication—for example, critical race studies (Flores, 2009), critical rhetoric (McKerrow, 2009), critical ethnography (Vannini, 2009), or critical organizational communication (Ganesh, 2009)—critical discourse analysis has a relatively inductive, empirical thrust. Communication scholars who define themselves as critical, in fact, might see CDA studies as theoretically light, i.e., not sufficiently engaging with critical theory ideas before moving to analysis of texts.

What distinguishes CDA from other critical approaches is its attention to the analysis of text. CDA studies analyze the content and design of written texts or oral exchanges, drawing on language, interaction, and semiotic concepts, all the while attending to the context in which a discourse was produced. Analysis of text is the hallmark of critical discourse analysis. In our content analysis of 10 years of D&S, the vast majority (95.5%) of studies included textual excerpts and analysis/commentary.

A CDA study may analyze oral or written texts, research interviews, or multimodal texts such as web pages (see Table 11.2), but written texts such as newspapers or institutional documents are most common. This text preference is not surprising given the political, language-oriented focus of CDA: 47% of the articles in D&S analyzed written texts. Although language features are the main foci in CDA, the study of multimodal or visual texts is an important area of interest (e.g., Kress, 2006; Kress, Leite-Garcia, & van Leeuwen, 1997; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001). Hodge and Kress (1988) labeled their approach to multimodal communication "social semiotics" to distinguish it from structural approaches that assumed signs had fixed meanings, and from other CDA approaches that were less attentive to visual aspects of texts.

CDA is relatively inductive compared to other kinds of critical approaches, but it is relatively deductive when compared to its neighboring *discourse* approaches such as conversation analysis (Drew, 2005), ethnography of communication (Philipsen & Coutu, 2005) or action-implicative discourse analysis (Tracy, 2005). CDA anchors its analyses in the ideas of critical theorists shaped by Marxism such as Althusser, Habermas and Gramsci, and a variety of social theorists including Foucault, Bourdieu, Giddens, and Bakhtin (see "Theoretical Roots" section), even though any particular study may not explicitly acknowledge these intellectual precursors. Hammersley (1997) noted that "the term 'critical' began life as a euphemism" (p. 244). Because Marxism was a taboo word, particularly in the American context, "critical" came into fashion as the preferred description for approaches growing out of Marxism.

The families of approaches that inhabit CDA quarters differ from each other in significant ways, but they also possess commonalities. CDA approaches tend to share: (a) a focus on social problems; (b) a weighing in politically on the side of the underdog or for progressive interests; (c) a close textual examination of how linguistic and semiotic practices contribute to problems; (d) an assumption that power relations are (partly) discursive, with discourse both shaping and being shaped by situations, institutions, and social structures; and (e) a belief that discourse is always doing ideological work, i.e., advancing and naturalizing the interests of dominant groups (Wodak & Fairclough, 1997).

There are scholars who analyze discourse to develop critical claims, but who do not label their work as CDA. U.S.-based anthropological linguists and sociolinguists studying law and society, such as Philips (1998), Mertz (1998, 2007), Bucholtz (2009) and Berk-Seligson (2009) would fall into this category.

Table 11.2 Kinds of Discourse Analyzed for 286 D&S Articles, 2000–2009

Discourse Type	Percent
Written Texts	46.9%
Oral and Naturally-Occurring (Interactive or Monologic)	30.1%
Research Interviews	9.4%
Other (Combinations, Multimodal or Visual Foci) or N/A	13.6%

In addition, numerous critically-oriented researchers have paid close attention to language and attended to how news items were structured in such a way to produce the appearance of objectivity while obscuring the subjective choices made when constructing the text. One of the earliest such scholars was French semiologist Roland Barthes (1957), followed by other semiologists (Fiske, 1988, 1996; Fiske & Hartley, 1978; Hartley, 1982, 1992, 1996), and cultural studies scholars (Hall, 1972; Hall, Critcher, Jefferson, Clarke, & Roberts, 1978). Although none of these scholars label themselves as critical discourse analysts, they all perform discourse analysis with a critical thrust.

Theoretical Roots

As noted previously, compared to other discourse analytic approaches, CDA emphasizes the importance of theoretical assumptions for building relevant analyses. Thus, rather than starting with the text as the main source of knowledge/claims, CDA scholars tend to reflect on the abstract concepts and frameworks that guide their inquiries before they turn to examining particular examples. CDA scholars see their deductive methodology as allowing them to be explicit about their own positioning while at the same time maintaining scientific rigor, something that, according to them, inductively-oriented discourse analysts fail to do. As Fairclough (2009) explains, "it is important not only to acknowledge [our perceptions on social matters] rather than affecting a spurious neutrality about social issues, but also to be open with one's readers about where one stands" (p. 4). From this perspective, "the scientific investigation of social matters is perfectly compatible with committed and 'opinionated' investigators...and being committed does not excuse [scholars] from arguing rationally or producing evidence for [their] statements" (p. 4). Beginning with theoretical background on societal processes, according to CDA scholars, also enables an analyst to build better connections between discourse's microstructures and the macrostructures of social institutions and society.

One maxim, with which all CDA scholars would agree, is that language is a social practice (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). This view can be traced back to the writings of Vygotsky (1986), Volosinov (1973), Vico (1948), and Williams (1977). Although this approach to language seems commonsensical today, it was developed to overcome the conceptualization of language as a mere reflection of an external, objective reality. For CDA scholars, language is mostly conceptualized as "practical material activity," which is both produced by and generative of reality (Williams, 1977, p. 38). Language, in other words, is both constituted and constitutive.

The endorsement of a constitutive view of language is closely tied to treating people's experiences as ideological, recognizing that discourses are produced, used, and understood for particular purposes. Ideology, as Huspek (1993) describes it, drawing particularly on Pierre Bourdieu (1984), "inscribes itself in and through discourse, taking the form of privileged words and meanings that, disguised as basic semantic constituents of a natural language, legiti-

mize the conditions of their use, and so reproduce the relations of power that are at their basis" (p. 1).

This emphasis on the ideological bases of our experience is often explored in CDA through Gramsci's (1971) conception of hegemonic processes. Gramsci developed the concept of hegemony to account for the reality of Western Europe in the 1920s and 1930s, where, in spite of the unequal distribution of resources, the working class-led revolution predicted by orthodox Marxism had not occurred. According to Gramsci, the reasons for this were found in the ways in which modern states ruled, not through direct coercion, but by winning the proletariats' consent. This was done through a series of ideological processes which resulted in the promotion and acceptance of a set of values, a "common sense" which, although supported by most, reflected the interests of only a few. In the realm of CDA, "hegemony" and "common sense" are typically used as more general analytic terms to explain the pervasiveness of inequality by looking at how they make ideological processes more effective. As explained by Fairclough (2009), "ideology is the most effective when its workings are less visible. If one becomes aware that a particular aspect of common sense is sustaining power inequalities at one's own expense, it ceases to be common sense, and may cease to have the capacity to sustain power inequalities" (p. 71).

Another conceptual framework from which to approach power dynamics, this time without emphasizing relations of domination, is the one provided by Michel Foucault (1972), especially through his notions of discourse and orders of discourse. Discourse, according to Foucault, represents a framework to historicize powerful claims of truth of normalized knowledge: about human nature, the sense of teleological history, or the more specific domain of the various scientific disciplines. Discourses are systems of possibility that constitute subjects by setting the limits within which those subjects can both think and act (Philp, 1985). "Orders of discourse" refers to increasingly abstracted levels of discourse and social practice. The first and most concrete level is what Fairclough (1992) calls the text. Texts are the focal pieces of talk (e.g., job interviews) or written documents (letters of recommendation) that are being analyzed. Specific texts, then, are part of a larger discursive practice (e.g., professional hiring activities) that include other texts and rules of interpretation. Discursive practices, in turn, are part of even larger discourses, for instance, the discourse of capitalism in 21st-century Western societies. Gee (1999) offers a simpler version of Foucault's idea, dividing discourses into only two types. There are little-d discourses, what Fairclough called texts, and there are big-D discourses. Big-D discourses refer to sets of beliefs and societal practices that go beyond any individual text: they are the networks of beliefs that organize a domain of life such as medicine, government, law, or family.

The localized understanding of power present in hegemonic-oriented accounts contrasts with the emphasis on the diffused nature of power relations in studies influenced by the "poststructuralist turn." This theoretical issue has also been taken up by CDA scholars. As Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) argue,

We agree with the post-structuralist view that all social practice is embedded in networks of power relations, and potentially subordinates the social subjects that engage in it, even those with 'internal' power. At the same time, we believe that the view of modern power as invisible, self-regulating and inevitable subjecting ... needs to be complemented with a view of power as domination [that] establishes causal links between institutional social practices and the positions of subjects in the wider social field. (p. 24)

Thus, and in spite of the influences of Foucaldian notions of discourse, CDA has adamantly resisted the post-structuralist turn so enthusiastically embraced by many of the other intellectual projects influenced by critical theory. Instead, CDA scholars have, for the most part, remained faithful to a realist approach that emphasizes the interrelationship of discourse and orders of discourse with social structures and a material world. Under this view, the world and discourses are dialectically related, and "the impact of discursive practice depends upon how it interacts with the preconstituted reality" (Fairclough, 1992, p. 60). Thus, the theoretical core of CDA continues to rely on notions of material outcomes that may change the current social order in which particular groups systematically benefit from the exploitation of others.

The (U.S.) Communication Field and CDA

Until recently CDA as a clearly identified tradition has been largely invisible in U.S. departments of Communication. Reasons for this can be tied to the particular ways in which specialization areas have been defined and have evolved. Critical/cultural studies, as this expertise area tends to be labeled, is lively in both the International Communication Association (ICA) and the National Communication Association (NCA). In both critical/cultural studies and CDA, key critical theorists (e.g., Antonio Gramsci, Jurgen Habermas) and cultural studies scholars (e.g., Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall) are identified as heritage influences, but in critical/cultural studies, there is usually little attention to interaction and language when looking at texts. An exception to this generalization is the work of Michael Huspek, who has advocated for a critical ethnography of communication (Huspek, 1989/90), written about key critical theorists (e.g., Huspek, 1993, 1997), and analyzed resistance discourse in working class communities (Huspek & Kendall, 1991). Yet, if Ono's (2009) review of critical/cultural studies is treated as a barometer of recent work in the area, it is significant that discourse ideas are noticeably absent. There is not a single citation to any of the language and discourse concepts that inform CDA scholarship.

On the other side of the aisle—Communication scholars who study language, interaction and texts—there has been equally profound inattention to critical theory ideas. Language and Social Interaction (LSI) scholars, as this specialization area is called at both ICA and NCA, have largely ignored CDA.

The Handbook of Language and Social Interaction (Fitch & Sanders, 2005) has not a single chapter on CDA and barely mentions it as a discourse tradition.[5] But in the last few years there have been changes. The Encyclopedia of Communication Theory included a short entry on CDA (Cramer, 2009) and the Language and Social Interaction Division at ICA now explicitly lists critical discourse analysis as within the division's purview.

CDA Scholars and Topics

Critical discourse scholars adopt politically evaluative stances; they also select for study sites in which issues of injustice seem an obvious focus (Meyer, 2001). Thus, CDA researchers privilege interaction and texts in institutional sites over those in interpersonal contexts, and they give explicit attention to categories of people who are devalued by the larger society. These foci are evident in the work of the three influential CDA scholars and in the research topics that are currently lively. In our D&S analysis, 59% of studies examined one or another marginalized identity category, with race/ethnicity/nationality being the most common, and gender second (see Table 11.3). In terms of the institutional contexts that CDA scholars studied, educational and media/political contexts were the most common.

Three Influential CDA Scholars

Analysis of talk or text that shows how power is naturalized, invisibly supporting the interests of dominant groups, is one way to define CDA. But as with "conversation analysis"—which initially referred to any language-focused analysis of conversational exchanges (e.g., Craig & Tracy, 1983) but later came to be restricted to analyses informed by Emanuel Schegloff and Harvey Sacks (for overviews, see Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; ten Have, 1999)—CDA has

Table 11.3 Identity and Context Foci for 286 D&S Articles, 2000–2009

Type of Identity	
Race/Ethnicity/Nationality	28.7%
Gender	13.3%
Sexual Orientation	3.1%
Social Class	2.4%
Other	11.5%
No explicit identity focus	40.9%
Institutional Contexts of Discourse	
Education (K-12, Universities, Training)	46.9%
Media/political	35.7%
Corporate	9.4%
Health-Related	6.6%
Other	1.4%

also come to be strongly linked to the analytic approaches of a small set of scholars, Norman Fairclough, Teun van Dijk, and Ruth Wodak being the most prominent. In our analysis of D&S, 66% of the articles cited one or more of these three scholars. Thus, although critical and critically-inflected analyses of discourse do not necessarily cite their critical theory grandparents, they do cite CDA's immediate parents. Each of these scholars in the parental generation has crafted a relatively distinct way of doing critical discourse analysis.

Of these three leading scholars, Fairclough (1995a) has written most extensively about CDA as an enterprise, including its theoretical grounding (e.g., Fairclough, 1992) and its method, which draws heavily on Foucauldian notions of discourse and on Raymond Williams's (1977) dialectic understanding of power relations (e.g., Fairclough, 2003, 2004). He has also addressed how to integrate theory and method in order to promote social change (e.g., Fairclough, 2006). When critiques are leveled at CDA, it is Fairclough's work that is the most frequent target (e.g., O'Regan, 2006; Toolan, 1997; Widdowson, 1998).

The *discourse* part of Fairclough's CDA has been strongly influenced by systemic functional linguistics, the linguistic approach (see Eggins, 1994, for an overview) that gives particular attention to how syntactic features of language, such as nominalization, modality, and passive verb form (see the appendix for definitions) hide agency and normalize the actions of the powerful. Fairclough's work in the 1990s included research on media (e.g., Fairclough, 1995b), norms and culture (e.g., Fairclough, 1992), and marketing and institutions (e.g., Fairclough, 1993). Fairclough's particular brand of CDA emphasizes transdisciplinarity, dialectics, semiotics, and interdiscursivity. For instance, Fairclough (2002) has focused on the role of discourse in contemporary social changes, especially globalization, neo-liberalism, new capitalism, and the knowledge economy.

In contrast to Fairclough, van Dijk's (2008a, 2009) approach to CDA is strongly cognitive. Before he turned to critical discourse analysis, van Dijk published influential work with Walter Kintsch on discourse comprehension (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). Van Dijk's cognitive science commitments set his work apart from other CDA scholars, as well as many other discourse analysts. Van Dijk (2008a) has criticized systemic functional linguistics, Fairclough's language theory grounding, for its inadequate analysis of context and for its anti-mentalist leanings. In addition to Fairclough, discourse analysts such as Antaki (2006), Kitzinger (2006), and Maynard (2006) also regard cognition as an explanatory concept to be avoided. In contrast, van Dijk (see also Chilton, 2004, Wodak, 2006) argues that an understanding of discourse must attend to cognition: "It is through mental models of everyday discourse such as conversation, news reports, and textbook that we acquire our knowledge of the world, our socially-shared attitudes and finally our ideologies and fundamental norms or values (van Dijk, 2001, p. 114).

Van Dijk has applied his framework to the study of ethnic prejudice in everyday talk and elite discourse. His books, *Prejudice in Discourse* (1984)

and *Communicating Racism* (1987), paved the way for a series of studies related to the ways in which (White) speakers reproduce racism in ordinary conversation. For example, in his discussion of stories about immigrants in the Netherlands and the United States (van Dijk, 1993), he shows how storytelling is controlled by mental categories such as the group membership of the story teller, and thus how narratives about other ethnic groups typically serve the purpose of highlighting an *Us* versus *Them* dichotomy.

Finally, Wodak has developed another approach within CDA, which she labels the "discourse-historical approach" (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). This approach integrates "all available information on the historical background and the original sources in which discursive 'events' are embedded" by exploring how particular genres of discourse change over time (Wodak, 2002, p. 149). Similar to Fairclough, Wodak has been extensively involved in defining CDA as an approach to discourse (Wodak & Chilton, 2007; Wodak & Meyer, 2009; Weiss & Wodak, 2007). But, in addition to systemic functional linguistics, which Fairclough privileges, Wodak's critical analyses are more likely to also make use of ideas from linguistic pragmatics, argumentation theory, ethnography, rhetoric, and corpus linguistics (Baker et al., 2008; Wodak, 2007).

For instance, in her book *Disorders of Discourse* Wodak (1996) emphasized the necessity of examining text and context equally. Her studies in the 1996 collection show how discursive practices such as doctor-patient communication, school committee meetings, or watching the news are usually "disordered," in the sense that the unproblematic routine expected by the participants is often broken in different ways. These "disordered discourses" are not accidental, but they "serve certain functions of exclusion, power, justification or legitimation" (Wodak, 2002, p. 170). The main consequence of these disordered processes is that patients, parents, or less educated audiences are systematically, through specific discursive moves, left outside of the different power structures, with no possibility of intervening in them except to reinforce the unequal dynamics.

Wodak has also investigated how national identities and collective memories are discursively constructed (e.g., Wodak & Kovacs, 2004; Wodak & Richardson, 2009); the ways in which racist discourse operates in elite and everyday contexts (e.g., Reisigl & Wodak, 2001); and the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in the discourse of immigration in Austria and in the rest of Europe (e.g., Delanty, Jones, & Wodak, 2008).

It is not simply the trajectories of these scholars that are of interest, but the directions in which others, especially in Communication, have taken their ideas. Fairclough has influenced critical organizational communication studies (Deetz, Heath & MacDonald, 2007; Mumby & Clair, 1997). Putnam and Cooren (2004), for instance, draw on Fairclough's definition of discursive events as social practice and his notion that textuality in multiple forms produces and reproduces organizational life. Van Dijk's claim that being seen as a "racist" must be accounted for in making comments potentially seeable as racist has been applied to other sorts of pejorative language, including a study

of homophobic comments by teens that has been analyzed by Thurlow (2001). In his article on CDA and metaphor, Hart (2008) cites the discourse-historical perspective as an important influence on his thinking and media scholars in Communication that study immigration and race (e.g., Graham, Keenan & Dowd, 2004) also build upon Wodak's work.

As these examples show, the works of Fairclough, van Dijk, and Wodak have stimulated critical analyses of discourse. In order to provide a sense of the breadth of current CDA scholarship, we next review studies in six key areas, many influenced by these scholars.

Ethnic Prejudice

A significant number of critical approaches to discourse address questions of racism and ethnic prejudice. Following the influential work by van Dijk (1984, 1987), authors from different fields have offered insights into the structure, functions, and implicit ideologies of racist discourses and their implications for contemporary societies. Some of these analyses have focused on the communication of racism in (new) media outlets (Erjavec, 2001; Harding, 2006; Teo, 2000) whereas others concentrate on how ethnic prejudice is reproduced in political settings (Blackledge, 2006; LeCoteur, Rapley, & Augoustinos, 2001). There is also a consistent body of studies that deals with discriminatory processes in organizations (Campbell & Roberts, 2007; Tannock, 1999; Tilbury & Colic-Peisker, 2006) and more recently a great deal of attention has been addressed toward the role that schools play in the dissemination of stereotypes and ethnocentrism, for example through the content and form of textbooks (Augoustinos, Tuffin, & Every, 2005; Bonilla-Silva & Forman, 2000; Eriksson & Aronsson, 2005; Kalmus, 2003). In the realm of everyday interaction, different studies have analyzed discursive moves used to avoid potential negative judgments or the functions of disclaimers when engaging in explicitly prejudiced talk (Billig, 1985; Kleiner, 1998; Tileaga, 2005; Wetherell & Potter, 1993).

In media studies, most CDA analyses attempt to show how the representation of minorities in mediated discourse reinforces negative stereotypes and fosters inequalities among groups. Simmons and Lecoteur (2008), for example, compare the ways in which two different "riots"—one involving indigenous community members, and the other non-indigenous ones—were covered by Australian media. Their analysis concentrates on discourses around "the possibility of change" in order to show how, in the case of the indigenous riot, change was not presented as a possible outcome, whereas the reports on the non-indigenous riot did present "change" as an achievable goal.

In political communication, most efforts have been directed to looking at how the rhetoric used by institutions and its representatives may contribute to hegemonic processes in the construction of racial and ethnic categories. In relation to this, authors are increasingly focusing on the challenges that the "new racism" with its subtle but pervasive strategies, posits for the con-

struction of an effective anti-racist discourse. Every and Augoustinos (2007) discuss the ways in which parliamentary speeches of Australian politicians who oppose allegedly racist asylum-seeking laws engage in a "socially delicate conversational act." This practice involves the careful management of the tension between avoiding direct accusations of racism while at the same time defending the interests of marginalized groups.

CDA scholars have predominantly analyzed how media talk implicitly supports racism, but there is a modest counter-voice exploring how speakers challenge racist discourse. For example, Del Teso-Craviotto (2008) explores how Argentinean immigrants to Spain participated in an Internet discussion that challenged, as well as supported, "xeno-racism," a particularly prominent form of discrimination on the rise in Europe based on wealth rather than biology or appearance.

Immigrants and Nation-Building

Another topic of interest for critically-oriented discourse scholars is immigration, a phenomenon usually seen as linked to dynamics of inclusion and exclusion. Consequently, the concepts of nation and citizenship are often discussed together with those of immigration and immigrants. For instance, Erjavec (2009) shows how discursive moves in media outlets define citizenship in ways that exclude undesirable bodies. Analyses of immigration have exposed the systematic incorporation of ethnic or cultural elements in mediated discussions of this issue (Adeyanju & Neverson, 2007); the pervasiveness of prejudice and negative stereotypes about immigrants in the media (KhosraviNik, 2009; Santa Ana, 1999); and the non-neutrality of sites, such as immigration policies (Gales, 2009; García Agustín, 2008; Schmidt, 2002) and political discourse (Charteris-Black, 2006; Lario Bastida, 2008; Mehan, 1997).

With regards to nation-building and representation, CDA scholars have concentrated on the following questions: How are national identities constructed and legitimized through discursive practices? For what purposes are particular national identities invoked? Most of these studies have explored elite sites such as political speeches (e.g., Lazar & Lazar, 2008; Ruiseco & Slunecko, 2006), parliamentary debates (Fuchsel & Martin Rojo, 2003; Kosic & Triandafyllidou, 2004), and the mass media (Higgins, 2004), although some of Wodak's work (e.g., de Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 1999) explored the ways in which national identities are challenged or created in everyday interaction.

Recently, the discursive treatment of asylum seekers has been a topic of special interest. Goodman and Speer (2007), for example, explore membership categorization terms in talk about asylum seekers through an examination of media texts belonging to the public domain. In these texts, they "examine how members of the asylum debate use the term 'asylum seeker', how different categories of asylum seeker are formulated, reformulated, and used, and how members use, contrast, and combine categories to construct asylum seekers as more or less deserving of support, sympathy, or punitive measures" (p. 168).

These authors analyze newspaper articles, pamphlets, and a range of televised political shows to display how participants in the "asylum seeker debate" systematically rely on category distinctions that form the basis for their different arguments. Asylum seekers are discursively distinguished from or conflated with "refugees," "illegal immigrants," or "economic migrants" depending on the position that speakers take in the controversy. These discursive practices, they argue, concentrate society's attention on whether asylum seekers are legitimate subjects, thus diverting attention from other debates such as a discussion of how these people can receive help.

Gender

There are many analyses of discourse and gender that are critical or critically inflected. The *Handbook of Language and Gender* (Holmes & Meyerhoff, 2003), to cite just one anthology, includes chapters on identity and representations (Weatherall & Gallois, 2003), sexual assault adjudication (Ehrlich, 2003), language ideologies (Cameron, 2003), and women's self-reference (Wagner & Wodak, 2006). Gender as it plays itself out in politics, media, and marketing is important (e.g., Bergvall & Remlinger, 1996; Caldas-Coulthard & van Leeuwen, 2002; Fairhurst, 1993; Kuo, 2003; Lazar, 2000; Shaw, 2000), as is identification of the subtle ways women are treated differently than men.

Trix and Psenka (2003), in a cleverly titled article called "Exploring the Color of Glass," examined 312 recommendation letters for faculty positions in schools of medicine for male and female applicants. Combining some simple quantitative counts with analyses of different sections of the letters, the authors show that letters written for women not only are generally shorter but use gender terms more often (lady vs. man), use more linguistic tokens that raise doubt (e.g., hedges, instances of faint praise), and praise women using a large number of grindstone adjectives such as "hardworking," "conscientious," or "dependable."

One visible CDA scholar studying gender and discourse is Deborah Cameron (1998, 2006). Cameron has been an outspoken critic of Tannen's (1990) much popularized "two cultures" view of gender that treats men and women as having misunderstandings because they come from different cultures. Take a dinner table conversation where the husband says to his wife, "Is there any ketchup, Vera?" Although this utterance is stated as a question rather than an order, most observers will hear it as a directing the wife to go get the ketchup. If the same utterance had been said by a child, however, it is likely to be heard as a request for information warranting a response such as "Yes, it's on the bottom shelf of the cupboard." Men and women, Cameron (1998) argues, do not differ in their ability to speak (or interpret) directly or indirectly. Rather, they differ in their assumptions about how gender should affect interacting parties: "As long as the right contextual conditions apply, there will be no ambiguity about what the [indirect] strategy means, because participants take

for granted one person's entitlement to request an item and the other's responsibility to provide it" (p. 449). In work situations, if men do not understand women giving orders indirectly—the style women are expected to exhibit more—it is because men do not believe women should be in positions superior to them.

A critically-inflected study is illustrated in Stokoe and Smithson's (2002) analysis of how gender categories enter talk. Gender, they note, may be explicitly oriented to in talk. In explicit orientations someone may self-initiate repair to find a more gender-neutral word. This occurs in cases in which the "generic female parent" is used in talk about parenting, i.e., always pairing "child" with "mother," defaulting to the "she" pronoun when talking about parenting or childcare, or even using "mother" to stand in for "parent." But at times a speaker will self-repair and add "father" or "parent." Gender may also be oriented to in subtle ways. For example, in recounting a workplace experience, a woman said, "I think the best thing is to, is to reduce the hierarchy so that your boss is not, some guy that you don't, you hate talking to, but someone you, some, just another guy who you work with" (Stokoe & Smithson, 2002, p. 232, simplified transcript). In this example, "guy" functions in a similar way to the generic male pronoun. And just as the generic "he" was once (and often still is) treated as a genderless stand-in for "he or she," "guys" is currently often taken as a gender-neutral group term that can relate to males and females.

A growing area in CDA is feminist critical discourse analysis. The latter, represented in work by Lazar (e.g., 2000, 2005), analyzes discourse as producing and perpetuating sexism and gender inequality. Lazar (2007) articulates five principles of a feminist critical discourse analysis: (a) *feminist analytical activism*—the purpose of critique is to create social transformation; (b) *gender as ideological structure*—ideologies about male-female differences structure the division of labor and simple mapping of biology and gender; (c) *complexity of gender and power relations*—interpretations of inequality are complicated and contingent, and need to be studied in subtle as well as blatant manifestations; (d) *discourse in the (de)construction of gender*—discourse and social practice reciprocally shape one another in creating and questioning gendered identities; and (e) *critical reflexivity as praxis*—being reflective about practice is necessary among institutional participants as well as feminists.

Gender studies also intersect with sexuality, and the ways in which sexuality and gender are caught up in the performance of identity. Kitzinger, for example, has explored how speakers enact themselves as heterosexuals (2005a, 2005b). Fine (2003) looked at sex education in a middle school and how the teacher moves the conversation away from talk of desire, and toward talk about disease and pregnancy prevention. Thorne and Coupland (1998) focus on how same-sex dating advertisements market sex and self-gendered identities. By analyzing the specific wording people use in commodifying their sexual selves, people creatively use the constraints of the genre to articulate idealistic identities.

News Discourse

As one of the most prominent forms of discourse in the public sphere, news journalism is a frequent object of analysis for critically-oriented discourse scholars and has been explored from several angles. In addition to the analysis of specific topics in the news such as ethnic prejudice and immigration (see sections above) scholars have studied the processes and products of news media (Bell 1991, 1997, 2003); the social effects of newspaper discourse (Locke, 2004, Matheson, 2005); as well as how the vocabulary of news reflects ruling class ideology (Chibnall, 1977; Ericson, Baranek, & Chan, 1987) such as through representations of gender (Bradby, Gabe, & Bury, 1995).

Journalistic voice has been used by many researchers to investigate news discourse (Iedema, Feez, & White, 1994; Martin & White, 2005; White, 2004, 2006). The most common news voice is the "reporter voice," which limits how explicitly authors convey their personal judgments. In essence, journalists advocate a particular value while backgrounding through a variety of discourse practices that the value is their personal stance. This process is demonstrated in a study by Caffarel and Rechniewski (2008) that compared three French news stories from *Libération*, *Le Figaro*, and *Le Monde* on the 2004 American handover of power to the interim Iraqi government. Thompson and White's (2008) *Communicating Conflict*, in which the Caffarel and Rechniewski study appears, offers cases of media coverage of politically sensitive issues around the world. By analyzing lexicogrammatical choices, evaluative positioning, ideological stances, textual organization, semantics, and journalistic voice, the media analyses show how the news texts advantage the views of those who are socially dominant. In the book *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis,* Richardson (2007) offers a useful introduction for how to begin doing such an analysis.

Attending to the visual aspects of media is equally of concern. Chouliaraki (2006) for instance, has carried out extensive work on how media visually represent war, including how visual scenes are paired with spoken narration and other language forms to frame suffering. The events of 9/11 and the subsequent "war on terror" have been one important arena for study (Chouliaraki, 2004, 2005; Hodges & Nilep, 2007), but other scenes of conflict have also garnered attention. In a recent article, Chouliaraki (2009) compares how BBC World and Arab media display the ongoing fighting in Gaza. Western suffering, she argues, is privileged over non-Western. In BBC coverage the war is displayed "through an imagery of panorama phantasmagoria and a language devoid of human agency"; … [it is] cinematic spectacle to be appreciated rather than a humanitarian catastrophe to be denounced" (p. 222). Rather than reporting "people" being killed, it is the "city" or the "compound" that suffers damage. In becoming spectacle, war becomes invisible as "a political fact that requires a response" (p. 223).

Education

In a review of CDA in education, Rogers, Malancharuvi-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, and O'Garro (2005) describe CDA's aim as being to "disrupt discourse, challenge restrictive pedagogies, challenge passive acceptance of the status quo, and reveal how texts operate in the construction of social practices" (p. 376). In our analysis of D&S, studies in education accounted for more than 45% of the context foci, with a major site for study being classrooms of all levels. Chouliaraki (1998), for instance, examined the teacher's use of modality (e.g. "think, "could," "might") in a classroom committed to a child-centered, progressive philosophy. The teacher's talk, Chouliaraki shows, worked in a subtle way to privilege ritual knowledge over substantive, ideational knowledge, thereby creating students oriented to jobs of lower status, i.e., secretarial roles, rather than those requiring creativity and autonomy.

In a study of college classrooms following the September 11 attacks, Hafen (2009) considered the complexities and implications of classroom positionings that orient to freedom, patriotism, and democracy as the uncontested status quo. She found a strong link between freedom, patriotism, and militarism in students' talk. These concepts slid into one another, as in the example, "I'm a soldier's man. I will work under the flag, fight under the flag, and I will die under the flag if necessary." Hafen explained that this jump from patriotism to nationalism and then to militarism is a "well lubricated skid" (p. 70), often exemplified in discourse about patriotism. At the same time, challenges to the dominant meaning of patriotism occurred when students used terms such as "blind," "uncritical," or "belligerent patriotism."

Educational discourse outside of classrooms has also been a focus of attention. Pitt (2002) examined how programs of family literacy preparing women to mother taught them to unquestioningly accept the role of learner and define self as always ready to drop other activities to assist their child's cognitive development. This training discourse, Pitt shows, reveals contradictions in the vision of motherhood, all the while supporting the society's capitalist ideology. Another example outside the classroom is Mehan's (2001) study of a school's educational team meeting in which a child is transformed from "normal" to "learning disabled" by virtue of the institutional weight given to the psychologist's voice over that of the teacher and parents. Other studies show how textbooks maintain dominant ideologies (Prins & Toso, 2008).

Healthcare Exchanges

CDA studies in health contexts run the gamut of methodological approaches from the most discourse-focused to those that look broadly at societal discourses (Agar, 1985). The situations analyzed also differ—from doctor-patient interviews (e.g., Binbin, 1999; Menz & Al-Roubaie, 2008), to drug testing meetings (e.g., Jenkings & Barber, 2006), to therapy sessions (see Bartesaghi,

2009 below) to considering how "medical discourse" is ideologically disseminated in texts (MacDonald, 2002).

We have made a distinction between *critical* discourse studies and *critically-inflected* discourse studies. To give that distinction greater clarity, we look at two studies analyzing healthcare exchanges that also illustrate a way to draw on conversation analytic transcription practices in the service of showing how institutional exchanges construct what is true from rhetoric "developing rituals which both create and legitimate the practices of the profession and the institution" (Sarangi & Roberts, 1999, p. 16) The two studies differ in how explicitly they represent the actions of the institution and its agents as problematic.

The explicitly critical study by Bartesaghi (2009) analyzes on-site therapy sessions in a family clinic in conjunction with the clinic's manual instructing therapists how to proceed, and the Beck Depression Inventory, a measurement tool used regularly in the clinic. Therapy, Bartesaghi argues, draws on everyday conversational practices to pursue institutional aims in less than transparent ways that delegitimize family members' framings of their experiences. Consider one exchange between a therapist and a mother about her adolescent son, the identified patient (Bartesaghi, 2009, p. 164).

T: Hmm. How do you know that there's something going on with him? How can you tell?
M: I just think there's something going on, he's acting different.
T: What do you mean, <u>different</u>?
M: <u>Withdrawn</u> from things.
T: Has he always been withdrawn from things?
M: No.
T: It seems like a couple of years ago when you first came here in '93 he was sort of sad and withdrawn. ((shows manila folder)) Here's his record.

Bartesaghi offers a line-by-line explication of the discursive features to show how the therapist's questioning constructs the mother as a poor institutional interviewee and incompetent. Her study concludes: "Psychotherapy's questioning practices exemplify asymmetric and forceful use of the resources of the question-answer pair … [T]hese resources are embedded in a covert logic of institutional authority that presupposes that clients are mysterious and unreliable" (p. 167).

Whereas Bartesaghi is straightforwardly critical of how the institutionally powerful enacted their definition of the situation, its clients, and their problems, Schubert, Hanson, Dyer, and Rapley's (2009) analysis of interviews with men who were receiving treatment at a detox center is implicitly challenging, a study we treat as *critically-inflected*. In this Australian detox center, all of the interviewed patients had received psychiatric diagnoses of ADHD (attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder) after entering treatment for amphetamine dependence. The diagnosis and treatment of ADHD is a contested issue within

the medical community, with the most common treatment being the use of dexamphetamine, what could be labeled as a "therapeutic" kind of amphetamine. In beginning their article, the authors provide background and diagnosis frequency, noting how Australia, which prescribes the drug four times more than other countries internationally, is second only to the United States, which prescribes the drug seven times more than the international average.

The focus of Schubert and colleagues' (2009) study is on the membership-term strategies the four patients use to steer away from the morally problematic identity of being an "illicit drug user" and toward the more reasonable identity of "ADHD patient." Their study's main purpose is to make visible how, in a situation where another meaning is pressing at the door, patients work to frame their actions in a positive light. At the same time, albeit implicitly, their analysis makes available a critique of the larger therapeutic-medical discourse that normalizes drug-taking and, hence, pharmaceutical companies' selling of drugs as the preferred answer to life's troubles.

Other Directions

This review and illustration of critical and critically-inflected discourse analyses in six areas by no means exhausts the topics, nor identifies the majority of studies within each area. As we noted, CDA as a research arena is attentive to social problems. As new problems arise or take their place on the world stage, CDA scholars begin to give them attention. Scollon (2005), for instance, developed a new type of CDA, what he called "nexus analysis," to examine an interconnected set of food issues in the world from consumption practices, to industrialized production systems, to global climate change and public health.

In the last five years, studies of environmental discourses have also grown (Alexander, 2009). Vannini and McCright (2007) have analyzed how reporting on the weather channel supports a dominant discourse of leisure, consumption, and capital accumulation; Carvalho (2005) has explored how climate change has been represented in prominent British newspapers; and Stamou and Paraskevopoulos (2008) have critiqued how ecotourism guidebooks conceal a consumerist essence within a superficial green wrapping.

Jan Blommaert (2005), scholar of African linguistics and popular culture, points out that most CDA research analyze data originating in present day European contexts, a fact that was corroborated in our D&S content analysis which showed that non-Western contexts comprised only 15% of the sample. But while this is true, social and political events in different countries often become the focus of a CDA study. To give examples, CDA studies in non-Western contexts have included: (a) an analysis of fifth-grade literacy discussions to show teachers' inattention to gay-lesbian themes in Brazil (Moita-Lopes, 2006); (b) an evaluation of the ideology of teachers' talk in Hong Kong English language classes (He, 2006); (c) an across-time analysis of New Year's day editorials in the Chinese *The People's Daily* (Huang & Chen, 2009); (d) an analysis of quotation patterns in ideologically opposing newspapers in Taiwan

(Kuo, 2007); (e) showing how national identity is constructed in the presidential speech of Alvaro Uribe Velez in Colombia in 2002 (Ruiseco & Slunecko, 2006); (f) looking at uses of invective in speeches of leading political party leaders in Ghana (Agyekum, 2004); (g) an evaluation of four major Japanese newspapers editorials following the September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States (Saft & Ohara, 2006); (h) showing how in Korea the United States is constructed as common cultural enemy in the controversy about the movie, *007 Die Another Day* (Lee, 2007); (i) researching power issues in the fragmented Arabic-English speech used by wealthier classes with their domestic servants in Lebanon (Haraty, Oueini, & Bahous, 2007); (j) an examination of discussions on an Al Jazeera religious talk show in Qatar about the *hijab* (head covering worn by Muslim women; Dabbous-Sensenig, 2006); (k) a study probing how the mass media propagate neoliberal policies in post-apartheid South Africa (Kariithi & Kareithi, 2007); (l) an examination in Venezuela of the issue management strategies of a corporation in the Las Cristinas mine (Brooks & Waymer, 2009); and (m) an analysis of the ideological positioning in columns from the journalist, Tafataona Mahoso in Zimbabwe (Maidza, 2008).

Criticisms of CDA

Over the more than 20 years that CDA has existed as a visible method, theory, and approach, it has not only amassed a broad array of practitioners, but has also generated a goodly number of critics. The interdisciplinary nature of CDA leaves it vulnerable to critiques from researchers who make use of the method/theory in disparate ways, as well as from scholars who critique CDA through the lens of the discipline or subdiscipline from which they come, including the different approaches within CDA. Critics of CDA (and more often than not, of Norman Fairclough's particular approach) have advanced five main claims.

It Pays Insufficient Attention to Particulars of Talk

A first issue for which CDA has been criticized, originating primarily with conversation analytic scholars, is that CDA studies pay insufficient attention to the particulars of talk. This criticism, as well as counters to it, has been played out in several journal debates. A key focus of the debates has concerned the extent to which CDA claims are adequately grounded in details of talk. Conversation analysis (CA) is strongly associated with Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (see Schegloff, 2007). Core assumptions associated with conversation analysis include: (a) claims must be made on the basis of what matters to and is oriented to participants; (b) claims must be grounded in empirical data and proven through rigorous analysis on a case-by-case basis; (c) context must be relevantly oriented to based on adjacent utterances; and (d) interaction is orderly and serves to accomplish and promote conversational aims developed through talking.

The transcripts that are the starting point for analysis in CA are detailed, capturing not only *what* people say, but also *how* people say things, including vocal stress, pauses, overlapping talk, repair, intonation, and rate of speech, all of which are represented with particular symbols and notations (see Atkinson & Heritage, 1999). CA's use of detailed transcripts flows from its commitment to minimize the role of a priori theory in interpretation. Because one never knows in advance what features of talk could be attended to by participants, it is important to capture as many specifics as possible. CA and other discourse analysts have criticized CDA analyses which they claim make inferential leaps to inequality and marginalization without grounding them sufficiently in the analysis of talk. This criticism has been the source of heated debates between Schegloff (1997, 1998, 1999a, 1999b) and critical discursive psychologists (Billig, 1999a; Wetherell, 1998), and has engendered further commentary (Mey, 2001).

In the debate, Schegloff (1997) criticized CDA for not attending to the particulars of the talk, which he argued needed to be understood in their own right before connecting them with political claims. "In the apparent multiplicity, and continuing multiplication of perspectives," Schegloff comments, "truth seems to disappear in a hall of mirrors" (p. 166). In her rejoinder, Wetherell (1998) accepts some of Schegloff's criticisms—recognizing that critical discourse studies sometimes do not engage adequately with the exigencies of talk. However, she counters, the problem with conversation analysts is that "they rarely raise their eyes from the next turn in the conversation, and further, this is not an entire conversation or sizeable slice of social life but usually a tiny fragment" (p. 402).

In the next round of the debate, Billig (1999a,b) weighed in to accuse conversation analysis of possessing a contestable view of the world that assumed cooperation and harmony and to oppose Schegloff's claim that CDA sees ideology where it is a minor or nonexistent force. CA's view, argues Billig, is not neutral, as CA frames itself, but is but one view, and a contestable one at that.

An opening remark in Schegloff's initial essay provides a nuanced sense of CA's central criticism of CDA:

> I understand that critical discourse analysts have a different project, and are addressed to different issues, and not to the local co-constructions of interaction. If, however, they mean the issues of power, domination, and the like to connect up with discursive materials, it should be a serious rendering of the material. And for conversation, and talk-in-interaction more generally, that means it should at least be compatible with what was demonstrably relevant to the parties—not necessarily their sequentially directed preoccupations, but, whatever it was, demonstrably relevant to them as embodied in their conduct. Otherwise the critical analysis will not "bind" to the data and risks ending up merely ideological. (Schegloff, 1997, p. 183)

It's Not Attentive to the (Correct) Linguistic Principles

A second kind of criticism, originating with linguists, is that CDA is inattentive to one or another important linguistic principle or theory, although which linguistic principle is forwarded varies widely. Among linguists, Widdowson (1995, 1998) is one of CDA's most outspoken critics. He argues that CDA is not rigorous or sufficiently scientific. He describes CDA methods and procedures of analysis as being akin to ideological literary criticism or literary hermeneutics, and is particularly critical of how scholars apply systemic functional linguistics in CDA. According to Widdowson, the grammar is applied piecemeal in order to forward a particular reading of the text, and he accuses CDA of not providing adequate proof for the ideological effects that are claimed.

Coming from an opposite stance is O'Regan (2006), a CDA scholar himself, who criticizes (Fairclough's version of) CDA as being inappropriately reliant on systemic functional linguistics. In essence, there is a dispute within CDA as to how ethnographic its discourse analyses should be. For O'Regan, systemic functional linguistics is an overly structural approach to language study, one that is inattentive to context in its analytic apparatus. If one wants to take the critical grounding of CDA seriously O'Regan argues, then CDA needs systematic ways to analyze context as well as texts' grammatical features. Likewise, Wodak's (1996) discourse-historical approach is an implicit criticism that Fairclough's approach is over-reliant on systemic functional linguistics and inattentive to contextual specifics. What CDA needs, argues Sarangi and Roberts (1999), is "a 'thick description' [that] reaches down to the level of fine-grained linguistic analysis and up and out to broader ethnographic descriptions and wider political and ideological accounts" (p. 1).

Besides CDA being seen as either too reliant or not reliant enough on systemic functional linguistics, it has been criticized for inadequately attending to other linguistic traditions including text linguistics (Toolan, 1997), cognitive linguistics (Chilton, 2005), and corpus linguistics (Stubbs, 1996). In our analysis of D&S, 22.1% of studies combined quantitative indices with discursive explication. So, although CDA studies might benefit from using corpus analyses more often, as Jäger (2001) argues should happen, CDA already uses quantitative methods more than most other discourse approaches do.

Its Academic Discourse is at Odds with What It Espouses

As an academic enterprise, CDA could be described as turning language back on itself to examine the practices of the ruling elites. One unexamined elite, Bar-Lev (2007) notes, is the community of academic researchers doing CDA. Employing a CDA-type analysis of two journal articles, one critiquing a speech of then-president Bush and the other analyzing Bush's response to the September 11, 2001 attacks, Bar-Lev shows that the authors engage in the

same linguistic practices they accuse Bush of using. As he comments, "Where it is at least possible to argue that demonization and self-righteousness are legitimate as rhetorical tools for leaders, surely they do not belong in academic research?" (p. 183).

Billig (2003) has been an outspoken critic from within the field and has asked whether labeling critical work with acronyms like CDA might exclude outsiders and undermine the intentions of the research. He also examines ways that critical discourse is written and concludes that the use of nominalization and passivization are inappropriate by virtue of the fact that they instantiate the linguistic processes of ideology they intend to expose (Billig, 2008a). "All discourse analysts," notes Billig, "face a paradoxical situation: We investigate language, yet at the same time we use language in order to make our investigations" (p. 783).

The issue of CDA's use of nominalization became the focus of a colloquy between Billig and other CDA scholars. Billig is distorting the treatment of nominalizations, argued Martin (2008); knowledge, which means discipline-specific terms, is dependent on nominalizations, but those kinds of nominal-ization are different from using them to convey evaluation, which is a goal in political discourse. Fairclough (2008) and van Dijk (2008b) likewise defended CDA's use of nominalization in its own discourse. Nominalizations, they both argued, are necessary in some contexts and problematic in others. But, coun-tered Billig (2008b), as an academic area criticizing language use in the world, CDA has a particular responsibility to be self-reflective and careful in its own language practices.

It Does Not Deliver on Its Commitments to Materiality and Agency

"Checklists of linguistic features are not...going to provide us with a reliable method of doing political analysis of texts" (Jones, 2007, p. 362); the condi-tions under which people are not free cannot "be elucidated by purely linguis-tic or discourse-analytical means" (Chilton, 2004, p. 45): so argue two scholars committed to critical analyses of discourse who feel that CDA (and especially Fairclough) have given inadequate attention to how the material world shapes and constrains discourse meanings. CDA does acknowledge the role of the material world, but for some critics the acknowledgment is not much more than lip service. The fact that social movement scholars have made no use of CDA, for instance, points to a noticeable absence of attention to CDA in a tradition where we might expect to see it.[6] Collins and Jones (2006) state the concern this way:

> The whole CDA enterprise remains problematic. It claims that commu-nication practices play a crucial role in processes of social and political context, yet, at the same time, it eschews the kind of engagement with "history and context" which might allow that claim to be demonstrated. (p. 52)

We would note that while Collins and Jones' (2006) criticism seems reasonable if Fairclough's work is its focus, it seems less applicable if Wodak's work is the target. This underscores one issue in just about all criticisms of CDA: because CDA is such a vast and diffuse enterprise, there are few things that are categorically true of all threads of its work.

If there is a single leaning that is applicable to most threads of CDA, it would seem to be that CDA privileges structural forces over agency. How to understand the relationship between social structure and individual agency is a truly thorny issue, and it is not our intention to enter this debate very far. Suffice it to say that theorists (and academic fields) tend to privilege the intentions/agency of actors OR the constraining forces of social structures, even if they explicitly recognize that both are at work. Critical discourse analyses, as our review has illustrated, typically foreground the constraining power of social structures. CDA sees people as caught in a web of conventions that bind them, including linguistic and social-structural ones.

CDA's focus on global and macro-structures can strip people of their ability to act while distorting how meaning-making works. Cobb (1994) notes that "Intentions are central to our understanding of the relation between power and discourse, not because intentions reveal (or mask) person's moves to dominate, but because intentions construct legitimacy or delegitimacy and all their corollary consequences" (p. 133). Thus, in seeking to show how inequality is naturalized and how discourse is doing ideological work, CDA scholars, critics contend, too rigidly fix the social world and inadequately recognize the ways people maneuver, playing little-d and Big-D discourses against each other to (sometimes) change oppressive conditions.

It Assumes a Western World View in Its Analyses

In the *Journal of Multicultural Discourses,* Shi-xu (2009), the first Chinese scholar to edit an international journal in the social sciences,[7] describes the state of scholarship in "language, discourse, and communication" in this way:

> Trends of research topics and questions are not culturally independent, or intellectually neutral, but reflect particular cultural, social, professional conditions, needs, and interests.... Objects of research often come from Anglo-American or some European cultures and realities, or, otherwise, the types of research question and so principles of research interest usually emanate from the Western Cosmopolitan institutions. (p. 239)

Blommaert (2005, see also Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000), who identifies with the central commitments of CDA, amplifies this criticism further. CDA, he argues, while giving lip service to cultural differences, treats the institutions and societies it criticizes as if the first world's way of organizing applied to all countries. This is not the case, he notes, as the majority of the world lives

more like villagers in Tanzania than like inhabitants in Manchester, England, Fairclough and Wodak's current home.

What those in the Western (or global North) often fail to recognize is that contexts come in different sizes. In addition to the local (country-specific context) there is also a translocal context. Societies around the world have different statuses, power, and amounts of prestige in the international arena. An upshot of this is that the same language or interaction feature, depending on the context of the speaker, may inscribe powerlessness or cue prestige. Thus, the speaking of English by an African in Africa will be a marker of prestige whereas the same speech will be stigmatized in London and heard as a nonstandard dialect. If voice is "the capacity to accomplish desired *functions* though language" (Blommaert, 2005, p. 68), then a particularly important part of the ability is the potential for a speaker's style to be semiotically mobile, where such capacity for such mobility is "very often associated with the most prestigious linguistic resources 'world languages' such as English, literacy, and more recently multimodal internet communication" (p. 69).

We agree with Blommaert and Shi-xu's criticism that CDA scholarship assumes a Western society orientation, taking cosmopolitan institutions as its benchmark. We saw evidence of this orientation as we performed our content analysis. Most scholars using data from Western locations assume a neutral (unnamed) orientation whereas non-Western data are identified as such. At the same time, we see it as important to note that CDA scholarship is more concerned about, and doing a better job at, remedying its first world tilt than most other discourse or communication traditions.

Summary

CDA includes many different threads. At its broadest we would define it as scholarship that grounds itself in ideas from critical and social theory in order to investigate contextually-grounded questions about the harmful exercise of power and domination. CDA combines a progressivist political commitment with analysis of talk, written documents, or multimodal texts, and it uses a variety of concepts from language, discourse, conversation, interaction, semiotics, and rhetoric to make visible how the analyzed texts sustain (and occasionally overturn) problematic, unequal relationships.

Taken as a whole, we view the criticisms of CDA as signs that critical discourse analysis is alive and vibrant. Whatever its short-fallings, the fact that scholars both inside and outside of CDA feel compelled to critique it, rather than ignore it, is a clear sign of its importance and relevance within the academy. Critical discourse analysis recognizes its responsibility to be self reflective, thereby positioning itself as a tradition that can grow and continue to benefit from critique. As two of its key scholars comment, CDA

> needs to be reflexive and self-critical about its own institutional position and all that goes with it: how it conducts research, how it envisages the

objectives and outcome of research, what relationships researchers have to the people whose social lives they are analyzing, even what sort of language books and papers are written in. (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 9)

In the final section we turn our attention to the Communication field as it is structured in the United States, considering what CDA can offer to each of five main areas of research.

CDA's Potential in Five Areas of Communication Scholarship

Critical discourse analysis has much to offer Communication scholars. In this section we suggest what it can offer to five areas that are usually demarcated from each other in U.S. Communication departments: (a) rhetoric, (b) critical/cultural studies, (c) mass communication, (d) organizational communication, and (e) language and social interaction.

Rhetoric

Of all the areas of Communication, CDA would seem to link most straightforwardly to rhetorical studies. Both are centrally interested in political/mediated events, both do close textual analyses, and both eschew neutrality as a desirable stance for authors. However, the two traditions have had little to do with each other. In a recent study seeking to bridge the two, Kaufer and Hariman (2008) commented: "The traditions of European critical discourse analysis (CDA) and American rhetorical criticism grew up independently, and judging from the paucity of cross-citation practices, have remained non-interactive" (pp. 475–476). This mutual inattention is particularly striking because both rhetoricians—especially those that adhere to a "critical rhetoric" project—and critical discourse analysts draw on similar social and critical theorists.

We see the cause of this inattention as related to the larger intellectual categories to which each tradition orients. CDA sees itself as a social science; rhetoric regards itself as a humanistic enterprise. To be sure, CDA scholarship has expanded beyond linguistics, but CDA research is anchored in a *social science* notion of scholarship, and a sharply drawn one at that. For this reason, it is possible to criticize CDA scholars by describing their work as just like "literary analysis" (Widdowson, 1995). Rhetoricians, in contrast, comfortably accept that they are critics and that their unique sensibilities will shape what they notice and argue. From a rhetorical vantage point, CDA's attention to its "rigorousness" seems a strange preoccupation.

In terms of developing rhetorical ideas that resonate with discourse-interested, social science communities and with rhetorical humanistic studies, no person has been more influential than social psychologist Michael Billig. Billig (1987; Billig et al., 1988) has developed a rhetorical approach to thinking and arguing that he has used as the cornerstone for exploring critical discourse issues such as banal nationalism (Billig, 1995) or racist jokes of the Ku Klux

Klan (Billig, 2001). A recent volume (Johnstone & Eisenhart, 2008) by 12 U.S. rhetoricians suggests that this type of bridge-crossing is becoming more frequent. The authors in Johnstone and Eisenhart's volume show how their rhetorical analyses can be made more persuasive when they draw on linguistic features to back up their claims, and many rhetorical scholars develop the kinds of insights about power and discourse that are consistent with CDA's political views.

If one defines rhetoric as a set of ideas rather than as an academic community, CDA and rhetoric have been linked since CDA came into existence. In many non-U.S. departments, rhetoric and argumentation are specialty areas within linguistics, and as the appendix of discourse terms shows, CDA scholars regularly use rhetorical tropes such as metaphor, personification, and synecdoche in analyzing texts. Other contributions CDA can make to rhetorical studies is to help it develop a more international, less U.S.-centric stance, and furnish it with language-interaction concepts that can enhance analyses. Rhetoric, in turn, might show CDA how to inhabit its critical-political stance-taking role in a more comfortable manner.

Critical/Cultural Studies

Even though critical/cultural communication scholarship is best described as both an interdisciplinary and a transdisciplinary project (Ono, 2009), one could argue that both the questions asked by critical/cultural scholars and the ways of addressing them are very much linked to a rhetorical approach to Communication. This translates into a primary concern for examining public discourses in terms of the ways in which they relate to different audiences. To this, critical/cultural studies have added an emphasis on how the status quo is reproduced and/or resisted in the different realms of the public sphere, although still the specifics of exactly how linguistic devices can be related to reifying processes are not a priority in the different analyses.

Critical/cultural approaches have produced valuable insights about the necessity to incorporate all kinds of cultural practices into communicatively oriented analyses. Yet this work is too often accompanied by an assumption of the primary role of discourses in constructing reality—and the people in it—at the expense of the material world with which these discourses interact. For this reason, attending to the epistemological orientation and methodological tools that CDA offers could be fruitful at two levels: first, CDA would help to create space for a type of critical/cultural scholarship that not only engages in a critique of the social order, but which grounds this critique in systematic, close textual analysis. Second, because CDA gives attention to the tightly connected relationship between discourse and material conditions—although as noted, not all critics see it as sufficient—it could assist critical/cultural studies in bridging the gap between political/economic and cultural analyses, a project that has been identified as crucial for the next generation of critical/cultural communication scholarship (see Ono, 2009).

Mass Communication

Scholars of mass communication have a plethora of choices for approaching their objects of study and CDA offers one highly salient option in and of itself or in conjunction with other approaches. Although some media scholars might frame CDA as attending to linguistic minutiae, the kind of careful and detailed analysis that CDA promotes would be useful for mass communication scholars being able to form a deeper understanding of how mediated communication functions. Concepts like conversationalization, marketization, nominalization, and synthetic personalization, among others (see appendix), can shed light on the micro-level practices enacted by media producers to craft their messages.

Second, CDA's critical approach to mass communication can be an effective tool for highlighting the ideological construction of power relations, representations, and social identities. Ideological processes are always complex, often nuanced, and sometimes even contradictory, as media audience reception studies have shown. However, those complexities do not negate the necessity of critical analysis. Media, everyone agrees, do affect society. As media discourses continue to saturate everyday life in late-modern society, it is more important than ever to examine the ideological meanings of the texts that surround us. In essence, CDA brings to the study of mass communication a method for understanding the connection between *how* media communicate on the micro-level and *what* media communicate on the macro-level, an important connection to which more media scholars should attend.

Organizational Communication

Within organizational communication, the North American name for an organizational studies specialization (Bargiela-Chiappini, 2008), critical approaches are a well-established tradition (e.g., Deetz, 1982; Mumby & Stohl, 1991). By and large, however, scholars in this tradition have not been interested in close analysis of talk or texts. Outside the United States, analyses of text and talk have been a research focus for some time among organizational scholars who are linguists (e.g., Bargiela-Chiappini & Harris, 1997; Firth, 1994); until recently, though, there have been few critical analyses of talk or text. This division of emphasis has begun to change.

Critical organizational communication scholars have begun to argue for the importance of discourse—meaning both talk/text and larger belief systems, such as "globalization" (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004; Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001)—and organizational scholars around the world are arguing for the value of critical analyses in organizational studies (Ainsworth & Hardy, 2004, McKenna, 2004). In a 25-year, 112-article analysis focused on the term "organizational discourse" across multiple organizational studies journals, Jian,

Schmisseur, and Fairhurst (2008) found both meanings of discourse to be alive and well. In a response to the analysis, however, Taylor (2008) counterargued that the majority of studies were focusing on Big-D discourse. Most of the organizational studies, Taylor claimed, were exploring discourses in society, but they were not attending to the particulars of language and social interaction.

Organizational communication has a rich critical tradition and it knows how to study Big-D discourse. It could, however, do a better job building connections to discourse particulars and interactional processes. CDA offers a way for critical organizational communication scholars to deepen their understanding of how the macro-discourses of inequality that pervade organizational life are reflected in and accomplished through concrete conversations and texts.

Language and Social Interaction

Language and social interaction (LSI) is an area of Communication in which scholars interested in discourse (language, text, talk, interaction) explore issues in a diversity of communication contexts. LSI is steeped in a variety of language-related traditions, including conversation analysis, sociolinguistics, linguistic pragmatics, philosophy of language, and ethnography of speaking, although, interestingly, not systemic functional linguistics. While LSI is the name for a distinctively Communication specialization, of all areas, LSI is the most similar to the European linguistics communities from which most CDA scholars come and to whom they target their arguments. Outside the United States, in fact, most LSI communication scholars have been trained in departments of linguistics or language studies rather than in Communication.

In LSI, critical discourse analysis is a recognized approach to the study of language and social life (Tracy, 2008). At the same time, it is an approach that is on the margins of the area. We mentioned that one criticism of CDA is that it does not pay sufficient attention to the details of talk. This criticism could be turned on its head and directed back at much LSI work. LSI work, which has been especially influenced by conversation analysis, could be accused of giving too much attention to details of talk, and doing so at the expense of speaking to larger issues, including normative issues of how persons ought to act or how institutions ought to be structured. Critical discourse studies offer LSI researchers exemplars of how to give serious attention to language and interaction *and* institutionalized issues of conflict, justice, democracy, or decision making. Linking interactional moments to social issues and problems is a key part of the CDA project. CDA can help LSI bring its discursive commitments into serious conversation with social critics.

Appendix 11. A Critical Discourse Vocabulary

The CDA lexis consists of elements that draw on its critical theory/social theory roots (e.g., hegemony, orders of discourse) and from its language and discourse traditions, including corpus linguistics, sociolinguistics, systemic functional linguistics, discourse analysis, rhetoric, conversation analysis, discursive psychology, and social semiotics. Below is an alphabetical list of the more commonly used language-discourse terms in CDA research.

Term	Definition and Illustration	Recent Applicaton
Collocation	The existence of a sequence of words that co-occur more often than would be expected by chance, e.g., disease terms (plague, epidemic, disease) that occur near the word "immigrant."	Orpin (2005) uses collocation to analyze words semantically related to corruption and discovers significant ideological differences in the use of words referring to activities within Britain versus those outside of Britain.
Conversation-alization	The use of informal speech patterns—back and forth turns—in a genre normally characterized by formal speech patterns and practices.	Patrona (2006) investigates conversationalization on Greek television discussion programs and finds that presenters do not sustain neutral stances.
Dialogism	The theory that texts (and utterances) can only be understood as a part of a greater whole, that none derive meaning unitarily (Bakhtin, 1981).	Pietikäinen and Dufva (2006) use dialogism to examine the construction of ethnic identity through the interplay of individual and social discourses.
Genre	A classificatory device used to designate conventionalized characteristics. The use of language associated with a particular social activity (Swales, 1990), e.g., meeting minutes, citizen speeches at school board meetings, and college lectures.	Thurlow and Aiello (2007) analyze airline tailfin designs as a visual genre and find that they service national identity concerns while also appealing to the international market.
Interdiscursivity	The presence of diverse discourses or genres within a text (Fairclough, 1995a).	Using 60 adversarial political interviews broadcast in the United Kingdom, Hyatt (2005) shows how interdiscursivity is central to the construction of political discourse. One of his examples is the combining of education and economics discourses in a speech by Tony Blair.

Term	Definition and Illustration	Recent Applicaton
Interruption	When one speaker intrudes into another's understood talk turn, most often, but not necessarily, through overlap.	Menz and Al-Roubaie (2008) perform quantitative analysis of doctor-patient interruptions and found differences based on gender and status.
Intertextuality	The presence of elements of other texts within a text either directly (such as reported speech) or indirectly (such as irony).	Li (2009) shows how newspapers in the United States and China draw on intertextual resources to construct national identities in their reporting on U.S.-China relations.
Membership Categorization Terms	Terms for referring to persons that categorize them, and in so doing convey evaluation (Schegloff, 2007) e.g., calling an 18-year-old who is stealing "a boy" or "a man," a "shoplifter," or a "thief."	Mallinson and Brewster (2009) investigate restaurant server categorizations of patrons and the resulting production of "racetalk" and "regiontalk" in server discourse.
Metadiscourse	Discourse about discourse (Craig, 2008). The collection of textual features that organize a writer's or speaker's stance towards the content and the addressee.	Martínez-Guillem (2009) analyzes how speakers in the European Parliament engaging in argumentative communication invoke knowledge about ongoing interactions and past and future communicative events using meta-discourse.
Metaphor	A figure of speech in which one entity is represented as being another; Pervasive in language, thought, and action (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003), e.g., argument is war or time is money.	Ferrari (2007) presents a metaphor-based analysis of the persuasion strategies used by George W. Bush in post-9/11 speeches.
Metonymy	A figure of speech in which an attribute is used to refer to the whole, e.g., using the word "Washington" to refer to the U.S. government or "the crown" in reference to royalty.	Meadows (2005) analyzes metonymical references to conceptualizations of us/them in Bush administration statements about the Iraq conflict.
Mitigation Markers	Words and phrases to soften requests and orders or make assertions less direct, e.g., "if it's not too much trouble" can serve as a mitigation marker in front of "could you wash the dishes."	Kendall (2004) examines mitigation practices at a radio network and shows how they function to create gendered identities.

Appendix 11. A Continued

Term	Definition and Illustration	Recent Applicaton
Modality	The degree of surety about an event, action, or situation (Palmer, 2001). The phrases "it might be a dog," "it must be a dog," and "it is a dog" represent varying degrees of modality.	Lillian (2008) investigates types of modality used in two conservative non-fiction texts by Canadian authors and finds that one constitutes persuasion and the other constitutes manipulation.
Nominalization	The use of an adjective, adverb, or verb as the head of a noun phrase or the process of producing a noun from another part of speech. For example, the verb evaluate can be used in the phrase "we will evaluate the data" or nominalized in the phrase "an evaluation will occur."	Bonnin (2009) analyzes the meanings, uses, and effects of the nominalized entity "reconciliation" in the context of religion and politics in Argentina.
Passivization	The process of transforming the subject of a sentence from an active agent to an object. For example, the sentence, "John moved the table" is constructed such that John is the subject and performer of the actions whereas the sentence, "The table was moved by John" is constructed such that John is an object.	Oteíza and Pinto (2008) show how passivization and other techniques are used to highlight some actors and processes while silencing others in Chilean and Spanish history textbook discussions of dictatorships and subsequent transitions to democracy.
Personification	The process of attributing human qualities to non-living entities, e.g., "the state is proud of her heroes."	Rojo (1995) analyzes the personification of the first Gulf War conflict in terms of good and evil.
Recontextual-ization	The process of transferring an element of a text—e.g., an argument, a quote—to a new context in order to give it new meaning. For example, using Hamlet's "To Be or Not To Be" speech within the context of a debate about the existence of Israel.	Hodges (2008) examines George W. Bush administration officials' and White House journalists' recontextualization of words spoken by General Peter Pace in order to contest each others' claims to the truth in regards to Iranian involvement in Iraq.
Reported Speech	One person's words as quoted or paraphrased by another person, e.g., "I was talking to Jim and he went, 'I won't do it.'"	Stokoe and Edwards (2007) examine the formulation of talk about ethnicity and race through reported speech in U.K. neighborhood disputes.

Term	Definition and Illustration	Recent Applicaton
Speech Act	The social function performed by an utterance. A question could be a compliment, a reprimand, a request for information.	Jiang (2006) analyzes the types of speech acts enacted during press conferences on the North Korea nuclear crisis and found that the frequency and distribution of requests and refusals occurred in conjunction with ideological and cultural indicators.
Synecdoche	A figure of speech in which a part refers to the whole (e.g., workmen as "hired hands").	Adams, Towns, and Gavey (1995) analyze synecdoche and other devices in male discourses about violence towards women that allow them to justify positions of dominance.
Synthetic Personalization	The process of treating mass or impersonal audiences as individuals (Fairclough, 1995a), e.g., fast food restaurants wishing customers to "have a nice day."	Grabowski (2007) identifies how financial institutions create relationships with readers, viewers, and the environment through synthetic personalization.

Notes

1. When we are referring to the field of Communication, we capitalize the "C" and leave unsaid the modifier, "U.S." In the United States, Communication as a field is sharply distinguished from linguistics, business, psychology, etc. Our comments need to be read as focused on the United States.

2. We coded 60 articles of the 286 articles to check reliability. Disagreements were resolved through discussion. In some cases the source of the disagreement raised an interesting interpretation issue. Department affiliation was coded only for the first author and reliability was 85%. Disagreements revolved around whether a department should be classified as communication or a hybrid program. Many non-U.S. program names included communication as part of a larger department name. In resolving disagreements we included these programs in the communication field category. There was 92% agreement for discourse kind, and context was 77%. Coding reliability for identity was 80%, and disagreements related to two issues of conceptual interest. The United States and the U.K. tended to not mark their nationality in keywords but other countries did. Much of the research in non-U.S. and non-U.K. countries was no more identity-focused than that in the U.S. or U.K. The other area of disagreement concerned the "other" versus "non-identity" categories; we coded studies that labeled categories—refugees, alcoholics, politicians—as other.

3. We searched *Communication and Mass Media Complete* for the same 10-year period that we did for *Discourse & Society. Discourse & Society* is one of the journals included in the database so there was overlap, although it was modest. *Communication and Mass Media Complete* includes full coverage of 380

journals and selected coverage of 200 others. Of note, very few of the communication journals sponsored by the International Communication Association, the National Communication Association, or regional U.S. communication journals had critical discourse articles. Most of the articles appeared in multidisciplinary journals with links to language study, linguistics, or culture.

4. Quoted from the back jacket of D&S of the May, 2009, Volume 20.
5. Although the handbook does not foreground CDA, its key authors are cited.
6. Our thanks to an anonymous reviewer for this observation.
7. See http://www.h-net.org/announce/show.cgi?ID=145338.

References

Adams, P., Towns, A., & Gavey, N. (1995). Dominance and entitlement: The rhetoric men use to discuss their violence towards women. *Discourse & Society, 6*, 387–406.

Adeyanju, C. T., & Neverson, N. (2007). "There will be a next time": Media discourse about an "apocalyptic" vision of immigration, racial diversity, and health risks. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 39*, 79–105.

Agar, M. (1985). Institutional discourse. *Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse, 5*, 147–168.

Agyekum, K. (2004). Invective language in contemporary Ghanaian politics. *Journal of Language & Politics, 3*, 345–375.

Ainsworth, S., & Hardy, C. (2004). Critical discourse analysis and identity: Why bother? *Critical Discourse Studies, 1*, 225–259.

Alexander, R. J. (2009). *Framing discourse on the environment: A critical discourse approach.* New York: Routledge.

Antaki, C. (2006). Producing a "cognition." *Discourse Studies, 8*, 9–15.

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1999). Jefferson's transcript notation. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 158–166). London: Routledge.

Augoustinos, M., Tuffin, K., & Every, D. (2005). New racism, meritocracy and individualism: Constraining affirmative action in education. *Discourse & Society, 16*, 315–340.

Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravinik, M., Krzyzanowski, M., McEnery, A. M., & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society, 19*, 273–306.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2008). Discourse and/or communication: Living with ambiguity. *Discourse and Communication, 2*, 327–332.

Bargiela-Chiappini, F., & Harris, S. J. (1997). *Managing language: The discourse of corporate meetings.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bar-Lev, Z. (2007). Mrs. Goldberg's rebuttal of Butt et al. *Discourse & Society, 18*, 183–196.

Bartesaghi, M. (2009). Conversation and psychotherapy: How questioning reveals institutional answers. *Discourse & Society, 11*, 153–177.

Barthes, R. (1957). *Mythologies.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Bell, A. (1991). *The language of news media.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Bell, A. (1997). The discourse structure of news stories. In A. Bell & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 64–104). Oxford, UK: Blackwell,

Bell, A. (2003). Poles apart: Globalisation and the development of news discourse in the twentieth century. In J. Aitchison, & D. Lewis (Eds.), *New media language* (pp. 7–17). London: Routledge.

Berk-Seligson, S. (2009). *Coerced confessions: The discourse of bilingual police interrogations.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bergvall, V., & Remlinger, K. (1996). Reproduction, resistance, and gender in educational discourse: The role of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 7*, 453–579.

Billig, M. (1985). Prejudice, categorization and particularisation. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 15*, 79–103.

Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology* (1st ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism.* London: Sage.

Billig, M. (1999a). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse & Society, 10*, 543–557.

Billig, M. (1999b). Conversation analysis and the claims of naivety. *Discourse & Society, 10*, 572–576.

Billig, M. (2001). Humour and hatred: The racist jokes of the Ku Klux Klan. *Discourse & Society, 12*, 267–289.

Billig, M. (2003). Critical discourse analysis and the rhetoric of critique. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 35–46). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Billig, M. (2008a). The language of critical discourse analysis: The case of nominalization. *Discourse & Society, 19*, 783–800.

Billig, M. (2008b). Nominalizing and denominalizing: A reply. *Discourse & Society, 19*, 829–841.

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas.* London: Sage.

Binbin, Z. (1999). Asymmetry and mitigation in Chinese medical interviews. *Health Communication, 11*, 209–215.

Blackledge, A. (2006). The racialization of language in British political discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies, 3*, 61–79.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 29*, 447–466.

Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2007). *The practice of critical discourse analysis: An introduction.* London: Arnold.

Bonilla-Silva, E., & Forman, T. A. (2000). "I am not a racist but...": Mapping white college students' racial ideology in the USA. *Discourse & Society, 11*, 50–85.

Bonnin, J. E. (2009). Religious and political discourse in Argentina: The case of reconciliation. *Discourse & Society, 20*, 327–343.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bradby, H., Gabe, J., & Bury, M. (1995). 'Sexy docs' and 'busty blondes': Press coverage of professional misconduct cases brought before the General Medical Council. *Sociology of Health and Illness, 17*, 458–476.

Brooks, K. P. de., & Waymer, D. (2009). Public relations and strategic issues man-

agement challenges in Venezuela: A discourse analysis of Crystallex International Corporation in Las Cristinas. *Public Relations Review, 35*, 31–39.

Bucholtz, M. (2009). Captured on tape: Professional hearing and competing entextualizations in the criminal justice system. *Text & Talk, 29*, 503–523.

Caffarel, A., & Rechniewski, E. (2008). When is a handover not a handover? A case study of ideological opposed news stories. In E. Thomson & P. White (Eds.), *Communicating conflict: Multilingual case studies of the news media* (pp. 25–50). London: Continuum.

Caldas-Coulthard, C. R., & Van Leeuwen, T. J. (2002). Stunning, shimmering, iridescent: Toys as the representation of gendered social actors. In L. Litosseliti & J. Sunderland (Eds.), *Gender identity and discourse analysis* (pp. 91–108). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cameron, D. (1998). "Is there any ketchup, Vera?": Gender, power and pragmatics. *Discourse & Society, 9*, 437–455.

Cameron, D. (2003). Gender and language ideology. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 447–467). Malden, MA: Blackwell

Cameron, D. (2006). Performing gender identity: Young men's talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (2nd ed., pp. 419–432). London: Routledge.

Campbell, S., & Roberts, C. (2007). Migration, ethnicity and competing discourses in the job interview: Synthesizing the institutional and personal. *Discourse & Society, 13*, 243–271.

Carvalho, A. (2005). Representing the politics of the greenhouse effect. *Critical Discourse Studies, 2*, 1–29.

Charteris-Black, J. (2006). Britain as a container: Immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign. *Discourse & Society, 17*, 563–581.

Chibnall, S. (1977). *Law-and-order news: An analysis of crime reporting in the British press.* London: Tavistock.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice.* London: Routledge.

Chilton, P. (2005). Missing links in mainstream CDA: Modules, blends and the critical Instinct. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *New agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 19–51). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chilton, P. (2007). Missing links in mainstream CDA: Modules, blends and the critical instinct. In R. Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A new research agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (2nd ed., pp. 19–52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chouliaraki, L. (1998). Regulation in 'progressivist' pedagogic discourse: Individualized teacher-pupil talk. *Discourse & Society, 9*, 5–32.

Chouliaraki, L. (2004). Watching September 11th: The politics of pity. *Discourse and Society, 15*, 185–198.

Chouliaraki, L. (2005). The soft power of war: Political and media discourses on the Iraq war. *Journal of Language and Politics, 3*, 1–10.

Chouliaraki, L. (2006). *Spectatorship of suffering.* London: Sage.

Chouliaraki, L (2008). Symbolic power of transnational media: managing the visibility of suffering. *Global Media and Communication, 4*, 329–351.

Chouliaraki, L (2009). Witnessing war: Economies of regulation in reporting war and conflict. *The Communication Review, 12*, 215–226.

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cobb, S. (1994). A critique of critical discourse analysis: Deconstructing and reconstructing the role of intention. *Communication Theory, 4*, 132–152.

Collins, C., & Jones, P. E. (2006). Analysis of discourse as "a form of history writing": A critique of critical discourse analysis and an illustration of a cultural-historical alternative. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 14*, (1/2), 51–69.

Craig, R. T. (2008). Meta-discourse. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of communication* (Vol. VII, pp. 3107–3109). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (Eds.). (1983). *Conversational coherence: Form, structure, and strategy.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Cramer, J. M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis. In S. L. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (pp. 220–223). Los Angeles: Sage.

Dabbous-Sensenig, D. (2006). To veil or not to veil: Gender and religion on Al-Jazeera's Islamic law and life. *Westminster Papers in Communication & Culture, 3*(2), 60–85.

De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse & Society, 10*, 149–173.

Deetz, S. A. (1982). Critical interpretive research in organizational communication. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46*, 131–149.

Deetz, S., Heath, R., & MacDonald, J. (2007). On talking to not make decisions: A critical analysis of organizational talk. In F. Cooren (Ed.), *Interacting and organizing: Analyses of a management meeting* (pp. 225–244). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Del Teso-Craviotto, M. (2008). Gender and sexual identity authentication in language use: The case of chat rooms. *Discourse Studies, 10*, 251–270.

Delanty, G., Jones, P., & Wodak, R. (2008). *Migration, identity, and belonging.* Liverpool, UK: University of Liverpool Press.

Drew, P. (2005). Conversation analysis. In K. Fitch & R. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 71–102). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eggins, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics.* London: Pinter.

Ehrlich, S. (2003). Coercing gender: Language in sexual assault adjudication processes. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *Handbook of language and gender* (pp. 645–671). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Ericson, R. V., Baranek, P. M., & Chan, J. B. L. (1987). *Visualizing deviance: A study of news organizations.* Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Eriksson, K., & Aronsson, K. (2005). "We're really lucky": Co-creating "us" and the "other" in school booktalk. *Discourse & Society, 16*, 719–738.

Erjavec, K. (2009). The "Bosnian war on terrorism." *Journal of Language & Politics, 8*, 5–27.

Every, D., & Agoustinos, M. (2007). Constructions of racism in the Australian parliamentary debates on asylum seekers. *Discourse & Society, 18*, 411–436.

Every, D., & Agoustinos, M. (2008). Constructions of Australia in pro- and anti-asylum seeker political discourse. *Nations & Nationalism, 14*, 562–580.

Fairclough, N. (1988). Discourse representation in media discourse. *Sociolinguistics, 17*, 125–139.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power.* Essex, UK: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society, 4*, 133–168.

Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.

Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media discourse.* London: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (1996). A reply to Henry Widdowson's "Discourse analysis: A critical view." *Language & Literature, 5,* 49–56.

Fairclough, N. (2002). Language in new capitalism. *Discourse & Society, 13,* 163–166.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2004). Critical discourse analysis in researching language in the new capitalism: Overdetermination, transdisciplinarity and textual analysis. In L. Y. C. Harrison (Ed.), *Systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis* (pp. 103–122). New York: Continuum.

Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and globalization.* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: Reply to Michael Billig. *Discourse & Society, 19,* 811–819.

Fairclough, N. (2009). *Language and power.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258–284). London: Sage.

Fairclough, N., Graham, P., Lemke, J., & Wodak, R. (2004). Introduction. *Critical Discourse Studies, 1,* 1–7.

Fairhurst, G. T. (1993). The leader-member exchange patterns of women leaders in industry: A discourse analysis. *Communication Monographs, 60,* 321–351.

Fairhurst, G. T., & Putnam, L. (2004). Organizations as discursive constructions. *Communication Theory, 14,* 5–26.

Ferrari, F. (2007). Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: Investigating a 'preventative war' persuasion strategy. *Discourse & Society, 18,* 603–625.

Fine, M. (2003). Sexuality, school, and adolescent females: The missing discourse of desire. In A. Darder, B. Marta, & D. T. Rodolfo (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 296–321). New York: Routledge.

Firth, A. (Ed.). (1994). *The discourse of negotiation: Studies of language in the workplace.* London: Pergamon/Elsevier Science.

Fiske, J. (1988). Critical response: Meaningful moments. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 5,* 246–251.

Fiske, J. (1996). *Media matters: Race and gender in US politics.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fiske, J., & Hartley, J. (1978). *Reading television.* London: Methuen.

Fitch, K., & Sanders, R. (2005). *Handbook of language and social interaction.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Flores, L. (2009). Critical race theory. In S. L. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 231–234). Los Angeles: Sage.

Foucault, M. ([1969]1972). *The archaeology of knowledge.* London: Routledge.

Fuchsel, H. G., & Martín Rojo, L. (2003). Civic and ethnic nationalistic discourses in Spanish parliamentary debates. *Journal of Language & Politics, 2,* 31–70.

Gales, T. (2009). 'Diversity' as enacted in us immigration politics and law: A corpus-based approach. *Discourse & Society, 20,* 223–240.

Ganesh, S. (2009). Critical organizational communication. In S. L. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (pp. 226–230). Los Angeles: Sage.

García Agustín, O. (2008). Fronteras discursivas: Las políticas migratorias de inclu-

sión y exclusión en la Unión Europea [Discursive borders: migration policies of inclusion and exclusion in the European Union]. *Discurso y Sociedad, 2,* 742–768.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* London: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2006). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Goodman, S., & Speer, S. A. (2007). Category use in the construction of asylum seekers. *Critical Discourse Studies, 4,* 165–185

Grabowski, I. (2007). Consumed by consumerism: The pervasive discourse of financial institutions. *Language and Ecology, 2,* 1–15.

Graham, P., Keenan, T., & Dowd, A. M. (2004). A call to arms at the end of history: A discourse–historical analysis of George W. Bush's declaration of war on terror. *Discourse & Society, 15,* 199–221.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks.* London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hafen, S. (2009). Patriots in the classroom: Performing positionalities post 9/11. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, 6,* 61–83.

Hall, S. (1972). The determination of news photographs. *Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 3,* 53–89.

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J., & Roberts, B. (1978). *Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state, and law and order.* London: Macmillan.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *Introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.

Hammersley, M. (1997). On the foundation of critical discourse analysis. *Language & Communication, 17,* 237–248.

Haraty, N., Oueini, A., & Bahous, R. (2007). Speaking to domestics in Lebanon: Power issues or misguided communication. *Journal of Intercultural Communication, 14.* Retrieved from http://www.immi.se/intercultural

Harding, R. (2006). Historical representations of aboriginal people in the Canadian news media *Discourse & Society, 17,* 205–235.

Hart, C. (2008). Critical discourse analysis and metaphor: Toward a theoretical framework. *Critical Discourse Studies, 5,* 91–106.

Hartley, J. (1982). *Understanding news.* London: Methuen.

Hartley, J. (1992). *The politics of pictures: The creation of the public in the age of popular media.* London: Routledge.

Hartley, J. (1996). *Popular reality: Journalism, modernity, popular culture.* London: Arnold.

He, A. (2006). Subject matter in Hong Kong primary English classrooms: A critical analysis of teacher talk. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 3,* 169–188.

Higgins, M. (2004). The articulation of nation and politics in the Scottish press. *Journal of Language & Politics, 3,* 463–483.

Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1988). *Social semiotics* (2nd ed.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Hodges, A. (2008). The politics of recontextualization: Discursive competition over claims of Iranian involvement in Iraq. *Discourse & Society, 19,* 483–505.

Hodges, A., & Nilep, C. (2007). *Discourse, war and terrorism.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Holmes, J., & Meyerhoff, M. (2003). Different voices, different views: An introduction

to current research in language and gender. In J. H. M. Meyerhoff (Ed.), *Handbook on language and gender* (pp. 1–17). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Huang, Y., & Chen, J.-p. (2009). Discursive democratization in Mainland China: A diachronic study of the New Year's editorials in the People's Daily. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 19*, 199–217.

Huspek, M. (1989/90). The idea of ethnography and cultural critique. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 23*, 293–302.

Huspek, M. (1993). Dueling structures: The theory of resistance in discourse. *Communication Theory, 3*, 1–25.

Huspek, M. (1997). Toward normative theories of communication with reference to the Frankfurt school: An introduction. *Communication Theory, 7*, 265–276.

Huspek, M., & Kendall, K. (1991). On withholding analysis of the political vocabulary of a 'non-political' speech community. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 77*, 1–19.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices, and applications*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Hyatt, D. (2005). Time for a change: A critical discoursal analysis of synchronic context with diachronic relevance. *Discourse & Society, 16*, 515–534.

Iedema, R., Feez, S., & White, P. R. (1994). *Media literacy (write it right literacy in industry research project — stage 2*. Sydney, Australia: Metropolitan East Disadvantaged School Program.

Jäger, S. (2001). Discourse and knowledge: Theoretical and methodological aspects of a critical discourse and dispositive analysis. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 32–62). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jenkings, N. K., & Barber, N. (2006). Same evidence, different meanings: Transformation of textual evidence in hospital new drugs committees. *Text and Talk, 26*, 169–189.

Jian, G., Schmisseur, A. M., & Fairhurst, G. (2008). Organizational discourse and communication: The progeny of Proteus. *Discourse & Communication, 2*, 299–355.

Jiang, X. (2006). Cross-cultural pragmatic differences in the US and Chinese press conferences: The case of the North Korea nuclear crisis. *Discourse & Society, 17*, 237–257.

Johnstone, B., & Eisenhart, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Rhetoric in detail*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jones, P. E. (2007). Why there is no such thing as "critical discourse analysis." *Language & Communication, 27*, 337–368.

Kalmus, V. (2003). 'Is interethnic integration possible in Estonia?': Ethno-political discourse of two ethnic groups *Discourse & Society, 14*, 667–697.

Kariithi, N., & Kareithi, P. (2007). It's off to work you go! *Journalism Studies, 8*, 465–480.

Kaufer, D., & Hariman, R. (2008). Discriminating political styles as genres: A corpus study exploring Hariman's theory of political style. *Text & Talk, 28*, 475–500.

Kendall, S. (2004). Framing authority: Gender, face, and mitigation at a radio network. *Discourse & Society, 15*, 55–79.

KhosraviNik, M. (2009). The representation of refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants in British newspapers during the Balkan conflict (1999) and the British general election (2005). *Discourse & Society, 20*, 477–498.

Kitzinger, C. (2005a). "Speaking as a heterosexual": (How) does sexuality matter for talk-in-interaction? *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 38*, 221–265.

Kitzinger, C. (2005b). Heteronormativity in action: Reproducing the heterosexual nuclear family in after-hour medical calls. *Social Problems, 52*, 477–498.

Kitzinger, C. (2006). After post-cognitivism. *Discourse Studies, 8*, 67–83.

Kleiner, B. (1998). The modern racist ideology and its reproduction in "pseudo-argument" *Discourse & Society, 9*, 187–215.

Kosic, A., & Triandafyllidou, A. (2004). Representations of the European Union and the nation(-state) in Italian party discourse. *Journal of Language and Politics, 3*, 53–80.

Kress, G. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. London: Routledge.

Kress, G., & Hodge, R. (1979). *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse*. Oxford, UK: Hodder Arnold.

Kress, G., Leite-García, R., & van Leeuwen, T. (1997). Discourse semiotics. In T. A. van. Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process* (pp. 257–291). London: Sage.

Kuo, S. H. (2003). Involvement vs detachment: Gender differences in the use of personal pronouns in televised sports in Taiwan. *Discourse Studies 5*, 479–494.

Kuo, S. (2007). Language as ideology: Analyzing quotations in Taiwanese news discourse. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 17*, 281–301.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by* (rev. ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lario Bastida, M. (2008). Crónica crítica del debate político sobre migraciones en España [Critical account of the political debate on migration in Spain]. *Discurso y Sociedad, 2*, 769–798.

Lazar, A., & Lazar, M. M. (2008). Discourse of global governance: American hegemony in the post-cold war era. *Journal of Language & Politics, 7*, 228–246.

Lazar, M. M. (2000). Gender discourse and semiotics: The politics of parenthood representations. *Discourse & Society, 11*, 373–400.

Lazar, M. M. (2007). Feminist critical discourse analysis: Articulating a feminist discourse praxis. *Critical Discourse Studies, 4*, 141–164.

Lazar, M. M. (Ed.). (2005). *Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse*. London: Palgrave.

LeCouteur, A., Rapley, M., & Augoustinos, M. (2001). "This very difficult debate about WIK": Stake, voice and the management of category memberships in race politics. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 40*, 35–57.

Lee, J. S. (2007). North Korea, South Korea, and *007 Die Another day. Critical Discourse Studies, 4*, 207–235.

Li, J. (2009). Intertextuality and national identity: Discourse of national conflicts in daily newspapers in the United States and China. *Discourse & Society, 20*, 85–121.

Lillian, D. L. (2008). Modality, persuasion and manipulation in Canadian conservative discourse. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines, 20*, 1–16.

Locke, T. (2004). *Critical discourse analysis*. New York: Continuum.

MacDonald, M. N. (2002). Pedagogy, pathology and ideology: The production, transmission and reproduction of medical discourse. *Discourse & Society, 13*, 447–468.

Maidza, N. (2008). Many faces of regime change politics: A critical analysis of a delection of Mahoso's African focus articles. *Nawa: Journal of Language & Communication, 2*, 89–104.

Mallinson, C., & Brewster, Z. W. (2009). "Blacks and bubbas": Stereotypes, ideology,

and categorization processes in restaurant servers' discourse. *Discourse & Society, 16*, 787–807.

Martin, J. R. (2008). Incongruent and proud: De-vilifying 'nominalization'. *Discourse & Society, 19*, 801–810.

Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. London: Continuum.

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave.

Martínez-Guillem, S. (2009). Argumentation, metadiscourse and social cognition: Organizing knowledge in political communication. *Discourse & Society, 20*, 727–746.

Matheson, D. (2005). *Media discourses: Analysing media texts*. New York: Open University Press.

Maynard, D. W. (2006). Cognition on the ground. *Discourse Studies 8*, 105–115.

McKenna, B. (2004). Critical discourse studies: Where to from here? *Critical Discourse Studies, 1*, 9–39.

McKerrow, R. (2009). Critical rhetoric. In S. L. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 234–237). Los Angeles: Sage.

Meadows, B. (2005). Distancing and showing solidarity via metaphor and metonymy in political discourse: A critical study of American statements on Iraq during the years 2004–2005. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines, 1*, 1–17.

Mehan, H. (1997). The discourse of the illegal immigration debate. *Discourse & Society, 8*, 249–270.

Mehan, H. (2001). The construction of an LD student: A case study in the politics of representation. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice* (pp. 345–363). London: Sage.

Menz, F., & Al-Roubaie, A. (2008). Interruptions, status and gender in medical interviews: The harder you brake, the longer it takes. *Discourse & Society, 19*, 645–666.

Mertz, E. (1998). Linguistic ideology and praxis in US law school classrooms In B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 149–162). New York: Oxford University Press.

Mertz, E. (2007). *The language of law school: Learning to "think like a lawyer."* New York: Oxford University Press.

Mey, I. (2001). The CA/CDA controversy. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 609–615.

Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In M. Meyer & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 14–31). London: Sage.

Moita-Lopes, L. P. (2006). Queering literacy teaching: Analyzing gay-themed discourses in a fifth-grade class in Brazil. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 5*, 31–50.

Mumby, D. K., & Clair, R. P. (1997). Organizational discourse. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies. Volume 2. Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 181–205). London: Sage.

Mumby, D. K., & Stohl, C. (1991). Power and discourse in organization. *Discourse & Society, 2*, 313–332.

Ono, K. A. (2009). Critical/cultural approaches to communication. In W. F. Eadie (Ed.), *21st century communication: A reference handbook* (Vol. 1, pp. 74–81). Los Angeles: Sage.

O'Regan, J. P. (2006). The text as a critical object: On theorizing exegetic procedures in classroom-based critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies, 3*, 179–209.

Orpin, D. (2005). Corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis: Examining the ideology of sleaze. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 10*, 37–61.

Oteíza, T., & Pinto, D. (2008). Agency, responsibility and silence in the construction of contemporary history in Chile and Spain. *Discourse & Society, 19*, 33–358.

Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Patrona, M. (2006). Conversationalization and media empowerment in Greek television discussion programs. *Discourse & Society, 17*, 5–27.

Philips, S. U. (1998). *Ideology in the language of judges: How judges practice law, politics, and courtroom control*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Philipsen, G., & Coutu, L. M. (2005). The ethnography of speaking. In K. Fitch & R. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 355–380). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Philp, M. (1985). Michel Foucault. In Q. Skinner (Ed.), *The return of grand theory in the human sciences* (pp. 65–81). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pitt, K. (2002). Being a new capitalist mother. *Discourse & Society, 13*, 251–267.

Prins, E., & Toso, B. W. (2008). Defining and measuring parenting for educational success: A critical discourse analysis of the parent education profile. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*, 555–596.

Putnam, L. L., & Cooren, F. (2004). Alternative perspectives on the role of text and agency in constituting organizations. *Organization, 11*, 323–333.

Putnam, L. L., & Fairhurst, G. T. (2001). Discourse analysis in organizations: Issues and concerns. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 78–136). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination*. London: Routledge.

Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rogers, R., Malancharuvi-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & O'Garro, G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 75*, 365–416.

Rojo, L. M. (1995). Division and rejection: From the personification of the gulf conflict to the demonization of Saddam Hussein. *Discourse & Society, 6*, 49–80.

Ruiseco, G., & Slunecko, T. (2006). The role of mythical European heritage in the construction of Colombian national identity. *Journal of Language & Politics, 5*, 359–384.

Saft, S., & Ohara, Y. (2006). The media and the pursuit of militarism in Japan: Newspaper editorials in the aftermath of 9/11. *Critical Discourse Studies, 3*, 81–101.

Santa Ana, O. (1999). "Like an animal I was treated": Anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse. *Discourse & Society, 10*, 191–224.

Sarangi, C., & Roberts, C. (Eds.). (1999). *Talk, work and institutional order: Discourse in medical, mediation and management settings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society, 8*, 165–187.

Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue - reply to Wetherell. *Discourse & Society, 9*, 413–416.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999a). "Schegloff's texts" as "Billig's data": A critical reply. *Discourse & Society, 10*, 558–572.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999b). Naiveté vs. sophistication or discipline vs. self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig. *Discourse & Society, 10*, 577–582.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R. (2002). Racialization and language policy: The case of the USA. *Multilingua, 21*, 141–161.

Schubert, S. J., Hanson, S., Dyer, K. R., & Rapley, M. (2009). "ADHD patient" or "illicit drug user"? Managing medico-moral membership categories in drug dependencies services. *Discourse & Society, 20*, 499–516.

Scollon, R. (2005). The discourses of food in the world system: Toward a nexus analysis of a world problem. *Journal of Language & Politics, 4*, 465–488.

Shaw, S. (2000). Language, gender and floor apportionment in political debates. *Discourse & Society, 11*, 401–418.

Shi-xu. (2009). Editorial. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 4*, 239–241.

Simmons, K., & Lecoteur, A. (2008). Modern racism in the media: Constructions of 'the possibility of change' in accounts of two Australian 'riots.' *Discourse & Society, 19*, 667–687.

Stamou, A. G., & Paraskevopoulos, S. (2008). Representing protection action in an ecotourism setting: A critical discourse analysis of visitors' books at a Greek reserve. *Critical Discourse Studies, 5*, 35–54.

Stokoe, E., & Edwards, D. (2007). 'Black this, black that': Racial insults and reported speech in neighbour complaints and police interrogations. *Discourse & Society, 18*, 337–372.

Stokoe, E., & Smithson, J. (2002). Gender and sexuality in talk-in-interaction: Considering conversation analytic perspectives. In P. McIlvenny (Ed.), *Talking gender and sexuality: Conversation, performativity and discourse in interaction* (pp. 79–110). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stubbs, M. (1996). *Text and corpus analysis*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Ballantine.

Tannock, S. (1999). Working with insults: Discourse and difference in an inner-city youth organization. *Discourse & Society, 10*, 317–350.

Taylor, J. R. (2008). Communication and discourse: Is the bridge language? Response to Jian et al. *Discourse & Communication, 2*, 347–352.

ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis*. London: Sage.

Teo, P. (2000). Racism in the news: A critical discourse analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers. *Discourse & Society, 11*, 7–49.

Thompson, E. A., & White, P. R. R. (Eds.). (2008). *Communicating conflict: Multilingual case studies of the news media*. London: Continuum.

Thorne, A., & Coupland, J. (1998). Articulations of same-sex desire: Lesbian and gay male dating advertisements. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 2*, 233–257.

Thurlow, C. (2001). Naming the "outsider within": Homophobic pejoratives and the verbal abuse of lesbian, gay and bisexual high-school pupils. *Journal of Adolescence, 24*, 25–38.

Thurlow, C., & Aiello, G. (2007). National pride, global capital: A social semiotic

analysis of transnational visual branding in the airline industry. *Visual Communication, 6*, 305–344.

Tilbury, F., & Colic-Peisker, V. (2006). Deflecting responsibility in employer talk about race discrimination. *Discourse & Society, 17*, 651–676.

Tileaga, C. (2005). Accounting for extreme prejudice and legitimating blame in talk about the Romanies. *Discourse & Society, 16*, 603–624.

Toolan, M. (1997). What is critical discourse analysis and why are people saying such terrible things about it? *Language and Literature, 6*, 83–103.

Toolan, M. (2002). *Critical discourse analysis: Critical concepts in linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Tracy, K. (2005). Reconstructing communicative practices: Action-implicative discourse analysis. In K. Fitch & R. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 301–319). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tracy, K. (2008). Language and social interaction. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of communication* (pp. 2645–2655). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Trix, F., & Psenka, C. (2003). Exploring the color of glass: Letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty. *Discourse & Society, 14*, 191–220.

van Dijk, T. A. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Dijk, T. A. (1986). *Racism in the press*. London: Edward Arnold.

van Dijk, T. A. (1987). *Communicating racism. Ethnic prejudice in thought and talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA, a plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95–120). London: Sage.

van Dijk, T. A. (2008a). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

van Dijk, T. A. (2008b). Critical discourse analysis and nominalization: Problem or pseudo-problem? *Discourse & Society, 19*, 821–828.

van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and discourse*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.

van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

van Noppen, J.-P. (2004). CDA: A discipline come of age? *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 8*, 107–126.

Vannini, A. (2009). Critical ethnography. In S. L. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 223–226). Los Angeles: Sage.

Vannini, P., & McCright, A. M. (2007). Technologies of the sky: A socio-semiotic and critical analysis of televised weather discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies, 4*, 49–74.

Vico, G. (1948). *The new science*. New York: Ithaca.

Volosinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. New York: Seminar press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Wagner, I., & Wodak, R. (2006). Performing success: Identifying strategies of self-presentation in women's biographical narratives. *Discourse & Society, 17*, 385–411.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., & Jackson, D. D. (1967). *Pragmatics of human communication*. New York: Norton.

Weatherall, A., & Gallois, C. (2003). Gendered identity: Complexities/intersections. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *Handbook of language and gender* (pp. 487–508). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity in critical discourse analysis*. London: Palgrave.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society, 9*, 387–412.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1993). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. New York: Columbia University Press.

White, P. R. (2004). Subjectivity, evaluation and point of view in media discourse. In C. Coffin, A. Hewings, & K. O'Halloran (Eds.), *Applying English grammar: Functional and corpus approaches* (pp. 229–246). London: Arnold.

White, P. R. (2006). Evaluative semantics and ideological positioning in journalistic discourse. In I. Lassen, J. Strunck & T. Vestergaard (Eds.), *Mediating ideology in text and image: Ten critical studies* (pp. 37–67). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language & Literature, 4*, 157–172.

Widdowson, H. G. (1998). The theory and practice of critical discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 136–151.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R. (1989). *Language, power, and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. London: Longman.

Wodak, R. (2002). Fragmented Identities: Redefining and recontextualizing national identity. In P. Chilton & S. Christina (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wodak, R. (2006). Mediation between discourse and society: Assessing cognitive approaches in CDA. *Discourse Studies, 8*, 179–190.

Wodak, R. (2007). Discourses in European Union organizations: Aspects of access, participation, and exclusion. *Text & Talk, 27*, 655–680.

Wodak, R., & Chilton, P. (2007). *A new agenda in critical discourse analysis, 2nd ed.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wodak, R., & Fairclough, N. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258–284). London: Sage.

Wodak, R., & Kovacs, A. (2004). National identities in times of supra-national challenges: The debates on NATO and neutrality in Austria and Hungary *Journal of Language & Politics, 3*, 209–246.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Wodak, R., & Richardson, J. E. (2009). On the politics of remembering (or not). *Critical Discourse Studies, 6*, 231–235.

12   *Commentary* Discourse, Context, and Interdisciplinarity

Ruth Wodak

University of Lancaster

1.   Dimensions of Comparison

The three contributions I was asked to discuss cover relevant social phenomena from very different perspectives: on the one hand, language attitudes consciously and subconsciously co-determine our perceptions of others in all possible contexts; on the other, the expression of emotions, such as love, governs in manifold ways our interpersonal relationships, our behaviors, and our activities. And third, critical problem-oriented qualitative research, as illustrated by many approaches in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), offers an entry point to investigate salient factors co-determining our daily lives. Thus, the three chapters in this section differ significantly in that one chapter reviews research on a specific phenomenon (love), the second chapter reviews research on an important factor which accompanies all communication (language attitudes), whereas the third contribution discusses a particular school in the domain of Discourse Studies (Critical Discourse Analysis), which could be employed and applied to study both love or attitudes towards language use. Hence, the three chapters have to be regarded as belonging to different dimensions of scholarly work: oriented towards specific social phenomena (as objects of investigation) in contrast to theoretical and methodological approaches which could be used to study such phenomena.

In all three chapters, however, it becomes obvious, that—although the theoretical and methodological approaches differ significantly (see below)—the context of an utterance (such as social, cultural, historical, genre-specific, language-specific, peer-group specific, organizational, gender-specific, class-specific, and so forth) has a major impact on both decisions on how to study a phenomenon as well as on the enactment and realisation of attitudes, discourses, and emotions. It is thus not surprising that the chapters all foreground contextual factors and attempt to integrate them into existing (or new) research models.

In my necessarily brief considerations, I will thus focus on the salience of theorizing and operationalizing context in communication studies. Such a focus entails, I claim, both interdisciplinary research and the study of authentic, natural occurring communication, be it written, oral, or visual. Studying